president of the government, Gaston Flosse. Despite Juventin’s demand that he sack Van Bastolaer, Flosse refused. The latest purge has undermined party solidarity and will exacerbate the steady decline in Here Ai’a’s public image and electoral fortunes.

The tenth anniversary of internal autonomy was celebrated by the government on 29 June 1994, although few members of the public were on hand, and representatives of the state were notably absent from the ceremony. The high commissioner boycotted the proceedings because of a perceived slight in protocol. President Flosse had decided that the territory’s national anthem would henceforth be sung last on territorial occasions instead of the Marseillaise. This move was similar to Flosse’s unilateral decision while hosting the Pacific Island Conference in June 1993, when he referred to the territory as Tahiti Nui instead of French Polynesia. To the irritation of the French government, Flosse has also been campaigning for French Polynesia to be granted observer status at the South Pacific Forum. These nationalistic gestures are, however, symbolic and do not indicate a change in the president’s position on political status.

Flosse’s attitude was confirmed in a media interview when he said there was nothing to be gained by acceding to independence in association, much less sovereign independence, in the foreseeable future. He reiterated that economic autonomy was a prerequisite for full political autonomy and that his government’s energies would be focused on developing the economy. Yet, he did bemoan the fact that the state Administrative Tribunal has applied a particularly restrictive interpretation to powers granted under the statute, often ruling against actions by the government. For this reason, he saw a need to improve the terms of the statute so that the territorial government could enjoy the full scope of autonomy without interference from the state.

KARIN VON STROKIRCH
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HAWAIIAN ISSUES
The attainment of some form of sovereignty continues to be the goal for many ‘Ōiwi ‘persons of Hawaiian ancestry’ who support their respective initiatives for self-determination. The common denominator is, none of the groups is satisfied with the current political relationship Native Hawaiians have with the United States. As a people, Native Hawaiians do not directly control trust lands set aside for them by US law. Instead, ‘Ōiwi are political wards of the state, with no legal rights of redress or mechanism for making legal claims to their lands. Consequently, each initiative strives to advance its own agenda in a period of this movement when different groups are best understood as “separate paths that sometimes cross.”

The centenary observance of the American military-aided overthrow of the Hawaiian kingdom reached into
the midsummer months of 1993 with special events, public and private mourning, and much reflection. These activities focused on the past, but, as the year came to a close, increasing attention was being paid to more future-oriented aspects of the indigenous Hawaiian struggle for self-determination. Significant sovereignty-related events occurred within and beyond the shores of the 'Oiwi homeland. Although there have been setbacks and disappointments, the cause of self-governance has moved in some encouraging directions.

In August 1993, an international tribunal was convened in Honolulu under the auspices of Ka Pākaukau, a pro-independence sovereignty initiative led by Dr Kekuni Blaisdell. The United States was put on trial for crimes against the Hawaiian nation, from the overthrow to the present. Tribunal panelists included persons from Aotearoa, the Creek and Cherokee nations of the Americas, and one from Palestine. They heard testimony that addressed all manner of American wrongdoing, from the banning of the Hawaiian language to the taking of trust lands without compensation.

Based on the evidence presented, the panel convicted the American government for its crimes. The group adjourned, its task carried to the furthest extent possible. At the very least, sitting jurists gave concerned parties a forum through which their voices were heard in the important context of international rights for indigenous peoples. The compiled testimonies are now part of a permanent record. The data, organized chronologically and by subject area, are accessible to the broader community of specialists in international law and indigenous rights. It is possible that analyses of the legal issues from various international perspectives by persons with legal expertise could bring new solutions to light for a problem that has long plagued the Hawaiian people: the brutal reality of living as foreigners in their own ancestral homeland.

