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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

For five days in May 2001, Honolulu played host to the Asian Development Bank's 34th Annual Meeting of the Board of Governors, a formal gathering of finance ministers from the bank's 59 member nations, and attended by 2,000 bankers, business people, economists, journalists, and other participants. Honolulu won the opportunity to host the conference by default when Seattle, which had originally won the bidding, backed out because it would have had to shoulder the cost of security preparations for the conference, a concern that had dramatically changed after the World Trade Organization summit that was held there a year and a half earlier in December 1999.

Hawai'i Governor Benjamin Cayetano appointed an Executive Committee that would oversee the State's end of preparations for the conference. State officials declared that hosting the meeting would boost the State's sagging economy - with at least $11 million from direct spending by conference delegates - and that the conference's success would put Hawaii on the map for future major international conferences. However, its success, according to its organizers, depended largely on the State's ability to deal with potentially violent protests and other security concerns.

Months before the conference formally opened, fears of violence similar to the one that rocked the WTO summit and the city of Seattle in 1999 began to grow. Stories and images from that event were resurrected in the news coverage of the run up to the actual meeting. Local businesses, particularly those located around the Convention Center, were reportedly making plans to board up store windows or simply close shop during the entire week that the ADB was meeting. The Honolulu Police Department

1 The expected number of conference attendees was 3,000.
announced that it would enlist the help of Federal law enforcement experts, especially those that were familiar with similar events and had had experience handling crowds at these events, as well as the National Guard. Security preparation for the ADB conference became Hawaii’s largest single-event law enforcement operation.

ADBwatch, an umbrella group of environmental, human rights, social justice, Hawaiian sovereignty, and academic organizations spearheaded the movement that sought to use the occasion as an opportunity inform the public about the bank’s projects and policies and how these have negatively affected the lives of the people in the countries that the ADB are supposed to be aiding through loans and technical assistance. In the months leading up to the conference, the coalition group sponsored various forums and discussions on the ADB and its policies and programs and why these have served to exacerbate the impoverished conditions of people from the countries it is ostensibly supposed to help.

The conference became a big media event, not so much because of what was going on within the convention center, but because of the massive media focus on potentially violent protests by the “anti-globalization movement,” which never transpired. The Honolulu Advertiser, Hawaii’s largest daily newspaper, was one of those media institutions that demonstrated a bias in their coverage of the protests against the Asian Development Bank in the form of its focus on the protests rather than the meeting itself, and on its portrayal of the opposition. The Advertiser’s bias was also evident in the way it framed the Honolulu protests as a possible repeat of the “rioting in Seattle”; thus framed, the Honolulu protests were fated to be defined in terms of violence as the
premise, even though the protesters had, from the very beginning made peace their promise. This bias arises from the media institution’s organizational structure as well as from its position as an industry that is part of a larger political-economic framework. While the criteria for newsworthiness includes a story’s relevance to the audience’s concerns, these also include drama, negativity, and conflict. Such criteria have been used, intentionally or not, to underscore the anti-globalization movement’s actions rather than the issues it raises. These have also been used to project the small anarchic minority within the movement as representative of the entire movement. News gathering and reporting is structured by space and time constraints – journalists must meet a daily deadline and be able to encapsulate even the most complex issues within specified column inches. This often makes it nearly impossible to articulate the subtle nuances of the debates surrounding globalization, the global economy, and the responses of civil society.
CHAPTER II. METHODOLOGY

This research, a critical discourse analysis of the Honolulu Advertiser’s coverage of the anti-ADB protests, juxtaposes the Advertiser’s news coverage of the ADB opposition with the interviews with the different stakeholders in the story – Hawai‘i government officials who directed preparations for the conference on behalf of the US government; local business people who participated in the conference; members and supporters of the protest actions against the Asian Development Bank; and Advertiser editors and reporters who covered the different aspects of the conference.

Data for this research consists of the Advertiser news articles, printed materials from the ADB and the ADBwatch, and the interviews with individuals who represented the government, business sector, and civil society. Several Advertiser reporters and journalists who were directly involved in the coverage of the conference were also interviewed in order to determine how the newspaper planned its coverage of the conference and the protests.

The starting point for gathering data on the news coverage of the conference was the identification of the news articles on the ADB conference that appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser. The articles were identified through a database search and then accessed on microfilm at the University of Hawai‘i at Manoa Hamilton Library. All news articles that were accessed were printed for reference.² These articles were used to establish what the Advertiser reported about the conference and the protests and were compared to the responses obtained through the interviews.

² One article, Rod Ohira’s “Security plans gel for Asian Development Bank meeting” was received as an e-mail through the ADBwatch listserve.
Information provided by the Asian Development Bank was also used as resource material. This was an integral part of the analysis as it also provided a reference point for looking at how the Advertiser presented the bank’s arguments and claims.

Interviews with 16 individuals were conducted over a period of three months. All but three of the interviews were conducted in person; the remaining three interviews were conducted over the phone. All but one interview was recorded on a micro-cassette recorder and then transcribed for reference. Notes from the unrecorded interview were taken down, and are included in this research as part of the interview transcripts.

Four of the respondents were government officials; two came from the local business community in Hawai‘i; four were from ADB opposition groups; two were in editorial positions at the Honolulu Advertiser; and four were Advertiser reporters.

Government officials interviewed for this research were Dr. Seiji Naya of the Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism; Governor Cayetano’s Executive Policy Assistant for National & International Affairs Brenda Lei Foster; and former Hawai‘i Tourism Authority Robert Fishman. Naya, Foster and Fishman formed the Executive Committee appointed by Governor Benjamin Cayetano. The fourth resource person from the government declined to be identified. Both respondents from the business community also chose not to be identified in this study. The interview transcripts appended to this research, therefore, were edited to remove any response that would violate their decision. The respondents from the ADB opposition were Joshua Cooper, co-coordinator of ADBwatch; Cha Smith of KAHEA, an alliance of cultural rights and environmental activists; Stephanie Fried, Senior Scientist for Environmental
Defense and Adjunct Professor at the East-West Center; and Brent White, Legal Director of the American Civil Liberties Union of Hawai‘i and counsel to the ADB opposition in their lawsuit against the city and county of Honolulu over their request for a permit to hold their march and demonstration during the conference. Fried and Smith, who requested to have the interview together, did not permit the recording of the interview. They cited their negative experience with the police's incessant video recording of their meetings. The two editors from the Honolulu Advertiser were Judi Erickson, Business Editor, and Mark Platte, Assistant Managing Editor for News. Capitol Bureau reporters Robbie Dingeman and Johnny Brannon also were interviewed together; the interview with former Advertiser business reporter Michele Kayal was conducted over the phone, as was the interview with Glenn Scott, also a former Advertiser business reporter.

Other requests for interviews were turned down for various reasons: a law enforcement official was reluctant to speak about the ADB conference because of the controversy, including a lawsuit, that arose from security preparations; some representatives from Hawaii’s business community said that even though their company took part in the conference, they did not feel they could comment on the media coverage of the event; others were unavailable or had schedule conflicts.
CHAPTER III. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Globalization & the Global Economy: Assent & Dissent

Globalization’s definition depends on who is being asked to define it. There are those who embrace it, those who reject it, and those who stand somewhere in between. According to Tehranian, globalization “as a concept has been paraded in so many different narratives that it tends to be more confusing than enlightening” (Globalisation – A Complex Tapestry 1). Much of the debate actually focuses on a more specific aspect of globalization: global capitalism as the new economic policy. The main points of conflict have been the neo-liberal ideology of global capitalism, which supports the reduction of state control of the economy in favor of deregulation, privatization, and the dismantling of economic borders and welfare states.

Proponents of global capitalism insist that left to its own devices, the market will work and the benefits of free trade and open economies will eventually trickle down to the masses. Another way of describing this trickle-down process is “(cushioning) the worst” for those who fall through the cracks of a global economy (Korten 71). But what global capitalism – or pancapitalism, according to Tehranian – has done in the process is “(tear) apart societies into the privileged and the poor” (Global Communication & World Politics 14). According to the United Nations Development Programme, globalization has created both greater interdependence as well as greater fragmentation. The world seems to be increasingly divided “between rich and poor, between the powerful and the powerless, and between those who welcome the new global economy and those who demand a different course” (1). According to the international development agency, people’s lives are affected by global policies and processes as much as by national ones.
This reality is at the core of anti-globalization protests in both industrial and developing nations, where protesters may have diverse forms and agendas, but often are “united by the demand that global actors and institutions be more inclusive and responsive to the problems of the world’s people” (UNDP 7). And the gravity of this fragmentation cannot be overemphasized: globally, 2.8 billion people live on less than $2 a day, while the richest 1% have the same annual income as the poorest 57% (UNDP 2).³

Mainstream Corporate Media: Running a Business vs. Serving Society

The ownership of much of the mass media in the world, particularly in the United States, has shifted from families to large corporations.⁴ This change has seen an emphasis on bigger profit margins, which, in times of economic prosperity, are easily met. But economic pressures during a downturn usually lead to decisions that have a direct influence on content, e.g., cutting down costs, shedding staff, closing down, merging operations. McQuail sees this as an inevitable economic logic that are “facts of life of media operation” (163). For newspaper companies, the consequence of such choices, according to Downie Jr. & Kaiser,

...is a diminished paper, less interesting and less important to its readers and its community. In the last twenty years or so, many newspapers have declined in quality and shrunk in size, while only a small number have improved. Economic pressures have undermined traditional journalistic standards and values (69).

Privileging profits, according to Downie Jr. & Kaiser, “can easily undermine the notion that journalism is a public service” (11), and yet the media continue to be seen as such. Many perceive the media as an institution of opinion makers, image formers, and

³ Put another way, the richest 5% of the world’s people have incomes 114 times those of the poorest 5% (UNDP 10).
⁴ Chains currently own 80% of newspapers in the United States (Downie Jr. & Kaiser 68).
culture disseminators (Compaigne). This institution has the power to “surround almost every man, woman, and child in the country with controlled images and words, to socialize each new generation of Americans, to alter the political agenda of the country” (Bagdikian 1). From mass society theory to functionalist theory to critical political-economic theory, the media have consistently been seen as a significantly important source of meaning for societies and individuals. Downie Jr. & Kaiser, referring specifically to newspapers, state that

(Newsapers’) public service is to bring a rich, detailed account of yesterday in the world to their readers everyday, an account that enables citizens to remain in touch with numerous aspects of contemporary life in their community, country and world. A good paper explains big events and puts them in context (67).

Mainstream Corporate Media & the “Anti-Globalization” Movement

The predominance of corporate interests was brought to the fore in November 1999 in Seattle. According to Solomon (The media battle of Seattle), the protesters that gathered in Seattle to challenge the WTO summit were “on a collision course with a decade of media support for ‘free trade’” (211). Years before the Seattle summit, mainstream commercial media were already singing praises to free trade, and associated it with jobs, wealth, a better standard of living, growing capital, and greater profits. But in 1996, when the WTO ruled the Clean Air Act unacceptable because of restrictions it placed on pollutants in imported gasoline, “it was a blip on the US media screen” (213). When it became apparent that the voices of labor, environmentalists, and human rights activists could not be silenced and the growing resistance could not be swept under the rug, mainstream commercial media used a different strategy. It portrayed the protesters
as the "virulent opposition", with New York Times' Thomas Friedman labeling them "a Noah's ark of flat-earth advocates, protectionist trade unions, and yuppies looking for their 1960s fix" (218). Friedman has also accused anti-globalization protesters of being "The Coalition to Keep Poor People Poor" (Solomon, 2001). Policy analyst Fareed Zakaria has declared, "the anti-globalization crowd is anti-democratic... trying to achieve, through intimidation and scare tactics, what it has not been able to get through legislation" (Solomon, Overdue: Media scrutiny of the 'White Bloc'). In another example, the Wall Street Journal ran an April 24, 2001 editorial referred to activists protesting the Free Trade of the Americas as "black-clad anarchists" (Solomon, Overdue).

During the World Economic Forum in New York, the media advocacy group Fairness in Accuracy in Reporting (FAIR) noted that mainstream New York newspapers tended to "frame discussion of the demonstrations in terms of their status as a security problem" (FAIR). While some newspapers like Newsday focused on the protest organizers' endorsement of non-violence, the New York Daily News chose to describe the anti-WEF activists as "legions of agitators", "crazies", "parasites", and "kooks" (FAIR). The Daily News even went so far as to compare the protesters to the terrorists that attacked the World Trade Center, with the threat, "New York will not be terrorized" to reference the planned protests.
CHAPTER IV. STAKEHOLDERS’ OBJECTIVES

Government

According to government officials interviewed for this research, the overarching goal in having the Asian Development Bank conference in Hawai‘i was to be able to successfully hold the conference in order to prove to the international community that Hawai‘i was capable of hosting large, international meetings.

According to Dr. Seiji Naya, a member of the Executive Committee Gov. Cayetano appointed to organize the conference on behalf of the state and the country, and a former officer at the bank during the 1980s, the state wanted to attract business tourists. The conference was “aimed at attracting intellectuals to come here not only to enjoy the beauty of Hawaii, but to also participate in some substantive discussions, something more value-added than simply coming to Hawai‘i to relax and then go home” (Naya). A specific goal in the ADB conference was linking the local Hawai‘i business community and the public with the bank through the Hawai‘i Business Forum, which Dr. Naya organized. The Hawai‘i Business Forum was a completely new feature for any ADB meeting; according to Dr. Naya, ADB annual meetings usually had “delegates simply come to attend conferences and many seminars, and then go home” (Naya), with relatively little contact with the local people. The Hawai‘i Business Forum, according to Dr. Naya, increased the interest on the part of Hawai‘i’s general public and community where previously “usually only a small number of the local people would participate because often they were not that interested in broad regional and global aspects which ADB discusses” (Naya). The Hawai‘i Business Forum was meant to give local businesses a direct link to how the ADB did business, and most local businessmen did not know how
to go about finding out what kinds of projects the ADB provided. Dr. Naya also felt that it was important that there was participation from Native Hawaiians, citing that it was important to understand the situation they were in, which included lower income, higher unemployment rate, and a lower level of education.

Robert Fishman, the Chief Executive of the Hawai‘i Tourism Authority at the time of the ADB conference, agreed that hosting the conference successfully would send the message to the representatives from the 59 countries that Hawai‘i was one of the best and safest meeting places in the world, and this would put Hawai‘i on the map as far as hosting world meetings was concerned. Fishman worked with the media, law enforcement agencies, the Treasury Department, the Hawai‘i Visitors and Convention Bureau, and all the local groups within the local visitor industry and beyond. Fishman pointed out that their initial concern was not the protesting per se, but who should pay for all the law enforcement that the professionals deemed necessary, since the state did not have an open checkbook to pay for any security concerns that might arise, and that the security for the event was something that needed to be hammered out in terms of shared responsibility with the US government. The state and federal governments initially could not come to an agreement, but it was through Hawaii’s congressional delegation, according to Fishman, that money was ultimately forthcoming to be able to allow the city—in particular the police department—to recapture some of their costs. Fishman also worked very closely with Sidney Hayakawa, the Chief Security Officer and State Security Representative appointed by the Governor who was given the law enforcement coordination authority.
Brenda Lei Foster, the Governor’s Executive Assistant, said that the importance of the ADB conference was that it had a wide variety of participants and players. This was the next step after the state hosted the Pacific Basin Economic Council (PBEC), which brought together 21 different economies and international business people. The ADB then brought together the private and public sectors of international finance because the conference was an assembly of both the international government finance community and the private sector that was involved in international finance that follows the ADB’s meetings. The conference was another step along the way in the Governor’s economic agenda of establishing Hawai’i as an international business meeting location that distinguished itself from previous businesses conference the state had hosted. As the Governor’s Executive Policy Assistant for International and National Affairs, Foster was in charge of coordinating all the arrangements with the foreign countries, which included airport arrivals, departures, visas, and security arrangements for the Finance Ministers and their entourage. Her work for the conference also included attending all the meetings with the Secretary of Treasury, the Finance Ministers, and the State Department.

According to a confidential source, Seattle was a learning experience that taught the security and law enforcement officials that they had to be “prepared for the unexpected” (Foster). The objective of the security planning was to support the ADB’s own goals and objectives at the same time protect everyone, both the demonstrators and the conference guests. This source, said, however, that if it were possible to do it all over again, he would have met and talked with demonstrators, because there was very, very little personal interaction between himself and the protesters or the media, with the
communication being done primarily by a government spokesperson, a National Guard Public Information Officer, and the lawyers who negotiated with the protesters' own legal counsel regarding the issuing of a permit to the groups that wanted to hold a march and demonstration. This was, he said, ostensibly part of the logic that "this was not a law enforcement issue, this is a meeting", and so the strategy "was to have professional spokespeople to do the talking". He said that planning for the security of the conference was influenced by what had happened at the WTO in 1999, which he considered "the first huge disruption that ever took place". This confidential source also disclosed:

We did a lot of planning based on what happened in WTO and other events throughout the nation because what we didn't want to do was to have Hawai'i become another venue for people who for some reason or other, (are) destructive. We didn't want that to happen. We wanted to have a peaceful event. So we brought in many people as we could in the planning stage. But again, like I go back to my original statement that we should have brought in people who wanted to protest. And it could have been a separate meeting, aside, but at least we communicated. Yes, we understand that you have a right to express your opinion. Where do you think you can do that? Why at the Promenade, why not closer, or explain why. But I guess the attorneys got involved and they designated the areas, they agreed.

He said that they brought in the National Guard as a back up because they didn't know what to expect, and that this was part of the mentality of law enforcement, even though some people might not like it. Another law enforcement decision that had to be made was how many officers to assign to the ADB conference because, clearly, "you cannot dedicate your entire workforce to this single event" because of other responsibilities. The biggest security concern, ultimately, was not knowing what exactly was going to transpire. He said that when the state agreed to host the conference, there was no money allotted for security, and he felt that one of the lessons learned was that
there was a large group of people that needed to be consulted before the state went ahead and agreed to host the ADB meeting. Overall, though, it was still money well spent, and the cost of the equipment could be considered an investment because it could be used for the next event.

**ADB & the Business Community**

Though much less known than other multilateral development financial institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, the Asian Development Bank has been in existence since 1966, and is owned by 43 regional and 16 nonregional members. The bank’s headquarters is in Manila, and it has 19 other offices around the globe: 14 resident missions in Asia, a regional mission for the Pacific in Vanuatu, a country office in the Philippines, and 3 representative offices in Frankfurt (for Europe), Tokyo (for Japan), and Washington, D.C. (for North America). In addition to this are a Special Liaison Office in East Timor as well as extended missions in Papua New Guinea and India. The bank has a staff of over 2,000 from 50 different countries.

The United States and Japan each have nearly 16% shares in the ADB, making them the largest shareholders among the member countries. The Board of Governors consists of one representative from each country: it elects the 12 members of the Board of Directors. The Chairperson of the Board of Directors is the bank president, who in turn is elected by the Board of Governors.

In 1999, the ADB adopted poverty reduction as a development strategy built upon pro-poor, sustainable economic growth, social development, and good governance. Poverty reduction is a profoundly important goal to a region that is home to two thirds of
the world’s poorest: one third of the region’s population – live on less than one dollar a day. The biggest casualties of poverty are women and children. Of the 900 million poor people in the region, two thirds are women, and the number has been increasing over the past ten years.

The ADB’s avowed goal is to halve poverty by 2015, as part of its International Developmental Goal. In 2001, the ADB approved 76 loans an average of US$70 million and for a total of US$5.4 billion. That year, India was the largest borrower, followed by the People’s Republic of China, Pakistan, and Indonesia. The bank also approved 257 Technical Assistance (TA) operations for US $146 million.

In his address to the Board of Governors during the Honolulu conference, ADB President Tadao Chino reported on the bank’s achievements and future endeavors in working towards its goal of poverty reduction in the region. President Chino described how the bank’s country-specific Poverty Analyses ultimately led to Partnership Agreements for Poverty Reduction with Bangladesh, Indonesia, and Mongolia, with more to be signed that year. President Chino also recognized the critical role that the private sector plays in poverty reduction, and explained how various moves had increased the private sector’s involvement. Another achievement was a draft Social Protection Strategic Framework, the result of multi-sectoral consultations, which emphasizes investing in human capital. A recent development was the establishment of an NGO Center that would “serve as the focal point for further strengthening ADB’s interaction and communication with NGOs and civil society in general” (Chino).
The key challenges facing the ADB's Developing Member Countries (DMCs), according to Chino, were "reducing poverty, addressing environmental degradation, and responding to globalization". In addressing the first challenge, President Chino listed three strategies: increased involvement of the private sector, provision of basic social services, and the promotion of good governance. President Chino announced that the bank was preparing a new Environment Policy to complement the Poverty Reduction Strategy, noting, "poverty is both a contributor to, and major consequence of, environmental degradation". Globalization, according to Chino,

Opens up opportunities for developing countries, facilitating wider and faster access to resources, capital, technology, know-how and markets, thereby expanding development options and increasing the potential for participation in the development process.

He acknowledged, though that there are risks:

On the other hand, globalization also involves risks that have to be managed. Globalization can generate social and economic stresses as well as financial volatility, (which) affects the operation of the domestic financial system, causes distress to the corporate sector, and can impose a heavy toll on developing economies, particularly when policies and institutional capacities are vulnerable. The poor, unskilled, and uneducated often suffer disproportionately.

The proper response to an increasingly globalized world economy, according to Chino, is not to turn away from open economies but to maximize globalization’s benefits while simultaneously minimizing its risks and negative effects. Among the measures Chino called for were reforms in the financial and corporate sectors and assisting the bank’s DMCs in coping with economic and technological developments.

The Asian Development Bank had hired its own press relations office to communicate its message to the public. Journalists covering the conference were supplied
with press releases and schedules. An information kit was also available that contained a few sample publications, a list of publications, a CD ROM of their 1999 annual report, and other brochures about the bank’s lending activities. The two representatives from the business community did not have anything they particularly wanted to convey to the public; their main objective in joining the ADB conference, through the Global Pavilion Exhibit and the Hawai‘i Business Forum was to network with the ADB officials and in the end create business deals with international companies.

**ADB Opposition**

According to Joshua Cooper, ADBwatch co-coordinator, journalism instructor at Maui Community College and a human rights activist working closely with the United Nations Human Rights Commission, the main objective of the movement spearheaded by ADBwatch was “to raise awareness” and to highlight some of the problems of the Asian Development Bank’s projects in terms of the rhetoric and what it has actually accomplished. Preparations for what they were going to do and how they were going to do it were begun in August 2000 in preparation for the May 2001 meeting, with intensive meetings every week. They had also wanted to make it clear that there was going to be no violence, that they were aware that any form of violence would only harm their cause. They wanted to explain that they wanted to create a better world, and tried to explain how they wanted that world to look.

Stephanie Fried, Senior Scientist for Environmental Defense, had written an analysis of ADB’s record in Indonesia, based entirely on the bank’s own documents.

---

5 Evaluating the ADB in Indonesia: The operation was a success, but the patient died. May 2001. Unpublished research. Fried said that she submitted her paper to the Advertiser, but it was not published.
paper argues that by ADB’s own account, at least 70% of the Indonesian projects are not likely to bring any economic or social development to the country. Furthermore, the burden of the debt will be on the poorest of the poor, who have no income tax.

If we assume for the moment, that ADB projects rated “Generally Successful” actually were successful, and if we extrapolate these number to the $16 billion of debt generated by Indonesian ADB projects through 2000, this would mean that by 2000, close to $5.9 billion of Indonesia’s debt was generated by largely unsuccessful, wasteful, or harmful projects. (Fried, *The operation was a success but the patient died*).

In trying to convey their message to the public, the ADB opposition tried to use both the mainstream media as well as the independent media. They sent press releases to the entire mainstream press in Hawai‘i and also made use of the independent media such as www.indymedia.org and other websites. The ADBwatch also created a listserv to where supporters could receive information and updates on events, activities, and developments.

The ADB opposition conducted numerous forums and discussions as early as January, and published articles about the ADB’s projects that they said had caused the relocation of thousands of families, inflicted severe damage to the environment, and exacerbated the impoverished conditions of the communities the ADB projects were purported to aid.
CHAPTER V. THE COVERAGE

Overall, the respondents from the government felt that the Hawai‘i media — including the Advertiser — were all consumed by security concerns related to the potential for violent anti-ADB protests. There was also the view from some of these respondents that the media did not really cover the more substantive issues that were being discussed inside the convention center. Both respondents from the business sector believed that while most of the media coverage centered on the potential for violence, the coverage was overall fair and balanced. The ADB opposition charged that the police and the press created such an atmosphere of fear that was meant to scare the public and justify restrictions on free expression. The press, according to the opposition, gave very little credibility to their statements that the protests were going to be peaceful, and did very little to discuss the issues that they were trying to get across. Resource persons from the Advertiser said that they felt they were able to convey a comprehensive picture of the conference, although they acknowledged that they could have done more.

Planning the Coverage

The Honolulu Advertiser coverage of the Asian Development Bank conference was divided between the Business Section and the City Desk (including the Capitol Bureau), with the former covering events that were taking place within the conference itself, including the business itinerary, the different seminars and country reports. The City Desk, meanwhile, was to cover the larger events outside the Convention Center, such as the protests and the issues related to it, that is, the cost of security preparations, who was responsible for paying for such costs, how the protests would affect traffic flow and how a potentially violent protest would affect the conference and hurt Hawaii’s
image. According to Kayal, the Business section had huge brainstorming sessions on how to coordinate their coverage. They began with reporters from their own beats outlining what they think should be covered, and then they pared it down “to get it to manageable point” (Kayal). Part of the brainstorming session was the decision to have a logo to clearly identify the news stories the Business Section would be doing on the ADB.

In order to make the coverage relevant to their readers, Platte said they had to determine what they were going to cover: the number of speeches, how much editorial space was going to be given to the conference, and how many of the activities out in the community – like the forums and meetings at the University of Hawai‘i – they were going to attend. Platte added that the newspaper was of two minds:

...because we are the dominant paper in Hawaii, and the dominant morning paper, on the one hand we wanted to give everybody the official record of everything that was going on, everything that came out of the conference, everything that was worth covering. On the other hand... there are a lot of arcane issues that were coming out that people, even though they could well understand them, I don't know how interesting they would be to a general audience. And so we wanted to have enough coverage inside the Convention that people who wanted to read would know what's going on...

Another consideration in the planning was preparing for the worst. They considered renting hotel rooms or office spaces in the Ala Moana area, in the event that the protests did get violent and there would be massive arrests and tear-gassing. A hotel room or office space within the area would give them a place to move into and allow reporters and photographers to continue reporting some of what was going on if they had to move off the streets. Deputy City Editor Ken Kobayashi also talked to his Seattle counterparts to find out how they prepared for it. In their own minds, though, according to Platte, they knew there wasn't going to be a lot happening because of several factors.
First, Hawai'i was isolated – protesters couldn’t just come here on a bus or in a car, unlike on the mainland. They also felt that it would be peaceful because “the people that protest here are pretty peaceful” (Platte), and that they were mainly concerned about the outside groups.

Security Preparations

In preparation for the ADB conference, the Honolulu Police Department’s 1,963 uniformed officers and 475 civilian employees agreed not to take vacations for the duration of the bank’s meeting. This was, according to HPD Chief Lee Donohue, because, “We have to prepare for the worst” (Ohira, Security plans gel for Asian Development Bank meeting). This was to become the mantra of every government spokesperson and police officer on why such preparations – at such a cost – were being undertaken. Articles in the Advertiser referred to Honolulu’s security and law enforcement preparations as the result of “lessons learned from the 1999 riots” (Ohira, “Medium” chance ADB protests will turn violent). A federal threat assessment estimated that there was a “medium” chance that the Honolulu protests would turn violent, compared to the assessment of “low” to “medium” for Seattle (Ohira, “Medium” chance), even though police officials expected that the number of protesters in Honolulu would only be 5,000, compared to the 30,000 to 40,000 protesters in Seattle. State security officials traveled to Seattle and attended political events like the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia and the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles to learn from the experts there how to deal with large groups of protesters. There was also a plan for the group to travel to Washington, D.C. to observe the security preparations for
the International Monetary Fund meeting there. Police categorized protesters into three groups: (1) the lawful peaceful groups, (2) the unlawful but peaceful groups, and (3) the unlawful and violent. According to Correa:

You have the lawful, peaceful groups. They are basically the marchers. Then you have the unlawful but peaceful groups, who are disruptive. They might stand in the middle of a street, blocking traffic, which is unlawful. The last group is the unlawful and violent. They are the ones who basically tear up a city. It takes a lot of energy and resources to deal with them (Ohira, "Medium" chance).

According to Cooper, ADBwatch contacted the media early on, found that they were faced with always having to be on the defensive, and always trying to set the record straight because the media took the police at their word, and yet considered anything they said as "a possibility". He related that throughout their interactions with the police, they found little support in trying to get answers to their questions about why such preparations were necessary when they had unequivocally said that they would be peaceful.

Cooper also related the story of an Advertiser photographer who approached him the day before the conference opened and asked him whether the protesters were going to be able to give them a great photo of blood and gore. Cooper recalled how he looked incredulously at the photographer, almost speechless.

According to the police, they were hoping that Hawaii's culture of aloha would help keep the protests peaceful, and that their real concern were not the Hawaii'i activists, but a mainland-based protest group that had been in Seattle as well as the Philadelphia and Los Angeles conventions. This group, according to Correa, had the resources to come to Hawaii'i and cause trouble. Cooper had asked the police to name the group so that his
organization could help set up a dialogue and avoid the worst-case scenario that the police were ostensibly concerned about. Cooper also said that the police might have been referring to Ruckus Society, a California group that provides non-violence training. The Advertiser described Ruckus as “a California-based group whose civil disobedience bootcamps train activists to scale buildings and form human chains” (Anwar, Activists don’t plan protests at Isle summit). Ruckus Society, however, claims to work “with a broad range of communities, organizations and movements, from high school students to professional organizations and maintains its commitment to non-violent social change”.6

In mid-February, ADBwatch sought to secure a permit from city and state officials to hold a march and peaceful demonstrations aimed at communicating their message to the finance ministers and investment bankers attending the conference. Restrictions had been imposed to keep protesters at least 100 feet away from the convention center and ban demonstrators from the Ala Wai promenade next to the center (Ishikawa & Brannon). The American Civil Liberties Union of Hawai‘i, through its Legal Director, Brent White, represented the protesters in a federal lawsuit filed against HPD Chief Lee Donohue, Assistant Chief Boisse Correa, City Parks Director Bill Balfour, Transportation Services Director Cheryl Soon, the state, the state’s Hawai‘i Tourism Authority, and Deputy State Public Safety Director Sidney Hayakawa (Dingeman). A permit was finally issued almost three months later on May 1, when the ACLU reached a settlement that would allow the protesters to march from Magic Island to Kapi‘olani Park and hold an hour-long demonstration in front of the convention center.

6 See www.ruckus.org.
According to White, the lawsuit hinged on whether or not there was a credible threat of violent protests, and the point in this case was that there was no danger the protests were going to turn violent, but there was nevertheless an atmosphere of fear created prior to the conference.

(There was) a cry by the state that there would be violence and they used that to try to restrict expression and by feeding all this to the press and by the press seizing upon the violence as what they wanted to talk about in all their stories... So they go together because certainly if there was a legitimate fear that there was violence and they had credible information that there was going to be violence by a particular group or particular person, then they could do something to control that violence. But here it was just an atmosphere of fear created largely by the press and the police (White).

Two days before the conference formally opened, the Advertiser reported a heightened sense of concern about potential violence erupting during the conference. Courts began preparations for massive arrests, including the installation of a video conferencing system that would allow the arraignment of individuals by video, unless defendants insist on being arraigned in person. The Straub Clinic and Hospital set up a special decontamination gear outside its emergency room to treat anyone exposed to teargas, pepper spray or other irritants, which included respirators and special showers. There was also to be a first aid station inside the Hawai‘i Convention Center to be staffed by two registered nurses or a nurse and a paramedic. Businesses, particularly around the convention center, hired private security guards “to remove troublemakers from private property and board up windows if the situation gets too raucous” (Brannon, City prepares for protests). Authorities by this time had stated that they were not expecting the same type of violence that took place in Seattle, but had an unknown number of National
Guard soldiers on standby, in case there was a need to respond to street disturbances (Brannon, *City prepares*).

According to Fried and Smith, all the time that the media were reporting the potential trouble that protesters could cause, no one was questioning the tactics being used by the police in preparing for the conference and the demonstration. No one in the media, they said, were questioning the fact that the Honolulu Police Department had trained with the Los Angeles Police Department, which was notorious for its brutality, as demonstrated in the Rodney King case. They also expressed frustration that the opposition was being made out as the troublemakers, and yet no one in the media reported the fact that students who had planned on joining the protest march were “promised (by certain police officers) that they were going to get the crap beaten out of them if they came” (Fried, personal interview).

The day before the conference an Advertiser article once again brought up Seattle and how a repeat of the “slugfest between police and some of the 30,000 protesters who came mostly from environmental and anti-globalization movements” would determine whether “Hawai‘i fulfills its self-appointed destiny as the Geneva of the Pacific or joins the ranks of disgraced destinations like Seattle” (Kayal, *ADB meeting puts spotlight on Honolulu*). Sources like Hawai‘i Visitors and Convention Bureau head Tony Vericella were quoted as saying that they did not expect the protests to be anything like Seattle, that if anything were to happen, it would have to be a lot worse, and that it was up to the local law enforcement to handle whatever was going to arise. Hawai‘i by this time had spent $3 million in state, municipal and private money to prepare for the ADB
conference, and the HTA had donated $500,000 for riot gear, money that should have been earmarked for tourism.

