BEING A REALM OR SOVEREIGN STATE WITHIN INDEPENDENT COMMONWEALTH (BRITISH) COUNTRIES - COOK ISLANDS, NIUE AND NEW ZEALAND

By Dr Kemal YILDIRIM

Abstract

This paper will discover does being a Realm mean being one sovereign state or can three sovereign states share one Realm. Initially these countries were called Dominions, but are now called Realms and Elizabeth of Windsor is Queen of all these Realm Nations. As you are aware a number of independent Commonwealth (British) countries have the UK Queen as their head of state. So, does being a Realm mean being one sovereign state or can three sovereign states share one Realm?

Keywords: Niue, Cook Islands and New Zealand, Realm, Sovereign State.

Introduction

I intend to present an alternative reading of the proclamation of Dominion status and use this historical moment to focus on ideas of nationhood and national identity. In particular, I argue that 'national identity'—a phrase which has been excessively mobilized in public discourses in recent years—is not only an artificial construct but is in fact a colonizing tool. The paper seeks to interrogate these notions and argues that 1907 ought to be read as a staging post in a progressive and evolutionary colonizing narrative; and that the nation and national identity are alibis for colonization, devices which legitimate ongoing colonizing processes and practices. The paper will attempt to answer the following questions: What is the relationship between history and national identity? How has the concept been employed in the past? And what are the implications for citizens of the early twenty-first century New Zealand 'nation-state'? The emphasis placed on the unitary nation-state, with its implicit homogeneity, has I suggest, bequeathed to us a rather problematic legacy.

Discussion

*First we have to discuss what is being of a "**Dominion**" in political definition as well as its spiritual extension?*

In political terms on the whole, Dominion is described as the power to rule: control of a country, region, etc. or a country that was part of the British Empire but had its own government. Legal definition of a Dominion is also described as a self-governing nation (as Canada) of the British Commonwealth other than the United Kingdom that acknowledges the British monarch as the head of state so the power (as authority) or right (as ownership) to use or dispose of property when we look at the term of Dominion in religious view.

So Justin Holcomb describes that, Dominion does not mean destruction, but responsibility. It may therefore be important to avoid flawed convictions about the right and power of humankind in relation to the rest of the natural world. So, Holcomb concludes that a Dominion is true that a false view of dominion has played a role in the mistreatment of creation, but a correct understanding of the concept can lead to service, responsibility, and stewardship. Holcomb indicates that God gives us the opportunity to reflect him in his work of caring for and transforming all of creation. To follow this aspect of our multifaceted calling as humans is to image in our lives the one who is at work in the world and in human life, creating, sustaining, and liberating creation. Jesus' resurrection is God's first step in making all things new, which will culminate in a renewed world that completely honours Jesus, who rules it. As theologian Glenn Sunshine writes, that we labour knowing that God redeemed us to carry out the work for that He uniquely prepared us to do (see Ephesians 2:8-10). While the Apostle John tells us that God loved the world (Greek cosmos, the entirety of creation) so much that he therefore gave his son to save those who believe in him. Our lives and work here are not about ourselves, but instead the good of the entire created order. We have a unique and critical role to play, however small it may look to us, in fulfilling God's purposes for the world.

I think the ruler of a region has dominion over it, and the area itself may be called the ruler's dominion. In the days of the British Empire, as known widely Great Britain had dominion over many countries throughout the world. Though Canada has been quite independent of Great Britain since the 19th century, its formal title remains Dominion of Canada. The word has an old-fashioned sound today, and probably shows up in history books, historical novels, and fantasy video games more often than in discussions of modern nations etc.

Scriptural Pretext for Dominion Theology

In theological view of religions, most religious people on this planet believe in the dominion = power/submission philosophy and really could care less what they do to its inhabitants both human or otherwise. All the while criticising, mocking, and ridiculing non- religious people who do care. Calling them tree huggers, hippies, libtards etc... I therefore hold no objection towards Christianity as a fundamental belief system in and of itself, or any other religion for that matter. So, having a responsibility to take care of such a glorious creation while exercising dominion over it seems implicit. Failure or refusal to look after it is hypocritical, greediness or perhaps laziness.

