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Bridging Indigenous and Immigrant Struggles: 
A Case Study of American Sāmoa

JoAnna Poblete-Cross

In American Sāmoa today, lines are being drawn between immigrants from Western Sāmoa, Tonga and the Philippines, and the indigenous population. A close study of the 2007 Future Political Status report, as well as the responses to the closure of the Chicken of the Sea tuna cannery, demonstrate how anti-immigrant sentiment has grown, along with fears over the stability and survival of the local economy. Such tensions between American Sāmoans and these Pacific and Asian immigrant workers have masked potential synergies in the struggles of both groups. This article provides preliminary suggestions toward a dialogue on how the goals of colonized indigenous groups might be combined with those of exploited working-class immigrants living in the same region.

Indigenous studies has focused on making the sovereignty and cultural perspectives of native groups central to academic analyses. According to Vicente Diaz and J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, Pacific Native studies “involves at least two interconnected fronts: the identification and dismantling of colonial structures and discourses variously conceptualized and theorized, and cultural reclamation and stewardship.” Such an emphasis is necessary to understand the historical colonial context and complex issues facing indigenous groups. Scholars of indigenous studies also prioritize the needs and goals of their communities of study. Duane Champagne claimed that “the primary focus of indigenous studies should concentrate on defining, analyzing, theorizing, making policy, and supporting indigenous nations.” Issues surrounding immigrant rights further complicate such research. Academics such as J. Kēhaulani Kauanui have discussed the incongruities between immigrant and indigenous rights. Topics like citizenship are seen as tangential, inconsistent with, and completely separate from indigenous rights. Nevertheless, there may be fruitful ways in which the struggles of immigrant workers could also support the anticolonial projects of indigenous groups. The plight of immigrant groups should not
subordinate the fight for indigenous rights. However, both groups could benefit from acknowledging their shared colonial connections to the United States. This essay demonstrates how indigenous groups and Pacific and Asian immigrants in American Sāmoa are part of the same imperial legacy. After becoming an unincorporated territory of the United States in 1900, American Sāmoa and its people were ignored by the U.S. government for sixty years. When the government finally started to invest in the region in the 1960s, U.S. officials encouraged and supported the development of a single-industry economy, tuna canning, through government subsidies. U.S. corporations recruited immigrants from Western Sāmoa, Tonga, and the Philippines to fill their numerous manual labor positions. Today, all groups in the region worry about the economic impact of the closure of the Chicken of the Sea cannery. U.S. colonialism in American Sāmoa created the current economic crisis in the region and the existing immigrant population. Both immigrants and American Sāmoans were subjugated to the political and economic interests of U.S. empire.

This work provides a critical space to acknowledge, connect, and coordinate the concerns of indigenous and other marginalized groups. Each group could benefit from collaborations to understand, address, and contest colonial and imperial structures that have constrained their lives on a daily basis. Both groups have a historical basis for joining together and fighting against continued U.S. imperialism in the region. This essay does not seek to equate Pacific and Asian immigrants with American Sāmoans. However, I do hope to redirect the anger surrounding the closing of the cannery away from these immigrant groups and toward the neoliberal policies that brought these non-American Sāmoans to the region in the first place.

In the later part of the nineteenth century, the United States, Germany, France, and Great Britain began claiming land in the South Pacific. By the 1870s, German businessmen had established themselves in the western part of the Sāmoa Islands, about 200 miles northeast of New Zealand and 2,600 miles south of Hawai‘i. The British had a consul general in the region, and the United States gained exclusive access to the deep water port of Pago Pago. From 1884 until 1898, these Western nations became involved in a tense balancing act of power and control over these islands. In 1889, a devastating hurricane destroyed both U.S. and German fleets in the area. After this event, the Western nations agreed to give the western islands of Sāmoa to Germany, the eastern islands to the United States, Tahiti and Tonga to France, and New Zealand to Great Britain. These agreements, known as the Berlin Act, went into effect on June 14, 1889, solidifying Western colonial rule in the region.
On April 17, 1900, the matai (chiefs) of Tutuila formally ceded the islands of Tutuila and Aunu'u to the United States. In the Deed of Cession, the signers stated that the “declaration is accepted by us with glad hearts . . . we do also cede and transfer to the Government of the United States of America the Island of Tutuila and all things there to rule and to protect it. We will obey all laws and statutes made by that Government or by those appointed by the Government to legislate and to govern. Our whole desire is to obey the laws that honor and dwelling in peace may come to pass in this country.” This submission to U.S. rule was based on U.S. Commander B. F. Tilley’s promise that “the authority of Sāmoan chiefs, ‘when properly exercised, will be upheld.’” Unlike other Western powers in the region, the United States seemed more willing to incorporate Sāmoan forms of governance in their territorial rule. Eastern Sāmoan leaders consequently turned over ultimate authority of the region to the United States government in exchange for the protection of their land tenure system and cultural practices.