Conference & Protests

The Advertiser came out with “An ADB guide: traffic, protests, banking,” which showed both the ADB and the alternative schedules: the former were the tentative highlights for the week’s conference and the latter was the schedule of forums, panel discussions, and the march sponsored by ADBwatch. It also had a Q&A column that was supposed to give quick facts about the ADB and its operations and a map showing the detours and how traffic was going to be rerouted.

Four stories of people from countries whose lives were impacted by the ADB’s programs were told in an article called “Villagers tell their stories at ADB” (Bricking). The first story, that of Cambodian farmer Mon Mon who lost his leg because of a landmine and was forced off his land by logging projects, was “the face that ADB critics wanted (people) to see” (Bricking, Villagers tell their stories). College student Rodalyn Dejino, on the other hand, was supposed to represent the “kind of person the ADB says it is trying to help”; she had grown up in Manila’s slums and used to sell flowers in the red-light district when she was a child. Dejino actually did not benefit directly from any ADB project, but the bank extended her stay in Hawai’i so that she could be “a voice for the people who need help”.

Platte said that these were the kinds of stories they were looking for, and that they were able to do this “on a limited basis”. He believed that the best way of covering the conference was through those stories.
Security preparations for the May 9th March for Global Justice began with security forces outnumbering demonstrators two to one, private security guards standing outside the convention center, police patrolling on foot, a helicopter overhead, and the National Guard on standby (Gordon, *Early protest reaps notice*). The following day saw a picture of ADB President Tadao Chino speaking with Darwan Chantarahesdee of Thailand on the front page of the Advertiser. Chino had left a luncheon meeting to accept a petition from the protesters who were waiting for him outside. The petition was a challenge for Chino to make the bank and its program more easily understandable, democratic, and accountable. Chino ostensibly listened and said he would consider the points raised, but made no commitments to any specific action (Gordon, *Protest message civil, peaceful*). The article noted the peaceful, Hawai‘i-style march was more of a parade than a protest, and that the 500 people who turned out, a figure much smaller than the anticipated 5,000, disappointed the organizers. The demonstrators were reportedly outnumbered by the spectators and police and at times were drowned out by a police helicopter overhead. It wasn’t until towards the end of the article that it was mentioned that the organizers had already anticipated the day that there would be less than a thousand attendees, but that they were glad they had specified 5,000 in their permit request.

According Cooper, Fried, and Smith, no one from the organizers had said, “they were disappointed”. They said that when they confronted the Advertiser reporter on the matter, they said that she was unable to give them a coherent answer.
Police Chief Lee Donohue was also reported as saying that the city should be proud of the police for “the way officers handled the march and made sure it was peaceful”. Another reason the Advertiser cited for the smaller-than-anticipated crowd that gathered that day was because the ADB was less known that the WTO, and therefore attracted less attention from anti-globalization groups. In addition, travel to Hawai‘i was made much more difficult by its geographical location. Unlike cities such as Seattle, Hawai‘i was not a place where people could take to the streets quickly. Businesses that had feared the worst reportedly realized they need not have board their windows, and the manager for a nearby business establishment was quoted as saying that she should have sold hot dogs and got a cooler of water. The article referred to Honolulu’s “peaceful character” and “small-town feel” as a big factor in keeping the peace (Gordon, Protest fears). Two editions of the same article yielded an interesting difference between the early Island Edition and the PM edition that had to do with the peaceful nature of the march. The Island Edition read:

But protesters, who refrained from the violence (italics added) that rocked recent global financial meetings such as the 1999 World Trade Organization meeting in Seattle, said they simply wanted to send a message that the ADB is not the savior of the poor. (Bricking, Protest message).

The PM edition read:

Yesterday’s demonstrations had none of the violence (italics added) that rocked recent global financial meetings such as the 1999 World Trade Organization meeting in Seattle. Organizers said they simply wanted to send a message that the ADB is not the savior of the poor (Bricking, Protest message).

In the first edition, the lack of violence was attributed to the protesters refraining from committing any violent acts. In the later edition, no attribution is made as to who
ensured that there would be no violence. In either case, no credit is given to the protests who had promised from the beginning that they were going to be peaceful. As Cooper recalled:

...even though we did everything to say that it was going to be non-violent, it still wasn’t accepted. And even when it was not violent, it was like, it was not violent because the police were so well-organized, or not too many people showed up. And the truth was they did everything to make sure people didn’t show up. It said, don’t show up, traffic’s going to be bad, it’s dangerous.... It was always this, “we were the problem”, because we were organizing to protest the bank; we were the reason they were spending so much money...

This perception was shared to some degree by Foster, who credited the peaceful demonstration to hard work of the “excellent team of professionals from the federal, state, city and county... and the military”, who did extensive planning and logistics. She also said that the local community was not going to be receptive to any type of disturbance.

Aftermath

By the time the conference ended, the HPD had spent between $2.5 million and $4 million in riot gear, training, overtime, and other costs dealing with the ADB conference (Brannon, Burden of security may lie solely in state). It was also reported that the Federal Government was under no obligation to reimburse Hawai‘i for the money spent by the state on security, and that this was apparently the very reason Seattle declined the opportunity to host the ADB, particularly after the costly results of the WTO summit. According to Cooper, the money spent on the riot gear was unnecessary. He also said that even some police officers thought that the entire preparation was “overkill”.
According to Dr. Naya, the state received a partial reimbursement of the total cost of expenditures for the conference. Fishman also said a significant amount was raised through corporate contributions, and that they actually spent less than what they had expected\(^7\). Kayal, however, said that one of the problems she encountered in trying to report on the conference cost was trying to get straight answers from the HTA regarding expenditures related to the conference. She explained:

> Numbers about how much it was going to cost, and also the Tourism Authority took some money that should have gone to something and gave it to the police force for riot gear. And I think I sort of wondered whether that was a valid use of money designated for tourism. They were saying, oh this will support tourism because we want things will go smoothly and that will bring more business tourists.

The expected number of delegates to the conference was also much lower than expected, according to an ADB post-mortem. About 300 journalists registered for the event, half of what was expected, the meeting itself attracted 1,000 people less than the 3,000 participants that had been predicted at the start, and the pre-meeting seminar suffered the worst attendance in many years ("State measures", 2001). In spite of this, the ADB President Chino called the conference a great success because his program received the support of the 59 diplomats.

Both Fisher and Foster said that they remembered that the media did not really focus on the issues that were going on inside the convention. Fisher clarified that this was not a criticism, but an observation. According to Fisher:

> I think probably on the whole, the media told the story that they thought was the most important for the public. I can't think of anything specific that caused me disappointment. I did believe that they rather enjoyed covering what was outside the Convention Center rather than what was

\(^7\) According to Fishman, excluding the price tag for security, costs came in a little under $2 million.
inside of the Convention Center. But again it's one thing if they don't cover what you want; you can be disappointed if you want but you can't fault them as long as they're true to their principles.

Foster noted that the media were consumed by the security aspects of the conference, although she clarified that the fears over the protests were just a part of an overall security and intelligence concern. She said that what the media saw was not necessarily the speakers and the substance of the meeting, and tended to cover the events that they figured would grab the headlines. She said that economic development issues didn't get the substance of play in the media as much as somebody throwing a rock at a window.

...my feeling was they drove a sense of fear in the community because of watching the WTO meetings and becoming extremely concerned. Should they be probing, should they be asking officials, the planners, the organizers, and the bank itself, you know, 'Will we see this, we don't want that to happen here, what are you doing about that?' Absolutely. The media should be probing those questions and doing that but to play violence over and over, and this is not just print – electronic media and the rest – I don't know how reassuring that is to a community. It tended to build up more of a fever pitch of issues...

Understanding Globalization & the "Anti-Globalization" Movement

An Advertiser article that appeared on the first day of the ADB conference asked the question, "What is globalization? And why are activists raising a ruckus about it?"
The article was also asking why the anti-globalists were targeting a multilateral lending institution whose stated goal is to reduce poverty in the Asia-Pacific region (Anwar, Activists fighting globalization). In answering its own question, the article claimed that globalization has made fast-food restaurants and goods like Nike, Starbucks and The Gap...

---

8 Later editions had the alternate headline 'Why all the fuss about globalization?' (PM edition) and 'Globalization a reviled word' (State edition)
available to everyone; equated globalization with McDonaldization and corporate greed; and lumped together the "unchecked spread of mass produced goods and ideas across traditional and national boundaries" and the Internet. It added that it was ironic that groups like the ADBwatch who were against the ADB, and therefore against globalization, were linked through the electronic forces of globalization. The ADB, the article said, was being accused of being an "agent of globalization", an institution that was forcing its Western industrial ideals on traditional cultures in developing countries, and whose projects such as dams and water treatment projects "have harmed the environment and benefited multinational corporations rather than the communities the bank is supposed to help" (Anwar, Globalization a reviled word).

Cooper explained that one of the problems of the movement for peace, justice, and human rights is their identification as an "anti" movement, so that "even 'nonviolence' is a 'non". He believes that it is important to create a language that will resonate with what their goals are: pro-people, pro-labor, pro-environment, pro-peaceful world. Whether or not the media will pick up on this is another story, though, he cautioned. One of the things that frustrated him, he said, was that he could never get the paper to print that their group was not against "global things", which was what they were being told by the press they were against. The point they had tried in vain to get across was that there cannot be economic development ahead of people's welfare. He added that:

... there must be basic rules and laws that defend people, then let's have all the other aspects of regional cooperation. But you can't do things before the people, and to push (for economic development) before you have environmental (protection) as well as basic issues of equality is just
backwards. But I could never get that angle in. I put in press release after press release. Why don’t we have a human rights commission (in Hawai‘i)? Why don’t the media ask about that?

The Challenge

Brannon and Dingeman both felt that the Advertiser was able to provide a comprehensive view of the conference, even though they might have been able to make it even more comprehensive. Brannon pointed out that he wasn’t sure mainstream readers would want anything more comprehensive than what they already did. Dingeman agreed with this view, saying:

You can always think of things that you can do more for any subject, but what Johnny said was accurate as far as (that) you can write too much than your mainstream audiences worrying about where to buy groceries and what they’re going to cook for dinner and what their company’s doing at work today. You have to fit it into what their needs and wants are.

According to Kayal, she believed that that there are a lot of people in the movement that have good and pure motivations, adding:

They don’t want to see people in Third World countries exploited and developing nations exploited; they don’t want to see the First World as we’re called taking advantage of people who have less and they’re trying to protect the interests of those people, I think they’re well-motivated, but… a friend of mine once said being against globalization is like being a against gravity. It just is, it just exists; it’s not a train that you can stop.

Platte said that from what he understood of the ADB and what the protest movement was saying, “the difference between the have and have-nots of the world is the difference between the superpowers and the rich and the poor and what we can do to be able to help that are being oppressed all over the world”. He said that he felt a little uneasy about his own opinion, but believes it is certainly a legitimate issue in the rest of the world.
I would say that we don’t think about it all that often from our standpoint of just living here in Hawaii. I think the fact that the convention was held here was a really good thing because it helped people, at least for five days, (to) think about these issues. I think it’s important that those issues were raised. It was important that we were able to cover those in the way that we could so that people would have some understanding because otherwise this thing could have come and gone and people would not have understood what it was and what it was trying to attempt. I think a lot of people still don’t understand what all the fuss was about.

Reporters and editors were asked whether it was possible to explain issues like globalization to a mainstream audience without sacrificing reader interest. Everyone agreed that yes, it is possible, and that it is an important challenge that they would like to explore.

Kayal responded that if an article is well written and if there is a big enough or interesting enough punch delivered in the first five or six inches of the story, then people would continue reading.

According to Platte, the Honolulu Advertiser had “a pretty heavy responsibility” as Hawaii’s newspaper. He explained:

> We have a real primary role in educating people about what’s going on around here. We have a responsibility to keep people informed about everything that’s going on, what’s going on in the environment, the government, the law enforcement, the health field, the business and all that. I think we take that responsibility very seriously. We want to get a diversity of opinion in our news pages, in our editorial page, everywhere throughout the paper.

The nature of newspaper reporting in terms of deadlines naturally puts a constraint on being able to do longer, more thoughtful pieces. Scott agreed, saying that it daily newspapers “have many constraints: time, space, certain conventions, certain routines and patterns that all kind of get in the way of being able to go (as) deeply as you want”.
According to Brannon, most people were “interested in things that affect them directly somehow in some way and a lot of times will get turned off if they feel they’re being preached to or lectured about things”. He added:

a lot of people simply aren’t too interested in what goes on outside their immediate environment and I think that’s true all over the world. And it’s a shame, but a lot of people have very direct, pressing needs that take most of their attention and that’s also true throughout the world... That’s one of the challenges that humanity as a whole I think faces - how to realize that what happens in one place impacts other people in another place and it’s certainly a challenge to the media to include aspects of that whole dynamic in ways that people will pay attention to. One of the venues for that to occur is on the opinion pages and the letters to the editor and the guest editorials and opinion pieces that are submitted and it’s particularly helpful if there’s a timely element to them that will make them more relevant to your average readers. There’s a treaty being voted on, or a law being debated, or an event that’s about to occur, it often makes a good time to take another look at these larger issues and put them in perspective and that’s something that will be a challenge to the media as this whole debate over globalization continues.
CHAPTER VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The violence that erupted during the World Trade Organization summit in Seattle in late November 1999 forever changed the way mainstream media cover “anti-globalization” protests against large international financial institutions. It also changed how these organizations choose the location for their high-security, often top-level, meetings.9 Together, these two developments linked Seattle and Honolulu and formed the narratives that came out from Hawaii’s mainstream media, including the Honolulu Advertiser. This connection was made not just in the news stories published by the Advertiser, but also in the interviews with all the resource person for this research. How the Advertiser described the violence in Seattle was no more than an echo of how most mainstream media reported the events that led to the shutdown of the WTO meeting. Consequently, it became a predictor of how the Advertiser was going to portray the anti-ADB protesters in the news reports.

If journalists see globalization as inevitable and those who are critical of the negative consequences of globalization as fighting gravity or trying to stop an oncoming train, then half the battle has been lost. When reporting arises out of this framework, then the issues become irrelevant, and everything is just hue and noise. The point is not that journalists must share the ideology of those that define themselves against the dominant discourse; that would merely reverse the bias from one position to the other, and that is the self-appointed role of journalists who work for clearly partisan publications, left or right. The journalism profession - and journalists as individuals - have declared a commitment to objective and balanced reporting and since they have acknowledged that

---

9 In 2001, the World Trade Organization chose to hold their summit in the militaristic city of Doha.
complex issues can be explained in words that can be meaningful to their readers' concerns about their daily lives. The decision to pursue this goal is very much within their court.

This study, however, cannot positively conclude that the Honolulu Advertiser was unique in its bias against the ADB protesters. Some of the recollections of the resource persons were spread across the entire spectrum of the mainstream media in Hawai‘i. Furthermore, for nearly all the interviewees, the conference happened so long ago, and their memories of which media covered which story in what manner tended to blend into one another, if not fade into uncertain recollections. The conference happened almost a year and a half ago, and some of the resource persons, even a few of those interviewed from the Advertiser, qualified that their memories were no longer as accurate. In order to obtain Advertiser-specific responses, the resource persons would have had to go over each and every article, which would have been an unwelcome burden. But what can be concluded is that there is a clear indictment by the opposition of how the mainstream media as a whole conducted the coverage of the ADB conference.

It is recommended that a study— or studies— of other mainstream media organizations in Hawai‘i and how they covered the ADB conference be undertaken. An analysis of the television coverage, for example, would probably yield a richer collection of data because of the additional component of the visuals chosen for the coverage. Additional interviews with more representatives from the three stakeholders— government, business, and civil society— should be conducted to solicit more points of views. Future studies on this topic may have to be conducted on a longer timetable,
should researchers want responses and reactions specific to the media company that they are studying, because this would involve exposing – or re-exposing – the potential interviewees to the news stories in the study.
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW WITH SEIJI NAYA

Q: I understand that you worked for the ADB for many, many years.

A: Not for many, many years, but many, many years ago for a few years.

Q: So you would know a great deal about what the ADB is all about. Do you think that was made clear to everyone involved in that people got to know the ADB better during the conference?

A: That’s what I felt. People, the general public, do not know the ADB very well, nor the World Bank, IMF, the so-called international development agencies; exactly what they do, how they raise money, who are they, how do they work with the countries they support. So I thought the newspapers had done a good job.

Q: So you think they did a very good job.

A: Not always pro; you notice there’s some anti. So I felt objective assessment of the ADB as they see it.

Q: As the newspapers see it?

A: Yes.

Q: So what do you think of the criticisms from the anti-ADB people?

A: You always have that. And in fact the anti-ADB are not as vocal as I initially thought. There is much more vocal opposition. And I thought there would be much active participation in opposing the annual ADB meeting but it came out quite smooth in a sense there is no real injuries, no violence. There was some demonstrations and so on. We expected that. As you can see what happens – WTO meeting in Seattle. If you look at any meeting of major international organizations, you are bound to have opposition.
Q: Do you think the criticisms against the ADB were fair?

A: Some misunderstood, some are fair, and it's always good to have anti people raising their issues because the ADB like any other development institutions have to improve. Because ADB's main purpose is to alleviate poverty in Asia. More poor people live in Asia than in any other place. So when you say that, it's hard for anti people to understand that; they think that ADB is simply a capitalist organization. But if you look at what they do, what they do is really try to provide assistance, lending – both capital lending as well as technical assistance – to countries in need in Asia. And they have at least the year, the main purpose of ADB was to reduce poverty in Asia.

Q: Since 1999?

A: Right, right, right. So I thought it was good message they were delivering. Of course, how it is financed as you know is basically members provide capital to ADB. Using that capital to borrow money in the capital market to lend to – or give money – to countries that need capital or technical assistance.

Q: So what was your office's role in terms of organizing the conference or how were you involved?

A: I was very involved. The Governor had appointed three people to spearhead the organization of the ADB annual meeting. Myself, Bob Fishman... he was the Executive of the Hawaii Tourism Authority – and the meeting was held at our Convention Center, so he was in charge. The third person of the three-man committee is Brenda Foster, and Brenda Foster is the Governor's Executive Assistant. So the three of us basically provided Hawaii's input to ADB and United
States because… sponsorship was by the US Treasury, and they have selected Hawaii as the site. But actually we did most of the work; most of the work was done by Hawaii, not the US, although sponsor was the US. It was a country representing at the ADB…

Q: Did you ever get reimbursed for the costs?
A: We got some money from the US government.

Q: Okay, that’s good. I remember, though, that there was news that the US Treasury was not going to reimburse the State for the security costs?
A: The money came from the US Congress, but not US Treasury.

Q: So you did get reimbursed?
A: Some, I forgot how much it was. The total amount we spent was much more. Plus a lot of in-kind services we provided. It was very demanding, time-consuming work. One thing we did which is very unique to ADB annual meeting, we had Hawaii Business Forum. And Hawaii Business Forum is a program Hawaii designed and asked the ADB to include as part of the ADB annual meeting and no other ADB meetings have something similar to that. Knowing ADB, ADB annual meeting is simply to come here to attend conferences and many seminars, and then go home; relatively little contact with Hawaii local people. Whereas I thought the main purpose of the ADB was to have the link with Hawaii business and the public in general. So we created that Hawaii Business Forum; we had our own seminars, some ADB people participated as speakers, basically to our community of public business people. That increased the interest on the part of Hawaii’s general public and community. Otherwise, usually only a small number of the local people
participate because often they’re not that interested in broad regional and global aspects which ADB discusses.

Q: What did the businesses think of the Hawaii Business Forum?
A: It was quite good and they were able to get a direct link to ADB and learn how ADB does business. ADB as I said lends out like 5 billion and now 6 billion dollars to various countries. Receiving countries have to select firms, individuals who will carry out the programs. Often it is open competition, so anyone can compete for the projects. So if you have a project, say in Indonesia, anyone can bid for the project, funded by the ADB. But most people don’t know... how to go about getting that type of business contract. So it was quite good for our people to learn how to go about finding out the projects and what kind of projects the ADB provides.

Q: So now with the Hawaii Business Forum, the Hawaii businesses can now compete for projects outside of Hawaii?
A: They can always compete, but they didn’t know how to go about. Those are the things often opposition people don’t know, often don’t quite appreciate. I noticed that the opposition tends to focus on broad, general negative aspects or some particular projects of the ADB in Thailand, and so on – they are not using their own people, they’re exploiting, all the farmers are left out, and things like that.

Q: Do you think there is any way to address those very general concerns.
A: I was very pleased that President Chino went out to talk to those people who oppose the ADB. Also I have observed that the ADB has been changing to include the voice of NGOs. NGOs often worry about the plight of these countries and how they
are carried out and I noticed that ADB itself is including NGO activities in their projects' implementation.

Q: Is this unique to the ADB?

A: I think not just ADB, I think other development institutions also began to do that. Because opposition is not just for ADB. Opposition to ADB is milder than opposition to World Bank, IMF, or WTO....

Q: Here in Hawaii or in general?

A: In general. One thing we did is to ask Native Hawaiian groups to participate.

Q: How did you do that?

A: We met with Native Hawaiian groups and we had some active participation held by Bumpy Kanahele, and Bumpy saw the merit of ADB and also they put up a booth where they show Hawaiian products, their way of doing things, so there was a... Native Hawaiian booth, attracted a great deal of attention by the general participants. Plus they had their own program, a regular seminar was held to talk about the plight of Native Hawaiians and so on. And as you know, they Native Hawaiians, they have lagged behind in terms of economic achievements. Their income is lower, unemployment rate for the Native Hawaiians is higher, they have lower level of education, so it's very important to understand the situation the Native Hawaiians are in. They wanted to show the world that there is a Native Hawaiian. So I felt it was quite useful.

Q: After the conference, was there feedback from the Native Hawaiian community in terms of how they felt about how they were given...
A: Yes. It was good. Native Hawaiian group, very large number, like 50 or so, sat in the first row of the main opening session. It was very visible, and some of them attended the reception given by the president of the ADB, and he's Japanese – Chino – and some Hawaiian people knew Japanese songs, and they sang together. You heard about that? (Laughing) They sang together... he was so touched.

Q: Do you think the businessmen and the finance ministers who came here came away with a better understanding of Native Hawaiian culture?

A: Yes, I think so because many of them saw the booth and they saw the actual participation, right? So it was quite unique. Of course, some people outside were making a lot of noise opposing. As I say, it was quite... much milder than I initially thought.

Q: What were your fears?

A: They said there would be 500 people demonstrating continuously and so on and we unsure what to expect, so the actual demonstration was fairly mild.

Q: Did you get to talk to any of the -

A: Yes, yes –

Q: - protestors?

A: Yes. Many of the protesters, they worry about exploitation by ADB and... not worrying about the impact of ADB program on disadvantaged. I think many of those issues are being more actively discussed at ADB, so NGO group I noticed is much bigger. But of course the ADB... they lend money – 5 billion dollars – so when you lend money, you have to make sure it is well done. So I think it is important to worry about NGOs' concern. See, development is not just economic
growth, follow me? Development is more than economic growth. I think economists in the past have made mistakes, saying that economic growth is most important. Yes, economic growth is important, but economic development is ultimate, and it's more than economic growth. You like to see the modernization of the society, industrial upgrading, and poverty reduction. Sometimes, (if you focus on) economic growth alone can leave disadvantaged even more disadvantaged. So it's very important to look at the whole development. And I think ADB has learned that aspect. Of course, they are lending institutions and lending becomes important. Unless you have economic growth, how to reduce poverty. Economic growth and poverty are very closely related. Hard to imagine (how) the countries can eliminate poverty if you don't have economic growth. You know what I mean? I have seen many countries – I look at the data – there aren't too many countries, in fact I can't think of any country which has really eliminated poverty when the country is not doing very well in terms of economic growth.

Q: So there has to be economic growth before they can improve the lives of the people?

A: Economic growth and improvement of lives of the people go together because (if) economic growth is not taking place, I don't see the people getting better off. I know that when you have better income distribution, economic growth will make it even better, okay. But the given (?) income distribution, economic growth is very important. So you have to do both: economic growth and also maintain good income distribution. You have to have some pro-poor growth strategy, you know what I mean? Pro-poor growth, not just... growth, but the growth which will have
more impact on the poor people. And these things ADB has learned, you know what I mean, and that learning is partly associated with people who oppose ADB. So opposition has had impact over time, not just in Hawaii....

Q: So it's not just the opposition has been negative in terms of saying the ADB is bad. Are you saying it has helped the ADB look at itself—

A: Yes, why that are they opposing.

Q: With the conference, there were three of you appointed by the Governor, but it still seems like a very big job. So how did the three of you divide up the work?

A: I focused a lot more on the seminar programs, seminar programs, plus Hawaii seminar. I sort of spearheaded Hawaii seminar, my staff... ADB has official meetings, Finance Ministers speak. Besides official meetings, they have three, four days of seminars, where certain development issues (are) discussed. So one has to come up with seminar programs, the topics, speakers, discussants, format, and I spent great deal of time thinking about and coming up with program. And they were of course in negotiation with ADB. Plus Hawaii Business Forum, I have to worry about the food, speakers, and so on. And also I worked with the Hawaiian group. Bob Fishman, since he was head of HTA, which supervises the Convention Center, he was much more concerned with the physical setup. Of course, all three of us are involved, but he was – it's not easy to have a setup... all these things, and he spent a great deal of time even just to – because not everyone can just walk in, right, you have the badges and everything... Brenda was more involved in international relations, meeting with the heads, delegation leaders and so on. So we had a fairly good division of labor.
Q: How often did you have to contact the media for your work?
A: They were always there. We didn’t have to have any formal meetings.

Q: Did you regularly send out press releases to the media?
A: No... and we had a number of ADB officials visiting, giving talks, lectures, attending meetings. ADB officials, many of them came here...

Q: Like N. Cinnamon Dorsife?
A: Well, she’s the Ambassador. The actual staff who implement ADB programs, and those staff are here about what the ADB is and so on...

Q: So did you think you got fair coverage from the media?
A: Yes, I think. Plus UH had its own – the Globalization Research Center spearheaded the seminars where ADB issues discussed and often ADB officials were invited to participate.

Q: Yes, I attended one with Shoji Nishimoto.
A: Right, Shoji Nishimoto like him a couple of times and there’s –

Q: Ian Gill?
A: Yes, Ian Gill, and the Secretary of the Bank... (pauses, trying to remember).

Q: It’s okay, I’ll find out.
A: (Looking for paper.) Lohani, Bindu Lohani.

Q: So, overall you think Hawaii has benefited from the conference?
A: Yes, I think Hawaii has shown to the world that Hawaii can organize major international conference, right? After all, see Hawaii... tourism is a major industry, right? So far, we have attracted a great deal of leisure tourism. Sun and surf people who come here to enjoy our beaches. What we like to do is we like to attract
business tourists. We like to attract intellectuals to come here not only to enjoy the beauty of Hawaii, but also participate in some substantive discussions, something the ADB accomplishes.... We’re bringing high level officials, and businessmen and bankers.... We like to have more people coming here to do something more value-added rather than just come here, relax and go home....

Q: So what’s the next biggest project for your office again?

A: Next week we have the big... sister state conference. State of Hawaii has many agreements with different provinces, prefectures, states in Asia – Japan, Philippines, China, right, all various places. So I think it’s important to get together and talk about how we can deepen our relationship – business, culture, education, and not just states, cities. Cities have their relationships. Honolulu has a relationship with some cities in Asia. So we are inviting all... states and cities, provinces involved with our state and city to talk about how we can deepen our cultural, economic, business and educational relations...
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW WITH ROBERT FISHMAN

Q: I understand that you were one of the people assigned by Gov. Cayetano to organize the ADB conference.

A: Right.

Q: What was it like organizing it?

A: Oh, it was a big challenge because you're dealing with not only with the Asian Development Bank itself, which is an international multilateral entity but also the United States government and – one agency of the United States government – and we also had the state and local government involved and the private sector. So it was really a very large coordination challenge. And it was a lot of fun.

Q: Why was it a lot of fun?

A: It was a puzzle and I enjoy doing puzzles and there's a lot of opportunities to do good things for lots of people. The Asian Development Bank is a wealthy organization that puts lots of money to programs that help to pull people out of poverty in the Third World. So from that point of view and also from the standpoint of making a major event happen in the state of Hawaii, it certainly helped to put Hawaii on the map as a very credible and a very acceptable meeting place for major international meetings. And also it put the Convention Center on the map. A lot of very senior government leaders and business leaders were able to see the Convention Center operating at its best. That's a very good thing. We had some top corporate leaders there; we also had some heads of government so it really was a very good thing.
Q: As the former Chief Executive of the Hawaii Tourism Authority, what exactly were your responsibilities?

A: My responsibilities were as Chairman of the Executive Committee of the US host group for the Asian Development Bank meeting for 2001. I think it was in that capacity that I did my job. Clearly it was consistent with my work as CEO of the Hawaii Tourism Authority but that was because the Governor gave us that assignment. So running the meeting was the Governor’s assignment as the Chairman of the Executive Committee.

Q: Did you have to work a lot with the media or who were the other organizations you had to work with?

A: Yes, I worked with all the media, I worked with law enforcement agencies, I worked with the Treasury Department, I worked with the Hawaii Visitors and Convention Bureau and all of our local groups, a whole lot of businesses both in and out of the visitor industry. We had an entire executive committee – in fact several executive committees – one of them that dealt with small business opportunities in launching our Global Pavilion Expo and there was one committee that dealt with law enforcement and I sat in that committee from time to time. There was a lot of organizational efforts going on at the same time. And we worked with the media on a regular basis, and the community.

Q: How would you describe your working relationship with the media?

A: Pretty good. I think we were very comfortable with each other. You’re straightforward with them, tell them the truth, and they tend to be as much as
possible straightforward with you. I think that we found a very good working relationship the entire time.

Q: Did you regularly give them press releases or were they around with you at the Convention the entire time?

A: We didn't issue any press releases that I'm aware of. Perhaps at the beginning when we announced the meeting and only when we had formal messages. However the Asian Development Bank had a press office, a very well staffed press office and they sent out press information on a regular basis that had to do with their meeting and that had to do with their agenda. But we didn't send it out as the host committee.

Q: What were your concerns regarding law enforcement and security?

A: Clearly, our first concern was that we communicated to the Treasury Department that the state of Hawaii could not have an open checkbook to pay for any security concerns that might arise. Clearly we were coming off of the recent history of a very expensive and very ugly situation in Seattle when the World Trade Organization met there. So when we met with the Treasury Department we told them that we really didn't have the ability to be an open checkbook even though we were hosting the event the security was something that needed to be hammered out in terms of shared responsibility with the US government and they understood that. They didn't come to an agreement with us in the beginning. Ultimately it was through our Congressional delegation that money was forthcoming to be able to allow the city mainly - it was the city police department - to recapture some of their costs. But the first concern obviously was who would pay for it. Then we had a
coordination challenge; the Governor appointed a very capable individual – Sid Hayakawa – to be his representative, his Chief Security Officer, State Security Representative – Sid has just recently been given a very important Federal position in Hawaii in the Transportation Security Agency. I believe he was the one selected for that. But he was a former Federal Law Enforcement person and he was the Deputy Director of the State Public Safety Department. He was – in the name of the Governor – he was the coordinator for security and he related to a counterpart at the US level – at the Treasury Department level – and he brought the Federal and State agencies and County agencies together in the working partnership that they had. So even though I was the Chairman of the Executive Committee, the Governor had decided to delegate the law enforcement coordination authority to Sid Hayakawa and so we worked together very well.

Q: So Sidney Hayakawa is no longer – what was his old position?

A: Well, I don’t know if he’s actually moved over yet but I just read in the paper that he was selected for this position to work for the Federal Department of Transportation as the – I guess he’s going to be the top coordinator for airport security activities in Hawaii. I’m not exactly sure what the job description is. I read in the paper that he was selected for a very senior position.

Q: Aside from the general concern about the protesting becoming another Seattle –

A: What I mentioned to you our concern was not about the protesting per se but who should pay for adequate law enforcement and we expressed to them that we didn’t have the resources to pay an unlimited charge card for all the law enforcement that the professional law enforcement agencies deemed necessary. That was the only
concern that I brought up at that point. Then it was turned over to the professionals to determine what was needed in order to protect the community from any lawlessness that might occur.

Q: So basically it was another office that was concerned with establishing what specific security concerns should be addressed?

A: Yes, that was a multi-governmental task force, okay, 'cause you had everything – you had Secret Service – because at that time we believed the President of the United States was going to be there – and then you had the FBI and then you had the local – the State – Department of Public Safety, of course the Honolulu Police and there were probably a few other individuals who were part of it to be able to make sure that it worked smoothly. They were the ones – these were professionals in law enforcement – who made the determination along with the security coordinator for the Convention Center as well as to what it needed to be done in order to make sure that the people could have their meeting in relative peace and quiet and the public's rights were preserved as well in the immediate vicinity of the Convention Center.

Q: Did any of the anti-ADB people tried to contact your group or anyone –

A: Yes, sure, I think there were people who called all the time. I can't recollect a specific conversation I had with them. But these aren't crazies, I mean some of these folks had a really genuine concern with the Asian Development Bank. We didn't agree with them; they believed that some of the beliefs of the Asian Development Bank were the instrument of evil and that we should not deal with them, talk to them, and in America they're entitled to their opinion. They're also
entitled to speak their opinion up front, make noise if they want, but (does not finish sentence). And we’ve always said from the very beginning, our Executive Committee always believed that people’s Constitutional rights to communicate their displeasure within the law should be preserved. And so I think largely these folks had very little concern with we who were running the meeting, and I think that to some degree that’s one of the reasons that the folks who did come were fairly civil, at least the people from Hawaii. There was a number of people who came from outside of Hawaii, not too many, but probably in the few dozens who decided that they were going to leave their mark, make noise, do other things just to be obnoxious.