Dominion Theology incorporates a Crusader mindset. It teaches that it is duty of Christians to take over the world, in a political sense, and if necessary, in a military sense, in order to impose Biblical rule. Christ will not return, (they say), until the church has "risen up" and "taken dominion" over all of the world's governments and institutions. Dominionists affirm that this is not a matter for us to discuss. As they see it, this is a direct unequivocal mandate from God. We are not to wait upon God, (they say). They say that He is waiting for US! And they are insistent, even bullying, in their demand that we follow them in their wild ride towards world dominion. But let's pause for a moment and consider our faith, and the Way of the Cross, the Way of our Lord Jesus. What sort of religious spirits are forcefully herding Christian believers into this impossible dream? Just where are these dark angels driving them?

Dominionists claim we can take over the world for Christ before Messiah returns. But where is the Scriptural authority for advancing such a notion? Those who embrace Dominion Theology base it on a passage in Genesis.

"And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth." - *(Genesis 1:26 KJV).*

Of course the idea of "dominion" that they have in mind is a strained and unnatural interpretation of this scripture. Most evangelical Bible students believe that a plain reading of this passage shows God setting forth man's responsibility to exercise faithful husbandry of the earth. God is charging mankind with the

responsibility nurturing and caring for the ecosystem He has created. This includes the land and seas with their plants, animals, and fish.

Dominion Theology has its own take on the Great Commission. For them it is more than the preaching of the Gospel and the nurturing of new believers in the Holy Scriptures. It is more than promoting the personal walk with God. Dominion Theology gives place to an inner human compulsion for pyramid building. Inherent in this is a desire for control over others. Carnally-minded men seek to increase their power over their fellow man. They want to build their own hierarchies with themselves being installed at the top. Carnal Christians often show themselves quite willing to resort to violence to fulfill their dreams of dominion. They are dead set on achieving "success" in their goals. Have we seen this in Church history before? Oh yes, we certainly have.

The status, prior to 1939, of each of the British Commonwealth countries of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, Eire, and Newfoundland. Although there was no formal definition of dominion status, a pronouncement by the Imperial Conference of 1926 described Great Britain and the dominions as "autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations." The main characteristics of dominion status were complete legislative authority as provided in the Statute of Westminster (1931) and, in the executive sphere, the right of dominion ministers to direct access to the sovereign (previously advice on dominion matters could be tendered only by United Kingdom ministers). Internationally, it connoted the recognition of the dominions (except Newfoundland) as separate states, entitled to separate representation in the League of Nations and other international bodies, to appoint their own ambassadors, and to conclude their own treaties. At the same time, the dominions were not considered to stand in the same relation to the United Kingdom or among themselves as foreign countries. After 1947 the use of the expression was abandoned because it was thought in some quarters to imply a form of subordination, and the phrase "members of the Commonwealth" came into use. The definition of 1926 was therefore modified in 1949, when it was agreed that countries could enjoy full Commonwealth membership but were not obligated to recognize the British monarch as their sovereign. The monarch was accepted as the symbol of the free association of the independent member nations and as such was the head of the Commonwealth. India was the first country to enter into such

an arrangement, and by the 1990s it had been joined by most of the other Commonwealth nations. Source: ***(Written By: The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica)****.*

The realms *classified as term of A territory or state, as ruled by a specific power, It is s a community or territory over which a sovereign rules; it is commonly used to describe a kingdom or other monarchical or dynastic state. The Old French word reaume, modern French royaume, was the word first adopted in English; the fixed modern spelling does not appear until the beginning of the 17th century. The word supposedly derives from Medieval Latin regalimen, from regalis, of or belonging to a rex. "Realm" is particularly used for those states whose name includes the word kingdom, to avoid clumsy repetition of the word in a sentence. It is also useful to describe those countries whose monarchs are called something other than "king" or "queen"; for example, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg is a realm but not a kingdom since its monarch holds the title Grand Duke rather than King. "Realm" is also frequently used to refer to territories that are "under" a monarch, yet are not a physical part of his or her "kingdom".* ***Similarly, the Cook Islands, Niue, and Tokelau are considered parts of the Realm of New Zealand, although they are not part of New Zealand proper. Likewise, the Faroe Islands and Greenland remain parts of the Danish Realm.***

In all but one of the realms is one country, but in the realm of New Zealand the countries are New Zealand, Cook Islands and Niue, each with its own independent parliament - Prime Minister.

