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Abstract

This dissertation explores the ways in which sovereignty and nationalism are expressed within four small island nations of Oceania. These four nations represent significant variation in the level of sovereignty and types of nationalism. Hawai‘i, though the largest of the four, remains a part of the United States following the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i. An active nationalist movement continues to fight for the end of U.S. occupation. Fiji, whilst legally fully independent, has seen considerable nationalist activity including four coups. Niue and the Cook Islands are in free association with New Zealand. Though independent nations, they have elected to outsource several government functions including foreign affairs and defence to New Zealand. They also maintain a close relationship wherein Niueans and Cook Islanders hold New Zealand citizenship. This unusual relationship tests the bounds of typical models of sovereignty and nationalism. Despite their small size, nationalism is present in all four nations.

Contrary to expectations given the contested status of the three nations and the ethnonationalist struggles Fiji has faced, the fiery and intense version of nationalism known as hot nationalism is mostly historical for these nations. Rather, we see nationalism expressed through taken for granted components of daily life. This phenomenon known as everyday or banal nationalism can be seen across areas that would not typically be considered as nationalist such as food, music, language and sport. Even extremely banal areas such as road naming, airport organisation, and mailing procedures, can serve to remind people of their place in the nation and create or reinforce a national identity.

Sovereignty has been the focus for activists across many modern movements. Though traditionally nationalists have often utilised folk definitions of sovereignty, international law
and the legal definitions of sovereignty have become paramount to many modern movements. Nationalists are increasingly using legal theory and academia as tools to gain legitimacy and support for their causes. How nationalism and sovereignty are expressed and contested have changed considerably over the past few decades necessitating the fresh look at nationalism in small island states provided by this study.
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Chapter 1

1 Introduction

This dissertation looks at the variety of ways in which nationalism is expressed in four small island nations of Oceania\(^1\). It explores this issue across a range of independence and sovereignty statuses, from legally fully independent Fiji to Hawaii’s\(^2\) ongoing occupation and status as a US state. Niue and the Cook Islands’ statuses are

\(^{1}\) Oceania has been defined in a variety of ways. This dissertation uses a definition that is common in the region where it includes all of the islands of Polynesia, Micronesia and Melanesia except New Guinea. Australia is not typically included in this definition, though it is within the geopolitical definition of Oceania. New Zealand can, depending upon the model employed, be considered to be part of Polynesia or Australasia. For comparative utility, New Zealand is often excluded from regional definitions and in this dissertation is not presented as part of Oceania.

\(^{2}\) This dissertation uses the spelling Hawaiʻi (with the ʻokina) rather than Hawaii. This form best represents modern Hawaiian orthography and is the form favoured by the National and State Parks services and the University of Hawaiʻi. Hawaii is used when referring specifically to the State of Hawaii government, as the official state name does not include the ʻokina. The ʻokina is not included in the word Hawaiian, nor in the possessive form (Hawaiian’s), as they are using English word endings, causing them to be considered non-Hawaiian words.

The term Hawaiian, when referring to people, is used here as a synonym for Native Hawaiian to describe peoples who consider their ancestry to trace back to the original Polynesian settlers of Hawaiʻi. A partial exception to this is when referring to the Hawaiian sovereignty movement. Most groups within the movement do not consider it to be a racial issue, but rather one affecting all people of Hawaiʻi. Though there is frequently an implied racial element in the Hawaiian sovereignty movement, the usage of “Hawaiian” here should not be considered an indicator that a group or the movement as a whole considered themselves to solely represent native peoples.
ambiguously positioned somewhere in between. These nations provide for an ideal exploration of the ways in which nationalism can be manifested in ways that are different from that which is typically studied. Though all four nations have experienced colonial domination in some form, their colonial experience is dramatically different from that of most other former colonies, resulting in very different approaches to sovereignty and nationalism. These nations are also much smaller than typically studied in nationalism research and in contrast to many other postcolonial states’ versions of nationalism, none of these nations has had significant violent or armed nationalistic movements.3

The way in which a nation gained its independence (or failed to gain independence) and its current expression of sovereignty appear to be the most significant factor in the ways in which nationalism can be observed. The Cook Islands and Niue have full legal independence and sovereignty, though they have entered into a compact of free association under which many of the rights of a sovereign state have been surrendered to New Zealand, their former colonial power. Fiji remains a largely independent state since its release from colonialism in 1970, but still frequently feels pressures from the more powerful countries of the region, namely Australia and New Zealand. Fiji also faces a complex postcolonial legacy of ethnic division and political instability. Following the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy in 1893 by the U.S., Hawai‘i has remained under the control of the United States. Though generally accepted as a state of the United States of America, many advocates of the sovereignty movement

3 Whilst Fiji has experienced four coups since independence, and Hawai‘i has had some historical armed skirmishes (discussed in greater detail in the chapter on hot nationalism), actual violence was fairly minimal, especially when compared with movements in other nations.
argue that Hawai‘i is an independent nation under U.S. occupation. These varying levels of independence and sovereignty have dramatic effects upon the character of these nations.

Nationalism, in its most visible fiery form, appears to be displayed most strongly in Fiji and Hawai‘i, whilst outward displays of this type of nationalism are relatively rare in the Cook Islands and Niue. Banal or everyday nationalism, however, seems ever-present in all four nations. In contrast to the extreme form of nationalism known as hot nationalism, everyday nationalism represents the taken-for-granted ways in which nationalism is integrated into our daily lives. In both Hawai‘i and Fiji, the nations can be considered under threat, with a resulting need for building a national identity in response. In the case of Hawaii, the threat to the nation is in the form of continued U.S. occupation. For Fiji, it is a combination of a threat from internal division and outside interference from neighbouring countries. Fiji has had a particularly turbulent history with four coups since independence in 1970. Since the 2006 coup, the government has oriented itself towards building a unified Fiji free of outside influence. In both cases, traditional nationalism is often internally divisive, and its reception mixed and thus whilst present, it has proved problematic for these nations.

Along with the backdrop of very active traditionally nationalistic displays are the under-considered presentations of everyday nationalism that appear in many ways to be more effective at defining that nation. Niue and the Cook Islands seem largely content with their political and legal statuses. Although there are occasional stirrings for change, there has been a considerable evolution in their statuses since the free association agreement with New Zealand was signed allowing their sovereignty to grow within the
framework of the agreement. Ending the compact with New Zealand in favour of full independence has often been a reoccurring issue for a handful of Cook Island politicians but has never gained much traction amongst the general voting public. In Niue reabsorption into New Zealand has been proposed a few times, such as following a devastating hurricane, but likewise fails to gain real support. Given the lack of any significant movement toward full independence, there appear to be only minimal attempts to make use of traditional nationalistic displays in the islands. Banal nationalism, on the other hand, is in heavy use in these nations. In Fiji and Hawaiʻi, similar displays of everyday nationalism are paired with often poorly received traditional hot nationalistic symbols and displays.

Though reasonably stable democracies at present, three of the four nations have had meaningful political turmoil in their recent pasts. Fiji has had four coups in a handful of decades. The Cook Islands saw a sitting prime minister removed by the courts for election irregularities and also experienced a recent coup attempt. Hawaiʻi has a very active sovereignty movement, whose supporters consider Hawaiʻi to be under foreign occupation since the forceful overtaking of the country 124 years ago. Niue, though on the whole politically stable, is currently facing rapid depopulation and an increasingly overextended government, which now employs nearly the entire labour force. Many of these concerns, however, are kept out of the world's attention because of these nations' dependence on foreign tourism. Foreign tourism is often harmed by impressions of political upheaval or other imagery that hurts the impression of the islands as a “paradise”.
The four nations of this paper were selected because they represent atypical versions of the nation. Niue is one of the smallest countries in the world and has an unusual legal status. The Cook Islands is also extremely small and shares the legal status of Niue. Fiji whilst larger than its neighbours is still a small nation by global standards. It has also been one of the most politically turbulent countries in the region, as well as the most developed independent state. Hawai‘i is interesting, as it is one of the most racially diverse places in the world and features an exceptionally low-key, but highly active, sovereignty movement.

1.1 Purpose

This dissertation aims to expand our understanding of the relationship between banal nationalism and sovereignty within small states. Nationalism, contrary to assumptions, is very present even amongst the smallest of nations. Though it may be less visible than in nations undergoing major political upheaval (a favourite for traditional nationalism studies), or the long-established large western nation (the recent area of interest in the field), it seems to be a critically important feature of the nation. Everyday nationalism can be argued to be a powerful, but under-explored tool in the battle towards independence and sovereignty.

The typical context for everyday nationalism research has been urban environments within large well-established nations. There has been a severe lack of research within small nations and particularly, small island nations. Similarly, most of the studies have focused on nations with traditional governance models and well-recognised sovereignty. By exploring nationalism in understudied environments with less typical
legal statuses, we can see how well the theories of nationalism hold up under more diverse examples.

In Hawai‘i, armed movements against U.S. occupation are both politically unworkable and practically impossible, given the clear superiority of military resources of the U.S. government. Likewise, the promotion of traditional pro-sovereignty nationalism through the use of the sovereignty flag and protests are met with general disdain or disinterest from the public. In contrast, tools of everyday nationalism such as food, language, sports and music have done more to bring the idea of a sovereign Hawaiian nation into the public’s mind, and with it, acceptance of a theoretically sovereign Hawai‘i, than traditional nationalism could ever do.

In Niue and the Cook Islands, everyday nationalism is effectively establishing stronger sentiments of independence and full sovereignty than political movements have been able to. In many ways, their arrangements of free association are so beneficial to the islands that eliminating them is unlikely ever to gain meaningful public support. Nevertheless, like most peoples globally, they feel the universal calls for sovereignty and independence. Again, banal nationalism seems to fill a gap that would otherwise be highly problematic.

Fiji has seen conscious efforts by the government to shape everyday nationalism in ways that fit its model of a unified, independent country. Fiji’s political climate, in the face of ethnic and religious division, is such that most outwardly nationalistic attempts are poorly received by large sectors of the nation, given their traditional relationship to ethnic division. Everyday nationalism allows the government of Fiji to establish a unified national identity in a way that is not harmful to the nation.
Everyday nationalism has played a clear, but somewhat unique, role in each nation’s pathway to independence and its postcolonial aftermath. Strangely, though, given this role, there has not yet been much academic attention paid to its effects. This dissertation seeks to provide a starting point to this apparent gap in the nationalism and sovereignty literature.

I will also explore how nationalism can function within very small nations. Benedict Anderson famously defined a nation as an imagined community. The nation is imagined “because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion”.\(^4\) Owing to Niue’s small geographic size and tiny population, it is not only possible, but reasonable for members of the Niuean nation to know, or at least know of, effectively all of their fellow members. The Cook Islands, though larger, is still small enough that many of its members will have some connection beyond that of the imagined community. In the larger nations of Fiji and Hawaii, knowing large percentages of their fellow members is not practical. However, attempts at finding non-nation connections between people are deeply ingrained in the local culture. Family ties (which are themselves often imagined) are a key element of South Pacific cultures, but their effects on nationalism have been underexplored. Despite their comparatively larger sizes, Fiji and Hawaii too remain dwarfed by most other nations, particularly those Anderson was writing about. This dissertation will argue that nationalism is still possible

---

and present in nations significantly below the size generally considered, but that this
nationalism may take a somewhat different form, particularly manifesting as banal
nationalism.

1.2 Conceptual Framework

1.2.1 The Nation

The concept of “nation” has proved to be quite tricky to define precisely.
Definitions often suggest that a nation is a group of people with common characteristics,
such as language, ethnicity, history and/or religion. Will Kymlicka, for example,
proposes that “nation' means a historical community, more or less institutionally
complete, occupying a given territory or homeland, sharing a distinct language and
culture”.\(^5\) Otto Bauer and others have chosen to focus more upon the commonality of
national character, noting that the people of a nation are “united by a common fate …
[which] is primarily a common history; the common national character involves almost
necessarily a uniformity of language”.\(^6\) These definitions seem, though, to overemphasise
actual commonalities, ignoring the flexibility that is exercised by nations in defining
themselves.

Whilst there is a great diversity in ways of defining the nation, Benedict
Anderson’s definition of the nation as an imagined political community seems most

\(^5\) Will Kymlicka, *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights* (Wotton-under-

useful for this dissertation. His 1983 work *Imagined Communities* has become one of the most frequently cited works on nationalism. However, within the study of nationalism, it is generally only a small portion of his first chapter that is utilised, with frequent disagreement over the applicability of the remaining chapters. In this first chapter, he proposes that a nation is “an imagined political community” which is “imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign”. He argues that nations are imagined in the sense that, in even the smallest nation, the members will “never know most of their fellow members, meet them, or even hear of them”; however, they hold an “image of their communion”. Despite an absence of actual bonds, members consider themselves connected through the bonds of their shared nation. There is a general shared affinity for each other, even when commonalities beyond nationality do not exist.

Nations are generally defined as limited, in that they have physical, finite boundaries. A nation cannot usefully include all peoples of the world, nor do nations imagine themselves as doing so. The boundaries of the nation are supposedly finite, and other similarly bounded nations are seen as existing beyond the boundaries of each nation.

Sovereignty is also presented as a requirement for defining a nation. The nation must imagine itself as sovereign in order to exist. Nations do not need to actually be able

---

7 Anderson, Imagined Communities, 6.
8 Anderson, Imagined Communities, 1-9.
9 Ibid.
10 Ibid.
to express sovereignty, but rather "nations dream of being free".\textsuperscript{11} Thus, a nation can exist as an imagined community, even when its members lack sovereignty, so long as they share in the belief that their community "should" be sovereign. Finally, the nation is a community in that "regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship".\textsuperscript{12} A member of the nation is presented as having a meaningful connection to fellow members, even when this connection might not exist in any practical form.

Anderson’s definition of a nation, whilst generally very useful, is somewhat problematic when looking at the nations in this paper. He suggests that it is not possible for all members of a nation to interact with or even know of each other. This impossibility of non-imagined bonds creates the need for the nation to establish a shared affinity. Without the nation, the peoples of that space would otherwise not generally be able to hold an “image of their communion” with their fellow members.

When looking at a nation such as Niue with a population around 2,000, the notion that it is not possible to interact with all fellow members of a nation no longer holds true. With only one primary and secondary school, one supermarket, a single hospital and only a handful of restaurants in the 260-square-kilometre island, the idea that any person living in the nation would be a complete stranger is highly unlikely. Any two members of the Niuean nation are likely to have been born at the same hospital, gone to the same school, attended the same church, and shared a host of social events. Should the person somehow

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
have avoided having a personal connection with another member of the nation, it is a virtual certainty that a close relation of the person would. Even in the somewhat larger Cook Islands, the population of around 10,000 suggests that whilst close bonds with all fellow members are probably not possible, most people will have more connections than just the imagined bonds of nationhood. Although it is statistically impossible to calculate with any real accuracy how many people someone will meet in a lifetime, many rough estimates describe numbers as high as 100,000 people. This suggests, then, a possibility of actually meeting around ten per cent of the population of even the larger nations of Fiji and Hawai‘i. When we start to consider connections beyond just direct contact, such as the connections of family and friends, it remains plausible that some sort of connection other than nationality can be found amongst most members of a nation. This dissertation will show that Anderson's apparent requirement of a large population is not necessary for the development of nationalism and that the bonds of the nation can continue to exist despite lacking the need for the imagined bonds of nationhood which a larger nation would require.

Anderson’s definition of the nation still remains useful in this dissertation. However, as noted above, it is necessary to redefine somewhat the “imagined” component of the nation. Whilst Anderson sees the imaginedness to be required as a

13 These estimates are typically based upon a thought experiment by travel writer William Least Heat Moon and are generated by multiplying the number of people a person will meet daily by average life expectancy (currently 71.0). The estimate of 100,000 people is reached by assuming a person will meet an average of four new people a day. Though this number will clearly vary based upon a variety of social and geographic factors and how “meet” is defined, it seems accurate to believe that most people will meet extremely large numbers of people in their lifetime.
replacement for other bonds, it appears that the “image of their communion” as a nation is still present even when other bonds exist amongst the members of the nation. These feelings of being connected by nationhood do not seem to be any stronger or weaker as a result of other bonds, but rather exist as an altogether different type of connection. Further, small nations still exist within a world of other nations. Even if the imagined community is unnecessary to connect a small nation together, its people are still going to be continuously exposed to others within the imagined communities of foreign nations. Given how deeply embedded the nation is within our daily lives, exposure to the idea of nationhood is unavoidable, and it is unsurprising that people within nations wherein the imagined component of nationhood may be unnecessary would still find themselves utilising it.

In recognition of the role of self-determination, the term nation in this dissertation is used to refer to any set of peoples that defines themselves as a nation, whilst still observing the other components of Anderson’s definition (“limited and sovereign” with at least a “dream” of sovereignty).

1.2.2 The Nation-State

Though nation is often used as a synonym for state or country, they are not the same. Nations in Anderson’s argument are closely related, but not necessarily the same as the states within which they exist. Nation-states exist when there is a convergence between the sovereign geopolitical entity which is the state and the cultural entity which is the nation.\textsuperscript{14} Nation-states “come in all shapes and sizes”. There is a common

\textsuperscript{14} Anderson, \textit{Imagined Communities}, 1-9.
assumption that nations are built upon objective variables such as language, religion or geography, on which the boundaries of the state can be established. Despite this assumption, no nations fully meet this standard.

Of the four nations this dissertation explores, none can be considered to be entirely nation-states. The Cook Islands and Niue, though having no trouble meeting general definitions of a nation, have unclear political sovereignty. Fiji, in contrast, whilst clearly politically sovereign, does not have the unity or homogeneity to be unambiguously a nation. Hawai‘i fails both parts. Its political sovereignty is unrecognised, and it lacks the cultural or social cohesiveness to form a nation (at least one that corresponds to its geopolitical bounds).

1.2.3 Nationalism

Nationalism, in the popular imagination, is most commonly associated with a fight for independence or extreme right-wing politics. It is also generally envisioned as something that occurs elsewhere, with established nations seen as not having nationalism. Though this is clearly not the case, instances of nationalism in established nations are often presented as being an exception or a fringe movement, so as to allow the mainstream society to maintain the illusion that they are not a part of the nationalism that they fear. Nationalism is perceived as a dangerous or exotic force, being the result of “overheated reaction”. For established nations, nationalism is presented as a function of the periphery; it is a tool of separatists and other extremists, not a part of normal activity. Michael Billig challenges this notion. He argues that, rather than an exotic part of the
periphery, nationalism is deeply embedded in the normal activity of the nation. The nation is continuously reproduced throughout its daily life. The term “banal nationalism” is proposed to cover the ways in which these established nations' habits serve to reproduce the nation. Within established nations, there is a continual “flagging” or reminding of nationhood. This nationhood provides “a continual background for … political discourses, for cultural products, and even for the structuring of newspapers”. In small, often subtle, ways the people of the nation are reminded of their place in a “world of nations”. This reminding, however, is so commonplace and constant that it is not generally consciously recognised.

It is commonly assumed that, within the daily life of most established nations, the nation’s identity emerged essentially spontaneously and organically based on a shared sense of the nation’s values. Billig strongly rejects this idea of a natural national identity. Instead, he suggests that the establishment of the nation, particularly the violence of the nation's establishment, is forgotten and the continuing of the national identity comes through largely unconscious reminders. Billig uses the concept of the waved and unwaved flag to illustrate this. The flag is said within nationalist thought to represent “the sacred character of the nation”. The flag is “revered by loyal citizens and ritually defiled
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by those who wish to make a protest”. Despite this symbolism, however, the vast majority of the times in which citizens see their national flag, it is not conveying a particular message. Though there are instances in which it will be “consciously waved and saluted”, most times in which the flag is viewed it will be “unwaved and unsaluted”. It will be passed by without conscious analysis of the symbolism. It is a part of the landscape of government buildings, patches on uniforms, and other unnoticed uses. Though serving as seemingly mindless symbols, flags do perform a function. They provide a daily reminder of nationhood. Other symbols such as money and postage provide a similar function.

Billig also challenges the notion that nationalism is an inherently harmful force, as well as the notion that it must ultimately be associated with violence. He does note, however, that banal nationalism should not be assumed to be harmless, as it provides a way of priming populations for nationalistic clashes.

Billig uses the term “hot nationalism” to distinguish banal nationalism from the form of nationalism that is routinely discussed. Hot nationalism is the “force which creates nation-states or threatens the stability of existing states”. He suggests it is found

21 Ibid.
22 Ibid, 39.
23 Ibid, 40.
25 Ibid.
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27 Billig, Banal Nationalism, 43.
in a time of exception when there is “social disruption” and struggle. Hot nationalism is generally assumed to eventually fade away after the new nation is established. Though many other authors present this fade-away as having nothing replacing it, Billig sees banal nationalism as often the ultimate result.

Although his work is extremely useful, Billig assumes that there is a necessary difference between nationalism in established nations and nationalism in nations fighting for recognition. This assumption seems problematic, as it presupposes that all facets of a nation's struggle will be hot nationalism. Though in young or especially violent struggles this might be the case, many instances reveal banal reproductions of the struggling nation rather than violent expressions of nationalism. Across the world, as many independence movements are now decades old, earlier symbols of hot nationalism have become uncontroversial and unnoticed. In Hawai‘i, the struggle for sovereignty has been going on since shortly after the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i in 1893. Though there have been isolated flare-ups, there does not appear to be a meaningful continuation of hot nationalism in the form that Billig describes. Whilst the notion is not incompatible with his work, he seems to largely ignore the possibility that banal nationalism is a replacement for hot nationalism in long-running sovereignty struggles, not just in cases where the sovereignty struggle has succeeded in producing a new state.

Jones and Merriman argue that Billig's separation of banal and hot nationalism may not adequately describe the way in which nationalism is commonly expressed. They note that banal nationalism can often be examples of hot nationalism expressed through
Hot nationalist movements will often focus their energies around banal topics because engaging in aggressively nationalistic campaigns would likely cause the marginalisation of their movement. Using the example of bilingual road signs in Wales, they show how this banal symbol became a rallying point for Welsh hot nationalism. English-only road signs were described by the movement as “symbols of oppression” and were defaced and destroyed by nationalist activists. Even within the debate over bilingual road signs, though their symbolic value was of great importance to the parties, much of the debate was framed around banal issues such as typefaces, colour and their effects on road safety.

Rhys Jones and Peter Merriman advocate “a focus on the everyday contexts within which nationalism is reproduced” rather than treating banal nationalism as a “categorically different form of nationalism from ‘hotter’ varieties.” Billig does note that banal nationalism can be used to prepare a country for hot nationalism and should not be seen as discrete categories of nationalism. This common oversimplification of Billig’s argument has led, unfortunately, to the majority of work on banal nationalism focusing solely on everyday and mundane expressions. It often ignores the hot
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nationalism underlying the expression.\textsuperscript{34} Though Billig suggests a fluidity to the
everyday, this fluidity seems largely ignored.\textsuperscript{35}

Jones and Merriman advocate the use of the term “everyday” in the place of
“banal”, as everyday “in addition to being a place of banal and mundane processes, may
also incorporate a variety of hotter differences and conflicts that affect people's lives on a
habitual basis”.\textsuperscript{36} This sort of everyday nationalism seems to be common in Hawai‘i.
Given the predictable lack of success hot nationalism has in Hawai‘i, many of the targets
of Hawaiian nationalism have been banal areas of life, particularly in issues relating to
the Hawaiian language. For example, activists were successful in gaining the passage of a
Honolulu City law requiring that many streets be given Hawaiian names.

In a proposal similar to Billig's, Brian McVeigh suggests a dichotomy of “hard”
and “soft” nationalism in looking at Japan.\textsuperscript{37} In this model, strongly nationalist instances
such as “politicians in denial about Japan's wartime atrocities, right-wing organizations,
and official visitors to Yasukuni Shrine” are contrasted with the “taken-for-granted
notions about the national state and its political and economic machinery”.\textsuperscript{38} Soft
nationalism forms the “hegemonic practices embedded in the education system, in state
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ideology, and in culture and social life”. McVeigh rejects the notion that
nationalism is found only in “other” countries as part of violent conflict. McVeigh, however, also shows that hard nationalism can be found in a nonviolent form in a more
developed country. This soft form of nationalism can be argued to be more dangerous and pervasive than hard nationalism.

McVeigh’s case study of Japan describes four general types of soft nationalism: economic, educational, cultural, and peace nationalism. Economic, educational and cultural nationalism seem applicable to most nations. However, his form of peace nationalism is so closely tied to Japan's post-war history that it has almost no generalisability.

Economic nationalism exists where there is a strong preference for domestically produced goods and is generally supported by quotas and tariffs. In Japan, it is manifested as a widespread concern about the safety and suitability of imported foods. “Buy local” campaigns or import substitution industrialisation programmes appear to be the most common way in which this form of economic nationalism is supported. The replacement of foreign imports with domestic products is encouraged. This type of
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nationalism is one of the most significant current focuses of the governments in this paper.

Educational nationalism is displayed in the ways by which their school systems reproduce and support national values.\textsuperscript{45} It provides a way for nationalism to spread beyond state structures and into everyday life with long-lasting effects.\textsuperscript{46} Especially in Hawai‘i and Fiji, educational nationalism is prevalent. The educational system has been a prime battleground in these nations for nationalist and counter-nationalist movements.

Cultural nationalism can be seen in the notion that a nation possesses cultural uniqueness and that this “unique” culture is a defining feature of the nation.\textsuperscript{47} Cultural features, including material culture and vague cultural ideology, are presented as being responsible for establishing the nation in a special cultural space.\textsuperscript{48} In doing so, the boundaries between the nation-state and other nation-states are reinforced.\textsuperscript{49} This form of nationalism can be harmful to the stability of the state because it can “bolster ethnic exclusivism, heightened ethnocultural self-consciousness, [and] racialised notions of identity” through explanations of supposed uniqueness and presentation as a cultural function.\textsuperscript{50} This style of nationalism can be seen frequently in Hawai‘i and Fiji. Each
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nation's uniqueness is useful both for typical nationalist functions and for tourism purposes.

### 1.2.4 Patriotism and Nationalism

It is often argued that patriotism and nationalism should be considered as distinct concepts. Alter suggests that patriotism should be seen as a "love of one's homeland", whereas nationalism is a new, more nefarious, force. Patriotism and nationalism have also been presented as both being along the same continuum with intensity serving as a key distinguishing factor. Patriotism is an affection for one's country, whereas nationalism introduces a xenophobic and aggressive hatred of others. The primordial versus modern debate on nationalism is often indirectly invoked by authors like Peter Alter. They suggest that patriotism is the older concept, representing the attachment to the homeland, whereas nationalism is newer and built around the rise of nation-states.\(^{1}\) Others such as Charles Taylor have argued that the difference between the two is that nationalism focuses upon “ethnic, linguistic, cultural or religious identity”, whereas patriotism is about identification with a territory.\(^{2}\)

Some have cynically decried the difference between the two as patriotism is what we have; nationalism is what they have. Steven Grosby’s work can be seen as an example of this application.\(^{3}\) This form presents a value-laden version of nationalism as violent


and built around difference, whereas patriotism is the positive loyalty to a territorial community. This definition is problematic both in its blatant bias and in its analytical uselessness. Even history's most horrific nationalistic expressions have been exercised by people who claim they are acting out of a love for their country rather than a hatred of others.

Though attempts at defining the difference between nationalism and patriotism are often unsatisfactory, there does appear to be a useful, though perhaps blurry, distinction. Many of the definitions frame patriotism in terms of attitude, whereas nationalism is framed in terms of action and consequences. This distinction may prove useful in exploring the apparently contradictory situation in Hawai‘i, where patriotism (toward the U.S.) and support for Hawaiian nationalism do not appear to be mutually exclusive. A distinction between the two concepts also seems appropriate for explaining the divide between the love for one's country and the minimal representations of nationalism in Niue and, to a lesser extent, in the Cook Islands.

1.3 Methodology

Everyday nationalism produces a number of unique methodological challenges. By its very nature, most of its expressions are relatively unconscious and rarely self-examined. It can be challenging to study because most inhabitants are unaware of how nationalism operates or affects their lives. I have adopted a multimethod approach in order to capture the effects of nationalism from several perspectives.

I spent nine weeks conducting fieldwork over the summer of 2013. My time was split, with approximately two weeks in Niue; two weeks in Suva, Fiji; one week in Coral Coast, Fiji; one week in Aitutaki, Cook Islands; and two weeks in Rarotonga, Cook
Islands. I grew up on the island of Hawai‘i (the Big Island) and have also lived on the islands of Molokai and Oahu for several years. As a young teenager, I lived in Fiji as well. Data for Hawai‘i are built upon both my experiences living in Hawai‘i and more systematic study across the past few years.

For this dissertation, I interviewed a number of government officials in each nation. Their official roles involve them in developing areas of everyday nationalism, including health/nutrition, cultural promotion, tourism marketing, and foreign trade. These semi-structured interviews provide insight into how everyday nationalism can develop within official contexts, even when the official may not be fully aware of this effect. These interviews were supplemented by mostly unstructured interviews with chefs, hotel owners and others working in hospitality, as well as those working in education, to see how they saw national identity presented in practice.

Interviews were primarily exploratory. As nationalism can be a fairly sensitive topic for many, questions were relatively broad and focused primarily on expressions of everyday nationalism. Given that sampling for this project was not representative, the interviews were mainly used to identify areas on which I should focus, to find general trends, and for information about specific topics, rather than to measure levels or types of nationalism. The interviews were conducted at the place of the interviewee’s choosing. Most were done at their place of work or a nearby café. Approximately 50 people were interviewed.

I also observed shoppers in grocery stores and markets, as well as attendees at sporting events and festivals across the research sites, to see how items of interest (signage, product marketing, etc.) were presented and how they were received. Though
opportunities were limited, I sought out and observed displays of hot nationalism in Fiji and Hawai’i, including protests and presentations by sovereignty activists in Hawai’i.

I observed how local culture and history were presented to tourists (and, secondarily, to locals) at museums, visitor centres, and exhibits at historical or culturally significant sites. When possible, I also interviewed those responsible for creating these presentations to learn more about their motivations in each particular presentation.

This dissertation is also built upon research conducted for my MA thesis. I spent seven weeks in Fiji over the summer of 2009 at three sites split between the cities of Lautoka and Suva and villages on Koro Island. I observed customers in grocery stores, eateries and hotel restaurants. I also conducted semi-structured and unstructured interviews with approximately thirty people. These interviews focused on a range of topics relating to nationalism and national identity. Because of the political situation at the time (the constitution had recently been dissolved, and several academics had been recently deported), questions that were directly nationalistic were avoided to focus primarily upon everyday nationalism.

Primary sources were used heavily to inform this dissertation. I collected a significant number of publications by government agencies (particularly by the Ministry of Health/Health Department in each nation); tourist promotional materials; cookbooks; and general audience publications that expressed everyday nationalism, both during my fieldwork and archivally at libraries in Rarotonga, Suva, Honolulu and Auckland. These sources were supplemented by an analysis of approximately twenty issues of each nation’s newspapers for references to both hot and everyday nationalism.
In selecting nations for this project, I sought places that had unusual legal statuses or other aspects that were atypical within nationalism studies. Niue and the Cook Islands were selected because of their small size and highly unusual legal statuses. As two of only five states in the World with a free association agreement, they provide a previously unexplored position within nationalism research. The Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia and Palau (associated with the United States under a Compact of Free Association) were also considered. However, these states, whilst undoubtedly likely to produce valuable data, have concerns so profoundly interwoven with climate change, the fulfilment of the Compact, and broader American nationalism that executing this project would be challenging and would reduce generalisability. Tokelau (a dependent territory of New Zealand), Rapa Nui (a special territory of Chile) and New Caledonia (a special collectivity of France) were also considered, but were eliminated for logistical reasons. Fiji was selected as it has had very active ethnonationalist and civic-nationalist movements in recent years, resulting in four coups. The low level of violence within the coups and the ways in which the nationalist message is accepted is unusual. Despite relatively fiery nationalist messaging (now mostly historical), popular support for nationalist movements have been muted. I choose to look at Hawai‘i, as it provides one of the few examples in the region of nations that have sought sovereignty but have been unable to achieve it. Across nations with contested sovereignty, it is also interesting to study because widespread support for independence and a lack of counter-sovereignty activism exist without a viable path to sovereignty. Like Fiji, Hawai‘i has also seen a reasonable amount written about nationalism in the islands, but virtually nothing looking at the role of everyday nationalism.
1.4 Significance of the Study

This dissertation is one of the only works on everyday nationalism in these nations. It provides a look at a previously unstudied area, testing several assumptions of nationalism research. It also aims to expand our understanding of the various ways in which nationalism can function in small nations in general. This dissertation pushes the limits of where nationalism has been previously thought to function by looking at extremely small nations.

1.5 Limitations of the Study

The most significant limitation is the result of it being a comparative overview of nationalism in these nations. Time and space limitations necessitated only relatively brief coverage of many topics. Unfortunately, many of these have not been meaningfully studied previously. Consequently, there is a multitude of further research that could and should be conducted to explore these topics in further detail.

It also becomes apparent in several sections of this dissertation that there is an imbalance in nationalistic activity amongst the nations. Whilst in some cases this could be interpreted as a lack of nationalistic feeling, it remains impossible to separate from functional resources limitation issues relating to their small sizes. In a small nation, there are very real practical limitations to any person’s ability to implement nationalistic agendas; lower priority causes will lack the dedicated supporters required to make them happen. In a larger nation, any idea is bound to have at least a few supporters who can to raise some resources to support it, by merely having a large enough population.

At the government level, a nationalistic agenda can be challenging to implement in small nations, again not necessarily because of lack of desire, but rather owing to a
lack of people to carry it out. Many government ministries in Niue and the Cook Islands are so small that they consist of only a handful of people. Even in Fiji and Hawai‘i, although much larger, they will still often be short in specialised resources. Though they may wish to implement particular policies or practices, they often do not actually have the personnel to do so. In a larger nation, it might not be a problem to allocate resources to lower priority goals, but for a small nation, few have the personnel to spare for anything other than top priority items.

Conversely, with small populations, it does not take many people to skew data radically. For example, Niue alternates between having the world's highest and lowest traffic fatality rates: a single fatality is measured as equivalent to the death of a tenth of a per cent of the nation. Similarly, the difference between the nation having an initiative or policy can often be a matter of only one person working it. The level of direct influence any member can have on his or her nation is radically magnified in these low-population nations.

### 1.6 Organization of the Study

Chapter 2 provides an overview of the literature on Oceania and nationalism in small states. Oceania remains an exceptionally poorly studied region with several of the countries highlighted in this dissertation being amongst the least studied. Whilst banal nationalism, in general, has been reasonably well explored, there remains a significant lack of studies in small nations.

The history of the four nations is explored in Chapter 3. Each of them has had a unique colonial and postcolonial experience that has meaningfully shaped the nations of
today. Information about key areas such as demographics, geography, race and land laws are also provided.

The question of sovereignty and independence is presented in the fourth chapter. As a concept closely related to nationalism, sovereignty has been the focus for activists across many modern movements. Whilst historically, folk definitions of sovereignty or conceptions primarily defined by de facto status were typical, increasingly however many modern nationalist movements are extremely focused on international law and the legal definitions of sovereignty.

Chapter 5 looks at hot nationalism. Hot nationalism is the form of nationalism that provides the most iconic representation for the public imagination. It is the fiery and intense struggle. This chapter looks at the organised and semi-organised nationalist movements occurring within the four nations. Though none of the nations has meaningful traditional style hot nationalism today, each still has a noticeable version of hot nationalism.

Banal or everyday nationalism is overwhelmingly the form of nationalism that we see today in most nations and is explored in Chapter 6. It represents the ways in which the nation is presented and reproduced through everyday life. It is present in each of the four nations, but is relatively different across, representing the unique character of each nation.

Across these chapters, it becomes clear that the four nations represent an expression of the nation and nationalism that differs considerably from what is often seen as the typical post-colonial nationalistic experience. The transition into colonialism was relatively smooth for each and with the exception of Hawai‘i, they all shifted into
independent nations without struggle. For the three currently independent states, they
gained their autonomy through reasoned negotiation, rather than a protracted
independence struggle. Even for Hawaiʻi, its post-colonial experience is unusual in its
absorption into the larger state, rather than maintaining a separate status. The four nations
are also much smaller than typically studied, as well as being a part of a region that has
received little scholarly attention. As such, they present an ideal set through which to
explore nationalism in a new way.
Chapter 2

2 Literature Review

Oceania has often been called one of the least studied regions of the world. Topics that are fairly common starting points for the social sciences, such as race\textsuperscript{54}, language\textsuperscript{55}, and even the basic physical environment remain vastly understudied. The smaller nations in the region receive virtually no academic attention, and thus, many topics in these nations remain completely undocumented. As such, literature is extremely scarce on most topics in Niue and the Cook Islands, and rather limited for Hawai‘i and Fiji.

In the last ten years, there have been three books (academic or popular) published about Niue; two histories, and a children's book.\textsuperscript{56} Over the same time period, nine books were published about the Cook Islands.\textsuperscript{57} These included two travel guides, a children's book, a history, and five special subject non-fiction works. In contrast, Fiji had over a hundred books published about it in 2016 across several genres; and Hawai‘i often can have more than 50 books published regarding it within a month.

Publications in academic journals have also been scarce for Niue and the Cook Islands. There were under a hundred journal articles published about Niue in the last ten
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The majority of these are looking at public health, economic development, natural sciences and migration patterns. The Cook Islands sees slightly more results, but still less than 250 articles published in the last ten years. Again, public health and the natural sciences dominate the topics of research. Fiji had about ten times as many articles published in the same period, and Hawai‘i had over five thousand across the last ten years.

2.1 Banal Nationalism

Though banal nationalism is a relatively young approach, it has been well embraced. Its flexibility allows, with minor adjustments, for it to be used to explain a wide range of nationalistic behaviours, including many that are subconscious. This work has included a variety of subjects, such as print media, sport, music, food, and several other less commonly explored topics of nationalist interest.

Often building upon Anderson’s work on print capitalism, as well as Billig’s examples, many writers have applied the concept of banal nationalism to the press. For example, Arus Yumul and Umut Özkirimli mirrored Billig in finding a number of nationalist positions that the Turkish media (and the consumers of these media) accept as natural. Similarly, Alex Law adapted Billig’s version of banal nationalism to look at the

58 Based on a search of Google Scholar, Proquest, JSTOR and MUSE for articles with Niue or Niuan in the title.
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media in the context of Scottish nationhood.\textsuperscript{61} Sport has also been common areas for the application of banal nationalism. In this context, research has been done on many nations, including articles looking at soccer in Cameroon\textsuperscript{62}, soccer and skiing in Austria\textsuperscript{63}, the Olympics in South Korea\textsuperscript{64} and the popular approach to sport in Nordic countries\textsuperscript{65}. Food has likewise been increasingly gaining attention in the banal nationalism literature. As one of the most relatable and approachable topics, it has provided a rich area of study

\begin{itemize}
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across Japan, Australia, Equatorial Guinea, the United States, as well as several other large nations.

Banal nationalism has provided a framework for many topics that would otherwise be disregarded despite having significant effects on nationalism. Scholars have looked at commonly encountered symbols of the nation in architecture, banknotes, licence plates, and road signs. Though there are still many areas in which the effect of


banal nationalism is underexplored, which invites future research, the largest gap in the literature, seems to be in applying banal nationalism to small nations.

2.2 Nationalism in Small Nations

There has been extremely little published about banal or everyday nationalism in small nations. Though the limited studies available do suggest that everyday nationalism is fully possible within small nations, there is little information available about the ways in which it differs from larger nations. Across the 83 nations that have populations of less than a million, there have only been a few dozen publications on how everyday nationalism operates there. Considering the wide variety of small nations, this represents a fairly significant and concerning gap in the literature. Furthermore, in many small nations, banal nationalism actually more accurately represents the displays of nationalism that are seen. Exhibitions of hot nationalism are much rarer yet have long been the focus of nationalism studies.

2.2.1 Theories of the Nation

Hot nationalism, for a variety of reasons, does not seem to gain much of lasting foothold in small nations. Nevertheless, there is clearly the sense of nation and national identity in these nations which mirrors what scholars have written extensively about in larger nations. Everyday nationalism is often useful to explain the nationalistic situation in small nations where traditional approaches to nationalism are inapplicable.

Malta represents one of the small nations where theories of hot nationalism seem largely inapplicable. Godfrey Baldacchino argues that, though having a common
language and lacking significant division, it is without a unified national identity.\textsuperscript{74} Malta had a long colonial period, but there was minimal desire for independence, particularly in light of the financial benefits of remaining a colony.\textsuperscript{75} In contrast to the typically expected decolonisation model, Malta strongly fought the end of British colonial presence. The island saw pro-colonial riots and political turmoil during the time when the British were intending to pull out.\textsuperscript{76} Baldacchino describes this as “upside-down decolonisation” in which the colonial power wishes to remove themselves, contrary to the desire of the colonised people.\textsuperscript{77} It appears, however, that, despite a long period of minimal public nationalism, the increasing number of undocumented migrants to Malta has caused great concern. Baldacchino argues that this has been responded to through a rise in symbols of national identity as expressed in banal methods such as currency.\textsuperscript{78} The Baldacchino model of banal nationalism representations emerging when the national identity is challenged in otherwise minimally nationalistic nations seems reasonable. It fails, however, to explain the situation in the Cook Islands or Puerto Rico where, like Malta, there was a strong financial benefit to continuing colonialism and an “upside-down decolonisation” model. They also in many ways have fewer negatives to colonisation than for Malta. Nevertheless, they have developed very visible examples not
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only of banal nationalism but also of hot nationalism (particularly for Puerto Rico) without significant external threat.

Denmark is often ignored as a colonial power, but it did once have numerous colonies scattered across the world. Of these, Greenland and the Faroe Islands are the only remaining. Both have had home-rule for several decades and, as of 2009, Greenland has had self-rule. In looking at this transition, Naja Graugaard provides a detailed depiction of Greenlandic identity in the context of colonialism and modernity, particularly the dichotomies between Greenlandic and Danish identities. 79 She argues that that Greenlandic identity has become synonymous with indigenousness and the “old” traditions. 80 As such she suggests that it seems difficult to be both Greenlandic and modern, as well as it being seen as impossible for newcomers to become a Greenlander. 81 These dichotomies and conflicts of identity seem extremely common across small post-colonial nations, particularly ones that did not have an especially contentious independence process. Niue and to a lesser extent the Cook Islands face these challenges. Many feel considerable pressure to embrace the New Zealand identity and the benefits that go with it, but they still wish to maintain their island culture.

Among the nations outside of Oceania, the Isle of Man provides one of the most analogous nations to those of this dissertation. Though a crown dependency, it is self-governing. Whilst Niue and the Cook Islands are independent in free association, rather
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than being dependencies, many of the challenges of defining the nation are shared, as are their unusually close ties to another nation. Paul Cottier takes a social psychological approach to the question of national identity.\(^{82}\) He elects to look at what people mean by the concept of the “nation” and the consequences of such meaning within the Isle of Man.\(^{83}\) It provides an interesting secondary approach to the study of nationalism, though given the dearth of research on banal nationalism in small states, a more traditional approach seems justified to build a framework first.

### 2.2.2 Newspapers

Researching newspapers has been one of the classic ways in which to study banal nationalism, as it provides writers with a highly influential but often little-noticed method to shape the feelings of the nation. In this vein, Linda Kenix looked at the way in which national identity was constructed within Samoa’s main newspaper the *Samoa Observer* and in New Zealand and Australian papers where they wrote about Samoa and Samoans.\(^{84}\) In using a quantitative approach (which is uncommon for studying banal nationalism in newspapers), he looked at the frequency of personal pronouns and symbols that evoke an emotive response.\(^{85}\) Contrary to many media studies in other nations, Kenix concludes that the creation of national identity does not require the
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exclusion of others within a nation’s news media.\textsuperscript{86} What remains untested is whether these results are a function of Samoan uniqueness in how they express everyday nationalism or the result of the application of a quantitative model to a subject that has largely been only explored qualitatively. Future studies are needed, as it seems very possible that other nations of Oceania could provide similar results.

In one of the only other studies looking at newspapers in small nations, John Richardson, Stephen Huckerby and Mike Williams explored the conflict between Corsican identity and French identity in Corsica (a Mediterranean territorial collectivity of France).\textsuperscript{87} In an environment of hot nationalism, they argue that the main newspaper of Corsica has adopted a form of Corsican identity that is depoliticised, regional, and folkloric.\textsuperscript{88} This style apparently fits well within the popular notions of Corsican identity, allowing it to be enforced in a way like that which Billig describes.

2.2.3 Food

Though several large nations have seen theories of everyday nationalism expanded to include food, notably Japan and France, it remains poorly studied in smaller nations. An MA thesis by Gina Butrico provides one of a small number of cases in which
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banal nationalism has been applied to food in small nations. In looking at Iceland, she notes an active effort to support Icelandic nationalism through the purchase and consumption of emblematic foods. Products visibly and proudly bear Icelandic branding, and their consumption provides a sense of camaraderie and shared national pride. This model seems to differ considerably from that which is seen in my four nations, where imported foods are preferred. Many nations have ongoing efforts to promote locally produced foods. As such, it is likely that in the future more nations will mirror what Gina Butrico saw in Iceland. A similar study focusing on Gibraltar was done as an MSc dissertation by Amy Nuñez. She finds that food acts as a national repository showing the ways in which a number of cultures have influenced nationhood with food as the medium. In contrast to the incorporation seen within Gibraltar (and the nations of my dissertation), Igor Cusack’s work in Equatorial Guinea found little blending of cuisines. Further, he suggests that national cuisine there
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has existed as part of the colonisers’ attempts to assimilate the population with other locally driven initiatives only just starting to emerge.95

2.2.3 Sports

Sport has often been a popular area for studies of banal nationalism. It is a unique area in which the energies of classic hot nationalism can be seen, but without the political significance we associate with this type of nationalism.96 Like other areas of banal nationalism, sport remains poorly studied in the small nation context. Simon Vaukins’ work on the Isle of Man and Clément’s look at Samoan rugby are the most significant.

The Isle of Man Tourist Trophy motorcycle races have been suggested by Vaukins to be a significant identity marker to the people of the Isle of Man (the Manx).97 As one of the best known Manx features, he suggests that they are highly significant to the Manx identity.98 The prominence of daily reminders of the race allows it to be embedded within the Manx sense of self.99 Unfortunately, the mechanism by which these reminders are to become part of the identity is to occur is absent from his article, limiting its utility.

95 Ibid.
96 Sport generally is described as a display of banal nationalism rather than hot nationalism, because despite fan rhetoric, the game is both a part of the everyday routine set of activities and is not of the seriousness displays of hot nationalism typically represent.
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Julien Clément, in his article on rugby in Samoa, presents three ways in which rugby is a part of the Samoan national identity.\footnote{Julien Clément, “Les Manu Samoa,” *L’Homme. Revue française d’anthropologie*, no. 205 (March 11, 2013): 79–97, https://doi.org/10.4000/lhomme.24422.} In looking at the Samoan national team, he emphasises the three parties that support the formation of their national identity through rugby. The first party is the Samoan community (both in Samoa and overseas); the second is the Samoan Government; the third is the International Rugby Board (known as World Rugby). Clément, unlike many others writing on nationalism (and particularly banal nationalism), explores the role groups outside of the nation can play in shaping national identity and nationalism. This is an extremely useful extra dimension that has not previously received significant attention. We shall see that each of the nations in this dissertation has clearly had its national identities influenced by outside actors.

### 2.3 Nationalism and Sovereignty in Fiji

The literature on nationalism in Fiji has largely been centred around the coups. As one of the most visible depictions of hot nationalism in Fiji, the four coups provide numerous examples of Fijian ethnonationalism. Stephanie Lawson has written extensively on what she describes as “indigenous nationalism”.\footnote{Stephanie Lawson, “Nationalism versus Constitutionalism in Fiji,” *Nations & Nationalism* 10, no. 4 (October 2004): 519–38.} This form of nationalism emerges from the ethnonationalist notion that a nation is built upon the common descent of peoples in a homeland, with a natural right to control this
homeland. Key to this narrative is a foundational myth that their people have been in that place since “time immemorial.” Building from colonial-era policy, which paternalistically protected iTaukei land rights and allowed the continuance of many traditional power structures, this narrative of indigenous nationalism has been pervasive in Fijian politics. Three of the four coups since independence have been orchestrated with a stated purpose of protecting indigenous rights and an apparent goal of establishing an “ethnic democracy” to protect the “paramountcy” iTaukei established in the colonial system. The post-2006 coup reforms saw much of the expressions of hot nationalism, including indigenous nationalism, fade. The government actively discouraged (both through policy reforms and oppressive restrictions on free speech and assembly) any form of nationalism that harmed the message of a unified nation. Indigenous nationalism, however, can still be seen in much subtler ways. Within the wider global conversation about Native rights, many iTaukei nationalists have found a framework that allows their message to be presented within a context of cultural protection and promotion.

John Kelly and Martha Kaplan provide one of the more comprehensive looks at the formation of the Fijian nation. During the colonial period, British authorities
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established a system in which the racial groups were kept separate, and iTaukei were favoured. It also redefined all Indo-Fijians under a single label, where previously they had defined themselves by region of origin, religion, caste and other group identifiers. Along with several other arguments on the ways in which feelings of rivalry were established (most of which seem to have faded from popular discourse and are no longer relevant to nationalism in Fiji today), they argue that Indo-Fijians historic decision not to join the armed forces during World War II (largely due to their insistence upon equal treatment) resulted in a long-lasting feeling that Indo-Fijians were not a part of the Fijian nation. They did not “shed blood” for their nation. Though the actual decision not to participate seems to now be accepted, effects of it remain. Indo-Fijian politicians are often stereotyped by nationalists as cowards who are not willing to sacrifice for Fiji.

Though I argue that banal nationalism is actually more present in and significant for Fiji, hot nationalism (particularly surrounding the coups) has received most of the attention, leaving only a few works looking at banal nationalism. Daniel Guinness and Niko Besnier, look at the contradiction created by the fact that the best Fijian rugby players play for and thus represent other nations, but are nevertheless heroes in Fiji.
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Fijian nationalism remains produced and reproduced through rugby, despite the players officially representing another nation.\textsuperscript{112} They suggest that this duality challenges Anderson’s conception of territorial boundedness.\textsuperscript{113} Rather than being bounded by the nation, the sense of connection shifts to being linked through identity politics.\textsuperscript{114} Though problematic for a strict reading of Anderson, it could be argued that this phenomenon actually reinforces his core message. The imagined component of the nation here seemingly survives a difference in physical territory.

In a rather unusual application of banal nationalism, John Connell looks at the ways in which the “good citizen” is constructed within the *Fiji Times*.\textsuperscript{115} He focuses upon a feature in the paper called “People” wherein the paper highlights everyday Fijians who have “made it”.\textsuperscript{116} It provides for the continual reproduction of ideas of the nation and modernity by focusing on values that are consistent with their ideology.\textsuperscript{117}

As a more general application of banal nationalism, my MA thesis applied Billig’s notion of banal nationalism to Fiji’s national cuisine.\textsuperscript{118} I argued that food
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provided a point of similarity within a national narrative full of differences. Rather than simply serving as a banal daily part of life, food allowed for the development of a unified national identity in a way that was unexpected. This provides a focused piece of a larger question of nationalism in small nations that this dissertation aims to explore further.

Given that Fiji is generally recognised as a sovereign nation, unsurprisingly, little has been written about sovereignty there. The threat of external forces (namely Australia) to Fijian sovereignty received considerable attention in the news media but largely failed to make the jump to academic literature. Vijay Naidu provides an extremely brief regional analysis of external threats to sovereignty (colonialism, nuclear weapons testing, “adventurers”, calls for democracy). Most of these threats, though still a serious concern for the region, are largely historic for the well-established Fiji. Donald Horowitz similarly in his comparison of the constitutional change process in Fiji and Indonesia makes a compelling argument for a loss of sovereignty caused by external pressures in the process. These threats, however, represent relatively minimal impact upon Fijian sovereignty. Other threats, such as that to economic sovereignty caused by economic

---
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dependence, though slowly starting to gain regional attention, remain understudied in Fiji.

### 2.4 Nationalism and Sovereignty in Niue

There has been virtually no work on nationalism of any variety in Niue. The only significant academic reference to nationalism in Niue is a single paragraph by Jon Barnett in a larger work on the effects of climate change. In his chapter on the effects of depopulation on Niue, he argues that national pride is rare in Niue, and Niue lacks any of the “powerful icons of nationalism associated with most modern nation-states”. He then briefly describes the challenges of identity within the context of New Zealand citizenship. This provides a very basic starting point for exploring nationalism in Niue. Though Niuean nationalism does not have the intensity of many other nations, to describe it as lacking the icons of nationalism seems to be inaccurate. As he notes, New Zealand citizenship and the relationship with New Zealand, in general, do represent one of the biggest challenges for conceptualising Niuean nationalism.

Sovereignty has been only marginally better covered. There are a handful of articles that briefly mention Niue’s special status in regard to sovereignty, such as Firth’s work on independence in the Pacific, but these largely fail to go beyond a basic legal
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analysis. Barry Bartmann in exploring para-diplomacy in sub-national island jurisdictions briefly discuss Niue and the Cook Islands concluding that they are “far beyond what is understood to be the various practices of para-diplomacy”. However, given his broad focus, he elects to not devote much discussion to it, asking that within the scope of these arrangements, “what is possibly left to meet the full international legal personality of sovereignty?”. There has also been some limited work on the commercialisation of sovereignty in Niue as it relates to the Niue domain extension (.nu), postage stamps, and tax haven status. These, however, are of limited usefulness as they completely ignore the socio-cultural effects of this commercialisation of sovereignty.

2.5 Nationalism and Sovereignty in the Cook Islands

The literature on nationalism in the Cook Islands has been very limited. The most substantial of this work is Jeffery Sissons book on national identity. It provides a detailed look at the ways in which the Cook Islands’ national identity was shaped in support of the
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128 Niue has marketed its country code top-level domain as an alternative to using .com domain, primarily in Swedish, Danish and Dutch speaking nations since "nu" means "now" in those languages.

tourist industry. Unfortunately, it has been almost two decades since the book’s publication. Beyond some passing mentions in larger works, modern nationalism there remains largely unstudied. Through this dissertation, I aim to expand the scholarly knowledge of modern nationalism in the Cook Islands and particularly how everyday nationalism can function within a small island nation.

Many of the general articles on sovereignty cover both the Cook Islands and Niue, such as Stewart Firth’s independence in the Pacific or Stephen Levine’s brief coverage of the two nations in his work on sovereignty in the Pacific. As a relatively unique example of a type of sovereignty (free association), the Cook Islands receives a cursory mention in dozens of larger works on sovereignty. These, however, typically fail to go beyond more than a few sentences on the Cook Islands’ or Niue’s status. There are also some purely legal analyses of issues related to Cook Islands sovereignty, such as Alex Frame’s look at defence obligations or Stephen Smith’s analysis of the possibility of UN Membership. Like with Niue, there remains a significant gap in the literature.

130 Jeffrey Sissons, *Nation and Destination Creating Cook Islands Identity* (Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies and the University of the South Pacific Centre in the Cook Islands, 1999).
131 Firth, “Sovereignty and Independence in the Contemporary Pacific.”
132 Levine, “The Experience of Sovereignty in the Pacific.”
Kevin Sobel-Read’s dissertation explored sovereignty and globalisation in the Cook Islands and its diasporic communities.\(^{135}\) He provides a detailed ethnography that does an excellent job of describing the lived reality of life in the Cook Islands. He rejects the notion that sovereignty is the same as nationalism (or sub-component of it) and proposes a new framework of emotional sovereignty to cover the portions that he feels are not well captured by existing theories.\(^{136}\) Many of the concerns he has with existing theories of nationalism are addressed at least in part by the work on everyday nationalism or the common expansion of Anderson’s work on imagined community. His definition of sovereignty is greatly expanded beyond that which academia and the legal community have generally considered being within its scope. This expansion whilst intentionally aiming to broaden the utility of the concept is of limited analytical use for us given a lack of scholarly consensus on the topic. It proposes a mechanism by which the vagueness of other models can be overcome but remains far from a proven model. It is also highly problematic to use the unusual case of the Cook Islands to try and build a new comprehensive theory of sovereignty. The Cook Islands is undeniably in a unique sovereignty space, however, existing theories do largely apply to it. Nations with similar diasporic communities such as Fiji would have provided a much better test case, in that it
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would allow a separation of the expanded sovereignty phenomenon that he describes from the unique legal position the Cook Islands holds.