Within two weeks of the cession, Commander Tilley, who also became the first governor of American Sāmoa, developed the basic ordinances that preserved Sāmoan authority at the village level and established overarching U.S. Naval authority in the region. Promulgated on April 30 and May 1, respectively, Regulations 4 and 5 are considered “the two most important regulations that Tilley issued during his tenure as Governor/Commandant of the Naval Station.” Notice No. 4, known as the Native Lands Ordinance, strictly limited land ownership in the region to either Sāmoans or the government. This restriction prevented the purchase of indigenous land by private foreigners, thus avoiding the exploitation of these lands by independent Western businessmen. The U.S. federal government, however, could acquire land freely. Notice No. 5 applied U.S. laws to the territory, as long as they did not conflict with Sāmoan customs. This rule also stated that “the governor, for the time being, of American Sāmoa is the head of the government. He is the maker of all laws, and he shall make and control all appointments.” The federally appointed governor held complete control over the region. But indigenous forms of governance, such as village, county, and district councils, remained untouched by the U.S. Naval administration. American Sāmoans consequently maintained the same political, economic, social, and cultural institutions that they practiced prior to the arrival of the U.S. military. These customs included descent-based land tenure and adjudication of issues by community elders, known as the matai system. However, the wording of these initial ordinances also left room for interpretation and change. The preservation of Sāmoan political power was
ultimately provisional, subject to change based on the observations and decisions of U.S. government officials.

American Sāmoans, like many other indigenous peoples, have had complicated forms of affiliation with the United States. Since the beginning of relations with the U.S., American Sāmoans have emphasized the protection and preservation of their culture, land, and ways of life.

Any study of native peoples should be cognizant, mindful and respectful of the group’s specific needs and goals. According to Diaz and Kauanui “the inseparability of land and blood,” or the strong “kinship ties between people and land” are fundamental principles for Pacific Natives.9 Such connections are apparent among American Sāmoans, where “one of the most important responsibilities of any matai is serving as trustee of family land.”10 The guarding of land rights has always been the central tenet of American Sāmoan relations with outsiders. Any threats to land rights are seen as obstacles to the continued preservation and function of Sāmoan life.

In American Sāmoa, land belongs to the entire ‘āiga, or extended family, instead of the matai or any one person. The matai gain their position from election by the entire ‘āiga. All political, social, and economic decisions are filtered through the leaders of each ‘āiga. In addition to land issues, the matai are also “responsible for maintaining family unity and harmony, promoting participation in religious or church-related activities, and insuring the family’s children are educated.”11 The judgments of the matai are considered final and absolute. Tongan and Filipino immigrants, however, are not included in, and hence not beholden to, the Sāmoan belief system and local forms of governance.

Some American Sāmoans have worried about the impact that immigrants who are not governed by Sāmoan culture and principles, or f’aa sāmoa, might have on their society. According to the 2007 Future Political Status (FPS) report, “while some are married to Sāmoans and live as Sāmoans, most aliens live outside the Sāmoan system.”12 The differential ethnic backgrounds of Filipino and Tongan immigrants do not require them to follow Sāmoan laws or verdicts. This variation in cultures is seen as a major hazard to conventional Sāmoan lifestyles. The report continues, stating that “the number of people in American Samoa living outside of the matai system, and the size of the economy under their control continues to grow. That is a clear threat to the system.”13 Non-Sāmoans are viewed as external, thus undesirable, groups that could jeopardize the traditional way of functioning in the islands. The report also claimed that immigrants have placed severe pressure on land, increased the cost of government services, overloaded social services, dominated business
opportunities and skilled jobs, as well as committed some of the most serious crimes. Such anti-immigrant sentiments stem from changes in social life presumably created by the migration, settlement, and integration of Tongans and Filipinos into the region.