Until a decade ago only New Zealand diplomatically recognised the governments of Cook Islands and Niue, but over the past decade a number of other countries (Australia, China, Japan) do. So, what changed when dominion status began in 1907?

Just the name: New Zealand stopped being a colony and became a dominion. There was no tangible political or legal shift.

From this date, the premier was styled as prime minister, and the term 'Members of Parliament' replaced 'Members of the House of Representatives'.

Did Dominion Status Make New Zealand Any More Independent?

Not a bit. Few New Zealanders actually wanted greater independence from Britain in 1907. Race sentiment, language, culture, defence and trade links bound

most New Zealanders closer to the wider 'Britannic world', then at the height of its prestige.

Those feelings persisted through the first half of the 20th century, even though dominion status evolved as a label for the constitutional position of the former self-governing colonies (and the Irish Free State). In 1926, after pressure from the Irish, South Africans and Canadians, the Balfour Declaration stated that Britain and the dominions:

> *"They are autonomous Communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown, and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations".*

New Zealand's prime minister, Gordon Coates, called this a 'poisonous document'. Until 25 November 1947, New Zealand refused to ratify the Statute of Westminster 1931, which removed London's right to legislate for the dominions unless they asked it. The Constitution Act 1986 finally removed the last faint provision for the British Parliament to make laws for New Zealand.

When Did Dominion Status End?

Dominion status ended with a whimper. In 1945, when the country joined the United Nations, it was simply called 'New Zealand'. In January 1946 officials were told to change their letterheads to say 'New Zealand' – but not to publicise the change.

In 1953 the official style was changed to the 'Realm of New Zealand'. The term 'dominion' hung on in the names of institutions (the Dominion Museum was not renamed the National Museum until 1972), businesses and in the constitutions of clubs and societies. The name still survives in the title of the Dominion (now Dominion Post) newspaper, first published in Wellington on 26 September 1907.

Although the term is no longer used to describe New Zealand, the 1907 royal proclamation of dominion status has never been revoked and remains in force today. New Zealand's formal title may therefore still include the term 'dominion'. Generally, however, the country is today known as the Realm of New Zealand.

Nearly a million people lived in New Zealand in 1907, and cities such as Auckland and Wellington were growing rapidly. Suburbs were expanding, and

electric trams, motor cars and cinemas were multiplying. Distinctive cultural and intellectual traditions were developing. Locally composed classical music was played at the Christchurch Exhibition of 1906/07. Novels and poetry about 'Maoriland' were enormously popular.

Maori remained a largely rural people, but, after decades of population decline, their numbers were rising. The term 'Young Maori Party' denoted a new generation of leaders, such as Āpirana Ngata, who would make an enormous impact on the country.

Britain was still the main source of migrants in 1907, but most people living here had been born in New Zealand. Ties to the British Empire and Anglo-Saxon racial identity were strong. Through the Treaty of Waitangi, Maori too claimed a special relationship with the British Crown. It became increasingly difficult for non-white people to settle here.

The Liberal government, now led by Joseph Ward, had dominated the political scene since the 1890s. It promoted New Zealand as the world's social laboratory, a 'workingman's paradise' where hard work and thrift paid off. Reality did not always match rhetoric. The country was reasonably prosperous, but wealth trickled down haphazardly. The white-collar sector was growing, and more women were moving into paid work (before marriage, at least), but life could be precarious for the old, the sick, Māori, and the many who relied on seasonal work.

Transport and communication links were expanding. In 1907 the North Island main trunk railway line was nearing completion after more than two decades of construction; it would open in late 1908. The Union Steam Ship Company introduced the modern steamer Maori on the Wellington–Lyttelton route in 1907. The number of telephone subscribers rose by more than one-third in 1907 alone.

Extractive industries – timber, coal, gold, flax and kauri gum – remained important, but the agricultural economy was thriving. Britain absorbed most of New Zealand's production, which centred on the processing and export of frozen meat and dairy products.

The adoption of dominion status was just one of many significant events in 1907. The Plunket Society came into being that year, heralding further improvement in child health. Two of the country's best-loved publications, the Edmonds cookery book and the School Journal, appeared for the first time. The first issue of Wellington's Dominion newspaper was published on 26 September. Cricket's

interprovincial Plunket Shield was first contested in the summer of 1906/07. Women's basketball (netball) arrived in the country, and the first New Zealand rugby league team toured overseas. The first New Zealand Open golf championship was held, and Anthony Wilding and his Australian partner defeated the mother country to win tennis's Davis Cup for 'Australasia'.