2.6 Nationalism and Sovereignty in Hawai‘i

Whilst nationalism in Hawai‘i has been written about fairly extensively, banal nationalism has not been meaningfully explored. Even when framed within the context of hot nationalism, the classic areas of banal nationalism (music, sport, media, etc.) have largely been ignored. As the site of an active sovereignty movement, efforts towards sovereignty have attracted reasonable scholarly attention. This focus has largely centred on specific historical, legal or political questions, such as those taken up by Norman Meller and Anne Lee, who looks to trace the history of the movement and its desired outcomes, or by Noelle Kahanu and Jon Van Dyke, who explore the legal foundations for various nation-within-a-nation models. Unfortunately, there has been only limited attention to the social effects of nationalism and sovereignty.

Music is one of the classic areas for research into banal nationalism. It has long played an important role in the formation of protest and resistance movements. George Lewis explores this use of music in the Hawaiian sovereignty movement. He elects to focus upon the context of the songs rather than the lyrics, for a genre he labels “Da Kine”


music.\footnote{Ibid.} Since many of the most influential songs have been in Hawaiian, much of the audience will typically lack an ability to understand the lyrics.\footnote{Ibid.} As such, the way in which the song is used becomes more important for analysis.\footnote{Ibid.} The first way he sees the music as functioning is in serving to connect people to their roots in response to a trend of bastardising and co-opting versions of Hawaiian music and dance to serve tourist desires.\footnote{Ibid.} He notes a second theme of protest and opposition to the misuse of Hawaiian land.\footnote{Ibid.} In a style that reflects protests elsewhere, several songs have been written as part of larger social movements in response to incidents such as the US Navy's use of one of the islands as a bombing range and evictions due to development needs.\footnote{Ibid.} Music is used in this way to attempt to build a social consciousness of resistance.\footnote{Ibid.} The third theme is one of preservation of the Hawaiian culture and people.\footnote{Ibid.} Lewis identifies many trends that had not been previously studied. However, in the decades since his 1984 article, it appears that the areas covered by his first and third themes have changed significantly. Both seem to have faded as distinct styles. The touristy pseudo-Hawaiian style that had previously dominated has declined as more traditional music and dance styles regain
favour. The theme of resistance has since grown much stronger with expansions in popularity and genre. It can also be seen as increasingly expanded in scope to respond to more general wrongs, as well as nation-building. Beyond music, areas of banal nationalism have received little attention.

Questions of identity in relationship to the sovereignty movement have been explored across a handful of articles. The US Supreme Court case Rice v. Cayetano brought considerable attention, both socially and legally, to the question of who is actually Hawaiian and consequently, who can “legitimately” participate in the Hawaiian nation.\footnote{148} The case challenged the policy of allowing only Native Hawaiians (using a blood quantum criteria) to vote for Office of Hawaiian Affairs trustees.\footnote{149} The court found this policy to be in violation of the Fifteenth Amendment to the US Constitution, which forbids race-based voting limitations.\footnote{150} As Kehaulani Kauanui notes, US policy has both encouraged and created the blood quantum criterion, as well as imposed patterns of assimilation. As a result, it works to reduce access to entitlements and recognition of Hawaiian sovereignty.\footnote{151} Robert Statham suggests that this ruling could have significant effects for ethnic national self-determination.\footnote{152} Given that Hawaiians are not recognised
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as a tribe and that the US Supreme Court rejected the argument that ancestry was not a proxy for race, it is unlikely that the US will accept any policy that treats Hawaiians as separate from others in affording them any meaningful special rights or privileges. As such, he rejects any possibility for self-determination within the US other than through a universal appeal or an establishment of tribal status.

Hawaiian sovereignty is often connected to the colonial experience that faced many other native groups. Haunani-Kay Trask’s essay collection *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai‘i* remains one of the most influential and controversial works on Hawaiian sovereignty in this space. Written from a highly radical Native rights perspective, it details the oppression and mistreatment Hawaiians have suffered since Cook’s first visit to Hawai‘i. It captures the anger and frustration that had largely been ignored within work on the sovereignty movement and still remains neglected. She does not shy away from making her feelings known in critiquing popular thought on Hawaiian sovereignty. In doing so, she provided a centring point for a part of the movement that had not been well heard and reminded people that the injustice of the overthrow is not over. The book (and her other work) has also been extremely controversial. It has been critiqued as hate-mongering, racist and advocating violence.
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153 Tribal status, though likely obtainable, is highly problematic for many sovereignty activists. While it could address some of the issues of self-governance and provide entitlements, it would require an abandonment of the ideal of restoration of the Kingdom and the struggle for actual sovereignty.
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The book is highly problematic from a scholarly perspective as well. It largely ignores the work of other sovereignty activists and non-supporting research. Though presented as an academic work, it fails to meet many of the standards for such work.

There have been a number of master’s theses and doctoral dissertations that have attempted to analyse the sovereignty movement in Hawai‘i and address the validity of its claims. This seems to represent the bulk of modern scholarship on Hawaiian sovereignty. Unfortunately, many of these are almost entirely focused on historical or legal analysis with the ways in which the sovereignty movement has affected social life in Hawai‘i largely ignored. There is also a noticeable lack of critical analysis or objectivity in many of these works. Whilst the core fact that the Kingdom was unjustly and illegally overthrown is typically acknowledged (even amongst those opposed to modern sovereignty), little since can really be said to have universal acceptance. Many of the arguments in these dissertations are spurious or logically contradictory, adopting poorly supported minority views of legal or political theory. Furthermore, many of the dissertations are written by people who are otherwise active in the sovereignty movement with clear biases despite claiming to present objective facts. Many directly reject any nuance in the arguments on sovereignty, preferring to claim that what they present on issues of history and law are clear and unambiguous.

One of the clearest examples of this is David Keanu Sai’s doctoral dissertation in which he presents his argument for why Hawai‘i should be considered “an internationally
recognised sovereign, but occupied State”. Sai has been one of the most politically and legally active sovereignty activists in Hawai‘i. His arguments have gained a reasonable following, but no legal success and one of his approaches earning him a Class B felony. Though extremely fascinating, his dissertation obfuscates his arguments and presents an analysis of international law that lacks any wider consensus.

Willy Daniel Kaipo Kauai provides a clearer and more reasoned version of the illegal occupation narrative and explores its theoretical effects on citizenship. Though mostly well-reasoned and thorough, much of its analysis of international law is poorly grounded, relying upon fringe interpretations.


158 Sai created a novel scheme in which after declaring himself Regent Pro-Tem of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i, he argued that all transfers of property titles following the illegal overthrow of the Kingdom were invalid. He offered, in his self-declared role of Regent Pro-Tem, to research and certify new land titles for a fee. Under this arrangement, he established titles for Hawaiians to several properties which had titles held by other owners who had purchased the property in the time after the overthrow of the Kingdom. This was used to create chaos for realtors, title insurance companies, and mortgage companies. In one case, a client of Sai used the property title Sai created to claim to be the rightful owners of a home that they had lost to foreclosure. The clients subsequently broke into the home and attempted to reoccupy it. They were charged criminally for the break-in, and Sai was charged with attempted grand theft (a Class B felony) for his role in the scheme. He was convicted and sentenced to 5 years probation and a $200 fine.

Another well-known sovereignty activist, Lynette Hiʻilani Cruz, in her dissertation, shares a narrative that has become quite common within the movement.\textsuperscript{160} It tells of sovereignty activists leading normal lives until for whatever reason they became interested in history and started researching the topic, leading them to conclude that Hawaiʻi is illegally occupied and having learned the truth, they started to take action.\textsuperscript{161}

In one of the more objective, though still supportive, analysis of the movement, Anthony Castanha attempted to catalogue the players and models within the sovereignty movement.\textsuperscript{162} As a result of this effort, it becomes evident that whilst there are a number of areas of agreement among activists, there are also widely varying views on what is the desired outcome for the movement.\textsuperscript{163} Unfortunately, this thesis was written almost 20 years ago. The players and the tactics have changed significantly since then, though the desired outcomes and the lack of agreement remain consistent. Similarly, Norman Meller and Anne Feder Lee article attempted to divide the movement into “Hawaiian Nation Separatists”, “Nation-within-a-Nation supporters” and those seeking status-quo with redress. Published around the same time as Castanha work, the article, though well done, is very dated. The players and tactics of the movement have changed considerably over time limiting the utility of the article.

\textsuperscript{160} Lynette Hiʻilani Cruz, “From Resistance to Affirmation, We Are Who We Were: Reclaiming National Identity in the Hawaiian Sovereignty Movement 1990-2003” (University of Hawaiʻi, 2003).
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In contrast to the legal/historic focuses of much of the other work on Hawaiian sovereignty and identity, an article by David Baker does explore the ways in which Hawaiian culture and national identity are constructed. He is highly critical of the version of Hawai‘i presented to tourists. He suggests that “the knowledge of Hawai‘i circulating off-islands is mass produced by a coalition of information organizations” where “profitable images are promoted, others obscured”, constructing “a virtual Hawai‘i”. His article however largely ignores the ways in which the sovereignty movement itself constructs images of Hawai‘i, Hawaiian history and the sovereignty movement. Using near straw man examples, it argues that any positions contrary to his are examples of ignorance. The article also shares a fixation upon blood-based definitions of Hawaiian status that remains problematic amongst a segment of activists (discussed in chapter 5).

Judith Schachter and Albrecht Funk look at how “Hawaiians identify themselves and understand themselves as being Hawaiian”.164 Rather than focus on the political activists, they spoke with “ordinary people” to capture the lived experiences of Native Hawaiians.165 They found Native Hawaiians to have distinct experience than Native American, and they recognised themselves as such.166 They also saw a rejection of a blood quantum for Native Hawaiian identity and a separation of ideas of sovereignty from ethnic identity.167 Their work provides a much needed ethnographic look at
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everyday conceptions of sovereignty and identity in Hawai‘i. Though brief, it reflects the ways in which most people outside of sovereignty activists seem actually to feel.

While there has been a reasonable amount written on nationalism and sovereignty in Hawai‘i, little work has been beyond the legal or historical spheres. Furthermore, much of the work that does look beyond these spaces are written by people so immersed in the movement that their objectivism is often compromised by their frustration at the injustice of the overthrow. There has been little work looking at the movement itself. In many ways, the ways in which the Hawaiian sovereignty movement has adapted their tactics over time and embraced new techniques are unique. This dissertation aims to go beyond just an exploration of the challenges of Hawaiian sovereignty and take a look the movement itself and its effects on forming the Hawaiian nation.

2.7 Nationalism in the Region

Oceania is composed of small island nations with a variety of governance approaches. Self-governance and full independence for many nations have been much more recent and limited than in most other regions. With the exception of Western Sahara, all of the remaining non-self-governing territories are small island nations and over a third of them are in the Pacific\textsuperscript{168}. Even within the independent nations, many face

\textsuperscript{168} This list is frequently controversial, as it excludes a number of nations who have contested statuses (such as Hawai‘i) and includes ones which would not be viable as independent states (like the tiny Pitcairn Islands). It also ignores the desires of the population such as in Tokelau where Tokelauans have twice voted against further self-determination.
a variety of challenges in defining their national identity, often as a result of their colonial legacy.

French Polynesia and Wallis and Futuna remain French overseas collectivities, whilst New Caledonia has special status as part of a 20-year transition process under the Nouméa Accord. The Federated States of Micronesia, Marshall Islands and Palau are independent in free association with the United States. Guam and the now uninhabited Wake Island are US territories and the Northern Mariana Islands, whilst technically a commonwealth is administered as a US territory. Tokelau remains a territory of New Zealand. As noted earlier, the Cook Islands and Niue are in free association with New Zealand. Rapa Nui (Easter Island) is considered part of insular Chile. The Pitcairn Islands are a British Overseas Territory. Fiji, the Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Kiribati, Nauru, Samoa, Tonga, and Tuvalu are fully independent states.

Between Samoa achieving independence in 1962 and Palau finally ending US administration in 1994, most of the region gained self-governance or full independence. Stephen Levine suggest that there exists a common perception that it is now “‘settled’ matter, with no ongoing legacy of bitterness or discontent remaining to be resolved, and with no further island communities denied opportunities for self-determination”. Though most of the region has now received at least some form of self-governance, he argues that for many of these nations, “the experience of sovereignty and independence has been something of a disappointment, with ongoing dependence and limited room for

manoeuvre a more accurate rendering”. Further, the world's response to further independence efforts have varied between “immobilised indifference” to outright hostility.

The path to independence for most Pacific Island countries was fairly smooth with little conflict. Levine suggests that this came “not through struggle so much as imperial exhaustion”. The utility of empire faded, and the colonies became an embarrassing burden on the colonial administrators. In many of the nations, independence was hastily imposed with little care towards the tensions between “democratic values and traditional patterns of rule and outlook” or demographic changes. The models adopted have been problematic for many of the nations. Further, many of the nations have only what Levine characterises as ‘semi-sovereignty’. The continued presence of the external powers limits sovereignty in many of the island nations. He likewise suggests that practicalities of dependency “mock the trappings of sovereignty, self-rule and independence”. As Levine describes, sovereignty in the region is much more complex than popular opinion assumes. Though many of the nations have self-governance that they achieved with minimal struggle, a number of them do not, in practice, have the ability to express their sovereignty as other nations can, despite their desire to do so.
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There are also clashes with the anti-colonial movement in nations like Tokelau and the Pitcairn Islands, who have made it very clear that they would like to remain colonies.

Not all of the nations have however had a completely smooth transition from colonialism. David Robie has described the violent events in New Caledonia, Palau, Vanuatu and Fiji as the result of “liberation movements” as part of “a quest for national sovereignty that takes into account the legacy of more than two centuries of colonialism”.176 He conjures up images of global struggles for liberation from oppressors. Similarly, Graham Hassall in a 1991 article suggests that independence for several of the Pacific Island states has been marked by ethnic identity & conflict with much of its origins in the decolonisation process.177 He notes that “whereas most Pacific peoples have obtained political independence, or achieved political decolonisation, the processes of adaptation are not necessarily complete, and have themselves become hidden catalysts to conflicts manifesting themselves in the political sphere”.178 He, however, does notes that not all of the modern conflicts are the result of colonialism with some of the conflicts caused by “rivalries of ancient origin” and that “not all ethnic conflict derives from nationalist aspiration”179
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Though this model of decolonisation is commonly applied, Terence Wesley-Smith has questioned the continual utility of this conceptual framework. He notes that there is an “absence of an ‘obvious colonial villain’”. Whilst it can be applied to the French territories, it fails when used for nations like Fiji whose struggles are postcolonial where neither side is representable as a villain. A similar problem exists in much of the rest of the region. The colonial experience, whilst far from ideal, was reasonably pleasant for many of the nations. Sovereignty was often granted without struggle and in some cases accepted with great reluctance. It is common to find people in the region who with great pride in their independent nation look towards the colonial power with nostalgia. For some states like the Solomon Islands, Wesley-Smith argues that beyond the “intrinsic value of sovereign independence”, day-to-day conditions have even decreased since independence.

The push towards decolonisation in the region came as part of a UN effort in 1961 calling for self-determination in the form of decolonisation. This effort was problematic in many ways. Wesley-Smith notes that it “discriminated among the colonised peoples of the Pacific” as it allowed France and the US to argue that the problematic votes by New Caledonia, French Polynesia, Wallis and Futuna and Hawai‘i for their statuses should allow them to be removed from the list of non-self-governing territories. The process was also very driven by the wills of the colonial power rather than the people of the
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islands.\textsuperscript{184} Also problematic, was the focus on imposing a Western view of the nation and the political structure.\textsuperscript{185} As was the case in much of the colonial experience, nations were divided or combined with little regard to common cultures or previous governance structure.\textsuperscript{186} Whilst some of this was logistically necessary given the low population sizes, it has meant that many cultures have been ignored in building the larger national identity.

Nevertheless, most of the nations of Oceania have been politically stable since independence. As Wesley-Smith notes, even the more serious conflicts in the region “pale in comparison to the conflicts that characterise many other parts of the previously colonised world”.\textsuperscript{187} He suggests that the issues they have had have been in part caused by a conflict between traditional and new models of governance, arguing that states with “hierarchical traditional political systems, a history of centralised forms of organisation and culturally homogenous populations” have been most successful. States such as Tonga and Samoa were able to adapt traditional practice to a Western political system, whilst the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu in their lack of traditional state model have struggled. Hassall likewise suggests that there is a conflict between traditional authority and legal
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systems and “modern” systems.\textsuperscript{188} Group-based consensual approaches to governance and traditional customary law were replaced with Western models of limited utility.\textsuperscript{189}

Several other authors have attempted to catalogue and further explain the political situation in the region. Amongst the more comprehensive efforts is Dave Peebles book \textit{Pacific Regional Order}. He divides the problems the region is facing into five broad categories; “challenges to sustainable economic development; to security; to the rule of law; to democracy; and the challenge represented by the rise in regionalism elsewhere in the world, a development that has so far excluded Pacific states”.\textsuperscript{190} Challenges posed by economic development are largely related to the limited resources and remoteness of the islands.\textsuperscript{191} Security challenges are limited with a few major conflicts representing the largest concerns.\textsuperscript{192} Peebles expresses concern over the region’s general lack of ratification of key humanitarian law instruments and a “general ambivalence” towards the domestic rule of law.\textsuperscript{193} He notes and dismisses the common explanation for this attitude towards the domestic rule of law of the “Pacific Way” favouring consensus and traditional dispute resolution.\textsuperscript{194} Though he fails to recognise it, the lack of adoption of
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international law is often explained by resource limitations and governmental priority rather than a statement on the nation’s support for humanitarian principles. His charts are also somewhat misleading in failing to recognise the treaties that apply in less conventional ways.

Peebles argues that in the region “colonial powers often implemented an imperfect model of Westminster democracy, which in some cases has been further corrupted rather than improved by Forum island countries”.\(^{195}\) He seems to suggest that the only acceptable system is a Westminster democracy. The coups in Fiji are presented as an example of democratic failure, completely ignoring the undemocratic portions of the system that were unconnected. He also suggests that “imbuing traditional authority with political power” is undemocratic.\(^{196}\) This conclusion is questionable. Jon Fraenkel, amongst others, has challenged the applicability of European governance models to the region.\(^{197}\) Across the Pacific, a number of unique or unusual models exist with reasonable success. He notes that whilst the European models were highly influential in the colonial period, wholesale lifting of governance models is often unsuccessful.\(^{198}\) Though not rejecting the utility of foreign models, he calls on reformers to “avoid grandstanding on international principle, and instead to base arguments on a deep and rich appreciation of

\(^{195}\) Ibid.

\(^{196}\) Ibid.


\(^{198}\) Ibid.
Though this is likely critical for successful governance in the region, there is a real danger of it providing a justification for practices that are harmful to the nation.

Many of the independent states in the region maintain significant ties to their previous colonial power. The Solomon Islands and Tuvalu both consider Queen Elizabeth II their head of state. Though this position is typically presented as largely ceremonial, Jon Fraenkel argues that this power is both significant and provides several examples in which through the Governors-General, the Queen has utilised these powers. He suggests that the influence goes well beyond the role of the crown to symbolise the “unity of a national community” in having a “critical part in Pacific constitutional crises”.

Though other nations in the region have seen scattered studies, French Polynesia and New Caledonia have received the most scholarly attention. New Caledonia had one of the region’s few traditional-style struggles for sovereignty. Between 1976 and 1988 the indigenous population, the Kanak, led an active independence movement against the French who had annexed the islands in 1853. This movement saw serious violence and disorder including seized farms and a pro-independence hostage-taking in Ouvéa resulting in the death four gendarmes, nineteen hostage-takers, two members of the

199 Ibid.
201 Ibid.
military and three additional deaths of hostage takers whilst in custody. The Matignon Agreements were signed in 1988 establishing the groundwork for the Nouméa Accord in 1998. This accord set up a 20 year special transition period ending with an independence referendum to be held in November 2018.

In many ways, the struggle for independence in New Caledonia represents the typical fight against colonialism. For French Polynesia, however, Nathalie Mrgudovic argues that “there was never such a strong feeling of deprivation of indigenous cultural and social identities as there was in New Caledonia”. She suggests that the movement is primarily a political one and that “the claim for sovereignty in French Polynesia had little to do with the struggle of an indigenous people”. The native people of French Polynesia remain the dominant ethnic group in the islands, and French Polynesia already operates largely as an independent country.

The Nouméa Accord encourages the government of New Caledonia to develop national symbols (including a motto, anthem, banknotes, and a flag). Its loyalist President has led the adoption of a number of symbols that though representing a separate New Caledonia identity contain very pro-French symbolism.

Mrgudovic notes that free-association with France is now a “perfectly conceivable option” for the French Pacific. However, she argues that free association, often presented as a good model for late decolonisation, may not actually result in less political instability.
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Much of the work on French Polynesia and New Caledonia has been focused upon the debate over the level of sovereignty the islands have. For example, Lorenz Gonschor has challenged the idea that French Polynesia has actually been decolonized, suggesting that France responded to calls for decolonisation by redefining the concept and creating a “de-facto continuity of colonial rule but also to create a corrupt authoritarian local government favourable to French interests”. 204 Similarly, an article by Gerard Prinsen, Yves Lafoy and Julien Migozzi argues that New Caledonia is not sovereign in a Westphalian sense and that “a unique ‘Islandian’ concept of sovereignty is emerging” 205

Beyond brief mentions, everyday nationalism and the subjects that it typically explores have been largely absent from the literature. This interesting given the frequency the ways in which food and language are used to build the French identity in Metropolitan France have been studied.

Though the nations of this dissertation are feeling only the secondary effects of climate change 206, it remains one of the most significant concerns for the region. Within

---


206 Hawaiʻi, Fiji and the Cook Islands are not expected to lose significant inhabited land to rising sea levels in the near future (though in a longer time-frame the effects could be devastating). Niue’s geological structure will prevent it from losing land, but its underground freshwater supplies are highly vulnerable. All of the islands are feeling increases in adverse weather such as cyclones and hurricanes. Hawaiʻi and Fiji are
the next few decades, it's estimated that thousands of low-lying islands will be submerged. Already, storm surges and groundwater contamination are rendering areas unliveable. Susannah Willcox notes that “a loss of habitable territory has not been recognised as a possible cause of state extinction in international law”. Nevertheless, there become significant practical problems if a state ceases to exist due to climate change. International law has always assumed that a successor state would absorb the rights and obligations of the extinguished state. Assuming a willing host state, a government-in-exile situation could be used. These, however, have always operated under the premise that the exile is temporary with a clear population and defined territory to which they seek to return. Willcox proposes a mechanism by which nations could continue to be seen as legally sovereign following a climate change related territorial loss. As she recognises, the usefulness of this model is still yet to be seen. Regardless of the legal situation, it is likely that nations will lose sovereignty and have significant cultural impact as its citizen lose their connection to the traditional territory.

also seeing significant increases in migration to their islands due to the flooding of other island nations. Coral bleaching, marine migration and other warming-related events have already started to affect the islands.
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The region has hosted a number of nationalist movements over the past few decades. Unfortunately, little has been written about them outside a purely historical or occasionally legal context. With a few exceptions discussed above, banal nationalism has been unstudied in the region.
Chapter 3

3 Background Information

This chapter supplies a brief background on the four nations explored in this dissertation. Niue and the Cooks Islands are very rarely studied, with much of the world having nearly no knowledge of their history, circumstances, or often even their existence. Hawai‘i and Fiji receive more attention globally, but most of this attention is focused upon their suitability as vacation destinations with the socio-political situations whitewashed. Even within the region, little is often taught about the islands of Oceania other than their own.

3.1 Geography

Hawai‘i is a large volcanic archipelago consisting of hundreds of islands dispersed across 2,400 km$^2$. There are eight main islands, of which seven are permanently inhabited. Located in the North Pacific Ocean, Hawai‘i is approximately 4,000km from California 6,000km from Japan and almost 7,000km from New Zealand. Consequently, it is one of the most remote population centres in the world.

Fiji is an archipelago formed of over 330 islands, of which 110 are permanently inhabited. It is about 2,000km northeast of New Zealand and is surrounded by several other small island nations. Though Fiji’s population is dispersed across many islands, 87% of the population live on the islands of Viti Levu and Vanua Levu. Most live in the capital city of Suva or the towns of Nadi and Lautoka (and the surrounding areas of each).
The Cook Islands are formed of coral atolls and consist of 15 major islands dispersed across 2.2 million km² (849,425 sq. mi) of ocean. Rarotonga is by far the most populous of the islands. If its ocean territory were to be considered a part of the total area of the country, the Cook Islands would be the 12th largest country in the world. It is about 3,000km from New Zealand and around 1,000km from its nearest neighbour, French Polynesia.

Niue, whose name is typically translated as “behold the coconut”\(^ {211}\) is unique in this dissertation in consisting of only a single island. It is one of the world's largest coral islands. As a coral island, it has limited beaches and many steep limestone cliffs. Large reefs limit the navigable waters to a small break close to the capital, Alofi. Though a majority of the population lives on the Alofi side, no part of the island is especially populous. Niue is approximately 500km away from its nearest neighbour American Samoa and is around 2,000km away from New Zealand.

### 3.2 Demographics

With a population of 1.4 million\(^ {212}\), Hawai‘i is the most populous of the nations in this dissertation and is the largest of the small island nations of Oceania\(^ {213}\). Fiji’s

---

\(^{211}\) The word Niue is formed from the words Niu (coconut) e (here). It is said to be so named because of the surprise of seeing coconuts growing on the rocky island.

\(^{212}\) Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism, “2016 State Population Estimates.”

\(^{213}\) Australia, Papua New Guinea and New Zealand are the only Oceania nations that have a larger population, but they are not considered part of Oceania under the definition used regionally.
population of over 880 thousand is the next largest.\textsuperscript{214} In contrast, the Cook Islands and Niue are both very small, with populations of a little over 15,000 and 1,600 respectively, making them some of the smallest countries globally.\textsuperscript{215} The only countries with a smaller population than Niue is Tokelau (a New Zealand colony) and the Vatican City.

Hawai‘i, Fiji, and the Cook Islands are all experiencing small, but positive, levels of population growth at present.\textsuperscript{216} Niue, in contrast, has seen a continuous slow population decline.\textsuperscript{217} Despite positive population growth, “brain drain” (the out-migration of skilled workers) remains a serious problem for Fiji, the Cook Islands, Niue and to a lesser extent Hawai‘i. The extremely high cost of living, insufficient housing and inadequate salaries have led to out-migration from Hawai‘i. This is, however, balanced by a continuous influx of new, often short-term residents, drawn by Hawaii’s myth of paradise. Political turmoil and the promise of better opportunities have caused migration from Fiji, but this has been balanced by natural increase and immigration from other developing nations. Niue and the Cook Islands have seen considerable out-migration (primarily to New Zealand) as residents leave for job and educational opportunities.
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3.3 Race and Ethnicity

The Cook Islands is one of the most racially homogeneous countries globally, with 88% of Cook Islanders identifying as Cook Island Maori. Niue is similarly homogeneous. Its population is almost 80% Niuean or part-Niuean. Fiji is considerably more diverse with 56.8% identifying as iTaukei, 37.5% as Indo-Fijian, and 1.2% as Rotuman. Hawai‘i, in contrast, has been described as one of the most racially/ethnically diverse places in the world. In the last census, 38.6% of Hawai‘i identified as Asian, 24.7% as White, 5.9% Native Hawaiian, 4.1% as other Pacific Islander and 23.6% as two or more races. Hawai‘i consequently has the highest percentage of Asian Americans and multiracial Americans of any US state and is the only state with an Asian American plurality. For each of the nations in this paper, their demographics have produced some interesting local conceptions of race and ethnicity that shape how nationalism operates within the nation.

Within Hawai‘i, it is not uncommon to hear people listing a number of racial and ethnic group memberships in describing themselves. Hawai‘i is often characterised as being beyond race or as being a place where race doesn't matter. Though racism does still

221 Blair, “Hawaii Most Diverse Population on Earth, Says Abercrombie.”
exist in Hawai‘i (most visibly towards Micronesians), race is not nearly as polarising as it is the rest of the United States. One big divide, however, in Hawai‘i is between local and non-local. Though the conception is not actually racially based, race is often used as a shortcut for determining localness. Generally, the local label is seen as a result of the adoption of Hawai‘i values (particularly a respect for the land and Hawai‘i traditions) and the adoption of Hawai‘i material culture. Further, whiteness is often used as the generic representation of the non-local person. It has become a shorthand for colonial mindsets, militarism, and modern attempts to impose mainland culture and attitudes on Hawai‘i, but should not be interpreted typically as actually referring to race.

Race also becomes relevant in Hawai‘i for some government and non-government entitlements that are only available to Hawaiians (discussed in a later chapter in its relationship to hot nationalism). Various blood quantum models have been used for service eligibility, but overall these seem to be primarily a legal construct rather than a social one. There are a number of people who will describe themselves as Hawaiian despite not meeting the full blood quantum, and similarly, there are many who do meet the quantum standards, who do not consider themselves Hawaiian.

Little has been written on race and ethnicity in Niue. There are no actual studies of the local perceptions of the concept. With limited numbers of non-Niueans residing in

---

222 The blood quantum model requires that a person have a defined percentage of their ancestry be composed of people who are a part of a certain ethnic group for tribal membership or access to services. For example, a requirement of 1/8 degree blood quantum for membership would be to having equivalent to one great-grandparent who was of that group, while a 1/2 degree blood quantum would require one parent to be a member.
Niue and a strict objective criteria for residency (born in Niue or having a parent born in or resident of Niue), race and ethnicity do not seem to have been a significant concern politically or socially. Anecdotally, people seem to divide others into the categories of Niuean, Pacific Islander and other. Due to the rapidly declining population in Niue, jobs are increasingly being filled by non-Niueans, particularly by people from New Zealand or Fiji. Further, as exposure to global discussions on indigenous rights expand many are proudly embracing a label that was not previously significant for them and connecting to a global conversation. It is possible that these trends may cause a future focus on race or ethnicity that would justify further research, but at present, it does not seem to be a particularly meaningful group level distinction.

The vast majority of Cook Islanders identify as Māori or part-Māori. They share common origins with the Māori of New Zealand, and many believe that the Māori of New Zealand came to New Zealand via the Cook Islands. Culturally and linguistically, Cook Islands Māori is distinct from New Zealand Māori, however, there are many commonalities, and the languages have a reasonable degree of mutual intelligibility. The Cook Islands has extremely strict immigration laws that substantially limit long-term residence by foreign workers, who are limited to three years in the Cook Islands with extensions available only if no local worker is available and a plan to train a local worker to replace them is in place. Permanent residency requires ten years (three years for New Zealand citizens) of lawful residency and evidence of significant contribution or investment in the Cook Islands. Exceptions are available for people who are married to Cook Islanders. As such, the Cook Islands has a fairly small long-term ex-pat community (mostly consisting of those married to Cook Islanders) and relatively small numbers of
foreign workers. Given that most of the exposure Cook Island residents will have with non-Māori will be as tourists or short-term workers, a model in which non-Māori people are treated as guests in the country has developed. This is not to say that non-Māori are not welcomed, but some have described facing considerable resentment if they try to take a role that exceeds what is appropriate for a guest.

Race and ethnicity in Fiji remain a complex and highly politicised topic. Though demographics have shifted following the coups, for much of Fiji’s late colonial and postcolonial history, iTaukei and Indo-Fijian populations were reasonably similar in size. Out-migration has reduced the Indo-Fijian population such that iTaukei now represent over half the population. Concerns of Indo-Fijian dominance have been a common political issue, providing motivation for several of the coups. iTaukei own the vast majority of land in Fiji, however, Indo-Fijians own nearly all of the domestically owned businesses.

In discussions of race in Fiji, iTaukei and Indo-Fijians dominate the literature, however there several smaller groups in Fiji. There small, but significant, numbers of Europeans, Rotumans, Chinese and non-iTaukei/Rotuman Pacific Islanders in Fiji. Intermarriage between all groups is increasing but still remains uncommon, though it is typically accepted. Socially and professionally, inter-group interaction is normal and unmarked.

Whilst it was somewhat controversial, the Bainimarama government officially re-designated Native Fijians as iTaukei (a Bau dialect word generally translated as “Indigenous”). The label of “Fijian”, which had previously only been applied to iTaukei people, was expanded to refer to all people of Fiji (for whom the little-used term Fiji
Islander had officially applied). This change was a component of the Bainimarama
government's campaign focused on building a more inclusive Fiji in the hopes of
addressing the underlying causes of the previous coups.

3.4 Land

For much of the land in Hawai‘i, typical US/Western land models are used. Land
is privately owned and can be sold with few abnormal limitations. The State of Hawai‘i is
unsurprisingly the largest landholder with 1.54 million acres including 194,000 acres
managed through the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (which provides long-term
leases via lottery to Native Hawaiians for homesteading at very low cost). The U.S.
Federal Government is the next largest landholder with over half a million acres of which
the extremely large Hawaii Volcanoes National Park on the Big Island and Haleakala
of the land held by the State and Federal governments is former crown and government
government land represented about 800,000 acres.\footnote{Ibid.} Crown land was land that was held
by the Hawaiian monarchy to be used as part of the fulfilment of their responsibilities to
the people of Hawai‘i with much of it leased to generate revenue and support crown
activities.\textsuperscript{226} Government land was land held for the operation of the state and encompassed government buildings, public parks and similar public works.\textsuperscript{227} Both types of land were seized in the overthrow, and about 50 thousand acres were sold by the Republic to private landowners.\textsuperscript{228} The remainder was ceded to the United States, which later transferred much of the land to the State of Hawaii.\textsuperscript{229} Under Hawaii Act 176, public lands in Hawaiʻi cannot be sold or transferred without a two-thirds vote by the State Legislature. Developing crown land is highly controversial and legally fraught. It is thus not often tried. As a result, there a number of scattered plots of land that are undeveloped in the midst of other large developments.

Several private landholders also own significant portions of Hawaii’s land. Kamehameha Schools is the largest private landholder with 363,000 acres held in a trust established by Princess Pauahi.\textsuperscript{230} In addition to several large school campuses, much of this land is leased for residential and commercial operations.\textsuperscript{231} Alexander & Baldwin is the next largest with 113,000 acres.\textsuperscript{232} As a major sugar producer and successor to much of Dole’s Hawaiʻi operations and owner of Matson shipping company (the primary cargo shipping company for the region), Alexander & Baldwin is highly economically
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significant and powerful. Parker Ranch though previously the largest private landowner now holds 107,000 acres.\textsuperscript{233} Though much smaller today, Parker Ranch once controlled most of the private land on the island of Hawai‘i and was one of the largest privately-owned ranches in the world.

The Cook Islands land tenure system is relatively complex and represents a blend of traditional style land tenure systems with a Land Court system for validating claims. In 1901, with the transition to New Zealand administration, the transition agreement prohibited the sale of land, a provision that was due to concerns over New Zealand’s (mis)handling of native land.\textsuperscript{234} In 1902, the Land Court was established to resolve land claims and to arrange for land leases.\textsuperscript{235} Land in the Cook Islands cannot be sold, only leased.\textsuperscript{236} In 1957, the court ruled that all children are to equally inherit the land of their parents.\textsuperscript{237} These non-Māori judges based the ruling upon a non-existent principle of Māori culture, creating a situation in which the land rules no longer actually reflect traditional practice despite the statutory responsibility to do so.\textsuperscript{238} This ruling has become problematic in that there are estimated to be 130,000 Cook Islanders globally, with most
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still maintaining rights to their customary lands. Absentee landowners are given considerable power to influence the usage of their inherited land regardless of the wishes of resident landowners. This structure also results in highly fragmented lands wherein land may be subdivided amongst so many relatives that it is impractical for them to use it productively. Land lease prices are for many unachievable, and the complex process makes it poorly suited for individuals seeking to build in the Cook Islands. There are also significant land shortages in Rarotonga leading such a high population density rate that it is actually comparable to many European countries.

Niue’s system of land tenure is extremely similar to that of the Cook Islands. Most notably, land rights can be maintained even after migrating from Niue. This has created an area of contention for many Niueans still living in Niue. As most changes to land usage require the consent of the family that collectively owns the land, it can be difficult for those residents in Niue to gain the agreement of the rest of the family living overseas on how the land should be used. Further, there remain a number of abandoned buildings partially destroyed by cyclones that cannot be repaired or razed due to an inability to gain consent from the overseas owners. There have been proposals to allow the cancellation of land rights for long absent landowners, but these proposals have not to-date been successful.
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Owing to its small population size, Niue has the twelfth lowest national population density rate in the World. The only countries with lower population density are those who have extremely large minimally populated areas such as Canada and Australia. Most small island nations, even those with reasonable land holding and small populations, will quickly face land shortages as the population grows. In contrast, Niue with its declining populations and comfortably sized island has not seen the pressures on land usage that other small island nations have faced. Consequently, though land titles may be messy, there is plentiful land on the island.

Fiji’s first governor established a policy that forbids any additional land from being sold. As a result, only about 8 per cent of the land in Fiji is freehold land. An additional 8 per cent is held by the state as Crown Land. The remainder is “Native Land” managed by the iTaukei Land Trust Board. These lands cannot be sold, but can be leased. Today, around a third of this land is currently leased, with the remainder operating under customary land traditions. The leases are negotiated and administered through the iTaukei Land Trust Board on behalf of, and with varying levels of input from, the customary landholders. These policies, though effective at limiting non-iTaukei ownership, have created a market in which the limited freehold land can be in very high
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demand with prices that are out of reach of many Fijians, leading to foreign ownership. A 2014 law aimed to address this concern by requiring that all rural land purchases by non-citizens be followed by the construction of a house valued at greater than FJ$250k within two years. This law was intended to crack down on foreign land speculation and to improve housing access for Fijians, though its actual effectiveness is questionable.  

Fiji’s land ownership model is often presented as an ideal model by native rights activists elsewhere (including in Hawai‘i). It is, however, highly problematic. This approach is very paternalistic in preventing “landowners” from expressing their agency in determinations of the use and transfer of their land. Generational dispersion means that for many their share of the land profits is so small that it is only symbolic and uses of the land require very high levels of consensus or rely upon fading traditional power structures. Further, the system prevents people (primarily Indo-Fijians) from being ever able to own the land that they have lived and worked on for generations. Most people in Fiji (including iTaukei) are, as a result of the extremely limited amounts of freehold land, highly unlikely to ever become themselves landowners in the typically understood meaning of the term.

3.5 Tourism

Tourism is highly significant for all four nations. Tourism and related services contribute 75% of the Cook Island’s GDP.\textsuperscript{250} With almost ten times the number of visitors as residents tourism has been a significant income source for Niue representing about 40% of the island’s GDP.\textsuperscript{251} It is also expected that most economic growth for Niue will be through an expansion of the tourism sector. Though Fiji is more diversified, travel and tourism still contributed 37% of Fiji’s GDP in 2014 and is estimated to represent 43.5% of the country’s GDP by 2025.\textsuperscript{252} In Hawai‘i, tourism contributes over $14 billion representing about 20% of Hawaii’s overall economic activity.\textsuperscript{253}

---


Niue does not publish GDP by industry in a way that can be used for comparison. This figure is based on the New Zealand's High Commissioner’s statement in the above article that “in 2014 we're getting close to NZ$6 million” and Niue's last official GDP of US$10 million (NZ $14 million).


Indirectly, Hawai‘i has also built a large industry selling products based on tourist impressions of islands. The speciality crops, such as flowers, coffee, pineapple and macadamia nuts, are sold using the same imagery of Hawai‘i that is promoted by the tourism industry. Fiji has a similar situation in which products, most notably FIJI Water, is sold using images of Fiji as a paradise and on this basis, it is able to represent a meaningful portion of the nation’s GDP alone. Niue and the Cook Islands, with their minimal export industries, have no significant examples of this phenomenon, but given the other small island nation trends and the new focus on premium small-scale exports, it can be expected that as they expand their export sectors this style of branding will be dominant.

Tourism, particularly island tourism, provides a significant motivator to shape world perception in order to support a relaxing image that meets tourist expectations. Ethnic conflict, environmental concerns, political instability, and sovereignty battles can reduce the ability to sell the islands as a tropical paradise. Thus, there becomes a strong economic motivator to lessen their impact or visibility. Issues are often downplayed or otherwise minimised so as to allow the tourist perception of the islands to be unharmed.

Similarly, many tourists to island nations are seeking an experience of an exotic, often fictitious, version of island life with beautiful beaches, friendly natives, and no worries. This can be problematic as a desire for tourism dollars can cause nations to establish policies of national identity which favour a tourist desired sense of “authenticity” and “tradition” rather than inclusivity or historical accuracy. As discussed in Chapter 6, a pan-Pacific representation has become favoured in many presentations of local culture for tourists. Tourists expect certain foods, styles of dance, dress and music,
all of which often become what the world (and sometimes even locals) see as representing the nations. Along with many other tourist focused cultural presentations, luaus and hula are prime examples of this in that both have been adapted considerably from traditional practice to reflect early Hawai‘i tourism advertising and travel stories better. Similar trends can be seen in most of the rest of the Pacific as well.

### 3.6 History

Each of the nations in this paper has experienced a unique colonial and postcolonial experience that is rarely explored. This section provides a very brief overview of the key historical events as they relate to the formation of the nations. Of particular concern in each nation is the initial settlement (which is key for the arguments of native nationalism), their colonial circumstances and eventual independence (except for Hawai‘i). More recent events are covered in greater detail in the subsequent chapters.

#### 3.6.1 Niue

There remains some debate over when people first came to Niue. Carbon dating of archaeological finds suggest that humans first settled in Niue around 200 CE. Due to high levels of natural radioactivity, carbon dating lacks the accuracy it has elsewhere and first settlement may have been much earlier, or possibly even later.


It appears that there were several waves of migration from Tonga and Samoa starting at least 1500 years ago. Within the Niuean language and tradition, all islands other than
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254 Due to high levels of natural radioactivity, carbon dating lacks the accuracy it has elsewhere and first settlement may have been much earlier, or possibly even later.
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Niue were described as Tonga, so there is a possibility that the migration patterns included other Pacifica people as well\textsuperscript{256} (likely Fijians\textsuperscript{257} and Cook Islanders\textsuperscript{258}).

For much of Niuean history, the island operated under a model of autonomous family groups without hereditary chiefs. Around 1700, a system of non-hereditary elected kings was adopted.\textsuperscript{259}

The first European contact with Niue came in 1774 when the island was spotted by Captain Cook.\textsuperscript{260} His party was allowed to land but were quickly driven off by the Niueans.\textsuperscript{261} One narrative has Cook’s crew attacked with rocks as they attempted to raise a British flag.\textsuperscript{262} Cook and his crew retreated after firing a musket shot, and when they reapproached the island they were met by several warriors and chose to retreat.\textsuperscript{263} Cook’s crew described Niueans as “unsociable”, caused by the “inhospitality” of the island, and saw no purpose in reattempting contact.\textsuperscript{264} Cook (re)named the island the “Savage Island” because of this. Local stories describe the Niuean warriors as friendly, offering
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the traditional challenge, which Cook misunderstood.\textsuperscript{265} They also say that he saw red dye on their lips, and clothing and believed it to be blood, implying cannibalism, but this was actually the juice from a local banana.\textsuperscript{266} Though Cook’s narrative was most likely biased, it led to Europeans avoiding the islands for some time.\textsuperscript{267} By 1828, limited trade was occurring with Whalers, but (almost definitely false) tales of Niueans violence, murder and cannibalism were common.\textsuperscript{268} Missionaries made several attempts to bring their mission to Niue without success.\textsuperscript{269} Eventually, in 1830, missionaries from the London Missionary Society were able to convince two Niueans to go with them to Samoa to be trained as pastors. One of these, Nukai Peniamina, returned in 1846.\textsuperscript{270} After several attempts at landing, they were accepted at the village of Mutalau.\textsuperscript{271} Peniamina was quickly successful in convincing the island to convert.\textsuperscript{272} The conversion also brought an acceptance of increased trade and societal change.\textsuperscript{273} After a series of missteps, regular trade with Niue was occurring by the 1860s and a very small number of Europeans had settled on the island.\textsuperscript{274}
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Early in his reign, Niuean King Fataaiki petitioned British Queen Victoria for Niue to become a British protectorate in a letter sent in November 1887. Germany objected under the Berlin Convention, and Niue remained neutral territory. Fataaiki again petitioned in 1889. After his death, King Togia sent another petition in October 1899. As the Berlin Convention had since collapsed, Niue became a British protectorate in April 1900. A year later, it was transferred to New Zealand, where, along with the Cook Islands, it became a protectorate under the Dominion of New Zealand.

Under the New Zealand administration, an island council was established. However, until 1903, Niue was administered by New Zealand along with the Cook Islands leaving residents with many unaddressed complaints. A separate administration was established in 1903 with its own resident commissioner. The first commissioner was Christopher Maxwell. He focused strongly on infrastructure but clashed with the Island Council over their call for alcohol prohibition and other “immorality”

275 Ibid.
276 Ibid, 89-147.
277 Ibid.
278 Ibid.
279 Ibid.
280 Ibid.
281 Ibid, 177-259.
282 Ibid.
283 Ibid.
ordinances.284 He was replaced in 1907 for adultery. This started several decades of short-term minimally qualified commissioners on loan from the Post Office or Customs whose individual impact was minimal.285 World War I saw a large number of Niuean volunteers serve at great cost to themselves and the islands.286 The war also distracted New Zealand from its colonial administrative responsibilities.287 Niue was an undesirable posting for New Zealand administrators that many tried to leave as quickly as possible.288 The longest serving of these was Commissioner Joseph McMahon-Box who, after 28 years of service in Niue left, due to poor health and financial issues.289 He was replaced by Cecil Larsen, a retired Army officer with experience in the Cook Islands (the first qualified commissioner after Maxwell).290 He found serious financial mismanagement and embezzlement having occurred under McMahon-Box, along with several other issues.291 Larsen made a number of positive changes for the island, but was also described as cruel and abusive.292 A growing unemployment problem and Niuean concerns about European immorality (mostly related to alcohol consumption and Sunday
labour) created some strife under his administration. Having been unable to find a long-term police chief, Larsen unpopularly took on the role himself. In this role, he was said to physically abuse prisoners and use them for household labour.

Larsen was murdered in his bed by three escaped Niuean prisoners on August 16, 1953. The prisoners were fairly young and had all been convicted of minor crimes. After killing Larsen, they evaded capture for four days before surrendering to a Native constable. Given the small size of Niue, it has been suggested that they had assistance in evading capture. They were tried and convicted by a special court which quickly sentenced them to death. There were many procedural issues with the case, including the fact that one defendant had a mental age of only 10. The sentence was extremely unpopular in Niue. Several groups in Niue and New Zealand began to petition the New Zealand government for clemency. The cases of the three men and the larger concern about the racially unequal application of the death penalty in New Zealand became a
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major issue in the upcoming New Zealand election.\textsuperscript{304} In May 1954, their sentences were commuted to life imprisonment in a New Zealand prison, and they were eventually released.\textsuperscript{305}

This case and New Zealand’s growing support for global decolonisation brought attention to the situation in Niue which led to the development and eventually the offering of autonomy in 1965 (at the same time as the Cook Islands).\textsuperscript{306} Niue asked that autonomy be delayed.\textsuperscript{307} Rapid development occurred over the next decade with significant infrastructure improvements.\textsuperscript{308} A referendum was held in 1974, which resulted in independence with a free association agreement.\textsuperscript{309} On the table for this referendum (and the Cook Islands independence) were the options of complete independence, full incorporation within New Zealand, self-government with free association, or membership in a future Polynesian federation\textsuperscript{310}.
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\textsuperscript{305} Ibid.
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\textsuperscript{310} Complete independence was economically problematic, whilst full incorporation or annexation was unpopular as a loss of control and identity. Annexation was also concerning for New Zealanders as it would have high costs for the rapid development the islands would require. A Polynesian federation was reasonably popular in some groups but was ultimately a highly flawed proposal that had been repeatedly presented as the solution to British, New Zealand and Australian holdings in the Pacific. Though very tidy for Britain, New Zealand and Australia, it would have created an absurdly widespread set of islands that, though sharing a common government, would lack a common language, culture or history. Its major advantage would have been in creating a power bloc unavailable to small island states and allowing the
The first elections in 1975 saw Robert Rex, who was key to the self-governance process, become the first premier. He served until his death in 1992, being continuously re-elected every three years. Young Vivian completed Rex’s term in 1992 and was again elected in 2002 for a six-year term. Frank Lui and Sani Lakatani served for years and three years, respectively, in between Vivian’s terms. Toke Talagi defeated Vivian in 2008 and is the current premier of Niue. All of the premiers have been either independents or until its dissolution in 2003, members of the country’s only political party, the Niue People’s Party. Niue continues to face issues with cyclones and depopulation leading to considerable concern for the long-term sustainability of the nation.

3.6.2 Hawai‘i

It is typically believed that people first settled in Hawai‘i around 300 CE.\textsuperscript{311} There is, however, archaeological evidence that people may have been in there as early as 124 CE\textsuperscript{312} or even as late as 1120 CE.\textsuperscript{313} Whilst there is a recent argument for rapid later Pacific migration and settlement, a two major migration model has been typically taught.
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The first migration is said to have occurred 300-600 CE from the southern Pacific, particularly the Marquesas Islands. The second wave is thought to have occurred around 1000-1300 CE from Tahiti. Quasi-mythical Pāʻao is said to have led the second migration which brought with it much of the social and religious structures that have become known as Hawaiʻi culture. Some modern sovereignty activists describe Pāʻao as the leader of a “number of warlike Tahitians [who] arrived on the peaceful islands of Hawaii”. Pāʻao’s group is credited by them as having introduced human sacrifice, war and oppression to Hawaiʻi. Pāʻao is presented in this as the first wave of foreign invaders who have been destroying Hawaiʻi, with the American overthrow and continuing occupation a continuation of the same bloodthirstiness and oppression.

In the period following the second wave of migration, rule by chiefs rather than councils of elders became the norm. The period was also marked by rapid population growth, large public works projects, and the end of long-distance voyaging.
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Though there is some evidence that Spanish explorers in the 1540s may have been the first Europeans to encounter Hawai‘i, Captain James Cook is generally credited as the first European contact with Hawai‘i in his January 1778 visit. They engaged in brief trade, and he soon proceeded onwards. In January 1779 he returned to Hawai‘i and was warmly greeted and celebrated as his arrival coincided with the Makahiki (a major festival). William Bligh (the future captain of HMS Bounty) described Cook as welcomed as the God Lono. This is generally considered to be a misinterpretation of the situation, but one that gained significant traction and helped build the global myth of Natives seeing European explorers as gods. In February 1779, Cook returned, having suffered the loss of a mast. While the ship was anchored in Kealakekua Bay, one of the longboats was stolen by Hawaiians. The reasons given for the theft vary significantly with each narrative assigning the parties differing levels of blame. Cook, accompanied by nine British Marines, kidnapped the king of the island, Kalani‘ōpu‘u, to hold hostage for
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the return of the boat (a strategy that they had used successfully elsewhere). Upon reaching the beach, Cook and the Marines were overwhelmed by Hawaiians. Cook was killed along with four Marines. The remaining Marines returned to the ship having killed several Hawaiians.

There were a number of stories told about Cook’s visit and death with varying degrees of accuracy. It has been used both as evidence of Hawaiian primitiveness and savagery, as well as a story of Native peoples being mistreated and subsequently being able to defend themselves and seek justice against a more powerful yet ignorant foe.

After several decades of fighting amongst the chiefs of Hawai‘i, Kamehameha I with a large armada of war canoes and soldiers set out to conquer the islands of Hawai‘i. By 1795, Kamehameha I had conquered all but the island of Kaua‘i. In 1810, with King Kaumuali‘i of Kaua‘i becoming a vassal of Kamehameha.

---
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had established a single Hawaiian kingdom.\textsuperscript{333} Kamehameha is typically revered as an excellent ruler.\textsuperscript{344}

After Kamehameha I's death, his first-born son Liholiho was crowned king.\textsuperscript{355} During his reign, American Protestant missionaries converted many Hawaiians to Christianity, ending many traditional practices.\textsuperscript{336} The hereditary rule of the House of Kamehameha lasted until Kamehameha V’s death in 1872.\textsuperscript{337} An election was held of eligible chiefs resulting in the election of Lunalilo (grandnephew of Kamehameha I). He died a year later.\textsuperscript{338} Kalākaua was elected by the Legislative Assembly in 1874.\textsuperscript{339} He ruled until his death in 1891, after which his sister Liliʻuokalani became queen.\textsuperscript{340} She ruled until the monarchy was overthrown in 1893.\textsuperscript{341}
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Starting not long after Cook’s death, sugar and pineapple became major industries in Hawai‘i.\textsuperscript{342} The sugarcane and pineapple plantations, like most plantations of the time, found themselves in need of labour. Introduced disease had decimated the Hawaiian population, creating a local worker shortage.\textsuperscript{343} Indentured labourers from China were brought over until the Chinese government suspended the program as a result of abuses.\textsuperscript{344} Labourers were soon brought from Portugal, the Philippines and other European and Asian nations thus establishing the groundwork for the diversity of Hawai‘i today.\textsuperscript{345}

The plantations brought considerable trade to Hawai‘i with American influence growing rapidly.\textsuperscript{346} King Kalākaua negotiated a treaty with the US under which sugar could enter the US duty-free in exchange for the rights to use Pearl Harbour by the US military.\textsuperscript{347}

In 1887, the armed militia of the Honolulu Rifles (the Hawaiian League’s all-white militia) forced Kalākaua to sign the 1887 Constitution, known as the Bayonet Constitution.\textsuperscript{348} The Constitution removed much of the King’s power and gave it to the
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white American controlled legislature.\textsuperscript{349} It also restricted the right to vote to those with an income of $600 and allowed noncitizens to vote.\textsuperscript{350} This effectively removed the right of Hawaiians and most non-white immigrants to vote and consolidated control in the hands of the plantation owners.\textsuperscript{351}

In 1893, Queen Liliʻuokalani announced plans to adopt a new constitution.\textsuperscript{352} A group, composed primarily of Americans and Europeans, which named itself the Committee of Safety, was formed to stage a coup.\textsuperscript{353} The Committee of Safety via the Honolulu Rifles took control of the palace and placed Liliʻuokalani under house arrest.\textsuperscript{354} At the request of the coup leaders, a company of U.S. Marines and two companies of U.S. sailors provided support for the overthrow\textsuperscript{355} In a desire to avoid bloodshed, the Queen ordered her forces to surrender, and the Honolulu Rifles took over the government\textsuperscript{356}

The Committee of Safety established a provisional government.\textsuperscript{357} Newly inaugurated President Grover Cleveland ordered an investigation which found that the
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"United States diplomatic and military representatives had abused their authority and were responsible for the change in government."  

Cleveland strongly supported reinstatement but was opposed by the provisional government and the US Senate.  

On July 4, 1894, the Republic of Hawai‘i was proclaimed with the aim of eventual annexation. In 1898, the Territory of Hawai‘i was established through the annexation of Hawai‘i under the Newlands Resolution. Hawaii remained a territory for sixty years, during which plantation owners and other members of the wealthy elite maintained considerable control. On December 7, 1941, the attack on Pearl Harbour by Imperial Japan occurred, which dragged the United States into the war and brought considerable attention to Hawai‘i. In March 1959, Congress passed the Hawaii Admission Act, which allowed for a referendum on statehood. In June, 94.3% voted in favour of statehood and Hawai‘i soon became the fiftieth state of the United States. There were some procedural issues with the vote, but by then, demographics had shifted enough that Hawaiians had become a minority population. Further, the ballot gave no option for Hawaiian sovereignty in any form. Given a choice between full admittance
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into the United States and the problematic territorial status, support for statehood cannot be interpreted as contentment with the lack of sovereignty.