The 'Ohana Council, a pro-independence sovereignty initiative from Waimanalo on the east coast of O'ahu Island, is led by Dennis "Bumpy" Kanahele. The 'Ohana Council receives more media coverage than all other groups combined because of its confrontational style. The television media usually portray Kanahele as a gentle, soft-spoken leader who has turned away from violence as any kind of meaningful solution to the sovereignty issue before the Hawaiian people. His supposed potential for contentiousness, especially when ordered by government officials to vacate public premises or be charged with trespassing, allows the media to sensationalize much of what he does. Because of his apparent willingness to stand firm and to be moved from an occupation of government land only by arrest, Kanahele garners headlines as a radical.

The 'Ohana Council’s year began with an occupation of a City and County of Honolulu beach park in their area and ended with them being relocated to Waimanalo agricultural lots controlled by the State of Hawai'i. The men of the 'Ohana Council left the beach park voluntarily, but in a departure from normal procedure, the women remained at the site when
arrests were imminent. Promises of a "peaceful arrest" and full cooperation by Kanahele's people gave the entire episode a surreal, almost choreographed air. From their new home, Kanahele vowed to continue the struggle for complete independence. Unfortunately, a well-defined plan for achieving that goal has never been presented by the 'Ohana Council.

Some charge the group with getting preferential treatment in deference to Kanahele's reputation as someone who is not afraid to run afoul of the law. Other 'Ohana Council activities, like hosting Native American nation leaders and exploring ways to use human rights conventions declared through the United Nations to further the efforts of Native Hawaiian self-governance, are less well publicized. In the last year, the group has also conducted protests aimed at tourists, urging them not to return to Hawai'i until the State of Hawai'i effectively addresses the sovereignty issue.

Another aspect of the movement, the one that focuses on sovereignty education, has been extremely active. The Native Hawaiian Advisory Council publishes one of the most comprehensive newsletters on sovereignty. Editor Elizabeth Pa Martin and her staff work diligently to produce a product that informs those in the movement, while educating neophytes as well. Similarly, Hui Na'auao, a non-profit educational group, has continued to hold information workshops and other public education activities upon request. Ka Pakaukau and the 'Ohana Council also have their own community outreach and education programs.

The same is true for the largest and, in my opinion, the best-organized initiative, Ka Lahui Hawai'i led by Mililani Trask. With duly elected representatives from all islands and a constitution to follow, this group patterns itself after hundreds of Native American nations recognized by the US government. This self-determination option is called a nation-within-a-nation. Trask sees the sovereignty battle being fought on three main fronts: local, national, and international.

In Hawai'i, the entity to be challenged constantly is the state government. The usual site is the annual convening of the State of Hawai'i legislature. Here, recent bills introduced for the purpose of acknowledging the sovereignty movement and taking action to facilitate the process of establishing a Hawaiian nation have been killed consistently. In place of legislation to guarantee that the process of nation-building would remain with the Hawaiian people, the state has stepped in and adopted Governor John Waihee's plan to control sovereignty.

His Sovereignty Advisory Commission has taken grassroots control of the movement away and in its place is a rubber-stamp operation that seeks to rush the process without giving sufficient attention to educating Hawaiians about the sovereignty issue. Currently, a plebiscite is scheduled for September 1995. The question to be posed to Hawaiians is, Should a Hawaiian nation in some form be restored? Assuming the response is affirmative, elections of delegates to a constitutional convention will be conducted. With an organic document created, the mechanism for nationhood would be
in place. Some critics believe any involvement whatsoever by the State of Hawai‘i is antithetical to true self-determination, which must come not from American government, but directly from a consensus of the Native Hawaiian people themselves. State intervention is seen as counter-productive.

Another entity Ka Lāhui must constantly watch is the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, a state agency that collects revenues from trust lands on behalf of the Hawaiian people and functions more at the behest of the governor’s office than for its native beneficiaries. Many programs the office has announced sound promising and offer hope. The results, though, have usually been anything but positive. Mired in their own petty politics and saddled by special interests, most of the trustees do not seem to have a clear role in mind for the office with regard to the sovereignty issue. Effective leadership from this agency could be aiding the cause, but that is not the case.