To mark the centenary of New Zealand's adoption of dominion status, a symposium was held at the Legislative Council Chamber, Parliament Buildings, on Dominion Day, 26 September 2007. A range of speakers discussed concepts of nationhood, how New Zealanders have represented these ideas, how they have changed over time, different approaches to nationhood, and possible future developments.

The symposium was hosted by the Prime Minister, the Rt Hon Helen Clark, who opened proceedings and chaired the keynote address. The Prime Minister also hosted an official reception that followed immediately after the symposium.

The sessions were recorded by Radio New Zealand and will be available on their website. The speakers' abstracts and links to the full papers are provided below.

We might look, for instance, at the Treaty of Waitangi, now considered by many as New Zealand's 'de facto' founding constitution. What was promised in 1840 was a sort of bifurcated vision of the future: while in effect the English language version has been 'historically' dominant, the Maori language version is now being accorded some legitimacy. But in terms of the nation, the Treaty might be seen as a sort of limiting instrument; a tool of control and submission rather than one promising possibilities. Those who call for Maori sovereignty might wish to use the Treaty to control and call into question the primacy of the nation-state itself, and with it, the legitimacy of settler nationalism. Claims for self-determination—articulated since the arrival of Pakeha on these shores and accelerated after the signing of the Treaty—remind us that sovereignty need not be indivisible and there are other ways to conceive of holding and sharing power. Pakeha historians have long attempted to co-opt the Treaty into the nation. But we might see the Treaty and the nation as incompatible and at odds with each other. The nation (and nation-state) is a settler creation. Many criticisms have been levelled at what we might term the 'bicultural project', not the least its insistence on binary difference, contestability and for some, exclusivity. Biculturalism itself is a flawed notion. It has been described as a colonial construct because it posits Maori in a (junior) position with the Crown and assumes that the cultural and political constituencies of Maori and Pakeha are

homogeneous. Biculturalism is a seductive concept because it promises liberation by respecting difference—but in reality it can be a sort of ideological straitjacket. Clearly, modern claims to plurality suggest that 'the nation' as a composite and singular body is a fiction. At the constitutional level at least, the idea of the nation in New Zealand is up for debate ***Source (Yet the nation has a surprising durability, both in terms of public rhetoric and institutional practice. Antoinette Burton has discussed the inadequacy but indispensability of the nation and laments that obituaries of the nation are premature. Burton, After the Imperial Turn, pp. 1-23.)***

So, if the nation and national identity are so problematic, why bother? And why should historians be concerned? There are two possible answers. First, recent issues which relate to or invoke the past, such as the public debate over the Foreshore and Seabed legislation and claims that serious social injustices stem from ongoing colonisation, have exposed a deep sense of anxiety about the past and, more importantly, its relationship with the present. In settler societies such as New Zealand, it is fair to say that public discomfort about New Zealand's history has fuelled debates examining the ways in which Europeans came to occupy New Zealand and forced them to reconsider what the conditions of continued occupancy might be in the future. At the heart of this unease is the status of national identity.

This process of self-reflection is by no means new: colonial nationalist movements in settler colonies like New Zealand can be traced back to the 1890s and beyond. But this public disquiet has become more intense in recent years, and is, I propose, part of the impulse to explain the past in order to better understand the present.

It is true that claims shoring up the nation's durability and relevance have multiplied in response to critiques of it; this is certainly the case in New Zealand too. It is no coincidence, therefore, that political rhetoric around a 'one people, one nation' vision have been made in the face of increasing social, cultural and ethnic diversity. New historical research is revealing that, here in Aotearoa New Zealand, people in the past participated above and below the nation—at global as well as local and regional levels. Nation has not been the overriding identifier for New Zealanders. Rather it has been just one of a number of associational structures that shape the lives of individuals or are shaped by them. Nation ought not to be seen as the dominant factor in shaping the past, but understood alongside class, gender, race, community, family, ethnicities and so on, all of

which operate across as well as against the nation. The difference is that the nation can be very easily rhetorically mobilised and readily co-opted for political, jingoistic and patriotic purposes. Put simply, a focus on the nation obscures diversity; the nation is a master narrative that silences as much as it potentially empowers