Since statehood, Hawai‘i has undergone several waves of modernisation efforts and increased tourism and migration. In 1993, United States Public Law 103-150, also known as the Apology Resolution, was signed into law by President of the United States Bill Clinton. It formally apologised for the overthrow but has no practical legal effect.

3.6.3 Cook Islands

People are thought to have first arrived in the Cook Islands around 800-1200 CE, though there is some evidence of humans there much earlier.\textsuperscript{365} Tradition holds that Aitutaki, Tangia and Rarotonga were settled by people from French Polynesia, whilst the northern islands were settled from Samoa and Tonga.\textsuperscript{366} It is said that New Zealand was settled by Rarotongan Maoris and others who arrived around 1000 CE with the Cook Islands as their final stop before reaching New Zealand.\textsuperscript{367}

The first recorded European contact is a sighting by Spanish sailor Álvaro de Mendaña in 1595.\textsuperscript{368} He was followed by Portuguese-Spaniard Pedro Fernández de Quirós in 1606 who was the first to make landfall.\textsuperscript{369} Captain James Cook visited in 1773
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and 1777 landing on the uninhabited Palmerston Atoll.\textsuperscript{370} Russian Baltic German Admiral Adam Johann von Krusenstern renamed the islands the Cook Islands in 1823 (though the name was not widely used until 1888).\textsuperscript{371} The same year, missionaries from the London Missionary Society brought Christianity to the islands with considerable success in their efforts at conversion.\textsuperscript{372}

In 1862 and 1863, the Cook Islands were visited by Peruvian slave traders (blackbirders) who kidnapped and enslaved people from several islands and took them to Peru.\textsuperscript{373} Hardest hit was the island of Penrhyn where they lost at least three-quarters of their population.\textsuperscript{374}

The islands became a British protectorate in 1888 when there were fears of occupation by other foreign powers, including France which had recently taken Tahiti.\textsuperscript{375} On 6 September 1900, a petition was circulated to request annexation.\textsuperscript{376} On 8–9 October 1900, seven instruments of cession for the islands were presented by the chiefs and
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accepted by the British thus incorporating the Cook Islands into the British Empire.\textsuperscript{377} The island of Aitutaki did not submit a cession request, but the inhabitants of the island did nevertheless consider themselves British subjects and the island was annexed in the Proclamation accepting the others.\textsuperscript{378} In 1901, the Cook Islands was added to the Colony of New Zealand (and eventually the Dominion of New Zealand).

In 1915, the Cook Islands Act caused a shift in the way the Cook Islands were administered.\textsuperscript{379} Prior to the Act, they were seen as individual islands operating as separate political entities.\textsuperscript{380} Under the Act, the Cook Islands became administered as a single political unit. This marks the birth of the modern Cook Islands nation.\textsuperscript{381} It was administered exclusively by a resident commissioner until 1946, when the Legislative Council was established.\textsuperscript{382}

The Cook Islands became a self-governing territory in free association with New Zealand in 1965.\textsuperscript{383} Independence was of mixed popularity with Cook Islanders, many of whom felt the previous arrangement with New Zealand was highly beneficial to the
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islands.\textsuperscript{384} New Zealand has been accused of pushing for independence more to serve its interests than those of the islands.\textsuperscript{385} As it was a vocal supporter of the newly independent Asian and African nations within the UN holding colonies, regardless of the desire of their inhabitants, was politically embarrassing for them and harmful to their foreign policy objectives.\textsuperscript{386}

Albert Henry was the newly independent country’s first premier\textsuperscript{387}. He was re-elected five times but remains a polarising figure in the Cook Islands.\textsuperscript{388} He had many beneficial achievements for the Cook Islands, particularly in the early part of his term. His later years were, however, marked by accusations of mismanagement, dictatorial conduct and other scandals. Many of Henry’s actions have been presented as self-serving. While often bringing positive developments to the Cook Islands, the actions also often provided for his personal gain.\textsuperscript{389}
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\textsuperscript{389} An example of this could be seen in the construction of the Rarotonga airport. He is said to have delayed the opening of the airport by 18 months to coincide with the Queen's visit, to allow her to open it officially. Though it is not uncommon to delay the formal opening of public works projects to facilitate larger opening events, Henry’s critics claimed that the reason for the delay was to allow him to receive a knighthood as this had been the protocol for royal openings of these sorts of projects.
The 1978 elections were hotly contested as a result of growing dissatisfaction with Henry’s government and his Cook Islands Party.\(^{390}\) His opponents accused him of treating the islands as his own personal fiefdom with rampant nepotism.\(^{391}\) He is said to have strictly controlled the state-run media and used the radio as a personal propaganda tool.\(^{392}\) Due to an oddity of Cook Islands law at the time, all of age Cook Islanders in the Cook Islands and abroad were eligible to vote, but could only do so when physically present in the islands.\(^{393}\) The parties developed a scheme to increase voting by chartering aeroplanes to fly in New Zealand resident Cook Islanders to cast their vote at a reduced cost.\(^{394}\) Henry’s party illegally subsided flights for his party using government funds.\(^{395}\) It was victorious in the election, but he was soon charged and convicted of corruption and election law violations.\(^{396}\) He was thus removed from his position of premier by the court, and his knighthood was revoked.\(^{397}\) Following the court order, opposition party leader Tom Davis (Democratic Party) became premier, marking one of the only times in which a court has successfully deposed a sitting government.\(^{398}\) The Cook Islands Party returned to power in the 1983 elections with Albert Henry's cousin Geoffrey Henry becoming
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prime minister. He served for ten years, followed by a brief term by Joe Williams. The 1999 elections saw the Democratic Alliance Party (a successor to the Democratic Party) taking a majority which they held under Terepai Maoate (until a no-confidence vote in 2002), Robert Woonton (2002-2004) and Jim Marurai until their loss in the 2010 elections. The Cook Islands Party under Henry Puna won both the 2010 and 2014 elections and is currently the majority party.

The Cook Islands, having significant maritime territory, focused much of its early foreign policy on defining these boundaries. In 1980, the United States signed a treaty with the Cook Islands delimiting its the maritime boundaries and dropping the US’s claim to the islands of Penrhyn, Pukapuka, Manihiki, and Rakahanga (on behalf of American Samoa). A similar treaty was signed in 1990 with France that clarified the maritime borders between the Cook Islands and French Polynesia.

Though overall fairly politically stable since the 1978 elections, on June 13, 2008, eight of the 15 high chiefs in the House of Ariki (an advisory body to Parliament) attempted to dissolve the government proclaiming themselves the rightful source of government. They argued for a return to the traditional chief structural and restoration of their power. The attempt failed to gain the support they had expected and ten days
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later they abandoned the effort, and members of the House of Ariki returned to their
typical duties.401

Today, issues of overfishing, global warming and depopulation remain significant
concerns. These concerns, along with development challenges typical of small states,
remain problematic. The relationship with New Zealand does nevertheless soften some of
the effects through foreign aid and migration options.

3.6.4 Fiji

Fiji has generally been thought to have been settled between 2000 and 1000
BCE.402 More recent work suggests that the first settlement may actually have been even
earlier,403 possibly as early as 8000 BCE.404 It is typically thought that Austronesian
peoples first migrated to Fiji followed about 1000 years later by Melanesians.405 The Tu'i
Tonga Empire included Fiji from the 10th century until its fall in the 13th century.406 This
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Tongan empire brought Polynesian culture and language into Fiji, though most indigenous Fijians are Melanesians.\textsuperscript{407}

The islands were first recorded by a western explorer in 1643 when Dutch captain Abel Janszoon Tasman visited north-eastern Fiji.\textsuperscript{408} European trade came heavily to Fiji in the early nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{409} There was extensive trade with Fijian produced sandalwood, and beche-de-mer exchanged for many European tools including muskets.\textsuperscript{410} This trade led to the establishment of the first European settlement, Levuka, in 1822.\textsuperscript{411} Missionaries first came to Fiji in 1830 from the London Missionary Society via Tonga.\textsuperscript{412} They were followed by Methodist missionaries (supported by Tongan Prince Enele Ma'afu) in 1835.\textsuperscript{413}

Fierce warfare amongst rival small kingdoms was common in Fiji for much of the nineteenth century, particularly heightened by recently available muskets.\textsuperscript{414} Using Swedish supplied weapons, Ratu Tanoa Visawaqa, the Vunikava of Bau (essentially Paramount Chief of Bua), took control of much of Western Fiji.\textsuperscript{415} In 1852, Ratu Seru
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Epenisa Cakobau succeeded him. He soon claimed the title of Tui Viti (King of Fiji). His claim was tolerated, but not supported by many of the local chiefs who saw him more in the role of first among equals rather than their ruler. It was also opposed by Ma'afu, who had claimed the Island of Lakeba.

Cakobau claims were also indirectly challenged by an incident in which American consul, John Brown Williams’ store was looted by Fijians after a fire caused by stray American cannon fire during a Fourth of July celebration in 1849. Williams’ house was also burned in a suspected arson attack in 1855. The commander of the United States naval frigate USS John Adams demanded US$38,531 from Cakobau (as King of Fiji) in compensation for these incidents. Unable to pay and with his control of the Fiji limited, he offered to cede the islands to the United Kingdom in exchange for the debt and the condition that his claims as Tui Viti be upheld. After four years of consideration, the United Kingdom rejected the offer. In return for 5,000 km² of land, the Australian-based Polynesia Company paid the debt in 1868. Other settlers soon

---
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arrived with messy land claims and limited actual governance over the settlers.\textsuperscript{426} In June 1871, under the direction of the British honorary consul John Bates Thurston, an arrangement was made in which a constitutional monarchy, with Cakobau as King and a settler-dominated Legislative Assembly, was established.\textsuperscript{427}

Government overspending soon produced excessive debt leading Cakobau to offer again to cede the islands to the British in 1872.\textsuperscript{428} The offer was revised, with his 21 March 1874 offer being accepted leading to British annexation on 10 October 1874.\textsuperscript{429} Though maintaining the title of Vunivalu of Bau, Cakobau, formally ceded the title of Tui Viti to Queen Victoria.\textsuperscript{430}

Sir Arthur Gordon was appointed the first governor of the new colony in June 1875.\textsuperscript{431} He adopted a series of policies that were intended to protect iTaukei.\textsuperscript{432} Central to these was his ban on further land sales (requiring the remaining land be leased) and a prohibition on using iTaukei labourers on the plantations (theoretically to protect them from exploitation).\textsuperscript{433} He also elected to allow the chiefs to maintain control of their local
areas and established the Great Council of Chiefs as an advisory body.\textsuperscript{434} Fijians were also prohibited from enlisting in World War I, again in what was described as an attempt to protect them.\textsuperscript{435} Though these measures allowed for a reasonably good, though highly paternalistic, colonial experience for iTaukei, the prohibition on using iTaukei labourers was a problem for European plantation owners whose business models depended upon cheap labour.

A system of indentured labourers to address the labour shortage was started in 1878 using labourers from India.\textsuperscript{436} The program was ended in 1916 due to concerns of abuse. Over the course of it, around 61,000 people came to Fiji from India.\textsuperscript{437} They worked under a five-year contract, after which they could pay to return to India or work five more years to allow the choice of a paid return to India or staying in Fiji.\textsuperscript{438} The majority choose to stay.\textsuperscript{439} Many parts of the system were quite brutal, and recruiters lied heavily about work conditions and the distance from India.\textsuperscript{440} Labourers were recruited from several parts of India, allowing much more diversity than is typical under the
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indentured labourer system.\textsuperscript{441} This, amongst other factors, also led to the disappearance of caste amongst Indo-Fijians.\textsuperscript{442}

In a shift in British policy, Fijians were allowed to participate in the Second World War.\textsuperscript{443} Many thousand iTaukei joined the Fiji Infantry Regiment which fought in the Solomon Islands campaign.\textsuperscript{444} Fiji was also used as a training base for the Allies.\textsuperscript{445} Indo-Fijians largely did not participate in the war efforts, as their demands for equal treatment with Europeans was refused.\textsuperscript{446} This non-participation was used by ethno-nationalists to justify exclusion and discrimination in the post-war years.\textsuperscript{447}

The Legislative Council became a partly elective body in 1904.\textsuperscript{448} It was, nevertheless, a largely European dominated and the iTaukei members were appointed by the Governor from a list of 6 candidates submitted by the Great Council of Chiefs.\textsuperscript{449} In 1953, the Council became equally divided amongst the three major ethnic groups of
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Fiji. Of the five members each for Indo-Fijians and Europeans, three were elected, and two were appointed. All five iTaukei members were selected by the Great Council of Chiefs.

By the mid-1960s Britain was divesting itself of its colonial empire. Independence was popular amongst Indo-Fijians who felt that it would allow for an end of discriminatory policies. Indo-Fijians were by this time a larger percentage of the population than iTaukei. As such, many iTaukei feared that independence would allow Indo-Fijian domination and a change in land protections. They opposed independence on these grounds. Despite iTaukei opposition, the British were determined to divest themselves of Fiji. A compromise was eventually reached in which Fiji would be governed by a Senate dominated by Fijian chiefs and a popularly elected House of Representatives (with ethnic quotas). Under this arrangement, Fiji became independent on 10 October 1970.
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The Alliance Party of Ratu Sir Kamisese Mara dominated post-independence politics; Mara served as prime minister from 1970 to 1992 (except a brief period in 1987) and as president from 1993 to 2000.\textsuperscript{460} Indo-Fijians took a majority in 1977 but were unable to form a coalition government.\textsuperscript{461} In April 1987, a coalition led by Timoci Bavadra (ethnically iTaukei) formed of Indo-Fijians parties established the government.\textsuperscript{462} This government was removed in a military coup led by Lt. Col. Sitiveni Rabuka on 14 May 1987.\textsuperscript{463} Rabuka, unhappy with the interim government, staged another coup on 25 September 1987.\textsuperscript{464} He declared Fiji a republic on 10 October.\textsuperscript{465} After protests from foreign governments, he resigned on 6 December, and Mara was reappointed prime minister.\textsuperscript{466} A highly problematic and discriminatory constitution was established in July 1990 which guaranteed iTaukei supremacy.\textsuperscript{467} Facing ongoing foreign and domestic pressure, a new constitution was created in 1997 which addressed many of the issues.\textsuperscript{468} The first elections held under the new constitution took place in May 1999 leading to the defeat of Rabuka's coalition by an Indo-Fijian coalition led by Mahendra
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Chaudhry. In May 2000, Chaudhry and much of Parliament were taken hostage in the House of Representatives by an armed group led by George Speight. Speight was an iTaukei failed businessman who had been living in Australia. Though successful in deposing the government, Speight was never able to meaningfully gain any control of the islands. He was unpopular amongst many in Fiji, though the coup itself was seen by a number of iTaukei as needed to address their fears of changes to land laws stroked by ethno-nationalist propaganda. Commodore Frank Bainimarama took control of Fiji soon after and implemented an interim civilian government led by Laisenia Qarase. In the 2001 elections, Qarase defeated Chaudhry. Speight was convicted of treason in 2002.

Controversial legislation to pardon those involved in the coup and allegations of government corruption caused clashes between Bainimarama and Qarase. Tensions between the military and Qarase’s government intensified following the May 2006
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As Qarase was unwilling to meet his demands, Bainimarama launched a military coup on 5 December 2006. Bainimarama arranged to have himself appointed Prime Minister. On 9 April 2009, the Court of Appeal ruled that the coup-appointed government was illegal. In response, Bainimarama dissolved the government and the constitution dismissing all judges, and civil servants. Bainimarama adopted a number of policies designed to address systemic discrimination, corruption and promote development. There were also serious allegations of civil rights violations and government brutality occurring under Bainimarama. A new constitution was established in 2013 and, after several delays, elections were held in September 2014, which were won by Bainimarama under the FijiFirst Party. The coups and relationship to the nationalist movements are discussed in further detail within Chapter 5.

3.7 Conclusions

The four nations of this dissertation provide a valuable, but largely unexplored set of sites at which to study the effects of nationalism. Though in the same region with considerable similarities, the islands have noticeable differences in population, ethnic diversity and
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land rights. Their experiences with colonialism and independence, whilst with many commonalities to each other, represent a reasonably unusual experience when compared with that of other post-colonial nations.

On the global stage, all four nations have tiny populations. Even Hawai‘i and Fiji, the largest of the region, are still smaller than almost 150 other nations. With Niue’s population under two thousand, it is one of the smallest countries in the world. The Cook Islands is nearly ten times larger with a population of a bit over 15,000. Fiji and Hawai‘i have populations of about 880,000 and 1.4 million, respectively. The nations also differ considerably in ethnic diversity. Hawai‘i is one of the most ethnically diverse places in the world. Fiji also has considerable diversity, particularly for a small island nation. Niue and the Cook Islands, in contrast, are some of the most ethnically homogeneous countries globally. This has had significant effects on how ethnonationalism can be utilised in these nations.

Land rights remain a major issue for the islands. Niue and the Cook Islands maintain a complex model intended to meld traditional land ownership practices with Western forms, creating a system of collective family land tenure. This has been problematic as migration from the islands has created issues with the ability to make land use decisions. Fiji mostly operates under a system of long-term land leases. The concerns surrounding the expiration of the leases and the land tenure system, in general, has been the cause of much of the instability in Fiji and is frequently presented by nationalists as one of the largest threats facing the Fijian nation. Within Hawai‘i, the legacy created by the theft of the land taken during the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i remains one of the largest problems the islands face. Perceived improper land stewardship is a
frequent cause of tension and the fight against it has become a core part of Hawaiian nationalism.

The four nations’ colonial experiences were atypical. Fiji, the Cook Islands and Niue became colonies as the result of cession agreements that were initiated by the governments of the islands. Hawai‘i became a territory and state of the United States following the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i. Their colonial powers administered Fiji, the Cook Islands and Niue in such a way that direct impact on the Native peoples was much less than colonial models typically had. Hawai‘i’s situation was also unusual in that the focus of the overthrow was eventual annexation by the United States. The Kingdom of Hawai‘i maintained diplomatic relations with the United States for almost 70 years until the government was overthrown with the support of the US military.

Independence also came differently to the nations (and Hawai‘i has yet to gain independence). The Cook Islands, and particularly Niue, showed considerable reluctance to become independent states. New Zealand, however, was a vocal advocate for decolonisation and was in a politically embarrassing situation in having its own colonies whilst advocating for other to divest themselves of their colonial holdings. However, the islands’ relationship with New Zealand was fairly positive, and their economic and logistic dependancy was well recognised. These concerns led to the formation of the new concept of “free association”. This arrangement created a system under which the islands could outsource to New Zealand the governmental functions they were unable to provide, yet still be an independent nation. Within Fiji, independence was mostly the result of advocacy from Indo-Fijians. Many iTaukeis saw the colonial arrangement as serving them reasonably well, with no urgency towards autonomy. When Fiji did gain
independence, its changeover celebration was carefully designed to be a calm and respectful handover of power.

Hawai‘i is today a part of the United States. Though calls for independence are frequent and many describe Hawaii’s current status as under occupation, there has not been a viable path to independence for decades. Hawaii’s position is relatively unique in that it had a recognised government prior to being invaded by a geographical remote larger state. Its later full incorporation into that state is also unusual.

Each of the nation’s histories, and particularly their colonial experiences, has produced a legacy that has very interesting effects upon how sovereignty and nationalism are manifested in these islands. There are several areas explored in the following chapters in which we can see these effects. The expression of sovereignty in Niue, the Cook Islands and Hawai‘i has especially been shaped by the islands’ experiences with colonialism and occupation. The manifestation of hot nationalism in Fiji and Hawai‘i, likewise has a clear historical basis. Though the effects can sometimes be subtle, much of nationalism in these islands can be connected back to the nation’s historical formation and experiences.
Chapter 4

4 Sovereignty

Sovereignty and nationalism are two extremely closely connected concepts.484 As Ichijo notes, “nationalism is typically equated with a nation achieving independence.”485 Protecting and asserting sovereignty is assumed to be one of the major interests of a nation.486 It is often one of the primary focuses of nationalists. For recognised nations, nationalist attention will be on protecting the sovereignty of the nation from internal and external threats (which may or may not actually exist). Unrecognised/under-recognised nations will generally see nationalists attempting to assert their nation’s sovereignty. Sovereignty is, however, not absolute for any modern state. Every state faces a variety of limitations and external pressures that prevent it from acting as a complete sovereign entity. Many nationalists now recognise that absolute state sovereignty is no longer an achievable goal today.487 Nationalist movements in several areas have as a result become increasingly creative in the ways in which they seek to build a sovereign nation (several of the more creative attempts can be seen utilised by nations within this dissertation). This chapter will explore what sovereignty and particularly statehood means for each of
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the nations. None of them fit the classic model of a fully sovereign state. As such, they provide an interesting set of examples of how sovereignty applies to smaller nations.

Fiji, as the least ambiguous sovereign nation in this dissertation, faces the typical challenges of a small state. Though there are no competing claims for its territory or overt attempts to undermine its sovereignty by other states, their ability to express their sovereignty is nevertheless limited. Economic dependency, pressure from NGOs and multinational organisations, and occasional breaches by its neighbours, prevent Fiji from operating as a fully sovereign nation. The effects of globalisation and interference by larger states have meant that many small nations are unable to function as a sovereign state in the same way that larger more powerful states can. Despite the practical limitations in expressing its sovereignty, Fiji remains widely recognised as a sovereign nation.

Niue’s and the Cook Islands’ situations are greatly complicated by the unusualness of their free association agreements. This agreement has them effectively outsourcing some areas of sovereignty to New Zealand. As extremely small nations, they are highly dependent upon New Zealand both financially and logistically. Whilst the free association agreement is unusual, as this chapter will show, they are nevertheless legally fully sovereign states. Though the legal position is reasonably clear, their size and uncommon governance status challenge the popular conception of what a sovereign state “should” be like.

The situation for Hawaii’s sovereignty is extremely muddled. There is no escaping the fact that Hawai‘i is under the control of the United States. However, its position under international law is debatable. The government of Hawai‘i was
overthrown in 1893, with the United States providing military support for the overthrow, contrary to international law. Its incorporation into the United States as a territory and later a state are similarly legally problematic.

Additionally, Hawaii’s geographic remoteness and the United States’ federalist system has allowed a level of legal sovereignty in ways that would otherwise be unexpected. Sovereignty is the primary battleground for nationalists in Hawai‘i. Given the ambiguity of its legal status, they are increasingly focusing their energies on ways in which tools such as legal definitions of sovereignty can be employed in the struggle for the restoration of a sovereign Hawaiian nation.

This chapter explores how these four nation’s sovereignties can be defined and how these definitions are utilised by nationalists. After a brief discussion of the types of sovereignty, I will explore how each nation fits into the various criteria for statehood (international legal sovereignty) and the multitude of issues they face in asserting their sovereignty.

The factual basis for many of the common arguments surrounding the nations’ sovereignty is also looked at within this chapter so as to provide a point of reference for exploring the creativity of the claims of nationalists. A full legal analysis of these arguments is outside of the scope of this dissertation. However, by providing a brief exploration I hope to demonstrate the ways in which nationalists have embraced conceptions of sovereignty and expanded their use to activities that would traditionally be out of scope for studies of nationalism.

In Niue and the Cook Islands, the way in which the legal community describes the states is congruent with how nationalists present its status. Despite this, there exists a
popular impression in other nations that Niue and the Cook Islands are not actually sovereign given their special status. In Fiji, without a meaningfully contested status, sovereignty is generally discussed by nationalists only in the context of how other nations are breaching it. Whilst any case in which a nation's borders are breached is concerning, nationalists have used these cases far beyond the actual impact of the breaches. Hawaiian nationalists present a fascinating case. The way in which sovereignty activists typically present Hawaii’s legal status differs noticeably from that which the legal community typically considers accepted. Many of their claims even go so far beyond the legal consensus that they can almost be seen as creating a new conception of what the term sovereignty means.

4.1 Types of Sovereignty

Krasner in his highly influential book *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy* presents four conceptions of sovereignty: international legal, Westphalian, interdependence, and domestic. This model recognises the limitations of the notion of absolute state sovereignty and describes the situations in which sovereignty can acceptably be breached. For legally focused nationalists, these provide the models under which their nation is able to define itself. Within nations that have contested sovereignty, discussions of exactly how their nation meets one of these criteria are becoming of growing importance for nationalist movements. As international law gains public attention, supporters are no longer content with vague folk notions of the meaning of independence. Increasingly

---

nationalists will frame their argument for independence around (often poorly applied) expressions of one of the commonly recognised sovereignty models.

*International legal sovereignty* refers to states recognising one another as independent. The two dominant models for recognising statehood are the declarative theory and the constitutive theory. Both are discussed in detail in the following section. Of the four nations, only Fiji has an entirely unambiguous case for international legal sovereignty. Niue and the Cook Islands have a somewhat less clear case, whilst today’s Hawai’i has virtually no ability to claim international legal sovereignty.

*Westphalian sovereignty* recognises that each state has full authority over its territory and domestic affairs without interference from any other state. Though somewhat eroded by globalisation and intentionally limited by principles of universal human rights, states are expected to respect the territorial integrity of other states. Fiji, Niue and the Cook Islands all have full Westphalian sovereignty (at least as much as any other small state today). Hawai’i by virtue of the continued US presence clearly does not have any Westphalian sovereignty.

*Interdependence sovereignty* is the ability to control the flow of people, goods, and capital across the state’s borders. It has been severely curtailed by globalisation. Though greatly reduced from that which could be seen in previous ages, Fiji, the Cook
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Islands and Niue all largely maintain this power. Even Hawai‘i has some limited authority in this area (though of course still subject to US federal authority).

*Domestic sovereignty* refers to a state’s capacity to develop and deploy policy within the state.492 Fiji, the Cook Islands, and Niue all unambiguously have this power. Within the system of federalism which the United States utilises, the State of Hawaii has a reasonable amount of domestic sovereignty. Despite a number of powers reserved to the Federal government, the federalist system leaves most domestic government functions within the control of US states.

### 4.2 Criteria for Statehood

There are two dominant theories defining the criteria for statehood (and with it, international legal sovereignty) under international law; the declarative theory and the constitutive theory. Both models have reasonably significant limitations, which becomes increasingly clear in edge cases, such as extremely small states and groups struggling for independence. Further, neither model has universal acceptance in the international community. They, nevertheless, represent the currently most accepted way for statehood to be defined. The ambiguity that these definitions feature represents one of the significant concerns for many nationalists. It forces a focus on the question of whether a state is in-fact a state. This creates a situation in several nations where much of the nationalist energy is focused primarily upon showing their nation’s legitimacy and even existence. In contrast, most larger and more recognised states typically do not have to
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concern themselves with the question of whether they are really a state as it is self-evident.

4.2.1 Declarative Theory

The declarative theory suggests that a state is a state because it has declared that it is one through the meeting of certain criteria. The 1933 Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States largely codifies the declarative theory of statehood and provides the classic definition of a state as recognised within modern international law.\textsuperscript{493} The first article of the treaty describes a state as possessing “(a) a permanent population; (b) a defined territory; (c) government; and (d) capacity to enter into relations with the other states.” Further, it declares in article 3 that ”the political existence of the state is independent of recognition by the other states.” The Badinter Arbitration Committee of the European Union adopted a fairly similar definition, in which they stated that “the State is commonly defined as a community which consists of a territory and a population subject to an organised political authority; that such a state is characterized by sovereignty.”

4.2.1.1 Permanent Population

The first criterion of the Montevideo Convention is that the state\textsuperscript{494} possesses a permanent population. For this definition, the permanent population does not exclude

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{494} Though it can be somewhat ambiguous in the case of Hawai‘i, for the purposes of this discussion of statehood under the Montevideo Convention (and continued throughout this chapter), the term state should be assumed to be used to refer to theoretically independent sovereign Hawai‘i rather than the State
transitory or nomadic groups. Rather, it requires a more nebulous criterion of permanent bonds to the territory. It is recognised that a state cannot be solely composed of foreigners, however, how a person becomes counted in the state’s permanent population is undefined. This criterion seems to be best represented in most nation-states by the sense of inclusion that is encompassed by Anderson’s theory of imagined community. The vague sense of belonging to a nation seems to be what the Montevideo Convention is trying to clumsily capture within the notion of a permanent population. One opinion on this by the German Bundesverfassungsgericht (Federal Constitutional Court of Germany) in Re Duchy of Sealand suggested that the population should form a “cohesive and vibrant community”.

There is not a minimum size specified for statehood. In theory, any number of people, no matter how few, could form a state. There is, however, a practical, though...
ultimately undefinable, lower bound to the population; to have even a minimally functional government requires a certain number of people in order to provide basic services. Provided this minimal number is reached there does not seem to be a problem with having extremely small states. The United Nations in 1974, as part of the UN Committee 24, expressed concern about the size of non-self-governing states seeking statehood.\(^{501}\) The UN today does not seem to share this concern any longer.\(^ {502}\) UN reports have repeatedly noted that they recognised the “the aspirations of the peoples of the [Non-Self-Governing] Territories” for self-governance and the need to find solutions for self-determination “without any prejudice to territorial size, geographical location, size of the population or natural resources”. This report on Non-Self-Governing Territories also expressed concern with the continued existence of Non-Self-Governing Territories and notes that “all available options for self-determination of the Territories are valid as long as they are in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned and in conformity with” the principles expressed in previous UN resolutions.\(^ {503}\) Given that this list currently includes the sparsely populated territories of the Pitcairn Islands (pop. 50), Tokelau (pop, 1,411) and the Falkland Islands (pop, 2,500), this would suggest that, at least in principle, the UN allows for statehood despite an extremely small population.
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Niue, as of the last annual estimate, had a population of around 1,400.\textsuperscript{504} It thus has a smaller population than any UN member state. The island nations of Nauru and Tuvalu, which are currently the smallest UN member states, have populations almost seven times larger than Niue.\textsuperscript{505} If Niue were to seek UN membership, it would have by far the smallest population within its borders of any UN member state. However, when considering the population size of Niue, the large number of Niueans abroad should also likely be included. Niueans living in other countries represent a much larger group than those still in Niue. New Zealand alone, accounts for over twenty thousand Niueans abroad.\textsuperscript{506} If this population were included in any metrics of size, it would make Niue one of the smallest, but no longer the absolute smallest.

The Cook Islands, whilst still a fairly small state with a population of almost twenty thousand, is still larger than UN member states Nauru, Tuvalu, and Palau.\textsuperscript{507} Population size is not an issue at all for either Fiji or Hawai‘i. Fiji’s population of about eight hundred and fifty thousand and Hawaii’s population of almost 1.5 million make them larger than several dozen existing UN member states. Problematic for a sovereign Hawai‘i, however, is the implied requirement for acceptance of the population’s inclusion
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in the state and the fact that the population is claimed by another state. Though not directly expressed, it seems as a practical point that the population must acknowledge at some level the existence of the state which is claiming them. To allow otherwise would violate the principle of community that this criterion seems to seek. This point may be academic, though, as most states with contested populations also have more serious issues in defining territory.

4.2.1.2 Defined Territory

The criterion of defined territory has been somewhat problematic to delineate. At its most basic level, it seems to require only that the state be able to actually define what its borders are. A state needs to be able to say where the state starts and where it ends. This ties fairly cleanly into Anderson’s notion of the nation being bounded. Though this seems to be a reasonably straightforward criterion, several states have expressed concern with how disputed territory can qualify under this definition.508 In regards to the admission of Israel to the UN, the Syrian delegate in the 1948 assembly stated that “the first qualification is that it should have a defined territory which is not contested by other States”.509 A US delegate made a similar statement arguing that “the reason for the rule that one of the necessary attributes of a state is that it shall possess territory is that one cannot contemplate a state as a kind of disembodied spirit”.510 In essence, they are arguing that the state must have a clear title to their territory in order for it to count.
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This definition seems to create a virtually impossible barrier to statehood if it were to be evenly and unhypocritically applied. There are hundreds of ongoing border disputes, many of which extend back to the state’s founding. Even the normally peaceful neighbours of the United States and Canada maintain an extremely low-key dispute created by an ambiguity in the Treaty of Paris over Machias Seal Island. The small island is on the border of the Bay of Fundy and the Gulf of Maine and is occupied only by an ongoing rotation of 2 Canadian Coast Guard lighthouse keepers, but both states claim it. To suggest that all disputes over territory, even fairly insignificant ones such as these, should block statehood creates serious issues for most states. Even the more generous interpretation of the Syrian and US suggestions that a state must have at least some of its territory undisputed (which would still block Israel but does not create issue for Syria in their dispute with Turkey over the Hatay Province), undesirably places considerable power to block statehood in the hands of any other state willing to make a claim. Despite the inconsistency in the UN, the International Court of Justice has repeatedly found that not all of the territory has to be free of controversy in order to be considered defined territory.511 As such, the control of Hawaii’s territory by the United States and the ongoing dispute over the rightful owners of the territory does not seem in itself to block Hawaii from meeting this criterion.

The qualifying size of the territory is not defined by the Montevideo Convention. The German Bundesverfassungsgericht in *Re Duchy of Sealand* noted that size was irrelevant to statehood. This case centred around a 0.03km² artificial island that was
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claiming statehood. Given a willingness to accept this a state (though Sealand statehood was rejected on other grounds), there does not seem to be a meaningful lower limit to the size of territory. Further, Niue with a territory of 260 km$^2$ and the Cook Islands with a territory of 236 km$^2$, though extremely small, are still larger than several UN member states (the Marshall Islands, Liechtenstein, San Marino, Tuvalu, Nauru, and Monaco). Likewise, Hawaiʻi and Fiji are both significantly larger than quite a few UN member states with total areas of 28,311 km$^2$ and 18,272 km$^2$ respectively. If we are to consider the Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZ) of each state as a part of the defined territory, all four grow considerably in comparison with other states. Hawaiʻi and the Cook Islands both have extremely large exclusive economic zones owing to their widely dispersed island nature. Hawaiʻi’s EEZ$^{512}$ covers over 2.3 million km$^2$ and the Cook Islands has an EEZ greater than 1.8 million km$^2$ placing them in the top 20 largest EEZs. Fiji and Niue, though with somewhat smaller EEZs, are still larger than the majority of global states. In a comparison of total controlled territory (exclusive economic zone plus total internal area), the four nations of this paper actually become amongst the larger world states.

4.2.1.3 Government

A government is required under the Montevideo Convention criteria. The type or system of government is not defined and is generally not considered a meaningful part of

\footnote{512 This assumes that both the main islands of Hawaiʻi and Northwestern Hawaiian Islands are included. There is some debate over the qualification of some of the geographically spread uninhabited northwest islands which is used to justify an EEZ of 1.6 million km$^2$. The islands are uninhabited and have a total land area of around 8km$^2$. Since the US is in a strong world position to defend an overly inclusive EEZ it has been mostly accepted, but an independent Hawaiʻi would not be as able to force the world to accept its claims.}
the criteria for statehood. Along with Article 1(2), it is very strongly implied in the
definition that the government must be independent (at least theoretically) and have
control of their domestic affairs. Each of the nations in this paper has some form of
government meeting this definition, though Hawai‘i has issues with the independence
requirement.

The Government of Niue consists of the Premier of Niue, a 20-member elected
Assembly, 14 village councils, the Court of Appeal and the High Court of Niue.513 Under
the Premier is the Ministry of Infrastructure, the Ministry of Natural Resources, the
Ministry of Social Services, the Central Agencies (Finance & Planning, Police, etc.) and
the Commercial & Trading Arm (Broadcasting Corporation of Niue, Tourism, etc.).
Though many of the groups within the government are extremely small, and members of
government often hold many roles (the current Premier, for example, is also the Minister
of Transport, the Niue Development Bank, Police and National Security, and seven other
areas), the government is fully formed and is of similar complexity to other larger states.

The Cook Islands is a representative democracy with a parliamentary system. It
has a prime minister, parliamentary legislature and an independent judiciary. The
executive branch has several dozen ministries and departments representing the typical
governmental needs of a small island nation.

Though interrupted by coups, Fiji has generally functioned as a parliamentary
representative democratic republic with a well-developed executive, legislature and

513 The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the UK serves as Niue’s highest court.
independent judiciary. Like the other states above, there is no issue for Fiji under this criterion.

This criterion of a sovereign government is very problematic for Hawai‘i. Prior to the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i in 1893, Hawai‘i maintained a fully sovereign government, except for a brief period of foreign occupation by the British in 1843. The arguably sovereign Provisional Government of Hawaii was established after the overthrow of the Kingdom, leading to the Republic of Hawai‘i in 1894. The Newlands Resolution in 1898 established the Territory of Hawaii as organised incorporated territory of the United States, fully ending any form of recognised independent governance for Hawai‘i. Though it has received very little legal support, the possibility of a Hawaiian government in exile/under occupation is explored later in this chapter. A limited argument could also potentially be made that the State of Hawaii fills the spirit of the criterion expressed in the Montevideo Convention. This argument is also explored later in this dissertation.

As of today, there is not a functional government in Hawai‘i independent of the State of Hawaii. Though several sovereignty groups have attempted to re-establish governments, they have not received much serious attention, and none have been able to provide even minimal government services or exercise any control over territories larger than personal residences or essentially squatter communities in public parks. Though sovereignty groups have frequently “appointed” people to various positions of their “government”, these appointments fail to convey any actual power or often any meaningful duties. Rather the governments seem to exist only as organisational charts online. Few groups have even managed to reach the point where they have established
the basic symbols of government, much less any real progress towards forming a credible state.

If we are to look at the State of Hawaii as the unit of government (somewhat ignoring Article 1(2)), the State of Hawaii provides the vast majority of the major services that are expected of a country with the noticeable exception of immigration services. The Federal Government also exclusively prints money and provides postal services. Other powers reserved to the Federal Government, and thus unavailable to the State of Hawaii, include the power to regulate interstate and international trade, make treaties and conduct foreign policy, declare war and form an army and navy.

Though these powers are reserved to the US Federal Government, their absence is not especially problematic in this case. Hawai‘i, like all other US states, has a reserve military force in the form of the Hawaii National Guard. During typical operations, the National Guard operates under the state governor and may be called up to respond to emergencies or otherwise as designated by the governor. National Guard units may also be “federalized” in which authority is transferred to the US president under certain conditions. Hawai‘i also has a currently inactive State Defense Force which is designed to protect the state when the Hawaii National Guard is mobilised and is under the authority of the governor. The State Defense Force is formed of retired military and other selected volunteers. The presence of a military force under the control of the local government could be seen to lend considerable legitimacy to the State of Hawaii forming its own government for the purposes of the Montevideo Convention. However, neither the Hawaii National Guard nor the State Defence Force would be especially useful in a real contested sovereignty scenario as US federal law (10 USC § 332) allows the National
Guard to be federalised to enforce Federal authority and the State Defence Force is formed primarily of US Military retirees. With respect to the power to print money, Section 10 of the US Constitution forbids states to “coin money” or “emit bills of credit”. This lack of an independent currency is not necessarily a problem, given that several independent countries use other country's currency (for example, El Salvador and the Turks and Caicos Islands exclusively use the US dollar). Finally, there exists a chicken and egg problem for immigration services as well as general foreign policy. As a part of the United States, the State of Hawai'i whilst has no need nor ability to meaningfully offer these services and thus does not offer them (creating this gap in services). However, should it gain independence, there is no reason to believe that the new government would be unable to provide these functions\(^5\).

4.2.1.4 Capacity to Enter into Relations with Other States

The requirement of a capacity to enter into relations with other states is one of the more obtuse requirements of the Montevideo Convention. Though it is most clearly met by states having active diplomatic relations with other states, the requirement seems only that the state has the means to enter into a relationship and the ability to bind the state to any agreements made in this relationship.\(^5\) However, even if the capacity exists, there

---

514 Despite the limitations, Hawai‘i officials have increasingly involved themselves in immigration policy and foreign affairs including a Hawai‘i member of Congress meeting with Syria’s President Bashar al-Assad in an effort to end the civil war there. In many ways Hawai‘i has already been more involved in foreign policy than other small nations.

does not appear to be any requirement that states actually do enter into relations with other states. Many small states will have fairly low numbers of diplomatic missions from other countries to their state and limited numbers of foreign missions to other countries.

Liechtenstein and the Vatican City both lack any resident embassies or consulates located within their territory. Other small states such as Palau, Nauru, Micronesia, the Marshall Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Lesotho, Kiribati and Saint Kitts and Nevis each have less than five resident embassies. They also each have very few embassies of their own abroad. Micronesia, Tuvalu, Tonga and Palau each operate four overseas embassies, Nauru and Kiribati have two, and the others above have less than 15. Though these small numbers are supplemented by honorary consulates and non-resident representatives, many states largely lack any sort of meaningful diplomatic relations in a multitude of other states. This is not generally interpreted as a statement on the state’s lack of sovereignty, but rather a reflection of practical realities.

Embassies can be very costly to operate. On the high side is the US Embassy in Baghdad with a USD$700 million facility\(^\text{516}\) and a post-war operating cost of USD$1.8 billion a year.\(^\text{517}\) Other US embassies and consulates have been much cheaper to construct with lower operating costs but are still exceptionally expensive compared to


most small states’ budgets.\textsuperscript{518} For smaller countries like Ireland, the cost can be lower due to reduced security and staffing needs. It remains nevertheless quite expensive. Ireland spent an average of €740,000 per embassy/consulate a year on operating costs (excluding Department of Foreign Affairs staff). Even for small island nations costs can be fairly high. Fiji’s current budget allocates a little over FJDS$31 million for overseas missions.\textsuperscript{519} With 20 overseas missions, Fiji is spending over FJDS$1.5 million per mission (assuming zero cost for honorary consulates\textsuperscript{520}). To have diplomatic missions to every UN member state, even at Fiji’s lower budgeted cost, would alone cost about two-thirds the GDP of the Cook Islands, 14 times the GDP of Niue and whilst overall a small portion of GDP would be a very noticeable increase in Fiji’s government expenditures.

States also often lack any practical need for especially developed diplomatic relations. States may have little meaningful effect upon each other. Even within today’s increasingly globalising world, many states will never have an ongoing need to interact with quite a few other distant states. For example, the small island state of Seychelles lacks any resident diplomatic missions to any Oceania state, and there are none within


\textsuperscript{520} The cost of honorary consulates can vary wildly depending upon how the country uses them. Costs can be extremely low covering little more than providing the country’s flag and stamp, to almost as much as a typical embassy including significant physical property and meaningful expenses associated with conducting business.
Seychelles from any Oceania state. This is unsurprising given the near complete lack of connection they have. It is almost 10,000 kilometres away from the closest Oceania state and thus has no territorial connection. There is also no significant trade between them and Seychelles is not meaningfully competing with any Oceania state. Even within tourism, there is little connection. Most months saw less than three visitors to Seychelles from Oceania with many months having not a single Oceania visitor.\(^{521}\) As such, there is little practical need for the states to have any significant diplomatic relations beyond creating the basic frameworks of diplomacy. Establishing a resident embassy for these states would be a completely unnecessary expenditure. Rather a system in which states have an ambassador accredited to multiple states or outsource their consular services to another state is used. For example, the Fijian ambassador to the UAE is also accredited to Seychelles along with several other states and Canadians in Hawai‘i are advised to seek consular services from the Consulate General of Australia in Honolulu.

The Cook Islands and Niue by the handful of states they have diplomatic relations with seem to have demonstrated that they have the capacity to enter into relations with other states but choose to do so very infrequently. Fiji, in contrast, by their active participation in world affairs, has shown that they have both the capacity and desire to exercise it. Hawai‘i is in a very problematic position in this regard. Though the pre-overthrow Kingdom of Hawai‘i had relations with many other states, the State of Hawai‘i and the sovereignty activists’ kingdoms have very little ability to do so. It is perhaps

meaningful for this criterion that there are a number of consulates located within Hawai‘i, but as these do not recognise Hawaiian sovereignty their value in this regard is uncertain.

4.2.2 Constitutive Theory

The constitutive theory provides the other major model of statehood. It suggests that a state exists when other states recognise it as a state. Recognition, in this model, is the only meaningful criterion for determining legitimacy. This theory takes a very practical approach. For its citizens, a state which is unrecognised is of little utility when they are outside their home state. Declaring the existence of the state is fairly useless to its citizens abroad if the state’s passports are unrecognised, its currency not exchangeable and it is not able to provide consular services.

Conversely, within the state, recognition by other states may have, potentially, little practical effect on its citizens’ daily lives. Assuming an otherwise functional government, international recognition means little to the presence of police and fire services, garbage collection, road maintenance and the multitude of other services a government can provide regardless of recognition. Even completely unrecognised states may maintain the ability to enforce laws on their citizens independently of their international recognition. Though a strict interpretation of the constitutive theory mandates it, in practice, states do not regard unrecognised states at *terra nullius* (nobody's

---
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land). Even when other states are not willing to formally recognise the state, they still seem to maintain a form of pseudo-recognition.

The approach of the constitutive theory seems very rational and useful in that it completely shifts from an impossible to precisely define criteria to something that should be clear and measurable. It, however, seems to rely upon a very naive worldview. For this model to work, states are to recognise other states as sovereign whenever they are actually sovereign. Though the criteria are left undefined for the ways in which states are to make their determination, it seems to mostly be assumed that states will recognise all “real” sovereign states. Unviable or unconvincing attempts that technically meet Montevideo Convention can be safely ignored under this model using a common sense-esque approach. Where this theory appears to fall apart is when the decision of recognition is made by the state for solely political reasons. It seems absurd to say well-established de facto states such as Taiwan, Israel or Palestine are not real states because others have chosen to make a political point by not recognising them. Further, it allows for the extremely messy notion of governments in exile. Under the model of the constitutive theory, a government can exist without any practical control or influence over its territory solely because other countries are willing to accept the claim. The utility or sensibility of recognising states whose ability to negotiate is on a solely theoretical basis is highly questionable. This model overall creates a situation in which the law no longer reflects facts.

This theory is also highly problematic in regard to the right to self-determination. Under this approach, if states are to decide that another state does not exist regardless of the reality or the peoples of the state’s will, then it does not exist as far as international
law is concerned. More secure states thus become able to use recognition as a bargaining chip and a tool to enforce their will on smaller states.

Under the constitutive theory, the Kingdom of Hawai‘i (pre-1893) does appear to have a strong claim for statehood. The Kingdom of Hawai‘i had a significant number of states with diplomatic presences in Hawai‘i and Hawai‘i likewise had significant representation across the world. They signed a number of treaties with other states and participated in the Universal Postal Union. The Provisional Government of Hawaii and its successor the Republic of Hawaii should also be recognised under the constitutive theory. Despite a brief delay by Japan in recognising the Provisional Government of Hawai‘i, all of the states that had recognised the Kingdom of Hawai‘i immediately recognised the Provisional Government.\textsuperscript{524} Similarly, all of these states soon recognised the Republic of Hawai‘i.\textsuperscript{525} Today, though a number of states have diplomatic missions located in the State of Hawaii, none of these missions are actually to Hawai‘i. Rather they are all consulates to the United States. The geographic distance from other consulates and the demographics of Hawai‘i have resulted in an unusually high concentration of diplomatic missions when compared with most other smaller US states creating a clear impression of difference in foreign affairs. However, as all of the consulates in Hawai‘i are to the United States, they do not provide any benefit to sovereignty claims under the constitutive theory.

\textsuperscript{524} Morgan, John. ‘Report to the Committee on Foreign Relations’,1894.

\textsuperscript{525} Ibid.
Fiji has no problem with recognition under the constitutive theory. They have diplomatic relations with much of the world and participate in a variety of international organisations. Further, as a United Nations member, their existence as a state is well recognised. It has frequently been argued that UN members have an obligation to recognise all other members as states.\textsuperscript{526}

The Cook Islands’ case is somewhat weaker, but it can still be considered a sovereign state under the constitutive theory. Though they have limited diplomatic missions to other states and even fewer from other states, they do have formal diplomatic relations with a large number of states. The Cook Islands, however, are not currently a UN member state; nor have they applied to become one. Nevertheless, they do participate in UN associated agencies such as UNESCO and WHO as a state.

Niue has only a single diplomatic mission located within its borders and only two overseas diplomatic missions of Niue. Just a few dozen states have formal diplomatic relations with Niue. Similarly, to the Cook Islands, though not a UN member state, Niue does participate in UN associated agencies such as UNESCO and WHO as a state. Given the constitutive theory’s vagueness on the threshold for recognition, it remains unclear if Niue can be considered a recognised state. However, given the power of the states that have diplomatic relations with Niue (including a third of the Security Council) and the lack of objection to their recognition, it would seem that Niue should probably be considered a state under this theory.

\textsuperscript{526} Raic, \textit{Statehood and the Law of Self-Determination}. 
4.2.3 Exploitation of the Montevideo Convention Model by Nationalists

The declarative theory, as expressed in the Montevideo Convention model, seems to encourage sovereignty activists across the world to essentially “play pretend”. They have deluded themselves into thinking that if they claim a bit of land, give their friends desirable titles in their play government and get an oblivious immigration agent to stamp their freshly printed passport, they now have a sovereign state. The Constitutive model resolves this somewhat in allowing states to shut down claims of sovereignty by pointing to a lack of recognition. Even in this model, activists have come up with some very creatively absurd ways to show recognition. For example, Sealand, an extremely small artificial sea platform that was then in international waters, has long claimed to sovereignty in part because of what they argue is recognition by Germany. This recognition consists solely of a single incident in which Germany sent a diplomat to help negotiate the release of a German citizen which Sealand was holding hostage. This clear lack of common sense in the interpretation of the Montevideo Convention model has

527 For example, the World Government of World Citizens provides a fairly extensive list of passport stamps that they have received using their “WSA Passports” which they present as evidence of recognition. Despite having apparently received entry into many countries, most of these stamps are decades old and best represent an unaware or conflict-avoidant immigration officer rather than meaningful recognition. The Hawaiian Kingdom (Akahi Nui) similarly seems to be very proud to have obtained a Swiss visa using one of their passports and notes travel throughout Europe on a Hawaiian Kingdom passport. Hawaiian Kingdom passports, however, are officially considered by the EU to be unacceptable for affixing a visa (as are WSA Passports). These groups seem to feel that what is likely a mistake by a single border agent should counter clearly and explicitly stated immigration/visa policy.
allowed many activists to try for legalistic approaches to justify sovereignty where it clearly does not exist.

4.3 Challenges for Statehood

Despite the clarity provided by the theories mentioned above, there remain several challenges for the unambiguous declaration of statehood which affect the nations of this dissertation. None of them are in-fact barriers to statehood, but each creates concerns for the popular conception of what it means to be an independent state.

4.3.1 Unusual Approaches to Foreign Affairs

In discussions of the sovereignty of Niue and the Cook Islands, their choice to delegate some aspects of foreign affairs to New Zealand is often presented as a barrier to sovereign statehood. This, however, should not be considered to be the case. As per their free association agreement, New Zealand provides foreign affairs and defence assistance, but only when requested by Niue or the Cook Islands. This section will show that while this agreement seems unusual (only three other states have free association arrangements), there are actually a number of other states that have similarly atypical arrangements. These states have adopted non-typical arrangements in which consular services and diplomatic representation are provided by third parties including other states. These services are provided under an agreement which defines the arrangement without any recognised effect on overall sovereignty.

One form of atypical diplomatic representation is through a “protecting power”. During wartime, most states will suspend all diplomatic relations and withdraw its
diplomats from the state they are in conflict with. Under the rules of the Geneva Conventions, the belligerents appoint a protecting power to handle diplomatic relations between them and to oversee the application of the Geneva Conventions. During peacetime, states may select a protecting power if they would otherwise lack diplomatic relations with another state. The protecting power remains a representative of their own state, but anything done on behalf of the protected state is considered to be as the representative of the protected state. The protecting power’s mandate can either be comprehensive, wherein the protecting power provides all diplomatic functions on behalf of the protected state, or it can function as a way to allow for an informal exchange of representatives of the protected state. Australia, Canada, and the United States are represented under a comprehensive agreement by Sweden within North Korea. Canada and Iran have a similar arrangement in which Italy serves as a protecting power for Canada in Iran, and Oman serves as a protecting power for Iran in Canada.

529 Ibid.
530 Ibid.
531 Ibid.
interest sections are also operated by Switzerland in several of its embassies. These sections are officially a part of the Swiss embassy but are staffed by nationals of the protected state. Switzerland serves as the protecting power for both Iran and Saudi Arabia, as well as between Russia and Georgia. They also represent Iran in Egypt and the United States in Iran. With the instability in Syria, the United States, Australia and Canada were represented in Syria as a protected state by the Czech Republic (US), Hungary (Canada) and Romania (Australia).

In addition to protected power arrangements, several countries have also signed agreements to handle consular services in countries in which they lack representation for reasons other than conflict. Amongst the most comprehensive of these is the Canada-Australia Consular Services Sharing Agreement. This agreement specifies 17 Canadian missions that are to provide consular services for Australia and 12 Australian missions that are responsible for providing representation for Canada in specifically designated consular areas. All of the Australian missions are located within Oceania, whilst the


535 Ibid.
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Canadian missions are mostly in the Americas and Africa.\textsuperscript{539} Under this bilateral agreement, the missions are responsible for providing typical consular services (with the notable exception of non-emergency visa and passport processing) in accordance with the appropriate consular guide.\textsuperscript{540} These agreements are somewhat unique in their level of formalisation. However, limited consular assistance has long been provided on a “best-endeavour basis” between New Zealand Australia, Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom under an informal agreement.\textsuperscript{541}

European Union states also have a mechanism for shared diplomatic services. Article 20 section 2c of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union states that citizens of member states have “the right to enjoy, in the territory of a third country in which the Member State of which they are nationals is not represented, the protection of the diplomatic and consular authorities of any Member State on the same conditions as the nationals of that State”. Under this arrangement, European Union citizens are entitled to consular representation by other EU states, if their state does not have “accessible permanent representation” or appropriate Honorary Consul in the area.\textsuperscript{542} The states are

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{539} Ibid. \\
\textsuperscript{540} Ibid. \\
\textsuperscript{542} Roberts, \textit{Satow’s Diplomatic Practice}. 
\end{flushleft}
obligated to treat the person as if they were a citizen of their own country and provide equal consular services.\textsuperscript{543}

Colocation has also been adopted in several countries to lower the cost of operating embassies. Under these arrangements, allied states will share the physical space of an embassy and support staff. Though each state’s diplomatic staff is separate, counter staff and security will be shared allowing for greater efficiency and lower cost.\textsuperscript{544} The joint Nordic embassies in Berlin provide one of the more visible examples of this model.\textsuperscript{545} Following the relocation of the German capital, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden established a large joint complex with a shared entrance and communal building.\textsuperscript{546} The United Kingdom and Canada have also established a Memorandum of Understanding for Enhancing Mutual Support at Missions Abroad which provides a similar framework for establishing co-located embassies.\textsuperscript{547} This model only minimally reduces a state’s sovereignty in that it creates some discularity with regard to whom shared staff are representing, as well as reducing the physical space of the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{543} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{546} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{547} Foreign & Commonwealth Office, “Memorandum of Understanding between the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade of Canada. Memorandum of Understanding for Enhancing Mutual Support at Missions Abroad.”
\end{itemize}
embassy's exclusive sovereignty. It is, however, explicitly allowed under the 1963 Vienna Convention on Consular Relations.\textsuperscript{548}

Several countries have entered into arrangements with private companies in order to outsource some consular services.\textsuperscript{549} For example, India has outsourced visa applications, Overseas Citizen of India status processing and passports issuance for residents of several states to VFS Global, a privately owned company.\textsuperscript{550} VFS, along with other companies including Travisa and Computer Science Corporation, are increasingly providing these services for several states.\textsuperscript{551} This model reflects neoliberal trends focused on privatising governmental services wherever possible.\textsuperscript{552} The outsourcee is contracted to handle “non-judgemental” tasks such as collecting fees and processing applications, allowing the regular consular staff to handle only tasks such as assessment and interviewing.\textsuperscript{553} Outsourcing of these tasks is said to reduce costs and allow for more efficient handling of applications.\textsuperscript{554} There is, however, a concern that whilst the


\textsuperscript{549} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{551} Wesseling and Boniface, “New Trends In European Consular Services: Visa Policy In The EU Neighbourhood.”