These fears, however, have roots in the form and structure of the U.S. colonial presence in the region. The infiltration of Western ideas and practices, such as private property, consumerism, and individualism, contradict the basic tenets of American Sāmoan life. When the U.S. military drastically increased its activity and personnel in the islands during World War II, American Sāmoans were rapidly introduced to Western goods and lifestyles. They started to listen to Western music, wear Western-style clothing and eat Western food. Such intense exposure to U.S. products and ideas stopped abruptly with the end of the war. However, this brief period made a lasting impact on American Sāmoans. Since that time, many have left American Sāmoa to take advantage of better opportunities in education, employment, and metropolitan lifestyles in other parts of the United States. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, 133,000 Sāmoans lived outside of American Sāmoa at the time of the census. With a total population of 50,545 Sāmoans in American Sāmoa, more than 72 percent currently live elsewhere.

Despite significant outmigration and the shift of younger generations toward Western lifestyles, the 2007 FPS Commission did not recommend any change in the region’s relationship with the United States. While the FPS Commission found that American Sāmoans wanted to “remain part of the American family of states and territories,” they also wanted to make sure that “a chosen status will not adversely affect customs and culture, and the perpetuation of the Sāmoan language.” Such a statement demonstrates the continued subordinate and dependent position of American Sāmoa to the United States. Executive Order No. 10264 placed the secretary of the Department of Interior in charge of American Sāmoa in June 29, 1951. Even though a 1983 law now requires U.S. congressional approval for all amendments to the American Sāmoan Constitution, the Department of Interior still has legal control to invalidate other forms of legislation created by the American Sāmoan government. To further guard Sāmoan land and culture, the FPS Commission recommended that the special protective provisions for lands and titles in the region’s constitution be affirmed by an act of the U.S. Congress without any change to their present political status. Such legislation would ease concerns over the ultimate authority that the Department of Interior maintains over American Sāmoa.

American Sāmoan desires to remain part of the United States while sustaining native forms of governance and culture, suggests a contradictory po-
sitionality. They rarely speak out against the United States and often actively support continued U.S. colonial relations, as long as their cultural practices are maintained. Since the U.S. government had very little interest in American Sāmoa until World War II, and only limited involvement after that, American Sāmoans have not felt the direct and obvious impact of U.S. colonialism in their daily lives. They did not lose local control of their islands or have to subordinate their practices to U.S. rule. Compared to the aggressive colonization of other Pacific Islands and the near-obliteration of American Indian lifestyles in the continental United States, U.S. rule in American Sāmoa seemed quite accommodating. Consequently, the degree of animosity toward the United States has varied among American Sāmoans.

In fact, American Sāmoans tend not to associate U.S. colonialism with the area’s economic underdevelopment. Instead of critiquing U.S. colonial government authority and policies toward the region, local animosity often focuses on Pacific and Asian immigrants, whose lives are just as much subsumed to the interests of the U.S. empire as American Sāmoans’ are. Immigrants from Tonga and the Philippines entered the region only after being recruited to work in the U.S.-subsidized tuna canneries. These groups migrated mainly because of the job opportunities.

In both the public hearings for the 2007 FPS Commission and reactions to the Chicken of the Sea (COS) / Samoa Packing cannery closure in 2009, immigrants have become scapegoats for the larger U.S. imperial and neoliberal practices that have dramatically changed the lives of American Sāmoans, as well as shaped the circumstances facing immigrant workers in the region. During the FPS Commission’s public study tour throughout American Sāmoa and nine cities in the United States with significant American Sāmoan populations, the main goal was to evaluate options for the future political status of American Sāmoa. Beyond this issue, the commissioners found that “the threat of being overwhelmed—loss of identity and loss of future opportunities—has become very unsettling to most American Sāmoans.”17 In these hearings, numerous American Sāmoans throughout the U.S. empire made passionate calls for immediate immigration reform.

Members of the American Sāmoan government (ASG) also supported the idea that immigration was a crisis threatening the well-being of American Sāmoans. On May 7, 2009, American Sāmoa’s governor, Togiola Tulafono, established a Territorial Population Commission. Executive Order No. 005–2009 stated that population pressure “is one of the most significant threats to our natural resources, our island and thus our current and future quality and way
of life . . . foreign migrants strain our basic social services and significantly modify the composition of our population, based on the fact that nearly half of the current population of American Samoa was not born here.” This order was promulgated just six days after COS announced the closure of its cannery facility in American Sāmoa, which employed 87 percent, or 1,892, non-American Sāmoan workers.

According to ASG representative Taotasi Archie Soliai, “the sudden announcement by COS Samoa Packing that it will be shutting down its operation as of September is cause for alarm and concern in several areas, one of which is immigration.” He continued, “I am particularly concerned that if prompt action is not taken . . . our already serious overstayer problem will only multiply, placing additional strain on our limited resources.” One result of the cannery closure involved a greater focus on the negative impact of immigrants on American Sāmoa’s public services.