Governance in Cook Islands

The British did not take control of the Cook Islands until 1888 and in 1901 they were annexed by New Zealand. In 1965 the New Zealand Parliament passed the Cook Islands Constitution Act and gave the Cook Islands self-government founded upon its own written constitution. Today the Cook Islands have a Westminster Parliamentary system with democratic elections every four years. The Head of State is Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II by Her representative in the Cook Islands and the legal system of the Cook Islands closely reflects that of New Zealand and most other English Common Law jurisdictions. There is a High Court and a Court of Appeal of the Cook Islands, which is presided over predominantly by current or former New Zealand High Court Judges. The ultimate appellate court is the Privy Council in London. (Please see below for a more detailed description of the development & workings of the Jurisdiction)

Self-government came to the Cook Islands in 1965 with the adoption of a written constitution which was enacted as a statute of the New Zealand Parliament, the Cook Islands Constitution Act 1964. This Constitution provided for a completely autonomous and independent Legislative Assembly elected by secret ballot under a system of universal suffrage. No law making powers were reserved to New Zealand; other than by the technical request and consent procedure. As to the foreign relations; The Joint Centenary Declaration of the Principles of the Relationship between the Cook Islands and New Zealand was signed by both countries in 2001. The occasion was the centenary of formal relationship having been established between the two nations. It states:

> *"In the conduct of its foreign affairs, the Cook Islands interact with the international community as a sovereign and independent state. Responsibility at international law rests with the Cook Islands in terms of its actions and the exercise of its international rights and fulfillment of its international obligations.*

Any action taken by New Zealand in respect of its constitutional responsibilities for the foreign affairs of the Cook Islands will be taken on the delegated authority, and as an agent at the specific request of the Cook Islands."

The Cook Islands Parliament thus has the sole law making authority for the Cook Islands. Although New Zealand continues to be a major source of reference for new enactments for the Cook Islands, increasingly the legislators and draftsmen have looked further a field for policies and precedents considered to be more applicable to Cook Islands conditions.

For Case of Niue Islands

Niue takes place in a framework of a parliamentary representative democratic dependency, whereby the Chief Minister is the head of government, and of a non-partisan system. Niue is self-governing in free association with New Zealand and is fully responsible for internal affairs.

Niue became a British Protectorate in 1900 and was annexed to New Zealand in 1901. In 1974 the people of Niue adopted a Constitution providing for self-government in free association with New Zealand. As seen ***Niue and Cook Islands exercise self determination rights as self governing entities.*** *This looks completely different from full independence. Under the Niue Constitution, New Zealand provides necessary economic and administrative assistance, and is finally responsible for Niue's defence and surveillance of its Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).*

Because Niueans are New Zealand citizens, they can work and study here without requiring special visas. About 24,000 Niueans live in New Zealand, compared to 1,500 living in Niue (2011 Census).so we can no longer claim Niue as an independent country but rather as protectorate or Dominion under New Zealand's Governance.

On 26 April 2019, the Governments of New Zealand and Niue signed a Statement of Partnership setting out the principles and priorities under which they will cooperate, coordinate and partner in shared priority areas.

When we look at the politics of the New Zealand briefly Status of the country is just a Monarchy under Queen Elizabeth II and its Legislature is simply New Zealand Parliament.

New Zealand is a constitutional monarchy and parliamentary democracy, with Queen Elizabeth II titular head of state, represented in the country by the Governor-General.

New Zealand plays an active role in Pacific affairs, and has special constitutional ties with the Pacific territories of Niue, the Cook Islands as well as Tokelau Island.

New Zealand , as a wealthy Pacific nation dominated by two cultural groups - New Zealanders of European descent, and the Maori, who are descendants of Polynesian settlers, play an important role in shaping politics in these island countries of Tokelau, Niue as well as Cook Islands.

I believe all these three islands are simply Dominions of New Zealand. New Zealand became a dominion in 1907 and therefore, 'dominion' became the distinguishing label for Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Newfoundland, Cape Colony, Natal and Transvaal. Australia remained a 'commonwealth', and South Africa was, from 1910, a 'union', but generally 'dominion' referred to the self-governing white Empire.