Q: Really?

A: Yeah, just to make noise. But still, as far as I’m concerned, they didn’t break the law and being obnoxious is not against the law. So, let them exercise their Constitutional rights. And as long as we have that fairly enlightened approach, we didn’t polarize people too much. Now there were still some people who had a fight with the City and County of Honolulu when they made their policy to close the street or not close the street. That was something that did not come from us, that was the street up from the Convention Center and the promenade behind the Convention Center, that community belonged to the City and County of Honolulu, and they were entitled to do their job as the law allowed and same thing with the Attorney General, they had some responsibilities, too, that didn’t involve the Convention Center but our responsibility for providing security was assigned to us by the coordinating group as the line in front of the Convention Center where the
traffic barricades were. So inside the traffic barricades we provided our security for the building and what have you and outside that was done by the security group, but mainly the Honolulu Police Department.

Q: How well did the meeting go, in your opinion?

A: Oh, it was a triumph; it was a wonderful thing for almost everyone. There was very little downside, the delegates who came to the meeting were all very pleased with the progress of the meeting, we had some extremely positive seminars that dealt with subject matter issues, that dealt with opportunities and business development, we had a first ever Global Pavilion Expo which had probably a hundred booths and the booths that ranged from Hawaii corporations that wanted to do business in Asia, there were some local companies that made very large business inroads, very large contracts. One was a housing construction company that made a deal with Malaysia, and there was a water purification company that made a deal with Indonesia, and these were large contracts, so we were very happy that there were some breakthrough for some Hawaii companies, and that was part of the purpose for the expo. That was done well. Also, we were able to get the message across to these 59 countries that Hawaii is one of the best, the safest, meeting places in the world, and we should have more business meetings in Hawaii and of course they all left with a very positive attitude so from that point of view it was a very positive experience. From the operational point of view, we stayed within our budget; what we said the meeting was going to cost, it cost a little bit less. We raised a significant amount of money for the private sector – corporate contributions – to help us pay some of the costs; we were very happy about that. The State contributed – the
Legislature – made an appropriation the previous year to contribute some of the money – about a million dollars – to help pay for the meeting and the rest was raised through the private sector or some other types of cooperating funds. I don’t have the numbers with me – I can’t remember exactly what the numbers were - but the whole conference in revenues from all sources – the State and the private sector and everybody else, without the security costs came in a little under two million dollars. But it was comprehensive; some of the costs were actually paid for by the attendees, depending on what it was, and did not include hotel. It had an impact, probably between 5 and 10 million dollars on the economy of the State of Hawaii, just on the amount of things – the hotel rooms and meals and hosted events and other things paid for by the participating countries and the companies that came. So on the whole it was an economic development success. It put Hawaii on the map as far as hosting world meetings; it was a very positive experience from that point of view. The Convention Center, although it didn’t make a lot of money to the bottom line, they made an enormous amount of milestones from the standpoint of their image, and people were very impressed with the quality of the Hawaii Convention Center where they had never even heard about it before, and now they’re talking about it and the international relationships Hawaii made with business leaders and government leaders from around Asia, you just can’t put a value on that. It was really very positive all around, so I think when you put it all together... In fact we had a celebration, we had a thank you reception with pupus and everything for all the volunteers – we had about a thousand volunteers – that helped with all the events, and ushering and registration and everything. We had a reception to say
thank you to all the volunteers and Mayor Lito Atienza from Manila came to the reception to participate and it was really very nice. The whole thing was a very positive experience. The community where they originally had concerns, all the condominiums around the building – around the Convention Center – built a whole new level of trust in the management of the building as a result of it because by and large the building did extremely good community relations and they made promises that they kept and the traffic didn’t create the crisis that everybody wanted and the police were there for security so they really... I think on the whole it’s something that Hawaii should be really proud of.

Q: Did you think that Hawaii’s media were able to convey this level of success to the public?

A: Hmmm, you mean to Hawaii’s public?

Q: Yes.

A: Hmmm, I can’t really say. The media... I have a very – more mature, cultivated expectation of the media. I think that their role is to communicate what they think is important at any given moment in time. And if they can be honest and true to themselves, to that principle, that’s about what I can expect. I mean, they are not there to communicate my message, except if it meets that standard for them. I mean, I can want them to do something and say something for me, and I may be very disappointed because they don’t agree that it’s important to communicate that. So I think probably on the whole, the media told the story that they thought was the most important for the public. I can’t think of anything specific that caused me disappointment. I did believe that they rather enjoyed covering what was outside the
Convention Center rather than what was inside of the Convention Center. But again it’s one thing if they don’t cover what you want; you can be disappointed if you want but you can’t fault them as long as they’re true to their principles. Their principles are, ‘We believe that the public really wants to know what’s going on at the Kapiolani Boulevard, not what’s inside the Convention Center’. Well then, I can’t fault them if they don’t say what I want them to say, as long as they’re true to their principles. But if they deliberately make up their mind that they’re going to try to hurt somebody, whether they’re going to be a vigilante or try to embarrass somebody... in other words there’s a purpose in mind that they’re pursuing that is less than high-principled, whether it’s less than providing the public with the information that they believe the public ought to hear, well then they should be ashamed of themselves. But in this particular case, I didn’t see any pattern; I thought that they tended to gravitate to covering the potential arguments out on the streets, rather than what was inside the building. But that’s not meant as a criticism, that’s more as an observation.

Q: Yes, I understand. Overall, did you think, do you feel that the media was fair in their coverage of what was going on outside of the Convention?

A: Pretty fair. I think they misstated some of the expectations for the size of the audience. I think they listened to the folks who would have people believe that there were going to be many thousands protesting. Put it this way, that was a year ago – May, right?

Q: Yes.
A: I cannot remember any gross journalism abuses, I can’t think of any. I mean, clearly I think it would have been a good idea for more of the reporters to have been dedicated to what was going on inside the Convention Center. For example, there’s a wonderful presentation – a very wonderful presentation – by Bumpy Kanahele and Dr. Sol Nalauil and a few other folks on the Hawaiian culture. They had a booth inside of the Global Pavilion and they presented a genuine picture of the matured Hawaiian culture over the generations and why they’re prepared to do business on a world scale. That was a wonderful story to tell; in fact the president of the Asian Development Bank spent a great deal of time over there meeting the folks and talking to them, and that’s the kind of thing I would have liked to see more of, but again as I mentioned to you, if I live my life waiting for the media to cover the things that I want them to cover, then I’m going to be a very disappointed person. That isn’t the way it works. They will cover what they think is important. And as long as they do that, as long as their hearts are pure and as long as they cover what they think is important, and I’ve learned to accept that.
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW WITH BRENDA LEI FOSTER

Q: What were you doing before you became the Governor's Executive Assistant?

A: I was the Director of the Office of International Relations for the State in Gov. Waihee's cabinet.

Q: So your career has always been...in government.

A: No, international. It's always been international. But I joined government about ten years ago. First as Gov. Waihee's Cabinet Secretary for International and then when Gov. Cayetano was elected and the Office of International Relations was eliminated, then Governor Cayetano asked me to come in to his office and be his Executive Policy Assistant for International and National Affairs. So I basically cover the world and Washington DC for him.

Q: You were working in international affairs before you came into government?

A: Yes.

Q: What was that like? What was your job like, or what was it that your job entailed. What was your career like?

A: I'm not exactly sure what you're asking, but I was the Executive Director of the Pacific and Asian Affairs Council, that you must be very familiar with...

Q: Yes.

A: ... so I did a very large community program of international activities - far more than what is currently done by the Pacific and Asian Affairs Council now - and also was very active at the Council of Organizations for New York (?) and was President of the National Council for World Affairs organization in addition to running the
Pacific and Asian Affairs Council and the Honolulu Committee on Foreign Relations. So, very active in international and foreign affairs.

Q: So you got to meet a lot of the officials from all the different countries.

A: Yes, yes.

Q: What was that work like?

A: I still do it (laughs).

Q: Yes, but I guess the difference is that –

A: It's still the same, you're still working with people on issues that are either important to their country or that are important to their country and Hawaii or important to their country and the United States, so for example, I was asked by the US government and the Chinese government to run the Presidential visits of Jiang Zemin, Vice President Wujing Cao - all these leaders – when they come to Hawaii. Even prior to being in government, when we would have various high-level leaders, various governments would still contact me and ask me to do the interfacing, and do the arrangements, and work on issues that they wanted to discuss with people here and I'll facilitate that.

Q: So how did your experience help you with what you had to do for the ADB conference?

A: I think it's just accumulation. ADB was no bigger than any other conference I've ever really put on or worked together with. It's just years of experience of working with people, negotiating with governments, years of experience in running programs, running conferences, and you just come by and after years of experience, basically...
Q: So what did you have to do for the conference?

A: I was in charge of working with all of the countries who were coming, all the finance ministers who were coming, ensuring that all of the visa requirements were facilitated through the US government, I was also one of the interfaces with the US Department of Treasury, working on the arrangements with the Secretary of Treasury’s office, also working with the letters for the President of the United States, working with all of the aspects of security that would come in, and being involved overseeing that as a member of the Executive Committee. The security was really run superbly by a person the Governor had chosen for the State – Sidney Hayakawa – who you really should also speak with. The Governor asked him to oversee the security and Sidney brought together the group of old Federal, State, and City and County officials and together with Chief Donohue and HPD, did a superb job on working on all of those issues. But my real areas then would be to take care of all the foreign countries, and any arrangements they would need and working with all the finance ministers. So for me it was still the international side of the meeting where others here like Mr. Fishman was in charge of the Convention Center, the logistics, that side of the meeting. I did all of the meetings with the Secretary of Treasury, the Finance Ministers, the government, Department of State, and that side of it; airport arrivals, departures, and how all that would be run.

Q: You said that based on your past experience with organizing conferences before and working with foreign dignitaries, the ADB wasn’t that big a deal, I mean, not as big a project, or not bigger...
A: No, you know... to clarify: I got the feeling from your question that ADB was the program and everything I’ve ever done led up to ADB and all I was trying to clarify was ADB was a very important program, very important program for the state. But everything I ever done didn’t culminate or lead up to “Wow, I got ADB”...

Q: No –

A: And I took your question to mean that.

Q: No, I’m sorry, let me clarify that. What I meant was, ADB wasn’t the culmination of your career, but it was – at least from what I get from the articles – it was a big thing for the State in terms of trying to create the atmosphere... or I guess trying to market itself as the Geneva of the Pacific – a great place for conventions and not just for leisure travelers.

A: Several things. There have been... let’s take a couple of steps back. There have been several large conferences in Hawaii over the years: American Bar Association, they’ve had somewhere around 30,000 people here for a conference; the American Medical Association, the Dental Association, all sorts of other people have come to Hawaii for their meetings and conventions. What was important about the Asian Development Bank’s meeting being here was bringing international conferences here that had a wide variety of participants and players. So before the ADB, we worked very hard under the Governor’s initiatives to have the Pacific Basin Economic Council meeting here which brought together the 21 economies very similar to the APEC economies from around the world. So we had international business people coming to Hawaii to meet. The ADB then brought together the international finance community and in this case government finance community
but what was important is the private sector who is involved in international finance follows that meeting so we could get both that public sector and private sector of international finance meeting here. And then we have always here international visits and conferences and meetings but they've either been more on a bilateral level or if they were on a multilateral level they were more private negotiations, this sort of thing, a la Asia Pacific Security Studies type issues. So what was important in terms of ADB, it was another step along the way in the Governor working to establish this as an international business meeting different than from AMA, the ADA or the others, which are also business conventions, but not necessarily international. So it was international in the scope and in that way it would distinguish it from the other conferences we've held in the past.

Q: Do you think it came out across clearly in the media, you know, that this is why this conference was important?

A: Um (pauses). I'd have to go back and look. It was clear to me in the media that they knew it was an international conference because the media was consumed by the security aspects of the conference, which would have been handled a little differently or would not have had the focus they did had it not been an international meeting. So I think in a sense the security issues drove the conference. In the media's mind, they knew it was an international meeting. Do I think that they picked up the significance and importance of it being international finance ministers, really being able to take advantage of that, the corporations and businesses, yes, but not to the extent I would have liked to have seen that. I think they really just were too focused on security issues and events that had happened in
other venues around the world where there had been disturbances at international meetings; World Bank meetings, for example, WTO meetings certainly.

Q: Do you think this was par for the course for the media or do you think that this was unusual in its, I guess, not obsession, but what you said was driving force? Do you think this was normal for the media in Hawaii or was it highly unusual because of the nature... because of the fact it was international plus you had security...

A: Hawaii had only seen meetings like this on TV in the past, and what they saw was not necessarily the speakers and the substance of the meeting. I find the media tends to cover the events that they figure will be more headline-grabbing. And a finance minister making a major agreement with a country which will add a major breakthrough in economic issues or economic development issues for a country doesn’t get the substance of play in the media as much as somebody throwing a rock at a window. So the answer is, I think the media focused on that much more than they should have looking for the other issues. But I think they drove, my feeling was they drove a sense of fear in the community because of watching the WTO meetings and becoming extremely concerned. Should they be probing, should they be asking officials, the planners, the organizers, and the bank itself, you know, ‘Will we see this, we don’t want that to happen here, what are you doing about that?’ Absolutely. The media should be probing those questions and doing that but to play violence over and over, and this is not just print – electronic media and the rest – I don’t know how reassuring that is to a community. It tended to build up more of a fever pitch of issues that the rest of us who were involved in it, who were getting the daily intelligence reports and the rest and knew how professional our
security staff was, perhaps didn’t feel that same sense of urgency because we knew we were going to be very prepared and I think we credit Sid Hayakawa and his committee and definitely Chief Donohue and HPD being very professional, knowing what they were doing and from the outset we were going to set a different tone for a conference of this caliber in Hawaii.

Q: Do you think – I guess there would be classified information you can’t tell me – but in terms of intelligence reports you were getting, was it in line with the way the media was reporting it, or was a lot of like seeing ghosts as far as you were concerned?

A: The media was never really reporting the intelligence reports then it wouldn’t have been intelligence. Intelligence reports would be (pauses) the police departments, the federal agencies, and all of us looking at possible people who may want to come to Hawaii and try to organize people to have a disturbance. We found that most of the reports we were looking at and the issues of trying to cause trouble were not people here in Hawaii. It was agitators and people from outside Hawaii wanting to come to Hawaii to organize people in Hawaii to do their bidding, basically. And we found that our community is not that type of community, and we’re really not receptive to that. We have disagreements on issues, we’re very capable I think of discussing those and working those out among our community.

Q: But these people who were outside Hawaii – from what I got from the paper, they never made it to Hawaii –

A: There were a few people who I think had come here to take up residence.

Q: Oh, really?
A: Yes, but they were unable to be very effective.

Q: So, all in all, do you feel that the opposition – there was the opposition that came from within the community of Hawaii but who were very clear as far their statements that there was not going to be any violence –

A: Right.

Q: Did you have any interaction with these people?

A: I did not have interaction but several people on our committee and I had a State Department person who was assigned to me for the last two years, a woman named Anne Wright who went out into the communities and worked very hard at the communities. We also – when these issues came up and I think there’s lots of issues even all of us would agree we wouldn’t, let me put it this way, we would agree to disagree with the bank itself, the Asian Development Bank, on some of their policies and programs and the rest. And I think a lot of the well-thought out arguments against policies of the ADB or programs, you know had a lot of merit and deserve to be heard and deserve to be heard by the ADB. When we were thinking of trying to get all viewpoints heard, and I think that was a key that for Bob, Seiji, myself, and the Executive Committee appointed to do this, we put this conference on for the State, we wanted to be able to make sure people’s viewpoints and different viewpoints could be heard, and we thought it was part of our role to be able to get that as far as the ADB meeting or as an ancillary meeting in conjunction with the ADB and we knew there were people out there so that when people approached us... the best way to work with them is to give them a forum, and to get them included. So I approached Dean Neubauer at the University of Hawaii who
was the head of the Globalization Research Institute and have nothing but praise for Dean Neubauer and the Globalization Institute to be able to put on a forum... presenting diverse viewpoints and getting a forum for ADB Directors and Board Members and other people to go out and address, and listen to why people have problems with some of the things they’re doing. Now one argue both sides of those issues, I mean should they go with those projects and programs or whatever, but the important part of that was the process of dialogue. And we went to the University of Hawaii to ask them if they would be interested in holding this kind of dialogue. And they were already working on globalization issues and they also ran a TV program, TV series on it. So Dean talked with us about the TV series, and the conference, and we worked very hard with him and Anne Wright, our State Department person in particular did, too. It wasn’t to get any particular viewpoint out, it was to get all the viewpoints out and people who wanted to be heard. And I think that was one of the successes of the conference overall. And in fact President Chino just saw me in Shanghai recently, and told me that the Hawaii meeting, in his mind, was still the best ADB Annual Board of Governors meeting that ADB has ever had.

Q: And this is like the first conference where the President actually came out to meet...

A: Yes.

Q: - the people.

A: Yes. Yes, it was. And it was a milestone and I think it still stands as a milestone for an ADB Annual Board of Governors meeting.

Q: And I think it’s also a milestone in for the protesters...

A: Yes.
Q: …because they were surprised that after all these years, they've expected that they would not have an opportunity to address the president of the bank.

A: Right.

Q: - and yet here he came out.

A: And we talked to him. Everybody talked with him about that. I think that's important. And I think what was important is the United States government was the official government host, Hawaii was the host for the US government, and I think we wanted to set a different tone for meetings to show the aloha spirit and that things are done a little differently in Hawaii. And were we going to tolerate violence? Absolutely not. Were we going to tolerate diverse opinions? It's not tolerated, it's encouraged dialogue and diverse opinions.

Q: It seems like – because I also attended some of those forums sponsored by the Globalization Research Center – do you feel that the media helped the community understand that there was this ingoing process and dialogue among all the participants in the conference and that it wasn’t just, you know, a bunch of anarchists who were going to come here to disrupt the conference?

A: I would have to go back and review all the articles. So I will give a caveat that my memory is not that good, but my only memory of all the media coverage was on protesters. Just day after day, protesters, and cops, and training police in getting people riled up that we were developing this massive police force. I can’t remember any article – and I’d have to go back and look at them – that talked about or spent time focusing on the dialogue encouraging these ideas. But then again, I didn’t read every article that came out on ADB in the meeting of the stuff (?) either.
Q: I’ll take that caveat (into consideration), of course. So after all the hard work and the success of the conference, I would have to say, do you feel that Hawaii is now in a better position economically and I guess in terms of recognition in the international scene as a place in the Pacific that can host future international conferences like the ADB?

A: Yes.

Q: And was it the ADB that made the difference?

A: No, I think it’s accumulation of conferences. Smaller conferences that have been held over the years, and then the previous year the Pacific Basin Economic Council and then ADB. So I definitely think it’s accumulation. We’ve held several APEC meetings here. When I was director of OIR, I ran several APEC meetings, both Finance Ministerials, the APEC Business Advisory Council meeting, Senior Officials meetings; the East-West Center is noted throughout the world for hosting international meetings. We have the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies who does their international conferences and meetings, we have international visitors here all of the time. I think it is just a continual process and that no venue can ever stop having those meetings because then if you’re out of sight, you’re out of mind. What was a little bit different on the ADB meeting is because there has been so much focus in the media and international media worldwide every time there’s a WTO meeting or a World Bank meeting or something that – they’re not focused on any of the issues that are going on at those meetings but the media only focuses on the demonstrators at those meetings that therefore by our having an international finance meeting here, there became a lot more media focus on it because of events
with WTO and the World Bank. And so when they got here they found that the
story had to be a substantive story because the story wasn’t about protesters.

Q: Eventually – and I can show you the articles – in the end it was for them a letdown
because it turns out that the protesting turned out to be one big parade –

A: Uhm hmm (agreement).

Q: - and celebration. And eventually I think they were forced to actually focus on
what happened during the conference –

A: Right.

Q: Because I saw the articles and ‘Now that we don’t have any of the violence to
report, let’s see... so what did happen?’ And so now you see the articles, now
they’re talking to the businessmen who were able to get contracts during the
conference. Do you think that – and I guess this is now my personal assessment –
that there was unfair focus, unfair coverage of the conference in the way that it
covered the substantive issues that were being presented at the conference but as
well as unfairness in terms of how they covered the protesters themselves? Or do
think that there was legitimate concern about security issues?

A: Oh I think there was definitely legitimate concern because it’s encouraged dialogue
and diverse opinions. we were legitimately concerned in this office and I was on
several trips to Washington, DC talking people involved in security with the US
government about security issues. But security issues to me weren’t just the
protesters; they were problems that were occurring between countries who were
member countries of the bank, who don’t get along in other venues and in the world
in general, being able to make sure we didn’t have assassination attempts on
Finance Ministers, that if they were going to be out of the country, what type of security would there be for the Finance Ministers and their entourage, what was happening between their countries, were there other – what I would consider other, more macro, more international, more immediate security issues – in the issue of hosting 85 countries from around the world, let alone our own Secretary of the Treasury. The protesters to me were what were everybody else here was worrying about. And I could see because that’s what they were seeing on the media. But if you want to know what the real security issues were, it’s making sure somebody doesn’t assassinate somebody else’s Finance Minister, or go after the bank, or try to blow something up, because these countries don’t get along. A lot of these countries, you know, aren’t friendly to each other in the world stage. So were there security concerns? Absolutely there were security concerns. That’s why the State Department and everybody else we knew – the State Department, the FBI, everybody – was heavily involved in this. The protesters were only one slice of the pie. Did people have a right to be concerned? Absolutely. But we were all focused, not all focused, we’re certainly focused on the demonstrators – and HPD, that was huge for them – but there were all these other security concerns and we just kept quiet, that we had to just keep working on. It was like running the Ms. Universe pageant that we had here that brought worldwide – a hundred forty-three countries and we had 45 professional stalkers trying to get these women. So these sorts of security, I mean there are legitimate security issues in hosting any sort of conference. There’s legitimate security issues every time the Governor goes anywhere, or anybody else. But to the extent that the media focused totally that this
is the conference, and to the extent that there was some naïveté that anybody just comes to Hawaii, nobody can get here so therefore nothing’s going to happen so therefore we don’t have to prepare any security measures and the police don’t have to spend money for equipment and do X, Y, and Z is just simply naïveté. They’re living in a dream world, that things aren’t the same. The result was there were people trying to hack into the computer system because they were so frustrated with everything else, there were all these kids trying to knock down the computer system because people couldn’t come here, they couldn’t disrupt the conference so they thought they could disrupt the conference and everything by taking out the computer systems. But our tech people - led by Joe Blanco in this office - had put the best firewalls around. So there’s all sorts of security issues from demonstrators on the streets, to problems within countries, to problems between individuals, to taking down a computer system where all your data and everything are on. So is security an issue? Absolutely security’s an issue. But the media never focused on an overall issue of security; the media focused only on what I call that vision of demonstrators on the streets and getting people rightly concerned - people had every right to be concerned.

Q: Do you think that Hawaii’s media’s coverage of the issue of the protesters was largely because of WTO or do you feel that this is a general thing the media is interested in: newsworthy events – events that have drama and conflict?

A: I think the result was because they saw everything on WTO. And that’s a very scary picture to anybody, let alone businesses surrounding a venue where they’re going to be...
Q: Do you think that the media coverage of the WTO was I guess more level-headed in its focus on the violence of the protests?

A: You mean here or there?

Q: Media in general, I guess, the way it covered the WTO.

A: I would have to have been at WTO to answer that question to see how bad it really was on the street or how bad it was. I do know that some governors had tried to go to meetings, couldn’t get over, I did meet one of the Chinese representatives there and the demonstrators on the street took away her shoes – this is the first time this woman had ever been to the United States, thinking she wouldn’t go into the venue if she didn’t have her shoes on, so she walked in barefoot – that sort of image to foreign countries isn’t particularly positive. And what demonstrators should realize, these people have the same rights to come, go to a meeting, as they do to stand on the street and voice their opinion. And I don’t know how the media goes through that.

Q: One last question: how would you evaluate the Honolulu Advertiser’s coverage of the conference in relation to the other media, you know, the electronic media?

A: I can’t answer that – and I’m very academic on that, I’d like to sit down and read their whole coverage before I gave you an opinion on that – and I haven’t done that, so I apologize.

Q: No problem.

A: So I wouldn’t know what to say on that.

Q: No problem. Maybe one last, last question.

A: I don’t know if I’m helping that much, though.
Q: Oh very much, very much. How was it possible that the security people managed to keep those who were really planning to disrupt the conference off the island?

Q: I’ll give you my opinion, you should really talk to Sid Hayakawa... and also Chief Donohue... I would like to say, at least from my perspective, in watching how hard they all worked, we had an excellent team of professionals from the Federal, State, City and County... and the military – the military was a very active player – on the security team. And with all of the resources those organizations brought to bear, not the least of which was cooperation and working together as a team and sharing information, dissecting what could be all the possible scenarios or venues and then prepare so that things don’t happen. One could also argue – and there may be some validity to this – that the newspaper coverage and the TV coverage focusing totally on how we were gearing up – in one case they thought we were a police, and what happened to the aloha state – the fact that there was so much coverage – this is the other side of the coin now, the security issues, the fact that there was all that coverage, could send out the messages, and they sent it out even on the internet, that if you are coming to Hawaii, you need to know that we are prepared. And I think that had a lot to do with it. The other side to that is – and I think it still did go to our advantage – Hawaii’s geographic location. It is not easy to come to Hawaii and live on the streets or bunk with other people or get a warehouse like they do on the mainland, and have busloads of people driving across each state, all of them staying together organizing and demonstrating. You either fly, or you come by boat, or swim, maybe if you’re really a good swimmer. The hotel accommodations are expensive, living here is expensive, if you don’t have networks and people that you
can plug into automatically who's already organizing on the ground for you, you're pretty much on your own. I think the aloha spirit and what's important to people in Hawaii really put us in good stead, in terms of this conference. But I give tremendous amount of credit to that security team with Sid and the police chief in terms of how they were organized, how they were prepared. They sent people to the Democratic National Conventions, Republican Conventions, to the World Bank meetings. They looked and learned how police and security forces handle things there and these are serious issues when people are literally busing people, or people say "Oh I think I'll go up and join the party, or go up and do these sorts of things." You can't do that readily in Hawaii. So in that sense, geographic location plays a part, but I think the biggest issue was there was full cooperation with every Federal agency you can imagine, because I think I talked to almost all of them, and our local people here, and the military, and we had good line into all of the countries. We worked with all the US embassies in the countries, we worked with various intelligence staffs in the countries just trying to know what was important and what would we have to look for or watch for so we could assess how we would handle the situation to ensure that the conference was a success. There was so much more behind the scenes putting on this conference, and on security on this conference than ever met the public eye or the media eye. We just don't talk about it because that's security. We just want to make sure it goes well. And I think it's to the security team's credit and the extensive planning on the logistics and to this community's credit that we live in that that conference was the most successful conference ADB themselves said they've ever held. So I think it's a combination of
everything. Also, when we were beginning the conference and the Governor asked Sid to be the overall security coordinator for it, Sid was the Deputy Director for Public Safety Department at that time, we brought in on the contract one of the gentlemen who was in charge of security for the Olympics in Atlanta. So we brought them in, went through all the stuff we need to do, and we had every worst-case scenario you could imagine, even more so than a lot of us had ever dreamed of that could even happen in Hawaii. But do those scenarios happen? Sure they do. Do they happen at things like the Olympics, or WTO, or World Bank meetings or Super Bowl, where there is large groups of people, may or may not be in between countries, but where you have lots of media coverage. It's the media that the demonstrators are coming for, it's not the bank. It's the media, that's the coverage they want. They don't care about talking to the bank. I don't think they care about resolving a lot of the issues, some of the really hard-core people who want to just disrupt. They're coming because of you folks, the media, that's why they're coming.

Q: Not so much to argue the issues –
A: No.

Q: - but to get media mileage?
A: Right. But are there people who do demonstrate who want to argue the issues? Sure there are.

Q: Do you think there were in this case?
A: Yeah, I think there were some very good people out there with good viewpoints and firmly believed in the issues that they were presenting to the bank. And they also
found venues and forums to get those issues aired. No, oh sure, there’s a lot of very, very credible people. People can disagree, but even just because we disagree doesn’t mean that we’re demonstrators. We’d have a lot of demonstrators, then, in the Governor’s Office (laughs), within the staff itself.
APPENDIX D: CONFIDENTIAL INTERVIEW WITH GOVERNMENT RESOURCE PERSON

*Portions of the interview that would reveal interviewee's identity have been deleted from this transcript.

Q: What was that experience like?

A: I tell you, it was a challenge. Because to gather all the law enforcement – Federal, State, local, emergency medical service – to bring the coordinators in, the planners, and ADB themselves, as well as the demonstrators was a huge task. One good thing about Hawaii is that you have a lot of cooperation. I think if this were held in another venue, you wouldn’t have as much cooperation from everyone.

Q: What was your working relationship like with the protesters, the anti-ADB group?

A: It wasn’t that much. It was basically through the attorneys....

Q: So you didn’t personally interact with them?

A: Very, very little, very little. This was a learning experience. I think if we had to do it again, I think what I would do is to meet with the demonstrators, talk to them.

Q: Personally?

A: Yes.

Q: Why?

A: I think opening the lines of communication is very important. So they know that we were there because we had a job to do. One was supporting the ADB – their goals and objectives – we were just there to protect everyone: both the demonstrators and all of the guests. And I think that had to be communicated, if I had to do it all over again, I would do that.
Q: So it would have been better if you all sat down and talked?

A: Yeah, yeah, I think so.

Q: Do you think you would have less – I don’t know if you had any difficulty –

A: I don’t know if it would have been less, but I know that when the attorneys talk and we agree to certain things, it minimizes the disruption, it really did. I think from the onset if I were able to talk to them, I think we really would have been able to do a lot… Again, I’m not a lawyer, so the lawyers are coming in… they have a different perspective on this thing. And they may say, “I have to protect the State. (I) made a decision, may have been a bad decision”, but my decision would have been based on allowing them to express their rights, as well as an understanding we also have to protect our visitors, guests and participants. There would have been that understanding, hopefully, and if not, then if not, then we would have to enforce the law.

Q: So what were your security concerns with regard to the conference?

A: It may have been, number one, I think we were influenced by what happened at WTO in Seattle. That was a first huge disruption that ever took place. The second thing for us, was this was the first time for the State. So again, being influenced by what had happened in Seattle, first time for us, so I guess that was a concern. But again we also understood that this is Hawaii and we cannot use a broad-brush approach for everything. And I think it showed that in the end.

Q: What lessons from WTO did you bring into the planning for the security for… the ADB conference?
A: We did a lot of planning based on what happened in WTO and other events throughout the nation because what we didn’t want to do was to have Hawaii become another venue for people who for some reason or other, be destructive. We didn’t want that to happen. We wanted to have a peaceful event. So we brought in many people as we could in the planning stage. But again, like I go back to my original statement that we should have brought in people who wanted to protest. And it could have been a separate meeting, aside, but at least we communicated. Yes, we understand that you have a right to express your opinion. Where do you think you can do that? Why at the Promenade, why not closer, or explain why. But I guess the attorneys got involved and they designated the areas, they agreed.

Q: Where would have been more practical –

A: Yes, we had talked about several areas, but I guess it was out of our control because there were some of these ordinances and laws that dictated that certain areas could not or should not be used to express – (did not finish sentence)

Q: So what were these places that were not allowed -

A: We talked about several areas, including the Promenade, and we talked about in front of the Convention Center. That was one of the areas we looked at. But the lawyers were the ones to intervene and say “You know what, you can’t do this because it’s private property”... and still thinking about access by the public, the residents who live there. So these different issues came about.

Q: I remember the uniforms of the security force. They were not the typical security force. Why did you come with that –
A: I'd have to defer that to Bob Fishman... Douglas Aton was the coordinator for the Convention Center. And under their agreement, they hired private security. I guess it was their thinking... non-intrusive attire. To me, it gave a good appearance. The only thing for me was that not everybody was consistent. You had people wearing aloha attire, some were wearing uniforms, so it wasn’t that consistent. And I say that more as a law enforcement person. In law enforcement you want to show that you have to show that you have consistency, compatibility throughout your workforce. If you were a law enforcement officer and you had to choose – and it's like being in a military maneuver – you’d want everybody to be in the same uniform, under the same commander. That would be the best-case scenario. But at times, you don’t have that and in this situation we didn’t have that –

Q: Why?

A: - because the Convention Center hired security for that area.

Q: So you had the Convention Center’s private security, then you had the State security, what about the National Guard?

A: The National Guard was also part of the State workforce.... (We) had to be prepared for the unexpected. That’s again another law enforcement mentality. Whether it’s liked or not, a lot of times, if you’re in charge of any event and you’re to provide the law enforcement and security service, you would have to be prepared for the unexpected. Like September 11, we weren’t prepared, so now we’re preparing. And you can’t only prepare for that, you have to look beyond and think like a terrorist. I’m no comparing the demonstrators – I’m just giving you an example. We weren’t prepared for September 11, now we’re trying to be prepared
for September 11. But… I want to go beyond that preparation. What’s next? What’s next? We got to look into that…. That’s why it’s so hard, yet people complain and say that, “Why do you gotta prepare for this?” Well you don’t understand. If I don’t prepare, then what are you going to tell me? I wasn’t prepared. So bottom line is, yes, that’s the reason why we called in the National Guard. We called it in as a back up… should the need arise. If you look at the total law enforcement security strategy – I’m not speaking for the police department – but again I’m saying I understand because you have responsibility for the entire island. You cannot dedicate your entire workforce to this single event. Although it is a well-publicized event, it would possibly help the state, but you can’t just say, you know what okay, because of this I’m going to dedicate everyone – so what happens to the people in Kaneohe, Waipahu, Wahiawa, Waianae when they need help? Oh, I can’t help you because we’re short of staff because everybody’s at ADB. It doesn’t sit too well with people. Again, that’s another law enforcement decision that has to be made. How much can we really dedicate to this convention? Only so much because we have other responsibilities. So okay, so State, you gotta come in with your officers, National Guard on standby.

