was unwilling to provide financial support of the pact without real evidence that the territory itself was willing to assume some degree of fiscal responsibility. The Pape'ete government, struggling with a heavily dependent economy and mounting budget deficits, seemed unlikely to be able to make the necessary contribution and the negotiations appeared doomed to failure. A breakthrough came in June 1993 when, for the first time in Tahiti's history, an income tax was instituted, called the Contribution for Social Solidarity. The tax was relatively modest and would be graduated by income. Those earning US$1,500 per month would pay 0.5 percent; those earning the highest monthly salaries (US$15,000 or more) would pay 3.9 percent.

The pressure to institute the income tax came from France, which considered it an essential condition for Tahiti's contribution to the Pact of Progress. During previous election campaigns, Flosse had repeatedly gone on record as being absolutely opposed to an income tax. How then to proceed without losing face? Flosse's solution was regarded as a strategic master stroke in Tahiti. He called for a marathon meeting with local labor unions. During the negotiations, he reminded labor leaders of the problems Tahiti was facing, and asked for suggestions. After a long silence, Hiro Tefaarere, head of A Tia i Mua, suggested an income tax, upon which Flosse replied, "D'accord!"

Local observers cautioned that the income tax in itself would not solve Tahiti's substantial economic problems. Even if the announced income tax rate was substantially increased, tourism was stagnating, the pearl industry faced international competition, and the artificially high cost of government was not likely to be offset without politically dangerous reductions of government salaries. It was also unclear if employees of the French state government could be taxed locally. Unanswered questions notwithstanding, Michel Jau, the recently appointed French High Commissioner, was reported to be quite happy with the new developments and confident that the Pact of Progress would soon become a reality and a long term solution to Tahiti's problems.

 MOSHE RAPAPORT

Sources consulted for this report include recent issues of La Dépêche de Tahiti, Tahiti Pacifique, and Tahiti Sun Press.

HAWAIIAN ISSUES

In 1993, the centenary of the overthrow of the Hawaiian government by a gang of haole (white) businessmen and US marines, the biggest story was native sovereignty.

After more than twenty years of political organizing, native Hawaiian nationalists finally succeeded in forcing the issue of self-determination upon a resisting State of Hawai'i Democratic Party machine and an ignorant, often racist, public. The issues are simple: Hawaiians, who compose 20 percent of the resident population of the state, demand recognition as a native people with human rights claims to sovereignty, including self-government; they claim restitution from the US government for the taking of Hawaiian domain and dominion in 1893, and for their subsequent forcible incorporation into the United States in 1898. Such res-
The constitution should include all the lands presently set aside by the US government (nearly 1.5 million acres) for the use of Hawaiians, but not currently under native control; monies rendered in restitution for the original injury of the overthrow and annexation; and basic civil rights, including access to state and federal courts.

The two major and opposing groups engaged in these demands have been a state-created agency, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA), and a native initiative for self-government, Ka Lāhui Hawai'i.

OHA's position has been consistent since its creation in 1978. No lands are to be transferred to the Hawaiian people; the Hawaiian people are not to be allowed litigation rights; and no group apart from OHA is to represent the Hawaiian people. Only money in the form of a one-time cash payment from the state to the Office of Hawaiian Affairs is supported. Finally, any relationship of the Hawaiian people to the federal government is to be established through the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, allegedly the only official native organization.

OHA's position is problematic on several fronts. Despite its vociferous claims to speak for the national interests of the Hawaiian people, OHA has always represented the state of Hawai'i. This is hardly surprising since the organization is an official state agency whose political position adheres to that of the state Democratic Party.

In terms of its track record, OHA has already concluded an agreement with the state to settle for money rather than land regarding native lands held in trust by the state. Simply put, this means not one acre of native land will go to the native people, many of whom are homeless. The state will continue to control the lands while a pittance will be paid into OHA coffers. Furthermore, OHA does not define or defend native sovereignty, preferring instead to maintain its parental ties to the state of Hawai'i.

Meanwhile, Ka Lāhui Hawai'i has defined sovereignty as the "ability of a people who share a common culture, religion, language, value system and land base, to exercise control over their lands and lives, independent of other nations." In political terms, Ka Lāhui argues that Hawaiians should be identified as native people (rather than merely individual citizens) with rights of inclusion in the US Federal policy on self-determination for native peoples. They would enjoy a "nation-to-nation" relationship with the American government. Such nation status would establish claims to self-government on an identifiable land base. With this status, Hawaiians would no longer be wards of the state and federal governments. The state of Hawai'i would not be our "parent" but a co-equal in a three-way relationship between the Hawaiian nation, the federal government, and the state of Hawai'i.

As public consciousness and support for this form of Hawaiian sovereignty increased steadily throughout 1992, it was obvious that Ka Lāhui Hawai'i had out-organized OHA at the community level. Calling for a large public march on 17 January 1993 to commemorate the overthrow of the Hawaiian government and to demand sovereignty, Ka Lāhui forced the issue of
land and government for the native people onto a very public platform. When fifteen thousand people peacefully demonstrated their support for sovereignty on the centennial day, OHA suddenly endorsed the concept of a "nation within a nation." Feeling overshadowed by Ka Lāhui, whose enrollment of citizens had soared to 15,000, OHA suddenly began speaking about "nationhood."

Sensing that the Democratic Party and OHA were losing control of the tide of public opinion, Governor Waihe'e and the OHA trustees teamed up with state politicians to submit a bill to the Hawai'i legislature calling for a state-controlled sovereignty constitutional convention (Con-Con). Praised by local media as a victory for Hawaiian self-determination, the bill actually placed the entire process in the hands of the governor, who is empowered to appoint nineteen sovereignty-commission members to determine all procedures for the Con-Con.

Since the bill created an undemocratic, top-down structure in which all authority rests with the state, Ka Lāhui Hawai'i and other sovereignty groups opposed it. Despite what the native people wanted, the bill passed into law and the governor selected commission members in August 1993.

While the state moved to foreclose native self-determination, international organizing by Hawaiians continued. Ka Lāhui joined with other independence groups to host an international tribunal in Hawai'i to bring charges of human rights violations against the United States. Experts on international law, including lawyers and scholars, aided Hawaiians in drafting submissions to international forums to register human rights complaints against the United States.

Meanwhile, Hawaiian sovereignty leaders traveled to Vienna and Geneva to attend human rights conferences to present the case for self-determination. Finally, Ka Lāhui continued to inform the public about the latest Democratic Party efforts to short-circuit Hawaiian self-determination. Despite a racist press and massive state opposition to real native autonomy, critical Hawaiian voices were heard, if not heeded.

It is a supreme irony that after nearly two decades of organizing for self-government, the drive for Hawaiian sovereignty should have been stunted by a Hawaiian governor, Hawaiian legislators, and an all-native Office of Hawaiian Affairs. At this stage in our history, sell-out Hawaiians are everywhere. As if taking their cues from "government" Indians in the continental United States, Americanized Hawaiians have begun to sing the song of collaboration. In a year's time, Hawaiians will be faced with yet another obstacle to self-determination: a state-called constitutional convention.

HAUNANI-KAY TRASK

MAORI ISSUES

The most momentous political event for Maori in 1992 was the signing of the Sealords deal in September between the Crown and Maori leaders. The Maori Fisheries Act 1989, which established the Maori Fisheries Commission, and returned 10 percent of the fishing quota to Maori, was only a partial settlement of the Maori fisheries