It looks that New Zealand had its own reasons for wanting to become a dominion and most politicians also liked the change to dominion status. When Ward visited London in 1907 for an imperial conference, he raised with officials the idea of New Zealand becoming a dominion. Ward wrote to Lord Elgin of the Colonial Office in May 1907, confirming his views: 'having regard to the position and importance of New Zealand, it had well outgrown the "colonial stage", and was as much entitled to a separate designation as the Commonwealth of Australia or the Dominion of Canada'. He was quite sure that New Zealanders would be 'much gratified' with the title 'The Dominion of New Zealand'.

Ward also had regional imperial ambitions. He hoped the term 'dominion' would remind the world that New Zealand was not part of Australia. It would dignify New Zealand, a country he thought was 'the natural centre for the government of the South Pacific'.

Politicians supported Ward's motion to ask His Majesty the King to take the necessary steps to change New Zealand's status. The Order in Council changing

the title from colony to dominion was issued on 9 September, and the proclamation was made on 10 September, taking effect on 26 September 1907, when it was read aloud throughout New Zealand. ***Sources (NZ history Gov.)***

For the time being , The system of politics in New Zealand is simply based on based on the principle that power is distributed across three branches of government — Parliament, the Executive, and the Judiciary. Parliament makes the law. The Executive (Ministers of the Crown also known as the Government) administers the law. The Judiciary interprets the law through the courts and New Zealand's head of State is the Sovereign, Queen Elizabeth II of New Zealand. The Governor-General is the Queen's representative in New Zealand.

New Zealand's Parliament consists of the Sovereign and the House of Representatives. The Sovereign's role in Parliament includes opening and dissolving Parliament, and giving the Royal assent to bills passed in the House of Representatives. New Zealand's Parliament is unicameral. This means it has only one chamber (the House of Representatives) and there is no upper house such as a senate. The House of Representatives consists of members of Parliament who are elected as the people's representatives for a term of up to 3 years. The usual number of members of Parliament is 120, but there are electoral circumstances when this could vary.

Responsible government' is the term used to describe a system where the Government is formed by appointing Ministers who must first be elected members of Parliament. It means that in New Zealand the Government can stay in power only while it has the support ('confidence') of the majority of House of Representatives. This support can be tested in a confidence vote, such as passing the Budget. Ministers are responsible to Parliament, both collectively for the overall performance of the Government, and individually for the performance of their portfolios.

New Zealand's House of Representatives is elected using the mixed member proportional representation (MMP) voting system. Each elector has two votes — one for a local member of Parliament and one for a preferred political party. Political parties are represented in Parliament in proportion to the share of votes each party won in the party vote in the general election. ***Source (parliamentary source on New Zealand (www.parliament.nz)***

The Leader of the Opposition, William Massey, preferred 'colony' and suspected that the change would fuel demands for increases in viceregal and

ministerial salaries. There were some who wanted no title at all. One asked, 'Why not cut out the word "colony" and the word "dominion" and be satisfied with New Zealand?'

(Member of Parliament for Eden) asked Prime Minister Sir Joseph Ward in 1907. Not much at the time as it turned out. Historian Keith Sinclair later claims that 'the change of title, for which there had been no demand, produced little public interest only.

To lot of New Zealanders meaning of being a Dominion is unclear but to me New Zealand itself still remains as a dominant nation with UK so all these island governments such as Cook Islands, Niue and Tokelau still can be clarified as political dependencies; so called political realms under New Zealand Dominion.

Finally to sum up all territories forming part of the British Empire were British dominions but only some were British Dominions. At the time of the adoption of the Statute of Westminster, there were six British Dominions: Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Newfoundland, and the Irish Free State. I think this political tradition still exists on the agenda. Although there was no formal definition of dominion status, a pronouncement by the Imperial Conference of 1926 described Great Britain and the dominions as "autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

So we are aware then the main characteristics of dominion status were complete legislative authority as provided in the Statute of Westminster (1931 the dominions were not considered to stand in the same relation to the United Kingdom or among themselves as foreign countries. After 1947 the use of the expression was abandoned because it was thought in some quarters to imply a form of subordination, and the phrase ***"members of the Commonwealth"*** *came into use.*

As historical sources indicate that the definition of 1926 was modified in 1949, while it was agreed that countries could enjoy full Commonwealth membership but ***were not obligated to recognize the British monarch as their sovereign,*** *the* ***monarch was accepted as the symbol of the free association of the independent member nations*** *and as such was the head of the Commonwealth. India was the*

first country to enter into such an arrangement, and by the 1990s it had been joined by most of the other Commonwealth nations.