Q: What were the biggest security concerns you had?

A: Looking back at it right now, to be really truthful with you, the unknown, because again, we didn’t know what was going to transpire. The concern was, looking back at what happened at the WTO, the Convention Center itself, is mainly glass. If we did have someone – a group of people – really intent on doing damage, then that would be the most – one of the most – I think it was a concern.
Q: Isn’t the Convention Center open air at the top?
A: I think it’s open – well yeah, at the very top level it’s open air but before that, it’s surrounded by all glass.

Q: I was thinking of something had happened, and you had to use teargas, that would have been –
A: You know –

Q: I’m sure you were hoping you wouldn’t have to –
A: To be truthful with you, we wouldn’t use teargas in a closed location. What’s the purpose? You’re going to hurt all the attendees, participants, and guests. I think that’s why you look at having the demonstrators expressing their own views at a certain location, not being able to come in. Because it was an ADB decision to make this invitees only. To deploy teargas, to me, an extreme measure, but to use it in a closed location, that’s when you use it in a hostage situation or barricade situation. In WTO they used it in the open to disperse the crowd. You didn’t have.

Q: What happens to all the equipment the State had to purchase?
A: What we did – the State purchased equipment for the police department to be equipped. Again, we go back to my initial statement – this was the first time for us and we looked at what happened at the WTO – our officers – when I say our officers, all the officers, HPD sheriff – they weren’t equipped to handle the situation should we have to use teargas, or push the crowd back. Again, being prepared was really important. So the philosophy we had, if you can’t protect the police officer, how do you expect the police officer to protect the guests? And the demonstrators? How can you expect that? You have to be able to protect the police officers. So that
was the reason why we had to buy the equipment. And you have to understand, too, that when they agreed to host this event, there was no money, no money that was allocated for security for this event.

Q: You said when they agreed, you meant the State?
A: The State agreed to host this. And again, I think this is one of the lessons learned, I think if you're going to host a large event, I think you need to look at the future, which is good, to have Hawaii become a host for large events but at the same time, the lesson learned would dictate that you need to figure in some cost for law enforcement, security, all these other services that come with hosting an event: transportation, hotels - I think there is a large grouping of people you need to consider, confer (with), before going out and saying you know what, I'm hosting this event.

Q: Do you feel that there wasn’t enough –
A: Well again, this was the first time for us. Yes, lessons learned, yeah?

Q: It should have been more –
A: A little more –

Q: Consultation –
A: Communication, consultation, yes, I think so. It would have helped. It would have helped.

Q: Do you think that all in all, though, it was money well spent?
A: I would have to say yes, although nothing really transpired or if it did, we were preparing (?). So... I look at it as an investment because should we have to host another event, at least you have the equipment necessary should something happen.
Because if we didn’t buy them for this event and we hosted event, we’re not prepared, how we gonna help? We can’t?

Q: But the teargas has a shelf life.

A: Yes, it will have to be replaced. Even some of the equipment… that’s true, it has shelf life. But if you don’t have it and an emergency arises…

Q: I wonder, what’s it like to use expired teargas?

A: You can’t use it, you can’t, yeah. I’m not an expert on that, but there’s a reason for an expiration date, like food, right? So I guess there’s a reason.

Q: How many people were you expecting in terms of the protestors? How many were you expecting from the mainland and outside or at least how many were you expecting who you knew were going to be disruptive?

A: We didn’t. In terms of actual numbers – we couldn’t talk to them, right – we would have found out we were going to have a hundred fifty. Sometimes they wouldn’t talk, that’s okay, that’s their right. But in terms of coordinating them – the numbers we had anticipated, we really didn’t know, could have gotten together with the demonstrators to find out… We had a range based on what we saw at the WTO. But you consider, it took money and time to fly here, and all the events some demonstrators were interested in other than Hawaii.

Q: How many people ended up coming?

A: I don’t know, I don’t have the – we didn’t count, we didn’t count. Whatever you saw. Were you there?

Q: No.
A: Whatever the papers – they say about 150, maybe – we didn’t count. I think the papers said like maybe 150, maybe less, actually.

Q: This was according to the newspaper?

A: Yes, so we didn’t do an actual count, we were too busy.

Q: So you didn’t do the counting, the media just did the counting?

A: Well, I don’t know how they got their numbers, but we didn’t actually do a headcount. We didn’t do that. We did observe them congregating at Ala Moana Park and marching, but it was an estimate, but we didn’t count.

Q: Was it peaceful?

A: I think the only disturbing part – and you may want to talk to the residents in the back – there was a lot of drumming and yelling. I don’t think people inside the Convention Center could hear, but I know the residents probably were disturbed by what was taking place…. What was very disrupting was well, we were right there and they were using a bullhorn and there was a tin can…

Q: What about the media? Do you think the media quoted your statements accurately or fairly?

A: You know, we didn’t talk to the media. Personally, it was through a spokesperson; we had Kim Murakawa from the Governor’s Office. We had – I forgot his name – Col. Anthony I think it was from the National Guard – he was Public Information Officer for the National Guard. So there was a spokesperson for the media. And I guess the thinking, the logic behind that, was that this is not a law enforcement issue, this is a meeting. So I guess that was our primary strategy, was to have professional spokespeople to do the talking. And as I was saying, what’s this really
It’s not a law enforcement event. There are law enforcement concerns, but you need to talk about what... what’s in store for the future of Hawaii.

Q: Do you feel that the media discussed that, or did they make it a law enforcement issue?

A: I think they did, because to me, you know, again, if we didn’t have WTO or any other event and this – put it this way, if we had this before WTO and any other event, do you think this would be a law enforcement issue for the media? But because of what happened, at other venues... law enforcement became an issue.

Q: In your own words, what did happen at the WTO that has become this big lesson that everybody has to keep in mind whenever you have an event like this?

A: I guess, you have to be prepared for the unexpected. You cannot expect to bring your workforce at the very last minute for a crisis situation. For me that was the biggest lesson learned. Because I wouldn’t want to be at the WTO as a law enforcement person when this occurred because it was too late. Too little, too late.

Q: Why was it too little too late?

A: They weren’t prepared, I think, for this disruptive nature. Whatever happened – and again, I wasn’t there so I can’t speak, but I know the results – but the bottom line is, if they had enough people stationed and talking to the demonstrators, then maybe it wouldn’t have been disruptive. But that was the lesson I took from all the events; that the possibility of disruption, property being destroyed, if you’re not prepared for that, you’re not doing your job...
Q: In several of the articles, there were several quotes from the protesters where they were giving their assurance that there would be absolutely no violence. If you had had the chance to speak to them, would have taken their word for it?

A: I would have at least listened to them, and again, not being disrespectful to them, my job was still be prepared. At least, I would have to test them. You know, they’ll say yes, we’ll have only 10, then there would 20; because a lot of times it’s beyond their control. They... make a good faith effort and say... we’re only going to be 10 people. But you have 20 other individuals who want to join in and they have no control over that, they cannot say hey, this is our party, you’re not invited. This is for the public, right? So, in that vein, I would listen to them and see what happens, but I would also have to be prepared. I wouldn’t say I wouldn’t trust them, but I know that they have something that’s beyond their control, because you cannot control everybody.... This is a spokesperson for their group, you depend on what this person says for their group. But there are other groups that we don’t know about that may just want to join in. We haven’t talked to them, so how can you – so to answer your question, yes, I would trust them but I would still have to be prepared for the unexpected.

Q: Overall, do you feel the conference was a success?

A: In terms of...

Q: In terms of what your expectations were and in terms of security.

A: In terms of security, yes. There was no real no – there was some disruption, noise, but there was no damage of property, no arrests made, and in that vein, yes, I think it was a success.
Q: But you were also prepared –

A: Yes. Again, we could be criticized for this; we may have been over prepared, but that’s part of our job. I think we’re caught in the middle because if something did happen and we weren’t prepared, what would the public say? Oh, (referring to self) wasn’t prepared, why wasn’t he prepared. On the other side, (referring to self) was over-prepared. So you just have to take the criticism. But based on our experience, and what happened in the past, we have to be prepared. That’s the bottom line for us in law enforcement. Because we are held to be accountable for our actions. That means to me, we can just justify and say, we were prepared, yes, we didn’t have that much intelligence information that would allow us to bring in this much people, but we have to be prepared. Because if the roads are blocked, how can you bring in this many people? You can’t.
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*Portions of the interview that would reveal interviewee’s identity have been deleted from this transcript.

Q: Who were your biggest clients?
A: We have people from all over the world.... We get people from all over.

Q: US –
A: US, we have a lot of Asian companies, we have somebody from Malta, people from Africa, South Africa, a lot from Europe.

Q: How did you get into this profession or business?
A: I was friends with the people who owned the company and as the business grew, they needed more people.

Q: How long have you been with the company?
A: Ten years. My background actually is in television. So when I came here the market was much smaller than New York.... This is kind of the next level from television, a whole new industry.

Q: Your background is television, so you would know a lot about the media and how it operates.
A: How it used to operate; I don’t think it operates the same way anymore.

Q: Back in New York, what company did you work for?
A: ABC, WABC. But that was in the old days when news was news.

Q: Where is WABC, is it right in New York City?
A: Yes, right around Lincoln Center.
Q: How did your company make the decision to join the Global Pavilion exhibit?
A: Somebody talked to (the company president) and that was a good idea. I don’t know, what the heck. We did, it was really interesting. I don’t think we saw many of the delegates to ADB as we saw other exhibitors.

Q: So there were more of the local businesses?
A: Yes... the Global Pavilion was all the local companies and not that often did members from ADB come in there. It was more networking among ourselves than...

Q: What was the purpose of the Global Pavilion? Was it to network with ADB or –
A: Yes, it was trying to sell Hawaii businesses to the other countries, or at least kind of get them to give and take. But I guess with the agenda of the meetings and the physical layout, they didn’t really come true that often. There were a couple of kind of parties at the end of the day, with pupus and stuff, and some people did come. I think it was a good idea, it just didn’t happen to work in this particular conference as far as us attracting new business. But we did make some contacts.

Q: On a scale of 1 to 10 how would you rate –
A: Having participated?

Q: Yes.
A: As far as new business, probably about a 1. But as far as having time to interact with other people in Hawaii... and it was good practice for us, too.

Q: Have you had experience before doing exhibits?
A: We’ve done a couple but not really that much. That was almost like our coming out. Because the data entry business is really where we put our focus because that’s
what they sell. And then (the company) is our future, it's our goal, but we want to build it ourselves rather than getting venture capital, then it's yours. And who knows, if we'd gotten venture capital, we might not be here anymore. So we're building (the company) slowly....

Q: You rated (participating in the Global Pavilion) a 1 as far as new business, but was it worth the effort you put into the exhibit?

A: As far as the experience, yes. I wouldn't say, knowing what we know now, I would never do it again, but I wouldn't go in with the same expectations.

Q: How important would the Asian Development Bank have been to the company's goals?

A: The bank itself, probably not... The people who come, the bankers, the businesspeople, because that's our market, people who are looking to do business in Asia. Probably the development bank itself is more about developing things that aren't developed. And we need the people who are already developed and maybe they'll move on to something else, but the small villages that don't have computer access, that's not our market. So it wasn't really the bank, it was more exposure to the people who are around, that sort of atmosphere.

Q: All in all, apart from the... results you got from the exhibit, how would you rate the conference as a whole and what it did for Hawaii?

A: I didn't participate that much in the conference itself and I think that there were two elements there. There was the bank stuff, your very formal meetings and then there was the conference, and the event of the conference. And I think the conference itself was good for Hawaii and I think Hawaii was good for the conference. I did go
to one function and I think that was the opening ceremony and it was so wonderful. It was Hawaii, but it was the world, and kind of looking and seeing wow, what would it be if it were another city in the United States? It wouldn't have the roots that it did here. And I think that because it was Hawaii, it was very mellow.

Q: Mellow...?

A: Well, the last big meeting like that was Seattle, where they had the riots and everything else. We do have the benefit of the distance and it would cost a lot of people money to come here and cause chaos. There probably were a few who wanted to do that and came here but I think the local dissidents have aloha. And I was very impressed with the way the Hawaii organizers — not the bank, because the bank just gave us a location, we're going to have our top level meeting, we're going to do our thing — but it was the Hawaii organizers that put together everything. I was very impressed with what they did. I think it was really wonderful that they brought in the kupunas, the elders, as part of the exhibit. They had their own exhibits with showing crafts and showing off their Hawaii and I think that also diffused some tension, too.

Q: Were you afraid that the protests would turn into something like Seattle, or a smaller version of Seattle?

A: I don't think I really did. I think I had great hopes for Hawaii and knowing how people are here. It was kind of weird to see all the barricades and everything; they had barricades all around and we had to go to some meetings for exhibitors and they were talking about security measures and we did have to jump through hoops to get into the building. We had credentials, pictures taken, and you couldn't do this, you
couldn't do that, you have to be in at a certain time... and I understand that they weren't taking any chances, but... Coming from New York, you're kind of used to kind of stuff.

Q: Which stuff? Security preparations or –

A: Security preparations as well as some things escalating. But even New York is not as bad as some places.

Q: Like –

A: I think LA –

Q: That answers the question.

A: New York is not mellow, but I think there's more – and I haven't been there since '84 – I haven't lived there – but I think there's still more of a community. Even though we're different, we're still part of a community. But I think in LA we're all for ourselves and we don't care about anybody else and we're going to get what we want. On all sides. And this is my sense because I've only been there once or twice...

Q: What about the media coverage of the conference? What's your assessment of that?

A: To tell the truth, I didn't really see much of that. I was so into participating, by the time you got home the news was over and I'm not really a big newspaper (person), believe it or not, having been in the news media I put all that behind me. The little bit that I did see I thought were fair. I did see things leading up to it.

Q: Fair in terms of what?

A: I think before, there was more of a buildup to a oh-the-world-is-coming-to-an-end. And then during, I think that then that kind of went away.
Q: When you think about what little you saw from the news, what was the most striking headline for you, or angle?

A: Probably the biggest one was the protest demonstration outside the Convention Center. And even that had more of a carnival feel than a protest. People on both sides of the barricades were “Hey, bruh, how you doin’?” From what I saw, that atmosphere did come across in the coverage. I don’t think it was so much spoken but the atmosphere was captured.

Q: How many people were there?

A: At the protest?

Q: Yes.

A: They were nowhere near what they expected.

Q: You mean expected by the media or –

A: By everybody, I guess. By the media, what the police and everybody were expecting this huge demonstration that would stop in front of the Convention Center and then go on into Waikiki and close things down and... We went out and looked out and saw them there and kind of went and did our thing came back and it's oh, it's gone already? It didn’t last very long. And one of the things the organizers did was the... Hawaiian elders, they made them – or they let them – sit inside the lobby. They had to sit very far back from the glass because they didn’t want anybody near the glass because if that glass shattered – so they had to sit back but they were in view so that the Hawaiian protesters could see the elders. And some of the elders were people who were pushing for Hawaiian sovereignty. But they were inside and they were... given the opportunity to explain their view. So
anybody outside who wanted to protest would see that well, somebody who has our point of view is inside. So it was good for everybody.

Q: So the elders got to talk about Hawaiian sovereignty inside the Convention –

A: Well, they had a beautiful display, a beautiful booth with... they had different people showing crafts, and they had different stories. It was really neat. I didn’t get to spend as much time there as I would have liked to, but they were really a prominent part of... And when they had the opening ceremonies, they really brought a lot of the people from the Hawaiian community to be part of the entertainment, to be part of the greeter, to really have a sense of... and the kupunas were invited to whatever events were going on. So if there was a cocktail party that people from the bank were invited to, the kupunas were here. They also had a pen, that Hawaiian Treasure. So they were really acknowledged as a living treasure and I just wonder how something like that could happen in New York or anywhere else, because there aren’t the roots that there are here. So whoever worked that out gets my vote (laughs).

Q: Was there anything more you wanted to add? Your observations, I guess?

A: I think that it was the aloha that... may set the stage for future high level meetings like that because we got that meeting like as a second choice. (The first choice) was Seattle and they were like, no way, we’re not going to go through that again and we didn’t even have that much time to prepare. Usually they have two years out ahead of time... (we had) a couple of months or something like that. So I think all the organizers did a fantastic job. But I think the way the bank works, they don’t mingle. I think they kind of “I’m a bank person and I just...” – you know. That was
my sense of the bank people. There were the bank people who were the gods and then there were the other people who were there to beg for whatever from the gods. And then we were just kind of the entertainment that nobody cared to be entertained. Whenever there was a function or something like that, there would be—we had the cocktail parties and we wanted to have them come, the bank would schedule something so all the supplicants would go to the bank thing and they’d be up on the roof of the Convention Center and we’re down in the... So I think the bank was really insulated. Even though they were here and they had the meetings, they weren’t part of the meeting. Or everything else wasn’t part of their meeting. Interesting.

Q: Do you think the way that says something about the way the bank operates or does its business?

A: I don’t know if they’re doing their thing because that’s the way they need to do it, I don’t know if—I mean I kind of elaborated when I said they’re the gods. But that may be the way they’ve always meet and always will meet and—like the Olympics. The Olympics started as let’s go and play games. And each year it gets to be more and more of an event. The athletes still do their own thing, but all of a sudden it’s this huge global event. So there’s two agendas going on and I think that was what goes on with this, too. The host city wants to show themselves off to the participants. I think this is the first time they had a Global Pavilion at an ADB. I think it was a good idea, except it didn’t quite for whatever reason—I guess when you’re a banker and you’re here and you only meet all together I don’t know but if
it's once a year you've got your business you need to conduct. You don't have time for all the rest of the stuff...

Q: What do you think the protesters were protesting against the bank?

A: I think they wanted to have a say and they thought the bank was a closed club and that the club was just out to benefit itself at the expense of the poor people of the world. And not only the people, but the people of the world in general. The environment had to go so what as long as we get rich. That's what the protesters were saying. I think there has to be a happy medium. There has to be the bankers, there has to be people making the money because if no one's making the money then there ain't no money to give to somebody else.

Q: So there is an extent to which you disagree as well as recognize the arguments?

A: I could recognize the arguments and maybe wish that some of what the protesters are asking for – okay, we got to do away with pollution, we got to do away with this, we got to help these people... but I don't know if they're going to happen because of your protesting and I don't know if they're happening because of what the bank is doing. And I think that's probably something that's great about Hawaii because people here are generally willing to talk to each other. And that was part of the reason for having the kupunas inside, was to give them an opportunity to talk. Now, I think that like us, they got more of an opportunity to talk to each other (laughs). I think somebody from the ADB did go out and say hi to the protesters, which kind of mellowed things out.

Q: That would be Chino.

A: Yes, yes, yes.
Q: So that helped to diffuse the tension?

A: I don’t really know how much tension really was here. I think the tension was more in the anticipation of what could happen rather in what was really going to happen. But I mean, if I were the police department or any of the security services I wouldn’t want to take the chance even though maybe deep down inside, it’s so far away, how can they get here, I’d still have to be prepared. But I think they did a very good job of preparing for it. But they also on the other hand they also did a good job in diffusing it.

Q: Do you think that tension in terms of worrying about what could happen, would that have been there if Seattle never happened?

A: No. If there hasn’t been a history of a problem, you wouldn’t expect a problem. But there had been threats that the next one was going to be bad. So I think the people who wanted to make a name for themselves as far as the protest, because they got Seattle to say no, they earned some brownie points. I think some people are more into the revolution of the thing than the actual outcome – (because) it’s kind of cool. And they didn’t find the following and they couldn’t bring a following because it’s pretty expensive. One of the people when we were having a security briefing, they would just go and get homeless people, and people from shelters, and get them on a bus and bring them and they would create the crowd. And they couldn’t do that here. I don’t know if that’s true or not.

Q: So you had security briefings, too?
A: It was kind like part of you want to be in here, these are the rules. So we got the credentials... because we were inside the barrier, so they had to make sure that people that were inside were not causing any trouble, either.
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A: So I guess from my perspective or my general overview of the conference itself... first of all let's look at it in a fashion of how it impacted Hawaii and was it something that was beneficial to Hawaii in general. I'd look at the overall conference and I felt that it... left a positive statement for the international and national scene as far as Hawaii was concerned. This was a very volatile conference where there was a lot of controversy, a lot of different issues in regards to – a very passionate issue that was looked upon from different factions and different venues. Because of that you had a situation where it could have been very explosive. You had major security issues, you had many other issues that came with this conference. And to me, my viewpoint was that Hawaii overall did an excellent job in handling that situation, because it was a very sensitive situation. So to me, the way I looked at it was it only verified or helped Hawaii increase its perception as a very safe haven destination for not just volatile type conferences but just in general overall. It made Hawaii seem like a very safe and wonderful place to be, period. So I think the perception in general was very good, that was gained from the conference. And I think that outweighed the controversy that Hawaii received because it actually held the conference here in Hawaii. Secondly I think, economically, it was beneficial to Hawaii as well. The exposure, and the overall economic impact was positive. The areas where I felt we could have done a better positioning of it was that I thought we could have probably – the way it was run to me, it was run by – the Convention Center's run by HTA and it was run to me not
as — and again it was a big conference and one of the first conferences of the magnitude that we actually had but it wasn’t run to me that smoothly in the sense that it could have been a lot better coordination from overall throughout the conference. It seemed like every step of the way we were behind in deadlines, we were kind of trying to catch up.... It felt like it was a little bit unorganized because of that. And again, it takes experience, it takes running this type of conventions and things consistently and this was new.

Q: Another person that I spoke to from the business community said that she felt that the ADB bankers didn’t really interact with the (local) business people and that it ended up more like networking among yourselves rather than networking with the ADB contacts. Do you agree with this?

A: Yes, absolutely. What happened was you actually - I don’t know if it was because they did not want to interact or it was just a lack of coordination.... And my viewpoint was that maybe it wasn’t set up in a fashion where we would have had more interaction. They had the cocktail hours and they had the dinners and the networking opportunities, however, was it presented in a fashion that the ADB conference members felt that they were either going to get benefit from it or feel obligated to go to it, that I couldn’t comment on. So because they weren’t there, was it due to them not wanting to be there or due to them not knowing the importance of their being there is two very different rational reasonings behind it. So because of that, I can’t... blame the conference members. But her observation was correct. I was disappointed in the sense that my thought process was that we would be able to interact more other than just a seminar type format, to be able to
listen more and talk one-on-one about the issues and their thoughts on what’s the future going to be looking upon and we weren’t able to do that. It was more all the local business people were networking more than with the ADB because they weren’t really there; I didn’t see many at all.

Q: So did that affect what your expectations were in terms of how the conference would impact your company in particular or –

A: Frankly, I didn’t get very – the way I looked at it there was very little impact on my company at all, which was to me – if I had to sum it up from my company’s standpoint – because I was going overall from the State’s standpoint – the biggest statement I could say is that I wouldn’t participate again if they had another conference. Because there was no real benefit or value in participating in the conference for me.

Q: Would it be right to conclude then that the effort you put in – and obviously you put a lot of effort in setting up your exhibit for your company –

A: Effort, time and money –

Q: - was not commensurate to the expectations you had?

A: Yes, yes. The reason again is it was due to the fact that the interaction with the ADB members were not there, right? And throughout the whole process, it was really not very formal. The organization left something to be desired. We really didn’t get the type of agendas and it didn’t run smoothly like most conferences should.

Q: Were you also concerned about the potential for violent protests and other security concerns?
A: That was may be a concern at the very beginning because of the media hype and because of the fact that we heard and read the sensational media would make you feel. But overall, once you were in the conference itself, once you were in the Convention Center, I didn’t personally feel threatened in any fashion. Now, did I feel that the security was exceptional and that made me feel comfortable? No, I didn’t think the security was that... great, but it’s just that... it wasn’t evident that it was a major controversy as it was hyped up to be –

Q: By the media?

A: By the media.

Q: After the initial concerns about the protests turning violent, you found out that you could feel secure, do you feel then that adequate preparations were made in terms of security or do you think that they went overboard with security or –

A: No, I don’t think they went overboard with security. I know that came up in the media that maybe we spent too much on security. To me, the gain that we received from a State standpoint... or from a Hawaii business standpoint outweighed the expense that I would put in for that because it would have been devastating if we ever had a major incident like a 9/11 type of a situation. Can you imagine if something like that occurred in Hawaii? That would have been devastating. So, do I think we overspent? No. Was the security worth the expenditures that we put forth? Probably...

Q: You said that statewide – in terms of the benefits to the State – are you talking about actual economic benefits like money pouring into the State or are you talking about the potential for Hawaii being put on the map.
A: It's more Hawaii being put on the map as a safe convention location. Remember now, we, up to the point, was not known as a convention destination. And so now, it actually put us at least on the radar screen as far as the Convention Center is concerned and as a convention state is concerned although we're not able to handle the large type of conventions. But at least we have the tie-ins not just the beaches and the beautiful sunsets and so forth, at least there's that little tie-in that we do do conventions. That was extremely beneficial. Not only that, but that we can operate one as high-profile and as controversial as this and yet still come out of it with a very safe environment a very warm feeling after all it's done. I thought that was important from a perception standpoint.

Q: You mentioned earlier that you felt the media hyped the potential for the protests turning violent. Do you feel that they should have focused more on other issues and what other issues do you think they should focused more on?

A: Something went truly wrong when it was held in the Northwest. It was a really violent situation... and they weren't really prepared for that type of a situation. So I can see where the media... their angle was focusing more on that fashion. But I do agree that the normal layman would have not known necessarily what the true issues were on why even the violence occurred. I think if you actually took a poll I think it would be very interesting to find out if the typical person would know why the controversy even existed. Because it was spent more on the end result than the reason why there is controversy. So I think they could have spent a little more time on that. And then also... I thought it would be more interesting to find out the different perspectives of why the different spectrums feel the way they felt.
Q: In your opinion, why do you think the whole violence happened in the Northwest?

A: (Sighs) It's a very volatile subject. I probably wouldn't be in the best position to comment on it because we as being part of the United States are not as - I don't know, the only word I can think of is passionate - on the issues. We're not as passionate on those issues; our culture's very different so our viewpoint's going to be very different than it would if we lived elsewhere. For us to say I don't understand why, it's because... we're not in the same environment. And so if you look in depth to it, it was a very emotional issue for those who lived overseas and I think for us to comment -

Q: 'Overseas' you mean people who live outside the US?

A: Yes.

Q: Do you think that if it weren't for Seattle, the media wouldn't have played up this whole thing about the protest? If Seattle hadn't happened -

A: Yes, I don't think it would have been such a large issue.

Q: Do you think Seattle was a turning point in terms of how the media covers big events like conferences like this for ADB, WTO?

A: Yes, yes. Although you know, the media... was looking for a story. So they sensationalized it, they made it bigger than it really should have been, in my mind. However, when it comes to safety, we can never take enough precaution. The positive part for the media standpoint, it did at least put it in a perspective that we would be sensitive to the fact that this could happen. But they did over sensationalized it.
Q: Does the Honolulu Advertiser's coverage of the event stand out in your memory or was it pretty much across the different types of media in Hawaii that you found this type of coverage?

A: I thought it was a wide range. It was not just print media, it was also TV; it wasn't just locally, either, it was nationally as well. But when nothing happened, of course, it became not as covered… nationally wise, that's what I saw. As far as CNN and so forth. I thought we had more coverage going into the conference, the maybe first day of the conference, and once the conference started to move forward and they saw nothing really happened, unfortunately they didn’t – and again that’s what I meant about that they focused more on the violence than the issues at hand.

Q: Not just Hawaii media but the national media, too?

A: Yes.

Q: Is there anything else you wanted to add, other thoughts you’d like to share.

A: No, no. Overall, like I said, I thought overall for Hawaii and its economy… the conference was a plus. Could the conference have been run better? Could it have been better organized? Absolutely. Could there have been other things that could have been done to improve it? Yes. But in retrospect, as I said – from a State standpoint, I think it was great – from a local business standpoint as far as participating in a conference, there was no value there, the way it was set up.
APPENDIX G: INTERVIEW WITH JOSHUA COOPER

A: The ADB Watch was... well, Cha and Colleen were working on it and so the first meeting I went to was what shall we do, how shall we be, at the center for Hawaiian studies was late August 2000 to be ready for 2001. The truth is no one really knew what ADB really stood for, no one knew the acronym. The main push was to raise awareness so we brought in speakers that were involved in the Asia-Pacific area to highlight some of the problems of the Asian development Bank and a lot of the problems of their projects of what it's accomplished in terms of the rhetoric. We started in August all the way through and we also had intensive meetings throughout the time once a week through the core group which you will be interviewing later. It was a core group with larger groups.

Q: Before ADB watch came along, you've been already active in this form of advocacy. When did you start?

A: It wasn't that big of the switch to go from student and grassroots politics to global issues of justice. The only difference is that there are larger entities that they don't have the ability to access and influence, but it's still the same issues. I've been doing a lot of work for the U.N. focusing on a human rights component. Then I was on the Board of Directors of students of free to debt (?), and we went to Ruckus Camp. Ruckus camp was the whole spawning for Seattle. The one I was at in Virginia was on the former slave housing area on this old farm right outside D.C. There was around 100 people who came to do nonviolence straining as well as learning how to hang banners off buildings. And so from there I was in with that group. They were doing the Seattle protests and were giving me the inside
information on what was going there so I guess all the way since the summer before, everything to have the ADB protests in May you started almost a year out and the same thing with a little less time for Seattle for planning in May for November.

Q: So this was 1998?

A: No, it had to be 1999. 1999 was the Ruckus Camp. It was May or about five or six months. Seattle was in November so the training or the Ruckus Camp was in May, so that was the one I participated in. If you look at Seattle, all the main players, they are Ruckus. So that's the group that I coordinated with. Seattle is kind of the launching for this anti-globalization movement as people know it now. So my organizing with that group really came out with Ruckus. Most of the Ruckus people did the banners, coordinated all the nonviolence strategies and all that. They were just one of the many groups, but they were quite pivotal.

Q: You mentioned the anti-globalization movement as we know it now. Would you say that you define anti-globalization the way mainstream media defines anti globalizion?

A: No. I think the problem of movements that are for peace and justice and human rights is we are always usually an "anti", so even nonviolence is a "non" violence. So I think one thing we really need to work on this creating a language that really does resonate with what we need. The problem with that is even when you create a language that really resonates with people, if the media will pick it up, that's a whole other story. I have a degree in journalism... I worked with... when I came up with my strategies, I thought of the whole... the need the intro paragraph, they need
this question, so I tried to spoon feed it as much as possible. And even then sometimes they wouldn't pick up on the story if they didn't really see it as a story. It's a challenge. It's really what they call anti-globalization is truthfully, it's pro people, it's pro human rights it's pro labor, it's pro environment, it's pro peaceful world where it's based on just and equality for all. I mean that's what it is and the sad part is it's defined as this group that's anti and that's furthest from the truth. The one point we tried to make, that never, ever, I could never get it in the paper was... it was, "Oh, you're against regional cooperation, you're against global things..." I'm like global than most people in the world. I'm not anti; it's just one of those certain words... and the reason it's a reviled word is because of what they show of it. They'll show this protest... I mean, here we are being as peaceful as possible. So you know all we did this entire time was as peaceful as possible, yet all we ever could see in the media was violence. They'd even have my voice with a picture of Seattle in the background. And so "This is what's going to happen" and it's like there's no proof for that. We're not gonna do that and the one word that we tried to get in, we weren't anti regional cooperation at all. But we're the only region in the world that doesn't have a human rights charter or commission or court or convention. So we're like, before we get a development bank, that's supposedly eliminating poverty, that's only exacerbating poverty, why don't we have basic rules and laws that defend people and then let's have all the other aspects of regional cooperation but you can't do things before the people and to push at economic before you have environment as well as basic issues of quality is just backwards. But you could never get that angle in. I put in press release after press release. Why don't have a human rights
commission? Why don’t the media ask about that? As well as to anybody; to the
government officials who sponsored it, the ADB and all their staff members -- why
do we not have that in why wouldn’t anyone answer that? That was the big
question; we want to be the Geneva of the Pacific, we don’t do squat on the human
rights component, and that’s a core part of Geneva. So if we really want to be the
Geneva of the Pacific, let’s host the talks for all the leaders of Asia-Pacific to create
an Asia-Pacific charter that guarantees human rights to all people based on Asia­
Pacific values. It that would be the greatest meeting ever. And if that worked out
well hey we could look at hosting the Commission or a Court or some body that
would try to administer justice for the whole region to develop certain standards.
But nothing. If we can host a conference of the Asian Development Bank, we could
easily host the meeting of all the heads of state as well as prominent NGOs that
have been calling for one for over two decades. It would be one of those things
where the tourists would be you’d have people coming here who really care about
the future of the region. But nothing. Nothing yet, but I have a long time to work
on that. So I’m going to organize the East-west Center; that’s one of the projects.

Q: You talked a lot about the press releases. What kind of relationship did you have...
how did you try to work with the mainstream media?