\textsuperscript{552} Menon, “Indian High Commission to Outsource Some Consular Services.”
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outsourcing firm officially does not have decision-making authority, their role in processing applications still allows them to shape or obstruct applications.

Liechtenstein’s arrangement with Switzerland provides another example of sovereign states allowing another sovereign state to represent them. In addition to a common economic, monetary area, and patent system, Switzerland has been granted the authority by Liechtenstein to represent them in treaty negotiations and provide consular protection. Switzerland is also responsible for Liechtenstein national defence as it does not have its own military. This arrangement is by far the most similar to the arrangement of the freely associated states. The only meaningful difference is the lack of colonial history.

This great variety of ways to handle consular services shows that allowing a third party to provide diplomatic services need not meaningfully harm a state’s sovereignty. Though Niue and the Cook Islands elect to have very minimal foreign affairs involvement by choosing to allow New Zealand to handle most of it, this does not seem to disqualify them from being considered sovereign nations.

4.3.2 Citizenship

Residents of Niue, the Cook Islands, and Hawai‘i all hold another state’s citizenship. Of the nations profiled in this dissertation, Fiji is the only one that currently
has its own passports and citizenship. Citizenship is often seen as a key component of statehood and nationhood, as the direct individualistic expression of these concepts.

Under United States Federal law (8 U.S.C. § 1401), a person born in Hawai‘i since statehood is a US citizen. The Hawaiian Organic Act (31 Stat. 141) in 1900 stated that any person who was a citizen of the Republic of Hawai‘i was then a US citizen. The 1894 Constitution of the Republic, Art. 17, had previously recognised those born or naturalised in the Hawaiian Islands as citizens. Given the time that has passed since the overthrow of the Kingdom and the establishment of the Territory of Hawaii, there is no longer any person alive who was recognised as a citizen of either the Kingdom of Hawai‘i or the Republic of Hawaii. Citizenship in Hawai‘i today is no longer independent of US citizenship.

Niueans are granted New Zealand citizenship and travel under a New Zealand passport. For most lex soli citizenship purposes, Niue is considered a part of New Zealand. Under the Niue Immigration Act 2011, New Zealand citizens who are born in Niue have the irrevocable “right to travel to or remain in Niue at any time” and are entitled to visa/permit free access. These rights are also extended to people who have a parent born in Niue or whose parent was a permanent or long-term resident of Niue. These rights effectively form an equivalent to Niuean citizenship in granting Niueans a permanent and irrevocable right to remain in their country and would likely serve as the basis for citizenship if the free association agreement was to end. New Zealand citizens

555 Some Hawaiian sovereignty groups have issued their own passports and claim distinct citizenship from that of the US occupiers. As these efforts have received little recognition, this section will ignore them.
who are not covered under one of the conditions above are not afforded any special consideration in entering or working in Niue. Like citizens from other countries, they are required to obtain a 30-day visa. It is unclear what, if any, rights non-New Zealand citizens who are born in Niue have in Niue as they are not, under New Zealand law, New Zealand citizens.

The Cook Islands likewise does not have its own citizenship. All Cook Island nationals have New Zealand citizenship and travel on New Zealand passports. The Cook Islands grants all people born in the Cook Islands permanent residency provided that they have a permanent resident parent. Children of permanent residents born abroad are also entitled to similar rights to that of permanent residency. New Zealand citizens, who are not permanent residents of the Cook Islands, are not granted any special rights to enter or stay in the Cook Islands. Further, the Cook Islands Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Immigration notes that the “grant of Permanent Residency in the Cook Islands does not carry any guarantee of gaining New Zealand citizenship”. It is thus possible for a person to become a permanent resident of the Cook Islands without being a New Zealand citizen, further emphasising the Cook Islands’ right to make its own immigration policy.

---

Niue and the Cook Islands maintain full control over their own immigration policy with full rights to determine whom they admit and allow to stay in the country. Hawai‘i, in contrast, has almost no control over its immigration or citizenship policy.\textsuperscript{557}

In practice, there does not appear to be any actual requirement for a state to have its own citizenship in order to be recognised as sovereign. For a number of years after independence, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia did not have their own citizenship. Citizens of these states were considered British subjects and travelled on British passports. There is a noticeable delay between independence under the 1931 Statute of Westminster and the new countries’ granting their own citizenship. Canada did not have its own citizenship until 1947, with New Zealand and Australia not providing their own citizenship until 1949\textsuperscript{558}. Despite not having their own citizenship, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, all participated in foreign affairs as sovereign nations including becoming founding members of the United Nations.

4.3.3 United Nations Membership

Though the United Nations charter requires all members to be sovereign states, there is no requirement that all sovereign states become members. Several states including Kiribati, Nauru and Tonga chose to not become member states for a number of

\textsuperscript{557} A few US states have made legally unsuccessful attempts at controlling immigration policy within their state. As such, given the likelihood of meaningful state-level immigration control being accepted, it does not represent an area which the State of Hawaii can be said to actually have any control over. Hawai‘i does, however, have some control over customs/agricultural policy, which is discussed further in chapter 6.

years after independence. Furthermore, given the withdrawal of Indonesia in 1965 and the proposals to expel apartheid South Africa, without any attempt to de-recognise their statehood, it does seem possible for a state not to participate without effect on their statehood. Though UN membership can be seen as a clear recognition of statehood, non-membership cannot be interpreted as a sign of non-statehood. For the Cook Islands and Niue, despite not being members of the UN, their "full treaty-making capacity" was recognised by United Nations Secretariat in 1992 (Cook Islands) and 1994 (Niue).

4.3.4 Economic Sovereignty

Globalisation is frequently presented as eroding national sovereignty. It is commonly argued that in a globalised world, governments are forced to adopt particular economic policies over which they have little control. Small states have little ability to oppose these policies, which are often to their detriment. Further, small island states often suffer from severe trade imbalances, as their general remoteness and high costs render them largely uncompetitive in a general export market. Rather, they are forced to rely upon fickle industries such as tourism and limited specialised, often romanticised, “island” goods. Foreign aid thus generally comes to form a large portion of the economies of small island states.
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Issues of economic sovereignty and dependence, however, are further magnified in foreign aid as it commonly comes with policy conditions explicit or implied. This is most noticeable in Niue and to a lesser extent the Cook Islands. In 2014, Niue received $14 million USD in official development assistance (foreign aid), whilst the Cook Islands received $27 million USD. The vast majority of this aid came from New Zealand with Australia also providing a smaller, yet meaningful portion. In 2014, Niue had a GDP of approximately $20 million USD and the Cook Islands a GDP of over $310 million USD. Clearly, Niue is extremely dependent on foreign aid, given that it represents nearly two-thirds of the country’s GDP. The Cook Islands, whilst less dependent, still receives foreign aid equivalent to nearly a tenth of its GDP. It also remains under fiscal limitations controlling taxation and spending as part of a 1998 austerity package negotiated with New Zealand and the Asian Development Bank. Under this agreement, the Cook Islands has entered a unique position in which the Cook Islands economy is strong enough to no longer need foreign aid, but policy limitations set by the aid granters create an ongoing dependency.
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High dependence on foreign aid severally limits a country’s ability to exercise its sovereignty. Niue’s continued need for New Zealand aid requires an ongoing positive relationship with New Zealand and at least theoretically prevents Niue from fully exercising its sovereignty without fear of reprisal. The Cook Islands, with less economic dependence, is in better shape in this regard but is still highly dependent. It does not, however, seem that this economic dependence is a meaningful barrier to state sovereignty. UN member state Sao Tome and Principe has a slightly higher GDP/ODA ratio than Niue and around 30 states have higher ratios than the Cook Islands. As such, economic dependence should not alone be considered a barrier to statehood. Given the complete absence globally of solely self-sustaining economies, the limitations imposed by foreign economic dependence are universal amongst otherwise sovereign states.

4.3.5 Monarchy

Being a part of an extraterritorial monarch’s realm also establishes limitations on the exercise of national sovereignty. Though a state may have an otherwise fully independent government, many states share a head of state. Whilst this may be a legally distinct position between states, the person in this position is the same across most of the former British Empire.

From 1874 until 2012, the monarch of the UK has officially held the traditional title of Tui Viti of Fiji (Paramount Chief). This position has been largely symbolic since Fiji became a republic in 1987. The position was dissolved in 2012 when the Great...
Council of Chiefs was officially disbanded. Despite this, symbols of the monarchy remain throughout Fiji. Pre-2013 currency featuring the Queen remains in circulation, the St Edward's Crown continues to be featured on badges of the military and the police, the Union Jack remains part of the Fiji flag, and the military motto remains "Fear God and honour the King/Queen". The Queen's Official Birthday remained a public holiday until 2013. Further, the current Prime Minister Frank Bainimarama proudly displays a portrait of the Queen above his desk and has stated "I'm still loyal to the Queen. Many people are in Fiji. One of the things I'd like to do is see her restored as our monarch, to be Queen of Fiji again."567

Niue and the Cook Islands are today a part of the Realm of New Zealand with Queen Elizabeth II, as head of state in her capacity as Queen of New Zealand. The constitution of the Cook Islands recognises the position of Queen's Representative as separate from the Governor-General of New Zealand. The Governor-General is limited in role to only limited defence and foreign affairs functions. Niue's Constitution, in contrast, has the Governor-General of New Zealand act as the Queen's representative. Though officially a part of the Realm of New Zealand and indirectly subject to the NZ Royal Succession Act 2013, the current relationship of the Monarchy is that of any part of the Commonwealth realm.

4.3.6 Military

For many nationalists across the world, a military is seen as the quintessential part of the nation-state. Within many highly militarised countries, such as the United States, supporting or celebrating the nation is often closely paired with military symbols. The idea of a country without its own military is looked at as unthinkable. However, a number of states actually lack a military.568 There does not appear to be any legal nor practical requirement for sovereignty which requires a military.

As an alternative to having their own military, many states choose to allow other states or regional consortiums to provide military defence. For example, Andorra has treaties with Spain and France to provide defence, Kiribati receives defence assistance from Australia and New Zealand under an informal agreement, and Australia is responsible for Nauru's defence under a similar informal agreement. Likewise, under a 1962 Treaty of Friendship, New Zealand is responsible for the defence of Samoa. As with Niue’s and the Cook Islands’ agreement with New Zealand, defence for the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia is the responsibility of the United States under their respective compacts of free association. Within the Caribbean, several states have adopted a consortium approach to defence. Under this, defence for Dominica, Grenada, Saint Lucia, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines is the responsibility of the Regional Security System.569

569 Ibid.
Furthermore, given the extremely small size of the militaries of many states, they cannot be seen to be able realistically to defend their territory alone. For example, Antigua and Barbuda have a total of 250 active and reserve members in its military. Its mainland neighbour of Venezuela in comparison has a force of 115,000 active duty members and 8,000 reservists. Should Venezuela have any desire to annex the islands, they have clearly superior direct military might. As such, given their size and the needs of the state, the Royal Antigua and Barbuda Defence Force function largely in a civil role rather than having any meaningful ability to protect the island from invading forces. Rather, Antigua and Barbuda participates in the Regional Security System and hosts U.S. military presence. Even larger island nations, such as Fiji, still lack meaningful military power to provide defence against most large state invaders; rather their military serves to provide civil defence functions and to supply troops to the United Nations for peacekeeping.

The absence of a military, though challenging to the popular conception of a state has no meaningful effect on the legal status of the state. As more countries de-emphasise their militaries, it is likely that this popular conception will start to fade.
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4.4 **Nation Specific Issues**

As well as the more general challenges small island states have in gaining recognition of their sovereignty, the states in this paper each have several issues specific to their situation.

### 4.4.1 Hawai‘i

Hawaiʻi as the only nation in this paper without any meaningful external recognition faces the most severe problems in exerting its position as a sovereign state and thus dominates the remainder of this chapter. Since the fall of the Kingdom and the later annexation by the United States, Hawaiʻi has not had an independent government. One of the major divisions amongst supporters of a sovereign Hawaiʻi remains the question of whether the Kingdom of Hawaiʻi continues to meaningfully exist. If so, should Hawaiʻi be considered an occupied territory? The political and social consequences of this divide are explored in detail in the following chapter. This subsection looks at the issues and justifications related to restoring Hawaiʻi as a sovereign state.

#### 4.4.1.1 **United States Occupation**

Hawaiʻi is often presented as being under prolonged United States occupation. Sovereignty activist Kauai, for example, suggests that Hawaiʻi was under US occupation
from January 16, 1893 (overthrow) until December 13, 1893 (creation of the Provisional Government) and again from August 12, 1898 (US annexation) to present.\textsuperscript{572}

The first period of occupation occurred following the overthrow of Queen Liliʻuokalani in 1893. The overthrow was conducted by a small group of insurgents with support from the US military. The group formed a brief provisional government leading to the formation of the Republic of Hawaii in 1894. It seems fairly unambiguous that this period was one of US occupation. The ongoing situation is, however, much less clear.

In 1897, recently elected US President William McKinley negotiated a treaty with the Republic of Hawaii to annex Hawaiʻi. Annexation had been amongst the goals of the plotters, but previous US President Grover Cleveland was supportive of Queen Liliʻuokalani and unwilling to accept annexation. The treaty of annexation was never ratified by the US Senate due to the lobbying efforts of Hawaiʻi officials and a petition from Native Hawaiians. It failed to be ratified, with 46 votes in favour out of 90 senators (the US Constitution requires two-thirds of the Senate to support ratification). On July 4, 1898, the Newlands Resolution was passed by the US Congress and signed on July 7 by President McKinley. This joint resolution annexed the Republic of Hawaii and created the Territory of Hawaii.

Using a joint resolution allowed for the motion to pass, but it has been argued that this is not a legal method by which a state can acquire territory. Chang notes that the only

\begin{footnotesize}
\end{footnotesize}
accepted ways for a state to acquire territory belonging to another state is through conquest, prescription or by treaty. The United States has never claimed to have acquired Hawaiʻi by conquest and prescription does not apply in this case. Given that a treaty was not ratified, he argues that the United States cannot have legally acquired Hawaiʻi through a joint resolution, and thus the US’s control of Hawaiʻi is that of ongoing occupation.

The US Senate debate in 1898 surrounding the joint resolution shows that even at the time, several senators had concerns regarding the viability of acquisition of foreign territory by joint resolution. Senator Allen of Nebraska stated that it is “impossible for the Government of the United States to reach across its boundary into the dominion of another government and annex that government or persons or property therein”. Senator Spooner of Wisconsin concurred stating that the “Joint Resolution itself, it is admitted, amounts to nothing so far as carrying any effective force is concerned. It does not bring that country within our boundaries. It does not consummate itself”. Other Senators also expressed concerns related to the lack of mechanism for annexation by an act of Congress as well as concerns of validity given that if accepted any country could claim another country through
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internal law. Senator Bacon of Georgia notes that if allowed, the Hawai‘i legislature would logically be able to “acquire the United States by a Joint resolution of its own.” As Bacon argues, allowing the notion that any state can simply claim another state and have that claim have legal force produces a clearly absurd result. The legally sound approaches available to the US to annex Hawai‘i were through a treaty with Hawai‘i or by conquest. Using internal law solely was untried then and has not been employed since then.

In support of using the joint resolution to acquire Hawai‘i, Senator Stewart of Nevada and Senator Foraker of Ohio presented arguments that were poorly received at the time. Senator Stewart argued for essentially unlimited power to annex as they wish with the only limit being the objection of the other state. When asked the hypothetical of annexing England, he stated that a joint resolution could annex England provided “England did not object.” Senator Allen then asked “But suppose the people of England did object?” to which Senator Stewart responded, “Then we would have to fight
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He further stated “We can annex anything. But we do not suppose that Congress is going to do those things. The fact that sovereign power exists implies that it might be abused. It is not abused in this case because we know that the people of the Sandwich Islands want to be annexed to this country.”

He was essentially advocating a “might makes right” theory with a half-hearted attempt at recognising some element of consent of the people. Though clearly invalid under international law, this argument seems to be the one which continues to be used to justify the taking of Hawai‘i.

The other argument in favour of the resolution's validity is exceptionally convoluted. Senator Foraker argued that since the resolution would dissolve Hawai‘i as a party to the agreement, it need not be a treaty. He notes that “people of Hawaii become merged into the United States” and there ceases to be a distinct entity to enforce an agreement. This argument did not gain much traction, and he later stated “We cannot by a joint resolution annex Hawai‘i … We can recite the fact that they have manifested a willingness, as shown by the treaty which we had in mind when that joint resolution was drafted to make a cession to us, but when we do not ratify the treaty, but do something else, namely pass a joint resolution the transaction is not consummated until they agree to it.”
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Though it has occasionally been suggested that Hawaii’s acquisition is justified as part of the Spanish-American War, Hawai‘i was not a territory of Spain and was officially neutral during the conflict.\textsuperscript{589} Thus, there does not exist a recognised legal basis for it to be a wartime acquisition.

The use of the joint resolution to annex Hawai‘i has been the subject of many of the legally focused sovereignty activists. Chang argues that absent any mechanism by which a joint resolution can acquire foreign territory (lacking a ratified treaty), then the “Republic of Hawai‘i never did pass dominion to the U.S”. He suggests that this break in dominion invalidates the inclusion of Hawai‘i islands in the Territory of Hawaii and later the State of Hawai‘i.\textsuperscript{590} Thus, “there was—according to U.S. law—nothing within the Territory of Hawai‘i[sic]” and “starting with the Organic Act, the Territory of Hawai‘i[sic] and the U.S. simply pretended, acting as if the Hawaiian Islands were within the U.S.”.\textsuperscript{591} The Act of Admission (1959) defines the territory of the State of Hawaii to include the islands, reefs, and waters of the Territory of Hawaii.\textsuperscript{592} The Territory of Hawaii was defined under the Organic Act as “the islands acquired by the United States of America under an Act of Congress entitled “Joint Resolution to provide for annexing
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the Hawaiian Islands to the United States.”. 593 This seems to create a chain wherein the State of Hawaii is defined as including the islands of the Territory of Hawaii which itself was defined as including the islands under the Joint Resolution. 594 Chang suggests that since the Joint Resolution was invalid, the subsequent acts that use its definition are also invalid and result in a territory-less State of Hawaii. 595 Further, he suggests that the territory-less-ness of the Territory and State of Hawaii were known to the US government, who intentionally chose to deceive the public into believing that the islands of Hawaiʻi were the territory of the US. 596 Thus, given an absence of legitimate authority, the US’s effective control of Hawaiʻi constitutes an occupation.

Chang’s core legal analysis seems potentially sound. There does not appear to be any mechanism under US law by which a joint resolution can annex foreign territory. There, however, is a lack of political will to address this issue and a widespread willingness to continue to ignore the constitutional issue. For example, when US Supreme Court Justice Scalia was asked at a talk about the constitutional issue of annexation via joint resolution, he stated that “there is nothing in the Constitution that prohibits Congress from annexing a foreign state through the means of a joint resolution”. 597
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Chang’s description of a vast conspiracy to avoid exposure of the deficiencies to the territoriality definitions seems to greatly undermine his credibility but may be very useful in giving him power within sovereignty activism. As is seemingly common in many writings on contentious sovereignty, he has chosen to adopt a style that allows for an exciting narrative of conspiracy to which he is the only voice brave enough to expose the truth rather than the far more likely explanation that the issue of the legitimacy of the Joint Resolution for annexation is a relatively minor point of constitutional law in the eyes of most politicians and government employees. Though in this case potentially extremely significant, there is no reason to believe that any of the drafters of later documents that he alleges are part of the conspiracy had any awareness of this issue. The exact power of a joint resolution is not a subject that is well taught or an area of common discussion outside of a subset of constitutional scholars. A lack of awareness rather than a conspiracy seems a much more likely explanation. Furthermore, assuming that they were aware of the issues, there is nothing other than convenience that prevented lawmakers from including a map of Hawai‘i as their definition rather than referencing previous acts and completely eliminating the entire argument.

There is also the practical issue of how could the deficiency that Chang identifies corrected. Attempts to challenge territorial jurisdiction in state courts have, unsurprisingly, been unsuccessful. Even if we are to accept that the issues of the joint resolution remain past the formation of the State of Hawaii, the remedy is largely a political question rather than a legal one. Again, whilst the legal issues raised are both largely unactionable, the ability to present a coherent legal justification for sovereignty is highly appealing and useful for nationalists.
4.4.1.2 Right of Conquest

The right of conquest through force was used globally by colonial powers as a theoretical justification for seizing territory from indigenous people without their consent. Conquest is defined as “an act of force by which, in time of war, a belligerent occupies a part or the whole of the territory of the enemy State with the intention of extending its own national sovereignty over that territory”. Until more recently conquest was recognised as a valid method of obtaining territory, provided the action was morally justified. This justification would not be well received today, given that spreading religion, commerce, and civilisation were amongst the accepted supporting reasons. Conquest under this model would convey a clear legal title to the conquered territory (though obviously not a morally clear title).


599 “Time of war” in practice should likely be interpreted fairly broadly given the frequency of undeclared war and the fact that the use of military force on a sovereign territory is generally considered to be tantamount to a declaration of war. Further, the US and others have considered their acquisition of indigenous peoples territory to be under the right of conquest despite a lack of declared war or occasionally even any actual violence. This use, however, does not correspond well to the underlying legal principles. Many of the situations of conquest of the territory of Indigenous people has occurred outside of a genuine war situation and cannot properly be considered under the right of conquest. The political will of the international community, however, remains so strongly in favour of accepting the historic right of conquest, that the incorrect application in regards to time of war is a largely academic debate.
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The United States’ actions in Hawai‘i raise the question: if a state effectively takes another state by conquest, but refuses to call its taking “conquest”, is it still acquisition by conquest? In the case of Hawai‘i, armed members of another country took over Hawai‘i by force taking control of the territory and the government. The country of which these combatants were citizens later took control of the state and incorporated it within its borders eliminating any previous government. Further, they claimed their actions were justified to protect the property and safety of American interests in Hawai‘i. Except in name, Hawai‘i appears to be have been claimed by conquest.

Though after World War II the right of conquest has become codified as unacceptable to the international community, the right was long a principle of international law and a key part of the formation of many modern states. Considering that it occurred prior to the 1928 Kellogg–Briand Pact (which recognised it as unlawful to annex territory by force), there does not appear to be any legal barrier to the US claiming Hawai‘i as acquisition by conquest and in doing so largely terminating any remaining legal claim to a sovereign Hawai‘i. However, whilst it is extremely politically undesirable for the US government to admit that their actions constituted an act of conquest, it very much seems they are. It is important to note that in the case of Hawai‘i, the US was unable to make use of the theory of *terra nullius* (nobody's land). *Terra nullius* refers to the idea that unowned territory is available to be claimed by a state. This theory

604  Ibid.
605  Ibid.
606  Ibid.
posits that only nation-states can own territory. Thus, any territory that is not owned by a nation-state is unowned. During the colonial period, only the territory of “‘civilized’ and recognizable governments” was seen as being capable of exerting territorial sovereignty. This justification was used by Western powers to seize much of the world; they argued that, while the land was occupied, it was not by a government that was recognisable and was thus “up for grabs”. This appalling legal fiction, however, could not be applied in Hawai‘i as the United States (along with several other recognised states) had established diplomatic relations with Hawai‘i thus asserting that Hawai‘i, possessed a recognisable government.

4.4.1.3 Citizenship in the Kingdom of Hawai‘i

Many Hawaiian Sovereignty activists go to great lengths to explain that citizenship in the Kingdom of Hawai‘i was open, inclusive and not racially based. Prior to the 1887 Bayonet Constitution, race was not used as part of the criteria for citizenship, but rather allegiance was the major criteria. It was not until the Bayonet Constitution that American conceptions of race, particularly anti-Chinese views, were imposed on Hawai‘i allowing race to become a part of the citizenship process. Following the overthrow, the citizenship model became even more exclusionary and more racially
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based.\textsuperscript{612} The model that is currently used for legally identifying Hawaiians is based upon these later race-based conceptions rather than the models of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i.\textsuperscript{613}

Kauai argues that given the absence of a treaty of annexation, “Hawaiian sovereignty was never extinguished and continues to remain intact today”.\textsuperscript{614} He suggests that Hawai‘i is under US occupation and should be subject to the obligations of an occupying power under Hague Convention\textsuperscript{615} Kauai interprets this to mean that the US’s allowing of Americans to settle in Hawai‘i and the granting of citizenship to those born in Hawai‘i is an actionable violation of international law.\textsuperscript{616} He suggests that as a result only those who can trace ancestry to a citizen of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i prior to the US occupation can be considered a Hawaiian national.\textsuperscript{617} Thus according to his estimates, 306,000 people of 1.4 million residing in Hawai‘i can be considered Hawai‘i nationals and the rest aliens.\textsuperscript{618}

This narrow view of citizenship in a new Hawai‘i significantly hinders sovereignty attempts by removing the majority of Hawai‘i from being able to participate fully in the process. If we are to assume that the way forward for Hawaiian sovereignty is
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through a democratic process (as opposed to an unlikely legal victory or the essentially impossible armed rebellion), it establishes a significant obstacle from the start. It asks voters to support a platform that will result in a choice between uprooting their lives and leaving Hawai‘i or being disenfranchised. This creates an extremely difficult sales pitch in asking for people to go against their own self-interests in order to correct an injustice from over a hundred years ago. Even amongst many staunchly pro-sovereignty non-Hawaiians, citizenship remains a point of passionate disagreement. In many ways, it seems that an obsession with building a legal case through international law has distracted activists from what is morally right and politically advantageous.

4.4.1.4 Advantages of being part of the United States

One of the biggest obstacles to Hawaiian sovereignty is the practical advantages of being a part of the United States. There are a number of resources that Hawai‘i has gained through US occupation which provide a powerful disincentive to asserting sovereignty. Being a part of the United States seems to have been advantageous to the economy of Hawai‘i and its development. With a per-capita GDP of $55,598USD, Hawai‘i dwarfs the economic output of any other state in Oceania. The next highest is Palau (which has a Compact of Free Association with the US) with a per-capita GDP of $16,300USD, less than a third of that of Hawai‘i. In terms of human development metrics, Hawai‘i likewise exceeds those of the rest of the region (though it still struggles compared with much of the US). Given that many other states in the region have similar natural resources and similar small island state challenges, the major differentiating factor seems to be the United States’ control of Hawai‘i. A study of 25 dependent and 30
independent small islands found that the dependent islands did significantly better in most economic and development metrics than independent small islands states.  

Many of those from Hawai‘i also benefit greatly from their US citizenship. Thirty-five per cent of people born in Hawai‘i live elsewhere in the United States. Without *jus soli* citizenship in the United States, many of these people would be subject to a convoluted immigration system rendering a significant portion unable to live in the United States. In world travel, US occupation of Hawai‘i is likewise very useful. By virtue of US citizenship, the people of Hawai‘i gain access to a US passport. The US passport is widely considered one of the most useful passports. It allows visa-free access to 154 countries with preferred status for many others. In comparison, Fiji, as is typical of small island states, has visa-free access to only 75 countries. The ease of movement that Hawai‘i residents enjoy is directly connected to their being a part of the United States.

Further, given the militarily strategic location of Hawai‘i in the Pacific, it would have likely been of great interest to a multitude of world powers. The Kingdom of

---
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Hawai‘i had little military strength of its own, as demonstrated by its brief occupation by the British in the Paulet Affair, the Sacking of Honolulu by the French, and the eventual overthrow of the Kingdom. It is highly likely that if the US had not taken over Hawai‘i, another state would have.\(^{624}\) Alternatively, it is possible that the Kingdom would have entered into a protectorate style arrangement with another state, but even in this scenario, considerable sovereignty is lost.

US occupation, however, has not been without disadvantages, particularly for Native Hawaiians. They are dramatically overrepresented amongst those with health issues\(^{625}\), in poverty\(^{626}\), and educational problems\(^{627}\). Further, they have seen considerable efforts to intentionally destroy their cultural identity, disenfranchise them and rob them of their traditional land rights.\(^{628}\)

---

\(^{624}\) France, Great Britain and Germany all had fairly significant colonial presence in Oceania and many other Oceania nations saw becoming a colony of one of the three as inevitable. If Hawai‘i had managed to maintain its sovereignty into World War II, it is likely that the United States or Japan would have occupied the islands as they were logistically highly significant for the war.


Despite these issues, the people of Hawai‘i overall do have a higher standard of living than most other small island states in the region. Though it is impossible to tell what the Kingdom of Hawai‘i would have built had it been left alone, it does seem likely that Hawaii’s elevated position compared to the rest of the region is in large part due to its being in the United States. This creates a significant barrier in motivating people to fight for their nation’s sovereignty when the alternative is mostly personally advantageous.

4.4.2 Niue

Niue has an exceptional small population and a rather tiny territory. It remains economically and logistically fully dependent on New Zealand. As a result of these factors, Niue’s sovereignty is often ignored or treated as a technicality. As the previous sections have demonstrated Niue can and should be considered a sovereign state under the accepted conventions of international law. However, despite the fairly compelling evidence for sovereignty, many treat Niue as if it were still a territory of New Zealand. Maps will often depict Niue as “Niue (NZ)” in the same way they style territories. Similarly, many NGOs continue to group Niue into New Zealand in reports. Socially, even amongst those who are aware of Niue’s existence, its sovereignty is often ignored. Compared with Hawaii’s much messier legal challenges to sovereignty (and of course the fact that it remains claimed by another state), Niue’s barriers to sovereignty are mostly world acceptance of a situation that many are indifferent towards.

4.4.2.1 “Apathy/Contentment”

One of the biggest issues for Niuean sovereignty is simply a lack of attention to visibly asserting its sovereignty. There is little direct advantage to challenging the status
quo, and there is a variety of more pressing matters for the government and people of Niue to address. As Billig argues in regard to banal nationalism, for most established nations, there is little need for overt displays of nationalism. The fact that a place is a nation is a part of the fabric of daily life. Given an absence of competing claims\(^{629}\) (such as there are in Hawai‘i), there is little practical reason to expend considerable effort in attempting to prove that you are sovereign. Fighting against the small and ultimately insignificant examples where Niue is incorrectly described as part of New Zealand would be very labour intensive with little of value actually gained from the efforts.

On the other side, there is also a lack of attention towards Niue from other countries. Its size and absence of geopolitical or economic significance place it extremely low on most other countries’ diplomatic priority list. Given that it lacks even a UN vote with which to bargain, there is little reason for other states to justify the time investment of meaningful diplomatic relations. Even for a large state that has the resources to build diplomatic relations with every small sovereign state, Niue’s size and lack of political utility greatly limit any return the large state would gain. Though some have interpreted this prioritisation as a statement on sovereignty, this seems to be incorrect.

The current arrangement is also quite beneficial for Niueans, they maintain their sovereignty, but also gain considerable advantages through their relationship with New Zealand. The ambiguity of the situation remains largely in their favour. They remain able to take advantage of the benefits of New Zealand, but since New Zealand accepts their

\(^{629}\) New Zealand fully acknowledges Niue’s sovereignty, those that attempt to assign Niue to New Zealand seem to do so against the express wishes of both Niue and New Zealand.
sovereignty and other states seem indifferent, they are able to express their sovereignty in areas that matter to them.

4.4.2.2 Connection to New Zealand

As discussed previously, the free association agreement between Niue and New Zealand binds the two states together in a special relationship. The agreement has New Zealand providing financial support, some administrative assistance, and defence; and they previously managed virtually all foreign affairs. All of these services are provided on Niue’s behalf with the full consent of the Niuean government. Niueans also receive New Zealand citizenship.

Niue is extremely dependent on New Zealand. All flights into the country are from New Zealand (1-2 times a week from Auckland), and as a result, it supplies the vast majority of tourists (which in turn provides much of the GDP of the island). New Zealand also provides most of the materials used by the government for school-based education and public health campaigns. The Niuean legal and health system also relies heavily upon New Zealand.

Unlike the free association agreements that several states have with the United States\textsuperscript{630}, the agreement between Niue and New Zealand is fairly one-sided. Niue benefits disproportionately from the arrangement. New Zealand’s major reward, beyond the general benefits of supporting a safe and prosperous region, is the fulfilment of colonial-era obligations. As a leading force in the decolonisation movement, Niue’s status as a

\textsuperscript{630} The US’s agreements in Micronesia provide valuable military benefits for what are ultimately fairly low costs to the US.
New Zealand colony was politically embarrassing to New Zealand. However, the complete abandonment of the island would have been economically disastrous for Niue and not within the spirit of New Zealand’s general positions towards Oceania. Free association provided a compromise that allowed New Zealand to decolonise but did not harm the people of Niue.

New Zealand’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade describes the relationship with Niue as “different from full independence” noting that New Zealand “provides necessary economic and administrative assistance, and is responsible for Niue’s defence and surveillance of its Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).”631 The Associate-Minister of Foreign Affairs, Joe Walding described the relationship to Parliament on the eve of Niue’s independence as a “new period of partnership on a basis of equality”.632 He further notes that “Niue will take its place as a full member of the South Pacific Forum along with other independent and self-governing states”.633 Given New Zealand’s actual handling of Niue in practice as a fully sovereign state, these statements leave considerable ambiguity in regards to what makes the relationship cause Niue to be “different from full independence”.
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4.4.2.3 Size

Niue’s extremely small size creates challenges in gaining recognition, particularly in the popular imagination. For many, it just feels “too small to be a real country”. The entire nation of Niue is dwarfed by most towns elsewhere. Even most medium to large organisation such as schools or universities will be several times the size of Niue. Though there does not appear to be anything that requires a sovereign state to be a certain size, it remains difficult to get people to look beyond their preconceptions of what a state should look like.

4.4.3 Cook Islands

The Cook Islands remains in a somewhat ambiguous situation. Its relatively small size and special relationship to New Zealand has led some to question its sovereignty. It does, however, appear to meet the criteria of both the declarative theory and the constitutive theory; and in nearly every way functions as a sovereign state. In many ways, the fact that there is even any question about its sovereignty seems to be an artefact of a stubbornness to accept the sovereignty of a country that does not quite look like is expected.

4.4.3.1 Connection to New Zealand

Though the Cook Islands is relatively small, it is not excessively so being comfortably in the middle of the small island state sizes. The issue that most challenges the Cook Islands sovereignty is its connection to New Zealand. As recognised by a 2001 joint declaration signed by the Prime Ministers of both New Zealand and the Cook Islands, New Zealand maintains “some residual responsibility for the external affairs and
defence of the Cook Islands”.634 This, however, confers “no rights of control to the New Zealand Government and can only be acted on at the request of and on behalf of the Government of the Cook Islands”.635 The declaration also notes that “In the conduct of its foreign affairs, the Cook Islands interacts with the international community as a sovereign and independent state.”636 Cook Islanders, however, do remain New Zealand citizens and the Cook Islands remains a part of the Realm of New Zealand.

4.4.3.2 **Tourism**

Tourism remains one of the largest and most profitable industries for the Cook Islands. Its political closeness to New Zealand is used strategically to make the Cook Islands feel less intimidating and more accessible to tourists, yet at the same time exotic. The way in which the Cook Islands presents its national identity is also very heavily shaped by tourism’s demands of authenticity. Any attempt at changing the ways in which the Cook Islands exercises its sovereignty could be seriously limited by a desire to avoid negatively impacting the tourism industry of the islands.

4.4.4 **Fiji**

As a United Nations member-state, Fiji has by far the least ambiguous sovereignty situation of the nations in this dissertation. It clearly meets the criteria under
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both the declarative theory and the constitutive theory. Fiji’s main concerns relating to sovereignty are related to its small size and lack of geopolitical power.

4.4.4.1 Commonwealth

Though Niue and the Cook Islands participate in Commonwealth activities through New Zealand, only Fiji of the countries in this dissertation is itself a member of the Commonwealth. Headed by Queen Elizabeth II, the Commonwealth is an intergovernmental organisation formed primarily of states that were previously a part of the British Empire. Participation in the commonwealth is voluntary. The Commonwealth emphasises this point, noting that “when countries had recently achieved their independence from the UK, it was important for them to stress the change in their relationship, from dependent status to equal partnership.”637 Nevertheless, membership and the benefit of participating in the program are used to support the goals of the Commonwealth states. Fiji’s membership in the Commonwealth was suspended as a punishment for failing to restore democracy as quickly as the Commonwealth demanded.638 Their membership was reinstated following the 2014 elections.639 Though countries are theoretically equal within the commonwealth, many have seen Fiji’s suspension from the Commonwealth (in 2000 and 2006) as another example of Australia
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and New Zealand exerting its power over Fiji. Fiji joined the Non-Aligned Movement shortly after its suspension from the Commonwealth, which some have described as a protest of another nation’s bullying.

4.4.4.2 Breaches of Sovereign Territory

In addition to the complications of economic sovereignty and globalisation that are the most significant direct threats to Fiji’s sovereignty, Fiji has also alleged that there have been a few recent direct breaches of their sovereignty.

Fiji accused Tonga of breaching its sovereignty when Tonga extracted Lieutenant Colonel Tevita Ului'lakeba Mara in 2012. Charges of sedition and attempted mutiny were pending in Fiji against Mara when he was “rescued” from Fijian waters by a Tongan Patrol boat. Mara and the Tongan government claim Mara was fishing off of Kedavu island when he found himself in trouble and put out a distress call. They state that a Tongan Patrol boat was coincidently nearby and was able to rescue him. Once on board, he requested that he be brought to Nuku'alofa to seek the protection of the Tongan

640 The Non-Aligned Movement is an organisation for states that officially do align themselves with one of the superpowers. It was founded during the Cold War advocating for the respect of each other's sovereignty and security. It remains a relatively weak organisation, despite including 120 member states. Its post-Cold War efforts have largely been in criticizing the policies of the US and UN and advocating for self-determination.
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crown.\textsuperscript{645} The Tongan government has denied any involvement in any planned escape attempt of Mara’s.\textsuperscript{646} Fijian and New Zealand maritime authorities, however, state that they did not receive a distress signal.\textsuperscript{647} Additionally, Tonga is over 700km from Kedavu island. Mara was a significant part of the 2006 coup, the commander of Fiji’s biggest military regiment and was close to PM Bainimarama.\textsuperscript{648} There were a variety of rumours about the reasons for his falling out with Bainimarama including financial irregularities and sexual improprieties.\textsuperscript{649} Since fleeing to Tonga, Mara has been publishing videos speaking out against Bainimarama.\textsuperscript{650} These videos have been embraced by foreign media and anti-Bainimarama social media sources.\textsuperscript{651} It has been speculated that Mara’s escape and Tonga’s involvement may have been supported by Australia to assert pressure on Bainimarama.

In the immediate aftermath of the May 1987 coup, the Australian government initially sought to use the Australian military to extract the deposed Fijian Prime
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Minister, Timoci Bavadra. The Chief of Australian Defence Force, General Peter Gration, opposed the plan owing to logistical challenges. There was also a proposal to assist in transporting Fijian military personnel stationed in the Middle East to Fiji to retake the islands under the command of the Republic of Fiji Military Forces commander, who was visiting Australia at the time of the coup. Lacking the support of New Zealand and noting the popularity of the coup in Fiji, they dropped the plans to intervene directly. They did, however, go forth with a plan to provide for the potential evacuation of the Australian nationals residing in Fiji. From May 20 until June 7, Australia had several Navy vessels, including two warships and an amphibious landing ship, off of the Fijian coast. The ships were initially docked in Fiji under diplomatic clearance which expired on May 18th. Australia moved the ships outside Fiji’s territorial waters on May 20th after the Fijian government ordered them to depart. As the situation in Fiji never escalated to the point where military aided evacuation was necessary, Australia did not make direct use of these ships. The Australian military
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maintains that any evacuation efforts would be done with the cooperation of the Fijian military and had no intention of challenging them militarily. Though some analysts have stated that Australia's deployment would not have been sufficient to challenge Fiji military, Australia's military presence would have been intimidating, and given the disparity in armament and naval resources, quite possibly sufficient for limited hostile actions. It is reasonable to believe that for Australia's interest in Fiji, serving as an intimidating presence rather than actually engaging in hostilities best serves Australia. It is further concurring that Australia would even draw up serious plans to support a military invasion of another sovereign nation.

Australia returned once more to Fijian waters in the build-up to the 2006 coup as Operation Quickstep. Again the stated purpose of the operation was to allow for the evacuation of Australian nationals with the cooperation of the Fijian government. This operation gained significant attention following the crash of a military helicopter killing two Australians. Though the mission was officially to be carried out only with the cooperation of the Fijian military, the mere presence of the Australian military immediately outside of Fijian waters created pressure. Fijian officials also accused Australia of breaching its sovereignty by sending people Fiji alleged were mercenaries or
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Australian police along with weapons onto Fijian soil. The Australian Defence Department later stated that they were most likely Australian Defence Force personnel assigned to provide additional security for the Australian diplomatic missions.

These incidents could be seen as examples of a global trend of countries failing to respect the sovereignty of less powerful states. Australia, in particular, has been repeatedly accused of pushing around smaller countries in the region; Timor-Leste described Australia as a “bully state”. Its government minister, Agio Pereira, expressed this common sentiment stating, “Australia is a powerful country; it's a very rich country in this region. And sometime when you are really powerful, you think that you can do everything you like.” The commander of Fiji's Land Force, Colonel Pita Driti, described Australia's policy in the Pacific as "Sheer ignorance, or hegemonic shoving of big brother policies down our throats". Even for well recognised sovereign states, foreign interference can restrict a state’s actual autonomy.

4.5 Political Will

Within a discussion of sovereignty, the concept of political will is of great importance. Political will is the desire of a government to carry through a policy. Though
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a government may officially agree with a concept (such as one of international law) in principle, actually carrying out their obligations under it remains subject to their current desires. It is not unusual in international diplomacy for a state to form agreements around broad (and generally vague) concepts, such as human rights, but be unwilling to actually enact or enforce meaningful applications.

As well as needing the political will to incorporate international law into domestic law, states must also have the political will to enforce their agreements between states. As awful as it seems, within actual applications of international law “might makes right” often functions as the dominant paradigm. There are a number of countries, notably the United States and Russia, which have undertaken actions that seem to be very clear breaches of international law for which no meaningful action is taken in response whilst smaller states will more frequently (though still far from universally) be held to account. The International Criminal Court, for example, has been frequently criticised by African leaders for having focused near exclusively upon situations in African countries despite its global mandate.670

The role of political will in the application of international law has created a situation that is very different from domestic law. Barring a significant miscarriage of justice, domestic law is generally respected in most developed nations. It is reasonable to expect that if a crime or civil wrong has been committed the victims will eventually be able to receive justice, at least in theory. The actual applications of international law, in
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contrast, can be as much about diplomacy as it is about the law itself. In many cases, clear wrongs have occurred, but there is no meaningful ability to handle the wrong, or the application of sanctions for the wrongdoing is judged to result in greater detriment to various interests. Though these decisions are increasingly now framed within international law principles, it often seems that decisions were made, and only then legal principles were found and stretched to serve the political goals of the involved groups.

As such even if claims such as that of the Hawaiian sovereignty movement can be determined to be morally and legally correct, they remain largely meaningless without a political will to respect the claim. States in deciding if they wish to support the Hawaiian sovereignty movement must accept the enormity that the decision to directly challenge the United States entails. Whilst Hawai‘i has some military utility (though increasingly limited), and support for Hawaiian sovereignty could be politically useful as a way to deliberately show a willingness to challenge the US, there lacks any compelling strategic reason for a state to support Hawaiian sovereignty given the immediate threat of US response. A sovereign Hawai‘i is unlikely to become a meaningful enough trade partner to justify losing the US market; nor would it likely command enough political power to be a useful international ally. Even its utility for military operations in the Pacific is rapidly dwindling as long-range ships and planes become more common. Calculated foreign support for Hawaiian sovereignty in any meaningful form would likely only come as part of an otherwise politically justified campaign against the United States. For example, in the scenario of China declaring war on the United States, support for a sovereign Hawai‘i might suit Chinese interests in causing domestic chaos, as part of an attempt to gain limited moral authority in supporting Native rights, or to protect the
sizable Chinese population in Hawai‘i. With a likely “best case” scenario of Hawai‘i being a pawn in an international power play significant international support for Hawaii’s international law claims cannot be expected.

Furthermore, support for a sovereign Hawai‘i also requires states to face their own mistreatment of Native peoples. Most states, at least at some level, were built upon land that previously belonged to Native peoples taken without their consent. Even relatively progressive states would require fairly radical changes in their own Native policies to be able to unhypocritical mirror what Hawaiian sovereignty would grant to Hawaiians. The world looks to be a long way away from this ultra-radical reform.

It seems that amongst many Hawaiian sovereignty activists a misconception exists that international law functions as domestic law will in its general compliance. They appear to believe that if the law is on their side, they will be victorious. Rather, in practice, states frequently ignore international law when doing so matches their political agendas. International law lacks any sort of meaningful enforcement body that would compel states to honour their agreements should they choose to ignore them for political reasons. This political reality is often overlooked (intentionally or otherwise) with sovereignty activists presenting their international law arguments as if there were a magical formula that summons justice. Though an ultimately flawed understanding of international law, this belief in magical justice can be useful for the sovereignty movement. Claims of legal superiority, even if false, misleading, or unenforceable, can be powerful tools in shifting public opinion and political will. As a narrative of justice reflecting the arguments of sovereignty activists gains traction, they gain power. The saying of “trying a case in the court of public opinion” is particularly pertinent when we
look at cases like these which are ultimately political questions and only secondarily legal questions. If sovereignty activists can convince the public that they are correct (even when their interpretation of international law is misleading and highly convenient), they are able to sway the political will of the voters (and with it the government) to support their position.

Similarly, Niue and the Cook Islands biggest problem seems to be a lack of political will to take any action. Ignoring the two states is in many ways the safest bet for most politicians and governments. Though both groups’ ethnic populations have become meaningful voting blocs in New Zealand, inaction along with continued ambiguity best serves most of the voters. Whilst most are quite proud of their island identity and heritage opposing any sort of annexation, they also benefit greatly from the special relationship with New Zealand. Globally, Niue and the Cook Islands have so little geopolitical or economic power, expending any meaningful political effort on their behalf would be of limited utility. This, however, can quickly shift as other states start to find the utility of having small states available for bargaining.

671 Beyond the previously discussed use of “selling” a UN vote, small sovereign states have been used to dodge politically or legally inconvenient problems for larger states. An example of this can be seen in the Regional Resettlement Arrangement between Australia and Papua New Guinea. Under this agreement asylum seekers who come to Australia by boat are settled in Papua New Guinea if their asylum claims were upheld. In this way Australia is able to alleviate its obligations to refugees and shift blame for mistreatment onto Papua New Guinea (despite the situation being entirely created by Australia). Niue has also hosted elephants and alpacas as a way to manage New Zealand quarantine requirements that have prevented the animals from coming directly into New Zealand.
Though in many ways international law is very high-minded and idealistic, it is ultimately highly subject to the political will of the states. Whilst actions are increasingly being taken to protect the rule of law even with minimal direct self-benefit to other states, it remains a fairly uncommon and recent phenomenon. This phenomenon, however, is being increasingly used by nationalists. They attempt to shape the issues around sovereignty as unambiguous cases in which international law clearly supports their positions. They play upon the public’s conception of law as overall just and enforceable. International law is presented as simply another set of laws that a country must follow without question. In doing so, activists are able to actually shift the political will of the state in such a way as to see meaningful change. Though it is too early to determine if these efforts will actually be successful, they remain a promising avenue for their supporters.

4.6 Conclusions

Though fundamentally a legal term, sovereignty has become a critical part of nationalism across the world. Sovereignty typically provides a concrete goal for nationalists, which is a sovereign nation-state. It represents an, at least theoretically, achievable outcome and an idea that must be protected once established. Threats to the nation are presented as threats to the sovereign state and vice versa. Sovereignty is also useful as a less intimidating way to frame nationalistic rhetoric. Radical overt nationalism is often concerning for the public, but when framed within the context of self-determination and preserving sovereignty, it can be much more readily received. Modern nationalists seem to have embraced the notion that for a strong nation they must have a sovereign state, not just in practice, but also in law.
International law and legal sovereignty have become, in many ways, the dominant language of pro-sovereignty activists in democratic states. It provides a framework under which radical change is theoretically possible. Activists see the previously unthinkable peaceful transition of former colonial states into independent countries, seemingly guided largely by idealistic principles of international law, and wish the same for their nation. The sort of armed hot nationalistic fight for independence that for much of the world long defined nationalism and the struggles for sovereignty is largely unworkable today. The military power differential between emerging nations and their holders are too great, and the public has lost its appetite for armed independence struggles. Politics and the courts seem today to be the tool of choice. Even when the law is not meaningfully on their side, many nationalists have developed incredibly creative ways to suggest that they are in the right morally and legally and with it try to move the political will of both their state and the larger world community.

Hawaiʻi has been fighting for sovereignty since the Kingdom was overthrown. It provides the most significant motivator and goal for Hawaiian nationalists: the restoration of the Hawaiian Kingdom. This struggle is increasingly one of shaping public opinion so as to convince people that this is both the correct course of action and is possible. Attempts to build a legal case for sovereignty using the framework of international law and even the less successful efforts to establish a restored state provide by far the most viable way for nationalists to accomplish their goals.

Fiji is increasingly seeing use of the global conversation of what sovereignty means and how native rights should interact with the sovereign nation. This conversation largely assumes an ongoing struggle for Native peoples’ self-determination, minority
status, a lack of political power and mass-land theft. By and large, iTaukei have not faced these challenges, which has placed them in a fairly different position than their contemporaries. Sovereignty and self-determination though have become a convenient way of talking about nationalism in an environment in which the government is actively trying to discourage ethnonationalism in favour of a unified civic nationalism.

The Cook Islands and Niue struggle with the challenge of their sovereignty being unaccepted in the popular space, despite clearly meeting the legal standards for it. This gap shows the challenge that many nationalists fighting for sovereignty have neglected. Even when the law and other nations support you, this still does not always translate into acceptance of your nation.

Across these nations, sovereignty, and particularly the legal frameworks it provides, serves as an extremely useful tool for nationalists. It gives the impression of an objective factual criteria for answering what is ultimately a political question built by public and world opinion. The following chapters explore the ways in which nationalism (and with-it public opinion in favour of sovereignty) is being developed both through traditional hot nationalism and, perhaps more influentially, everyday nationalism.
Chapter 5

5 Hot Nationalism

Hot nationalism is the form in which nationalism is typically imagined. It is active and “in-your-face”. It is a representation of “social disruption” and struggle. Hot nationalism is an extremely powerful force that may call on people to commit incredible action on behalf of their nation. This chapter looks at how hot nationalism is expressed in four nations, none of which seem to match the expected model.

Though it is often presented as a clear dichotomy, it should be recognised that the line between hot nationalism and everyday nationalism is extremely fluid. As Jones and Merriman argue, hot nationalism generally underlies the expression of everyday nationalism. This chapter focuses upon hot nationalism by looking at the organised and semi-organised nationalist movements occurring within the four nations. Whilst the groups of interest focus primarily on hot nationalist style actions, it is becoming increasingly common that groups will manipulate everyday nationalism, intentionally or not, to match their agenda. As there is considerable bleed-over between hot nationalism and everyday nationalism, there is also bleed-over between this chapter and the following chapter, which focuses on the subtler forms of nationalism.

Hot nationalism within modern Oceania has been fairly rare. When it has occurred, it has generally been isolated short-lived flare-ups as part of larger long-running issues. With the exception of Tonga, all of the nations in the region are former colonies of a Western power. Through the colonial experiences of each differed considerably, they remain shaped by their occupation. Fiji, Cook Islands and Niue were
previously colonies of Great Britain. Hawai‘i was a territory of the United States for 61 years until it was absorbed as a state. It was also previously briefly occupied by France and Great Britain. The expression of hot nationalism in these nations has reflected this legacy.

5.1 Hawai‘i

Hot nationalism within Hawai‘i is almost exclusively centred around the Hawaiian sovereignty movement. This movement is founded upon the notion that the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i was a legal and/or moral wrong that needs to be corrected. The movement, however, is extremely fractured with little agreement on most issues. Some activists focus largely upon the right of indigenous peoples for self-determination, whilst others see it as a non-racial issue of restoring a government that was unjustly overthrown. Still, others see it as a largely modern issue focused around building a nation that represents today’s Hawai‘i. Perhaps the only commonality amongst the pro-sovereignty groups is an assertion that the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i was illegal and has established an injustice that needs to be corrected. There is little agreement upon the appropriate methods to correct the wrong nor the desired outcome. Further, there is even a lack of consensus on the question of whether the Kingdom of Hawai‘i still meaningfully exists.

This section looks at hot nationalism in Hawai‘i by dividing it into actions and desired outcomes. The actions sub-section explores the functional ways in which hot nationalism is being expressed in Hawai‘i. The subsequent sub-section looks at the various outcomes Hawaiian nationalists are seeking through their nationalist efforts. This division reflects the common divide presented in the patriotism vs nationalism debate, in
which nationalism is framed in terms of action and consequences whilst patriotism is presented in terms of ideology.

5.1.1 Actions

Hot nationalism is marked by its focus on action. Whilst everyday nationalism can be subtle and unconscious, hot nationalism is active and very visible. It is important to note that of the methods that are functioning in Hawai'i, none really match the level of intensity that Billig uses to contrast hot nationalism from banal nationalism. However, they do represent something that is clearly different from banal or everyday nationalism. There is nothing subtle about the ways in which Hawaiian nationalism is expressed. The methods described in this section are the efforts of organised nationalist groups that are engaging in these intentional non-subtle actions. Though largely lacking the intensity implied by hot nationalism, they have a lot more in common with hot nationalism than what could be considered banal/everyday/soft nationalism. McVeigh’s dichotomy of “hard” and “soft” nationalism captures this somewhat in allowing hard nationalism to represent nationalism beyond the “taken-for-granted”. He, however, largely applies the negativity and otherness of extreme nationalism that Billig argues against. Given these limitations in describing nationalism using existing definitions, it thus seems appropriate that hot nationalism for a nation like Hawai'i should be considered to include the non-subtle organised actions of nationalists. The rest of this sub-section looks at three ways in

672 This appears to largely be the case globally as well. Actual extreme hot nationalism today seems to be reasonably rare and fairly short lived.
which this form of hot nationalism is being expressed in Hawai'i and then explores how violence and armed resistance, both hallmarks of hot nationalism, are largely absent.

5.1.1.1 Legal Challenges

Whilst traditionally the courts have not generally been seen as a significant tool of nationalism, it should not be surprising that it is now being used as one. Given that in modern conflicts, issues are increasingly settled in court rather than on a battlefield, the courts have become a frequent tool of sovereignty activists across the world. In Hawai’i, there have been several attempts to force state courts to indirectly rule upon Hawaiian sovereignty. These cases generally attempt to get the courts to find that the defendants should be relieved of their liability because the State of Hawaii has no jurisdiction over them since they are citizens of a still existent sovereign Kingdom of Hawai’i. Regardless of the legal merits of the cases (which are often dependent on fairly tortured interpretations of the law), they are fundamentally problematic in asking for an outcome that the court is unable to actually provide. Despite the routine failure of the cases, sovereignty activists cling to the court’s acceptance of minor points of judicial proceedings as supporting their cause. The courts, however, have been reluctant to directly rule on the continued existence of the Kingdom of Hawai’i preferring to rely upon other reasons to dismiss the arguments. The cases are frequently fairly messy, with defendants attempting a variety of arguments in the hope that one of them “sticks”.