To me all these islands enjoy self determination and sometimes complete or semi relations in terms of conduction foreign relations but we have to analyse the British Empire's role in its early history how it has shaped today's geographic coordinates in its own zone.

British Empire, is a worldwide system of dependencies—colonies, protectorates, and other territories—that over a span of some three centuries was brought under the sovereignty of the crown of Great Britain and the administration of the British government. So to the reader it's worth to know that policy of granting or recognizing significant degrees of self-government by dependencies, which was favoured by the far-flung nature of the Empire, led to the development by the 20th century of the notion of a "British Commonwealth," comprising largely self-governing dependencies that acknowledged an increasingly symbolic British sovereignty.

Conclusion

National histories that prioritize national identity tend towards insularity too. Ann Curthoys has noticed such a trend in national histories of Australia, where she observes that National histories generally tend to focus on what is distinctive about the history of the nation, what seems to hold it together ... There is an implicit assumption, that this—the discovery of what makes a nation, a people distinctive— is the task of national history, rather than a focus on what is shared with histories and societies elsewhere'.7 So how has the relationship between history and national identity played out in New Zealand? The search for 'national identity', along with national exceptionality, the idea that New Zealand experiences were different and even unique, have significantly shaped New Zealand general histories over the past century. In these texts, the story of New Zealand is told as a transition narrative, where growth, development, independence and maturity are the central topics and governing motifs. This is a progressive tale, where the themes of discovery, growth, development, independence and maturity loom large, where 'progress' is both natural and innate. The history of New Zealand is recounted in an evolutionary development: from Polynesian homeland to colonial outpost to independent Pakeha-dominated nation-state. 'New Zealand history' may only have been recognised as a

'stand-alone' teaching subject in New Zealand schools since the 1970s,8 yet these two mythic tropes remained dominant. Many historians bristle at the suggestion of myth infusing history, it is usually seen as the antithesis to history: one implies fable while the other connotes fact. Yet we cannot dismiss or downplay the role of myth-making in national histories. All histories trade in some type of myth, shared values and common assumptions in that they reflect the concerns of their own age. The assumptions, style and mode of analysis all reflect the times and breathe life into the truism that history is really about the writing of the present rather than the past.

The beginnings of a national narrative supporting national identity might be traced back to the 1890s. As in Europe and the United States, the first historians were amateurs; the first professional historians emerged later. The making of an insular past which prioritized national identity was confirmed and perpetuated by Sir Keith Sinclair, whose work in large part picked up on that of William Pember Reeves and put cultural nationalists in the driver's seat.9 Historians sought a narrative of national experience: and, as in other edges of the Empire, that was framed and define by middle-class white men. But from the 1970s this script began to be questioned as local historians, energized by feminist, indigenous and the 'history from below' approach turned their attention to New Zealand however as new Zealand history embraced difference and diversity, it became more inward looking.

At the turn of this century the orthodox narrative of national identity was seriously challenged by the work of James Belich and his 'recolonization' thesis, explicated in Paradise Reforged (2001). Since then, another six general histories of New Zealand have been published, including the late Michael King's commercially successful Penguin History of New Zealand. ***Source (See, for instance, Michael King, The Penguin History of New Zealand, Penguin, Auckland, 2003; Matthew Wright, The Reed Illustrated History of New Zealand, Reed, Auckland, 2004; Gordon McLauchlan, A Short History of New Zealand, Penguin, Auckland, 2004; Tom Brooking, The History of New Zealand, Greenwood Press, Westport, Conn., 2004; Philippa Mein-Smith, A Concise History of New Zealand, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005. In 2004 a new revised edition of Ranginui Walker's Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou Struggle Without End, which first appeared in 1990, was published)***

With the notable exceptions of Paradise Reforged and Philippa Mein-Smith's Cambridge Concise History, none of these texts have tackled the problem of

national identity. In New Zealand, the relationship between history and the nation is complicated by the rhetoric of biculturalism alongside claims for alternative ways of seeing the past. In New Zealand there are indeed many 'nations', in the sense of Hobsbawm's and Anderson's terms, yet despite claims to acknowledging diversity, there is one recognised nation-state.