A: We contacted them early on, months out and the problem was almost always
battling even before anything ever happened, the first articles talked about the
police, security, and how they started cracking down on our fundamental freedoms.
So the crazy thing was just to host the ADB meeting, basic civil rights we’re going
to be violated. And it’s crazy because there was nothing to indicate that there would
be a protest, that there would be bad events, and so it was from the beginning the police had already allocated money... state and city government we're looking at changing laws to suspend certain rights and nothing had even been done. So they took the offensive and we almost had to do a step to kind of set it straight. And it was even up to the last... three hours before the actual protest, the big Global Justice march, I still had Leslie Wilcox doing a live interview before 40 minutes on that Wednesday going, "So Josh, what are you doing when it turns violent? What are you going to do when the police try to protect the people from when it gets out of hand?" I'm like, "I don't know how many ways I can tell you the word peace -- maluhia, paz." I said it in like 20 languages. "It's going to be peaceful." And she's like, "How can you guarantee it?" "Well how we can guarantee it is that we've done all these trainings, and we're prepared for it..." And even though we did everything to say that it was going to be nonviolent, it's still wasn't accepted. And even when it was not violent, it was like it was not violent because the police were so well-organized, or not too many people showed up. And the truth was they did everything to make sure people didn't show up. It said don't show up, traffic is going to be bad, it's dangerous, they showed the showers for teargassing that Queens and everybody had set up to make sure that we... if there is violence there will be teargassing but they will put them in these showers, security forces are going to be at this level, it always was this "we were the problem"; because we were organizing to protest the bank, we were the reason they were spending so much money and it was like there shouldn't be any money being spent. We're going to do exactly what we said we're going to do; we did everything we set out to accomplish.
That's the one thing I'm most proud of -- that we brought a loose knit broad coalition that never existed before in Hawaii -- we got the Communists and the Greens, the human rights activists, the labor, the Kanaka maoli, and everyone came together and deliberate everyone from the whole region: the indigenous peoples of the Asian Pacific as well as everyday activists and we weren't split. We kept it together during that whole time period and we presented the issues -- we had a great parallel forum -- at the Center for Hawaiian Studies, at the Campus Center and the problem was it never got the coverage it should have and instead it was this sensational "Oh there's going to be a conflict" and we did everything to prevent a conflict because our issue was if there's a conflict, that's what everyone was going to focus on; they weren't going to focus on the issues of what's going on why this Bank has such bad policies in why it's projects actually harm people and destroy their lives. So that was our cork and we knew that if there was violence it wouldn't work and I'm firmly committed to nonviolence so we were as transparent as possible. I need even the first time we got covered, it had a picture of my hand (makes the V sign) and it had the peace sign on the back of my shirt... and the other picture was the National Guard thrusting batons at peoples faces and that I think was Star Bulletin. We'd never done anything to indicate that it would be violent. They were always looking for something: the rocks were stacked up to worship the King and they were like the night before, "Josh, it seems like there's rocks and stacked so I guess you're going to throw them against..." So no matter what you did to say you're going to be nonviolent they have this picture that it's going to like Seattle and you don't think they want it to to be Seattle but it wouldn't make any
sense. The other issue that was big was that the always said there was this group that was coming that was going to cause all the harm. So after we were able to establish that where a good group, we're a broad coalition and were committed to nonviolence then it was "Well, it's not you, it's gonna be this group that comes in". And so I would even ask the journalist and the police "Name the group because all of us know everyone". Cha has great contacts, I have contacts at Ruckus, everyone had contacts with all the different groups that's supposed to be causing the trouble and no one could say one group. They would never say it, even when you ask the media, "C'mon..." (snapping fingers) and they tried and they couldn't get it. What kind of journalists are you? You can't get an answer and yet you'll run a story based on pure speculation by a police officer. The police would say something and it was good enough and bold; we'd say something and it was "a possibility" and so it was always that situation and so we knew it was against us but on the other hand really had one media to really push through: the indie media site so we had that going; I write for Ka Leo so I put a lot of things in Ka Leo, I did one article that ended up in the Advertiser but it was totally different than what I wrote. So at least it was in the Advertiser, and that was pointing out some of the problems - it was one of their Sunday Focus sections...

A: (Looking at the articles) Right here, "an ADB guide"... and how about this, they say the Black Block's coming in, and there was nothing to prove that but they still ran it. The way they say "Hawaiian culture given prominent exposure", the way they marginalize Hawaiian culture is ridiculous, like a token or something. "Best not to drive through Waikiki"... saying not to come... "Courts plan for massive arrests"... I
mean so all these things like this one, they're planning for massive arrests, they cleared the courts... I have friends who work in the Prosecutor's Office, "Just to let you know, Josh, it's all cleared, the dockets are all cleared to arrest as many people as possible and put everybody through it". And I'm like "You've got to be kidding me" and they're like "No, you know it's insane..."

Q: What would constitute a violation, or would warrant an arrest?

A: Well, everything. They had it down to... Remember at the beginning, if you had more than five people gathering, that was going to be a felony. So we were looking at going 1, 2, 3, 4... put numbers on all the shirts and never have five so we could never get arrested. And it was from that to anything. They said they had the whole docket cleared just to bring the cases forward and we're like we don't plan on getting arrested. We're doing everything according to the law, we have a permit, we've done everything according to the book and we've even done training and we even organized the march where it was host culture first -- Kanaka maoli -- then indigenous peoples from Asia and then all the groups from Hawaii. But no matter what we said... And then the next day, "Oh, we're gonna host the WTO now and now we're the perfect location" and no, we're not the perfect location, and no it doesn't mean we hosted it just because we did everything we were supposed to do. We'd just organized well and we made sure we accomplished what we said we were going to accomplish, that was our goal a. And the police didn't change their tune until the night before. I got a call from the Police Chief the night before the march at 11 o'clock at night saying you want to have a meeting at Zippy's, "How'd you call my mom?" who called me on my cell, and I'm like "We tried to meet with the
police six months out, giving business cards out to people who know people. Let's stop all the tension, let's deescalate it. Our issue is the issue of the ADB and how the programs it has really harm people... that's it." And the police a that's just a distraction; we don't want any distraction and we really want the issues to come out... It was actually amazing... "Remove troublemakers"... Everybody hired security guards, people put something on their windows... we told him they never had to worry about anything, were not going to do that at all. They had all these things, "more security more security"... how much money was spent on security. They could not have spent any of that money. And the truth was, how much money we owe at the end, and how much the ADB owes us, and how we bent over backwards... it's called the white paper. Most importantly it's not about how the state of Hawaii spent so much money to accommodate the ADB, but how much it cost us to host it.

Q: The ADB got the Convention Center for free.

A: Yeah, and all the changes to it... I can't get the Convention Center if I want to have a peace rally, but the ADB has come in and can get that, and how it is supposedly boosting our economy. Well, the whole thing was it was never a boost to our economy. It cost us money... I was at a panel with (N. Cinnamon Dorsife), we did so many different things, we did everything peacefully, everything proactively. We weren't responding to, but every article got everything covered from a certain way. Here's the story for you: there's no chance for things to become violent, and they kept saying "No, no, it is" and so we kept pushing and pushing until finally they said, "You know what, you're right, it's not going to be violent" and that's what we
said all along.

Q: Did you ever feel that the media gave you the credit for the lack of violence?

A: No, but it doesn't matter in the sense that the people did. Like everywhere I went for the next couple of weeks, everyone was like "Hey, you're not a tourist, you're a protester" and "Hey, you stood up for what you believed in", and even inside - I had a pass to go inside (the academic pass) that I applied for way early - it was great because when I went in, the people who were serving them were like "Way to go, wooooh", you got cheers at rallies everywhere you went around town. So the crazy thing was you're deemed as this "evil" yet among the people, it was great, we got what we needed to do.

Q: Tell me more about that.

A: It's kind of bizarre. The people we worked with on a daily basis, the people who saw us doing what we did, I think they learned to respect what we were out there for. And we did it always with respect for the people whose rights are being violated first and foremost. But then also, with the people we dealt with, we never screamed at the other side we engage them in conversation, we debate with them whenever they want to... We had all the open forums... let's have a debate, let's have a discussion. And you have the other aspect, where they don't want a debate, they don't want an open discussion. Everytime they'd meet to talk, they'd have their own rules, and they'd not even show up sometimes, especially the Globalization Research Center, hosted a couple of... their main people who were supposed to come didn't show up.

Q: Who were the main people?
A: It was one of the... under the chair of the ADB who was supposed to... didn't appear at that time. But if you think about it, our goal is to present the petition, get on the agenda of the ADB and have a document introduced so that they can then see how things are being done and more importantly see what we want to change. And so it was the only globalization protest that was able to bring a bank president out for people that are being affected and to meet them and shake their hand. You never had that anywhere else.

Q: How would you describe that meeting between Tadao Chino and the people.

A: (Whoops) It was a... it was what Correa called up about the night before. It was to negotiate, "You guys want Cayetano to come out? And the bank president?" And were like, "No, don't bring Cayetano out, we'll have a riot, and we don't need that, and we don't want that. You leave Cayetano inside and bring out the bank president, and then the always try to limit it one person only not 2 people, 3 and I think in the end we ended up getting the three to five to go meet with him. So you know we had to hear the gates, we had to walk the people who were going to go in and do the presentation. And yeah when you stand inside the convention Center... we tried to come up with all the different ideas for the nonviolence training. If you see someone's hand up in case something was thrown, you know there was police all-around on 2 streets back of every main road we were and so you know at anytime if anything did happen... they were more worried about people infiltrating, we weren't really worried about nonviolent protesters. They know we trained everyone, we knew who was coming in from outside, we actually booked their flights, and so you know the whole time they were going, "There's this group
coming out", that's why I came out with this concept ghost group, I'm like how can you come up with a ghost group and keep claiming without saying who the group is and get away with it? The media covered it, everybody covered it to like it was the truth when there's not a shred of evidence except for "It's under security so we can't explain to you why it's really going on". There's never really open conversation of what's happening, so that's one of the problems.

Q: Why do you think the Advertiser did the coverage that way?

A: I don't know, I mean I know most of the reporters went to journalism school but it would be amazing how whenever the police set the story, and whatever the protesters say is the response so it's always the 2/3--1/3 of you trying to get that in there, so that's the problem. And it was brought up and they are like "We're doing the best we can, we're trying to give you coverage..." If you look it's really are a lot of press so you can't complain but on the other hand if you see how it's presented, here look, "We're gonna welcome them here, everybody's happy to welcome the ADB". And yet they don't mention the pay... they're paying people to hand out the leis. They could easily have had a picture of the people from Asia Pacific coming and getting traditionally welcomed at Center for Hawaiian Studies, and the connections between indigenous peoples around the world, but that wasn't ever covered. But it's always "ADB's coming" and it was like "So's everybody else, 'cause we're making sure that it's not just going to be the same old story". And all of our protests, strategically thought them out. I mean we did a banner off of Leahi that said "Land is Life" on the opening day. No one wants to come "Leahi? We're down here at the corner, if you come down here, we'll cover it" and we're like "No,
don't you get it? It's the 'land is life', the sunrise... We're putting this banner on the rim of Leahi that says 'land is life' and 'no ADB'' Good, it is a good action, but we're here down here now and if you guys want to bring it down we'll take a picture of it" No, you know. It's some crazy stuff, one side was our first little action when we did the -- and it's almost ridiculous -- the "ADB equals BAD" ... the guy who came to take the picture, we had this whole conversation afterwards and he's like "I covered Tiananmen Square where I got the picture of the bayonet through the chin, you guys going to give me any blood photos that I can use?" That's the photographer. "You know what, we're not really here to get people hurt or injured. Were trying to raise awareness." "You guys going to do any lockdowns, anything but I can get any good blood and gore shots?" And I'm like "It's not going to be my blood, and it's not going to be anybody I know's blood", and that was his focus. We spent a good half an hour talking and I just looked at him, "What are you thinking?" It's a pretty simple little thing, we did things to point out so that anyone who would look would go "Look, they're out with beach mats, how dangerous is this?" It's not that dangerous, if they're running around with beach mats. All the money we spent, we got everything from recycled. We picked up those (the mats) off the beach the night before, because at the end of the day people at Waikiki throw all the mats. So nothing cost any money. So it was amazing that that's what that guy was asking, "...I need the back scoop so I can really cover it" And it was really insane. And that's the mentality of the reporter. I don't think he was the kind of person who was in the main room, but on the other hand... (Referring to headline: "Turnout disappoints organizers"): We never said that the turnout disappointed us...
Q: Okay, you're saying that you never said that the turnout disappointed you?

A: No, we had who we wanted to come, everybody, you know what I mean? There were people out even though everyone said not to come out, and there was nothing that said hey, be part of the festival of resistance in there, I thought, and he had to keep pushing it as the festival of resistance, that it's a positive coming together and that the speeches were great. It was a great event and the crazy thing was it was oh, it's going to be violent, and going to cause conflict in Hawaii, destroy Hawaii, we're the problem. No we're the solution we are the ones seeking the solution for social justice, we're the ones who care, we're the ones organizing the people to come here, and we're doing everything open and transparent. Everybody knows this is why we're doing it and how we're doing it. So it's interesting to see it all... (looking at the headline: "Many thank Honolulu's peaceful character") -- well that's what we said it was always going to be. We never said anything else in so the main thing was when it was peaceful it was, "Oh my gosh it's peaceful" and then of course they weren't that many people... I can count the number of people from being on top of the flatbed truck. It was closer to 1000 -- 1500 and 1800. If you have a sea of humanity still coming around the bend at the Hard Rock Cafe and you're down near that path ___ near Pink Cadillac and Jack in the Box and you're looking back and you see all those people, unless you're in a single file line, which wasn't the case, I mean that's a lot more people than what they're saying. People come down for their lunch break. I mean, people were like "I really want to come but I'm nervous about my safety". And I get calls everyday, "I support you, I wish I was down there with you, but I can't, I'm worried about my safety". That we create that kind of reign of
terror around a meeting coming is just ridiculous when... and that we wouldn't even question it... (Reading headline): "National guards training", we're doing peaceful training over there under a tree and then there's that picture, I think it was Star Bulletin, there's not a problem of why the National Guard's doing this. It's we're the one causing the trouble because we're organizing to raise awareness. It was definitely an uphill struggle. But we knew we had the cause, we're on the right side, we know we had the arguments, we know we had the issues, we know he have the alternative models to really make the Asia-Pacific a better place, so we did everything we're supposed to do so in the end you feel pretty good. On the other hand you're shocked it doesn't get any coverage. And so it's kind of one of those things where we can't go on "if it bleeds, it leads" anymore. You have to really say, look, it's a good protest, we did everything we were supposed to do, it deserves the same coverage it would get if something were destroyed. In fact the only thing that was destroyed was the ADB reputation. And the sad part is after a year later everyone forgets it. "It's a year ago, I don't remember" Well, I think you do, you know, you hosted a couple of events, you had some nice things going on, you met some certain people, you're able to keep your trading going in the Pacific region with your bank. Now way you forget it. I have two pages of business cards of ADB people who gave me their cards. The other crazy side is - I was one of those who went inside - so we actually talked to them and I was so shocked how little they knew, that their experts on indigenous peoples who don't know the UN mechanism, who don't know anything about the regional mechanism, that they're not aware of the Draft Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and they're the experts. It.
was more of oh my gosh, you have to educate them. There was a little bit of empathy, but on the other hand that's no excuse to cause all that harm and conflict. Being paid a certain salary and not knowing what's going on in the world... so that's no excuse. And then the other side, something that the ADB admitted, "Hey, before you no one knew what ADB was, so we thank you for doing what you did otherwise no one would even care who we are". That's sweet, but I don't really care if you care if people know who you are, if you know what's really going on. They did a really great job of plastic, and pens, and buttons, but they don't do a great job on the people, so it's really superficial. We had did everything we're supposed to do -- we had parallel events where people could talk, I have great notes of how much I learned, I learned so much about issues of Asia-Pacific, I just had the permanent forum on indigenous issues; and the indigenous people from the Philippines, the Cordillera People's Alliance, they taught us so much about what they did to try and prevent dams. We knew each other at the UN but we know each other more now more with ... we're still organizing networks, so the network's still going at different levels. We do different things at the United Nations, we organize on the regional level, in fact one of my goals would be at the 2-year anniversary, it would be great to have a meeting where we could create an Asia-Pacific Human Rights Commission or Court to uphold these rights that we think are so important. The truth is, when anything like this happens, the first to be trampled on is truth, truth is the first casualty of all that's going on... They tried to make us look like villains and we were always doing the nonviolence training, just trying to make the victims' voice was heard. It's never heard enough. Nobody knows about international
financial institutions - the US and the global north are just learning about them or stepping up, what the south has known for decades. It's just America woke up; we just caught the second nap part. I think we really did well, considering we didn't bring in big people. It was all people from Hawaii standing up for what we wanted to represent, so I think we did what we were supposed to do.

Q: How would you compare the Advertiser with the other mainstream media?

A: It just sort of depended on the day. There were times when Advertiser did a story pretty good, another time Star would get one really good. But it then gets to the personal relationships you build with people. Media people would start talking to us on the side whenever we want, coming up with things. Television worked out pretty good in some ways, because you could talk directly. But on the other hand they wouldn't cover everything that you were working on so it would really depend. When we wouldn't be allowed in the back to the Convention Center when we were supposed to, they loved it because I was there, I had my phone, the security guard saying "You can't come here" -- they loved that "Oooh, it's a conflict - a protester can't get in". The news was good when there was some kind of a conflict, but when it was just certain issues that really had to be... I think it's one of the things of ... I mean, I teach journalism now over at MCC... people aren't going to read the papers if it's always the negative news, but it's what seems to drive them on. You've got to have positive news, you've got to have inside features, you have to do a lot of different things. I think there are so many ways to cover an article that it's shocking how little was put into making this thing into perspective, as a case study. There were so many things they could have done. They could have looked at 10 projects
the bank has done, and interviewed 10 people who've lived with the bank, then
talking to 10 bank people, then really trying to come out with it. Nothing, nothing
like that. It was much easier to say, "Police chief says there's going to be a
thousand, there's going to be a riot". It's a quote, there are deadlines, but you know
it's happening, it's months out, so no excuse. Write more in-depth. Give people
human stories and talk about what they deal with on a daily basis. Would've been
much more constructive than (reading headline) "Rally expected to stall drivers".
Even the headlines - I know headlines are bad when they write them up - but the
headlines are some of the worst (reading headline) -- "Protest fears subdued" - of
course, we were always saying we were gonna... "Protest draws far fewer than
expected". If everyone worked with us and they didn't say to stay away... (reading
headlines) "Businesses beef up security... courts plan for mass arrests"... who would
go out on that day? If I was... my god, this is insane, and that's the way it was made
the whole time, even when you had three full days of peaceful protests with pictures
like this, there still was the “That’s what’s going to go down, it’s going to be this
(violent)”. They really tried to make it something more than it was when all we
really tried to get was the conversation and then... nothing on what the ADB
meeting was. “... gives island business people a lift”... that’s just a prop (?), to say
how much we got from it and then later, oh yeah, we didn’t really get that much
from it, sorry.... (Quoting headlines): “Honolulu _____ confident for ADB”...
“Civilian law enforcement”... It’s amazing. “Park access limited”. They did
everything to make sure we didn’t meet; we did everything to make sure we could
meet... so we that we wouldn’t be violating the law.... We had our evening talks
where we had thousands in that room in the church, thousands listening to eight
different globalization speakers. And that’s not a main story the next day. Those
were the people who were at Seattle... they were amazing, but (there are) no big
quotes based on that. Here are... the quotes where I can say ‘‘We’re for people
globalization, for people coming together and most of the ADBwatch members
oppose policies that favor multinational corporations over the people. It’s profits
before people,’’ Cooper said. Sponsors(?) invite anyone who wants to learn more
about the issues to join the rally and march. It’s going to be a great festival of
resistance and celebration of diversity.’ I had to say it six times to get that in. And I
know the tricks; you say only what you want to say no matter what their question is.
It’s a sad part, but still you don’t get it all in. (Talking about the kind of images of
protestors the media like to use): They also show... the freak(s).... They pick the
ugliest, meanest, less educated woman and interview her to symbolize the women’s
movement. They could take pictures of anyone, right? (Talking about the Star
Bulletin article on himself, what he called the Josh Cooper lovefest): That was a
little too much credit to one person. The other thing that’s a problem with the
media is they find one person and they cover that one person. And the truth is
everyday we had different people lined up to speak but they’d still come back to
certain people. So I know I got a lot of coverage. But I would tell them to also call
other people and every press release we sent out, we always put Cha, Colleen,
Carolyn..... (Referring to article on police) “Police Chief Donohue said he believed
police had acted responsibly and ensured that no problems occurred. He said the
city should be proud of the way officers handled the march and made sure it was
peaceful...” And we we’re like, what did the officers do? They did what they were supposed to do: not bother us. And we did what we said what we said we were going to do: a nonviolent march. So how can you get credit for what we said we’re going to do? We knew we were going to be blamed if anything went on. But the other side would get all the credit if it worked out exactly as we planned....

It definitely could have been covered in a “Hey, protestors successful in raising issues”, “Protestors give petition”, “Protestors force bank President outside”, whereas everything was being (covered)... like we didn’t do anything.... We didn’t let anything go unanswered, (although)... still our quotes are pretty dismal. The pictures are still law enforcement... law enforcement looks good, and we look...

(Talking about the protest): The protest was great. And we asked, “Can you tell us who (you quoted who said) we’re disappointed? If you say “Protest turnout disappoints organizers” – well, we know all the organizers, we’re all sitting here, which one of us said it? (Reporter’s reply): “We can’t say it, we don’t know”. Then how can you possibly put that in a headline? So it’s (really) irresponsible... to have that.

Q: You say that they were always looking for conflict. You graduated from journalism and you know that a really good story has to involve conflict and drama. Why do you think they didn’t cover the conflict that you experienced in trying to secure your permit?

A: Details! It’s hard work and research. At some point you’re almost thinking it’s conspiracy theory if it wasn’t happening to you. Just to get a parade permit shouldn’t be anything. But all the steps we had to go (through) to get it, it was
insane. At one event, we had a banner that said, “Why does the gap between the rich and poor continue to grow?” with the Gap logo. I was going to throw it off of the Gap in Ala Moana. I was calling the media just to let them know... we’re going to do it at the Gap and it’ll be around 6:00. (Media’s reply): “We can’t go on to Ala Moana without permission from the owners of Ala Moana Shopping Center.” The media can’t cover anything. They can’t go on to the property without permission....

Man, things were worse than I thought; I didn’t know it was that bad. Ala Moana is private property; you can’t do anything on it. Well the mall is where America gathers, so if the malls are where we gather, can’t even have a conversation or a dialogue or do anything, anymore.... The amazing thing is, you can’t cover a protest if it’s at a shopping center.... That’s the larger issue of globalization, of the Gap and sweatshop labor, child rights abuses, you can’t cover it? That’s pretty big news, if children are living in basically slave labor conditions, that’s not a story, and you can’t pull out a pair of pants here that are made here and point to the connection because you can’t cover it? In spite of freedom of speech and everything else we’ve studied, there are some limits based on capital, and it has to change.

Whatever City and County and police said was okay, and then whatever we say we had to prove.... There’s no reason to cause alarm and to get people to spend more money and to hire security. It was a great security fest, but it had nothing to do with what was really going on. And if they do that here, you can only imagine what they do in other countries... where they have more access to the military, less civil rights, less media functioning.

The police were marching with us, we could see them marching with us. And what
would prevent one of the police people from throwing something and then saying it was (us)? I mean it's happened all the time. And so we just did our best to do our nonviolence training to identify everyone who said was going to come, who's going to be there; we had cameras. We did everything we were supposed to do to organize a nonviolent rally, especially the New Globalization rallies, and the crazy part was it should have been on the cover of... Time, Newsweek. Not because it was that great because it was what it said it was going to be. But because there's no conflict, there's no story.

Q: Yes, why wasn't there?

A: That's the craziest thing. Because nothing was destroyed. If something was destroyed, then I guess it would have been a story. But that's something that the media needs to look in its soul... how it's going to cover these kind of events, because it's not going to go away. More and more lands are being taken away by corporations as well as international finance institutions, and they're causing totally irreparable harm to people's lives that you just can't ignore it.... I think the media maybe will get better, but on the other hand it's not going to get any better without us working with them.... I guess we should have more board meetings with them, and do different things, but it's an uphill struggle. There's another meeting coming, (and) it would be interesting to see who would sign right away and who would say, "I don't know if I have time... nine months of my life" or something.

Here's another thing I had a problem with. The police videotaped us the whole time. And so when I asked, "What did you use the videotape for and could I get a copy?" No. And so I want to know, am I the new poster boy for this-is-what-you-
do-to-a-protestor-in-this-situation. Am I part of a training video? They used at least 10 hours of footage of covering us at every different event, where they wouldn’t even answer you, they just videotape you. And I asked the media, “Could you guys ask them some questions since they won’t answer us?” The media should have a good dialogue where they should be the one if the people organizing can’t get a response from the police or the forces, then the media has to. Media has a lot more weight. Everyone does a “We only do what we can do”, but they can do what they want to when they want to get the story, and I think the media... should challenge a lot more, it’s got to be a watchdog; it was a puppydog. And this one, it didn’t do anything to challenge the police and their reign and what they said was going on. It really did a we’ll-take-the-information-and-then-respond. It could’ve been a lot better at active reporting, a lot better doing research, a lot better at getting responses from us, soliciting, “What’s the big question, Josh?” They needed a lot work. I would have loved to have covered it... because I knew what actually goes on because I’m at the scene. Journalists need to learn that.

Yeah, videotaping us for hours – in your face the whole time – and then not talking to you. “Hi, excuse me, could you tell me what it’s going to be used for?” “Sorry, you’re going to have to ask my Captain.”

So I go to the Captain and “Hi, can I ask what’s going on, can I get a copy of this?” “No, no, it’s for police business.”

“Well, actually, no it’s me. This has nothing to do with police business, we’re being secretive, you can watch the TV at night. But you’ve taken all these hours of videotape of us, and for what? Where are you putting it?”
Q: You mentioned that the media were puppy dogs instead of watchdogs. Then you mentioned and you seem to attribute it to the training that the reporters have. Would you say that was a major reason that they were puppy dogs?

A: No, training’s one thing, and that’s more long term. But really looking at how media covers serious issues in a much more comprehensive perspective. The other is the nature of the beast of deadline writing. So I mean if they don’t give the training and they’re not prepared before the story, the story reflects it. And that the part (where) work needs to be done. They need to learn how to cover protests. They haven’t been covering that for 30 years, all of a sudden, it’s “Yoohoo, it’s just like the ‘60s!” No, it’s totally different. You need to understand, which they don’t. They need to be better scholars, they need to do have their homework done. They’re jumping from beat to beat, trying to get things done. As well as the editors. Editors have to do a lot better job. I don’t think the editors... (prepped) their staff... And the editorials... (were) pitiful. The whole State’s in a flux for a week about this protest and this is your (editorial comment)? If they want to focus on whenever (for example) Rene Mansho doesn’t pay something, or waste and fraud and abuse; the amazing thing was because it was the Asian Development Bank, none of that matter. So we waste taxpayer dollars. “It’s security, we’re trying to make sure everything’s okay.” You’re like, comment on how much money we wasted on security. Comment on why we did all that overtime training. Talk to them. Not every police officer thought it was the best thing for us. Officers would come up to us and say it was overkill. We knew it was overkill, they knew it was overkill, and it was overkill. And it didn’t need it. We wasted money to host it, and we waste
money on security, yet we’re cutting teachers’ salaries. It’s all connected. (You asked me) how long I’ve been involved. I’ve been involved since undergraduate. It’s the same issues. If you’re raising my tuition and I’m not getting better classes, and if you’re hosting meetings of organizations that don’t represent what I believe in – I mean it’s all connected. It’s accountability, it’s responsibility, it’s creating a better world. That was our other slogan. Creating a better world is what we want… (Our protest) was trying to explain how we want our world to look…. (On the use of trolleys): That’s where we had the kupuna to sit, so they wouldn’t have to walk. It was the most peaceful, family-oriented event you could ever imagine, where we cared for nothing else but making the world a better place, so it was positive.
Q: So how did you get involved with ADBwatch and the case?
A: We were contacted by them. What we do is... defend the Bill of Rights and one of those rights is the right of free expression, and the right to protest. So when the city (and the state) tried to curb the right of people to authentically protest during the ADB meeting, they contacted us and we got involved to help them secure a permit for their protest.

Q: How difficult was the case?
A: Well, it depends on how difficult it is as a legal matter, how difficult it is politically. Politically, it was a very difficult problem partly because of the press coverage and because of the atmosphere of fear that had been created around the protest.

Q: So you think that politically, it was more difficult than legally?
A: Well, it had legal issues as well, there’s certainly legal challenges as well. But there’s also lots of legal precedent for the fact that people have a right to protest in a location where they can be seen and heard. Whereas it all hinges on whether or not there’s a real danger or not and the point here is that there wasn’t a real danger the protests were going to turn violent but there was an atmosphere... a cry by the State that there would be violence and they used that to try to restrict expression and by feeding all this to the press and by the press seizing upon the violence as what they wanted to talk about in all their stories and send that message of/to the protesters and they wanted to use that atmosphere of fear to justify restrictions on expression. So they go together because certainly if there was a legitimate fear that there was violence and they had credible information that there was going to be violence by a
particular group or particular person, then they could do something to control that violence. But here it was just an atmosphere of fear created largely by the press and by the police.

Q: Have there been similar cases –

A: There are similar cases all over the country. It happens every time you have a major protest or a major international meeting.... You have... Washington, D.C. The model we followed in the lawsuit was the L.A. model when they tried to restrict protesters from protesting at the Democratic National Convention...

Q: What do you think were the implications of this case on civil rights in general and civil rights in particular in Hawaii.

A: I think it's too soon to tell. Certainly in that particular instance the people were allowed to have their march, they were allowed to protest, and I think the consequences would have been severe if the government was allowed to shut people down, to shut the protest down, I think that the consequences would have been much more severe. But post-9/11, it remains to be seen if this case helps us very much.

Q: Have you found in your experience that this is fairly common – you have a group of people who want to protest or have a march and then you have the political dilemma of having an atmosphere of fear being created to prevent these people, as well as legal restrictions?

A: I think it’s very common. Anytime you have a group of people who want to protest against the government, the government does what they can, especially in this kind of structure – in an event where the city prestige is so important, the last thing they
want is people to protest and mar this great event that was coming to Honolulu. It was just a struggle between those people in power and those people who change the power structure.

Q: But in this case it was the people against a private institution... with the backing of the city.

A: The State brought them in, the city was providing the police protection. The Asian Development (Bank) is not a private organization, it’s a semi-private organization funded by the United States government and the Japanese government predominantly as well as some other members. The head of the bank of is Japanese, the vice president is American and they have control of the bank. So it’s not a private bank in the sense of Citibank, certainly... And this is where political interests and economic interests become aligned, and the whole point of the Asian Development Bank is to force the capitalist system and open developing countries’ markets to the US and Japan and other developed countries.

Q: Did you find that you had to deal with the media to -

A: I dealt with the media all the time, constantly. I mean, that’s the big struggle, and you’ll see in the press coverage that almost everything is about the violence... You had the ‘Medium chance protest will turn violent’, you have all these ads preparing for the violence, and everyday’s about the violence. And if you watch the TV, they run the same image from the Seattle protest over and over again, where they show some protestors throwing some bottles and... always the scenes of violence on behalf of the protestors. But what you never see in the press coverage are the police beating people with batons; any violence but the police-perpetuated (violence)
against the protestors. You don’t run that image over and over again, right? If you went to the alternative news events you would see it... Refuse and Resist sponsored a movie about what really happened in Seattle and there you see the police brutality, but you never see that in the media. What you see repeatedly are images to make people afraid, and the whole point of the media coverage leading up to the event was to make people scared and to sensationalize everything.... The media wanted there to be some kind of violence, then there’s more to report. And so when there was no violence, and it was peaceful... then they made a point to say the turnout was low, but in fact it was a great turnout and if you’d been there was tons of people and it was quite a showing of... opposition to the bank. But they seized upon one person’s comment of how many people they thought would be there and used that as a standard, and when it didn’t turn out to be that many people, then they wanted to paint it as a failure.

Q: There were several city ordinances that prevented people from organizing in more than groups of five...

A: I’ve never seen that. I think there was something about a group of people gathering to commit a crime, but that’s not saying you can’t lawfully protest. There’s also a lot of misinformation out there, a lot. The protestors were scared as well. The protestors were scared of what the police were going to do. Anything that the city did – a law they passed, they thought this was the worst thing, that this was going to be used to exploit the protestors. There was a lot of fear on both sides and a lot of misinformation so when you talk to people, you hear people... The protestors would say outlandish things about what the government’s doing, and some of it’s
true and some of it’s imagined. The police would talk about what a dangerous situation this was, and would take credit for creating a peaceful situation when in fact there was never any chance of violence at this event.

Q: Do you think it would have helped if the media coverage had been different?

A: Certainly it could have been different. The media could have approached it from a rights perspective. The coverage could have been about how the government was shifting our right to protest and there was some of that coverage, but never in the headlines. The headlines were always about the violence. The media could have also focused on the message of the protestors, and they were certainly trying to get out there, they talked about it repeatedly and they passed out pamphlets and brochures but the media never covered the message. So most people just don’t know what these protestors are about; what they think is that... these protestors are troublemakers, that they are just people out there trying to cause trouble – anarchists, lawbreakers – because that’s the image that’s promoted.... If the media had approached it differently, there might have been ten thousand people there, who knows. People were scared away by the coverage. But it’s by design – that’s by the design of the media, that’s by the design of the government. Scare people away, keep them away, and the big show of police force to scare people from coming. I think it worked well from the government’s perspective to scare people away.
APPENDIX I: NOTES FROM INTERVIEW WITH STEPHANIE FRIED & CHA SMITH

• One of the criticisms against the Asian Development Bank was a project in Indonesia, ADB’s biggest client (Pakistan is the second biggest client).