673 As a general principle of law, a court cannot rule itself to be invalid. They can find themselves to not have jurisdiction over a matter, but to actually find the state (and by extension the court) to be legally non-existent is logically and legally impossible.
State v. Lorenzo and Nishitani v. Baker provide two cases that typify the Hawaiian nationalist use of the legal system. In State v. Lorenzo, Anthony Lorenzo was charged with several counts related to an automobile accident he was involved in. He sought to have the case dismissed as “the Kingdom was illegally overthrown in 1893 with the assistance of the United States; the Kingdom still exists as a sovereign nation; he is a citizen of the Kingdom; therefore, the courts of the State of Hawai`i have no jurisdiction over him”. The trial court dismissed his claims finding that the continued existence of the Kingdom and his citizenship in it would not pre-empt nor preclude jurisdiction in the criminal matter before the court. The appeals court affirmed the trial court’s decision.

Nishitani v. Baker saw a similar finding. Nishitani v. Baker involved an attempt to enforce promissory notes and mortgages. The defendants challenged the jurisdiction of the court under a similar argument to that of Lorenzo. The appeals court found the case and the land under which the case was about to be under the jurisdiction of State of Hawaii. These cases, along with several others including State v. French and State v. Lee, have established that individuals remain subject to the state court's’ jurisdiction regardless of their claims to not be citizens of the state.

Direct legal challenges to the occupation of Hawai`i have also been completely unsuccessful. One of the most prominent recent examples, Sai v Obama, et al. saw sovereignty activist Sai naming President Barack Obama, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, Governor Linda Lingle and Admiral Robert Willard of the US Pacific Command as defendants wherein he asked the court to declare the 1898 Joint Resolution which annexed Hawai`i to be a violation of Hawaiian sovereignty and unconstitutional under US law. He also attempted to include as
defendants the ambassadors of 35 countries which have what he claims are illegal
consulates in Hawai‘i. The court dismissed the case finding that any ruling on the matter
was barred by the political question doctrine\textsuperscript{674}.

In contrast to the above cases (which were largely doomed from the start), \textit{Hawaii
v. Office of Hawaiian Affairs} provided one of the best hopes for a legal victory for limited
Hawaiian sovereignty and one of the few exceptions to the above-mentioned pattern.
\textit{Hawaii v. Office of Hawaiian Affairs} was a United States Supreme Court case that asked
the court to address the issue of the State of Hawaii selling land obtained from the
overthrow of the Kingdom in light of the 1993 Apology Resolution.\textsuperscript{675} Despite much
activist optimism, the Court ruled against the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA), finding
the apology resolution did not confer any additional rights. Though this case addressed a
fairly narrow portion of the wrongs created by the overthrow and a finding in favour of
OHA would have had little direct effect on much of Hawai‘i, it was hoped that an OHA
success would establish a legal precedent for the reclaiming of stolen land.

\textsuperscript{674} The political question doctrine is a doctrine of American Constitutional law which holds that
questions that are fundamentally political rather than legal cannot be settled by the courts. Typically, cases
covered under this doctrine will involve issues that are well established as the responsibility of another
branch of government or are issues that lack any constitutional basis which the court can use to make a
decision. It is a poorly settled and often controversial doctrine. Ultimately, it is based on the notion of
separation of powers and is used to prohibit the courts from creating law.

\textsuperscript{675} The 1993 Apology Resolution was a Joint Resolution of the United States Congress under which
they "acknowledge that the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii occurred with the active participation of
agents and citizens of the United States and further acknowledges that the Native Hawaiian people never
directly relinquished to the United States their claims to their inherent sovereignty as a people over their
national lands, either through the Kingdom of Hawaii or through a plebiscite or referendum".
Despite the routine failure of the cases and the apparently unrecognised irony in attempting to have occupier’s courts rule against their own occupation, the courts have been a favourite tool in recent years for expressing Hawaiian nationalism. The cases become a rallying point for activists who despite the record of failure seem to keep holding out hope that a court will eventually accept their argument.

5.1.1.2 Attempts to use International law

As discussed in the previous chapter, several groups have attempted to gain support for their efforts by employing international law. Starting with the legitimate legal wrong of the unlawful overthrow of the Kingdom, these groups attempt highly questionable and often blatantly spurious legal arguments in an effort to get other nations and global groups, such as the International Criminal Court and the United Nations, to intervene. These efforts have met with predictably little success and completely ignore the political will of the groups they are petitioning, in favour of unique interpretations of international law principles.

Also characteristic of the attempts of Hawaiian sovereignty activists to make use of international law is the practice of over-interpreting minor portions of responses in ways that favour their cause significantly beyond the meaning the organisation intended. An example of this can be seen in the “Hawaiian Kingdom” posting regarding the Royal Canadian Mounted Police’s (RCMP) response to the Hawaiian Kingdom’s allegations of war crimes committed at Mauna Kea. Where protesters were arrested by Hawai‘i police
As per the groups’ typical pattern, the complaint was sent to any organisation that they felt had a chance of responding favourably regardless of rational connection. The RCMP unsurprisingly concluded that it did not have “jurisdiction over the issues brought forward based on the requirements of section 8 of the Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes act”. The RCMP cites the absence of Canadian citizen involvement as the reason for the lack of jurisdiction. Despite the RCMP rejecting the case, this is presented by the Hawaiian Kingdom as a great victory for sovereignty activists, as they claim RCMP’s rejection under section 8 rather than because of the substantive issues of the complaint means that the RCMP (and by extension the government of Canada) is accepting the issues as true. As is typical for the evaluation of cases, the RCMP rejected it on the first criteria of jurisdiction. There was likely no evaluation of the substantive issues in any form, and no such evaluation can be concluded from their response. Nevertheless, the Hawaiian Kingdom chose to reinterpret this procedural rejection as meaning the RCMP fully agrees with the Hawaiian Kingdom but happens to be blocked by jurisdiction, rather than the RCMP statement meaning only that they are blocked by jurisdiction, and any other issues have remained unevaluated. This sort of usage of the infrastructure of international law remains characteristic of Hawaiian sovereignty activists’ interpretation and manipulation of international law to promote the Hawaiian nation. It is very possible

The RCMP was likely contacted because Canada is one of a small number of countries whose war crimes laws and practices clearly allow for the prosecution of crimes committed outside of their soil. Canada and Canadians, however, had only incidental connections to the telescope project that the activists are objecting to. They also argued to the RCMP that the 1851 Hawaiian-British Treaty remains in effect and remains binding on Canada.
the members of the Hawaiian Kingdom are fully aware they are misinterpreting international law, but in doing so are providing very useful ammunition for enhancing Hawaiian nationalism. Their misinterpretation helps energise the movement in giving hope and helping to keep going the notion that the Kingdom of Hawai‘i is still alive and could be restored if they could get the “correct” people to listen to their claims.

5.1.1.3 Political Action & Social Activism

Political and social activism is a very visible feature of the Hawaiian sovereignty movement. As well as being a common way to express nationalism, it is generally a sign of a healthy civil society. Protest rallies are a fairly common occurrence within Hawai‘i with protesters often addressing issues indirectly related to the Hawaiian sovereignty movement. Environmental issues are a frequent subject of protests with the issue commonly framed around “malama ‘āina” (to care for the land). The protection of the land and its resources have become a persistent rallying cry for sovereignty activists. There is often an underlying implied (or occasionally overt) message that the destruction of the Hawaiian environment is a direct result of the occupier's lack of respect for the land. The solution suggested is thus both an end of whatever destructive project that is being protested, as well as an end of US occupation of the islands.

The controversy surrounding the Thirty Meter Telescope (TMT) typifies this kind of activism. The Thirty Meter Telescope is a planned “Extremely Large Telescope” to be
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built on Mauna Kea on the island of Hawai‘i. Despite opposition extending back to 1964, 13 telescopes have been built on Mauna Kea, a 4,205m mountain located on the island of Hawai‘i. Though uninhabited, it is a very sacred site. Kealoha Pisciotta, of the opposition group Mauna Kea Anaina Hou, describes the mountain as “where our origin story begins. It’s a place where significant ancestors are buried, so it’s a burial ground. It’s the abode of the gods and goddesses”. The construction on the mountain has been said to desecrate the sacred site. Protesters have also brought up a number of environmental and economic issues related to the development of Mauna Kea.

On October 7, 2014, during the ground-breaking of the TMT, protesters interrupted the ceremony and obstructed the roadway with picketing and chanting. Further up the mountain, protesters laid down in the road to block the progression. In March 2015, protesters again blocked the road leading to several arrests. Protests have continued despite a temporary halt in construction.

---

680 Ibid.
682 Knapp, “Understanding The Thirty Meter Telescope Controversy.”
683 Kelleher, “Protesters Halt Mauna Kea Telescope Groundbreaking.”
684 Ibid.
685 “Police, TMT Issue Statements on Mass Arrests on Mauna Kea.”
Hawaiian opinion has been very mixed, especially amongst young adults. One of the more visible faces of the protests, Joshua Lanakila Mangauil, sees his task as protecting the mountain and allowing the sacred place “to rest”. 687 There are many who do support the construction, even amongst Hawaiians. As well as the significant economic and scientific benefits, supporters note that Hawaiians have traditionally placed a great emphasis on astronomy. The telescope’s function, its focus on the stars, is they suggest fully compatible with the sacredness of the mountain. Others reject the complaints as being a part of a proxy battle for Hawaiian sovereignty. They suggest that the controversy over the TMT is really only an attempt to readdress issues of the self-determination and land management stemming from the overthrow of the Kingdom.

The debate has grown significantly beyond the issue of the telescope itself and has become a place in which people are able to centre their frustration and other feelings towards the US government and its history in Hawai‘i. 688 Social media has seen a wide variety of people weighing in to support the protesters, including several global celebrities. Far beyond the issue of the telescope itself, the TMT has become a rallying point for the Hawaiian nation and has been slowly gaining global attention for the cause.

State holidays have repeatedly served as the catalyst for protests directly related to the issue of Hawaiian sovereignty. Hawaii Admission Day 689 (also known as Statehood
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Day) has been particularly controversial, stirring up several protests and limited counter-protests, as well as an attempt to occupy ‘Iolani Palace.

The overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i can be seen as one of the core symbols of the modern Hawaiian nation. ‘Iolani Palace and particularly the Quilt Room in which Queen Lili‘uokalani was imprisoned after the overthrow has often served both as a symbol of defeat, but also as a rallying point for restoring the nation. Though it has much less of an invented quality than many other nations symbols, the emphasis placed here mirrors the role in identity Steven Mock describes. As he notes, there is a seemingly contradictory practice in which nation will use symbols of their defeat as central to their national identity.690

5.1.1.4 Violence

Nationalism has frequently been described as fundamentally connected to violence.691 Depictions of nationalism in the media stereotypically present it in a framework of excessive violence.692 Nationalism is popularly seen as directly connected to “images of bloodshed, killing, dying, martyrdom, suffering, and destruction” as well as “insurgencies and terrorism”.693 Despite this perceived fundamental characteristic of
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violence in nationalism, there are “no natural linkages between nationalism and violence”. \(^{694}\) Hawaiian nationalism appears to largely support this finding.

The Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) notes that there are no known hate groups in Hawai‘i and there is a “much-trumpeted spirit of aloha or tolerance”. \(^{695}\) There, however, does remain a serious issue with racism which does occasionally result in violence. \(^{696}\) Though many groups have been targeted, anti-white sentiments are the most relevant to this paper’s discussion of Hawaiian nationalism. This sentiment has been described as being caused in part by an “ancestral memory”. \(^{697}\) The invasion and overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i, along with the resulting theft of the land and loss of culture is passed down between generation breeding resentment. \(^{698}\) More recent attempts to deracialize Native Hawaiian benefiting entitlement programs have created further resentment. \(^{699}\) Whilst Hawaiian sovereignty in its modern form is generally not presented as a racial issue, in the frustrations of the struggle, a narrative of white oppressors can emerge.

Haunani-Kay Trask, a Hawaiian Studies professor at the University of Hawai‘i, in one of the stronger expressions of anti-white sentiment, wrote "Just as … all exploited peoples are justified in feeling hostile and resentful toward those who exploit them, so we
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Hawaiians are justified in such feelings toward the haole. This is the legacy of racism, of colonialism. Despite this resentment, hostility and racism, racial violence has been very minimal.

Hawaiʻi reports an extremely low number of hate crimes each year. In the first six years that hate crime data were collected (2002-2008), only 12 hate crimes were reported. Given the size of Hawaiʻi population, national data would suggest that there should be over 800 hate crimes during this period. With these low rates of documented hate crimes, unreported “schoolyard” and “alleyway” violence also needs to be explored to get a fuller picture of the relationship between nationalism and violence in Hawai‘i. Unfortunately, these data are largely uncollected. There are numerous anecdotes of white targeted violence, but little evidence of a systematic problem. In a dissent by Judge Reinhardt of the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, he wrote that “the last school day in Hawaiian schools, for example, has long been known as “Kill Haole Day,” with white students—“Haoles”—targeted for harassment and physical abuse”. Yet there remains a lack of documented incidents of this sort of ritualised racial violence actually occurring.
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700 Haole is used within Hawaiʻi to refer to Caucasians. Its usage, however, is complex and controversial. The Civil Rights Commission of the State of Hawaii has stated that “the word “haole” is a non-derogatory term used to denote a person of the Caucasian race” They noted, however, that the term can be used as a racial slur. In a 1994 case in which a Caucasian employee was allegedly called a “fucking haole”, a “fucking haole bitch” and a “haole bitch”, by an angry employer the terms became “racist and sexist slurs”. The term “haole” is used within medical and science academic journals unmarkedly up through the early 90s as a way of identifying white populations living in Hawaiʻi. Since then, its usage in academia seems to have largely been limited to those writing within a Native advocacy framework.
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Honolulu Advertiser reporter Cataluna notes that "in terms of actual, first-person, eyewitness accounts of Kill Haole Day, no one had any that happened in the last three decades. Not one teacher, not one police officer, not one victim or perpetrator". Interviews I conducted with teachers and former public-school students similarly revealed little knowledge of the concept of Kill Haole Day and no first-hand knowledge of it ever actually occurring.

Individual cases of racial violence are challenging to identify because of frequently unclear motives. In many of the violent incidents that could be labelled as racially connected, the offender cites a non-racial slight that the victim is said to have made that the offender claims to have reacted to rather than attacking them largely because of their race. Road rage or typical bar fight motivations generally accompany these incidents of potential racial violence. There is also a lack of clear data on bullying motives. It has been suggested that while white students have been bullied in ways that include racial taunts, it is not at any higher rate than bullying with racial elements directed at other races. Race is argued to be just one of many features that bullies can taunt their victims using (similarly to wearing glasses or hair colour) rather than being a key motive in victim selection.

An example of the ambiguity of racially motived violence can be seen in a 2007 assault which received significant media attention. In this case, a white soldier and his wife were attacked by a Hawaiian man and his teenage son near Pearl Harbor after the
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soldier’s car hit the other man’s car. The soldier and his wife were pummelled and kicked by the two men. The son shouted “fucking haole” during the assault.

Following the attack, a prosecutor stated that the incident should not be considered a hate crime, but rather it was a road-rage incident. The case combined anti-military sentiment (only some of which is connected to the Hawaiian sovereignty movement), road rage and a racial slur. It remains impossible to tell if the same violent response would have occurred if the couple had been of a different race or had been local. As such, as in many similar cases, it becomes very hard to classify it as a case of racially motivated violence.

The low number of hate crimes and directly connected to racial violence would suggest that there does not appear to be any (or at least very little) systematic violence directly tied to Hawaiian nationalism. Whilst racially connected violence justified by perceived white oppression likely does occur, it does not appear to be a meaningful part of Hawaiian nationalism.
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708 The large military presence in Hawai‘i serves as one of the most visible reminders of US occupation for sovereignty activists. Beyond this, many are bothered by the military presence as they are frequently involved in petty violence (such as bar fights), disproportionately need ocean rescue services and are responsible for many of the abandoned vehicles in the islands. They are also blamed for putting a strain on the already too small housing market. Cultural differences and perceived lack of respect for the land (including using islands for bombing practice), intensified by their impermanence, further harm the relationship.
5.1.1.5 *Armed Resistance*

Armed resistance is a common part of the imagined stereotypical nationalism. Particularly given that the issue at stake is one of independence and sovereignty, armed resistance, even if only by a fringe group, is to be expected and can be seen to have occurred in many historic independence struggles.

Following the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i, a counter-revolution by royalists took place in 1895 known as *Kaua Kuloko 1895*. This conflict lasted three days with three battles and a decisive victory for the Republic. At the end of the conflict, Queen Lili‘uokalani and other political leaders were convicted of misprision of treason. Robert Wilcox and other plotters were convicted of treason by a military tribunal and sentenced to death (which was reduced to 35 years imprisonment). Queen Lili‘uokalani formally abdicated her throne in an effort to avoid further bloodshed on January 24, 1895, 15 days after the end of the counter-revolution. This marked the last significant attempt at restoring the Kingdom through military action. Given the overwhelming military power of the United States and the complete lack of popular support for a modern-day counter-revolution, armed resistance is likely to never be an effective tool again for Hawaiian sovereignty.

Despite the lack of viability for armed resistance, China threatened in early 2015 to provide arms to Hawaiian independence activists. This came in response to U.S.
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arms sales to Taiwan against the wishes of China.\textsuperscript{712} Whilst it is almost certainly just political sabre-rattling failing to present a meaningful consideration directly, of significance, is the implication that Hawaiian sovereignty could be a geopolitical bargaining chip in the future.

5.1.2 Desired Outcomes

The Hawaiian sovereignty movement has little agreement on what outcome the movement should try to achieve. Whilst there is general agreement that something needs to be done to correct the wrongs created by the overthrow of the Kingdom, the proposed solutions have ranged from enhanced social programs to a fully independent nation. There is a definite trend within the movement to advocate for the more extreme solutions, even whilst recognising the lack of political viability. This seems to match the ways in which hot nationalism is typically expressed. It is very difficult to raise the same level of excitement characteristic of hot nationalism for relatively minor increases in entitlements compared to the promise of a restored homeland. As increased sovereignty becomes more politically viable, it remains to be seen if softer compromise solutions gain traction or if the hardline full sovereignty position continues to dominate.

5.1.2.1 Increased (or Maintenance of) Entitlements

Today, there already exists a system of entitlements that aim to help correct some of the imbalances created by the overthrow of the Kingdom. The continued maintenance and expansion of these programs provide ways to correct for the overthrow of the
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Kingdom without creating any meaningful increases in sovereignty. They provide concrete advantages to Native Hawaiians and further legitimise the idea that Hawaiians are a distinct group entitled to differing benefits, but largely leaves sovereignty unaddressed directly. Additionally, as several of the programs were actually established prior to the overthrow, the continued maintenance of the programs and their power demonstrates a continued legitimisation on the system of entitlements from a nation perspective rather than purely a correction of imbalances.

One of the clearest examples of these entitlements is Kamehameha Schools. Kamehameha Schools were established by the will of Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop who was the great-granddaughter of King Kamehameha I.\textsuperscript{713} The trust was granted 375,000 acres of crown land.\textsuperscript{714} Today, it holds 365,000 acres of land, making it the largest private landowner in Hawai‘i.\textsuperscript{715} Whilst the vast majority of its holdings are kept for conservation and agriculture, over 15,000 acres are used commercially (including some of the most valuable commercial properties in Hawai‘i).\textsuperscript{716} The trust is estimated to be worth nearly US$8 billion.\textsuperscript{717} These holdings are used to support the school’s mission of educating Native Hawaiian students both directly within the Kamehameha Schools’ campuses and through scholarships for K-12 and postsecondary education.\textsuperscript{718}
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Kamehameha Schools has long held a policy that gives “preference to children of Hawaiian ancestry”. This policy has been extremely controversial but remains in place despite several legal challenges.

As the number of Native Hawaiian applicants generally greatly exceeds the number of slots available, very few non-Hawaiian students are ever admitted. On Maui, which sees fewer applications for the number of slots it has compared to other campuses, only one non-native Hawaiian student has been admitted in the past 40 years. Prior to the mid-1960s, non-Hawaiian children of school employees were permitted to attend.

The school currently requires students to demonstrate that they have at least one ancestor who lived in Hawai‘i prior to 1778. This policy was challenged in 2003 by Brayden Mohica-Cummings, a seventh-grader, who was rejected from the school after being unable to supply proof of Native Hawaiian ancestry. Brayden Mohica-Cummings’ mother was adopted by a Hawaiian family and considers herself and her son to be Hawaiian. They brought a lawsuit against the school alleging violation of federal...
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anti-discrimination laws.\textsuperscript{726} The school eventually settled, allowing Brayden to attend the school.\textsuperscript{727}

A 2003 suit (\textit{John Doe v. Kamehameha}) also challenged the admission policy under the federal Civil Rights Act. Though a District Court Judge ruled against Doe stating that the policy served "legitimate, remedial purpose by improving native Hawaiians' socioeconomic and educational disadvantages"\textsuperscript{728}, in 2005, a three-judge panel of the 9th Circuit of Appeals reversed the lower court; they found that the policy was in-fact racially exclusionary.\textsuperscript{729} This finding was itself reversed by a 15-judge en banc panel in February 2006 reaffirming the lower court’s finding 8-7.\textsuperscript{730} The case was expected to be heard by the US Supreme Court, but was settled for $7 million US dollars in favour of Doe, immediately prior to the court’s decision on accepting the case.\textsuperscript{731} Additional challenges are expected with uncertain results. The school has already stopped accepting federal funds due to fears of further civil rights challenges.\textsuperscript{732} Future challenges could also result in the trust's tax-exempt status being revoked which could cost the school US$80 million a year and up to a billion in back taxes.\textsuperscript{733}
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Na Pua Ke Alii Pauahi (an organisation of Kamehameha Schools students, parents, teachers and alumni) collected 84,000 signatures opposing the Mohica-Cummings’ challenge to Kamehameha Schools' admission policy, with many alums expressing strong opposition to any change in school admissions.\textsuperscript{734} One alum described the Mohica-Cummings settlement as being like “another overthrow of the monarchy” and claimed that the school represented “the last icon for native Hawaiians”.\textsuperscript{735} Kamehameha Schools has also been described as the “only forum in which native Hawaiians can get together as native Hawaiians”.\textsuperscript{736} The later admission of a non-Native Hawaiian in Maui also drew strong emotional responses. Haunani-Kay Trask, a professor of Hawaiian studies and an alum, said that the admission of the student “really hurt people, … and the pain was so palpable you could almost smell people's anger”.\textsuperscript{737}

Kamehameha Schools maintains that their policy is not race-based and should not be treated as a racial issue.\textsuperscript{738} The vast majority of students are of mixed-race with 78 per cent of the students identifying as part Caucasian, 74 percent as part Chinese, 28 per cent as Japanese, and 24 per cent stating that they were of other ancestries.\textsuperscript{739} The courts, however, have largely disagreed, finding that ancestry is being used as a proxy for
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race. Though in similar cases, courts have allowed the use of federally recognised American Indian statuses for entitlements, this usage does not apply to Hawaiian groups as American Indian groups are said to represent political units, not racial groups. Given the current lack of recognised Native Hawaiian tribal governments, this option remains unavailable to Kamehameha Schools and similar groups.

The strong emotions the Kamehameha Schools issue provokes, and its clear framing as one of keeping Native Hawaiian culture and connection are emblematic of the position of entitlements as a nationalist issue. The language and emotions surrounding it differ greatly from typical affirmative action justifications of correcting inequality and more closely resembles other nation-building efforts.

Another significant entitlement is the Hawaiian Home Lands program. This program was established by the US Congress through the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 under the guidance of Prince Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaʻole. It provides for the creation of a commission to allocate select public lands (over 200,000 acres) for use by Native Hawaiians as homesteads. In addition to providing financing assistance, the commission provides “99-year homestead leases at $1 per year for residential, agricultural, or pastoral purposes”. In contrast to Kamehameha Schools and several other entitlements programs, Hawaiian Home Lands defines Native Hawaiians as persons
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with at least 50 per cent Hawaiian blood.\textsuperscript{745} The program’s primary focus has long been on single-family homes through returning families to the “ʻāina” (the land\textsuperscript{746}).\textsuperscript{747} The program is reasonably successful, though it has faced a number of problems related to inadequate funding and inappropriate allocations of land away from the program. In its management of former crown lands for the purposes of supporting Native Hawaiians, the Hawaiian Homes Commission provides a reinforcement of the continued existence of Native Hawaiian entitlements.

A variety of other entitlements also exists which provide special benefits within education, healthcare and a variety of other areas. They remain very problematic legally but are generally unchallenged as there is reasonable popular support for these entitlements.

5.1.2.2 \textit{State-within-a-State: Integrating Hawaiian Self-Government into the State of Hawai‘i}

The state-within-a-state model provides the weakest form of self-governance. This model provides for an increased role for Hawaiians in the operation of the state government, most equivalent to that of a county. It would allow for the creation and enforcement of ordinances but also leaves its members fully under the jurisdiction of the existing government of Hawai‘i.
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This model would likely start with the movement of existing entitlement programs to a new entity and the granting of this new entity limited powers over selected areas of concern to Hawaiians.\textsuperscript{748} This model is supported by the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, as a precursor to the nation-within-a-nation. They advocate moving its assets to a “new Native Hawaiian governing entity”.\textsuperscript{749} The creation of family courts focused on supporting Hawaiian values has also been proposed in SB992.\textsuperscript{750} This highly controversial bill would have allowed a tribunal to receive jurisdiction over divorce and paternity cases where one of the parties is Hawaiian.\textsuperscript{751}

The state-within-a-state model provides limited recognition of Hawaiian self-government, whilst not requiring a meaningful change to the lives of non-Hawaiians. There, however, remain legal concerns of race-based discrimination. Attempts at establishing separate systems of government or government services exclusively for Hawaiians have met with significant legal opposition.\textsuperscript{752} As such any state-within-a-state style programs would likely need to be open to all peoples and participation would probably have to be voluntary to avoid drawing the attention of the courts. This clearly limits its nationalistic utility.
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5.1.2.3 *Nation-within-a-Nation: Hawaiian self-government within the United States*

The nation-within-a-nation model proposes a system similar to the status of many Native American Indian and Alaskan nations. This model would allow for limited sovereignty whilst remaining under the authority and control of the state and/or federal government. In following the Native American Indian and Alaskan model, the Hawaiian nation might have sovereignty over a geographically bounded area and its member inhabitants but would otherwise be subjected to US governance. This model is often suggested as an intermediary phase towards full independence.

Unfortunately for its advocates, Hawaii’s modern geography is poorly suited to traditional forms of the nation-within-a-nation model. In contrast to many Native American Indian and Alaskan nations, Hawai‘i lacks clear geographic borders on which to establish a Hawaiian nation. Though a few islands are predominantly Hawaiian, the vast majority of Hawaiians live in areas that are racially mixed. Barring a mass-resettlement program, a geographically bounded Hawaiian nation would either be so under or over-inclusive that it would lack utility.

The nation-within-a-nation model has been suggested by the popular sovereignty group, Ka Lahui Hawai‘i, as a “realist” option.\(^753\) The group has called for the return of former crown land to re-establish the Hawaiian nation.\(^754\) This would allow for a reasonable level of Hawaiian sovereignty in a bounded area with limited effect upon on
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the rest of Hawai‘i. The group, however, faces serious obstacles in that it needs to convince both the state and federal governments and sway public opinion. Additionally, it would require people to relocate to currently unused land, whilst providing the infrastructure required.

5.1.2.4 Free Association: An Independent Hawai‘i in Free Association with the United States

Free association provides a possible compromise model. In this approach, Hawai‘i becomes an independent state, but still maintains close ties to the United States. In adopting this strategy, Hawai‘i and the United States would sign a "compact of free association". This agreement would define the terms under which the two nations cooperate. In other nations that have compacts of free association with the United States, the United States provides a defined set of government services and is responsible for military defence. In exchange, the United States receives the right to station military forces in the freely associated state. Other, often less tangible, benefits are also enjoyed by the states. The associated state generally maintains full legal sovereignty over their territory but elect to “outsource” some government functions to the other state. This may include allowing the other state to manage significant government functions, such as
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foreign affairs and national defence or it may take the form of allowing the host state to handle smaller tasks such as consular services and supplementary law enforcement.

If Hawai‘i is successful in gaining independence, there is a reasonable chance that this is the model that would eventually be adopted. It provides virtually all of the advantages of independence but allows for the practical challenges independence would create which are numerous.

A withdrawal of the federal government from Hawai‘i would create a number of significant gaps in critical services. At the present time, no sovereignty group is anywhere near ready to form a government and whilst the State of Hawaii could feasibly replace many of the federal government services, it too is not in the position to easily do so. Though many of the local offices of federal services could be transferred without significant problems, most are still very dependent upon a support structure provided from outside of Hawai‘i which would need to be replaced.

There are also a number of direct economic consequences to any form of independence that would need to be handled. Federal funds formed 21.54% of the state budget in 2015 with the federal government contributing $1.46 for every dollar paid in Hawai‘i in federal taxes (thus Hawai‘i is being heavily subsidised by the other US states). Additionally, the federal government directly employs almost 6% of the Hawai‘i workforce (excluding active duty military, who are also economically significant). The newly independent Hawai‘i would need to find a way to cover these
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costs without federal funds, as well as potentially pay for its own military. Increased taxes and reduced spending might cover some of the deficit, but the levels of taxes and service cuts this would require would likely be highly unpopular and probably alone unworkable (at minimum a 10-15% across the board income tax increase would be required). This also ignores the economic effect independence would likely have on tourism and the probable out-migration from Hawai‘i due to the uncertainty surrounding the formation of any new country. Additionally, direct and indirect military spending currently form one of the major pillars of the Hawai‘i economy and would need to be economically replaced. Barring new creative solutions or socially undesirable solutions (legalised gambling, offshore banking, etc.), this deficit would likely have to be met by foreign aid. A compact of free association between the newly independent Hawai‘i and the United States could provide this economic assistance, federal support services and military protection.

Free association, at least theoretically, requires both states to reach an equitable agreement in which both states provide value to the other. For Hawai‘i, the benefit would likely be largely economic whilst for the United States, the strategic utility of Hawaii’s location is significantly advantageous militarily. Both states also maintain a likely strong interest in supporting continuity as much as possible.

For many members of the general public who support sovereignty, this form seems to be the one which they favour, even though few actually recognize it as being called free association. In discussing sovereignty options, I have found that most of those
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who favour independence (outside of sovereignty activists) are still hoping for little practical effect on their daily lives. They support the general principles of sovereignty but are unsurprisingly not in support of a radical change to services or dramatically increased taxation. Additionally, whilst many favour reduced military presence, having to rely solely upon the Hawaii National Guard for military defence is a scary prospect for them. There is also a very practical concern that an independent Hawai’i would not be financially viable causing serious changes in daily quality of life. Free association, either indefinitely or for a transition period, largely addresses these concerns.

The most significant problematic aspect of free association remains the psychological and moral issue of ridding Hawai’i of the colonising force. Free association would mean a continued dependence upon a country that illegally overthrew the Kingdom and then occupied it. Much of the call for Hawaiian sovereignty relies upon the moralistic argument of correcting the illegal overthrow and returning the land to its rightful owner. Thus, whilst free association may be more practical, it fails to correct the moral wrong fully. Under it, Hawai’i would remain, at least partially, subjugated to the United States.

There are also concerns relating to how the United States has handled people under existing compacts of free associations. Though Micronesians form a disproportionate percentage of the US military and the islands provide many benefits to the US, the federal government continues to seriously under allocate resources to support Micronesians. Micronesians also continue to face significant issues with housing, education, healthcare and employment when living in the US. Whilst Hawaii’s larger population and greater importance to the US would likely provide them with a stronger
bargaining position, free association does put Hawai‘i in the position of negotiating with a much more powerful country which already has a history of neglecting its obligations under compacts of free association.

Free association was initially advocated by Robert Wilcox in 1899 through the founding of the Home Rule Party.\textsuperscript{759} The party was successful in the first territorial legislative election in 1900, but after losses in subsequent elections, it was dissolved by 1912.\textsuperscript{760} A short-lived version of the party re-emerged in the mid-1970s\textsuperscript{761} and again in the 1990s. Despite its history, the parties have not received much attention nor have the proposal of home rule or free association.

Free association provides a compromise solution which, while ultimately desirable, is of lessened utility in the current phase of the struggle for independence. Within a simple negotiating strategy approach, one basic principle is that “whichever negotiator starts with the more ambitious opening position wins the compromise”.\textsuperscript{762} As such, opening negotiations for independence by asking for the compromise of free association would place activists in a weak negotiating position. Yet as acceptance and political viability for independence increases, proposals such as this will likely become more common.
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5.1.2.5 Full Independence: Hawai‘i as a fully sovereign nation

Under this model, Hawai‘i would become completely legally separate from the United States and any arrangements between the two countries would be negotiated as, theoretically equal, separate nation-states.

Prior to the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i, Hawai‘i was recognised as a fully sovereign state having formed treaties with many European nations as well as the United States. The Kingdom had established almost one hundred diplomatic and consular posts and was a member of international organisations including the Universal Postal Union. Supporters of the full independence model argue that they are merely calling for the restoration of this internationally recognised kingdom that was illegally overthrown. With several nation-states within the Pacific having gained their independence in the last few decades, independence for Hawai‘i is presented as being a realistic possibility.

There is little agreement, however, on what this new nation-state should look like. The groups largely accept the idea of permitting residence for non-Hawaiians and most provide a pathway by which non-Hawaiians could obtain citizenship. There is a complete lack of agreement on how land ownership should function in the new kingdom, ranging from immediate or phased eviction of noncitizens to restriction on their land.
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ownershio. The different sovereignty groups generally accept the idea of non-Hawaiians in government positions, though many advocate for the highest level or culturally significant positions being restricted to Hawaiians. They are very mixed on tourism and immigration in general. Whilst sovereignty groups have provided several models of how their theoretical government could function, the immense political challenges that remain until independence can be obtained would make it likely that the eventual government will have little actual resemblance to their proposed hypothetical models.

The most significant challenge of establishing full sovereignty is the lack of a clear successor government. With the death of Prince Jonah Kūhiō Kalaniana’ole in 1922, all subsequent potential heirs to the throne were born long after the overthrow of the Kingdom and are only distantly related to the monarchy. Quentin Kūhiō Kawānanakoa (the great-nephew of Prince Kūhiō), a lawyer and former Republican state representative, provides the most direct connection to the throne. Kawānanakoa has stated in regards to the prince title that he does not “allude to myself in that fashion, but I certainly am proud of my forefathers who in fact were of the royal family”, and it was noted when he ran for office that he neither “claims nor rejects the title”. The other most direct descendant of the royal family is Abigail Kinoiki Kekaulike Kawānanakoa
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(the great-grandniece of King David Kalākaua). However now over 90 she is unlikely to be able to head a newly independent nation, nor has she shown any interest in doing so.  

Several sovereignty groups have people whom they claim should be the successor to the throne. Almost a dozen groups claim to be the legitimate government of the Hawaiian Kingdom. These groups range greatly in numbers of members, though most still have fairly small numbers. Many of these groups are centred around a person whom they claim has a direct linkage to the Hawaiian monarchy (though it is often fairly tenuous) and should thus be considered to be the legitimate heir to the throne. There is little recognition that any of the other groups have any legitimacy, with most choosing to completely ignore the others claims. The currently operating sovereignty groups who claim to be a successor government are seen across Hawai‘i as being radical fringe groups, none of whom would be in any way suited to form a new government (both in terms of popular support and logistical capacity).

One greatly underexplored option is allowing the State of Hawaii government to break away from the United States. In this model, the Governor would become the executive of the new country, at least on an interim basis. This mirrors the peaceful handoff of many other postcolonial states. It would minimise disruption and respects the

771 Keany, “Contenders to the Throne.”
772 Ibid.
773 Ibid.
774 Ibid.
democratic process. This option however largely fails to answer the moral wrongs committed by the overthrow and rather only addresses the legal wrongs.

    Full sovereignty, despite being the ultimate goal and what many would argue is the legal and moral obligation, is by far the most unlikely outcome of Hawaiian nationalism. In a 2014 poll by the Honolulu Star-Advertiser, only six per cent of respondents envisioned independence for Hawaiians.\textsuperscript{775} The process of forming a new country is frequently messy and risky. Barring some major change in US policy or a significant shift in Hawai'i public opinion, full sovereignty seems more like a dream than a realistic future.

5.1.3 The Counter-Sovereignty Movement

    Given the intensity of the Hawaiian sovereignty movement, the minimalism of a counter-sovereignty movement is remarkable. There is a complete absence of organised groups advocating against sovereignty. Rather there are a small number of fringe activists and scattered court cases which form the major opposition to sovereignty.

    The federal government of the United States has largely maintained a status quo policy towards the sovereignty issue despite a 1993 Joint Resolution apologising for the overthrow and some limited efforts by the Obama Administration. The State of Hawaii maintains a somewhat more nuanced view, but largely effectively operates under a status quo policy as well. Though both would likely be very involved in combating any actually viable attempts to establish a sovereign Hawaiian nation, neither can really be said to be
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acting as part of a counter sovereignty movement at this time, at least as far as nationalism is concerned.

Outside of the purely legal space (such as Rice v. Cayetano and Akina v. Hawai‘i), Kenneth Conklin and the group to which he is connected, “Aloha for All” provide the closest resemblance to an organised counter-sovereignty movement. Conklin is a prolific commenter online and is frequently selected by reporters to quote when seeking a counter-sovereignty perspective for “balance”. He remains a highly controversial person who has accused the Hawaiian sovereignty movement of advocating for racism and apartheid.776

The group Aloha for All states that their mission is “to ensure that ALL citizens of Hawaii are treated equally under the law”.777 Though the group was involved in some legal challenges and political advocacy, they never reached the level of attention that the pro-sovereignty groups found. Whilst the website remains online, Aloha for All’s was dissolved as a non-profit corporation in January 2015.778 It appears that the counter-sovereignty platform seems to exist today largely as a handful of commenters online without much of an active response beyond that.

There are also scattered discussions on white-supremacist websites that provide typically racist arguments about why Hawaiians should not be trusted or permitted to operate an independent state. Rather than provide any sort of meaningful political,
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historical or legal argument, they rely solely upon claims of white superiority over native groups. As these white-supremacist groups do not form a meaningful contingent within Hawai‘i, there is little value in attempting to analyse their position further, other than noting its existence.

5.2 Hot Nationalism in Niue

Amongst the islands that are the focus of this dissertation, the lowest level of hot nationalism is found in Niue. Indeed, there does not seem to be any active nationalist groups nor any sort of noticeable pro-nationalist action. Rather there is a more subtle and passive expression of nationalism. Niueans do consider themselves to be a separate people than New Zealanders. This, however, does not seem to have resulted in much efforts to make this distinction clearly known. The fact that Niueans are not New Zealanders seems to simply be accepted as an unchallenged statement within Niue, and there has been virtually no call for Niue to end the free association agreement in favour of full independence. Also, apparently absent is the sort of identity conflict that other groups in similar circumstances have felt, such as what can be seen in New Caledonians relationship with France.

It has been argued that the mass emigration from Niue has resulted in a situation in which Niuean identity is rapidly fading.\textsuperscript{779} Barnett argues that, as a result, “national pride is a rare feeling in Niue”\textsuperscript{780} He suggests that this lack of national pride is closely
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tied to the lack of “signs and symbols of the nation”.\textsuperscript{781} For whilst Niue “has a flag and a song, these are hardly the powerful icons of nationalism associated with most modern nation states”.\textsuperscript{782} Further, he suggests that the weakness of Niuean nationalism, particularly in comparison to other Pacific Island nations, is the result of the way Niue gained independence.\textsuperscript{783} Most other countries, even those who have obtained independence peacefully, have a narrative of struggle surrounding their independence.\textsuperscript{784} Niue, in contrast, obtained independence largely as a result of New Zealand’s offer and subsequent 1974 referendum rather than a long struggle. Even the way in which it marks its independence shares this theme. October 19-20 is celebrated as “Constution Day”, rather than Independence Day or Nation/Niue Day. It places the focus on the legal document rather than a victory over outside control or even a celebration of nationhood.

As a result of the free association agreement with New Zealand, Niueans carry New Zealand passports. Niueans can receive an optional stamp in their passports that identifies them as Niueans so as to allow for one-way travel to Niue.\textsuperscript{785} This has led the former premier of Niue to say that “‘the only document that tells us who we are is our
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passport, and it shows that we are New Zealanders.”.\textsuperscript{786} Niueans do not, however, consider themselves to be New Zealanders\textsuperscript{787}; and the assumption that they do because of their passport seems to be unequivocally rejected by Niueans and by the New Zealand Government.

Despite the mass migration away from Niue, Niueans abroad still maintain a strong connection to their homeland. Many people I interviewed expressed the sentiment that whilst few people wanted to stay in Niue, everyone wanted to ultimately be buried in Niue. Though for practical purposes, New Zealand is where they live and work, Niue remains what they consider “home”. There is a common feeling that they will eventually return to Niue (at least when they get old), despite their lives being in New Zealand and the resulting infeasibility of return.

Niuean nationalism seems to be most clearly expressed through cultural strengthening and revival efforts rather than a focus on hot nationalism. The formal efforts have come under the heading of Taoga Niue. This program is designed to build a stronger Niue through the promotion of traditional Niuean cultural practices. Though this mission could produce hot nationalistesque results, at least at present, it seems to fall more under the heading of everyday nationalism.

Whilst Niue’s independence is well recognised, there have been occasional calls to reintegrate with New Zealand.\textsuperscript{788} As increasing numbers of Niueans emigrate, it
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becomes increasingly difficult to provide services to the standard desired. Many residents feel that they could improve the quality of life on the island by again becoming a part of New Zealand. The Niuean Premier strongly rejected this notion in 2005. He called it “immoral” and noted that the infrastructure needs of Niue would not be different if they were to reintegrate with New Zealand. The discussions of reintegrating with New Zealand largely focus on the change as a practical decision rather than a reflection of Niuean nationhood. Supporters are not calling for reintegration because the nation of Niue no longer exists, but rather because of resource limitations. Cyclone Heta, which hit Niue in 2004, renewed concerns of the continued viability of Niue as an independent nation. The cyclone killed one person, seriously injured several and destroyed many homes and government buildings including the island’s only hospital. It also seriously damaged the island’s infrastructure and cut off power and communications. Even a decade later, many homes affected by the cyclone remain derelict with the owners having left for New Zealand. The storm also devastated the island’s young commercial agricultural industries. As a result, there was considerable concern with the lasting
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viability of an independent Niue.\textsuperscript{796} Rapid depopulation was expected, and many predicted a necessary end to Niuean independence.\textsuperscript{797} New Zealand stated that decision would be left to the government of Niue, noting "we need to acknowledge what the people on Niue want, rather than being seen as a former colonial country imposing our will".\textsuperscript{798} Niue ultimately remained independent with the population loss being much less than was predicted. Niue, however, remains at the edge of the minimum number of people to practically continue to maintain an independent nation. Niuean government agencies are already extremely small with many people filling several roles in government and the community. Another major wave of emigration, such as the result of another cyclone, could be devastating. This precarious position may mean that Niue may become the first modern nation to fail, not because of conflicts of national identity or because of foreign actors, but rather an inability to maintain the resources required to form the functions of a nation.

Whilst there is a clear absence of hot nationalism within Niue, it does not appear to be the result of a lack of national pride nor a belief that Niue is not an independent nation. Rather it appears that the lack of hot nationalism is the result of a combination of a strong presence of everyday nationalism (discussed in detail in the following chapter), and perhaps a lack of motivation given the continued recognition of their sovereignty by
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New Zealand and the significant burden many Niueans are under in maintaining the nation’s infrastructure.

5.3 Hot Nationalism in the Cook Islands

The Cook Islands has experienced more hot nationalism than Niue. It has emerged during several different periods, the first of which came during World War II. With the recent failure of New Zealand’s attempts to revive the fruit industry and increasing migration to New Zealand of young people, many Cook Island leaders became dissatisfied. An American Air Force unit stationed in Aitutaki provided increased development and wages to the island which had been previously fairly poor. They also provided a strong voice for what they perceived as New Zealand’s neglect of the island. Growing dissatisfaction led to the formation of the Cook Islands Progressive Association (CIPA). Though the group lacked a clear mandate or programme, it helped develop a critical voice against New Zealand administration. Over time, the CIPA developed labour union style methods to focus on wages and political reform. The group’s pro-Cook Island nationalist message was very popular in the islands, but its
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leadership was fragmented. The CIPA and the government engaged in a series of minor scuffles, after which the CIPA’s militant opposition to the New Zealand Administration gradually faded.

As noted several times already, New Zealand was a fervent supporter of the UN’s calls to ensure the political, economic, and social development of its non-self-governing territories. Amongst several programs to address this within its territories was the granting of limited home rule in the formation of the Cook Islands Legislative Council in 1946. With this shift, the CIPA altered their Cook Island nationalist agenda to focus their opposition to the New Zealand Administration into the Legislative Council.

Though the nationalist fervour faded, the CIPA continued to exist, eventually playing a large role in the formation of the Cook Islands Party. The Cook Islands Party though a nationalist party advocated for maintaining ties with New Zealand.

During the 1965-1974 period of Albert Henry's (Cook Islands Party) government, a very controlled type of nationalism emerged. In this form, Albert Henry's
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government promoted a number of carefully designed performances to show the world a version of Cook Islands unity and identity.\footnote{813}

### 5.3.1.1 Ending Free Association

There have been occasional calls for ending the free association agreement with New Zealand, but these efforts have failed to gain meaningful traction. Under the 1946 agreement, the Cook Islands has the right to unilaterally end the arrangement and become fully independent. New Zealand PM Helen Clark said in 2000, that “If they [the Cook Islands] want to exert complete independence, New Zealand would not stand in their way”.\footnote{814}

Cook Island politicians have suggested that full independence would facilitate UN membership and increase foreign relationships.\footnote{815} The vote in the UN and the new foreign relationships are presented as allowing for increased bargaining power in obtaining foreign aid and investment.\footnote{816} This approach would likely generate additional income for the Cook Islands. Several small nations have also successfully monetised their UN votes by offering larger states their support on issues in exchange for foreign aid.\footnote{817} For example, Nauru (a small Pacific island state) was offered $50 million by Russia in exchange for extending diplomatic recognition to Abkhazia and South Ossetia.\footnote{818}

---

\footnote{813}{Ibid.}
\footnote{814}{Andrews, “NZ Won’t Stand in Way of Cook Islands’ Independence.”}
\footnote{815}{Small and Day, “Cook Islands Push for Independence.”}
\footnote{816}{Ibid.}
\footnote{817}{Lockwood, “International Vote Buying.”}
\footnote{818}{Ibid.}
Similarly, Iran gave $200,000 to the Solomon Islands (another small Pacific island state) to support Iran’s opposition to Israel joining the UN General Assembly.\(^{819}\) China and Taiwan have both also contributed significantly to several small states in exchange for recognition or de-recognition of Taiwan.\(^{820}\) Deals favourable to small island UN members are common, resulting in aid and other concessions.\(^{821}\) This has resulted in many small states supporting larger players on issues that are of little direct concern to them.\(^{822}\) As these deals are commonplace and are generally seen as legal\(^{823}\), the Cook Islands would likely stand to gain significant financial advantages via UN membership.

Whilst the Cook Islands could probably join the UN under its current system\(^{824}\), its relationship with New Zealand would limit its ability to fully negotiate freely and thus may leave them unable to fully reap the financial benefits.

Of great concern for full independence efforts, is the automatic New Zealand citizenship that Cook Islanders currently receive as a result of the free association agreement.\(^{825}\) It is under this arrangement that many Cook Islanders live, work, and
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receive schooling in New Zealand and Australia. Ending the free association agreement would almost certainly mean an end of the automatic New Zealand citizenship. New Zealand citizenship is seen as providing many jobs and opportunities that do not exist within the Cook Islands. Unless nationalist politicians are able to secure an alternative arrangement for citizenship, any referendum on ending free association is highly likely to fail.

5.4 Hot Nationalism in Fiji

Fiji across its four coups and the instability surrounding them has seen several flare-ups of hot nationalism. This has almost entirely manifested as pro-iTaukei ethnonationalism. The Banimarama government has however in recent years attempted to establish a unified nation with deliberate attempts to replace ethnonationalism with civic-nationalism.

Ethnonationalism is built around the idea that the nation should be formed on the basis of common ethnic ancestry. The nation, in this view, is characterised by a shared heritage, language and religion. In Fiji, this is manifested primarily through the notion
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that the nation of Fiji should be defined in terms of iTaukei heritage. For iTaukei ethnonationalists, their long connection to the islands as the indigenous people of Fiji is used to justify measures to ensure their continuing control over the nation.

Civic-nationalism refers to nationalism that is built around the notion that all people who live within the geopolitical borders of the nation should be considered part of the nation regardless of ethnicity, religion or other similar factors.\textsuperscript{831} Bainimarama has spearheaded efforts to redefine the language used to talk about Fijians as well as shape how the nation is reflected in sports, music and other national celebrations. Much of these efforts fall within the realm of everyday nationalism and are discussed within the following chapter.

5.4.1 Actions

5.4.1.1 Land Laws

The policy that most strongly defines iTaukei supremacy is Fiji’s land ownership laws. Under policies established by Sir Arthur Gordon in 1882, about 82\% of land in Fiji is held as “customary” land or “native” land.\textsuperscript{832} This land is considered to be owned collectively by a clan, tribe or family.\textsuperscript{833} It cannot be sold, even to other iTaukei.\textsuperscript{834} It can
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only be leased.\textsuperscript{835} Of the native land, two-thirds have been leased to non-iTaukeis.\textsuperscript{836} The vast majority of these leases are held by Indo-Fijians.\textsuperscript{837} This has created a situation in which despite having been in Fiji for several generations, owning the land on which they live and work is a completely unattainable dream for most Indo-Fijians. They are instead trapped in a cycle of land leases, that each time may or may not be renewed. The expiry of land leases in the late 1990s caused considerable concern amongst Indo-Fijians as many were not renewed.\textsuperscript{838}

Fiji’s land restrictions are codified within the Constitution of Fiji.\textsuperscript{839} As such they serve as a powerful reminder that despite any work to the contrary in building a united Fiji, iTaukei will always have a more privileged position in the fundamental area of land ownership.

The strong protections for native land ownership used within Fiji are often presented as a model of preserving native rights from which other nations can learn. This sort of support from academics and activists in other countries has been routinely used to justify the continuance of the system and the whitewashing of its problematic limitations. Fijian land tenure, as well as being used as a tool of ethnonationalism, is not even ideal for iTaukei peoples. It imposes a paternalistic model which robs people of their agency in the disposition of what is supposed to be their land, whilst granting the Land Trust Board
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enormous powers. It does not even actually reflect a traditional model of land ownership.\textsuperscript{840} Exclusive rights to land was a concept introduced to Fiji by European settlers\textsuperscript{841}. Even the model of mataqali\textsuperscript{842} land claims, on which the policy was based, is the model of the Bau group, not all of Fiji.\textsuperscript{843}

5.4.1.2 Constitution

The constitutions of Fiji have served as one of the most hotly contested battlegrounds of iTaukei ethnonationalism. Various revisions have been used to provide constitutionally guaranteed dominance for iTaukeis.

The first post-independence 1970 constitution granted significant power to the entirely iTaukei Great Council of Chiefs and the Fijian Affairs Board.\textsuperscript{844} It also guaranteed the Native Land Trust Board’s control of all “native land”.\textsuperscript{845} A 22 member senate was also created and composed in a manner that would ensure iTaukei control.\textsuperscript{846} Whilst the lower house of Parliament used an electoral system that gave equal seats to Indo-Fijians and iTaukei (along with a lesser number of seats for other ethnic groups), the
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iTaukei controlled senate held veto power over issues related to iTaukei interests.\textsuperscript{847} Constitutional change would also require two-thirds of the Senate to approve it.\textsuperscript{848}

Following the 1987 coups, the interim government announced a new constitution.\textsuperscript{849} This constitution expanded the lower house of Parliament to 70 seats of which 37 are to be elected by iTaukei, 27 by Indo-Fijians, one by Rotumans, leaving five seats for other races.\textsuperscript{850} The Senate was adjusted to give iTaukei an even greater majority.\textsuperscript{851} This constitution established a process wherein the Prime Minister was selected by the President from amongst the iTaukei members of the lower house.\textsuperscript{852} Both the president and the iTaukei members of the Senate were to be selected by the Great Council of Chiefs.\textsuperscript{853}

The National Federation Party and the Fiji Labour Party Coalition described the proposed constitution as “profoundly authoritarian, undemocratic, militaristic, racist and feudalistic. It would be derisive and sow the seeds of terrible violence. It would retard our social and economic development. It would isolate us from many of our valued neighbours, the Commonwealth and the international community”.\textsuperscript{854} Despite heavy
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criticism both domestically and by the international community, the constitution was adopted in 1990.855

Constitutional change became one of the key political issues of the 1992 and 1994 elections with Indo-Fijians groups advocating for repeal and many iTaukei groups strongly supporting it.856 Facing growing international pressure, a commission was eventually established to review the constitution and form recommendations as provided under Section 161 (which required a review before seven years).857 The three-person multi-ethnic commission provided 697 recommendations.858 After eight months of debate, Parliament and the Great Council of Chiefs endorsed most of the recommendations.859 The recommendations were incorporated into the Constitution (Amendment) Bill 1997 which was adopted in July 1997.860 This constitution allowed for equal representation in the lower house and removed the ethnic requirement for Prime Minister.861

The 1997 constitution was abrogated in 2009 following the Appeals Court’s ruling on the constitutionality of the 2006 coup.862 In 2012, a commission was established
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to draft a new constitution in preparation for the 2014 elections.\footnote{863}{“Fiji Begins Public Hearings on New Constitution.”} After significant
community consultation, the Commission submitted a draft constitution to the
government.\footnote{864}{Siegel, “Fiji’s Government Rejects Proposed Reform Constitution.”} The government rejected the proposed constitution and elected to adopt a
modified version written by Fiji’s Attorney-General.\footnote{865}{“Fiji Releases Final Version of New Constitution.”} Though fairly similar in many
areas, the government's version rejected the Commission regional constituencies
model.\footnote{866}{Ibid.} It also preserved military power.\footnote{867}{Siegel, “Fiji’s Government Rejects Proposed Reform Constitution.”} The constitution contains a number of
provisions aimed at promoting a single national identity and countering
ethnonationalism.\footnote{868}{“Fiji Releases Final Version of New Constitution.”} It also formally lowered the voting age to 18, adopted a one-person-
one-vote model (ending the ethnic electoral roll system) and recognised multiple
citizenships.\footnote{869}{Ibid.} Despite its positive changes, the constitution has been heavily criticised
by human rights groups, including Amnesty International, who state that the “new
constitution not only erodes basic human rights for the people of Fiji but grants military,
police and government officials absolute immunity for past, present and future human
rights violations”.\footnote{870}{“Fiji: New Constitution Fails to Protect Fundamental Human Rights.”}
5.4.1.3 Political

Political parties in Fiji have historically been divided largely along ethnic lines. Despite this division, most have adopted a somewhat centrist policy. Though several parties such as the Alliance Party under Ratu Sir Kamisese Mara, have advocated a “Fiji for All” platform, they do not generally see great cross-ethnic support. Other parties such as Sitiveni Rabuka’s Soqosoqo ni Vakavulewa ni Taukei party started as staunch ethnonationalists, but eventually shifted to be more inclusive. Further, for several parties, despite being officially committed to national unity and multiracial cooperation, many of the parties that have held power have been perceived as supporting one group over the other. Of the recent governments, Chaudhry’s was popularly perceived as being too strongly Indian oriented, whilst Qarase was seen as too focused on iTaukei issues. The political parties have though whilst generally taking an officially multiracial stance used their power to reinforce more subtle ethnonationalist agendas.
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Interestingly, despite the ethnic divide and rhetoric, strongly ethnonationalist parties do not seem to have been especially successful. This is particularly evident in the 2014 election in which no strongly ethnonationalist parties ran.\textsuperscript{877}

5.4.1.4 \textit{Coups}

Matching what many imagine when they think of hot nationalism, Fiji has seen significant political upheaval. Fiji has undergone four coups since independence in 1976. Three of the four coups were directly related to ethnonationalist policies, whilst the fourth was presented as necessary to counter ethnonationalism.