We might look, for instance, at the Treaty of Waitangi, now considered by many as New Zealand's 'de facto' founding constitution. What was promised in 1840 was a sort of bifurcated vision of the future: while in effect the English language version has been 'historically' dominant, the Maori language version is now being accorded some legitimacy. But in terms of the nation, the Treaty might be seen as a sort of limiting instrument; a tool of control and submission rather than one promising possibilities. Those who call for Maori sovereignty might wish to use the Treaty to control and call into question the primacy of the nation-state itself, and with it, the legitimacy of settler nationalism. Claims for self-determination—articulated since the arrival of Pakeha on these shores and accelerated after the signing of the Treaty—remind us that sovereignty need not be indivisible and there are other ways to conceive of holding and sharing power. Pakeha historians have long attempted to co-opt the Treaty into the nation. But we might see the Treaty and the nation as incompatible and at odds with each other. The nation (and nation-state) is a settler creation.

To sum up, my task here today has been to unsettle and destabilise the nation, and to question the implications of the events of 1907. The 1907 'shift' did not so much create as augment the conceptual scaffolding for nation; it created the discursive space where narratives of the nation could be written. 1907 thus offers us a moment in which we might pause and reflect on the idea of the nation state and its rhetorical partner-in-crime, national identity. Ultimately, New Zealand's shift from 'colony' to 'Dominion' status was important in terms of perceptions of evolving nationhood. Yet nations are not just historical constructs: they survive into the present. So the resilience of the nation validates the need for ongoing scrutiny. Perhaps instead of 'questing for' a national identity which does not exist, we need to accept that the end-point is the process, where vigilance, examination and constant questioning of the centrality of the nation ought to be the goal; but in such a way that does not valorise its centrality and thus its power. Clearly, then, there is no one monument, one single place or a universal theory to explain the history of New Zealand: rather, we have a fragmented past which has produced an equally diverse present. So when, in his 1936 New Zealand: A Short History, historian J. C. Beaglehole declared New Zealand 'the

most over-written of all the British Dominions ***Source (J. C. Beaglehole, New Zealand: A Short History, Allen and Unwin, London, 1936, p.10.)*** *he was only partially correct: New Zealand has indeed been thoroughly written over and written about, but from the perspective of what we ought to admit as a colonising narrative.*

For the case of the Cook Islands, Responsibility at international law in terms of its actions and the exercise of its international rights and fulfillment of its international obligations. In the conduct of its foreign affairs, the Cook Islands are likely to interact with the international community as a sovereign and independent state. In this sense we can claim Cook Islands as an independent country but rather a dominion or realm since it is a self governing entity binding its rules directly with New Zealand or symbolically annexed to UK The Head of State is Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II by Her representative in the Cook Islands thus UK and New Zealand still has empowerment on governance of Cook Islands.

So we simply claim then that it is just a former British protectorate which became self-governing in 1965, the territory is now in free association with New Zealand. It is all up to the reader also to decide whether Cook Island is a Dominion (Realm) or independent state but of course to me it is not yet an independent state rather a Dominion.

Cook Island's Governance as well as Tokelau Islands who went for a referendum of independence in the past I guess. But Finally New Zealand is main Dominion with protectorate of these overseas realms and it remains as a dominant with UK at present. I would also conclude that government is conducted through complex interactions between citizen participation, and the actions of governing elite which, in the end, continues to hold the upper hand.

References

Effect of Statute of Westminster in Statute of Westminster

History of British Empire in British Empire: Dominance and Dominions Canada

Politics in New Zealand by R. G. Mulga, Peter Aimer

Notable People in the History of New Zealand by Atkinson, Jane Maria

A Concise History of New Zealand by Philippa Mein Smith

Pacific People in New Zealand by Teresia Teaiwa and Sean Mallon

Government Reform in New Zealand by Graham C. Scott

The Origins of New Zealand Diplomacy - Victoria University, Wellington Library

Title: Blackstock R.M the Office of Agent General for New Zealand in UK 1870-1905

***Professor Dr Kemal Yildirim** is a Professor in Comparative Politics, has more than thirty books as well as articles published in Academic peer journals and is Director of Kofi Annan African Studies Institute. He works independently on Africa and Middle East - New Political Theories and Religious ideas. He can be reached by Email: conflictresearch@yahoo.com*