• Fried actually sent her study on ADB and Indonesia to the Honolulu Advertiser, but it was turned down for publication.

• By ADB’s own account, at least 70% of the Indonesian projects are not likely to bring any economic or social development to the country. Furthermore, the burden of the debt will be on the poorest of the poor, who have no income tax.

• An ADB-sponsored irrigation system and dam-building project in Indonesia caused the relocation of close to 5,000 people.

• Scholarly analysis of the ADB is why people are on the streets. People do not want to see ADB policies become public policies. This is the discussion that is totally absent in the media.

• The media deflected the discussion on the anti-ADB protests by connecting it to the Seattle protests and focusing on what were actually 10 people who targeted no more than a dozen windows.

• The State’s biggest concern was preventing the Native Hawaiian community from airing their grievances and sovereignty plans. One of the last things the Federal government wanted was a united Native Hawaiian community displaying an upside down flag in front of the media.

• The Federal Government wanted Hawaii to have a safe, isolated place where they could have pariah meetings.
Tadao Chino was forced to come out and shake the hands of a woman from Thailand (Darwan Chantarahesdee). Sources from within ADB were more afraid of HPD than the public, since the former might use lethal and non-lethal weapons in its overreaction.

The HPD trained with the LAPD, one of the most notorious Police Departments (Rodney King incident).

Opposition counted 1,400 – 1,500 people using helicopter photos.

Students planning to join the protest march “were promised that they were going to get the crap beaten out of them if they came”.

It is absolutely untrue that organizers were “disappointed” with the turnout.

ADB warned Fishman not to proceed with organizing the “alternative meetings” because they would be too obviously fake.

The only coverage that wasn’t shallow was Robert Rees’ article on the Committee of Safety (“Send in the Goons”, Honolulu Weekly, February 7, 2001).

What the media didn’t report was that Mon Mon, a farmer from Cambodia (his picture and a brief story appeared in the Advertiser on May 9, 2001) was interrogated for eight hours together with other delegates from Thailand.

The ADB hired a public relations firm based in Cambridge, Massachusetts to train its people “how to talk to NGO people”.

APPENDIX J: INTERVIEW WITH MICHELE KAYAL

Q: When did you join the Advertiser and how long were you there for?

Q: Before the Advertiser, what other papers did you work for?
A: Immediately before the Advertiser, I worked at a paper called the Journal of Commerce; I was in their Washington bureau and I covered aviation policy and airline business issues.

Q: You've always worked in what area in journalism?
A: I've bounced around, actually. When I first started I covered politics in Washington at a small news company there then I moved to Eastern Europe and I covered everything; I covered business and politics, and mostly cultural stuff because that's what I enjoyed. And when I moved back, I came to Washington and I covered aviation. I became kind of a specialist on that. And when I moved out here, then I covered tourism and a lot of aviation because it's such an important issue for Hawaii and I knew a little bit about it, so I don't always have a specialty.

Q: So you pretty much got assigned to whatever needed to be covered?
A: Yes.

Q: So how did you end up helping out in the coverage of the ADB conference?
A: The ADB conference was being billed as a way to spruce up Hawaii's image as a great place to have a business meeting. That was what all of the government folks were saying to try to convince everyone that it was a good idea to spend however many millions they wound up spending on attracting the business. And they were also holding it up as a consolation prize for not getting the WTO conference, which
went to Seattle, you may remember, in 1999 and I covered that as well. So I wound up covering it because I covered tourism and this was our – there are two branches of tourism: one is just leisure travel and one is business – so this was part of the business travel arm of that beat.

Q: So you mean the beats within the Advertiser, you had the leisure travel –

A: Well, the tourism beat covered dozens of things. It was part of my responsibility to cover it because it was being held up as a way to attract business travelers and more conventions and as you know the Hawaii Visitors and Convention Bureau here, it's their job to bring in conventions and I covered them as part of my beat. Beats are never clear-cut, you know, so when lines always cross and that's why reporters often fight with each other about whose story it is. But that was my part of it; will this really improve our business tourism? Will this really bring business travelers to Hawaii? Will it really inspire other groups to have meetings here? That was the angle I looked at.

Q: And what did you find?

A: (Groans) Oh, you're going to ask me that. I don't remember. My basic point of view on it as I recall – I have not been through my clips – and I never did, I'd say, a final analysis on it. Other people at the paper really took that over in doing the final analysis. You mentioned Johnny Brannon before; he did a lot of the numbers. But my overall sense was that it wouldn’t do us any harm to have the ADB here, but it wouldn’t necessarily help. I really was not convinced – and I'm not saying it wouldn’t do this – but I'm saying the folks in power did not convince me that having the ADB here would directly generate business from other groups of its kind.
- WTO, or ASEAN, or any of those other groups. Those guys would come here because they said, "Oh, ADB had a great time." I'm not sure that there's a direct link, or at least nobody ever convinced me that there was. There was also a potential for it to go awry if there were big protests and if they weren't handled properly, that could have been a big black mark on Hawaii. So it was a bit of a gamble. I mean if there were big protests, and they were not handled properly by the police, that could have sent a very bad picture – literally, picture – on television screens and newspapers to people around the world. It didn't turn out that way and maybe it had the opposite effect, but like I said I'm not convinced because I think people have looked at it and said, "Wow, look, ADB was there" and there was some protests but they weren't big because people couldn't there and even the problems that there were, the police handled them very well. So ultimately I think the risks it posed weren't realized.

Q: The risks that the protests posed?
A: Yes. And having those protests kind of broadcast across the world.

Q: You said that you covered the WTO summit in Seattle.
A: No, I didn't cover the summit; I covered the fact that we didn't get the meeting for whatever year it was, 2004, 2002, I don't know. The famous WTO meeting, with all the rioters in the streets and things, Seattle and Honolulu were both bidding to have that meeting and Seattle won and we didn't. And Hawaii set after – well, no body said this on the record but everybody was like, see if they'd had it here, we wouldn't have that trouble – and that was supposedly what ADB was trying to
prove, that we don’t have big protests and even if we do, we handle them well, that kind of thing.

Q: Are you saying that there weren’t big protests in Hawaii because of the people or because of the police?

A: No, I think we didn’t have any protests on the scale of Seattle because I just don’t think there were as many protesters here. And that was one of the points the government was making, that it’s so hard to get here, you’re only going to get really hardcore people flying in, otherwise it will be – I mean it isn’t every group that can rustle up the airfare and hotel and all that to fly to Hawaii to protest. It had to be a pretty serious group to do that. Whereas Seattle, you rent a bus and basically get there.

Q: What is your view of what happened in Seattle?

A: My view of what happened in Seattle?

Q: Yes.

A: In what respect?

Q: In terms of – I remember this article that you wrote, you’re saying “…but with rewards also come risks. The 1999 meeting of the World Trade Organization in Seattle degenerated into a slugfest between police and some of the 30,000 protesters, mainly from environmental and anti-globalization movements. Property damage and lost sales cost the city $8 million.” I guess I’m asking for your personal opinion on what happened in Seattle; why did it degenerate into a slugfest?

A: To tell you the truth... I wouldn’t be able to say why that happened. I only know what I read in the newspapers... I mean, I know what I read that there were the
protesters and that it did degenerate that way. Why that happened, I don’t know. I guess my impression was that it was because maybe the police weren’t expecting it to be of the magnitude that it was. I think they just got a lot more protesters than they expected and the protesters and a lot more ready to assert themselves than they had expected. And maybe I’m sure those things feed on each other; I’ve never been in a situation like that but I’m sure that if the police think the protesters are being aggressive and if the protesters think the police are being aggressive and that kind of feeds on each other and everybody gets upset. But I don’t really have an opinion on why it became that way, because I just don’t know enough about it.

Q: Okay, fair enough. It’s been so long ago, but do you remember what it was like for you covering the ADB conference?

A: In terms of what?

Q: In terms of what a typical day was like, and who were the people you spoke to or interviewed?

A: Well, to tell you the truth, and you might see from my clips there, I didn’t do a lot of on the ground reporting. Glenn Scott did most of that for the Business Section. Glenn was the one who was at the Convention Center, and we kept him there. I mean he was at the Convention Center with a laptop and a cellphone and was told not to leave in case there were protests outside and he couldn’t get back in.... I think there were a whole lot of other things going on that week, too. It just happened that there was a lot on of other news. And this is just to note: we were also in temporary makeshift offices then. The Business Section was downstairs in the conference room. All six of us were working together in one room because they
were renovating the offices upstairs. So it was... very crazy and I remember that Glenn was the guy who was at the Convention Center and he would kind of feed stuff back to each of us as we needed information.... I know I went to the Convention Center a couple of times but it may not have even been during the convention; it may have been the day leading up to it, to see how things were going, to see what was going on, that kind of thing.

Q: Yes, because the in fact the article you wrote was May 6, this was the day before the convention. The article you wrote – “ADB meeting puts spotlight on Honolulu” – that came out May 6, the day before. It wasn’t a fairly long article about the prospects for the conference as well as the risks involved. So I think you remember it correctly.

A: Oh, okay, okay.

Q: Was there any brainstorming when you found out that the ADB conference was going to –

A: Oh yes, huge –

Q: - be in Honolulu?

A: Oh, huge, huge, huge.... (Judi Erickson) is an extremely organized editor and we had lots of brainstorming sessions and lots of memos outlining – it first starts with what do you think we should cover? We throw it all onto one memo. And everybody just from their own beats, what they think should be addressed. And then you kind of pare it down and get it to a manageable point. You discuss whether or not you should do a special section for the conference. I think we had a logo; we decided we needed a logo for it. So yes, there was a lot of brainstorming about how
to coordinate coverage and who would do what.... There was a lot of planning that went into it.

Q: And this involved the entire newspaper?
A: No, this was in my section. I’m talking about my section, that’s the Business Section.... I think Judi had a couple of meetings with other editors to coordinate but there were never thirty people in the room talking about the ADB, at least not that I know of.

Q: So you figured out who was going to cover what – I guess that determined in a sense, how much you were going to be writing about it.
A: Right, yes.

Q: Were there any problems that you encountered during the time that you were writing (about the conference), apart from the stress of working in a makeshift office?
A: I don’t remember any major problems. I’m trying to think.... The only problems are trying to get – oh, this is coming back to me – because I used to cover the Tourism Authority – the biggest problem I had was getting real, straight numbers out of the people who ran the Tourism Authority.

Q: What sort of numbers?
A: Numbers about how much it was going to cost, and also the Tourism Authority took some money that should have gone to something and gave it to the police force for riot gear. And I think I sort of wondered whether that was a valid use of money designated for tourism. They were saying, oh this will support tourism because we want things will go smoothly and that will bring more business tourists. So that I do
remember and when you ask about problems the only problems I can remember trying to ever get accounting figures from the Tourism Authority.

Q: That’s interesting, because that never came out in the media.

A: I think Honolulu Magazine ultimately did a story a couple of months after the ADB that kind of looked back at the numbers and questioned whether or not they were — I think during the whole thing, too, there was some back and forth about people not being sure how much it was going to cost….

Q: Was this particular to your dealings with the HTA or was this particular to the ADB conference?

A: You’re going to get me into trouble on that one.

Q: If you want, I can stop the tape.

A: No, no, no, no. That’s okay.

Q: And remember, you have the option of keeping all this confidential.

A: I did not have as much trouble getting numbers from the Tourism Authority as much as I sometimes did from the Hawaii Visitors and Convention Bureau. That’s kind of a roundabout way of answering it…. Well, Marianne Higa, the State Auditor had shown that she’s not entirely happy with the way the numbers are kept and accounting practices and things like that at the HTA. And I would say that any issues I had are probably encapsulated in whatever she had to say…. I’m not trying to be cagey, but I don’t remember specifically and that’s why I don’t want to say. I can’t think of an example, so I don’t want to accuse them of being cagey when I can’t even give you an example. But I remember when Marianne Higa’s report came out, I thought, that’s interesting that she’s analyzed this because I have a
vague sense that it was sometimes hard to come across the numbers but I can't say anything concrete about it.

Q: Have you ever similar events?

A: Similar events like a big convention like this? No, I mean I've never covered a political convention.... Here in Hawaii, I covered the PBEC Conference – Pacific Basin Economic Council.

Q: What was that like?

A: It was excruciating. We wrote so many so many stories about PBEC and frankly – and I think all of us agree on this – the we maybe even over-covered it because we were sort of gung ho about covering PBEC and maybe that this was a new wave of having business travel come here and that kind of thing but we wrote a lot of stories about PBEC and by the end of it none of us ever wanted to look at PBEC again. I mean if you spend two weeks with anything constantly you get a little burned out on it. In fact I think we called ADB “Son of PBEC” or something like that, PBEC 2....

Q: Was it as excruciating?

A: ADB? No, it wasn't. ADB was not. But that may just be for me....

Q: Whenever there are big conferences like this, is it typical for the Advertiser to plan and have this major brainstorming for how it's going to be covered?

A: Well, it is at least in the Business Section. I can't speak for the whole paper, but under Judi Erickson there's always an attack plan, there's always a method and a rationale and thinking through of how you want to come at it and what's important
to cover. She’s a great editor... one of the best I’ve ever worked with, anywhere...

She always has a plan.

Q: So what was the attack plan?

A: I have to be honest, Len, I don’t really remember. Judi will know because she has all the memos; she’s a compulsive saver, so I believe she’ll have those memos.... I mean I remember we all had marching orders, we all had things we had to cover and different stories got assigned, but I don’t remember what mine were.

Q: Other than the HTA.

A: You mean the HTA riot gear? Well, the HTA riot gear, though, wasn’t necessarily part of the ADB coverage. That was stuff that came out of HTA meetings. I mean, I went to the meetings every week and obviously they would settle these issues in those meetings. So I kind of reported on it as it developed throughout the year leading up to ADB. So that wasn’t necessarily at conference time or during the conference.

Q: Was there anything you wanted to add in terms of what your recollection was of the conference and the aftermath, the impact it left or the imprint it left on Hawaii?

A: You know, it just seems like an awful lot of buildup for not very much.

Q: In terms of results?

A: In terms of everything. I mean, we were all geared up for protests and there weren’t really very many protesters or they weren’t very vociferous, which is a good thing and the folks in charge will tell you “Oh that’s because we were so well-prepared” and maybe that’s true.

Q: But what do you think it was?
A: If this conference had taken place in Washington, D.C., you probably would have gotten a lot more protesters because there are a lot more people there involved in the anti-globalization movement and that kind of thing. And also in terms of return. I have yet to story about anything the ADB may have brought up or anybody who flooded the phone lines to the HVCB after the ADB conference. HVCB would always say “Yes, but that’s not the mark of success; this is just an overall, image boosting event.” You have to pardon me, but I’m kind of cynical about that because that’s just a catchall that says “We don’t have to be held accountable because we don’t have a specific goal we’re trying to reach; we just think it would feel good to do this.” And I understand the general image boosting; that’s part of marketing, it certainly is. But the State spent a decent amount of money on ADB and it’s not unreasonable to ask for some sort of accounting of what came back. And I haven’t yet seen a story that measured what came back, if anything. Even in terms of goodwill.... The PR people running the ADB were keeping track of newspaper coverage around the world.

Q: Who were the PR people?
A: Stu Glauberman was doing a lot of it. He’s now at Aloha Airlines.

Q: You mentioned the anti-globalization movement. I want to know your personal take on what this movement is all about and what it’s trying to do and what its issues are?
A: I think a lot of people in the movement have good motivations, pure motivations. They don’t want to see people in Third World countries exploited and developing nations exploited; they don’t want to see the First World as we’re called taking
advantage of people who have less and they’re trying to protect the interests of those people, I think they’re well-motivated, but… a friend of mine once said being against globalization is like being against gravity. It just is, it just exists; it’s not a train that you can stop. I have no overall opinion about the movement itself; like I said, they’re well-motivated. Obviously sometimes they’ve turned violent but I can’t use the word ‘they’ collectively; individuals within that movement. For instance, animal rights groups, there are some that are aggressive, and loud, and violent. And in the environmental movement, people who cut down trees and that kind of thing. But the Sierra Club doesn’t cut down trees. So it’s hard to talk about the “movement” because I think the groups within it are more what people’s impressions are.

Q: Do you feel that because of the constraints of the work that you do in terms of time, in terms of space, the medium itself, that it is inevitable that you make decisions about how you write stories in a way that some aspect of the story gets lost?

A: Oh, absolutely. A 500-word story is materially different from a 900-word story. They’re different creatures; they have a rhythm and a feel that’s totally different. They call for different information to be included. A 10-inch story is different from a 25-inch story, which is different from a 50-inch story. After you do it for a while… you develop a sense for what that means. If somebody says, “I need 10 inches on this’” you know what they’re expecting to get, the information that they’re expecting to have in that story.

Q: Is it markedly different when you use those different types of measurements, for you at least?
A: You mean the way that I write?

Q: Yes.

A: Sure, and the things that I'm able to include, absolutely. Ten inches is basically information. I'm just going to deliver a report about what's going on here, who said what, and why it happened. But if I've got 25 inches, I'll deliver that and maybe give a little more background and develop the genesis of it more, and the future of it more, that kind of a thing. And if you have 50 inches, it's basically a dissertation. I remember at the Advertiser I wrote 50-inch stories a couple of times, but not that often.

Q: Do you feel that it's possible at all for longer stories to be written without losing the impact of a story?

A: That's a very interesting question? I mean, yes, if it's well-written, you should deliver the punch in the first five or six inches of the story, and if that punch is big enough or interesting enough, people will keep reading. I mean, 50 inches is a lot to read anytime. But 25 isn't.

Q: Fifty inches is about how many, how long?

A: How many words? Usually, just as a rough measure, you multiply by 40. So 50 inches times 40 words is 2000 words. And there are about 250 words on a double-space page, right? Eight, 8 pages. That's a huge story.
APPENDIX K: INTERVIEW WITH MARK PLATTE

Q: What was your position when the conference happened?

A: Same as it is now, Assistant Managing Editor for News, which means that I’m in charge of the Metro Section and Business Section. So I’m kind of in charge of all local news that takes place here at the Advertiser.

Q: What was the plan of action when you found out that the conference was happening

A: We knew months in advance that the conference would be here for five days and we had to determine how we were going to cover it from a business perspective and from a news perspective. The Business Editor and Assistant Business Editor put together a plan for the business section, which would basically say what went on inside the conference, what we were going to cover in terms of the speeches and the meetings and so forth. So there was a plan developed for that and then there was a plan developed for outside the conference because we did expect potential violence like we had seen in Seattle. We prepared for the worst and... hoped for the best. We assigned seven reporters from the Metro staff, two outside the conference and then inside the conference I think it was the entire Business staff, which is five reporters. So we had several planning sessions with a number of Senior Editors beforehand. On the Metro side we had our Deputy City Editor Ken Kobayashi; he was in charge of all the security aspects, he would go to the Honolulu Police Department, attend all the briefings with some of the reporters just to figure out what to expect, what we would need to buy – do we need to buy gas masks or whatever and we actually did end up buying a couple, two or three, I think. We had all kinds of scenarios laid
out because we had to prepare like you would prepare for a natural disaster, like a hurricane or something. So we looked at gas masks, we looked at renting an office right across the street from the Convention Center. We talked about, should we book some hotel rooms in case everything went wild and we couldn’t get back to the office. The office isn’t that far from the Convention Center, it’s only a few miles, but did we need to set up computers in a hotel or in an office building directly across the way from the Convention Center and how much would that cost. So we talked about that at length. What kind of basic package would people need in terms of the gas mask, or could we get away with just having towels, and Johnny was one of the people who was out there for most of the time in the hot sun, waiting for something to happen. We kind of went into it, as I said, worst-case scenario, what if there was fighting, if there were a number of arrests, how would we staff for that. We put out an afternoon edition, as you know, so we had to figure out – things would happen in the morning and they would have to be written up for the afternoon paper and then we have to staff for the events later at night. Even though the meetings would end late afternoon, what would be happening during the night, how many people would be out there protesting. So those were kind of the preparations that we went into in terms of what was going to happen on the outside. The inside we knew pretty that we were going to – it’s actually interesting because on the inside we knew how important the issues are that the Asian Development Bank were discussing, but we’re a general circulation newspaper and the people that really crave all the little bits of information that are coming out of that conference, it might have been a little bit too, we wouldn’t want it to be over their
heads. So we had to figure out a way that people to get information, people who subscribe to the Advertiser, and get enough information at the same time we didn’t want to go overboard because some of this stuff, for a general audience, is pretty arcane, so we wanted to make it accessible to people. So how many of the speeches would we cover... on our editorial page, how much would we print, how many columns should we have. There were things out in the community... like at UH and other places – how many of those meetings and forums would we want to attend. We knew we couldn’t take our whole staff and cover this, because there was other news happening while this was going on. So we had to basically figure out... what is our coverage, how are we going to define our coverage out of these meetings and then conversely, if there was a lot of violence, we want to be prepared, so that we had everything covered. So a lot of discussions, many, many meetings, and then many plans in terms of what would be happening outside and how people would be able to get around, and how photographers would be able to get photos and we kind of scoped out the area around the Convention Center. We knew what hotels were there; Ala Moana Hotel being right there, just a block away and should we rent a room or probably get access so we could shoot photos in case there were big, massive arrests or teargas or whatever and they moved everybody out because we understood that there would be a perimeter where people could march in a certain area but there were some areas where they couldn’t go and worst-case scenario if got moved completely out of the picture, we had to be in there with reporters and photographers to be able to report some of what was going on and so we wanted to make sure that if we were moved out we had a place that we could stay. Either an
office building where there was nothing they could do to us because we had rented an office; or a hotel room from which we could shoot or file our stories or stay overnight if we had to if we couldn’t go back here. So every scenario was kind of laid out that way.

Q: You said that you went in there preparing for the worst and hoping for the best.

A: Right.

Q: Was this a concern brought about mainly by Seattle or Seattle and the police briefing and the police’s own concern about what could happen in the conference?

A: I’d say both because what happened in Seattle – we actually had Ken Kobayashi, our Deputy City Editor, call Seattle newspapers and he would talk to his counterparts there to find out how they prepared for it. And that was a scenario where they didn’t – I don’t think anybody – expected what happened there. The police certainly didn’t expect what was going to happen, they were totally caught off-guard and I think the Honolulu Police Department didn’t want to be caught off-guard in the same way because... if you get overwhelmed by something like that as the Seattle demonstration and you don’t have enough people in there, you can get overwhelmed very quickly and it can lead to all kinds of things. But if you have too much force, you are accused of being heavy-handed. And there was criticism that way, too. Even though people thought that it went pretty safely... that the cost was too high... I think it was 4 million or 5 million dollars just in – I forgot what the final police number turned out to be but – So we were hearing from the briefings, and from Seattle, we were expecting that, or at least preparing for, that worst-case scenario, but nobody had any idea. One saving grace we had, I think, was that in
our own mind, we kind of thought there wasn't going to be a lot happening because there was actually.... There was another conference going on somewhere... or had just ended... I'm trying to remember what it was but I could look it up –

Q: The Republican Convention in Philadelphia?

A: Maybe it was the convention there. Yes, maybe it was the Republican Convention. The idea was maybe the protesters would be there and they wouldn't be able to get out here. And we're isolated; we're an island... you can't just get on a bus or a car and come here. So I think we were thinking if it was confined to the local protest group that we knew... out here in Hawaii, that it wouldn't be that big... it wouldn't get out of hand, it would be pretty peaceful because the people that protest here are pretty peaceful. So that was kind of a saving grace for us; we kind of knew at the back of our minds, maybe it won't be so bad because that other thing was happening. On the other hand, you never know; people could get on planes and come over here...

Q: So you took the word of the local groups here that it would be peaceful; you were just concerned about the outside group?

A: Yes, yes. I think everybody figured that anyone who would be protesting here would not be violent in any way. We were worried about anybody who might come from the outside; we were also monitoring the ADBwatch website – there are a number of websites that you could look at and find out – kind of feel the pulse of where people were headed and we didn't get any sense – I think they were saying they wanted it to be peaceful; local groups were saying, we're not going to tolerate anything outside that's going to be especially violent. But the unknown here is that
you never know how people’s emotions are going to run right in the middle of it. If
people get hyped up, and then the cops do something, one thing can lead to another
and then that’s kind of what happens in a lot of these things; somebody touches
something off and then you have a situation where everybody is kind of agitated. It
didn’t happen, which is good.

Q: Was there ever a question among the editors – or among the people who planned
the coverage – that there would be a need to explain to the readers what
globalization is about in terms that would not go over their heads?

A: Yes, yes. There was a lot of discussion about that. I think we were of two minds;
because we are the dominant paper in Hawaii, and the dominant morning paper, on
the one hand we wanted to give everybody the official record of everything that was
going on, everything that came out of the conference, everything that was worth
covering. On the other hand, as I said, there are a lot of arcane issues that were
coming out that people, even though they could well understand them, I don’t know
how interesting they would be to a general audience. And so we wanted to have
enough coverage inside the Convention that people who wanted to read would
know what’s going on…. I guess if the New York Times covered it, they’d have
big, full-page transcripts of everything that was going on. So we were really kind of
torn between those two things and I think ultimately what we ended up doing was
giving them a pretty comprehensive look at what went on inside the meetings to the
extent that we thought people would be interested in it. We knew it was five days…
this thing wasn’t going to go on for a month, so we did have people in there at all
times, and of course as you mentioned, the gentleman came out… that was a
moment of high drama for what would have been a fairly mundane – at least from a news standpoint – that was something a little unusual, no one was expecting that to happen. We wanted to cover everything that was going on inside in a fairly comprehensive way. I would say that people on the outside felt it was – even though they were probably happier that there were no protests – I think the general feeling was it was kind of boring for them on the outside because… with people marching around and talking to people and saying the same thing day after day…. I’m not saying we were hoping for action or riot but having to stand up everyday under the hot sun and walk around and not really having much to report, I think that was probably a little disappointing to them.

Q: What do you think of the anti-globalization movement? But first, I guess, if I were to ask you what globalization is, and ask you what is the anti-globalization movement?

A: Well, from what I understood from the protesters and from the people who followed these types of things, and from what I understand of the ADB, I think it’s basically a movement that says, I mean the difference between the haves and have-nots of the world is the difference between the superpowers and the rich and the poor and what we can do to be able to help that are being oppressed all over the world. And I think it’s absolutely what you saw on September 11th in terms of the people who really despise the superpowers and want to see a more equal distribution of wealth, the people who feel like the Starbucks of the world, the McDonald’s – that’s the other thing we were thinking, that’s where a lot of the violence was going to take place as well, because we thought that some of those places would be targeted because that’s
symbolic of the anti-globalization, sort of these conglomerates coming out taking and kind of making money and what they say is taking advantage of some of the poorer people of the world. So we were out there making sure that they weren’t going to throw rocks through the window of those places. But I think it has to do with people’s thinking that there’s not – you’ve got all this money from the ADB, how is that money being spent? Is it being spent on the right projects? Is it being spent in the right ways, are people even seeing that kind of money? Are they able to do the kinds of things that they’re going to help them get out of their situations? I feel a little uneasy about my own opinion about how I feel about this; I can only talk in terms of how we covered. It’s certainly a legitimate issue in the rest of the world. I would say that we don’t think about it all that often from our standpoint of just living here in Hawaii. I think the fact that the convention was held here was a really good thing because it helped people, at least for five days, think about these issues. I think it’s important that those issues were raised. It was important that we were able to cover those in the way that we could so that people would have some understanding because otherwise this thing could have come and gone and people would not have understood what it was and what it was trying to attempt. I think a lot of people still don’t understand what all the fuss was about.

Q: That was the next question I was going to ask. You mentioned that if it had been the New York Times, there would have probably been a big section on what had happened and their own news analysis and their own take on globalization. And as you said, that’s not really what you did. Would you say, having come from New
York as well, that the New York Times is very different from the people of Hawaii and the Advertiser?

A: Yes, I think the New York Times audience... is the top echelon of readership of people who are sort of the intelligentsia of the country. We don’t... pretend to be the New York Times; we do want to be comprehensive on local issues but I think we understand that we are writing for people up here and down here and – we have a cross-section of people that we are writing for and yes, they would have probably written it in a very different way.... And I think that writers and editors that work at a place like that probably have a little more sophistication in terms of being able to deal with these kinds of issues than we do. That’s not to say that we don’t take on the responsibility seriously. I want to go back to the point about that we really did think – in my own mind I thought, how comprehensive do we want to get with this? Do you want to print every word that comes out of these conferences or do you want to have more of an overview of what’s going on and try to get to the issues. I was really trying to get us to write about people who had come to the conference who had suffered in some ways in other countries and we were able to do that on a limited basis. I thought if you could tell those stories, that would be the best way to cover the conference. Because people who were speaking and talking heads from the Asian Development Bank were just, they’re fine, but they’re bureaucrats in a sense. But the people who were coming to talk about, this is what happened in my country, where I try to get money for this but it was really siphoned off for this and nobody ever saw it. And there were legitimate protests but I wanted to know what those stories were. I was more interested in finding those people. Once we hit upon
a couple of those, that... was kind of the balance of coverage that I was looking for as opposed to position paper – boom – okay, here’s some big hundred-page position paper. Who’s going to read through that and make sense of it? That’s from... the ADB’s perspective. What about all the other people who’d come from the outside?

Q: I know that the ADB hired its own press relations office. Did they try to work with you or did you get the press releases from them?

A: I think when you went to the Convention Center and I didn’t go over there myself... but I think they provided everything... I think it was probably a pretty slick machine. I think you could go there and get whatever you needed and they were going to provide whatever they could. I think everything was there, and printed out, for editorial page use or for news use or whatever. I don’t remember who they were or what they did since I wasn’t over there....

Q: I got an information kit from them.

A: Yes, see?

Q: It had the annual report –

A: Right, right. They have a message that they’re trying to get across and they do it in a very slick fashion and they have money to do it and that’s what I’d expect them to do. Our job would be to cull through all that and find out what’s important and what’s not important and what stories need to be told. There’s a balance issue here, too. There’s a whole issue of – you talk about protesters, okay. What are you protesting? A lot of people use these conferences to protest any number of things that they want to protest and then they have nothing to do with the Asian Development Bank. They... may be anti-globalization or maybe mad about –
maybe it's a political thing. Maybe they don’t like George Bush. Maybe it's something else. Some of it was Hawaiian rights, sovereign rights. They use a forum where a bunch of people that come together and where they know they’re going to get some media attention to hold up signs about whatever it is.

Q: Was that successful, the sovereignty issue? Did it get the publicity they wanted?

A: I think it was probably mentioned but I don’t think – I think when you become so disparate in your protest that you’re protesting a hundred different things at a convention like this – and Seattle was doing the same thing, there were a lot of different concerns; people came there protesting all kinds of things – you may be a little less united about the kinds of things that you want the media to know about. When you’re a little more unified, I think your message could probably get out in a more effective means. I’m not saying there’s any problem with people coming in protesting whatever they feel, but it’s kind of tough from our perspective to figure out... what’s your protest, what’s your beef with this group or with what’s going on in the world or developing countries. That’s why I wanted to go back and get... specific stories of people and what they were going through. I think once you can tell those stories – and they did that effectively, too, the people who came here – you get those stories out, I think that’s probably the best way to get out your message.

Q: You talked about looking for a balance in the coverage. Is it possible to always have balanced, objective coverage? Or am I talking about two different things?

A: Can you be –

Q: Objective and balanced?
A: I think we go into it always seeking balance and seeking – I think we’re always objective, at least we try to be objective – we always go in seeking balance. Whether the balance comes out at the end of the coverage, I don’t know. You probably read through all of this, and probably know better than I would. Let me put it this way: if there had been violence here, that would have been the coverage. That would have been 80% of the coverage. The fact that there wasn’t violence, even though we spent probably 20% of the coverage saying that there was no violence, everyday, I think that helped to get the fact that – I think once we didn’t have to deal with that, I think we’re able to deal with the real issues of what was going on at the conference. So what would have skewed it actually, is if there had been massive arrests and all that kind of stuff so to the extent that that didn’t happen, I think you’ll find that there was more balanced coverage. Otherwise I think it would have gone completely the other way. It would have been about police tactics and how many arrests and were the arrests justified and court appearances and that could have happened…. And then police response, and the police chief, what happened in Seattle. I know personally the guy who was the police chief in Seattle; he got tossed out, he’s a really good man – Norm Stanford – because I worked with him. I used to work for the L.A. Times and I covered San Diego Police Department and he was the Assistant Chief there. He’s a really good man. He’s the kind of guy the protesters would really have liked as a police officer. He’s a sensitive guy; he’s the kind of guy most police rank and file don’t like because he’s such a nice guy and he’s much more attuned to the community. The lopped off his head because he wasn’t prepared. Everybody came down on the Mayor and then the
Police Chief had to go and it was sad for him, but that’s definitely the kind of stuff that could have happened here in terms of all those other issues clouding whatever it was that the actual conference was all about.

Q: There is the other side, that what happened in Seattle, that it was the police who started the violence. What is your perspective on what happened in Seattle?