The first coup came in 1987 following the April election of a coalition government led by Timoci Bavadra (an iTaukei), with a majority Indo-Fijian membership.\textsuperscript{878} Though the government was multiracial, the power of Indo-Fijians within the coalition government greatly concerned many iTaukei nationalists.\textsuperscript{879} A strongly racist and ethnonationalist movement known as the Taukei Movement held a number of protests demanding a government formed of only iTaukeis be created.\textsuperscript{880}

With ethnonationalists becoming increasingly vocal, Lt. Col. Sitiveni Rabuka removed the Bavadra government in a military coup less than a month after the election.\textsuperscript{881} Rabuka accompanied by ten armed soldiers entered the Fijian House of
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Representatives and ordered the Members of Parliament to leave the building. They complied with his demands, allowing Rabuka to dissolve the government and declare himself head of state. He claimed to be acting to prevent racial violence and maintain order.

Having lost faith in and control of the post-coup interim government he appointed, Rabuka staged a second coup on September 25th. In December, facing international pressure, Rabuka resigned as head of state allowing the previous PM Ratu Sir Kamisese Mara to be reappointed and Rabuka to become Minister of Home Affairs. A discriminatory constitution (discussed above) was put into effect in 1990 which prevented Indo-Fijians and minorities from holding a majority in parliament. Under this constitution, Rabuka became Prime Minister in 1993.

In May 1999, in the first elections held under the 1997 Constitution, Indo-Fijian parties led by Mahendra Chaudhry won, and Chaudhry became Fiji’s first Indo-Fijian prime minister. His election was used by many iTaukei nationalists to enflame anti-
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Indian sentiments.\textsuperscript{890} In May 2000, Chaudhry and Parliament were taken hostage as part of a civilian-led coup.\textsuperscript{891} The coup leader, George Speight, has been described as a failed businessman who had recently been dismissed by the Chaudhry government from his position as head of the Fiji Hardwood Corporation and was facing charges of extortion.\textsuperscript{892} Speight described his actions as being in the interests of promoting “the supreme rights of our indigenous people in Fiji”.\textsuperscript{893} He made heavy use of ethnonationalist rhetoric, though many questioned his sincerity.\textsuperscript{894}

The Fijian military was able to retake control eight weeks later\textsuperscript{895}, and by September 2001, general elections were held restoring democracy, leading to four years of reasonable stability.\textsuperscript{896} In May 2005, the government proposed a highly controversial Reconciliation and Unity Commission which could grant amnesty to those involved in the 2000 coup.\textsuperscript{897} In response to the commission and accusations of government corruption and racism, Commodore Frank Bainimarama seized power, appointing
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himself Acting President of Fiji on 5 December 2006.898 In contrast to previous coups, Bainimarama presented his coup as anti-ethnonationalist and necessary to “clean up” the damage ethnonationalism had done to the country.899 Bainimarama had previously served as the leader of the interim military government in 2000.900 In early January, he restored Iloilo to the Presidency, who formally appointed Bainimarama the Prime Minister in an attempt to legitimise the coup.901 In 2009, the Court of Appeals rejected these actions as unconstitutional, leading Iloilo to revoke the constitution, prior to re-appointing Bainimarama.902 Though this government has made significant changes aimed at improving civil rights and correcting systematic racial discrimination, there have also been serious issues with censorship and human rights abuse. Following five years of delays, elections were finally held on 17 September 2014.903 In a “fair and free election” 904, Bainimarama's FijiFirst party won with 59.2% of the vote allowing Bainimarama to become an elected Prime Minister of Fiji.905

In 2014, at least 65 people were arrested and face charges of sedition as part of an alleged plot to form a breakaway Christian state.906 The group is accused of being
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engaged in military-style training under the direction of a former British army soldier.\textsuperscript{907} The group is said to have been preparing to declare a portion of the northern province of Ra independent, establishing the Ra Sovereign Christian State.\textsuperscript{908} With several of those arrested traditional iTaukei chiefs\textsuperscript{909} and the identification as a Christian State, the attempt appears to be a rejection of Bainimarama’s plans for a “unified nation” and another example of pro-iTaukei ethnonationalism.

The first three coups are undeniable examples of hot nationalism. They used ethnonationalistic rhetoric to convince significant portions of the nation that the coups were necessary to avoid serious harm to Fiji. Enthusiastic support for the coups was fairly short-lived, and in retrospect, many have expressed regret for their role. The leader of the 1987 coups, Sitiveni Rabuka, has since apologised for the coup and advocated for multiracialism. Similarly, Ratu Meli Vesikula, one of the most prominent and extremist leaders of the ethnonationalist movement later asked for forgiveness from the Indo-Fijian community. In the 18 years since the 2000 coup, ethnonationalism has not been well received in Fiji. The Bainimarama government has made it very clear that they are not willing to tolerate divisive ethnonationalism, including deploying often oppressive
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\textsuperscript{907} Though the government has not confirmed it, it is assumed that the person is a Fijian national who had served with the British army, rather than a foreign national. \\
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restrictions to protect against it. As such, ethnonationalism and most traditional expressions of hot nationalism have largely faded away from modern Fiji.

5.4.1.5 Military

The military’s position within Fijian nationalism is one that is rife with contradictions. The military is unusually large for a nation of Fiji’s size and has played a significant role within Fijian governance. It is overwhelmingly composed of people of iTaukei descent with Brigadier General Mohammed Aziz serving as one of the only senior Indo-Fijians officers in the military. Overall, the Fijian military can be seen as an organisation of ethnic iTaukei power. Interestingly, the military sees very little ethnonationalist ideology and for the past several decades has largely served to combat the rise of ethnonationalism.

The military under the command of Bainimarama took control of the government following the ethnonationalist 2000 coup and quickly re-established a civilian government. The military-led 2006 coup resulted in the establishment of a military government that actively combated ethnonationalism and implemented a series of policies to strengthen civic nationalism. Though members of the military have participated in ethnonationalist events, the ideal of an inclusive Fiji built on civic nationalism seems to be widely shared in the Fijian armed forces.

---

910 The Bainimarama government no longer collects employment data by ethnicity. Estimates place Indo-Fijians at between two and five per cent of the Fijian military.
5.4.2 Desired Outcomes

5.4.2.1 Supremacy of iTaukei

“Fiji for Fijians” has long been the rallying cry of iTaukei ethnonationalists. It calls for a privileged position for iTaukei peoples within the nation. What this should actually mean is often left undefined, but it remains a frequent slogan of those who oppose civic-nationalism.

It has been suggested that modern iTaukei ethnonationalism can be traced to Sir Arthur Gordon’s 1876 policies that strongly favoured iTaukeis.\textsuperscript{911} This principle of paramountcy of iTaukeis interests was expressed repeatedly by the colonial government.\textsuperscript{912} Built out of an apparent concern for native rights and as a way to avoid Indo-Fijian demands for representation, the principles remained into the independent Fijian state.\textsuperscript{913}

Ethnonationalism in Fiji is not occurring within a vacuum. Many iTaukei ethnonationalists have made great use of global discussions on native rights in order to support ethnonationalist superiority. Sakeasi Butadroka, one of the most vocal ethnonationalist politicians, justified his party’s strong ethnonationalist agenda as necessary so as to “prevent Fijians from succumbing to competition, as the North American Indians, Hawaiians, and Maoris had done”.\textsuperscript{914} Global calls for justice and self-
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determination for indigenous people have been repeatedly perverted by ethnonationalists to gain support and justification for discrimination and racism. There remains no legal basis within international human rights law to differentiate between peoples based upon native-versus-settler status. The right of self-determination is recognised as belonging to “all peoples”.

5.4.2.2 Removal of Indo-Fijians

Conspicuously absent in iTaukei ethnonationalism is the lack of a serious politically viable call to remove Indo-Fijians from modern Fiji. The only major exception was when Sakeasi Butadroka, a strongly ethnonationalist politician, proposed a motion to Parliament calling for the repatriation of all Indo-Fijians to India. The motion quickly failed, and the proposal badly fragmented his party. The severity of this failure to his party and his own career can be seen as indicative of the nation’s feelings.

There is a reasonably widespread recognition that Indo-Fijians contribute positively to the country. Despite the lack of a call to remove Indo-Fijians, the conditions within Fiji have encouraged mass emigration, with most of those leaving Indo-Fijians. As the migrants are disproportionately skilled and educated persons, the
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economic impact is significant with some estimates placing the loss as high as F$274.7 million.\footnote{921}

5.4.3 Other Ethnonationalism

In looking at the strength of iTaukei ethnonationalism, there becomes a noticeable absence of Indo-Fijian Nationalism in Fiji.\footnote{922} Though now having been in Fiji for several generations and having been mistreated and discriminated against at many points in Fiji’s history, despite holding substantial economic power, there has never been calls for an Indo-Fijian nation. This appears to be the result of an acceptance of the narrative that Indo-Fijians are visitors with limited legitimate claim to the nation.\footnote{923} Ease of emigration, particularly to Australia and New Zealand, has also helped to provide an outlet for the most frustrated Indo-Fijians.\footnote{924} Rather than fight for a nation within Fiji, the most agitated, who would otherwise be motivated to fight, elect to leave the country.

Whilst iTaukei ethnonationalism has received most of the scholarly and non-academic attention, there is also the long-standing issue of the Rotuma nation. The Rotuma islands were ceded to Great Britain in 1881 to be administered as part of Fiji following a war amongst the chiefs of Rotuma.\footnote{925} Rotumans are of a different ethnic group than iTaukei Fijians, with the joint administration being the result of practical
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administrative concerns by Britain, rather than natural commonality between the colonies. Though there was widespread dissatisfaction with the way in which the islands were represented, there was little call to split from Fiji when it was granted its independence in 1970. The 1987 Fijian coup, however, led to vote of Chiefs and representatives of Rotuma districts. They elected to remain part of Fiji. A vocal minority objected and formed a group which declared the islands of Rotuma to be an independent nation. Fiji sent police and military several weeks after the declaration “to restore order” and again a month later. Though the secession efforts have largely faded with Rotumans now being able to elect one representative to the Fijian House of Representatives and appoint a representative to the Fijian Senate, there still remains some discontent.

5.5 Conclusions

The classic image of hot nationalism is one of an extreme, typically violent, fight for the nation. In this traditionally imagined form, it is marked by flags, protests, riots and marches. It is assumed to be an emotionally driven time of upheaval and radicalism fighting for their nation’s sovereignty. Despite these images’ place in the popular imagination, the vast majority of separatist movements today have abandoned most of the extreme forms of hot nationalism. Even most of those that still have a militant component
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to their movement has seen a transition into becoming the military of a de facto state rather than remaining as a “rebel” militant group.

Modern hot nationalism has taken on a new shape. The courts and political action have come to replace the displays and violence of the past. Groups will engage in highly visible attempts to promote their idea of the nation to the public. The energy and brazenness that marks hot nationalism remains completely present within these efforts, but the methods by which they act have only become more refined, as the public’s taste has shifted and its tolerance for violent extremism has waned.

Fiji is an excellent example of the transitions in hot nationalism. Though extreme hot nationalism existed in Fiji only in extremely short bursts, Fiji has still had several coups with rather fiery rhetoric surrounding them. The first three coups heavily utilised hot nationalistic style ethnonationalism to build support for the coups. Public tolerance of the coup’s culture has rapidly faded, such that the last coup was sold with the premise that it would prevent future coups through the building of a strong, unified sovereign state.

Hawaiian nationalism has seen a similar reimagining of hot nationalism. Its opponent in the struggle for sovereignty is so much more powerful that there is little chance of success with an armed independence struggle either directly or in a guerrilla-style effort. Furthermore, there is a near complete lack of public support for any sort of violent method. As such, the technique required is one that shows that it is a distinct nation and makes a moral appeal to convince the world to correct a historic injustice. Though many directions have been employed, the current favourite seems to be utilising
a twin approach of showing a strong, recognisable national identity and by making an
appeal to people’s sense of justice with a legalistic approach.

Both the Cook Islands and Niue share in a lack of appetite for traditional style hot
nationalism. They are by and large happy with the current arrangement. They are
independent states with a distinct national identity without any need or desire for blatant
nationalism.

Whilst hot nationalism has changed considerably across these nations to its
modern and more politically focused form, many nationalists are increasingly turning
their attention to the subtler everyday nationalism. Though everyday nationalism is
traditionally the result of unconscious expressions of the nation, it has become
increasingly part of the tool chest of nationalists as they work to shape what their nation
looks like.
Chapter 6

6 Everyday Nationalism

Every day we encounter many reminders that we are situated in a nation. Even in the smallest of nations (such as several of those in this paper), subtle symbols of nationhood are a significant, though oft-ignored, part of daily life. These symbols are highly pervasive and include those which are both very obviously nationalistic, such as flags and anthems, and ones which are much less commonly seen as nationalistic, such as food and sport. Billig argues that even some of the obvious symbols of nationalism can be a part of the realm of everyday nationalism. He uses the example of the waved and unwaved flag to differentiate between these two ways of using nationalistic symbols. The waved flag represents the classic imaginings of nationalism; the flag being waved proudly calling attention to itself. The unwaved flag describes the seemingly ever-present but mostly ignored flag depictions. It encompasses the times in which the nation’s flag has become a part of the background. This can include most of the times it is flown from a flagpole in front of a business or attached to a uniform. Passerbys may subconsciously register that the symbol of the nation is being flown but are unlikely to think much about it or the nation it represents. This chapter explores the ways in which these unwaved daily expressions of nationalism are expressed within the four nations of this dissertation.

One of the challenges with banal nationalism is that many expressions of it involve decisions that are made for ostensibly practical reasons. The actor did not typically set out to create a nationalistic representation but rather chose a course of action based upon what they see as ordinary concerns. These decisions, however, are strongly
influenced by ingrained, unconscious values relating to nationhood. Take, for example, Billig’s classic case of newspaper layout. An editor may have directly chosen to divide the paper into “national” and “world” news for practical reasons based on printing limitations, reporter allocation, etc. Ultimately, however, the fact that this division even seems logical to the editor (versus arbitrarily splitting the paper into fifteen-page sections or other content-neutral policy) is because of the pervasiveness of nationalism in our everyday lives.

Further, whilst everyday nationalism is generally reproduced through unconscious, or at-least minimally examined, behaviour, it can be orchestrated or manipulated intentionally to serve nationalist agendas. Particularly within sovereignty movements, activists will commonly encourage smaller, less offensive, changes to aspects of daily life in order to normalise their idea of a sovereign nation. In doing so, they encourage a gradual acceptance that allows for change that might otherwise be unachievable.

Though attempts at gaining recognition of Hawaiian sovereignty have to-date largely been unsuccessful, subtle recognition of a Hawaiian nation is present across daily life in Hawai‘i. There, however, remains some challenges in interpreting these symbols. By co-opting the symbols of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i, early state leaders managed to rob those in favour of sovereignty of any of the clearest symbols of the movement. The differences between the Kingdom version and the co-opted version are often too subtle to be useful as a protest. The flag gains only a tiny amount of additional white space around the cross between the Kingdom and the State of Hawaii versions. Even, the State coat of arms differs from the Kingdom’s version only in replacing the centre with a star and
some extremely minor stylistic changes. Sometimes there are no differences at all. The anthems of the Kingdom and the State of Hawaii are identical. As such, it would be unclear if a person singing “Hawaiʻi Ponoʻī” is supporting the State of Hawaii (by singing the State anthem) or protesting against statehood in singing the Kingdom's national anthem, as they are the same song. For many of the other symbols, there is a similar challenge; the differences are noticeable only when in direct comparison to each other. Simultaneously, however, the symbolism also works against the State of Hawaii by the fact that nearly all of the State’s official symbols symbolically undermine the legitimacy of the State by promoting the kingdom. As discussed later in this chapter, “Hawaiʻi Ponoʻī” praises the monarchy, the State seal has symbols of the crown, and many State holidays honour the monarchy.

The Cook Islands and Niue also feature meaningful contradictions in their nationalist efforts. Both nations have a high dependence on New Zealand to fund government activities. Any pro-nationalist government actions are likely to be undertaken with funds that ultimately come from New Zealand, the very state that nationalists are aiming to express distinction from. These contradictions may also be meaningful evidence of these states’ independence and sovereignty. If they were truly just puppet governments under New Zealand's control, it would be unlikely that they would be undertaking official action that affirms a nationalistic distance from New Zealand.

Fiji represents a more traditional exploration of nationalism. With its sovereignty fully recognised, the nationalistic fight is one of building an identity within historical circumstances, rather than a struggle for recognition. As we have seen, unlike most of the South Pacific island nations, Fiji has significant cultural and ethnic diversity. Fijians face
challenges in building an inclusive identity while preserving traditional culture and land rights. Where traditional expressions of hot nationalism have been largely divisive in Fiji, evidence of everyday nationalism suggests that a unified identity may already be occurring with much greater success than official or most academic narratives suggest.

Despite contradictions and challenges, the expressions of banal nationalism do reasonably reflect each nation’s typically recognised sovereignty status and version of nationhood. Fiji’s symbols are those of a fully sovereign nation. Hawai‘i clearly represents a special status: not really fully part of the U.S. nation, but also still undeniably not that of a fully sovereign nation. Niue and the Cook Islands express most of the symbols of everyday nationalism, but in a much subtler and more muddled way than in many other small, clearly independent island states.

This chapter opens with a discussion of some of the more banal aspects of banal nationalism and progresses into an exploration of the more typically studied areas of everyday nationalism. Though each of these areas can be highly important for identity, many are seen as the result of more seemingly practical minor decisions rather than statements of nationalism. These apparently insignificant decisions when looked at a nation level form a meaningful part of their expression of everyday nationalism. Further, even when practical reasons provide a reasonable explanation, the acceptability of the choice and the climate that allows that choice would suggest that banal nationalism is functioning across many areas of daily life in each of the nations studied.

6.1 Customs and Immigration

Crossing through customs and immigration provide the clearest and often first encountered demarcation that a person is entering another nation. It provides an
exceptionally obvious symbol of the state’s recognition of its own boundedness. Going through customs and immigration is an unavoidable ritual for most border crossings.\textsuperscript{929} This ritual and the physically demarcated space associated with it serves as a place in which boundary identities are confirmed, and the rules of acceptable goods within a nation are enforced. As the first point of contact with the state, there is a highly significant opportunity for the state to express its identity and define its relationship with the world.

Travellers to Niue (including those coming from New Zealand) are required to complete an arrival card, which must be submitted to an immigration officer along with their passport. Baggage is screened by customs, and strict biosecurity limitations are imposed. Although processing relatively small numbers of people, both immigration and customs officials attach the same seriousness and attention to detail as any other state’s inspection services. The Cook Islands maintains largely the same system as Niue. There are no special exceptions made for New Zealanders. In this regard, both Niue and the Cook Islands act indistinguishably from any other sovereign state to protect their borders from unauthorised immigration, biosecurity concerns and control importation. This contrasts with the model typically employed for overseas territories (like Guam or Puerto Rico) where no passport is required when travelling between the territory and the state. It thus reaffirms the sovereignty of Niue and the Cook Islands in following the model expected of a sovereign state.

\textsuperscript{929} Even within a group of countries that have common travel areas such as the Schengen Area, there is still typically the physical infrastructure for controlling immigration and customs checks.
Fiji operates a customs and immigration service typical of a nation of its size. All visitors complete an arrival card, present their passport, and submit their baggage for customs screening. There is no special priority given to citizens from any other state. This procedure contrasts with the model under which many other states operate. In those states, there will be dedicated immigration queues for citizens of countries that have special relationships with the state. For example, New Zealand has dedicated immigration queues for Australian citizens, reflecting the privileged status of Australians under the Trans-Tasman Travel Arrangement\textsuperscript{930}. Fiji, however, lacks these sorts of close ties with other states and has only citizen and noncitizen immigration queues (as well as logistically necessary disability assistance, VIP and crew queues).

Although Hawai‘i does not have its own immigration requirements for travel originating in the United States, it does have strict customs-style agricultural enforcement. All travellers are required to complete a form documenting what agricultural items they are bringing into the state, with significant penalties for failing to complete the form or for bringing in prohibited items. Though serving a slightly different function, this process is most similar to the experience of travel to a foreign country, rather than typical domestic travel. Budget cuts have reduced the agricultural inspection process to a largely honour-based system, but visitors used to be required to submit their agricultural inspection form to an inspector with random bag searches prior to exiting the

\textsuperscript{930} This agreement between Australia and New Zealand allows for citizens of the two nations to live and work in the other country with only a few limitations. For the vast majority of Australians and New Zealanders, except those with criminal charges, it allows unrestricted free movement between the two countries.
baggage area. There have been frequent calls to return to this stronger system or an otherwise more intensive formulation. Departing Hawai‘i, all baggage is screened by USDA inspectors. In this way, Hawaiʻi is fairly unique. It is exceptionally rare for states to have inspections like this at their domestic borders. This system of formal inspection, though legally different from customs and immigration, provides a similar feel of crossing a nation’s border.

In all four nations, visitors are typically greeted with local style music prior to going through the above-mentioned entry rituals (in all but Hawaii, typically performed by a live band). This could be seen as further increasing the ritual of the border crossing by demarcating it further and adding a non-practical, solely symbolic element to it.

6.2 Air Travel

The typical division between domestic and international as it relates to air travel provides a very obvious, though not very frequently encountered, reminder of the boundaries of the nation. Flights are generally sorted into domestic and international within the physical spaces of the airports. This flagging serves to remind travellers of what can be considered within the nation and what is outside it. Though not mentioned by Billig, this is an extremely clear example of the style of banal nationalism he describes. The differences between domestic and international travel are explicit, but often underexamined by most travellers. The ways in which the two differ are generally clearly noticed in the numerous logistical distinctions, but few reflect at the time upon the fact that these are required because of the arbitrary boundness of their nation. For example, a flight from Toronto to Windsor, Ontario is treated completely differently than a flight from Toronto to Detroit, despite the two airports being only 34km apart. The notion that
some flights have one set of characteristics because they are “domestic”, and others should have another because they are “international” is accepted without question, demonstrating the internalisation of the idea of the nation.

Given the division of flights into domestic and international, we would expect that nations would have flight divisions that reflect their national status. Flights within the nation's borders should always be treated as domestic, and flights outside its borders would be treated as international without further distinction. This is the case for Niue, the Cook Islands and Fiji, reinforcing their sovereignty and identity as a nation. Hawai‘i, however, provides an unusual case.

As is to be expected, flights from Auckland to Niue and the Cook Islands operate out of Auckland Airport’s international terminal. Like all other international flights, travellers to Niue and the Cook Islands must complete a New Zealand departure card and clear outbound immigration on departure. As is typical for independent countries, travellers to these islands are treated as would any international passenger departing Auckland without any regard to the special status of Niue and the Cook Islands.

Niue International Airport currently has flights only to Auckland, and due to the small size of the country will never have domestic flights (perhaps with the exception of sightseeing circle tours). As such, all flights out of the Niue International Airport are international and are treated that way operationally. Rarotonga International Airport in the Cook Islands, however, has both domestic and international flights. The airport is split into a domestic gate area and an international area. International flights require travellers to go through exit immigration. Flights to Auckland and Christchurch are treated no differently than non-New Zealand international flights.
Fiji has two international airports: Nadi International Airport and Nausori Airport near Suva, the capital. Nadi has separate international and domestic terminals. All flights within Fiji leave from the domestic terminal. All international flights, including flights to neighbouring island-states, leave from the international terminal. Due to its very small size, Nausori Airport has only one terminal. They, however, do divide the terminal into a domestic section and an international section. Scheduled air service within Fiji is operated exclusively by Northern Air and Fiji Link. The national flag carrier, Fiji Airways, operates no domestic flights. Fiji Link, however, operates flights to five international destinations in Tonga, Tuvalu, Samoa and Vanuatu. Though unusual for what is otherwise a small regional carrier, this model has been used in other parts of the world to serve neighbouring countries on routes where larger planes are not economically sound. For example, the Canadian carrier Jazz Aviation serves over twenty secondary U.S. destinations from Canada under the brand Air Canada Express, along with its extensive domestic route network.

Honolulu International Airport, Hawaii’s main airport, has three terminals. Dividing flights into “overseas”, “inter-island” and “commuter” (inter-island flights operated by prop planes). U.S mainland domestic and international flights are operated out of the same gates of the overseas terminal without any differentiation. This division is fairly unique as no other major U.S. airport separates intra-state flights from other flights. This separation creates the impression of the typical split between domestic and international as if flights within Hawai‘i are domestic and flights to everywhere else are international. Flights to Hawai‘i also share this unusual division. Though not universal, many flights to Hawai‘i from mainland U.S. airports are operated out of dedicated gates.
or gates shared only with international flights, often in terminals or concourses separate from most other domestic flights for a combination of logistical and marketing reasons.

Flights to the U.S. mainland are referred to as “domestic” flights, but there is a sense that they are not really domestic flights. Though there are a handful of longer domestic flights within the continental U.S., the flight to Hawaii is still significantly longer than the majority of domestic flights and spends more time over water than any other U.S. domestic flight. Hawaiʻi is almost twice the distance from the mainland United States than is the furthest point in the U.S. from any other country. Flights to Hawaiʻi are frequently over twice the cost from the U.S. mainland compared with international flights to Canada, Mexico or the Caribbean. Even flights from Hawaiʻi to other countries (such as Japan or Australia) are often cheaper than domestic flights to the U.S. mainland. Furthermore, many airlines operate service to Hawaiʻi using a hybrid of their domestic and international service models. For crew scheduling purposes on most airlines, Hawaiʻi-U.S. flights are considered international and flights are typically catered differently with meals specially marketed for the route. Additionally, a handful of Hawaiʻi routes still have complimentary meal service long after it was discontinued on other domestic routes. These differences all serve as reminders to travellers at every step of the process that they are not on a typical domestic flight.

The division between domestic and international flights is largely arbitrary. Air France’s Paris to Papeete flight takes over 22 hours, flys 15,715km and crosses two oceans, but is a domestic flight. However, their Paris to London flight takes less than an hour to fly 348 km yet is considered an international flight. Though both flights cross the ocean, the difference is solely within how the nations are conceptualised. Fiji, Cook
Islands and Niue use a domestic/international split that is fully in line with what is expected of them as sovereign nations. Hawai‘i’s situation is unusual in that not treated fully as a domestic nor an international destination. This sort of ambiguity can help to establish a national identity that is unique from the rest of the United States.

6.3 Shipping

How mail is expected to be addressed, though typically seen to be of minimal importance in daily life, like many areas of banal nationalism can actually serve as a reminder of the nation. One aspect is the designation of mail as foreign or domestic with changes in shipping cost and process. Another aspect is how the mail is addressed, which differs based on its status as domestic or international. Fiji, Niue and the Cook Islands all have their names listed in the country field of an address (i.e., PO Box 42, Alofi, Niue Island for the Niue Tourism Office). This is to be expected of an independent nation that is a member of the Universal Postal Union. In contrast, non-sovereign territories will generally include the host country’s name (i.e., PO Box 1030, Cocos Keeling Islands, Indian Ocean WA, Australia 6799). Hawai‘i, since statehood, has been considered a domestic shipping destination for mail from mainland U.S. Mail from other countries should include U.S.A in the address field. Although considered a domestic destination by the U.S. Postal Service, many merchants choose to treat Hawaii differently. It is not uncommon for companies to advertise free shipping within mainland U.S., but then charge to ship to Hawai‘i (often without any disclaimer of this fact). Although this decision is generally based on practical cost or logistical reasons, the fact that merchants see it as acceptable indicates that they do not fully consider Hawai‘i a U.S. destination.
Again, Fiji, Niue and the Cook Islands operations are congruent with their status, and Hawai’i operates in a hybrid position.

### 6.4 Sense of Foreignness

Many visitors to the islands of this dissertation note a strong sense of foreignness. One guidebook suggests that you should “approach Hawaii like you would another country”, and another notes that “it’s not outside the United States yet seems like another country”. “Do I need my passport to get to Hawai‘i?” is a common question across the travel websites for Hawai‘i. Various campaigns and travel guides have described the Cook Islands, Fiji and Niue as being “like another world”, “totally unique” and other similar representations that visitors are going to experience something different than their home nation. This sense of foreignness is extremely difficult to quantify but seems very present in each of these nations.

Like much of banal nationalism, the sense of foreignness that these nations have is very much a self-reinforcing concept. An initial impression of foreignness or historical difference sets visitors onto a mindset of foreignness in which each example of it (no matter how small) is perceived as significant evidence of such. Furthermore, given the utility of marketing exoticism in tourism, this sense of foreignness is often used to establish a specific pro-tourism impression of the islands. This can be seen within many tourist-audience oriented practice of mixing in of traditional language (such as the frequent seemingly random context-less incorporation of Hawaiian words in tourism materials), statements along the lines of “here in the islands we do X” and other high-profile expressions of mildly “exotic” culture. Though it is often a blurred line, this sort of cultural usage generally has the feel of cultural appropriation rather than genuine
attempts to incorporate local culture. Rather what is presented is a version of the culture built to fit tourist’s preconceived notions of the islands, rather than the island's culture would be otherwise. Tiki bars and the like are clear examples of this sort of model. Regardless of the authenticity and motivations for the sense of foreignness, it could help strengthen the nation in defining mental borders. The feeling of foreignness helps to internalise the idea that it may actually be another nation.

6.5 Remoteness

All of the subject nations are a considerable geographic distance from other nations. As small island states, none share land borders with any other state. Further, whilst all have navigable waters, their distance from other states means there is no scheduled passenger service by sea to any of them. Air travel is the only viable option to travel to these states. Niue is a 3.5-hour 2,484 km flight from Auckland, and the Cook Islands are a 3,014 km and almost four-hour flight from Auckland. Fiji, though having flights to many of its smaller island neighbours, is still over 2,000 km and three hours away from Auckland, the nearest of Fiji’s larger neighbours. Hawai‘i is an over five-hour flight from San Francisco, almost 4,000km away (the nearest major city). All of these island nations are quite geographically remote with Hawai‘i being described as the most remote population centre in the world. As such, regardless of the islands' actual status, travellers to each will feel that they have completed a long journey to a remote place. The rituals of travel associated with a journey of this type create a gravitas that is not felt on shorter journeys. Travel to any of these nations is not something that can be done lightly. The trip is not a short hop across the border, but rather a meaningful, typically well
planned journey. As such, travel to these nations fully feels as if you have in-fact entered another nation.

6.6 Language

Language has long been one of the major battlegrounds of nationalism. It provides a way in which diverse populations can be artificially united around a common identity. This can be seen quite clearly in the Soviet Union's Russification policy. Although not overly successfully, use of the Cyrillic alphabet and imposed learning of Russian was a key part of forming a larger Soviet nation. Though the nations of this dissertation have historically discouraged native language usage (including an outright ban in Hawai‘i), today, language is a key battleground of banal nationalism. All the nations of this dissertation have a native language as an official language, but English continues to dominate public life. Having already obtained official language status, the focus for pro-Native nationalists must then be to encourage the language’s acceptance and usage in everyday life. The goal for them will be to shape the expressions of banal nationalism. Using the native language should become unconscious and normalised wherein every usage further strengthens the nation’s identity in reminding people that it is a distinct nation.

Despite Hawaiian being one of the two official languages of Hawai‘i (along with English), there is only minimal visible use of it. Hawai‘i lacks any sort of language policy on the level of Canada's Official Languages Act (in which services must be delivered in both languages) or Québec’s Charter of the French Language (requiring French in commerce and other areas of daily life). Rather, Hawai‘i has a much weaker standard in which, per the state constitution, “Hawaiian shall be required for public acts and
transactions only as provided by law”. The state government has virtually no obligation to provide services in Hawaiian, and private entities have no obligation at all. As a result, beyond limited services specifically targeting Hawaiian populations, Hawaiian is not used for most areas of daily life for actual conversations. Many Hawaiian phrases, however, have become a normal part of daily life in Hawai‘i. “Aloha” and “Mahalo” is likely used more commonly across Hawai‘i than “hello” and “thank you”. Similarly, puka (hole), keiki (child), and kuleana (responsibility), amongst others, are used quite frequently within conversations that are otherwise in English.

Despite the commonality of incorporating short Hawaiian phrases or emblematic statements within state-sponsored or official activities, Hawaiian sees only minimal and often symbolic usage. For example, airport arrival announcements are pre-recorded in both Hawaiian and English, and a bilingual video is available for airlines to play to welcome travellers to Hawai‘i. Flight boarding announcements, however, are typically entirely in English (and sometimes in the destination country’s language) with minimal Hawaiian mixed in (often little more than aloha, mahalo or other phrases of greeting or thanks). Across the websites of the University of Hawai‘i, virtually no content is available in Hawaiian. Even the Hawai‘inuiākea School of Hawaiian Knowledge at UH Mānoa switches to English after its introductory paragraph. UH Hilo’s College of Hawaiian Language website is the only part of UH’s online presence that is fully bilingual. The State of Hawaii’s website has virtually no Hawaiian language content, offering only the option to translate the site using the automated Google Translate tool. Similarly, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, though making heavy use of Hawaiian phrases, is entirely in English. The Department of Education has only a single page, “Hawaiian
Education”, available in Hawaiian. Even within those actively promoting the Hawaiian language, English remains the primary language for communications. Of the twenty-one Hawaiian language immersion schools listed by the Hawaii State Department of Education, only one has a website that is fully available in Hawaiian (and English). Additionally, the website of ‘Aha Pūnana Leo, a state-wide set of preschools focused on Hawaiian language and cultural support is largely available in both Hawaiian and English, but it defaults to English and has several gaps in its translations.

Despite the limited public usage of Hawaiian, there has been a concerted effort to promote Hawaiian as the language of daily life. The most significant of these would be Hawaiian immersion schools. Though Hawaiian has been taught in schools for some time, it has been limited to language and cultural education courses (often only one to two hours of instruction per week). Most students learn only basic phrases and have limited ability to converse in Hawaiian. Hawaiian immersion programs, in contrast, aim to provide instruction fully (or primarily) in Hawaiian, allowing students to gain a mastery of the language. There are currently twenty-one public Hawaiian immersion schools and a handful of private ones. These programs aim to restore the Hawaiian language and culture. There are also a number of churches that offer services fully in Hawaiian, as well as a small number of health clinics that provide service in Hawaiian (often along with traditional/blended Hawaiian health care). Despite these services, it remains difficult for a Hawaiian speaker to use only Hawaiian in daily life, as for example, store clerks, wait staff, utility workers and most government employees would be unable to assist in Hawaiian. Though most Hawaiian usage is symbolic and minimal, it
does still serve an important function in building national identity. This function is reinforced as intentional efforts to improve daily Hawaiian usage increase.

Niue’s constitution grants equal legal status for Niuean and English for legislative business. Proceedings of the assembly are to be translated on request, and all bills are to be in both English and Niuean with no preference given to either language. However, there does not appear to be any statutory requirement for other government functions or services to be provided in either language.

Though many speak Niuean, English remains widely used. The website of the government of Niue is almost exclusively in English, with a few Niuean phrases incorporated. Tāoga Niue (the agency tasked with promoting Niuean culture, language and tradition) has significant portions of its website in Niuean, but it falls far short of a full translation. Throughout Niue, a small amount of signage is printed bilingually, with the English text dominant. The vast majority is, however, in English only. A notable exception is the “Welcome to Niue” sign at the airport, which has the Niuean statement “Fakaalofa Lahi Atu” first.

Niue’s migration patterns, with frequent immigration and travel between New Zealand and Niue, have necessitated strong English-language skills. English remains the primary language in schools. Given the lack of higher education options on the island, all higher education would be received overseas, likely in English-speaking New Zealand universities. Niuean is, however, frequently used at home and socially. Both within Niue and abroad there have been efforts to promote and preserve its language. The New Zealand government, through its Pacific Language Weeks program, has coordinated Niue Language Week with events designed to celebrate and promote Niuean culture and
language in New Zealand. A resource book is also supplied for teachers and students to build language skills. As these efforts are largely funded by the New Zealand government’s Ministry for Pacific Peoples, they share the same contradictions of the New Zealand government’s other cultural identity promotion in strengthening a non-New Zealand national identity.

In the Cook Islands, the official languages are English and Cook Islands Maori. The *Te Reo Maori Act 2003*, which established Māori as an official language, tasks the Ministry of Cultural Development with raising Maori to equal status with English. Beyond that, the act adds no obligation to the government or others to offer services or publications in Māori. English is the most typically used language in Rarotonga, with casual Māori usage declining. Similar linguistic shifts appear to be occurring in the other islands as well.

Most web pages of the Cook Islands' government are exclusively in English. The Ministry of Justice translates some of the content, but the majority is available only in English. Tauranga Vananga (Ministry of Cultural Development) mostly uses English on its site with Maori headings. Select notices of the Ministry of Health are published in both languages. Physical signage across the islands is mostly in English, though some government-printed signs are in Māori as well. A few protest signs (such as those opposed to Sunday flights) are written only in Māori.

Cook Islands Māori is a compulsory school subject up to Year Eleven, with full bilingualism as the stated goal. In practice, however, Māori language learning is seriously limited by the lack of teachers, instructional materials and other needed resources. There
have been a number of efforts to improve Māori language learning and reverse the harm done by previous Māori bans in schools, but results have been slow.

As is the case with Niuean, the New Zealand government sponsors a Cook Islands Language Week. Additionally, New Zealand Māori has a special legal status in New Zealand, allowing it to be used for official business within the country. This is of limited assistance because Cook Islands Māori, while closely related to New Zealand Māori, is a distinct language. Like other Pacific languages, its usage is frequently accommodated in New Zealand, but there is no legal obligation to support it.

English serves as the de facto lingua franca in Fiji. The vast majority of Fijians speak English as either a first or second language. Fijian is spoken by most iTaukei, and Hindi is spoken by most Indo-Fijians as either a first or second language, with English as the other language. It is extremely common to hear Hindi or Fijian spoken in public, with speakers frequently switching between English and Fijian. Business is frequently conducted in any of these languages. Though there is an increasing number of Indo-Fijians who speak Fijian and iTaukei who speak Hindi, it is not expected. English competency (or at least confidence in English competency) varies greatly. Many prefer to communicate when possible in their other language, despite their bilingualism. Particularly in rural areas, it is entirely possible for a Fijian to communicate solely in Fijian or Hindi without any need to switch to English. Although English dominates signage, Fijian or Hindi is frequently used, with many signs written in all three languages. All three are taught in government primary schools as compulsory subjects.

The Constitution of Fiji recognises English, Fijian and Hindi as Fiji’s official languages (since the 1997 Constitution). The 2013 Constitution also mandates that it be
translated into all three languages. The English edition is recognised as the legally authoritative version, with the Fijian and Hindi editions considered translations. As part of the Right to Education section, the 2013 Constitution added the mandate that “Conversational and contemporary iTaukei and Fiji Hindi languages shall be taught as compulsory subjects in all primary schools”.

Although standard Hindi is constitutionally recognised, there is a lack of clear, official recognition of Fijian Hindi. Fijian Hindi, through derived from standard Hindi, is linguistically distinct. The language blends several regional dialects of Hindi and incorporates loan words from Fijian and English and is typically written with Roman script. Though more commonly and widely spoken in Fiji than standard Hindi, Fijian Hindi is often seen negatively as a “broken” or “corrupted” Hindi and inappropriate for formal settings. Denial of the linguistic validity of Fijian Hindi, though typically done by Indo-Fijians, is extremely useful to pro-iTaukei nationalists. Fijian Hindi remains one of the most visible markers of difference between Indo-Fijians and other Indians. By denying the language, pro-iTaukei nationalists can support the argument that Indo-Fijians should be treated as guests in Fiji without any obligation towards cultural preservation. Though the 2013 constitutional mandate seems to be fairly clear that Fijian Hindi should be taught in school, in practice it appears that Standard Hindi is what is typically taught.

Despite constitutional guarantees of language equality, English is the primary language of government services. The website of the Fijian government is nearly entirely in English without any translations available. The constitution, however, is available from the government site in Hindi and Fijian, in addition to English (though not Fijian Hindi). The government also publishes a Fijian language news sheet entitled Noda Viti, which is
paired with but is not a translation of, the English language *Fiji Focus*. The last edition of both was in late 2015. There does not appear to be a Hindi edition. Individual interactions with the government can and often will be in the citizen’s preferred language, but this choice seems more a function of the individual government official’s personal language competence than an official policy.

Languages policies vary greatly across states. They are frequently a target of nationalists looking to use them to strengthen feelings of connectedness or as a boundary marker. All four nations have policies that promote the indigenous language of the nation. Only Fiji’s, however, seems to be particularly effective. The Cook Islands and Niue have declining numbers of Māori and Niuean speakers, as practical limitations overwhelm nationalistic and cultural preservation goals. Hawai‘i has one of the most active sets of language revitalisation efforts of any nation. These efforts, though very effective at strengthening the Hawaiian nation, are still in their infancy. Fiji, in contrast, sees frequent use of all three of its official languages. Its official language policies, in creating equal status for all three languages, seem to be fairly effective at promoting a civic-nationalism agenda. Language policy, however, does remain an active battleground for ethnonationalists fighting the government's position towards civic unity.

931 Efforts to promote New Zealand Māori would likely be the only other language revitalisation scheme to see the same level of energy and acceptance. Its number of native speakers, however, never fell as low as Hawaiian.
6.7 Newspapers

Print media have traditionally been highly significant for nationalism. They have historically been a key way in which nationalist agendas are spread to the masses (though this role has increasingly been replaced by the Internet). As I noted earlier, Newspapers are also one of the classic areas of study for banal nationalism. Beyond the overt nationalistic agendas of many papers, is a much subtler reproduction of nationalism in the way in which the paper is arranged. The common division of news into “local”, “national” and “world” sections (typically with the paper’s resources placed in this order as well) normalises this division of the world. It assumes that there is a natural reason why news should be divided up in this way. News occurring within the nation is presented as if it is more relevant than that which is occurring geographically closer but on the other side of a national border. Each of the nations in this paper has newspapers that have adopted various conventions on how they define local and national news.

The Fiji Sun and the Fiji Times are Fiji’s largest print newspapers. Both are dailies published in Suva. They are widely available and read. Issues of the Fiji Sun are typically divided into large “National News” and ”National Sports” sections; one page for “International News” and “Australia/NZ updates”; and another page for “Bollywood News”. The Fiji Times labels its national news section, which occupies the majority of the paper, simply as “News”. Issues also include small sections labelled “Pacific News” and “World”. The sports section, however, mixes both national and world sporting events under the title “Sport”.

The Jet Newspaper claims to be Fiji’s first community paper and is published monthly out of Nadi. The bulk of the paper features “Local News”. The national news
and sports sections lack any section headings. No international or regional news is included.

Hawai‘i has five daily newspapers as well as a number of weekly and specialised papers. The Honolulu Star-Advertiser is Hawaii’s largest paper. Issues are divided into a “News” section that is primarily local news with high-profile national news incorporated; a “National” section, including news from across the U.S.; a “World” section; and a “Local” section covering news within Hawai‘i. The Hawaii Tribune-Herald, which serves the east side of the island of Hawai‘i (the Big Island), focuses more heavily on Hawai‘i. Hawai‘i news is presented without a section heading; non-Hawai‘i news is under “Nation and World” or “News”. This grouping suggests U.S. news and world news are interchangeable and need only be distinguished from news occurring in Hawai‘i. The island of Hawaii’s other paper, the West Hawaii Today, uses an identical model. The Garden Island, which serves the island of Kauai, uses a model in which issues are split into “Hawaii News”; “Nation News” (covering U.S. News); and “World News”. The Maui News, which serves the island of Maui, uses the headings “Local News” (covering stories about Maui County); “Hawaii News”; “National News” (covering U.S. news); and “International News”. All the newspapers in Hawai‘i, except the Maui Time Weekly, are owned by non-Hawai‘i publishers. The Canadian company Black Press Ltd. owns The Garden Island, the Hawaii Tribune-Herald, the Honolulu Star-Advertiser and the West Hawaii Today. The Maui News is owned by Ogden Newspapers of West Virginia.

The Niue Star is Niue’s only newspaper. Though claiming to be a weekly, it currently seems to publish an edition roughly once a month. It is published in Niuean with an English translation. It is available exclusively in print at limited news-sellers in
Niue and New Zealand. Since Cyclone Heta in 2004, the paper has been printed in New Zealand by a Niuean living in New Zealand. According to its editor, Michael Jackson, the paper is “the community newspaper”; “it's mainly information, village happenings, community happenings, family interest stories like hair cuttings and ear piercing.” With such a large portion of Niueans living abroad, the paper serves an important role in connecting Niueans in diaspora with the island. Most issues are under twenty pages and focus almost exclusively on Niuean news. A section labelled “Regional News” provides events of interest to Niueans living elsewhere by reprinting selected *New Zealand Herald* articles. No attempt is made to cover general-interest world news.

The *Cook Islands News* is published five days a week. It divides the news into national and regional. National news is split into “local” (Rarotonga) and “other islands”. Regional news appears to cover the other Pacific Island nations and New Zealand. The *Cook Islands Herald* is a weekly paper. The issues published in February 2016 average twenty-two pages. With the exception of foreign lottery numbers on the cover, the entire paper is about domestic topics and foreign news solely as they relate to the Cook Islands; only a single article per paper covers general world news. Even the world news articles cover only Pacific island topics of direct interest and relevance to the Cook Islands, such as “Concern over dead fish in Fiji and Vanuatu” and “Zika virus monitoring continues in Pacific”. The paper is mostly in English, but the “Te Kave Korero” section has quotations in Maori, with an English translation sometimes provided.

---

932 The most recent month available on their site when studied
The newspapers of these nations share the typical divide noted within studies of banal nationalism globally. They split newsworthy events into national and international news with a greater emphasis on national news. Of interest in Hawai‘i is the trend of frequently grouping news about the United States with the international news. This division seems to feel natural to readers even though it does not reflect current political borders.

6.8 National Anthems

National anthems are in a hybrid position between hot and everyday nationalism. Though undeniably a highly visible part of displays of hot nationalism, most renditions of a state’s anthem are banal; and, barring significant secondary politicisation (such as that which occurred recently within U.S. sports), they are not often examined.

“Hawai‘i Pono‘ī”, the official state song of Hawaii, was also the final national anthem of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i. It was written in 1874 by King David Kalākaua with music by the king’s royal bandmaster, Captain Henri Berger. The song is similar in spirit to many other national anthems. With the title translating to “Hawaii’s Own”, the song calls on the people of Hawai‘i (“Hawaii’s own true sons”) to be loyal to their king and respect their duty. It praises King Kamehameha I and has an implied message of unity and protection in this praise.

As part of the ceremonial marking of the annexation, “Hawai‘i Pono‘ī” was played by the Hawaiian band as the flag was lowered over the Iolani Palace.933 The

American flag was then raised, and the military band of the U.S.S Philadelphia played the “Star Spangled Banner”. Nineteen members of the Hawaiian band refused to play because they saw it as the “funeral hymn of their dying country”. A Hawai‘i newspaper, The Independent, described the ceremony as “more like a funeral than a feast day”, with many, including supporters of the annexation, described as openly crying during the event. One person present for the ceremony noted that it marked a welcoming into a new nation, “but the history of Hawaii as a nation was, nevertheless, ended forever; its annals for the future are to be blended with those of the great republic over the sea. Never again, except as an echo of the past, will [“Hawaiʻi Ponoʻī”] be sung as the national hymn of Hawaii”. This prediction, fortunately, proved to be false. “Hawaiʻi Ponoʻī” regained popularity and eventually became the state anthem. “Hawaiʻi Ponoʻī” has traditionally been used to close music performances. Although this tradition faded following the overthrow, by 1902 it had been revived. “Hawaiʻi Ponoʻī” became the de facto song of the territory of Hawaiʻi (typically played with the “Star Spangled Banner”) and became the official state song by an act of the Hawaiʻi State Legislature in 1967. This decision is interesting, considering the lyrics and politicisation of the song.
A post-overthrow column in an 1894 issue of The Pacific Commercial Advertiser suggested that “If Hawai‘i Pono‘ī is to be retained as the national anthem until it is exchanged for America, it is at any rate high time to adopt some words which will not be a standing invitation to insurrection”939 They suggest a “Patriotic version with the royalist sentiments elided”, noting that “Hawaii Pono‘ī is a good old song, but it contains too much feudal sentiment to suit these progressive days. Here is a version which strikes out the too effusive references to the Alii, etc.”940 The proposed version replaces references to the monarchy and chiefs with vague sentiments about the nation. The same year an ultrapatriotic version of “Hawai‘i Pono‘ī” was published by the stridently pro-Hawaiian monarchy newspaper Hawaii Holomua, possibly in response to the proposal in The Pacific Commercial Advertiser. This song, entitled “a Mele for Liliuokalani”,941 called on “Hawaii’s Own” to “Look to your Sovereign Liliuokalani” with a chorus of “Queen Lolokulani For Hawai‘i nei942 Prevail”. It is unclear if either version gained any sort of meaningful traction, as neither paper mentioned its version again.

With “Hawai‘i Pono‘ī” becoming the official state song in 1967, an unusual situation has arisen. One of the officially endorsed symbols of the government is itself anti-government. When “Hawai‘i Pono‘ī” is played it covertly undermines the very state it is meant to promote. This situation is different from past historical examples of the

940 Ibid.
941 Mele typically translates to song or chant
942 Hawai‘i nei is best translated along the lines of “this beloved Hawai‘i”.
absorption of state symbols by successor governments because no attempt is made to adapt the symbol. “Hawai‘i Pono‘ī” is left completely intact, despite its extremely pro-monarchy message (and thus anti-state of Hawaii message). This sort of counter-government usage can be seen in the hearings over federal recognition of Hawaiians. In a public hearing conducted by the U.S. Department of the Interior, several attendees started singing “Hawai‘i Pono‘ī”, emphasising the line Nānā i kou mo‘ī (Be loyal to your king).  

Since independence in 1970, “God Bless Fiji” has been Fiji's national anthem. This song asks God to bless Fiji while its people “stand united under noble banner blue” and “honour and defend the cause of freedom ever”. The national anthem does not appear to have been codified at any point, although the People's Charter for Change, Peace and Progress (a nonbinding precursor to the recently adopted constitution) did state that the national anthem should be in the country's three main languages: Fijian, Hindi and English. “God Bless Fiji” is typically sung in English. When Fiji competes in World Rugby events, “God Bless Fiji” is sung (in English) even though the team is entirely iTaukei. “Meda Dau Doka” (a Fijian language song) is often also sung. Though commonly reported as the Fijian version of the national anthem, it remains unclear what the actual official status of “Meda Dau Doka” is. The Fijian Embassy to Brussels lists the lyrics to “Meda Dau Doka” as the “Fijian Lyrics” to the national anthem, and the CIA


**World Factbook** vaguely notes that “the anthem is known in Fijian as "Meda Dau Doka". It is not, however, a translation and has not been codified as an anthem for the country. A Hindi version of either song, or any other national anthem like song, does not appear to have ever been created. The anthem “God Bless Fiji” is routinely played at Fijian sporting events and often at other civic functions. “Meda Dau Doka” is less frequently played at sporting events.

Niue has used "Ko e Iki he Lagi" (The Lord in Heaven) as its national anthem since 1974 when it became a self-governing state. The song recognises that the “Lord in Heaven, Who loves Niue … rules completely over Niue”. “God Save the Queen” is also retained as the anthem for the monarchy. "Ko e Iki he Lagi" was a popular song in Niue and seen as representative of Niue even prior to self-governance. Before independence, however, there were few occasions that needed the song. One of those times was during the 1963 South Pacific Games in which the organisers asked countries to select "identifying tunes” to represent them, rather than only their national anthem (many of which shared "God Defend New Zealand" or "God Save the Queen"). Niue elected to use "Ko e Iki he Lagi”, though it still competed using the flag of New Zealand. However, Niue failed to win any events, so there was no occasion on which to play it. With Niue’s limited participation in multinational sports and other occasions of public anthem performance, there is still little opportunity for the anthem to be played outside limited state functions.

The Cook Islands national anthem is defined in the constitution as "Te Atua mou e" (“To God Almighty”, though the song is typically titled “God is Truth” in English). The song is a prayer “To God Almighty” to “protect and guide us; and give us your
crown of truth; so we can be successful; and so that love and peace will rule forever over our beloved country.” The song was composed by Sir Tom Davis, then prime minister of the Cook Islands, with the lyrics by his wife, Pa Tepaeru Terito Ariki. It was adopted in 1982 to replace the no-longer-relevant New Zealand anthem, "God Defend New Zealand". “Te Atua mou e” reflects the Cook Islands’ strong religious identity. A 1994 referendum to change the anthem was overwhelmingly defeated with 80 per cent of the voters opposed to the change.

National anthems serve as very noticeable nationalist symbols. They are used to evoke feelings of pride in the nation and often to energise the audience’s connection to their team. Though its usage is clearly nationalistic, listeners often don’t feel this way. The anthem blends into the background as just another part of the ritual of the event. In this way, the lyrics of the anthem can be ignored, but they are nevertheless serving a role in promoting the nation.

Hawaii’s anthem is highly unusual. It is a clearly nationalistic song, but the nationalist message run contrary to the State’s own existence. The other nations have national anthems that are mostly in-line with what would be expected, given the other ways in which they imagine their nation. Their anthems recognise the religiosity of the

945 New Zealand legally has two national anthems, “God Defend New Zealand” and “God Save the Queen”. Both have equal legal status, but “God Defend New Zealand” is by far the most commonly used. Typically, “God Save the Queen” is used only in the presence of a member of the royal family or the governor-general. The Cook Islands, when a colony of New Zealand, would have also had "God Save the Queen" as its anthem until independence. It is likely that this was sung on the occasion of her visit to the Cook Islands in 1974.
nation, but in contrast to many others where there was a struggle for independence, they
do not tell of victory or otherwise promote specific nationalistic messages.

6.9 Flags

Flags share a hybridity similar to that of national anthems. They can be a highly
visible component of hot nationalism (and are virtually required to be so) when
nationalists loudly and proudly wave the flag as they rally. However, most of the time
flying the flag is a quieter more everyday occurrence more characteristic of banal
nationalism. Studies of nationalism have traditionally focused on the waved flag when we
see it being shown off and the remainder of nationhood is explicit. The unwaved flag,
Billig argues, is actually more significant in the reinforcement of nationhood. When it
appears on shoulder patches, products and other subtle everyday depictions that we see
constantly rather than the occasional overt patriotic display that reminds us of our nation.

The flag of the State of Hawaii is essentially the same flag as that which was used
by the Kingdom of Hawai‘i, and later the protectorate, republic, and territory of Hawaii.
Unique among U.S. states, the flag features a British Union Jack in the top left corner.
According to a popular, though somewhat historically dubious, story, the flag was
designed to be a hybrid of the British and U.S. flags. King Kamehameha I flew a British
flag for much of his reign to honour the gift of the flag from King George III. During the
War of 1812, he raised a U.S. flag to placate American concerns. British members of his
court objected, and the new flag was said to be commissioned to honour both allies as the
new flag of the Kingdom. Kamehameha also had a personal flag known as the Kanaka
Maoli. It features a shield at the centre and green, red and yellow stripes. Though the flag
stopped being officially used after the five months of British occupation in 1843, it has
re-emerged in the last few decades as a protest flag. Given that the Kingdom flag was co-opted by the State of Hawaii, those advocating for sovereignty would be unable to use it as a meaningful symbol of protest. However, even among many supporters of sovereignty, the flying of the Kanaka Maoli often produces negative responses. It has become increasingly associated with fringe activists who deny the practical existence of the state of Hawaii (such as by driving without state license plates or occupying state-controlled beach parks).946

Flying either the U.S. or the State of Hawaii flag is much less common in Hawai‘i than it is in the rest of the United States. Few private residences or businesses routinely fly either flag. The Kanaka Maoli is often seen, but it is less frequent than the already infrequent flags of the State or the U.S.