On the national scene, Ka Lāhui has approached Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt via reports and other correspondence. Ka Lāhui’s overtures to Babbitt include a formal request to conduct oversight hearings in Hawai‘i to document the State of Hawai‘i’s dismal record as trustee over lands held for the Native Hawaiians. A political crony of Hawai‘i’s governor, Babbitt has been informed of the state-sponsored view of sovereignty, not the peoples’ view.

When President Clinton visited Hawai‘i in summer 1993, Ka Lāhui was there. The small but vocal contingent managed to get Clinton’s attention while he was addressing the thousands that had gathered. He stopped and spoke directly to the chanting Ka Lāhui faithful, and therein lie the victories, seemingly insignificant but so very encouraging in a struggle that yields few rewards along the way. Clinton issued a formal apology on behalf of his nation for its complicity in the overthrow. Some see this as the first step toward federal recognition of Hawaiians as Native Americans. A blanket US policy is needed. Ka Lāhui has monitored Hawai‘i’s congressional delegation with regard to their role in seeking such status for the ‘Ōiwi.

Ka Lāhui has also made its presence felt in the third of Trask’s areas of emphasis—the international arena. Traveling with another Ka Lāhui official, Keali‘i Gora, Trask attended indigenous rights conferences in both Geneva and Vienna. Declarations and conventions are usually drafted at these meetings then forwarded to appropriate committees within the United Nations or similar international governing bodies that address the needs of indigenous peoples.

Continuing to maintain an international presence and defining a role for Native Hawaiians at these gatherings is the third front from which the struggle for sovereignty must be waged. In the same vein, Jon Kamakawiwo‘ole Osorio, a citizen of Ka Lāhui and professor of Hawaiian Studies at the University of Hawai‘i, Mānoa, went to the Netherlands on sovereignty-related business at Trask’s request to discuss possible private Dutch financing of the ‘Ōiwi self-determination effort here. A strong and substantive presence in all three arenas, local, national, and inter-
national, is the most comprehensive approach to sovereignty that can be pursued. This is the policy that Ka Lāhui’s national legislature has mandated and the course Trask has ably followed since the initiative’s inception in 1987.

Much remains to be done, although significant inroads have been made. Sovereignty is now a recognized issue of concern that is openly debated through newspapers, in homes, and at places of employment throughout Hawai‘i. Most observers now believe sovereignty, including the control of a land base, is a matter of when, not if. The coming year promises to be no less challenging or eventful.

KANALU G T YOUNG

MAORI ISSUES

Maori participation in resource management and conservation in New Zealand is becoming increasingly prominent as the effects of the provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Conservation Act 1987 start to take hold. These Acts give particular prominence to the rights of Maori, which were guaranteed in the Treaty of Waitangi when it was signed in 1840. They include the rights of reparation for past and continuing violations of the treaty, including the rights to have lands and resources currently held by the Crown returned to their rightful tribal owners. They also include the right of Maoridom to control and manage their natural resources according to their own traditional and cultural values.

In both local and central government, resource management and conservation bureaucrats are invariably Pakeha (Europeans). The overwhelming majority of them have found themselves grossly ill-informed and inappropriately trained to administer the Maori-related provisions in these Acts, which require a good knowledge of a completely different set of cultural values if they are to be adequately implemented. Yet these managers have been extremely slow to equip themselves with the necessary level of Maori expertise. It is rare to see any regional or district governmental body with more than one person hired specifically for their expertise in Maori matters.

Where such persons have been employed, they will invariably be overloaded trying to meet the demands placed on them by both Maoridom and their employer. They also frequently find themselves in a conflict-of-interest situation when the two sides clash. The Department of Conservation is the prime example, and although it endeavors to prevent such conflicts coming to the attention of the general public, they are frequently reported in the media. Media reports, particularly those compiled by Maori news media interests, highlight Maoridom’s criticism of the department’s overbearing attitudes toward tribal and subtribal objections. The tribes frequently point out that these attitudes are in direct violation of the department’s own Act, and several tribes have taken legal action against the department.

While the Department of Conservation at least has some Maori expertise