A: Since I wasn’t there, I don’t know enough about it. From what I’ve read, I think what happened was they didn’t prepare enough. I think that’s what, anyway at least some of the reports showed, they didn’t have enough police presence and I think as they tried to gather more and more police at the last second, I think it just became a situation that was out of control and became overwhelming. I’m not saying that in this case more police presence is the key, but I think you have to be prepared. I think this Police Chief basically went in and said, I think we can cover it with the minimum amount of people and it just – Frankly, I mean, I covered at the L.A. Times, I covered the riots in 1992. I was out on the street for 10 days or whatever it was, 15 days, and so I was out in the streets and I know how people in those areas – that’s a different situation – but how those people feel about the police and there’s a great mistrust of the L.A. police in that south central area. So nothing can work that way because there’s just no give and take; it’s just like, police are out to get us, and they have been since all our lives, we can walk down the street, we’re going to get stopped, because we’re black. That’s the way it is and we might get beaten… that whole thing was just a crazy situation. Now here, in terms of the relationship – I’ve been thinking a lot about this because I kind of watched the police and the relationship between the police and the community and – I think the police here
compared to other places I’ve lived in are a lot less heavy-handed when it comes to dealing with the community. You see some shootings that are maybe questionable here—and I worked in San Diego, I mean they were shooting people like every week, unprovoked. A guy would come and somebody with a garden trowel would be shot and it seemed to be happening there all the time and they had one of the highest rates in terms of shooting unarmed people in the country. You don’t see that here. I don’t know why I get off on this track, but I know we’re talking about the police and rioting and all that stuff. But it has something to do with that, with the trust between the police department and the people in the community and whether or not there is trust or mistrust. I think there’s more trust here than mistrust. I’m not saying the police do everything right in this community, but I think I don’t see that there’s a tension that there’s been in almost every other place I’ve lived, frankly.

Q: Speaking of, where are the other places you have lived?

A: I worked for the L.A. Times for 10 years. Prior to that, I worked at the Orange County Register for about two and a half years. Prior to that I worked at the Miami Herald for four years and prior to that I worked at the Atlanta Journal Constitution for about three years.

Q: You talked about the relationship between the people and the police. What about the relationship between the people and the government? How would Hawaii be different?

A: Than other places I’ve lived?

Q: Yes.
A: I sense there's a general mistrust of government here, probably worse than I've seen it in other places. I think that - totally unrelated to the ADB, of course - but with a lot of corruption we've seen on the City Council and in the State Government. This is totally off-point, but we're doing a series called "The Vanishing Voter", which we're trying to get people to register to vote, and we've done six installments of that now. It's basically a pet project of the summer... and basically what it seeks to do is to get people involved in the process. Go register, go vote - we have the lowest voting turnout in the nation here - and the idea was for the paper to do something about that, find some solutions, figure out what's going on, done a lot of numbers crunching, talked to a lot of people, and there is this really underlying mistrust, of, why should I vote? It doesn't matter, they're all the same, they're all corrupt, there are no good public servants out there. I don't know if that translates to the police department or not but I certainly see it here than I've seen in other places. People are just very disillusioned with government. Because every time you see something that's happening, like the kickback at the airport, or Rene Mansho or Andy Mirikitani and Nathan Suzuki or what's been going on with Jeremy Harris, I mean... people in general say, why bother? They're all the same. The whole idea is to get in and vote is to get in somebody that you may want... and put that person in office. It's really been interesting from a political perspective here to see how people feel about the government and how they feel about one political party having been in power for so long....

Q: What do you think is the Advertiser's role in the community?
A: I think we have a pretty heavy responsibility. We call ourselves Hawaii's newspaper. We have a mission statement, which you can read. We have a real primary role in educating people about what's going on around here. We have a responsibility to keep people informed about everything that's going on, what's going on in the environment, the government, the law enforcement, the health field, the business and all that. I think we take that responsibility very seriously. We want to get a diversity of opinion in our news pages, in our editorial page, everywhere throughout the paper. We're the biggest paper, we're the biggest news organization in Hawaii. We have more reporters and editors than any TV station or the Star Bulletin or any of the papers on the other islands. So with that, we've got heft with all those people. I think we do have a responsibility to have a broad coverage of what goes on here, particularly to investigate and go below the surface and investigate corruption. We have a couple of really good investigative reporters, that's something I have done a lot myself and then I came here and I was really interested in pursuing that. It's one of the reasons I left the L.A. Times to come to a place like Hawaii, because I saw what this newspaper could be. A statewide paper in a state capital with a major university in a major city, which has a lot of different issues. I wasn't familiar with all the issues that were going on here until I moved here but I thought, there's going to be a lot of news here and there's a chance to shape what happens and what we can put on the front page everyday and what we can tell people and we want to be very aggressive about covering the news and we're obviously in competition with another newspaper and other TV stations everyday. We watch those and we're sometimes influenced by it, but we want to set
the agenda here, I think.... I’d like to do more of that (“The Vanishing Voter”)... finding some problem and coming up with a solution. I think that’s what a newspaper can do well. I don’t know what they think exactly, the Advertiser, I’m sure everybody can be better, I think most people don’t like their local newspapers. I worked at the L.A. Times and people complained about the L.A. Times and the L.A. Times is one of the top three or four newspapers in the country. But people had complaints about it. And I think people will always kind of complain about their local newspaper but I know we work awfully hard to try to improve and take suggestions for what we should cover. When people call us, we take that very seriously and we try and go out and investigate things and try to uncover wrongdoing and things that are not right or not working for people. So yes, it is a big responsibility. We meet it head on; we don’t shirk from the responsibility.

Q: Do you think there’s enough diversity of opinion among the different mass media in Hawaii, considering it’s a pretty small market?

A: Probably not. We could do better at that, I think everybody could do better at that. It is a small market, but for such a small place there’s so many different issues. There’s so much news and there’s so much to cover; I don’t think we’ve even scratched the surface. I really don’t. And I wish we could get to more of that diversity. I’ve got to figure out, we’ve all got to figure out how to make that work and how to find those different opinions about what’s going on. I do tend to think that we can all grab on to an issue and stick with it for a while beat it to the ground. And what you find out is when one media outlet is following another, then they’re all covering the same thing. Where’s the variation in what has been covered? We
like to get away from that. We like to set the standards that everyone else is following. Or they can go another way.

Q: When did you move to Hawaii?

A: I started here on November 5th of 2000, right before the election, the Monday before that. Crazy election between Bush and Gore, so that was a crazy time and it hasn't stopped. It’s been a very, very busy year. As I said there’s just a lot of news to cover.
A1: Robbie Dingeman

A2: Johnny Brannon

A1: Did you want to refer to any particular articles or were you just going to ask us –

Q: Well, we could add the articles... if you want to go back to those articles. If necessary, we could. But I’ll start off with a general question about how you started preparations for coverage of the conference; who was in charge and who got assigned to do what.

A2: Well, the editors were the ones who prepared who was going to do what and assign it. I personally didn’t have much a role in any of that. I was kind of assigned several stories... and they were mostly the security preparations for the event and the actual protest that took place during the day of the opening of the conference.

A1: At some point they realized that – the editors – thought it could be a big story and so they put together a team and had us have a meeting. There were a couple of meetings; I remember one, Ken Kobayashi was the editor in charge of it and they talked about different aspects of it: the security because of the situation in Seattle where there’d been riots at a conference that involved some of the same issues; and who were the protesters likely to be, were they likely to come from here, were they likely to be people who were going to fly in from other states and other countries; just a little about the conference itself, just explaining to people what the Asian Development Bank was. So they wanted us to do a comprehensive approach, because people really didn’t know what to expect from it.
Q: I'm going to the end and then I'm going to jump (back) into the middle. Do you think you were able to accomplish what you set out to do, which was do a comprehensive, I guess, story-telling of what the conference was about, what the ADB was all about?

A2: Reasonably comprehensive. I mean it can always be more comprehensive but from the standpoint of mainstream media, I'm not sure mainstream readers were interested in much more of a comprehensive view than we were able to present. Some may have been, but it was a reasonably balanced and comprehensive package of stories.

A1: ... the paper did a good job in supporting us in covering various aspects of it, talking to the protesters, finding out what the issues were; we didn't just do the daily coverage, oh will there be a riot, oh why would they riot; we did more than that and then the Business Department delved into more of the what the conference is, what the bank meetings were like, what the people were talking about. There was a community-wide dialogue about it involving the Native Hawaiian groups that came out and so it kind of brought in a number of different voices. You can always think of things that you can do more for any subject, but what Johnny said was accurate as far as (that) you can write too much than your mainstream audiences worrying about where to buy groceries and what they're going to cook for dinner and what their company's doing at work today. You have to fit it into what their needs and wants are.

Q: Who were the people that you regularly spoke to or interviewed for your stories?

A1: On security, we talked to Assistant Police Chief Boisse Correa.
A2: Police Chief Lee Donohue. Protest organizers who insisted from the beginning that it would be a peaceful demonstration and that’s exactly what it was.

A1: We talked to several people – some people were involved with Refuse and Resist, Attorney Ted Baker who was working with the groups who said they wanted to be peaceful and they’ve let in a mixture of academic and people who were just interested in the issues. I also talked to the merchants nearby and some were concerned if there were riots, would their windows be broken, that sort of thing. Some of the main players.

A2: Yes, some of the key organizers of the demonstrations, both from here and the mainland and from abroad.

A1: And then we started reading the independent news media websites more often because they tracked other protests in other areas and other immediate responses to other conferences so that was interesting to get a glimpse of that.

Q: So what was like? What were you finding when you were reading the independent media?

A1: What the issues were, why they were protesting. It wasn’t just because there’s a Starbucks on every other corner; it was more what would happen when globalization brings a dam that’s built in an area and while the dam may bring... new jobs and an industry where new jobs are available for the people who make hardly any money, it also meant that it eliminated the cultural village lifestyle for the people who were living along the river.... I think some of it explores some of the issues and why some people are opposed to globalization and then there’s also a range within that movement because there were some who were very, okay, here’s
how to protest here's what to do if you get teargassed, so it ran the gamut from people who were very issue-oriented and concerned about maybe we should look at what industries bring to an area to the very thoughtful to the very we need to get in there and get in their faces here's what to do when you get arrested, go slack. I mean there was a range of people who seemed to be interested in various aspects (of globalization).

Q: Did you have to try to speak to the members of the Executive Committee who were organizing the conference?

A1: That wasn't my role in it. I spoke a little bit to some of the people who were setting up the conference about the logistics of moving in but it was more like I said the business people who were speaking to the conference people directly. (Turning to J.B.) Did you talk to -?

A2: I spoke to some of the people involved in the State's preparation for the conference, limited mostly to what it would cost the State to host the conference. And that's one of the areas I looked at after the conference was whether it had been worth it for the State to host it in terms of spending all the money we spent on its preparations and the use of the Hawaii Convention Center. That's one of the things I followed up on after the conference and that was how much they really cost us residents of Hawaii and to what extent was it cost-effective for us to host it.

Q: What did you find?

A2: I found that obviously it had cost some significant taxpayer dollars to prepare the security arrangements and to use the facilities and that public officials at least believed it had been beneficial for the State by demonstrating that such a conference
could be held here peacefully and that they believed business opportunities had been opened up for Hawaii business because so many people had been able to meet and interact. A lot of the people who had protested the events objected to Hawaii being used as kind of a sanitary zone of civility or an area where controversial globalization issues could be talked about in a setting that would not threaten corporate interest who did not want to deal with riots or bad publicity or the other things associated with the controversy of the event. So there was a range of views; a lot of people thought it was a big waste of taxpayer money because they didn’t see any particular benefit for most people but others felt that there were economic benefits in the long range, that it would help Hawaii position itself to host other such events and to participate in economic development projects as contractors in other nations so there was definitely a range of views on those subjects.

A1: Some of the protesters were bothered by the choice of Hawaii because... clearly it was a lot harder and more expensive to get to Hawaii to protest and than would be another mainland where people could cheaply drive. And then other people said that’s exploiting Hawaii’s reputation for having aloha for other cultures of the people to take advantage of the good nature. I also covered the city discussion of the same issues about how was it a good use of taxpayer dollars and there were people from both sides who came down to the council to speak because the council— the city ended up spending millions of dollars as well — to help with the security. That whole discussion.

Q: How do you now reconcile these two sides that obviously opposite in their view what benefits the State and the city gained from hosting the conference about
Hawaii's role as the Geneva of the Pacific? How do you manage these arguments when you write the story?

A1: To let the people speak for themselves and present them because it's not an issue that's going to be decided – at the beginning of the discussion the various sides held their views and at the end of the discussion I think they held pretty similar views. The protesters said it would be peaceful; it turned out to be peaceful. The business people and the organizers who wanted it here said well, we're having it here so we can prove do it so we can bring more of that similar business.

Q: What was it like covering the protests?

A1: On the day of the event or the smaller ones leading up to it?

Q: Both.

A1: The smaller ones leading up to it were fairly small. There were people dressed in black at City Hall carrying signs, bringing banners. The ones that I went to some of them were people whom I have seen speak in other protests at other events on other topics and then some had come in from other states – a few – a few others I just hadn't seen them before but they said they'd been involved in other issues but they felt moved to come out because of the importance of globalization so there were people, I didn't feel threatened; I mean that was an issue that some people thought that they were going to be dangerous, they were going to be dangerous to the people who were at the event, and I never felt that. They chanted, they seemed fairly organized and not dangerous. And then the day of the event, I was stationed in the office more hearing from people who were out in the field like Johnny.
Q: Did you get to speak to any ADB officials with regard to security issues, or was it exclusively the concern of the... police and the state?

A1: I knew that part of the ACLU discussion of that first the State was going to limit where the protesters could be to a very small area where it could have been dangerous for them if they ended up – they could have been pushed out of the street if they had stayed in that area. So we covered some of that debate as well. And in fact the State changed the boundaries after the ACLU raised the issue about – and others raised the issue – that it was an unfair place to put so many people in.

A2: ...was mostly not wanting to talk too much about that because they weren’t the ones directly involved with providing the security; that was more the police department and the State. Their concern obviously is that they wanted the event to go off peacefully and safely. I’m sure they said that much, but as far as the details of the security, they weren’t really in charge of that. The sponsor of the event from the United States was the Treasury Department, which ended up reimbursing Honolulu for a lot of the expenses associated with the preparation and the security. But they were also not directly involved implementing the security measures that the public was aware of at least. There may have been some other security concerns that they weren’t willing to discuss publicly. I’m not sure if there were or there weren’t. We tried after the fact to request from the Treasury Department any security analysis they had prepared that would have justified the expenditures on security and I personally filed it – it’s called the Freedom of Information Act – with the U.S. Treasury Department and the response I got was that they weren’t involved directly in the security preparations and if there had been a threat analysis prepared,
they would not have been able to release it because of the sensitive nature of the work. Perhaps we could have pressed harder... if we were really interested, but at that point the story was getting old and we chose not to pursue it further. But I was never informed by any other sources that there was a security analysis prepared that did not justify the security expenses but a lot of people probably questioned whether they had gone overboard because the event was obviously very peaceful and a lot of money spent on security, in hindsight, as if it may have been unnecessary but those kind of arguments are always pretty subjective because if something had gone wrong and we would not have been prepared, then people...

Q: Do you think it's a story worth pursuing is it because the conference happened a year ago, it wouldn't make much of an impact in terms of reader interest?

A1: As far as if there was an analysis?

Q: Yes. I know it's hard to say that the city may have overspent on security because now they can always argue back that well, if we didn't and something did happen –

A2: Right, it would have been a tremendous liability and it would have been something that we would be roundly criticized for because when there were protests over a similar but in many ways different event in Seattle the year before, Seattle was unprepared for the level of protests that occurred and they got out of control and the police got out of control and the police chief ended up resigning as a result so if Honolulu had not been prepared a year after that event I think the thinking would be there would have been no excuse to not be prepared because you see how events can get out of control even when it's not expected to be as tense and confrontational as it was, it certainly can turn that way very quickly. So that whole issue of security
to a large extent is subjective and it's hard to really pin down whether it was handled right or wrong because you never really know.

A1: Because the police view was that if they hadn’t shown obvious preparation that cost a lot of money and they hadn’t been prepared for the worst-case scenario, then more people would have flown in. They kept telling us that they were getting reports that professional rioters were planning to come, organizations that are more militant. So their sense of it was if they didn’t prepare for that maybe those people would have come but maybe preparation helped persuade them to go someplace it would have been easier to make trouble. And we can’t know that.

Q: Based on what you saw during the run up to the conference and then the actual day when they had the protests, was it peaceful because the groups promised that it was going to be peaceful or was it because of the police presence and the preparation or a combination of both?

A2: I think it was both. I think clearly if there had been no police presence, there may have been people who would want to take advantage of that and sometimes when that happens it gets out of control very quickly when you have a lot of different groups together and sometimes people not feeling an obligation to respect the considerations or use of others involved in the demonstration. But the protest organizers said from the beginning that it would be peaceful and it was and I believe that they – the organizers at least – meant what they said, that they wanted to stage a peaceful demonstration and I think they meant that from the beginning and they certainly did what they could to make sure that’s what happened. I do think there were some people involved in the protests who were clearly more
militant and would have liked things to get out of hand but were restrained largely by their peers who realized that that would not be an effective strategy to convey the points they were trying to make, especially in light of the riots in Seattle. I think what a lot of anti-globalization protesters wanted to do was to provide legitimacy to their views in terms of demonstrating that they were not just a bunch of out of control rioters breaking windows in Seattle, that they were people who were thoughtful and sincere and committed to making their points without causing a riot. And to that extent I think they were successful.

Q: Some of the interviewees from both sides – from both the government side and anti-ADB side – felt that the media – and they’re talking about the media in general, not just the Advertiser – unnecessarily focused on the issue of security and the potential for violence. And yet clearly as I talk to you, I hear that you are aware of the different issues and that you understand those different issues. So what do you feel are the constraints posed on journalists in terms of how much time you’ve got to write, how much space you’ve got to write that in, and the interest or the relevance of the story to your audiences… the constraints that you face on a day-to-day basis and also in particular with this conference?

A1: One of the things I think was making it relevant for our viewers and one of the things I think when it comes down to it is what about the story would most of our readers care about. And while most of our readers would like some idea of what the issues are and why the Asian Development Bank does what it does, why do protesters do what they do, and what the history of it is, a lot of people only want to know how it affects them and if it’s going to mess up the traffic and make it
difficult for them to go to work that week; a lot of people care more about how things affect them as far as those things we were focusing on involved our tax dollars at work so how much of the money from Hawaii was being spent to deal with this conference. So we tend to focus more on some of those nuts and bolts issues on our day-to-day coverage versus the large global, philosophical issues; those are things we touched on several times over the weeks of coverage and I know the editorial viewpoints where they gave... more space for people to explore those in more detail. But a lot of what we write needs to be relevant to our readers and I think that’s one of the constraints, is that not everyone’s going to be interested in philosophical discussions on issues that are happening on the other side of the globe.

A2: I agree with that completely. Personally, I felt that the media in general obsessed too much on the whole security preparations issue. However, to our audience, that was very important because for the most part, people simply wanted to know whether Honolulu was going to get trashed like Seattle was just the year earlier, which was extensively covered by media and people were very much aware of and very much fearful of having that situation replicated. And as far as mainstream media, we did face constraints in that we couldn’t approach this whole subject from the standpoint that perhaps academic journal approached it from, going deep into the whole background of the ADB and its many projects and history although we did certainly do an element of that. What it boiled down to for a lot of people was, you know, are they going to break windows? And because of that, that’s one of the subjects we had to pay a lot of attention to. I still feel that the media as a whole
probably paid too much attention to the paranoia around security issues but at the time, you know, it wasn’t really clear, I don’t think, to anyone, what would happen, although the protest organizers certainly had their view of what they intended to happen, which was a peaceful protest and that’s obviously what occurred. I’m not sure they were in a position to guarantee that or to predict the outcome because a lot of times it doesn’t take much to set something off and crowd control events can be very unpredictable, and things can happen accidentally and get out of control very quickly.

A1: In addition, even though the protesters were always very clear about keeping it organized and keeping it peaceful, they also predicted thousands more people would be there than ended up being there. So I think that showed one example of how unknown everything was even to the people who seemed very sincere in their efforts to have a peaceful message come across; they weren’t clear on how many people would even be there, either. I think they sincerely believed many of the larger numbers that were predicted.

Q: I think they gave – one of the interviewees I had – gave a figure of about 1,400; 1,300 to 1,400. Do you agree with these figures?

A2: As far as the number of people, the number of people that took part in the street demonstration, there were disagreements after the demonstration as to how many people had participated. I don’t have my notes in front of me but I remember it being more like around 500 to 700, although some of the protest organizers had claimed that it was more like 1,500. I don’t believe there were that many people there from my viewpoint, which was right in the middle of it, but some people had
suggested that some people had joined the march but didn’t participate in the complete march and that therefore increased the overall number. I’m not sure if I agree with that, but you know, it may have looked different from a different vantage point that I had but I still think there were no more than 700 involved in the main demonstration. There may have been, but that’s not what I would estimate.

A1: Yeah, I was watching some of it on television because I was back in the office having people call in eyewitness reports from the field and it seemed more like hundreds from the aerial views we were getting in from the counting that we were able to do. I mean, we tried to actually count; okay, this is many people in this area and then multiply from there. It seems like there were fewer. It was still a sizeable protest for Honolulu; people shouldn’t think otherwise. That was still a big protest for here. You don’t have huge protests very often.

A2: One point that a lot of the protesters made was that repetitive media coverage about the potential for violence and the security preparations had intimidated others from participating in the demonstrations because they feared things could get out of control or they worried the police would get out of control or they just didn’t know what was going to happen and therefore stayed home but would have participated if they knew it was going to be as peaceful as it ultimately was. I think that’s a very legitimate point, but I also think that, again, when you deal with protests and crowds, it can be very unpredictable. I don’t think anyone was truly in a position to truly guarantee that the outcome would be the outcome that ultimately occurred. Because sometimes crowds just get bottled up and somebody panics or somebody falls and somebody gets shoved and things can get out of control very quickly
despite the best intentions of most people to not have that occur. But I think it is true that people stayed home because they worried it would get out of hand. I think there’s no doubt about that. The number of people, we can only guess. Who knows? I think a lot more of people would have participated if they could have hitchhiked over or drove over or caught the bus over but in the middle of the Pacific that can’t happen and that’s probably one of the reasons that this location was viewed as a good one from the standpoint of the Asian Development Bank and participants and I think that’s one of the points the protesters made is they felt that Hawaii was being used as a cordon sanitaire or a control zone where people with opposing viewpoints could be kept out, and there’s probably a lot of legitimacy to that. But again, that’s kind of a variable that no one can really know how many people would have shown up if things had been different, and the other variable that goes along with that is how many people who were truly committed to the issues being discussed would have shown up and how many people might have just come along for the ride because they heard people were going to break windows and they wanted to break windows, too. That’s the other half of that is that I think people who made the effort to participate in this were probably a lot more committed to the issues that were being discussed and perhaps some of the people who have participated in other violent demonstrations have been because clearly sometimes people are attracted to protests simply because they view it as an opportunity to kind of go wild in the streets and get away with it. I’ve covered many protests and demonstrations and I know that to be a fact, not limiting that to the issue of globalization or the Asian Development Bank but just in general, there are people who take advantage of
crowd situations to get away with being (doesn't finish sentence). And the difficulty of coming to Hawaii to participate in this particular demonstration I think limited its participants to a large extent to people who are very seriously focused and committed to debating and protesting the issues the Asian Development Bank was discussing here in Hawaii.

Q: I guess this is not a question on the profession, but more of like a personal view on globalization and the people who are protesting it. Do you feel that... the issues are legitimate and that there are ways of addressing those issues, or do you feel that against globalization are trying to stop an oncoming train?

A1: I guess just coming from my background I would say that when people feel strongly about something, they should speak up, that's the only way to get you to be heard and to possibly change things, regardless of how much effect they think they might have at the beginning, coming from our background, we encourage them to speak up and speak out for what they believe in.

Q: Do you think, though, that Hawaii, as the place for the ADB conference and perhaps for future conferences, since it's proved itself an effective what you called earlier a sanitary place where people from corporations don't have to deal with dissidents; do you feel that Hawaii helps what you said people who should speak out for what they believe or would Hawaii hinder that, because it's so much easier to cordon off people who are a little, probably, fanatical or would hold protests for the opportunity to go wild on the streets, as you said?

A2: I think that really depends on the perspective of the people involved. Clearly, the Asian Development Bank did have to contend with these events when it came to
Hawaii; it was just of a different nature than they had than other globalization entities, I guess, had to deal with in Seattle. Clearly there was a massive protest here so it wasn't as though no one noticed that the Asian Development Bank was in town. I think more people are aware of the Asian Development Bank in Hawaii now than ever were in the past and I think the whole conference and the protests brought a lot of debate about the ADB. As to the future, you know, other conferences with the ADB or other entities that are viewed as agents of globalization could attract larger protests or unruly protests, every case will be different, and whether that's good or bad I think is really subjective because I think it's still a matter of great debate as to what the impact of the riots in Seattle had; I think a lot of people who were committed to protesting against globalization in Seattle felt that the riots were a disaster because they discredited the anti-globalization movement but I think there are other people in that movement who felt that the riots were a great success simply because the media and the public would have largely ignored the protests in Seattle if it had not been for the violence and I think in some people's view the violence was there for a success because it made the whole issue of globalization much more publicly debated and whether or not that they discredited a lot of their views because of the violence I think is really a subjective one that I'm not really sure anyone knows the answer to. One thing is for sure, it got talked about a lot more because of the violence, whether that helps or hinders the anti-globalization efforts, who knows. I don't think, you know, globalization is just going to be stopped; I think to a large extent it's inevitable because of the technological revolutions that are occurring through the Internet, and through media, and through
the mass migrations of humans that are occurring all over the world - immigration, travel. As to the extent that globalization is going to be regulated and implemented fairly or as non-destructive as possible, I think those are very relevant debates for every country and I'm pleased that they're occurring. I would never suggest that I have the answers to all those but they're certainly worth paying attention to as a journalist and as a member of the public and a consumer of media.

Q: I guess one last question. You say that globalization is an issue worth paying attention to. Is there a way the media, you think, will be able to convey the issues around globalization to the public in a way that would be relevant to them, or in a way that would not require people to think they have to consult academic journals for analysis, or how would you try and convey those issues in a way that it doesn't change what journalism tries to do?

A1: I think one way might be if you could find ways that people are touched by it, I think people - it sounds simplistic - but people understand something as basic as when you go to the store to buy a shirt, if you buy it from a chain that's everywhere, it's going to cost, maybe it's going to cost you less money than if you go to the boutique where the people make it and they make it in environmentally friendly ways but the boutique, the same shirt's going to cost you $30.00 whereas you can go into the chain that's everywhere and it's going to cost you $9.00 so maybe painting it in ways that the reason it's going to cost you $9.00 is that it's made by people who are making 4 cents a day working in a place that's not very healthful to them but why are they there? If you made it maybe relevant to them in some other ways, that might be one way to look at it. A lot of these people want to know how
they’re affected by something and I think if you can bring it – if we as journalists can show in ways that they can understand, then that might help to bring the debate because – I mean I think we’ve seen on a smaller scale in Hawaii for the last 10 years you’ve seen a lot of debate about big box stores and mainland chains coming in and pushing out mom and pop businesses, things like that. So I think people are more aware of the large-scale issues than we sometimes maybe give them credit for.

A2: Yes, I agree is from the point of view as mainstream media, you have to remember that most people will be interested in things that affect them directly somehow in some way and a lot of times will get turned off if they feel they’re being preached to or lectured about things. And frankly, a lot of people simply aren’t too interested in what goes on outside their immediate environment and I think that’s true all over the world. And it’s a shame, but a lot of people have very direct, pressing needs that take most of their attention and that’s also true throughout the world. That’s one of the challenges that humanity as a whole I think faces - how to realize that what happens in one place impacts other people in another place and it’s certainly a challenge to the media to include aspects of that whole dynamic in ways that people will pay attention to. One of the venues for that to occur is on the opinion pages and the letters to the editor and the guest editorials and opinion pieces that are submitted and it’s particularly helpful if there’s a timely element to them that will make them more relevant to your average readers. There’s a treaty being voted on, or a law being debated, or an event that’s about to occur, it often makes a good time to take another look at these larger issues and put them in perspective and that’s something
that will be a challenge to the media as this whole debate over globalization continues.
APPENDIX M: INTERVIEW WITH JUDI ERICKSON

Q: When did you join the Advertiser?

Q: And did you start out immediately with the Business Department?
A: Yes.

Q: And that’s your background?
A: I have a very wide background but – let’s see – I started out in – I can’t remember what year – but as a business reporter at the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson and moved from there to working on the copy desk at the newspaper – the daily morning paper then went to Connecticut as an Assistant or Deputy Business Editor. I worked for five years at the Hartford Current then moved to Europe and worked for three years in Germany as a City Editor for Stars and Stripes, a newspaper for the military although it’s not operated by the military. And then came back here five years ago as Business Editor.

Q: How would you compare the media in Hawaii with all the other media that you’ve worked for in Arizona, East Coast, and Europe?
A: In what sense?
Q: I guess in terms of the market?
A: (Hesitating) In terms of what?
Q: In terms of your readers, I guess. Is there a significant difference in the kind of readers you get from here in Hawaii, like the readers of the Advertiser?
A: No, I don’t think so. I actually never noticed that. I think all communities seem to want the same sorts of news. Some to more or lesser extent, but they all want their
local newspaper to tell them what's going on locally on all sorts of different levels. In Connecticut it was a little different because we were sandwiched between Boston and New York, so you know, a lot of people read The Globe or The New York Times and they turn to the Hartford Current for all sorts of local mini news, which is a little bit different than the other markets. But it's very similar to Arizona in some ways, in terms of readership and what people want. It's much different in terms of politics and the economy and the willingness or non-willingness of people to talk in stories, you know.

Q: Is there more willingness here or much less?
A: (Nods head to signify much less willingness of people in Hawaii to talk)

Q: That was a very –
A: (Laughs)

Q: You mean willing to talk about issues –
A: Anything, anything. People don't like, they just don't like to be quoted, they don't like to talk about things that might be controversial, they don't want to – I don't know. It's an interesting cultural thing, I think. It might be some of the Asian cultural influence and just – people are more reticent, reluctant to speak up.

Q: Do you think that's part of the reason why the conference ended up becoming what it was, I mean the protests?
A: There is some – I thought with the stories afterwards about why it didn't turn into a huge protest, and I thought the culture, you know, Hawaii's geographic isolation, number one, and the culture of Hawaii and it's not necessarily seen as big business hotspot with a lot of manufacturing so it didn't really draw the same attention.
Those were some of the theories out there. I really don’t know why it didn’t, though. You can only speculate.

Q: What happened when you found out that the ADB conference was going to take place in Honolulu? How did you start planning for the coverage?

A: I don’t really remember. I’m pretty sure when we found out the ADB conference was coming, we didn’t really realize what it was. Another conference was coming. And it — because I’m sure we found out late the previous year or something and then it was in May. We typically don’t start planning much of anything very far out. We kind of work on deadlines. So it’s probably a month before ADB when we really started getting into the planning process. I think so, probably a month. We had to get credentials, you know fill out — you know there was high security — get credentials for all the photographers, all the reporters, all of the — couple of editors. Actually, there was an interesting piece of the — I wasn’t involved in so much because Mark Platte and the City Desk did most of the planning on the protest side…. Mine was mostly from the content and economic impact of the meeting. So I mean, they were planning for gas masks, and renting, you know, an office across so they can shoot photographs and stuff. I didn’t pay attention to that too much.

Q: So what was the objective of the coverage in terms of what you were supposed to cover and focus on the economic impact?

A: Well, I guess there are different layers of coverage, you know. The big picture — what you would hope the entire newsroom’s coverage reflects is — you know, the protests, the economic impact, the content of the meetings, the business positioning, you know, for Hawaii, any major news that came out of it in terms of
announcements, as well as local traffic issues that people need to know. So I mean you’re talking about all sorts of different levels of reporting. But ultimately when it’s all over you kind of want this big comprehensive package that touched on everything. From the business perspective – what did we do? – we got the agenda. Actually, it kept changing, the agenda, while it was really fluid up until maybe a week before. We got the agenda and the list of participants, and probably – you know we probably started planning a month and a half or two months out, actually. Because it was about a month out when we did our first Sunday story that looked at what the ADB is, who the players are, why it’s an important agency, what it does. I remember that was a big centerpiece. We had a –

Q: Focus?

A: No, in the Business Section. The Focus Section did stuff, too, they were doing stuff too. You know, what economic impact DBED was projecting it would have, how Hawaii businesses – it was pitched a lot as potential for Hawaii businesses to get contracts with some of these countries, so we were trying to figure out how realistic that was for these Hawaii businesses and who would show up and why they were going to show up and what they hoped to achieved. And I don’t think that really turned out. I have heard of only one contract actually being signed out of that.

Q: I’ve actually spoken to a couple of businessmen and that’s what they said: they didn’t get anything out of it.

A: Right.

Q: But they did say that it put Hawaii on the map for, you know, future events like this.
A: That’s what people say. I don’t know if that’s true, because we certainly – when was it, 2000 – 2000 or 2001?


A: We haven’t really gotten a convention or meeting this size since then. Even booked or anything, you know, even far out. I don’t know.

Q: Just from a business perspective, would you say that – because they are claiming, the government is claiming that this was a résumé-builder for Hawaii – do you think that objective was met, considering that they haven’t received bookings for the Convention Center?

A: It’s really hard to say. You know, it can’t hurt to have that on your résumé, it absolutely can’t hurt, you know. But it – so it could only help, I would think. But I haven’t seen any effects of it.

Q: Do you remember what it was like covering the conference – how busy it was, who the people were you spoke to, who the reporters were who were assigned to what, I guess, areas…?

A: Yes, I think we were actually – the newsroom was being renovated so the Business Section was in the conference room downstairs and at that point we were all sitting there around a big conference table and that’s where we worked. So we had these terminals and we just sat around – it was really awful. And every single person in that room went to something at ADB at one time or another. So that was John Ducsheman Andrew ____, Michele Kayal, Susan Hooper was not here, Glenn Scott, myself, David Butts. Seems like I might be missing somebody. Frank Cho, I think. Nope, that’s it. That’s all of us. So when you get the agenda that you –
Q: From the ADB?