The patch and badge of the Honolulu Police Department and the Honolulu Fire Department feature two Hawaiian flags and a Kanaka Maoli coat of arms. The uniform, however, does not include a flag patch or pin (either of the Hawai‘i flag or the U.S. flag). Some turnout gear worn by HFD does have a U.S. flag. Maui, Kauai and Hawai‘i (Big Island) police and fire personnel also lack flag patches on their uniforms, but it can be seen on some turnout gear of each fire department. Whilst it is not unique (the NYPD and NYFD for example do not wear flag patches), it has become increasingly uncommon for

946 Typically, the land they select to occupy will be disputed crown land. Though the State of Hawaii’s claim to the land is itself legally questionable, the occupying activists will rarely have any legitimate claim themselves, such as a pre-overthrow land grant, to justify their taking of the land and it is thus often poorly received by the public.

947 This may be solely a function of the way this gear is acquired, rather than an intentional statement.
emergency workers uniforms in the U.S. to lack flag patches or pins. Hawai‘i Emergency Medical Services wear a state of Hawaii flag patch, as do many private security guards.

Unlike many “made in” campaigns, none of the “made in” campaigns for Hawai‘i features the state flag. Rather, other symbols are used, such as the hibiscus, taro leaf and monstera leaf. The “Made in Hawaii with Aloha” program, administered by the Hawaii Department of Agriculture in its statutorily protected mark, uses a *Hibiscus brackenridgei* (a native plant and the official state flower), along with the tagline “Made in Hawaii with Aloha”.

The Niuean flag is yellow with a modified Union Jack in the top left corner. As noted in the *Niue Flag Act of 1975*, the yellow represents sunshine and “the warm feelings of the Niuean people towards New Zealand and her people”. The Union Jack symbolises the protection Great Britain gave Niue as British Protectorate. The four stars are for the New Zealand historical administration and “the continuing close relationship between Niue and New Zealand”. Finally, the largest star and blue circle “represents the self-governing status of Niue, standing alone within the deep blue sea.” The symbolism of the flag, codified in the Flag Act, sends a strong message about how Niue would like to be represented. Niue has a strong connection to its past administrators but is today sovereign and alone. This message is reinforced every time the flag is displayed both in waved and unwaved contexts.

---

948 Oddly, the monstera plant is actually non-native, but is so frequently used to imply the tropics and is so common that it has become strongly associated with Hawai‘i.
Niue's government building flies the Niuean flag out front, but it seems that not many others choose to fly it. The flag does still adorn a number of government-connected items like driver's licenses and vehicles. The Niue police uniform includes a small Niuean flag pin over the right breast pocket. Niue appears to lack a formal “made in” campaign, and though the Niuean origin is clearly branded on the products exported from Niue, the flag does not appear.

The flag of the Cook Islands features the Union Jack in the top left corner and a ring of fifteen stars. The Union Jack represents the historic ties to Great Britain. The fifteen stars stand for the fifteen major islands of the Cook Islands. The current flag was adopted in 1979 and replaced a green ring with a yellow ring of fifteen stars. The green represented growth and life, with the yellow stars symbolising faith and the unity of the islands. Following the collapse of the Henry government, the green flag was replaced, owing to its connection to Henry-style nationalism. Cook Islands nationalists would, soon after, adopt the green flag to represent their movement. A referendum held in 1994 to change the flag failed with slightly under half supporting the current flag.

Though designs featuring the Cook Islands circle of stars are common, actually flying the flag seems infrequent. The “Buy Cook Islands, Made in Cook Islands” campaign uses the flag of the Cook Islands encircled by a traditional pattern. The uniforms of the Cook Islands Police and Fire Service do not include a flag. Given that their uniforms are virtually identical to their New Zealand counterparts, which are also flagless, this is unsurprising.

Fiji’s flag, only slightly modified from the colonial Fiji flag, contains the British Union Jack in the upper left corner and a shield featuring a lion holding cocoa pod, sugar
cane, a coconut palm, a bunch of bananas and a peace dove. The light blue background symbolises the Pacific Ocean, and the Union Jack represents the historic connection to Great Britain. The shield is formed of symbolically significant elements of Fijian life.

The first raising of the flag at Albert Park on October 10, 1970, differed significantly from the typical independence ceremony. The British flag was lowered the previous night, leaving a bare flagpole on which to raise the Fijian flag. Ratu Mara (the first and longest-serving prime minister of Fiji) notes that he "had seen films of independence ceremonies elsewhere, where the British flag had been lowered at midnight and the new independence flag raised, both to frenzied cheering. I did not think this appropriate to our relationship with the British Crown. We decided to have a final beating of retreat before independence when the Union flag would be lowered with the quiet dignity and respect our long association warranted." Fiji’s transition was neither the jubilant occasion of victory over oppressors nor one of solemn loss like Hawaii’s. It was a happy and optimistic event that marked a hopeful new era for Fiji.

As part of his New Year's Day address in 2013, Bainimarama announced plans to change the flag as part of his overall reforms with the intention "to reflect a sense of national renewal, to reinforce a new Fijian identity and a new confidence in being Fijian on the global stage". A competition to pick the new flag was established with a final shortlist of twenty-three designs submitted to the cabinet. After several delays and a reopening of the competition, Bainimarama announced in August 2016 that he no longer
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intended to change the flag. "While I remain convinced personally that we need to replace some of the flag’s colonial symbols with a genuinely indigenous expression of our present and our future, it has been apparent to the Government since February that the flag should not be changed for the foreseeable future". Though the competition for the new design generated considerable enthusiasm and over 200 proposals, support for the change was very mixed.

The Fijian flag is very present throughout Fijian daily life. Many businesses and, increasingly, a number of private residences routinely fly the flag. Fiji’s government-run “Fijian Made” campaign, though choosing to include a stylised map of the islands in its mark, uses the Fijian flag heavily in its promotional materials. A digitally added Fijian flag serves as the backdrop for all the photos on the official site, and in-person events are blanketed with dozens of small flags. The flag is also featured as part of many government functions. Several uniform styles of the Fiji police feature a Fijian flag patch on the left shoulder. The introduction of the flag patch appears to have come as part of the post-coup police reforms and professionalisation efforts.

6.10 Currency

Currency provides a visible representation of a state’s power. The ability to issue currency and have this currency accepted has traditionally been viewed as one of the key practical metrics of statehood. Further, as a highly valued item, currency’s depiction of national symbols creates a feeling of value tied to the symbol. Currency typically will

depict the heads of state and former heads of state along with other valued symbols of the nation. It serves as a way for the state to say that these items are so treasured, we will depict them on literal treasure allowing them to become a part of it.

The power of the state to control its currency is known as monetary sovereignty. It is often closely associated with ideas of national political sovereignty. It “refers to a State's undeniable power, recognised by international law, to regulate its own currency”. The state's ability to issue currency and have it accepted is, along with passport acceptance, forms one of the most common practical representations of statehood a citizen encounters. Ultimately, a state in which its citizens are unable to use its money is likely to become a failed state. Similarly, the replacement of a national central bank is often presented as naturally reducing the state’s sovereignty in an undesirable way. Further, monetary sovereignty is assumed to belong to the national-level government, rather than any government or body below or above this level. Countries can issue currency, but it is expected that other types of government entities will not.
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National currencies supposedly support national pride and serve as a symbol of national identity. They are said to provide an expression of the state’s power and economic fortitude. Though this argument may be true for a small number of nation-states, Schuler argues that national currency has not, in fact, been generally successful in improving national pride. He notes that, across the world, many people distrust their national currency, preferring instead to hold foreign currency. For example, 70 per cent of U.S. dollar banknotes (and similar numbers for other desirable currencies) are estimated to be held outside the U.S.

In recognising the suboptimal position of many national currencies, states have increasingly embraced a cooperative common currency (such as the euro) or completely adopted another country’s currency. This process of dollarisation (where a country adopts a foreign currency), in theory, does not eliminate a state’s monetary sovereignty. The state maintains the ability to reintroduce its own national currency and often has negotiated arrangements for additional limited control of currency issuance. However, in both of these models, and in many states with their own weaker national currency, states always have significant limitations on their actual ability to make use of monetary sovereignty, owing to external political and economic factors. Most limiting is that
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they are unable to increase inflation strategically by printing more currency or otherwise control how their currency trades against others. Nevertheless, many countries share a currency. In addition to common currency zones such as with the euro (shared by 19 of the 28 member states of the European Union) and CFA franc (used by fourteen African countries), there are several countries that have adopted the currency of another including Lesotho, Namibia and Swaziland use of the South African rand or Panama’s and Timor-Leste’s use of the U.S. dollar.

Reflecting one of the common tourist questions, the Hawaii Tourism Authority prominently notes on its website that “Hawaii’s currency is the U.S. dollar”. This should be an unnecessary statement given Hawaii’s status as a part of the United States. The frequency with which this misguided question occurs is a sign that an impression of monetary sovereignty still exists in Hawai‘i. Though even then using the U.S. dollar, Hawaii briefly had its own series of banknotes during World War II. These notes were typical U.S. notes, with the word Hawaii overprinted on one side. They were used to replace U.S. currency in the islands so that, if Japanese forces were able to capture Hawaii, the U.S. government would be able to void all currency that had been
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captured. Although the notes only lasted slightly past the end of World War II, they provided a visible reminder that Hawaii's status was not the same as in the rest of the United States. Though the U.S. government responded to a credible fear, the fact that this solution was acceptable and still seems reasonable, even when it was not used in other at-risk parts of the U.S., shows an acceptance of the notion of Hawaii's difference.

Developing a separate Hawaiian currency has been proposed a number of times by people connected to the Hawaiian sovereignty movement. One advocate for a Hawaiian dollar, Laurence J. Brahm, notes that “aside from a standing army, I can think of only one other thing which gives a people both sovereignty and authority, … is having your own currency”. He advocates it as a local currency backed by geothermal energy, though the actual mechanism by which this would work is unexplained. Cryptocurrencies have also been created, but have failed to gain any meaningful attention. Another proposal suggests reissuing the dala (the currency of the Hawaiian kingdom) as a local/complementary currency. Complementary currencies are designed to supplement rather than replace national currencies and are not considered legal tender.
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thus avoiding many potential legal issues.\textsuperscript{969} This proposal suggests that re-establishing a Hawaiian currency “would stimulate curiosity and provide an opportunity to educate people about and win support for the Hawaiian kingdom; and it would be evidence of the de facto Hawaiian kingdom government effectively providing a government service to its\textsuperscript{sic} citizens/residents, which is an important step in eventually restoring recognition internationally”.\textsuperscript{970} It is questionable how useful this would actually be for the cause, but it is likely that it would help gain attention and is thus highly compatible with the general strategy of the sovereignty movement.

Niue officially uses both the New Zealand dollar and the Niue dollar. The Niue dollar is an interesting example of Niue exerting its sovereignty for a clear economic benefit. Niue mints several series of coins that feature popular characters, such as those from Star Wars and Disney on one side and the Queen on the other.\textsuperscript{971} Though technically legal tender, the coins are noncirculating and frequently made of precious metals.\textsuperscript{972} Except perhaps as a tourist novelty, these coins would never actually be used for transactions in Niue. They are minted strictly as legal tender because commemorative coins that are legal tender are generally valued more highly by collectors. By lending its sovereign right to mint coins to commercial activities, Niue is able to generate income at
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very little cost. It also serves as a reminder of Niuean sovereignty to a set of people who would likely otherwise never have any interaction with or even knowledge of Niue.

The Cook Islands uses the New Zealand dollar, along with the now-limited Cook Islands dollar. The Cook Islands issued its own currency starting in 1987.\(^{973}\) It was officially pegged to the New Zealand dollar with strict requirements for 100 per cent backing in foreign exchange reserve.\(^{974}\) This requirement was later reduced dramatically, with some denominations requiring only a 5 per cent backing.\(^{975}\) By the early 1990s, inflation and fears of a currency devaluation pushed the two major banks to no longer convert Cook Islands dollars to New Zealand dollars.\(^{976}\) Facing this crisis, the government passed the Currency Amendment Act of 1994–95, which declared the New Zealand dollar the sole monetary unit for banknotes above $3.\(^{977}\) The Cook Islands continue to circulate Cook Islands dollar coinage (including a $5 coin). Of the notes, only the $3 banknote remains in circulation. Cook Islands coinage features the queen on the obverse and traditional symbols, including local plants, Tangaroa (the sea god), and a vaka on the reverse. The $3 banknote, unlike the rest of the Cook Islands currency, does not feature the queen, but rather has a church congregation on the obverse and a series of traditional imagery representing the island of Aitutaki on the reverse. The now-
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discontinued $10, $20 and $50 banknotes followed this same pattern, with other islands’ symbols on the reverse.

The Cook Islands’ continued use of its own currency is significant as a statement about its nationhood. The practical reasons for a state choosing to have its own currency, particularly functions such as money creation, largely do not apply when it is limited to small denominations. The Cook Islands dollar is a reminder of the existence of a sovereign Cook Islands nation, rather than a practical economic policy.

Unique among the nations of this study, Fiji exclusively uses its own currency. Though it has been a republic since 1987, Queen Elizabeth II has been featured on the obverse of Fijian banknotes and coins until recently. The removal of the queen from Fijian currency has been very unpopular with many of Fiji’s tribal chiefs (and much of the public), as it reflects a visible symbol of the diminishing of their power through the removal of the traditional governance. The change in Fijian currency design marks a significant shift in the ways national symbols are used. Rather than continuing to pair a foreign symbol with domestic symbols, the new bills and coins feature only symbols of the Fijian nation. “Important and iconic flora and fauna of Fiji has been selected to


replace her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II's portrait”, said Bainimarama. These changes allow Fiji to both practically express its sovereignty and further reemphasise what symbols are of the highest importance to the Fijian nation.

The Cook Islands and Niue’s use of currency can be seen as primarily symbolic expressions of their nation. Neither has any significant practical reason for issuing its own currency yet chooses to do so. Fiji, though having operational needs for it, has placed an unusually high amount of attention on the symbolic messages the currency expresses. Hawai‘i, in contrast, has no meaningful ability to issue its own currency and attempts to do so have not been even slightly viable.

6.11 Street Names

Street names serve significant symbolic value despite being highly mundane. They are often an expression of everyday nationalism in a space that, while occasionally recognised as political, is typically unexamined and banal. These names, however, are of significant importance to nationalists. They provide a symbolically powerful way to construct a national identity. Also of particular salience is the fact that street names are generally administratively controlled and are thus easy for officials to change as desired. Giving streets commemorative names allows administrators to introduce an
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authorised version of the historical identity of the area. They can establish who and what is worthy of official recognition as a symbol of the nation.

Some governments have made renaming streets a highly visible symbolic representation of their regime change. For example, East Germany saw mass renaming of streets with the rise of the German Democratic Republic, as had also occurred under several previous governments. Streets named for people with Nazi connections, as well as those named for people who fought in the First World War, were quickly replaced by those of Communist significance. After German unification, many of these roads were again renamed to reflect anti-Nazi heroes and de-emphasise Communist figures. Iraq and Iran have seen similar mass renamings.

Though street naming is occasionally a part of large-scale propaganda (or counter-propaganda) campaigns, commemorative naming is often the result of more localised, less consciously nationalistic, efforts. It has long been a favourite tool of politicians looking to gain easy political support at minimal cost. People selected for memorialisation in street names are typically well-liked, no longer controversial historical figures. One of the most popular for street naming in the United States is
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Martin Luther King, Jr.\textsuperscript{989} Naming a street for him is politically well received, with controversy usually limited to which street to rename, rather than opposition to renaming.\textsuperscript{990} Similarly, naming roads for locally significant figures provides officials with an easy way to show the community that they understand the area and its history.

Hawaiʻi has fully embraced the significance of commemorative naming. Roads have been named after Hawaiian royalty, such as Kamehameha Highway and Kapiʻolani Boulevard; prominent historic Hawaiʻi families like Dole and McCully; and even mythical figures like Lehua and Ōhiʻa. However, unlike many other U.S. states, there are very few streets named after U.S. presidents or other historically important Americans. The vast majority of those that appear to be named after important Americans are actually named for locally important people with the same name.\textsuperscript{991} Hawaiʻi is also one of a small number of U.S. states that does not have a road named for Martin Luther King, Jr.

In Niue, limited new road construction and a habit of naming roads after the villages they connect has left Niuean politicians with few opportunities for commemorative naming. The most significant of these is Sir Robert Rex Wharf, named after the first premier of Niue. As the island’s only wharf, it is one of the most important pieces of infrastructure on the island.

\textsuperscript{989} Derek H. Alderman, “Street Names as Memorial Arenas: The Reputational Politics of Commemorating Martin Luther King in a Georgia County,” \textit{Historical Geography} 30 (2002): 99–120.


Many of Fiji’s roads have been named to commemorate important people in its history. For example, in Suva there is MacGregor Road (after Sir William MacGregor, the first chief medical and health officer); Ratu Sukuna Road (in honour of Ratu Sir Lala Sukuna, a Fijian chief and architect of Fijian self-governance); Queen Elizabeth Road; and Vishnu Deo Road (after Pandit Vishnu Deo, a powerful Indo-Fijian political leader). Fiji’s two most important motorways are Kings Road and Queens Road, generically named for the British royalty.

In the Cook Islands, though their nation itself is named after the British explorer Captain James Cook, there does not seem to be much other commemorative naming.

Even outside of commemorative naming, street names can serve the construction of national identity. All four nations of this paper have, either by policy or practice, adopted conventions of naming streets with historically connected names. Hawai‘i (at least for Honolulu) has the clearest policy in this regard. Under the Revised Ordinances of Honolulu 22-8.2, highways and freeways should “whenever practicable” be “named after Hawaiian royalty”. ROH 22-8.3 requires that street names in Honolulu “shall consist of Hawaiian names, words or phrases and shall be selected with a view to the appropriateness of the name to historic, cultural, scenic and topographical features of the area”. It also requires that appropriate diacritical marks be used on any new or replacement signage. The other counties of Hawai‘i largely follow this policy, despite limited or no statutory requirements to do so.

The road names across the Cook Islands are mostly Maori, with the notable exception of “Airport Road”. There does not appear to be any legislation that governs
how roads are named. Similarly, all roads in Niue have Niuean names, but not because of any statutory requirement.

Fiji seems to have the most variety in its street names and seems to lack any statutory requirements related to road naming. Yet, it appears as a matter, of course, that new roads will receive non-English names (mostly Fijian or Hindi) or be named after people significant to Fiji.

Within each of these nations, the obstinately practical choice of what a street should be called serves as a highly visible way to reinforce stories of a nation. The traditional name choice functions as a frequent reminder to everyone who uses the street of the connection between place and history. Though the person driving along looking at street signs might not consciously consider the full political and nationalistic implication of the street name, it is likely (and in the case of Hawaiʻi certain) that the person who named the street was fully immersed in its significance.

6.12 Music

Music typically draws strong, often subconscious, emotional responses. As such, it is ideal for orchestrating and manipulating nationalist sentiments.

Hawaiʻi has been credited with many contributions to music that are remarkable for its size. Musicians from Hawaiʻi popularised the slack key guitar and the ‘ukulēlē; they also invented the steel guitar. Hawaiian music has been described as a “unifying
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factor in the development of modern Pacific musics”. Though sharing many of its radio stations and music distributors with the United States, much of Hawaii’s music is distinct.

Hawaiian music gained widespread popularity in the early twentieth century. The 1912 Broadway show *Bird of Paradise* exposed Hawaiian music to many who had never heard it before. In the 1920s, Hawaiian music became a key part of Hawaii’s tourism efforts. Particularly when paired with hula, Hawaiian music, through attractions like the Kodak Hula Show, became a defining part of the Hawai‘i tourist identity. Today, it remains a key part of how Hawai‘i is presented to tourists. Virtually every tourist-focused hotel in Hawai‘i will have nightly Hawaiian music, and many tourists describe it as an integral part of their Hawai‘i vacation experience. Even for locally focused events, Hawaiian music plays a big role. It is a popular and non-controversial choice.

A distinct Hawaiian identity is reinforced by the playing of Hawaiian music. Its uniqueness serves as a reminder that Hawai‘i is different from the United States. More directly, notions of Hawaiian sovereignty and nationhood are often also presented through music. Much of the popular Hawaiian music contains themes of monarchy, nation, sovereignty and place. Music is a common way in which ideas of sovereignty are reinforced, even when the listener does not realise how strong a message the song sends. Music in Hawaii seems to be a way in which a subtle popular support for nationhood has developed even amongst those who would baulk at the political versions.

As discussed previously in this chapter, “Hawai‘i Pono‘i”, the state song and former national anthem of Hawai‘i, provides a strong pro-monarchy message. Many
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other iconic songs of Hawai`i are explicitly pro-sovereignty. Most notable is “Living in a Sovereign Land”, written by Israel Kamakawiwo'ole, the most famous Hawaiian singer (and one of the most famous modern Hawaiians). The song is extremely popular in Hawai`i and has been covered by many other bands. It calls for a recognition of the wrong that was done (“Our Children Deserve To Know; What Went Down A Hundred Years Ago; You Can Pay The Man, You Can Take The Land; But You Can't Take The Truth Away!”). It also calls upon everyone to restore the nation (“Brothers And Sisters, Brown, Yellow and White; Its Time To Do What You Know Is Right; Whats Been Taken Must Be Returned; Give Our Children What They Deserve”).

Another very popular song by Israel Kamakawiwo`ole advocating for justice for the Hawaiian Nation is “E Ala E”. This song, in Hawaiian and English, calls for the people of Hawai`i to stand for justice (“Rise for justice the day has come; For all our people to stand as one”) and (“Defend our birthright to be free; Give our children liberty”). Other popular songs such as “Hawai’i ‘78” —sung by Makaha Sons of Ni`ihau—mourns the desecration of sacred grounds and loss of the Hawaiian nation. The song asks how the monarchy would feel if they were to witness the state that Hawai`i is in today (“Could you just imagine if they were around; And saw highways on their sacred grounds; How would they feel about this modern city life; Tears would come from each other's eyes … All the fighting that the king had done; To conquer all these islands now these condominiums”). The song has been well used by those opposing the overdevelopment of the islands. “I Ka La `Apopo” provides a more active call to action. (“Rise up Hawaiians, rise up descendants; claim your rightful things”) and mourns the many losses of the overthrow (“The people cry for their queen; They cry because of the
overthrow … The native cries for his important thing; He cries for the thing which was lost. He cries for the hurts of the land; the hurts of today remain”). It concludes with the optimistic verse that “Sovereignty will return tomorrow”. These well-known songs are routinely played throughout Hawai‘i. Although other explicit pro-sovereignty nationalism efforts routinely fail in Hawai‘i, music is a way in which the message has been well received and incorporated.

Music is extremely important to the Cook Islands' identity. It has been said that “if there is one outstanding ability which appears to be shared by all Cook Islanders it is music and song”.

Music is an integral part of Cook Islands social life. The popular contemporary Cook Islands music, known as “island music”, is widely performed at nightclubs, bars, and community events such as weddings. It is also played as a key part of community fundraising.

Cook Islands music is largely characterised by Christian music and drumming, though many other contemporary styles are popular as well. Drumming is the “backbone of music and dance in the Cook Islands”. The Cook Islands style of drumming is widely recognised but is commonly thought to be Tahitian. This misattribution has
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been described by former Cook Islands Minister of Culture Jonassen as “a blatant plagiarism of cultural images and sounds too often being misappropriated by commercial institutions”. The Polynesian Cultural Center, a popular tourist attraction in Hawai‘i, has been described as one of the significant sources of this confusion. It bundles the Cook Islands drumming into the Tahitian village. Though initial tour guide scripts in the 1970s did correctly note that the drums were not of Tahitian origin, this is no longer mentioned. This situation has become particularly problematic because the Polynesian Cultural Center serves a dual role: it provides cultural education to tourists and also supports cultural revitalisation amongst Polynesian people. Thus, Cook Islands style “Tahitian drumming” has been absorbed into Tahitian culture as a traditional practice, displacing actual traditional Tahitian drumming.

Cook Islands songs were traditionally done as chants. The Cook Islands Christian Church banned the ute (celebratory song) style of chant for twenty years, which has caused it to fall out of daily use. Today this style is typically performed only as part of constitution celebrations or at community functions.
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songs) are among the most popular types of music in the Cook Islands. These songs are typical hymns performed in a harmonised manner. ‘Imene tuki feature similar messages but are done in a traditional chant style.

Cook Islands contemporary music is extremely popular in the Cook Islands; among Cook Islanders in the diaspora; and among other Polynesians.¹⁰⁰⁷ Radio Cook Islands plays primarily this style to widespread listenership.¹⁰⁰⁸ Songs are typically composed about life-stage events, relationships and community events.¹⁰⁰⁹ Contemporary Western or Pacific songs are also commonly reworked to localise their lyrics.¹⁰¹⁰ With significant numbers in diaspora, songs often feature a theme of longing for the islands.¹⁰¹¹ The very popular song “Sea Breeze” describes this longing with the lyrics “Sea Breeze, so peaceful; Back in Aitutaki; I yearn to see you; I would love to be there this night”. ¹⁰¹²

Many Cook Islanders have expressed concern that globalisation is leading to the absorption of their traditional music. ¹⁰¹³ The contemporary music has been called a “‘bastardisation’ of ‘traditional’ expressive forms and an indicator of ‘global’ corruption”. “Local music is seen as ‘swamped’ by Western popular music”. ¹⁰¹⁴ As a
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small island nation, the Cook Islands has limited abilities to combat the spread of cultural absorption that is commonly paired with globalisation. Though producing a disproportionate amount of music for their size, the multitude of other musical options and growing popularity of Western popular music options limit their ability to directly combat globalisation.

Music is a key part of traditional Fijian culture and modern daily life. It is rare to find a shop or office that does not have the radio playing in the background. Even the buses will typically have music playing. There is also a multitude of shops and street vendors selling music across Fijian cities and towns.

While iTaukei are ethnically and geographically Melanesian, Fijian music is more Polynesian in character. Historically, music played a significant role in iTaukei ceremony and warfare. The lali drums were heavily used for communications in order to call people together and to announce births, deaths, call to battle and other events of significance. Modern iTaukei music adds the guitar, ukulele and mandolin, as well as other percussion instruments. Church music is among the most popular genres. A style known as “vude” has also emerged in Fiji to great popularity. This genre mixes traditional Fijian songs with modern R&B, jazz and disco. Though not well known outside of Fiji and the growing Fijian diaspora, it provides a uniquely Fijian style that is widely played.

Indo-Fijian music has developed several distinct styles that have become popular globally. Bhajans are the most commonly exported. This style of music pairs devotional music with the harmonium and dholak (drums). A style of Qawaali (a type of Sufi devotional music) has also developed in Fiji; it uses the dholak rather than the traditional tabla because of a lack of trained tabla players in Fiji as a result of colonial immigration
patterns. Imported Indian music, particularly Bollywood soundtracks, are also extremely popular in Fiji.

Music is a significant part of tourism in Fiji. Most tourist hotels have live musicians regularly playing Polynesian-style music. Many hotel restaurants will use the lali drums to announce the start of dinner. Shops selling tourist goods play this kind of music to set a mood of authenticity and island life. Even the airport has Fijian musicians playing in the arrivals area. Like most tourist-focused representations of Fiji, this music is almost entirely of a Polynesian style, thus ignoring the music of Indo-Fijians and other Fijian groups. Similarly, it will also typically be pan-Polynesian music rather than Fijian specific styles.

Nevertheless, music in Fiji is an area in which Fiji’s unique identity can clearly be seen. Whilst Western music is undeniably popular, Fijian music has developed several unique styles that are becoming increasingly widespread globally. Though public music listening habits are influenced strongly by ethnicity, it remains very common to see people listening to music that is not associated with their ethnic group. iTaukei artists will cover Indo-Fijian songs, and vice-versa and nightclubs will play music from both groups within the same setlist.

Niuean music remains a seriously understudied subject. Information on it is based primarily on two studies, one from 1926 and the other from 1984.\textsuperscript{1015} They suggest that

Niuean music existed primarily to support dance.\textsuperscript{1016} Non-traditional music appears to be very Samoan influenced, with some other more recent Polynesian influences. Tourist presentations of Niuean music seem largely indistinguishable from those of other Polynesian islands. Arrivals at the airport are met with government-sponsored musicians playing Polynesian music. Though this immediately reminds visitors and residents that they are entering island culture, there is little about it that would seem to be uniquely Niuean.

A number of Niuean-language music albums have been produced, particularly by Niueans in diaspora and by church choirs. Several Niueans in New Zealand have gained attention performing non-traditional music there and globally, creating great pride in Niue. Most notable among these is Pauly Fuemana of Otara's Millionaires Club with the hit song “How Bizarre”. Given the limited data on Niuean music, it remains hard to fully assess its impact on Niuean national identity and nationalism. Based on the studies available and interviews I conducted, music is not having anywhere near the same significance as it does for other nations. This could be a result of the small population's lack of venue, audience and sufficient talent. What remains surprising, though, is a seemingly complete lack of diasporic “longing” music. With the vast majority of the Niuean population living in diaspora and the widely shared sentiments of connection to the Niuean homeland, we would expect to see some musical representation of nostalgia for island life. This absence suggests a need for future studies on the Niuean community in diaspora.

\textsuperscript{1016} Ibid.
6.13 Sport

Sport has long been one of the ways in which nationalism is expressed symbolically. It is often an area in which nations are able to compete against one another in a way that reflects national conflict without the consequences of real conflict. They can become united around their national teams as they compete against rival nations. This signalling of nationhood represents one of the classic focuses of banal nationalism.

Sport also provides a way for underrecognised nations to assert their identity through sports rivalry. For example, the Montreal Canadiens symbolic representation of Francophone Quebecers and their rivalry with Anglophone teams can be seen to represent more general conflicts of national identity. The Spanish football team Athletic Bilbao exclusive selection of Basque players and its rivalry with Catalan dominated FC Barcelona similarly reflects the team's strong identification with Basque and Catalan nationalism.

In addition to the obvious nationalistic implications of having a national team, sports also provide numerous opportunities for more subtle presentations of national symbols. National flags are typical components of sporting events, as are national anthems and other national songs. Even the food that is available at a game can be representative of the nation. The hyper-American hot dog is a regular part of American sports. Meat pies and lamb sausages are common at games in Australia. Roti wraps are a fixture of Fijian sports. These symbols, though not unique to sporting presentations, are so thoroughly ingrained into the events that their presence is rarely even questioned.
6.13.1 Olympics

The Olympics provide one of the most obvious visible displays of nationalism. Nationalistic symbolism is proudly and prominently displayed throughout. States compete against one another for national pride, and when they win, their flag and anthem are highlighted. Though of course having no legal effect upon a state’s independence, the Olympics are an extremely emblematic expression of statehood and serve as a popular barometer for sovereignty. A nation’s presence or absence at the Olympics can be highly symbolic for nationhood and sovereignty.

The Kingdom of Hawai‘i had already been overthrown prior to the first modern Olympic games in 1896. As such, Hawai‘i has never competed independently in the Olympics. Hawai‘i’s first Olympic athlete was Duke Kahanamoku. Duke was born shortly before the overthrow to a prominent Hawaiian family, whose members were considered lower-ranking nobles. He was a five-time Olympic medallist in swimming and is considered responsible for re-establishing and spreading the sport of surfing across the world. Competing as part of the U.S. Olympic swimming team at the 1912 Summer Olympics in Stockholm, he won a gold medal in the 100-meter freestyle and a silver medal in the 4×200-meter freestyle relay. He represented the United States in four Olympic Games and won a total of three gold and two silver medals. His accomplishments are widely celebrated in Hawai‘i and across the world. His statue in

1017 Duke was his given first name, not a title or nickname as is often erroneously reported.

Waikiki is one of the most visited and iconic in Hawaiʻi. Duke represents the challenge that many athletes from Hawaiʻi face (along with other Native athletes in similar conditions). He is quite clearly Hawaiian, but as a result of political and practical concerns, competed under the flag of the occupying United States. Since Kahanamoku, a number of athletes born in Hawaiʻi have competed on behalf of the United States and other countries.

Hawaiʻi does not have its own National Olympic Committee (NOC), typically a requirement to compete as a country in Olympics. Though American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands (all of which are administratively part of the U.S.) have their own NOCs, these committees predate a 1996 rule change, which requires international recognition of the state as independent. The International Olympic Committee has allowed a number of athletes to compete as “independent athletes” under the Olympic flag (a potentially ideological acceptable option for Hawaiian athletes). But this relaxing of the rule has largely been used for exceptional cases relating to recent major political developments, rather than a viable option for athletes unwilling to compete for their country of legal citizenship. As such, until Hawaii’s sovereignty is internationally recognised, or the IOC changes its rules, Hawaiʻi athletes must compete under another country’s flag.

Fijian athletes first competed in the 1956 Summer Olympic Games whilst still a colony of Great Britain. They have competed in fourteen Summer Games and three Winter Games in a variety of sports. At the 2016 Summer Olympics in Rio, Fiji won its first medal, placing first in Men's Rugby Sevens. Rugby has long been one of Fiji’s strongest sports, but it had not been played in the Olympics since the 1924 Summer
Olympics. The reintroduction of the sport to the 2016 Olympics gave Fiji a chance to compete in its strongest sport against other nations and show the world the power of a small island nation. Prior to this victory, only two Fijian athletes had competed in the Olympics based on the standards to qualify rather than as wild cards. The two were Makelesi Bulikiobo, who competed in the women's 400-metre sprint at the 2008 Games in Beijing, and Leslie Copeland in the men's javelin event at the 2012 Games in London. Both placed in the middle of their events. With the reintroduction of golf to the 2016 Games, Vijay Singh would have also qualified on merit had he not chosen to skip the Games owing to Zika concerns.1019

Fiji’s sevens victory was an extremely important moment for Fijian nationalism. In a globally televised match, Fiji beat its former colonial overseer, Great Britain, 43-7. This score represents both the highest score and the largest margin of victory of any sevens team in a world championship game. In Fiji, the game was nearly universally watched, with PM Bainimarama noting that “our productivity has been nil for the last couple of days”.1020 After the victory, he declared the following day to be a public holiday.

Niue has never sent athletes to the Olympics. Its NOC is an associate member of the Oceania National Olympic Committees but is not a member of the Association of


National Olympic Committees. Reflecting a 2012 decision by the Niue NOC to limit its focus, Niue can currently only participate in regional events (including commonwealth events) rather than the Olympics itself. As an associate member, however, it is recognised as meeting the fundamental requirements to qualify for full Olympic participation. Niue’s physical environment, however (particularly its lack of shallow navigable waters and limited beaches), does not allow many Olympic events favoured by small island states to be played there (such as volleyball or kayak events). Further, its small population, remoteness, the absence of specialised facilities, and lack of enough skilled athletes/trainers prevent competition in most sports. The sole stadium in Niue is the Niue High School Oval, which can accommodate 1,000 people. There are no facilities that would allow any other specialised events on the island. Attempts at building competitive mountain biking teams have been limited by the fact that the bikes are rented from a local car hire agency.\(^{1021}\) Despite these limitations, Niue has competed in a small number of sports at the Commonwealth Games, including the 2014 games, in which they placed either last or in the bottom three of each event. Niue’s strongest sports are likely netball (for which their national team placed twelfth of twenty-four in the 2003 World Championships) and Rugby Sevens (placing twenty-three of twenty-eight at the 2011–12 IRB Sevens World Series). Though very respectable positions in these sports for a country of their size and limitations, the strength of other countries in the region prevents Olympic chances (as does the fact that netball is not currently an Olympic sport). Niue’s
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nonparticipation in the Olympics seems most representative of their uncompetitiveness, rather than any sense that they could not participate. Despite this, their absence in the Olympics, even if their performance was abysmal, does very much work against Niue’s image of statehood in the world’s eye.

The Cook Islands has competed in six Summer Olympic Games, though it has never competed in the Winter Games and has won no medals. The Cook Islands first participated in the 1988 Seoul Games and has competed in each Summer Games since. The Cook Islands has exclusively competed in individual sports and has never sent more than nine athletes. It has entered into sailing, canoeing, swimming, weightlifting and boxing. Qualification has been nearly exclusively through regional inclusion policies rather than competitive placement. Though much larger than Niue, the Cook Islands remains a small country with limited resources. The abundance of lagoons and beaches does allow athletes for some sports to train. However, the islands lack meaningful specialised facilities for many other sports. Although performances have been credible, no Cook Islands athlete has managed to move beyond the bottom places of any event. Participation in the Olympics does nevertheless serve a powerfully symbolic role. It reminds the world and the people of the Cook Islands that no matter how small they are, they are still able to compete as a nation on a global stage against much larger states.

6.13.2 Multinational Competitions

Each nation in this study has competed in multinational competitions. These competitions provide a lower-key representation of the same values that form the Olympics. They provide a way for countries that would be uncompetitive at larger events an opportunity to compete as a nation.
The Cook Islands has competed in ten Commonwealth Games to date and has never won a medal. They are also a member of FIFA (International Federation of Association Football), though they have never made it past the first round. In netball, they have ranked as high as tenth, but are not currently especially competitive.

Niue has competed four times in the Commonwealth Games without any medal wins. They are an associate member of the OFC (Oceania Football Confederation), but not FIFA, making them eligible only for regional football competition. However, they have not competed in football since 1983. Rugby and netball have been the only sports in which Niue has seriously competed.

Both Niue and the Cook Islands compete in the Oceania Cup (a rugby union competition for countries and territories from Oceania) with developmental band national teams (the lowest level of national rugby). In addition to Niue and the Cook Islands, teams competing include four independent countries (Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tahiti and Vanuatu); as well as U.S. territory American Samoa and French special collectivity New Caledonia. Niue and the Cook Islands both do fairly well in this league. Niue won the 2008 FORU Oceania Cup and was the 2007 runner-up. The Cook Islands won in 1996, 2005 and 2013, placing second in 2002 and 2009. Though successful regionally with a few surprise victories against tier-one teams (such as Niue’s 48-4 defeat of highly ranked South Africa), neither team has done especially well internationally. Niue is currently ranked 85th in men's World Rugby rankings, and the Cook Islands is ranked 45th of 102. Neither state has a national women’s team.

Fiji, in addition to successfully competing in the Olympics, has been fairly competitive in regional sporting competitions. Fiji is ranked thirty-two in Women’s
World Rugby rankings and tenth in Men’s. Fijian athletes have also been a member of the International Cricket Council since before independence and have regularly competed in ICC Trophy tournaments. Cricket was introduced during the colonial period by the British governor of Fiji. It has found a considerable local following and seen a number of successes and high-profile players, including eventual PM and President Ratu Kamisese Mara. Unlike iTaukei-dominated rugby, Fijian cricket has seen many Indo-Fijian players. Both sports are widely followed across Fiji, with fans of every ethnic group united in their support of the national team.

Many teams across the region are formed of Pacific Islanders in diaspora. There are several prominent players on the national rugby teams of New Zealand and Australia who are a part of these diasporas. Only three of the twelve players on Japan's men's rugby sevens squad are foreign born (two Fijians and a Tongan). Still, the popular impression among many island fans is that Japan’s recent success is because they have brought in Pacific Islanders. Most of the players who compete on Niue and the Cook Islands national teams are actually residents of New Zealand. For example, in 2014 it was highly significant when Niue welcomed its first Niue-resident player to its modern rugby team; previously, none of the players actually resided in Niue.1022

Hawai‘i frequently competes in several sports against other national teams. Though often geographically farther away than other U.S. teams, many Hawai‘i-based teams will compete against national teams representing Asian and Pacific nations in

addition to or instead of competing against American teams. Whilst this decision is often made for logistical, marketing, or skill-based reasons, for the purposes of banal nationalism the message it sends can be quite mixed.

Even when teams are competing along with other American teams, it is not uncommon for Hawaiʻi to be presented as a separate entity. This can be seen in the Associated Press article “Title Game Set at Series: Hawaii vs. Japan” and the New York Times reprinting of the article under the title “Hawaii and Japan Will Play for Little League Crown”. The headlines suggest that the two entities competing are equivalent. More accurate headlines could have been “U.S.A. vs. Japan” (country vs. country); “Tokyo Prefecture vs. Hawaiʻi” (internal administrative unit vs. internal administrative unit); or the most accurate, “Waipahu vs. Tokyo” (town vs. city). Despite the headlines, the article does note that the Hawaiʻi fans were chanting “U.S.A.! U.S.A.!” and waving Hawaiʻi “flags and tea leaves for good luck”.

Sports also provides an opportunity to play the state’s national anthem. In this regard, the trend toward playing “Hawaiʻi Ponoʻi”, even though it is not typical to play the anthem of non-countries, is significant. This pattern can be seen clearly at the ‘Ohana Cup. The 2016 Ohana Cup Rugby League Festival in Hawaiʻi featured New South Wales Police vs. the Hawaii Chiefs; Fiji vs. Canada; and Tonga vs. Samoa. As is traditional in rugby, the national anthems of Fiji, Canada, Tonga and Samoa were played prior to the
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match. To represent the Hawaii Chiefs, “Hawai‘i Pono‘ī” was sung. For New South Wales Police “Advance Australia Fair” (the national anthem of Australia) was performed.

6.14 Food

Food is closely interwoven with "social relations, including those of power, inclusion and exclusion, as well as with cultural ideas about classification (including food and non-food, the edible and the inedible)". It is inseparably tied to notions of who we are, both as individuals and as a nation. As Fischler argues, "Food and cuisine are a central component of the sense of collective belonging and the symbolic value of food is central to our sense of identity, at both [the] individual and group level". Food establishes an identity. It can be used to establish who we are as individuals, but also who we are as a nation. Though rarely formally defined as a national cuisine, a particular set of foodstuffs often becomes associated with a nation. The presentation and consumption of these dishes serve to remind residents of the nation. Food remains arguably the most influential representation of banal nationalism. This section highlights a selection of the foodstuffs that are most iconic for each of the nations. Given the diversity of foodstuffs available within each, it should by no means be seen as comprehensive.


1027 Bob Ashley et al., Food and Cultural Studies (Routledge, 2004).
6.14.1 National Cuisine

Coconuts are used extensively in Pacific cooking and have significant symbolism associated with them. Coconut trees are "the universal symbol of the tropics in the popular imagination". They are used as a symbol of a tropical island paradise, representing "hot weather, sea and vacation time". The coconut tree is also known as the "tree of life" or "divine tree" in the South Pacific, owing to its use as food; building material (wood and leaves); material for weaving; and oil. Coconuts are of critical dietary importance for many islanders.

Taro is similarly iconic. It was by far the most important and commonly eaten starch in pre-colonial Pacific. Its consumption has declined as other starches have gained in popularity. It remains a status food for many islands and is often seen as essential for an authentic traditional meal. Its high cost limits its consumption largely to special occasions and meals for tourists.

Across the Pacific, traditional feasting is typically accompanied by music and dance becoming a key part of the tourist representation of the islands. Hawai‘i calls it a luau; Fiji calls it a lovo. Both the Cook Islands and Niue have their own versions,

\[\text{\[1029\ Ibid.}\]
\[\text{\[1030\ Lovo technically refers only to the earth oven in which the food for the event is cooked. It, however, has become synonymous with the entire event.}\]
where they are known for tourists as island nights\textsuperscript{1031}. The imagery and meanings of food are often manipulated for a variety of reasons to serve a multitude of goals. This manipulation is very evident in these presentations. These meals rarely include the scope of the island's cuisine, nor what is typically consumed. They are generally designed to fulfil tourists' desires for an exotic and pseudo-authentic meal. Though often incorporating symbolic traditional dishes and popular conceptions of what people eat in the islands (such as absurd amounts of pineapple), these meals are typically catered to the perceived desires of tourists for food that is familiar to them, but at the same time is suitably exotic.

Each of the nations in this dissertation, as well as sharing these general patterns, also has national cuisine trends that can be seen to reflect their national identity. Hawaii’s popular cuisine well reflects its identity. It is distinctly Hawaiian, but fully incorporates the cuisines of the many cultures that form Hawai‘i. The food that could be said to represent Hawaii’s national cuisine is a blend of Hawaiian, Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, American and other culture's dishes.

Rice is one of Hawaii's most significant foods. With Chinese immigration, rice quickly replaced taro as the primary starch and was consumed by nearly every ethnic

\textsuperscript{1031} There are traditional names for feasts with dancing and music; however, these names do not seem to be typically applied to tourist or casual versions rather favoring more generic names like buffet or borrowing the better known name of luau.
group in Hawai‘i.\textsuperscript{1032} Today, it is not uncommon for people in Hawai‘i to consume rice daily or multiple times a day. In preparing for natural disasters such as hurricanes, grocery stores will see runs on rice and Spam, similar to how stores elsewhere may have shortages of milk, eggs and bread. Even for those currently incarcerated, rice is significant. For example, a prison riot occurred in Arizona, where prisoners from Hawai‘i were housed in a correctional facility. Their complaints about the type and quality of the rice provided were credited as the reason for the hour-and-a-half-long riot, during which they caused damage and injured a guard.\textsuperscript{1033} In Hawai‘i, the general reaction to the riot, although disapproving, was one of understanding.

Spam and Spam musubi are amongst the best-loved foods in Hawai‘i, where consumers of Spam eat over 7 million cans a year. This meat product was introduced to the islands after World War II.\textsuperscript{1034} It has been jokingly called “Hawaiian steak” and is celebrated with a large annual street festival in Waikiki called the Spam Jam. Spam is eaten in a variety of ways, including fried as a breakfast food, as a sandwich, or most popularly, as a musubi. Musubis are a type of fusion sushi wherein meat (typically a slice
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\textsuperscript{1033} Due to on-island space limitations, many prisoners will be sent to mainland U.S. prisons to serve out their sentence. This creates frequent issues with feelings of cultural disconnect.
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of Spam) is pressed with rice and wrapped in nori (a type of Japanese seaweed). They are commonly eaten as a snack or a light meal and are sold at virtually every convenience store in Hawaiʻi. It is also typically seen at children’s sports games, brought by a team parent as a post-game snack for them. Similarly, many parents will send a musubi for a child's lunch on field trips. Both McDonald's and Burger King in Hawaiʻi serve Spam as part of their breakfast menu and have offered burgers with Spam as well.

A number of other Hawaiian dishes remain popular and iconic. *Poi* is a traditional staple. It is a thick paste made from taro and is often served lightly fermented. Though highly iconic, its daily consumption varies widely. *Poke* is another popular traditional food in Hawaii and, recently, across the rest of the U.S. and Canada. In its most common form, it is raw fish (typically ahi tuna) and seasoned with salt, onion, shoyu and often limu seaweed. It can be eaten on its own or on top of rice (known as a poke bowl). *Lomi-lomi salmon* is another common raw fish dish. Raw salmon is cured with salt and diced with tomatoes and onions. Pork was traditionally highly valued in the Pacific, and pork dishes remain popular today, particularly *kalua pig* and *laulau*. Kalua pig is pork slow-roasted in an earth oven. Laulau is pork, chicken or fish wrapped in layers of taro leaves and cooked until soft. Chicken long rice, though not actually a traditional dish, has become adopted as one. It features clear mung bean noodles cooked in chicken broth with chunks of chicken and ginger. These dishes all remain widely consumed both as part of tourist presentations and by residents of Hawaiʻi.

Plate lunch, though not a food in itself, is a quintessential Hawaiian meal. The representative plate lunch consists of two scoops of white rice, macaroni salad, and an entree. Typical entrees include chicken katsu (Japanese-style fried boneless chicken);
beef teriyaki (known as teri beef); Korean kalbi; char siu pork; kalua pork; hamburger steak; and Filipino chicken adobo. Likely derived from the Japanese bento, plate lunch is a popular meal. Given the quantity of food offered by a plate lunch, the price, and the way in which it is classically served (in a white unbranded Styrofoam container), it is often seen as a “working man's” meal, though it is eaten by all. In many ways, plate lunches are seen as symbolic of the modern nation of Hawai‘i. They represent a distinct fusion of cuisines that are accessible to all.

In addition to the foodstuffs mentioned above, there are also a number of foods that have become associated with Hawai‘i that lack the same historic significance or actual connection. Hawaiian pizza is an excellent example of this. It is topped with ham or bacon and pineapple. Invented by a Greek immigrant in Chatham, Ontario, it has no natural connection to Hawai‘i. Though available at most pizza places in Hawai‘i (as is the case for much of the U.S.), it enjoys no greater popularity in Hawai‘i than anywhere else. This trend of adding pineapple to dishes and branding them “Hawaiian” occurs frequently both in Hawai‘i and elsewhere. For example, Hardees (an American fast food chain) has offered a “Hawaiian Chicken Sandwich”, which featured teriyaki sauce and a slice of grilled pineapple. Similarly, McDonald's in Waikiki (Oahu’s main tourist area) bundles pineapple with all of its combo meals.

Cook Islands’ national cuisine would likely be considered traditional Polynesian. Though there are food options in the Cook Islands that span a wide range of cuisines (including continental, Indian, Chinese and Italian), they do not seem to be incorporated into national cuisine in the same way as in Hawai‘i or Fiji.
The Cook Islands are reasonably agriculturally diverse, with a variety of tropical fruits and vegetables available. Seafood, including fish, clams and octopus, is also common. Food cooked in an umu (earth oven) is most commonly described as Cook Islands cuisine. However, this process is labour-intensive and does not actually represent a commonly consumed set of foodstuffs. Other iconic dishes include ika mata (raw fish with coconut milk and finely chopped vegetables marinated in citrus); curried eke (octopus in coconut curry); rukau (taro leaves with coconut cream); and poke (banana or pawpaw pudding made with coconut milk).

Unlike in much of the Pacific, which views fruit as low-status snacks, the Cook Islands does not seem to have the same social stigmas for fresh fruits. This could possibly be seen as a sign of tourism promotion’s success in breaking the traditional stigma to support the paradise imagery of fruit.

Tourism is extremely significant for the Cook Islands, and food is well represented in the tourism promotional materials. Various travel writers have described Cook Islands food in glowing terms including calling it a “food lover’s paradise” and in the “Top Ten List of International Food Destinations.”1035 This promotion is likely a significant part of the reason why conceptions of Cook Islands cuisine are so focused upon traditional-esque Polynesian cuisine. Cook Islands tourist focused marketing materials sell the islands as traditional paradieses playing up the tropes of the exotic island. Thus, whilst many other cuisines are more widely available, and some can

arguably be more important for daily life, there is a vested interest in maintaining traditional Polynesian cuisine as representative of the Cook Islands’ national cuisine.

Seafood is the most significant part of the Niuean cuisine. Fish, uga (coconut crabs), or crayfish are a key feature of most Niuean recipes. Ahi tuna, mahi-mahi, barracuda, and parrotfish are the most typically consumed. Uga is both highly iconic for Niue and widely desired but has become somewhat scarce and thus no longer eaten frequently. Interestingly, given the emphasis on seafood and despite a variety of edible seaweeds being present in Niue, they have apparently never been meaningfully consumed. Taro, papaya, coconut, banana, yam, cassava and breadfruit are also widely consumed as part of traditional style meals.

What seems to most define Niuean cuisine is the source of the key ingredients. Though dishes like cream of crab soup and fish and chips are not traditional Niuean food, they have become a part of the national cuisine because they proudly feature Niuean seafood. Even restaurants like Kaiika Sushi & Gourmet Cuisine, which advertises “authentic Japanese cuisine”, are seen as Niuean in their focus on using premium locally caught fish.

Taro, as in most of the Pacific, is seen as the highest status and most desirable starch. Yams and cassava, being much easier to grow, form a significant, but less desired portion of daily traditional style starch consumption. Papaya and bananas are very low-status foods and are mostly consumed raw by tourists and children. However, a cooked papaya, coconut and taro casserole, Takihi, form what can be described as Niue’s national dish. As one of the few uniquely Niuean foods, Takihi is very iconic. It blends together several classic island flavours in a distinct way.
Much of Niue’s food is imported. Canned beef and frozen chicken will be frequently incorporated into meals of otherwise largely traditional ingredients. Most fresh produce is imported, though local production can inconsistently supplement demand. Soda, chips and other high-calorie sugary foods are extremely common and widely consumed, though not seen as part of the Niuean cuisine.

Food has not played a significant role in Niue tourism promotion, with a few recent exceptions of food festivals. There has been a notable lack of linkages between the tourism and agricultural sectors.\textsuperscript{1036} In fact, many guidebooks focus more on reassuring visitors that they will find something they want to eat rather than emphasising the quality or uniqueness of Niuean cuisine. This approach is beginning to shift. KaiNiue, a food festival started by the premier in 2014, is an event featuring prominent New Zealand chefs, designed to showcase the quality of Niuean foods.\textsuperscript{1037}

Fiji has considerable diversity in food consumption. Meals will regularly incorporate ingredients that span a number of cultures and have non-traditional origins. Even traditional Fijian diets were extremely diverse. What is likely most iconic of Fijian cuisine is its variety and the incorporation of ingredients from across the cultures of modern Fiji. Food provides a point of similarity within a national narrative full of differences. Through foods such as rice, cassava, coconut and curry, a culinary
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experience is shared by all peoples of Fiji. These foods, despite their origins, are consumed by everyone. Food in Fiji has become an area of the national identity in which it is possible for all people to be represented.

Curries are perhaps the best example of incorporation within Fijian cuisine. In Fiji, a curry is essentially any meat or vegetable cooked in a spiced sauce. Curries are seen as Indian; however, everyone in Fiji eats them. Curries will incorporate a variety of local ingredients, with many variations. Curries can be either vegetarian or contain a protein. Chicken appears to be the most common; mutton and beef (by non-Hindus) are also popular. The curry may also contain coconut, mango and bananas. Coconut milk is a common ingredient for Fijian Indians who identify themselves as South Indian, as well as for native Fijians. Like most other meals, curries are generally served with a starch such as roti, rice or cassava.

Each of the nations has established a de facto national cuisine. They incorporate the values of the nation in what they emphasise, and every time they are consumed they strengthen the nation’s identity. This occurs even if when they are consumed, the person is not consciously aware of the meanings behind the food. Fiji and Hawai‘i feature cuisines that are distinctive to the islands but incorporate the multitude of cultures that form the nation. Similarly, the Cook Islands and Niue have found a way to identify food as theirs, despite much of it being imported.

6.14.2 Food Branding

Food packages are frequently “flagged” with national symbols. This can include direct flagging with the nation’s flag, but also other representations of the nation such as stylised maps of the nation and prominent symbols. They are present with somewhat
different goals, both in products intended for domestic consumption and in products for export. For products intended for domestic consumption, this flagging can be used to signal authenticity and connection. In products intended for export markets, the symbolism may be intended as part of the marketing of the exoticness or otherwise desirability of the source nation. Increasingly, though, the symbolism is used to connect the product to the “homeland” for those living in diaspora.

Niue does not have any significant locally manufactured food products. Harrington's Brewery in New Zealand does, however, brew a pale ale specifically for the Niuean market under the brand Kalaga (shout). A locally brewed Fiafia Lager was previously available in Niue. Government-owned Noni Niue has also been experimenting with bottled water for the export market. These products do not seem to have gained any meaningful market penetration in Niue with imports continuing to dominate shelf space.

Niue does export a handful of small-scale agricultural commodities, most notably, taro. Niuean pink taro is considered one of the highest quality taros. Though it is known in Samoa as taro Niue and sold in New Zealand as Niuean pink taro, it is sold without any particular branding or marketing that would connect it to Niue beyond its species name.

Niue also has small-scale vanilla, honey and noni production intended for export. These products have such limited market reach that they mostly function as souvenirs for tourists rather than being meaningful in serving the domestic market or appealing to Niueans in diaspora.

In Hawai‘i, a large number of food products are manufactured for both the local and export markets. Though these products are heavily branded with symbols of Hawai‘i, the flag and the outline of the islands (both common national symbols on food elsewhere)
are largely absent. The hibiscus (the state flower) is heavily used. For example, Kauai Kookie, the most prominent Hawai‘i cookie manufacturer, uses the hibiscus as its logo and decorates its boxes with it. Plumerias are also used in the branding of other Hawai‘i food products. Aloha Shoyu, Hawaii’s largest and most iconic seller of sauces and vinegars, has a ring of plumerias around the label on each bottle. Many prominent brands use other iconic flowers and plants to decorate their packaging. These brands include Hawaiian Sun (a major beverage and syrup manufacturer); Hawaiian Springs (a significant water bottler); Mountain Apple Brands (a local grocery store brand); and Hawaiian Host (the most popular chocolate-covered macadamia brand).

An exception to these styles is Noh Foods of Hawaii’s export-focused products. Noh is Hawaii’s primary seasoning company. Its products such as char siu powder and Hawaiian Iced Tea mix are widely exported. Along with Hawaiian Host macadamia nuts, they probably have the best global availability of any Hawai‘i food product. Interestingly, Noh uses two logo variations. On its larger packages, sold almost exclusively in Hawai‘i, they use their logo without the outline of the Hawaiian Islands. The rest of their product line includes the logo with the island outline.

The Cook Islands has virtually no locally manufactured food products outside of the beverage sector. The Cook Islands owned Pacific Springs sells bottled water and carbonated soft drinks under the Vaima and Vaiora brands. Though the Vaima bottled water brand dominates the Cook Islands market, Vaiora soft drinks are hard to find and do not appear to be widely consumed. Both products, though, are strongly branded with symbols of the Cook Islands. The Vaiora bottle even has the slogan “the peoples [sic] drink”. Low sales numbers for Vaiora soft drinks have been attributed to higher
production costs than Coca-Cola products, because of a long-running improper application of tariffs to Coca-Cola products. Matutu Brewery brews Mai-branded lager. The packaging bears a tapa-style pattern with the tagline “proudly brewed in the Cook Islands”. These beverages do seem to support everyday nationalism by subtly reminding consumers of where they are, though they have not yet reached the level of production needed for their effects to be fully felt.

The Cook Islands exports some fruits and vegetables. However, despite some attempts at marketing a premium frozen fruit product, nearly all of the Cook Islands agricultural exports are sold as commodities without any meaningful island branding. The situation with fish in the Cook Islands is similar. The waters of the Cook Islands are home to some of the world’s most significant albacore tuna populations. Despite massive commercial fishing operations, the tuna is almost exclusively fished by foreign operators, processed in American Samoa, and exported without any Cook Islands branding. Until recently, the Cook Islands imported NZ$500,000 of fish, even though much of it was caught in Cook Islands waters. The Minister for Marine Resources arranged with Starkist, the largest processor of Cook Islands fish, to establish a brand called Golden Tuna, which, in addition to serving the domestic market, would also be branded with Cook Islands labelling to help build a premium export market. The packaging for Golden Tuna includes the Cook Islands ring of stars and is labelled “Cook Island Golden

---
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Tuna”. It appears that the brand has never managed to gain a meaningful domestic or export market share.

Fiji has fairly significant domestic production of a variety of foods. These products often make heavy use of their “Fijianess” to sell the product. This can be seen most clearly in the ways in which soda is sold in Fiji, though it is present across many sectors and products.

Three main brands (Coca-Cola, Pepsi and Sprint) are available in Fiji. Sprint is locally owned, and all three have local bottling plants. Coca-Cola has been available in Fiji since 1944. In 1972, Coca-Cola Amatil began local production. Coca-Cola for consumption within Fiji and Tonga is manufactured on the outskirts of Suva. Coca-Cola is often marketed in Fiji through the use of local imagery. The current can design for Coke features the word “bula” (used similarly to Hawaii's “aloha”) on the side. Advertisements often include scenes of the beach or iconic Fijian sites. Coca-Cola also markets its products as natural accompaniments to Fijian foods. Many eateries are decorated with posters advertising Coca-Cola products paired with popular local dishes, such as lolo with dalo, chicken curry or chow mein. The Coca-Cola fridge is a regular site at Fijian shops and eateries. Pepsi is bottled in Fiji by the Tappoo group. Despite extensive advertising and sports sponsorship, Pepsi products are much less popular than Coca-Cola products and are available only in a limited number of places. By their numerous sports sponsorships, they are able to pitch the message that buying Pepsi is part of supporting the national teams and, in turn, being Fijian. The Motibhai Group manufactures soft drinks under the brand "Sprint”. These soft drinks are significantly cheaper than Coca-Cola or Pepsi products and are manufactured in Fiji by an Indo-Fijian
owned company. As the owners of the PET bottle manufacturing plant and many retail stores and restaurants, the Motibhai Group maintains a very high level of vertical integration and trades heavily on the resulting Fijianess of this integration. Marketing campaigns for Sprint reflect this uniqueness. Sprint soda marketing generally emphasises its localness.

Food branding in the islands does not seem to be significantly focused on promoting authenticity, outside of the beverage sector. Though there may be considerable pride in local production, locally made products are not generally seen as preferable. Within the diasporas, however, there seems to be an increasing market for food made in the home nation. Nationalism in the Pasifika diaspora, however, remains a seriously understudied topic.

6.14.3 Import Limitations

As islands, all four nations face significant limitations and challenges related to food supply, particularly domestic production limitations and high import needs. These limitations create a situation in which dependency on other states is required. Though Fiji and possibly Hawai‘i could theoretically increase domestic production such that they become no longer dependant on imports, market forces and consumer preferences render it unlikely. Niue’s and the Cook Islands’ small size and agricultural limitations would require fairly dramatic shifts in food consumption (essentially reverting back food choice by several decades) in order to obtain food independence and is thus similarly unlikely to occur.

All food imported into Niue must come either via infrequent container ship or by twice-weekly flights from New Zealand. A container ship sails from New Zealand to
Niue via Fiji, Samoa, Tonga and the Cook Islands, taking about three weeks to reach Niue. Any fresh goods must be sent by air. Theoretically, packaged food could be sent from any of the countries at which the ship stops. But beyond a few speciality items from Fiji, New Zealand is effectively the only food source for imported goods.

Though the Cook Islands has more selection for food imports, minimal competition means limited imported food choice. Cook Islands Trading Corporation (CITC) largely dominates the food import market. As the operator of both of the major supermarkets in Rarotonga and the primary restaurant/catering supplier, they largely determine what food products are going to be available in the Cook Islands.

In addition to reasonable local production, both Fiji and Hawai‘i import significant amounts of food from a variety of countries. Hawai‘i receives several hundred cargo ships a year and Fiji similar numbers. There is also a large amount of air cargo transported to the islands. Fiji has direct cargo routes from the U.S., Asia, Australia and New Zealand. Thus, food will be imported from a variety of countries. As is typical with developing countries, a significant amount of the food is imported based upon current market conditions and shipping schedules rather than any sort of typical logistical pattern. It is not uncommon to see food coming from a variety of atypical countries. During my previous research, I found sodas imported from Papua New Guinea, jarred fruit salad from Sri Lanka and ketchup from Indonesia sold alongside products imported from typical Fijian suppliers, Australia, India, New Zealand and the U.S.
The vast majority of the food in Hawai‘i is shipped from the U.S. West Coast, including food originating in Asia. Restrictions under the federal Jones Act\textsuperscript{1041} prevent foreign cargo vessels from profitably operating service directly to Hawai‘i from Asia.\textsuperscript{1042} Though there is significant cargo transported between Hawai‘i and the rest of the South Pacific, food cargo does not appear to form a meaningful component. South Pacific brands are available only in speciality shops in Hawai‘i, and Hawai‘i-manufactured food has little presence in the shops of many South Pacific islands.

6.14.4 Health Promotion Efforts

Many of the world’s most obese and overweight populations are in Oceania. The Cook Islands and Niue currently have the second-highest mean body mass index (BMI) (neighbouring Nauru is slightly higher).\textsuperscript{1043} In the Cook Islands, 81 per cent of the population is overweight, with over half considered obese, giving it the highest obesity

\textsuperscript{1041} The Jones Act requires that all goods transported between U.S. ports be transported on U.S. ships. Thus, while a foreign ship could stop in Hawai‘i between Asia and the U.S., it would not be allowed to take on any additional cargo for transport between Hawai‘i and its next U.S. port making the stop unprofitable. Some interpretations of the act would forbid foreign ships from stopping in Hawai‘i and proceeding to another U.S. port without an intermediary foreign stop.


Though BMI is in many ways a clumsy measure of health risk, particularly since it fails to account for the Polynesian body type, the rates in each of these nations still greatly exceed the likely imprecision in BMI calculation. Fiji, for example, publishes slightly higher BMI numbers to be considered obese and overweight than the typically used numbers. Even with this adjustment, obesity and overweight percentages are still extremely high.
rate in the world. Similarly, almost three-quarters of Niue’s population is overweight, and over 40 per cent is obese. Fiji has a lower obesity rate of 36.4%, but 78.2% of the population is overweight. Hawai‘i has rather low overweight and obesity percentages for the U.S. (56.4 and 22.7 per cent, respectively). Nevertheless, there is considerable variation across ethnic groups. Many groups (particularly Hawaiians and other Polynesians) have high overweight and obesity rates comparable to the rest of the Pacific. The obesity rate has also climbed dramatically over the past few decades. In addition to the other health concerns of obesity, diabetes related to diet has been described as one of the top concerns for health officials in each nation.

Many of these health problems are directly connected to globalisation and colonialism. Imported food has replaced many of the traditional foodstuffs with higher-calorie, highly processed items. These foods have become socially desirable, particularly amongst children. Similarly, in some Pacific islands cultural values favour larger body types as a symbol of power and wealth; an outlook slow to change. There are also traditions of celebratory feasting for many life events. Desirable unhealthy foods have become accessible to wider populations, shifting them from occasionally consumed to regularly consumed. Changes in job functions have further reduced exercise that used to

1044 World Health Organization, “Obesity.”
1045 Ibid.
balance traditionally high-carbohydrate meals. These factors, along with several other locally specific issues, have created a significant problem for most of the region.

Though approached as a public health problem, the solutions have significant implications for nationalism. A major trend favours local traditional foods in an attempt to combat obesity. Local food can serve as an “identity marker”. Consuming it helps promote a sense of cultural identity and self-sufficiency, and with it build the nation. Although some, particularly in Hawai‘i, have intentionally tried to shape it for nationalistic goals, much of it is seemingly unintentional under public health efforts.

Niue’s Ministry of Health has been implementing a multipart strategy to target obesity and diabetes. This plan aims to encourage people to limit their consumption of imported foods and refocus on eating traditional foods. The ministry operates educational campaigns to promote these goals in the schools and for the general public, including a community cookbook of healthy Niuean recipes. Given a lack of other cookbooks, this could easily become the defining representation of Niuean national cuisine. There is also a push to encourage Niueans to eat more fruit. Though fruit is reasonably plentiful, there are social stigmas related to its consumption; many fruits are seen as a food of last resort. Eating a raw papaya would be something done only by children or with shame by the poor. Tourist consumption has somewhat increased its acceptability, but it still remains a

source of amusement for many that tourists find them desirable. Coconut water sees a similar pattern.

The efforts by the Ministry of Health in Niue are interesting in light of the fact that they are primarily funded by the New Zealand government. In effect, the New Zealand government is paying for efforts to reduce the consumption of New Zealand made imported foods and also attempts to further define Niue’s identity as distinct.

The Cook Islands Ministry of Health has for some time attempted to encourage healthier eating to combat obesity. However, it does not appear to have any significant current campaigns.

Fiji’s Ministry of Health’s recommendations for food and health strongly promote eating locally and avoiding food “sold in brightly coloured packets”. Fairly unique amongst nutrition guidelines, their guidelines also advocate growing food at home. All of the food shown in the guidelines are foods that are strongly identified with Fiji. This includes both foods that are traditionally associated with Fiji like taro and coconut, as well as later additions like ghee and rice.

The guidelines for schools feature healthy meals representative of Fijian cuisine, such as “fish and green leaves in lolo with cassava”; “chicken curry with rice and cucumber”; and “chicken or egg fried rice with vegetables”. Notably absent from their


1050 National Food and Nutrition Centre, “School Canteen Guidelines Summary,” Consumer Council of Fiji, accessed December 5, 2016,
recommendations are any of the meals thought of as Western (fish and chips, sandwiches, etc.). Beef and pork are also absent both for health reasons and to be applicable across Fiji’s population.1051

The Ministry of Health’s guidelines are clearly built with Fiji in mind, rather than being simply an adaptation of another nation’s or FAO/WHO recommendations. As such they promote foods that strengthen the Fijian identity and national cuisine in a way that many Pacific island states have only recently started to do.

The Hawai‘i governmental structure has meant a different style of approach to nutrition policy. The Hawai‘i Department of Health has focused on general healthy eating and exercise advice through its “Healthy Hawaii Initiative”. The campaign, though featuring some photos that are clearly in Hawai‘i, has virtually nothing that is Hawai‘i specific. Its food suggestions show no awareness of Hawaii’s cuisine or food options and could be unnoticeably interchanged with any other U.S. state’s. School lunches for state-run schools in Hawaii follow the federal U.S.DA school lunch guidelines, limiting the ability to adapt them to Hawaii’s foodways. Nevertheless, school lunches often do reflect local taste. Rice is served in some form most days. Most schools serve it daily for either breakfast, lunch or alternate lunch. Further, Hawai‘i entrees such as kalua pork, chicken katsu, teriyaki beef, Portuguese sausage (for breakfast), and shoyu chicken/turkey are regularly appearing. Pineapple also appears more frequently than in non-Hawai‘i schools.


1051 Ibid.
The Hawaii Department of Education’s School Food Services Branch manages food services for all public schools in Hawai‘i and does all purchasing as a single entity. This model means that with demand for local food exceeding supply, despite public support, little food for Hawai‘i schools is locally grown or produced.

Nongovernmental efforts to encourage Hawai‘i-specific dietary change saw some highly significant early successes but have since lost much of their momentum. One of the most meaningful of these efforts was a study in Waianae conducted in 1991. In this study, Hawaiians were provided with a diet of foods that were available pre-Western contact. They were encouraged to eat as much as they wished, as the food was low in fat and calories. Adherence to the diet was extremely high; feelings of cultural pride were credited with this success. Across the initial three weeks, participants lost an average of 1.6 kg (3.5 lbs). A follow-up study in 1999 found a sustained weight loss average of 6.8 kg (15.1 lbs). Despite this success, since then most efforts have been smaller, targeting eating local.

1053 Ibid.
1054 Ibid.
1055 Ibid.
1056 Ibid.
1057 Ibid.
1058 Ibid.
1059 Ibid.
The message of a return to more traditional foods has become a part of the undercurrent of sovereignty activism and cultural revitalisation in Hawai‘i. Food is used as a symbol of resistance to the occupiers and as a part of the formation of the identity of the sovereign nation. Food has a historical role in Hawaii as a “cultural symbol of alliance-building and loyalty, celebration and spiritual reverence”. It is because of this role that food has become a tool of resistance within the Hawaiian sovereignty movement. Sovereignty activists have described the Hawaiian nation as a “people who make their livelihood from the land and the sea”. A return to Hawaiian food and an escape from the oppression of a supermarket-oriented food distribution system have become key parts of the goals of rebuilding the Hawaiian nation. Direct action, however, has been typically treated as a low-priority item. Small-scale attempts at promoting traditional foodways serve as the major representation.

6.14.5 Biodiversity

There have been some attempts at promoting traditional edible plants in the region as a way to ensure continuing biodiversity. These efforts typically focus on encouraging education regarding traditional practices in growing and harvesting culturally significant plants. The Secretariat of the Pacific Community has organised a number of these


programs for the region including their fairly successful root crops program.\textsuperscript{1062} Though these programs are not explicitly designed to have a nationalist message, like with nutrition policy, they will often serve to support nationalist causes. Within Hawai‘i, working on the taro crops have become integrated within other cultural promotion efforts and sovereignty activism. A moral component has emerged wherein by supporting traditional local plants, you are supporting local cultural values and fighting the devaluation of local foods.\textsuperscript{1063}

6.15 Conclusions

Hawai‘i, as expressed through everyday nationalism, creates an unusual situation. Across a wide variety of areas of daily life, it is treated as distinct from the United States. Simultaneously, it is not operating as a sovereign nation. It is an undeniable reality that the U.S. continues to maintain control of the islands and the world remains largely content with this status despite the efforts of activists.

Fiji is one of a growing number of nations in which everyday nationalism is being intentionally shaped to promote a desired vision of the nation. The government’s efforts to promote a unified Fijian nation are highly significant. Interestingly, these now intentional efforts actually fit the way in which everyday nationalism was expressed prior to government's attempt reasonably well. Furthermore, their multi-part efforts to

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1063} Ibid.
\end{flushright}
eliminate areas that are contrary to a message of unity seem to be occurring with moderate success.

Niue’s and the Cook Islands’ expressions of national identity seem to largely reinforce the idea that they are in fact independent nations. There is little within the everyday life in the islands that would indicate otherwise. Though both face struggles similar to that of other very small island states, they are prospering with distinct identities.

Across a number of areas of daily life, these four nations see their identities reproduced. Little thought about mundane areas, such as that of customs and immigration, air travel, and shipping, all clearly reflect and reinforce the nation. Even the vague sense of foreignness and the distance travelled can strengthen this idea. The effects of everyday nationalism on the nation’s identity are, however, most clearly felt within sport, music, and food.

Sport provides a clear way in which nations can compete with each other where simply the fact that they are competing as a nation against another nation reinforces their identity. Though only the Cook Islands and Fiji participate in the Olympics, all four nations compete under their own banner as a nation regularly. They are able to repeatedly show who they are and what they represent.

Music is another area in which the nation is built, often without conscious thought. Music has played a big role in sharing what the nation represents. It is a fairly inoffensive way to express ideas that might be rejected in other settings. The casual acceptance and incorporation of other ethnic group’s music in Fiji or the widespreadness
listenership to Hawaiian protest music has done more to shape the nation's identity than what any nationalist could achieve through traditional approaches.

Food is increasingly an area of nationalistic concern. Throughout the four nations, the efforts toward returning to a traditional diet are nutritionally sound, but largely unrealistic unless it can be strongly paired with nationalistic identity efforts. Traditional foods lack the variety to which Pacific Islanders have become accustomed. They are generally low fat and low sugar (though relatively salt heavy) but rely on limited flavours for seasoning. Many traditional foodstuffs are also fairly labour intensive to produce and are poorly suited to factory farming methods. Should people manage to actually return to a traditional diet, we would likely see massive improvements in the obesity rates. However, given human’s biological urges for salt, sugar and fat, it is hard to convince people to abandon the cheap and plentiful world of unhealthy manufactured food. By incorporating nationalistic messages, health promotion efforts call upon powerful forces of nation and belonging in an attempt to defeat the biological urges. These efforts also simultaneously strengthen the nation by establishing a pro-nation officially endorsed representation of everyday nationalism. The health promotion efforts are still, relatively speaking, in their infancy. We need much more time and data to determine if it is, in fact, possible for nationalism to be used with success in such a way as is being tried.
Chapter 7

7 Conclusions

There are a number of surprising absences within the four nations’ expressions of nationalism, particularly when looked at using a traditional hot nationalism model. This approach to nationalism would expect to see Hawaiʻi, the Cook Islands and Niue engaged in a fiercely contested struggle for full independence, whilst Fiji would be in the midst of ethnic conflict and unrest. This is not, however, the case. Further, through all four are small island nations in the same region, there is considerable diversity in the ways in which nationalism is actually expressed.

Hawaii’s sovereignty movement, though fairly active, is surprisingly disorganised in tactics and desired outcomes. Few of the hallmarks of sovereignty struggles, at least as exists in the popular imagination, can be seen in Hawaiʻi. There is no militant wing, no mass protests, nor even any particularly notable icons of the struggle. The symbols of resistance are few and subtle. There has not been a politically viable pro-independence political party in decades, and the last referendum on its status was held over fifty years ago. Nevertheless, there is a very active movement with widespread support.

The movement, though united on the core issue that the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaiʻi was wrong, agrees on little else. There have been several models for handling the wrong of the overthrow proposed, but most contradict each other. Further, while each group has tried a variety of methods, iconic tools of hot nationalism such as armed resistance and mass nationalist protests are largely absent. Armed resistance was last meaningfully tried in 1895 and protests whilst common, are almost never directly
about core nationalist topics, but rather indirect issues such as land usage or environmental impact.

The lack of a meaningful counter-sovereignty movement in Hawai‘i is also significant. Given the activity level of the Hawaiian sovereignty movement, it would be expected that we would see meaningful opposition or, if there is not actually any opposition, sovereignty would be expected.

For Niue and the Cook Islands, the minimalism of hot nationalism is remarkable. Though many nations like to believe that they have evolved beyond hot nationalism with hot nationalism being a thing that happens in other less developed nations, an actual absence of hot nationalism is rare. Today, neither nation has seen much that is typically expected in terms of nationalistic sentiment. Though both have well defined national identities and a widespread undeniable pride in their nation, symbols of the nation are typically understated.

Fiji is surprising in the relative peacefulness its nationalist driven displays have had. It seems in many ways to be completely set up for serious nationalistic conflict. It has a large politically weak minority population who wields disproportionate economic dominance. Its military is fairly large for its population and has had limited oversight and control by civilian leadership. Though there have been four coups in the last few decades, no shots were fired in overthrowing the government, and the three military coups saw no fatalities. Even within the civilian-led coup in 2000, the coup proper saw only a handful
of fatalities\textsuperscript{1064}. During the two 1987 coups and the 2000 coup, there was also serious, though brief, rioting mostly targeting Indo-Fijians and their property. Though clearly present, violence has been minimal, and displays of divisive hot nationalism have been fairly brief. When compared to other nations, Fiji’s coups have been remarkably low in violence. Additionally, despite the coups and discriminatory policies, there is a surprising lack of Indo-Fijian nationalism.

There is also a seemingly strange pattern within several of these nations in which efforts to promote sovereignty and independence is being funded by the party that they are working against. Most directly this can be observed within the Office of Hawaiian Affairs. The Office of Hawaiian Affairs is a semi-autonomous state agency which has actively worked to promote Hawaiian sovereignty. If it were to accomplish its goals, it would result in the dissolution of itself and the government of which it is a part. Similarly, the University of Hawai‘i typically takes a rather pro-sovereignty position whilst again being primarily state and federally funded. Within Niue and the Cook Islands, a large percentage of government funds are coming from New Zealand foreign aid. As a result, government efforts to strengthen their national identity and distance themselves from New Zealand are being funded by New Zealand.

\textsuperscript{1064} There is considerable disagreement about how to count the number of deaths within the 2000 coup. During the coup, a security officer suffered a heart attack fleeing an angry crowd, and a police officer was shot by coup supporters. A mutiny within the military’s Counter Revolutionary Warfare Unit several months after the coup saw four mutinying soldiers beaten to death by loyal soldiers. Beyond these, there are another ten fatalities that have much more distant connections to the coup that some choose to include in the coup’s death count.
7.1 Nationalism in Small States

Nevertheless, and despite their small size, nationalism is present in each of the four nations. Even in the extreme example of Niue, there still is a pride in the nation and a sense of comradery and nationhood that is at its core indistinguishable from larger nations.

7.1.1 Effect of Small Numbers

One of the characteristics of nationalism in small states most directly connected to its small size is the disproportionate effect a handful of people can have. The difference in many small island states between an active nationalist movement and a minimal one can be as small as the time availability and motivation of a couple of people. For example, within Niue, the fact that a newspaper exists is because of the work of one person. Particularly in the case of hot nationalism, we must be careful to not overattribute importance to its absence or presence. The appearance or absence in a small state could be the work of an extremely tiny number of people and cannot be said to truly represent the nation’s sentiments. At the same time, though, care must also be taken to recognise the effect a few persuasive individuals can have. In general, though, for small states, everyday nationalism seems to be much more representative of the nation’s identity.
7.1.2 Economic Development

All of the nations in this dissertation are somewhere in the middle of most development indexes. Hawai‘i\(^{1065}\) is the most developed economically in the region and does acceptably on most human development metrics. The Cook Islands is set to move to developed country status in late 2018 under the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) listing methodology. This places it with most of Western Europe. Though it is set to graduate, many remain very concerned because it is right on the edge. Niue and Fiji remain in the upper-middle-income list. Though there are some development challenges due to geographic factors\(^{1066}\), they have reasonable average incomes and standards of living in much of the nation.

---

\(^{1065}\) Hawai‘i is hard to classify under typical development metrics. It has the highest life expectancy in the US, but below average school enrollment, educational achievement and infrastructure. Hawai‘i has a middle of the US median income level, but one of the highest costs of living and with it one of the lowest purchasing power rates in the US. As a result, when adjusted for purchasing power, Hawai‘i is one of the poorest states in the US. It also has by far the highest rate of homelessness and income inequality in the US. Thus, whilst it is more developed than any of the other island nations in the region, it is not fully reaching the standards that being a part of the US would suggest.

\(^{1066}\) Both the Cook Islands and Fiji have some difficulty providing services to some of the more sparsely populated remote islands which skews developmental metrics. There are also issues with the typical measures of development when applied to many Pacific island states. Many of these metrics do not accurately reflect the quality of life in the region, encouraging comparisons to states where conditions are in fact much worse for the people. Water access is a good example of this effect. In much of Oceania, access to improved water supplies falls short of most desired metrics. However, unlike in much of the world, the unimproved water supplies are often of reasonable quality. So whilst by typical development metrics a person in Oceania who has access to an acceptable quality unimproved water source (such as a clean stream) is seen as in the same situation as a person in sub-Saharan Africa whose primary water supply is contaminated, scarce, or requires a great distance to access.
It seems likely that the development levels of each nation may be having a moderating effect on the ways in which nationalism is expressed. For most people living within these nations, despite the challenges, the status quo is working fairly well for them. They lack the motivation for radical change. Many past independence movements were largely motivated by a frustration with the administration and a belief that daily life could be much better as an independent state. When there is little to lose and much to gain, it becomes easier to back hot nationalism. In contrast, nationalists within the nations of this paper have much less to promise. Improvements that changing statuses can provide are fairly minimal and would likely cause considerable turmoil. The Cook Islands and Niue gain considerably from their relationship with New Zealand and would face a much more difficult economic situation if they were to end the free association. For Hawai‘i, there is a considerable lack of popular support for meaningful changes to the situation. The time since the overthrow has meant significant changes to demographics, a near complete loss of the pre-overthrow governance infrastructure and the development of an economy that heavily utilises its connection to the U.S. Despite popular support for addressing the wrongs of the overthrow, disruptions to the status quo are largely unwelcome.

7.1.3 Tourism

The value of tourism to these small island nations provides a powerful motivator to maintain a specific public image of the nation. Traditional models suggest that within the types of tourism island nations typically see, tourists demand a nation that is suitably exotic, but also simultaneously familiar and unintimidating. Particularly for the “standard island” tourist, they want a relaxing, peaceful place with the complexities of conflicting
national identities hidden. They don’t want to see protests or other displays of hot nationalism. They view their trip as an escape from the cares of the world, not a time to contemplate colonial legacies. This creates a very powerful economic motivator to push aside any exhibitions of nationalism that do not meet these values. As a result, the colonial legacy issues in Fiji and the sovereignty struggle of Hawai‘i rarely receive the attention of other similar concerns do in other less tourism-dependent locales.

These fears of lost tourism income are not without merit. The coups in Fiji have seen direct costs in the millions from tourism declines in the immediate aftermath of each coup. The indirect costs are staggering with most estimates showing that Fiji has still not regained its tourism momentum from the losses caused by the 1987 coups.

The importance of tourism could, at least in part, explain the minimalism of hot nationalism in these nations. On a number of occasions, primarily in Fiji and Hawai‘i, the government has worked to hide issues from world attention if they would be harmful to the tourism image.

7.2 Academia and the Legal System in Modern Nationalism

There has been a noticeable refocusing within nationalism on the academic and legal spheres. Unlike in many past nationalist movements where academia was seen as out of touch or the enemy, they are increasingly recognising the utility of academia in promoting the cause.

Several Hawaiian sovereignty activists have earned graduate degrees for with a dissertation that serves as a treatise on their subject of activism. Though their works are
primarily legal arguments, the vast majority are earning their degrees in disciplines other than law and often present arguments that are at best fringe interpretations of legal theory. Nevertheless, it has been an extremely effective strategy for gaining legitimacy and support for their causes. A number of them have also been able to utilise their degrees to gain positions within the colleges from which they can promote their pro-sovereignty message to a receptive audience.

In Fiji, many nationalists have used global academic discussions on indigenous rights and postcolonialism to justify pro-i Taukei positions. Even when inapplicable, the ability to connect their cause to a larger generally well-received body of scholarship has been very useful. Niue and the Cook Islands occasionally see similar, though often less well received (given the benefits of the free association), connections between local discussions and the larger academic focus.

There is also growing attention on gaining formal skills and developing local academic materials that strengthen the culture and the nation (primarily through areas of everyday nationalism).

Nationalists have increasingly been paying close attention to discussions of sovereignty and independence from an international law perspective. An increasingly common nationalist tool is to present an argument of why their nation should be considered a legally sovereign nation, despite practical realities. No longer content with vague arguments of the illegality of past conquest, nationalists today will often argue that their nation continues to exist today as an occupied state. Convoluted arguments regarding flaws in the instrument of annexation or conquest will be paired with selective application of international law and misunderstandings (intentional or otherwise) of legal
technicalities to build an argument for sovereignty. Though many of the arguments have some legal basis, they typically ignore all contrary facts, issues of jurisdiction, basic legal theory and often common sense. They are also often exceptionally self-serving in requiring fairly large leaps to explain why they (and usually they alone) are the rightful successor to the past state. Despite the deficiencies of the legal approaches, they are amazingly popular at gaining popular support. Within nations that feature reasonably functional legal systems people typically expect justice to prevail. Nationalists sell their approaches as clear-cut legal arguments in which they could only lose if the law is ignored. They conveniently neglect issues of political will, the fact that most of what they are asking for is either logically impossible or not a legal question, and subtleties of law and procedure. In this way, even in their losses, they are able to present it as an example of continued oppression and when they have their minor legal successes, as full vindication of their approach. The effect of this approach thus lies more within its ability to shift the popular opinion then it does the law.

7.3 Everyday Nationalism

The prevalence of everyday nationalism appears to be the most significant feature of the ways in which nationalism is expressed in these small island nations. Traditional hot nationalism, for a variety of nation-specific reasons, does not seem to gain much of a foothold in these nations. Even the expanded form of hot nationalism described in chapter five largely lack the intensity typically expected. In contrast, everyday nationalism seems to be an ever-present part of life in these four nations.

Everyday nationalism provides a way to explain the clear presence of the nation and its symbols in many small nations, despite fairly minimal hot nationalist
presentations. Across a variety of spaces, everyday nationalism is a clear part of daily life in these nations. Even many banal practical decisions such as naming streets or arranging airports can serve to strengthen an image of the nation. Though it has traditionally been thought to be the result of mostly unconscious decisions, areas of everyday nationalism are increasingly being shaped by activists with clear nationalist agendas. Even in areas which are not directly being targeted by activists, there is an overall sense of the nation that is often intentionally shaped by activists.

Nutrition policy provides one of the strongest examples of the increasingly conscious, though sometimes indirect shaping of everyday nationalism. Whilst the projects are typically presented as a way to address the alarmingly high obesity rates found across the islands, the proposed solution has been a nation affirming return to traditional foodways. It allows for a stronger nation through an improved sense of cultural identity and self-sufficiency. Despite its powerful, but subtle, effect on nationalism, food is often treated as a minor concern for nationalists.

Other areas of everyday nationalism can be clearly observed within the four nations. Sport and music have long been favourites for looking at everyday nationalism. The ways in which sporting competitions are set up, as well as how music is performed, can be very indicative of the popular conceptions of their nation. Similarly, there are a number of extremely banal areas that have powerful impacts on the identity of the nation. Airport layouts, customs and immigration procedures and even currency can show the ways in which a nation’s citizen accept their nation.

In looking across the nations of this study, it becomes very evident that the ways in which nationalism are expressed have clearly changed, particularly within small more
developed countries. Though they have not faded away completely, traditional hot nationalism is becoming uncommon for these nations. As Billig notes, the fiery, in-your-face style nationalism will turn into much subtler forms of nationalism within established nations. However, it's not just established nations that have seen this transition. Even within nations like Hawaiʻi, which have an active sovereignty movement, classic hot nationalism has faded away to more subtle forms. Further, as these expressions of nationalism disappear, and everyday nationalism comes to dominate, we see that it is no longer the extremists promoting a nationalist agenda, but rather a commonplace part of daily life.

7.4 Factors that Affect the Type and Intensity of Nationalism

In looking at the four nations, a number of factors have emerged that can in-part explain the variance in nationalism seen across the four nations. Unlike hot nationalism, everyday nationalism does not lend itself well to measures of amounts of nationalism or intensity. As a tool for describing what is arguably ever present within a nation, it is nearly impossible to compare levels of everyday nationalism between nations. Where the differences seem to emerge is within the levels of visibility of it and the clarity of the message it promotes. Similarly, the level of awareness of it and the organised attempts to affect it seem to vary as well in a somewhat measurable way. Hot nationalism has been most noticeable in Hawaiʻi and Fiji, whilst its presence in the Cook Islands has been limited and is mostly historic. Beyond a minimal amount of nationalistic energy surrounding independence, Niue seems to have virtually no hot nationalism. Everyday nationalism is present and significant in all four nations. Within Hawaiʻi its role in
shaping and reinforcing Hawaii’s unique identity is clear, and it is often consciously
manipulated by a variety of activists. Fiji has seen everyday nationalism become a core
component of the government's agenda. The expressions of everyday nationalism are less
explicit in the Cook Islands and Niue but have a noticeable effect on the nations’ identity.
Whilst there is no clear single cause for the differences in nationalism between the
nations, the following eight factors seem to have a meaningful effect.

7.4.1 Population Size

One of the largest differences in nationalism between the four nations seems to be
an effect of population size. The two larger nations see much greater expressions of hot
nationalism and even more visible displays everyday nationalism, then do the two smaller
nations. Globally, larger nations will generally be the sites of intense hot nationalism with
examples in smaller nations much rarer.

As previously mentioned, population size may also serve as a proxy for capacity
to enact nationalist agendas. Small nations will often lack the resources (both economic
and personnel) to devote too much focus to any single cause. The members of the nation
may share a similar bond with their nation and feel as much passion as a larger nation,
but simply be unable to recruit enough people to get their movement going.

Whilst there is a lack of systematic research exploring the effects of nation size on
types of nationalism, it seems, that even outside the region, small nations do not typically
display much hot nationalism. With the exception of a handful of nations with disputed
territory (such as Gibraltar, New Caledonia and Western Sahara), hot nationalism has
been very rare in small nations. This may indicate a lack of capacity (hot nationalism
requires organisation and resources that may be problematic for small nations), external
pressures, or a lack of public acceptance for the methods of hot nationalism. Members of smaller nations will generally have more bonds that extend beyond just the nation, which can inhibit hot nationalism. Further, the othering that often accompanies hot nationalism is less necessary and less possible given the small numbers and frequently the high levels of cultural and racial homogeneity. There is likewise a lack of anonymity in small nations. Unpopular radicalism is hard to sustain when the actors are known to one another and are subject to familiar and community pressures.

7.4.2 Political Structure

All four nations are essentially democracies. Whilst each has had some issues, they all currently have representative governments featuring inclusive free and fair elections and have had so for some time\(^{1067}\). Though there are notable exceptions, hot nationalism seems to be most intense either as a precursor to or during authoritarian rule.Whilst democratic societies are by no means immune from hot nationalism, intense hot nationalism does seem to be less common.

The inclusion of nationalist parties within the governance process seems also to have an effect. The Cook Islands’ and Niue’s\(^{1068}\) ruling parties are nationalistic, allowing

\(^{1067}\) Though Fiji has not reliably respected the democratic process, its elections have been largely without issue and a democratic government has been maintained as the ideal with variances minimal.

\(^{1068}\) Niue’s only party was dissolved in 2003, but prior to its dissolution, it was nationalistic. Though all officially independent, Niue’s elected officials still commonly run on values similar to that of the previous party.
the energy of nationalism to find a space within the government. In Fiji, whilst civic nationalism is embraced by the ruling FijiFirst party, other forms of nationalism have not been accepted. Hawai‘i currently lacks any politically viable nationalistic party. It functions as a two-party system with neither party taking much of a stance on nationalism. The last significant nationalist political party, the Hawaiian Independent Party (later renamed the Independent Home Rule Party) dissolved in 1914. The intensity of hot nationalism within these four nations may be correlated with the opportunity for nationalists to participate in the political process. The lack of political inclusion for Hawaiian nationalism could be part of the reason Hawaiian nationalists have embraced other approaches, including the occasional expression of traditional hot nationalism.

It seems that the incorporation of nationalistic political values can potentially allow other expressions of hot nationalism to fade. Following the argument Billig described as common for more developed nations, hot nationalism is merely a tool to deploy in the fight for the nation’s identity whilst it is being formed. Once the battle is over, and a government that allows nationalists to have political power is formed, they have no need to keep employing the intensity of hot nationalism. People often perceive

1069 Though both the Hawaii Republican Party and Democratic Party of Hawaii field candidates in most races, Republican candidates are rarely elected effectively creating a one-party system. Currently, only five of the 51 representatives in the Hawaii House of Representatives are Republicans. Democrats have dominated state government since 1962.

1070 The Aloha ‘Āina Party was established in 2015 as a Hawai‘i nationalist party. Though the most viable Hawai‘i developed third party, it has repeatedly failed to secure the required 750 verified signatures to be considered an official political party in Hawai‘i.
nationalism to be the domain of radicals but will accept it as a necessary part of the construction of their nation. Whilst we can clearly see that nationalism does not go away, the intensity does seem to fade.

7.4.3 Civil Society

With allotments made for their size, all four nations have fairly strong civil societies and reasonably free presses. There are a number of non-governmental organisations in each nation that work to serve the interests of the public and operate largely independent of the government. Whilst none of the four nations have especially great track records towards human rights, most citizens in these nations can expect to have their rights respected in daily life. Freedoms of expression and peaceful assembly are generally possible\textsuperscript{1071}, and political participation is common. News media is closely interwoven into daily life and is generally respected. As such, any expressions of hot nationalism must be seen as a disruption to daily life. Nevertheless, the people are free to express their conception of the nation with minimal governmental restriction. Nationalists have limited ability to justify nationalistic resistance, and similarly, the government has no need to use nationalism to support otherwise unpopular actions.

\textsuperscript{1071} Fiji in particularly has a somewhat spotty record in regards to respecting these rights. Since the lifting of the 2009 Public Emergency Regulations, there has been considerable improvement. The 2010 Media Industry Development Decree still, however, remains in effect which allows for penalties for reporting that is against the “public interest or public order”. Though occasionally threatened, under the current administration, rights to political speech including criticising the government is generally respected.
7.4.4 Perceived Threats

Nationalism can often be seen quite strongly in response to a situation that is perceived as a threat to the nation. Nationalists will often frame issues as needing extreme action in order to protect the nation from threats outside the nation or from those who do not represent the values of the nation. To sustain or justify the extreme action, the rhetoric of the nation under attack must be continuously deployed. Whilst the threat is often overstated or occasionally completely fabricated, the threat has to seem plausible.

None of the nations of this dissertation has much that can be spun by nationalists into a significant threat to the nation. Classic nationalist targets such as immigration are not useful, as each of the nations has a recognised need for immigrants. Ethnic or cultural threats are largely unusable for the Cook Islands and Niue given the still exceptionally high levels of ethnic and cultural homogeneity. Hawai‘i and Fiji, at the other extreme, are so diverse that radical ethnic nationalism demands unrealistic goals. All four nations have good relations with their neighbours limiting the utility of claiming external threats. Even the colonial powers provided an acceptable experience rendering call-backs to persecution or brutality under colonialism unusable. Even for Hawai‘i, enough time has passed, and demographics have shifted such that the U.S. occupation cannot be meaningfully used to justify extreme nationalistic action. With the lack of plausible threats to the nation, it is unsurprising that hot nationalism has been short-lived or non-existent in these nations.

Across Europe and the Americas, many radical nationalists have used perceived threats from labour migrants and refugees to rally support for nationalistic policies. These migrants are presented as direct threats to jobs, general welfare, and lifestyle. Though the
actual threat is absurdly overblown by most nationalists, some component of the concern is clearly gaining traction within many nations. Immigration, however, presents little threat to the nations of this dissertation. All four nations have low unemployment and a serious need for more workers. Further, the migration patterns to these islands have had only minimal numbers of people coming from unfamiliar states around which radical nationalists could create fear.

7.4.5 Lack of Anti-Nationalist or Counter-Sovereignty Movements

There are only very minimal anti-nationalist or counter-sovereignty movements in the four nations. This could explain why hot nationalism has been so minimal and everyday nationalism so visible. Typically, hot nationalist movements will have some group that they oppose, allowing an us-vs-them battle that can sustain the movement. It is hard to establish or maintain the energy required for hot nationalism when there is no one meaningfully objecting to your message. Whilst it is impossible to say if the lack of counter-movements is a result of a lack sustained of hot nationalism or the cause of it, its absence seems significant.

7.4.6 Kinship Models

South Pacific culture places a high value on family ties. Kinship models are often extremely inclusive and would include a number of people as fictive kin greatly beyond most Western models. It is possible that this expanded model of kinship can take on some of the role the imagined community takes. Within Anderson’s conception of the imagined community, its members are tied together by little more than a sense of commonality in being a part of a nation. In many nations of the South Pacific, small populations and expansive family ties mean that the members of the nation will have more than just the
bonds of the nation to connect them. This reduced need for national bonds could be a part of the reduced presence of hot nationalism in the region.

### 7.4.7 Ethnic Homogeneity

The Cook Islands and Niue have exceptionally high levels of racial and ethnic homogeneity. Hawai‘i, in contrast, has one of the most ethnically diverse population in the world. Fiji similarly has unusually high diversity for a small island nation. Given the classic conception of the nation being formed on the basis of a shared cultural and ethnic experience, Niue and the Cook Islands are able to establish political legitimacy for their nation on this basis. In contrast, ethnic nationalist claims, though employed, are fundamentally unworkable in Hawai‘i and Fiji.

The nations in this dissertation represent both extremes of ethnic diversity. Niue and the Cook Islands have such limited ethnic diversity that a focus on it by nationalists would be pointless, as shared cultural values can be assumed without a connection to the nation. A politician or activist trying to make promoting a Niuean or Cook Islander ethnic identity a serious part of their campaign would likely get a poor response because this identity can already be assumed. Fiji and Hawai‘i are at the other end of the spectrum with very high levels of ethnic diversity. Ethnonationalist initiatives are naturally poorly received, given the limited audience that can be included. Even the few attempts at ethno-nationalistic campaigns typically are forced to obfuscate themselves by framing it as a non-ethnic issue and appealing to other principles, such as native rights and (often misleading) notions of inclusiveness.

There does not seem to be a specific ratio of ethnic homogeneity at either end of the spectrum that triggers these effects. Ethnically homogeneous countries can still see
ethnonationalism emerge, particularly if there is a perceived threat in shifting
demographics. Likewise, ethnically diverse countries can still turn to exclusionary
ethnonationalism, even if that ethnic group is a minority. Nevertheless, as in these four
nations, civic nationalism does seem to be the most viable nationalistic expression in the
long-term and ethnonationalism hard to maintain.

7.4.8 Communications Infrastructure

Anderson argues that the modern nation emerges through a common language and
discourse made possible through the printing press and print capitalism. It provides a
mechanism for establishing commonality and sharing the ideas that form the nation’s
identity. The internet has largely replaced this function in most nations including those of
this dissertation. Fiji and Hawai‘i have reasonable-quality affordable high-speed internet
across most of the islands. Niue has nationwide free wifi, and the Cook Islands has 4G
and DSL widely available. The internet in each nation is heavily used for news and
political debate. Interestingly, newspapers maintain higher readership in these nations
than they do in much of the rest of the world. A healthy communications infrastructure
does not seem to favour any particular type of nationalism with both hot and everyday
nationalism possibly strengthened by it. It does however potentially explain the
seemingly slow historic rise in nationalism across some of the more remote islands.

Communications infrastructure does not emerge as a major factor anymore in
cross-nation comparisons. Even the poorest or most remote of nations will now have
reasonable cell phone and radio access. Areas without television are likewise fairly
uncommon today. Nationalistic movements are able to quickly spread in a way that
would have previously been inaccessible. It creates an extremely low barrier to entry and
the possibility of very large audiences. Nationalist movements in Fiji and Hawai‘i have made heavy use of the internet and are generally extremely media savvy. Whilst not all nationalists groups globally have utilised their full range of communication options, even radical nationalistic organisations are increasingly seeing their battles for acceptance fought on social media.

7.4.9 Colonial Past

One of the most noticeable ways in which Fiji, the Cook Islands, and Niue differ from many other small post-colonial states is the way in which nationalists view their colonial experience. Though colonialism is not loved anywhere, many people in these three states (and some of the others in the region) have adopted a nostalgic fondness for the colonial period. There even exists a popular narrative within Fiji, that it only became a British colony because the Fijian people wanted it to become one and the British were too impressed or afraid of the Fijian warriors to try to take the islands without consent. For Niue and the Cook Islands, becoming a colony is often seen as a rational choice to protect the nation.

All three nations were ceded more-or-less voluntarily, and the colonial experience was comparatively positive. Great Britain and New Zealand interfered minimally with existing governance structures and typically avoided exploiting native labour or resources. The most common complaint of the colonial era is that of neglect and indifference from the colonial power. The colonial period is locally often presented neither positively nor negatively, but merely as part of the formation of the nation.

Independence also came differently for these three nations than is typically seen. Much of Fiji was reluctant to advocate for independence and many Native Fijians were
actually opposed to the idea. Niue and the Cook Islands obtained independence more because New Zealand did not want to have colonies than as a result of their own wishes. The transition for the three states was fairly seamless without the struggle that is often expected to accompany a path to independence.

Nationalists in other nations have frequently made the struggle for independence a core part of their national symbols. Independence days are celebrated as victories over their former colonial oppressors with national anthems that describe the struggle. For example, the Algerian national anthem has a verse that states “We are soldiers in revolt for truth / And we have fought for our independence. / When we spoke, nobody listened to us, / So we have taken the noise of gunpowder as our rhythm / And the sound of machine guns as our melody.” and the Argentine national anthem celebrates its independence with “Hear, mortals, the sacred cry: "Freedom! Freedom! Freedom!"/ Hear the sound of broken chains/ See noble equality enthroned”. Many nationalists will use the struggles of independence to unite or lend legitimacy to their movements.

Fiji, in contrast, had a changeover ceremony when they received independence that was designed intentionally with a positive stance towards Great Britain. Niue and the Cook Islands similarly had fairly muted celebrations with a focus on the future of the new nation rather than victory over a colonial power. Without an energising story of struggle, it is much harder for nationalists to create an identity around a shared sense of victory or sacrifice for the nation.

7.4.10 Dependency on Other Nations

In some nations, the level of dependency has become a crucial part of their nationalist efforts. For many Latin American nationalist movements, the need for the
nation to free itself from its colonial legacy of dependency and oppression were familiar rallying cries for nationalists. Nationalism served to galvanise anti-colonial struggles where it would be hard to otherwise unite people against the economic interests of post-colonial dependency. It provides a justification for actions that may not otherwise gain support.

Within the context of everyday nationalism, reducing dependency on imported goods can also strengthen the nation. Seeing goods made within the nation, particularly when clearly branded as such, reminds people every time they see it that they are a part of that nation. When store shelves are filled with imported products and services are provided by foreign firms, it becomes hard to gain a sense of nationhood in daily life.

Many of the nations of Oceania remain highly dependent for goods, services and general logistics on other larger states. This dependency exceeds that of most other regions. Indeed, several island nations of Oceania are so highly dependent on larger nations that they would be nearly unable to function without them. Fiji and Hawai‘i, with significant decreases in the standard of living, could conceivably become completely self-sustaining. For both, however, it would require significant efforts to refocus industry and would still require noticeable sacrifice. Niue and the Cook Islands, in contrast, lack the resources to meaningfully maintain modern living standards without assistance from other states. Further, the lack of any adversarial relationship with the former colonial powers on which they are dependent greatly limits the popular appeal of any message calling for self-sufficiency.

For larger nations, reducing dependency is a viable goal that nationalism could enable. However for many small island states, particularly those in Oceania, there are
clear limits to these efforts. Foreign aid and imported goods are so necessary for many of the islands and the caveats that accompany these so insignificant that nationalists in the region have made minimal direct mention of reducing dependency. Where we have seen some efforts towards reducing dependency, is indirectly through nutrition and energy policy.

7.4.11 Global Political Power

As nations express themselves on a global stage, their legitimacy and sense of nationhood are strengthened. The perceived threat of other states not taking them seriously or otherwise losing its global political power is often presented by nationalists as a serious danger to the nation.

There are clear differences amongst the four nations in their political power. Hawai‘i commands a reasonable amount of attention on the world stage. Fiji similarly can get attention as the common spokesperson for the region, though their voice is still limited. Niue and the Cook Islands receive almost no attention globally.

Though useful, Hawaii’s power is, however, very much a double-edged sword. Whilst their position as a US state automatically affords them global attention, it also prevents discussions of recognising sovereignty from occurring. Further, from an everyday nationalism perspective, it shares the muddled position many expressions of Hawaiian nationhood share in the hybrid role of the State of Hawaii.

Niue and the Cook Islands lack any meaningful global political power. Lacking any strategic geographic importance, usable natural resources (except tuna for the Cook Islands), or even a UN seat, they provide little reason for larger states to give them any
attention. This lack of global political power seems very much to fuel those who express doubt over the islands' sovereignty and nationhood.

7.4.12 Logistics

In looking at other successful sovereignty movements, one of the factors in their success seems to be logistical. Movements that have clear pathways towards operating as a sovereign state seem to be the most likely actually to obtain sovereignty. Nationalists can be very persuasive in building a justification for sovereignty. However, people are much more wary of supporting specific action rather than general principles when there is no clear vision of what the future will look like.

For Hawaii, there is a lack of any sort of viable government (or plan for one) that supporters of sovereignty can back. There is no de facto government or government in exile that other nations could recognise. Unlike other efforts in places like Palestine or Abkhazia that have de facto governments or Tibet with a government in exile that could gain global recognition, Hawaii’s path to sovereignty would require establishing an entirely new government. Hawaiian nationalists to-date have not been able to agree upon any shared vision of what a sovereign Hawai‘i should look like. Furthermore, none of the groups active today could possibly serve as or even provide a meaningful framework for a successor government. This lack of a viable pathway has further limited the ways in which recognition of Hawaiian nation can occur and with it the acceptance of Hawaiian nationalism.

Though Fiji had some reluctance with respect to independence, they were able to follow a model that had been applied a number of times within the decolonisation
movement. Niue and the Cook Islands had a slower path to sovereignty largely due to the need to establish an effectively new style of government.

7.4.13 Challenges Shared with Other Small States

Small states across the world often encounter similar problems within their nationalist efforts. Their relationship with larger states frequently fluctuates between apathy and being bullied, with foreign pressures often moderating their nationalistic desires. As nations express their identity, larger states may completely ignore it, or if it does not fit their interests, they may directly interfere. The small states, however, remain forced to continue to participate in arenas that are dominated by larger states, as withdrawing would often be disproportionately devastating.

Small nations will generally be economically or logistically dependent on neighbouring larger nations who will typically wish to quell any potential instability causing nationalistic energy. Whilst the larger nations may have few concerns about the issues composing the nationalistic values, a desire to ensure continued market access and to prevent refugee or humanitarian needs is common. Though these concerns are typical across most nations, small nations will generally have limited ability to ignore the pressures of the larger nation.

1072 Whilst true free association had not existed previously, there were a handful of other states that had theoretically similar relationships. These states, however, existed primarily as transition stages as they worked towards full independence or puppet states of the larger state. The Cook Islands was the first state to both have it be considered a permanent status and have full independence.
The apathy of larger states can, however, be quite useful to smaller states. Their lack of geopolitical power can make them appealing for friendship agreements between states and allow them to serve as testbeds for new initiatives. They are not seen as a threat to anyone, so there is little harm in trying out new arrangements with them (such as free association).

7.4.14 Islands

One of the most significant advantages nationalist in small island nations have is the physical boundedness of the islands. There is a clear and discreet border that is difficult to ignore. Whilst land-locked nations can and often do have borders that are clearly arbitrary, islands have no ambiguity. Further, this clear border, especially when there is some geographic distance, allows for arguments of difference from other peoples to be easily supported. Whilst it is not a guaranteed winning argument (islands such as Hispaniola and Ireland are still split), it does seem to be persuasive.

7.5 Areas of Future Study

This dissertation aimed to provide a broad overview of nationalism in four small island nations. There are a number of trends I observed that had to be reserved for future research. Most interesting amongst these are the effects of diaspora from these four nations upon the expressions of everyday nationalism. Diaspora can create an extremely powerful longing for the nation that was left behind. Within the geographic bounds of the nation, everyday nationalism is typically an ignored force that occurs seemingly naturally. For those in diaspora, though, there is more of a need to consciously reproduce the nation. Elements of material culture have to be specially imported, and cultural celebrations require coordination. Despite the extra effort required many of the
communities in diaspora will actually devote more energy towards strengthening the effects of everyday nationalism than will those still living within the nation’s borders. There are even hot nationalist movements emerging within the diasporic communities, sometimes for safety reasons (for those in exile, where the home state would be unsafe for the movement), but also increasingly because they feel a stronger connection to that nation than the one within which they reside.

All four nations have extremely large populations in diaspora. The diasporic population of Cook Islanders and Niueans abroad is several times that of those living in the islands. A third of Indo-Fijians live outside of Fiji, as do large numbers of other Fijians. Hawai‘i similarly has large numbers living outside its borders.\footnote{Because of the lack of border crossing and fuzziness on who should be included, it is hard to determine how many people from Hawai‘i are living outside of Hawai‘i. Nearly half of Native Hawaiians live outside of the islands, as do large numbers of people born in Hawai‘i who belong to other ethnic groups.}

Though we are starting to see numerous effects of the diaspora on nationalism with food and music being amongst the most noticeable, there has to-date been little academic work within the diasporic communities of these four nations. Music (and for Fiji, film as well) is increasingly being marketed to the large and in many cases more affluent, communities in diaspora. Similarly, food provides a very visible way in which communities in diaspora can strengthen their identity. It is no longer just restaurateurs opening restaurants which serve an adapted menu targeted towards the people of their new country. Increasingly, the target customer is those wanting a taste of home. Across the United States, there has been a recent trend of new Hawaiian restaurants serving
people from Hawai‘i which typifies this. Though Hawaiian restaurants have been a part
of the mainland US landscape since the 1930s, namely as tiki bars, most had a menu that
would be barely recognisable to someone from Hawai‘i and was developed by people
from outside Hawai‘i to sell a romanticised version of the islands. In contrast, many of
the recently opened restaurants are opened by people from Hawai‘i, have menus that are
indistinguishable from those in the islands and lack any of the inauthentic tiki decorations
that have long marked Hawaiian restaurants outside of Hawai‘i. These diasporic
communities, though briefly explored throughout this dissertation, represent a meaningful
area in the ever-changing ways in which small island nationalism can be expressed.

7.6 Impact

In looking at these four nations, it is clear that nationalism is still present. Though they are small states with unusual statuses, existing theories of nationalism
remain applicable. Further, whilst the small size and strong kinship ties would suggest
that there is less of a need for the bonds of the nation, the comradery and feeling of
connectedness described by the “imagined community” are as present within these small
countries as anywhere else. Despite the applicability of these theories, there are
nevertheless a number of differences in how these small nations express their nationhood.
Hot nationalism is significantly more muted than would be otherwise be expected, but
everyday nationalism is as everpresent as it is in larger nations. Similarly, the effects of
other nations on the ability of small nations to express their nationhood is greatly
magnified. By exploring nationalism far outside the areas it is typically tested, we can
expand our knowledge of nationalism in general, as we are able to probe the universality
of these concepts.
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