A: Yes, they had a pretty good website and it had all of the events leading up to it — you know, they’d have a golf tournament, or this or that, opening night ceremonies — and then it had the agenda of all the conferences everyday, and evening ceremonies throughout, so we got that. We tried to ascertain which ones we thought would be important enough to cover. So there was actual coverage of events at the meeting and speeches. In addition there were people, reporters working on stories about, you know, the traffic or hotel occupancy or all the local impact stories in addition to the content.

Q: But were there some stories that, you know, didn’t quite make it to the paper? I guess you had to cover all sorts of events, but some I guess did not make it to the paper or, you know, had to be edited out because it — like for example, golf tournament —

A: Oh yes, there were some things we just chose not to cover. You can — it’s basically just choosing editorially what you think your readers are going to be interested in. Can you — with the resources that you have, and essentially you have five reporters, I have five reporters, is that the most important thing to cover that day? Or should I skip that and go look over here and do a story about this. So some of the things we chose not to cover didn’t even pan because for our audience, it was esoteric, or — just some of it’s very arcane information that really didn’t have much bearing on anything that our readers would be interested in, or that even a national wire service would be interested in.
Q: Do you think that these arcane issues might issues that readers should be interested in?


Q: Except that they’re not.

A: Yes. And in fact there was a lot of – I don’t think – local readers knew or understood what the ADB was or really cared that much.

Q: Do you think that this is unfortunate?

A: Yes, of course. Yes. Part of the coverage – you know, you can only do so much with five people, and this was just one event and there’s lots of other news happening, too. So that’s really hard and in some ways I wish we had done more with it in terms of educating or offering information about the different projects ADB is doing in different countries. But there’s just, you know, in terms of resources, there’s just not quite enough time or availability.

Q: What were the biggest problems you encountered when you were doing the coverage?

A: The biggest problems were that we had revved ourselves up for this big protest, this big thing, and so when it didn’t materialize, it was very disappointing (laughs). You know, it’s just another meeting and we have a lot of people, talking heads. Incredibly intelligent people covering, you know, addressing very important issues, but essentially talking heads. And some of the seminars were incredibly boring. I mean, I can’t even remember what some of the seminars were – I wish I had the agenda in front of me – but not even, not even, you know, the water issues facing, you know, Third World countries, or health issues. I mean, those were interesting.
But something, you know, obscure, very obscure – I’m trying to figure out an example – the relative merits of steel framing versus concrete for building 30 stories and taller in, you know, like countries with letters, whose names begin with the letter R. You know, that’s such an extremely small niche the participants will find interesting but very few other people will. So the reporters became very let down (laughs). You go and towards the end of the conference what you would find is that morning meetings would be pretty crowded and then the seminars in the afternoon would be almost empty because all the attendees would go out and play golf or do whatever – shop, or network – and there was hardly anybody there. It was very frustrating to be looking for the companies that – it was very frustrating from a media standpoint to be dealing with State position that this was the best thing since sliced bread to hit town and everybody was going to get these big contracts and we’ve heard about this contract and this contract and this contract and this contract and we go and try to follow it because we want something good to be happening. Okay, they say something good is happening; let’s get it. And we’d find out, no, that’s not exactly, no, they didn’t exactly sign a contract, no, well, no, they’d only heard about it and – so we couldn’t get our hands around anything. That was very frustrating. That was probably – those were the biggest things. Sometimes the discussions sounded like they were going to be very good and informative and actually they were very boring and nobody was there. So then a reporter would be faced with, I’m supposed to write a story about this, but it’s really, I don’t know what to write! So we had those moments. Sometimes, towards the end, I think I kept Glenn Scott just there; he was just there all day the last two days. He had a
laptop, and he would just go from seminar to seminar because it kind of got — I think things changed — different seminars didn't happen when they were supposed to. So it became easier just to keep one person there. And then he could — he knew who he had talked to and who he hadn't so he could just work the room, rather than try to — two reporters trying to coordinate who they talked to, overlapping and stuff.
APPENDIX N: INTERVIEW WITH GLENN SCOTT

Q: You said you’ve been a journalist for a long time. So how long have you been working as a journalist?

A: I’d say, daily newspaper reporting and column-writing and editing, probably 22 years maybe a little bit more than 22 years, full time daily work.

Q: How long have you been with the Advertiser?

A: Well, I was only at the Advertiser for one year.

Q: Okay.

A: That was... It must have been starting in the summer of 2000 to the summer of 2001. I had a one-year temporary position; I had been at the University of Hawaii the year before on an Asian Studies fellowship and then at the end of my year I was accepted here and so – I knew I was going to seek a PhD program, so I was very, very happy to have that one-year opportunity.

Q: With the Advertiser.

A: Uhm hmm. And I was covering business.

Q: So you were with the Advertiser from the summer of 2000 to the fall of 2001 –

A: I think that was right, yeah. When was the –

Q: That was May 2001.

A: That’s right, that’s correct then.

Q: So before the Advertiser, where were you working? What newspapers have you worked for?

A: The last paper before the Advertiser was Pacific Stars and Stripes, based in Japan and I worked there for two years and I also worked part-time at Nikei Weekly,
which is in Tokyo and that’s an English-language weekly newspaper of the large financial daily newspaper in Japan....

Q: Now I’m remembering something that Dr. Brislin told me, is that you have quite an extensive background on Japan and you would know quite a bit about the ADB.

A: That was one of the reasons I was interested in covering the ADB. I’m interested in Asia-Pacific things in general.

Q: Did you ever cover the Asian Development Bank while you were working in Japan?

A: No, never did. In fact at that point, I didn’t even know it existed.

Q: That’s interesting.

A: Yeah, I think I found out about it when I was at Advertiser.... Pacific Stars and Stripes is a US government-run newspaper that serves the American military.

Q: Sounds like it.

A: Yeah, sure does. So even though I was a civilian and I was a professional journalist in Japan, most of the issues I covered had to do with the US military and US-Japan issues so I really wasn’t often covering regional issues, something like the ADB. So even though I had been in Asia a little bit, I hadn’t really been focusing on things like that. And the ADB’s so interesting because it just touches on every country in Asia, including the South Pacific. So it was a great learning experience for me, at the same time a pretty good story, a pretty big story.

Q: Now that we’re getting to your experience in covering the Asian Development Bank conference, what do you remember from how the Business Department planned the coverage? How did it start, who got assigned to what –

A: At the Advertiser?
Q: Uhm hmm.

A: Well, the Business Department was part of the coverage but we were not all of the coverage. So I would say that overall I can’t remember precisely but I would say overall the coverage was kind of designed and coordinated by probably the City Desk and the Assistant Managing editor, that would be my guess. City Desk Editor’s Marsha… McFadden, is that right.

Q: Yes, Marsha McFadden. I didn’t get to speak to her.

A: Yeah, and the Assistant Managing Editor’s Mark Platte.

Q: I did get to speak to him.

A: So I think, I would say, that they were kind of overall coordinating then my boss, the Business Editor, was Judi Erickson.

Q: Yeah, I got to speak to her.

A: Right, and so I worked through her up to the chain of command. So what I recall a year and a half later is that the business side, we mostly covered what was going on… kind of substantially what the issues were… what was happening with the conference itself in terms of the business itinerary and then other reporters were more or less covering the larger issues, such as the protests and some of the city-wide, State-wide issues about who’s paying for this, how much is this going to cost, what kind of efforts is the police making to be prepared, what does it mean in terms of traffic circulation during the time of the conference, and little probably spillover as to some of the issues about what does it mean for tourism, what does it mean for the State economy, what does it mean for the image of Hawaii, things like that. And then there were also some cultural issues as well that we were looking at. So I think
most of those were outside the business area so we were looking – those of us from the business stance who were there – were mostly kind of following the agenda of what was going on, trying to describe a little bit what the ADB's role and function is, and what particularly – you know, newspapers tend to look for a local angles, and we were looking particularly at how local people were getting involved, whether the conference was going to have benefits for local business people and benefits for local cultural groups, whether it represented opportunities for the State and for its people because obviously by hosting the conference the State was also accepting some costs, which as I recall at that time were not quite established yet, how much it was really going to cost. Does that help?

Q: Yes. It definitely does. I was going to go back to what the business side covered. You said that you covered what was going on substantially, you know, what the issues were that were happening with the conference itself. So when in fact did you actually have to go out into the field, as it were, I guess to do your reporting?

A: We did some stories in advance. I can’t remember when the first couple of stories were, but my guess is they probably ran about two or three weeks before the conference. I might be wrong; you can probably have a better idea if you do a content analysis.

Q: I actually have the articles.

A: Good. And then of course by the time they came out – I probably started working on those a week before, at least. And in some cases, you know, we were just kind of making some phone calls and leaving messages for people.... And then as the conference came closer we did some more, as I recall.... Three weeks or a month
before, I mean that's when we really started focusing our resources because – as
I'm sure everybody in the world will know – you've just got other stories you've
got to write, you've got other things you've got to do so even if you have a great
curiosity of something, you've only got eight hours a day to get things done, and
you have to spread yourself around so you can't always do everything you want to
do.

Q: Do you feel that you were able to successfully convey to your readers the things
that you felt met the criteria of looking at it from a local angle?

A: Probably not. You know, every time you use the word 'successfully', you get to
decide where you want to set the bar and to me, the ADB was a tremendously
interesting episode in Hawaii's current history. The ADB has lots of layers of
meanings, I think, and to really be able to shake out all those meanings and to be
able to unpeel the layers takes a lot of time and effort and work. And I know that as
the conference started to come, and when it finally arrived, I was just going in so
many different directions trying to gather enough information for stories and just to
talk to so many people and hear what so many people have to say that I'm sure I
didn't get to write everything as well as I wanted to. And I think in some cases, I
just didn't get to do every story I wanted to do. You know, you also have to deal
with the constraints of – as we always say – space and time and you're interviewing
people at four in the afternoon and you have to have a story done by 7:30 and you
just can't do it was well as you want and you can't get everything done. I mean I
did a lot of interviews; I probably have two or three notebooks full of notes, most of
which I never got to use at all because I just couldn't conceive of the story that was
going to tell it well enough that I could feed all these interviews, all the quotes and background information in a whole story. So you kind of have to shoehorn things in and it’s an imperfect operation, for sure. But I think we started at least — we put more emphasis on what the local meanings were than we did for some of the greater meanings. So I think we pressed on some things. I mean, there were some really interesting — as I’m sure you know — kind of social networking and interactions going on among different groups. There was kind of one group of Native People who decided that — kind of a coalition of people — who decided they did want to be part of the ingoing dialogue inside the Convention Center. A lot of the — as you probably know — a lot of the discourse at the time was between what was going on inside and what’s going on outside and is somebody an insider or are they an outsider. And it was interesting that some of the local people decided… for various reasons — I think everybody had their own motives — but kind of decided they were better off being inside where they could speak to some of the powerful people and make some of the points they wanted to make about Hawaiian culture, for example. And other groups wanted to stay outside and that tended to be, obviously, a very large network of people as well. And I think probably everybody in our paper wished we could have kind of fleshed that out better. But that takes really a lot of insight, a lot of work and at the same time you’ve got so much breaking, so much happening that it’s really hard to have the time to do it well.

Q: Do you think that the nature of newspaper reporting, with all the daily deadlines, naturally puts a constraint on, as you said, unpeeling all these layers of —
A: Oh sure, absolutely, absolutely. You can do it a lot better if you had a nice, long magazine piece that wasn’t going to be due for three weeks, or even one week. For sure, daily newspapers have many constraints: time, space and certain conventions, certain routines and patterns that all kind of get in the way of being able to go deeply as you want. I mean, frankly, that’s one reason I’m getting a PhD because there’s a kind of a – after 22 years out there, I’m really satisfied getting the chance to look at big pictures, and to analyze and to research. It’s much more satisfying for me right now in my career than to go out and, you know, hustle up another story tomorrow. So yeah, I mean I think definitely, definitely that’s true.

Q: But the main constraints you had to deal with were just space and time and the deadlines. There was never – and you can opt to have this off the record if you want – you wouldn’t say that there was a directive from, you know, higher up – higher even than the editors – that said, we have to focus on such and such an angle and try to avoid such and such –

A: No, not really. I didn’t get much directive about what I should write about at the ADB. In fact, it was kind of the other way around. It was sort of like, “Well, Glenn, where’s the story, what’s the story?” One of the things about ADB – about any kind of a meeting like a development bank meeting – is that – and of course all the people at the ADB kept warning us of this for months in advance – there tends not to be any strong or bold big breaking news that come out of the meetings. It’s just kind of an exercise in their own peculiar form of participatory representation where, you know, you’ve got the opening night speech, you’ve got every representative from every country gets to give their 20-minute presentation, you’ve got some
behind the scenes wheeling and dealing going on, but there weren’t many what by journalistic norms would be called big breaking stories. The story I think that was most engaging for the visiting journalists, especially those who call themselves ‘economics reporters’, was the kind of continuing story about whether individual countries were going to continue to create unilateral trade agreements with other countries – Singapore was doing a lot of that – instead of working through regional groups such as ASEAN. And then the other kind of breaking story was whether there would be kind of an ‘Asian fund’, which Japan had been sort of pushing for a while. So the next time there is kind of a currency crisis, the Asian countries themselves could pony up the money for it and it wouldn’t have to depend on the World Bank or International Monetary Fund for bailout assistance because by depending on them, you have to play by their rules and so there is this sense that do the Asian countries feel like they want to have different rules and more autonomy from some of the Western financial powers. Those were the stories that were probably the most interesting to the visiting pack of reporters, but those were not local-oriented stories, really, because the US wasn’t a big player in that. So on one hand, you have stories that play well globally, or at least regionally, and then you’ve also got stories that play more locally, so for us for example, how were the sessions that were designed for local business people working out, and were local business people managing to strike any deals to get contracts and service contracts to make money off of the whole process. And how were the cultural negotiations taking place for Hawaiian people and environmentalists, for example, who kind of represented the islands, to be heard by the people who control a lot of spending on
some of these big projects? There were two or three different levels of stories going on. Did I go sideways on that or did I answer my question?

Q: No, you answered my question. No problem.

A: Okay, anyway –

Q: I wanted to make sure I didn’t interrupt you.

A: No, oh, that’s very kind of you. But I think – the point is, the reporters tended to have a better angle on those stories than the editors did, or the publishers or anybody else. And so we were just trying to chase all that stuff at the same time. And then you have the issues of the more pressing issue of will the protesters kind of break up the sessions, and we had to kind of chase that at the same time, too. So we’re really looking at stories on kind of different streams that were all flowing at the same time. Hour by hour you had to decide where you need to put your effort. So it was hard for anybody to tell us what to do. For the most part, I had more ideas and more stories that I wanted to do and as I called them in later and later in the afternoon, the editors would start saying, we’re not going to have any more space, don’t write any longer than 12 inches on that or, you know, do this, do that. I was trying to encapsulate all the reports from each country that came through at the same time follow some other stuff and we finally put a lot of the country reports on the Internet – didn’t even get them to the paper – because we just didn’t have space for it. So we had to make a lot decisions about summarizing and digesting as the time went on just because of space considerations, I think. But I think the other side of that question is, are there sort of socialized understandings in the newsroom where nobody ever has to say it, you just know it (laughs) and so reporters learn
almost through osmosis that there are certain approaches that you do or don’t take, certain issues that you do or don’t go after. I can’t remember in the ADB feeling like there was anything terribly untouchable. One of the big issues, of course, is whether tourism overwhelms the rest of Hawaii and its needs and aspirations, whether the corporate need to pack them in and make money helps or hurts the economy and helps or hurts people. I thought we covered that pretty well – I don’t know if ‘well’ is the right word – but as I recall we weren’t avoiding that question as it came to covering the whole conference. Whether it’s enough for other people remains to be seen.

Q: So you think that, I guess, the results of the conference in terms of the benefits in terms of contracts with local businesses has not yet, I guess, happened, I mean the end has not yet –

A: Yeah, well, I would say that’s probably true because you’re making contracts. The real issue with the ADB and I think the real issue in what the conference in Hawaii might do for people in Hawaii was to just familiarize them with the system, let them understand how the game’s played and what you have to accomplish. A lot of times, it’s not enough just to have a good idea. You have to really know how to write the proposal, and line up the right people, you need to have usually a coalition between people who are from a certain country who have a distinct need and people who know how to work with a bank, and people who want to provide a certain kind of service. And they all have to kind of learn how to work together, probably, my guess, to get a contract. I don’t know because I didn’t cover it for that long. So yeah, I think the benefits from that point of view, whether more people will be able
to get business providing the kind of services. I mean – I’m sure this was in the story somewhere – that Hawaii tends to be in a position of offering professional services, educational services, consulting kinds of things rather than bricks and mortar kinds of projects. A lot of design, project design, things like that. So I would think in the long run there might be some benefits to that. And then you have to weigh that against the pros and cons of whether what the ADB does as we now know it is sort of democratically proper. That’s why I say there’s a lot of layers. On one hand you’re hoping that the local folks can get good at it; on the other hand, you hope that what they’re getting good at is going to help people. There’s so many nuances, there’s so many things to think about and it’s very hard to capture all that in, you know, 800 quick words when you’re on deadline.

Q: Did you ever have to, I mean, did you ever try to write about the other issues surrounding the ADB, which were the issues the protesters were bringing up about how their projects and policies have caused environmental destruction –

A: Yeah (pauses). I can’t remember all the coverage. I didn’t get assigned to that. There were some stories as I recall. I did some research because I wanted to know, I wanted to know how it all worked together and I’m sure that a couple of – at least one of my advances – I’m sure must have tried to provide a kind of point-counterpoint about all that. And I did one story as I recall on NGOs and how they were getting more involved, trying to get more involved, on the inside, to present some of the kinds of mistakes that had been made in the past so that the people at the grassroots level would have more control over the project that were taking place so that there wouldn’t be the kind of environmentally degrading projects that had
taken place in the past. Yeah, I tried to write some of it but that wasn’t mostly what
I was personally given to do, as I recall. And once you’re inside you’re trying to
cover all this different stuff going on. That’s one of the stories but it’s not the only
story.

Q: Did you also, in general, I guess, for the Business Section, did you talk about
writing about the ADB and how it relates to globalization and how that is relevant
to Hawaii?

A: A little bit. That’s a great question that I wish I could have done more. We talked
about how it was relevant, how Hawaii’s trying to market itself as a major regional
meeting point and kind of mediation point to some degree where people from all
parts of the Pacific Rim can get together and where the tone is harmonious. But
probably not as much as I would have liked. We tended to be a little bit more
concrete (laughs) than big picture, I think and then again that’s a little bit the
function of the patterns of newsworth and a little bit in my case probably the
function of the fact that this was the first time that I had much exposure to the ADB
or any kind of World Bank model and I was learning fast but sometimes when
you’re learning fast you’re not in a position to be the best framer of the issues.

Q: Do you think there is a way of discussing, given the structure of newspaper work, is
there still a way of being able to talk about globalization in more concrete terms
rather than the general picture so that you can make it interesting and relevant to
your readership? Or is that something that something that is sort of a new thing that
reporters will still have to learn?
A: Well, kind of a new thing, kind of a new thing. You know, I think to some degree we need to – one of the layers to unpeel is what is the newspaper’s sort of definition of its own mission? And how often and how much are we likely to swing to the fence, to use a bad metaphor.

Q: You’ll have to explain that metaphor to me because English is not my first language.

A: Oh, okay. “Swing to the fence” is a baseball term meaning “try to hit a homerun”, try to go for the grand gesture of meaning and the Advertiser is the kind of paper and the size of paper that tends to filter everything down to local development. And so to speak a lot about globalization, obviously the only way to do it is to sort of keep the islands in the forefront as, you know, what’s the relationship between Hawaii and globalization generally? I think we often sort of flirt with that notion, whether we’re talking about the economy because I think during the year I was there covering the economy and covering business, the most common theme in any story about Hawaii’s economy, is the fact that it’s related to developments all over the world. It’s not an economy that responds primarily to local pressures but almost entirely to pressures that it cannot control very well. And so in that regard, we do talk about globalization pressures, but do we really try to frame how the world is changing and how globalization pressures have sort of palpably made a difference in terms of the decisions we make and the perceptions that we share? We probably didn’t do that very much. I would love to see that.... What would really be nice, you almost need to have somebody who’s so attuned to that, so ready to understand the forces and counterforces, the center points and the margin points, the flows of
power, the flows of information, the flows of communication, the flows of migration. You really need somebody who does that, and does it well. What I’d like to see – I would love to see this – at the Advertiser would be to have someone who kind of did that full-time, almost like a commentary writer, a columnist because there are times when a third-person, kind of impartial, neutral reportage – although it’s impossible but we still seek some sort of an ideal – can’t do it as well, can’t do it as well unless you have just a remarkable and great collection of sources who you can call on all the time to sort of inform your readers in very thoughtful and enlightened ways. Hawaii’s not a huge place and we would probably be calling Dr. Tehranian nine times a week (laughs), you know, and so it becomes a problem that you kind of end up repeating yourself a lot. It’s a little bit different for a columnist. It’d be kind of nice if there’s one person maybe who wrote one story a week and tried to just keep that on the front burner and explain it to people. I think some of the elites on the island certainly understand it already, but it would be interesting to try to translate it down to the common folks, try to show people how what you buy at the supermarket in Kailua is affected by what happened last month to the Asian Tigers, or something. That’d be really a fascinating job.

Q: So you think as of now, there is no one at the Advertiser who does that?

A: No. I think that’s probably fair to say. I don’t know what other people said. I’m sure they tried – Judi’s a terrific editor, by the way, and she has a great grasp on what’s going on in the world. But on a day-to-day basis, it’s a little bit more general than what the Advertiser tends to shoot for, I would say. I think everybody would love to have a couple of great stories on it. Whether they can afford to have anybody more
often is hard to say. I mean, I tend to agree that stories like that are pretty valuable
if done well, and it's not easy to do that well, but if done well, very valuable. But on
the other hand, I also had a one-year crusade there which failed, to try to get the
editors to hire someone to be a full-time columnist only on Waikiki, which is very
nuts and bolts grassroots, local. So I think you need both. I think these are different
layers on the onion.

Q:  Yeah. Now I'm going to ask you to wear a different hat, as a member of the public,
a private citizen, a reader, whatever you want to call it. How would you evaluate –
first, overall, how Hawaii media in general and then more specifically the
Advertiser covered the protests that happened during the conference?

A:  So I'm evaluating everybody just on the coverage of the protest?

Q:  Yes.

A:  Hmmm. Not surprisingly, I'd probably say we were more interested in the nuts and
bolts question. Number one, is there going to be violence? Number two, what is this
going to mean for the City and the State? Are the roads going to be close? Is
anybody going to get hurt? How much are we going to pay? Is this going to hurt our
reputation? We probably covered that more than we did to investigate what the
protests were about. And there's reason for that. Our readers are people who live
there and they have daily lives to live and they tend to think about their own
interests first. And secondly, it's pretty easy to ask those questions and get some
kind of answers although the police didn't help us much –

Q:  I'll get back to you on that.
A: (Laughs) It's a little bit harder to put your finger on what the protests really mean. There were a couple of people we talked to among the early protesters who could verbalize and articulate pretty well what some of the things meant. But the protests were always kind of a coalition of different interests and they were always so free form that you were never really sure how well they could be articulated. I mean, what does it mean when people get ready for protesting the ADB by getting together on Saturday nights in Waikiki and just making noise? What does that mean? So it's hard to know how much you can say about the intentions and motives in situations that are so free form like that. So it's hard. It's very hard. And of course the protesters for a while had a kind of a hotline, which was great, they had a little office for a while as I recall, which was great. But they weren't always there and sometimes you got calls back, sometimes you didn't. So it was a little on the vague side. Right before the protests - a couple of days before the protests - some of the people at UH and so forth I think did a better job of articulating some issues. Wasn't there a teach-in up at UH a day or two before?

Q: Uhm hmm. Yeah.

A: Seems like it. I didn't cover that; somebody else did. And that was good and in fact I was thinking at the time, boy I wish they'd done that a week ago. Because I could have gotten more direct answers, more voices, more of a sense of what is it the protesters are really saying? I mean, some of the issues about projects in Thailand and so forth and there was I think a sociologist from the Philippines who'd done a lot of - Waldo what -

Q: Walden Bello.
A: Walden Bello, yeah. And he came, I think, to the teach-in. And I wish he'd been around earlier for our purposes. So I think probably I wish we at the Advertiser had been able to capture that a little bit better. And I think probably the same for everybody. I think even some of the other – I can't really say because I was really busy. I didn't watch TV that much and I can't remember what the Star Bulletin did. I think overall it would have been nice to be able to flesh out some of the issues a little bit better.

Q: So you think that aside from the questions of is there going to be violence, how much is this going to cost, how is this going to affect traffic, do you think it is important to understand or convey to the readers what the protests are all about?

A: Yeah, because protesters don't just – well, for the most part, I should say – protesters don't just do it for nothing. There's certainly the sincerity among a lot of people. But for sure, yeah, absolutely. Now on the other hand – I shouldn't say this, I sound like an old guy when I say this (laughs), I sound like an old establishment person. I just got a kick, like on the last day of the conference, you know you've got eight people sitting down by the creek there just banging on trash can lids. And to me when you cover a story like that so that you say, so inside they're talking about whether they're really fulfilling their function, outside the people who are criticizing them are banging on trash can lids. And this doesn't seem equal. The people inside are at least trying whether their structure's correct or not. They're at least being self-reflective, but they're not getting as much – the protesters didn't really articulate, in my opinion, to some degree, they didn't really articulate it as well although they might have with their sincerity at times but I don't think banging
on trash can lids makes the people of Hawaii think necessarily that the protests were very serious. But I guess that's all part of protesting (laughs) so it's hard to say.

Q: I had a question and I lost it.
A: About the police?
Q: Yes.
A: I didn't cover the police at all, but I know that we asked many times — well, actually, I did once — City Hall has a pretty effective system for not answering questions when they want to. And you call the police and say, we'd like to know what kind of new equipment you have and we'd like to know what your estimate is for the cost of this and things like that and they give you to the special representative of City Hall, Citizens Answer Person. And by the time they give you an answer, it's like, well, we think we're doing all the right things. And that's the answer. And that's not the question. So it was a little frustrating. Basically, they didn't want to play to opponents, they didn't want to tip their hand, they didn't want to give any material that would sort of hurt their cause in the marketplace of ideas. Reporters are, for the most part, equal opportunity critics (laughs) and if I'm going to criticize the protesters for banging on trash can lids, I also need to criticize, I think, the city officials for just not saying as much as they could have about what they were doing.

Q: Okay, one last question. Well, maybe not. Were you around when Tadao Chino came out to meet the woman from Thailand and Walden Bello and the other protesters?
A: No, I was inside. I watched it through the window. I was in the lobby at that time. That was sort of the zenith of the event; that was the high point of the drama where the insiders and the outsiders actually went and met each other. So we had other reporters assigned to that particularly; I just watched it. I think I was on the second floor of the landing. Part of my job was to talk to the people inside and hear what they had to say about it. But you know, almost all of the delegates left, when the protests started. There was almost nobody, none of them were even in the building, very few of them were in the building.

Q: Were they out golfing?

A: No, but I think they knew it was coming and they just didn’t want to be there for it. They didn’t want be a) embarrassed, b) kind of overshadowed and c) delayed. So they just didn’t have much going on for those couple of hours. And there’s really nobody to talk to. Most of the people who watched it, in fact, were the local people; people who were working there volunteering, a lot of the Native people stayed inside to watch it. It was very interesting to me because most of the people I talked to had, again, very nuanced opinion. They were really glad that there was an interaction, they were glad to know, and I think it’s true, that – the ADB brass knows that in the past, the bank was not as sensitive to criticism and to the needs – I think we can say the grassroots needs – of different people and groups and so they were trying to do better and a lot of the dialogue was about that and the people inside like the Native people who were inside were there for that reason. They were there to make sure that there was exposure that said, next time you guys want to build a big water treatment plant, you’ve got to think about the rights of the people
who are already there and quit worrying about the other 5 million you’re going to serve. And so I think that was starting to happen to some degree and so the people on the inside for the most part were saying, hey, this is good, we’re getting their attention, it’s good people have a chance to express themselves freely, that’s good, the bank’s starting to listen a little bit, that’s good, and it feels like we’re doing a little bit of good. Now, was that true? I don’t know. But that’s what I was hearing on the inside for the most part. And people – the representatives from the different countries – were nowhere to be seen. So I just watched it. And I talked to some of the people afterwards. I heard Mr. Chino talk about it a little bit.

Q: When you meant delegates, you meant delegates from the other countries.

A: Right. The people who were part of the official delegation, not just the delegates themselves. Every country had four or five people there at least. But the word was out that this was the time when the protesters were going to come –

Q: How did Chino get trapped in there?

A: To go outside?

Q: Yes.

A: I think he really wanted to. You know, I think the discourse in Honolulu was actually pretty good, pretty healthy and I don’t think that Chino was worried about his safety at all. I think everybody by the time the conference started, I think everybody felt like at least there were enough kind of safety valves in place that nobody was going to freak out.

Q: Did you ever speak to anyone who had said that the ADB brass were actually more afraid of the police reacting or overreacting to the protesters than they were of the
protesters themselves when they were demanding that Chino come out and talk to them?

A: I never heard that. I never heard that, no. But do I think they were worried about it? I think that’s a reasonable concern on their part anywhere, not just in Hawaii but anywhere. And I think that the ADB people – and especially the American delegation – was very concerned that any demonstrations on American turf really needed to be provided with fair treatment and chances to express themselves. Now that didn’t mean that everybody got to come in. But I think the American side… Paul O. Neill, the Secretary of Treasury – the Treasury people were very concerned that the way this was handled in America needed to be open and democratic. So to that degree, I think they wanted to make sure that the cops were not going to be out of control. By the way, were you there at all, did you get to see it?

Q: No.

A: Okay. You know, they hired a private security force as well. And I don’t know if they were always at the Convention Center, if they brought these guys in just for this one time. I think in some cases they were brought in just for one time. But they were mostly local guys. Big, strong, local guys and they were so relaxed, for the most part, and so kind of cool about it. That set a pretty good tone so the first kind of line of people you saw around the building weren’t guys in riot gear or anything like that. They were guys in aloha shirts with radio and that I think was probably a pretty good tone-setter to help kind of lower the tension level, somehow.

Q: Okay, I said one last question earlier, but I said maybe not. And this is the reason why.
A: Okay.

Q: You mentioned earlier that there were some groups of people who decided that they
would rather be inside than outside so that they could take part in the ongoing
discourse there.

A: Uhm hmm.

Q: Do you think that the protesters were out there by choice because we also know that
the conference itself and all the activities there – all the seminars, all the events –
were by invitation only?

A: Uhm hmm, which is always a problem, yeah. Yeah, some of the protesters were
there by choice. Even the coalition of protesters, I forget what they’re called –

Q: ADBwatch.

A: ADBwatch. They had a few people inside.

Q: Yes, Joshua Cooper.

A: Joshua, yeah. I don’t know if there were more but I think there were a couple more.
So there was an interest among some of the people on the outside to have a voice
inside and I think that voice was available, which was nice. In other cases, sure, not
everybody’s going to get inside for no other reason than there’d be too many people
inside so certainly some protesters were outside because they couldn’t get in – not
by choice – but also by choice because part of the protest is a symbolic spectacle.
It’s a symbolic gesture that wouldn’t be very effective as media event if everybody
was just sitting inside clapping (laughs). So I think both. The ADB at least was
willing to work with the local organizers here and invite people in to have a little bit
more of a discourse inside than probably they did in the past. And there were more
NGOs represented inside than there had been in the past. And the NGOs were kind of gaining some momentum in terms of being heard. I did go to one session with the NGOs where president Chino attended and sat and listened for a while as different groups said – they were very smart, they were wise, they complimented him for inviting them in, but then they said, you know in the past sometimes, ADB has done some things that if your engineers had just stopped to talk to the local people who lived around there, they would have told you that what you were doing wasn’t going to work. But you guys never asked. And so then after a while, people gave up trying to tell you. And he sat there and listened and shook his head and said, yes, you’re right. So there was some discourse, I think, beyond probably what we would have seen five years ago, based on what I heard because I wasn’t there. So I think there was more discussion inside but certainly I think a lot of protesters had to be outside. They couldn’t get in and in some cases they didn’t want to get in. Does that sound right?

A: Yes.... Usually I have a last question but I always let my interviewee sort of add whatever he/she would like to add as a closing statement.

Q: Well, the only closing statement I’d probably make is that I found the event really fascinating. A lot of that just has to do with the fact of my own interest, my own motives, my own sort of changing attitudes about what satisfies me, and just kind of discovering the incredibly complex politics of international development. To me, it’s just absolutely fascinating. I was glad that the ADB people seemed at least formally to be more interested in hearing from grassroots groups, unhappy people, and people who think that they can help make the operation better, or to rethink it,
to rethink what and how the ADB should be acting. I also think it’s for newspapers – probably for TV as well – pretty difficult one-time event to cover. If we had someone on our staff who covered ADB meetings every year, they’d probably be better at getting all the voices, framing the issues in meaningful ways, being able to do a better job of appreciating how globalization pressures – if you want to call them that – affect all this, that at least for the short run, just for the month we had it in the front burner. We tried (laughs), we tried to do our best that I think given a second shot, we’d probably try to do more. But we worked at it pretty hard. We put a lot of people on it and I know that it was the most important thing on my plate for about a week and I really appreciated the chance to do it.
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