This fear over the harmful presence of foreigners was also reflected in the comments posted by readers of the online version of the local daily newspaper, the Samoa News. One anonymous poster stated that “non-citizens can then go back to their countries and we regain American Samoa for American Samoans. What’s so hard about that? Less strain on our schools, roads, crime rates, and of course, the environment.” The fear over limited resources was directly connected to predictions of economic downturn as a result of the COS closure. Governor Togiola claimed that this “single industry meltdown has caused havoc with the business community and many businesses are facing possible downsizing or closure . . . it is predicted that as many as 7,500 people will lose their jobs during this year.” Another Samoa News article commented that the cannery closure “impact on the community will include drastic hikes in food costs, because shipping costs will go up—due to the fact that the container vessels will be without shipments” from the cannery. These very real concerns about the economic impact of the cannery closure easily combined with anti-immigrant attitudes. One anonymous reader proclaimed that “this is a great opportunity to return American Sāmoa to American Samoans. Let them all go back to where they came from so we can get back to our ideal population.” These kinds of anti-immigrant comments prioritized the needs of American Sāmoans and failed to acknowledge the simultaneous suffering of exploited foreign workers who would face unemployment and financial hardships in the coming months.

The FPS report further stated that “there is a growing concern among native American Samoans that too many foreign nationals come to American Sāmoa
and give birth to children who then become U. S. Nationals—equating them to children of native American Samoans. These new nationals, born of two alien parents, are entitled to participate in the political and social life of the Territory. They can run for office and may even be governor.”25 This statement presented such access for immigrants as a major threat. In American Sāmoa, issues of sovereignty and citizenship for native groups versus immigrants often conflict. American Sāmoans want to maintain a level of autonomy from the United States, and would like the choice to become U.S. citizens, but they also do not believe American Sāmoan status or rights should be provided to non-American Sāmoans living in the islands. While American Sāmoans can see the benefit of U.S. citizenship for themselves, and believe they have the right to such status, they rarely believe non-American Sāmoans should get the same kind of flexibility and accommodation in the islands. Tied to the land by blood and kinship, indigenous groups often struggle to establish their ultimate right to benefits in their region from colonial settlers. While such goals are important and necessary, these efforts can also overlook the struggles and oppressions of other marginalized groups in the same area. In American Sāmoa, a focus on indigenous rights can eclipse the grave problems facing migrant cannery workers from Western Sāmoa, Tonga, and the Philippines.

A History of the Canneries

As stated, immigrants from Western Sāmoa, Tonga, and the Philippines came to American Sāmoa primarily to support the fish processing industry. In addition to federal grants that total about $63 million each year, most of the income in the islands has been from the tuna canneries.26 This business was established in the region in October 1948, when Harold C. Gatty, a well-known aviator and businessman of the time, made plans to set up a $1,500,000 tuna cannery in American Sāmoa. The initial plan called “for an annual output of 125,000 cases of tuna at the beginning, with an eventual yearly capacity of 350,000 cases . . . The tuna cannery will be the first industry of its kind in Samoa.”27 By 1955, products from the Van Camp Sea Food cannery accounted for 80 percent of the region’s total exports: $1,016,438.40 of $1,270,548.28 In 2008, StarKist and Chicken of the Sea had a combined total of five thousand employees and generated a thousand tons of canned tuna per day, worth $400 million a year. These canneries were the two largest fish-processing plants in the world.

When plans for the first cannery began in 1948, “Samoans were consulted and approved the enterprise. Initially it will provide work for 150 Samoans.
Not more than 10 non-Samoans may be employed in the plant.”

Even at this early stage of development, there was tension over the nationality of the cannery workers. American Sāmoans did not want foreigners to profit from this industry more than themselves. But as this labor-intensive industry grew, American Sāmoans began to look down upon cannery work. Consequently, the tuna companies started bringing in immigrants to process the fish.

When canneries are in production, they must function twenty-four hours a day. The multistep process involves difficult manual labor at every stage. First, frozen fish are unloaded onto broad platforms under the blazing sun. Workers must hunch over to sort the fish by size with a hatchet-type pick. Another group of laborers transport the fish into the freezing cold-storage warehouses. Next are the arduous and dangerous stages of defrosting and deboning the fish. Then there is the swift canning, sterilizing, and packaging of the final products. There are two 12-hour shifts for cannery workers. Conditions are smelly, wet, hot (unless one works in cold storage), deafening (from the noise of machinery), exhausting (from standing for an entire shift), and dangerous (from the heat of steaming processes, the quick and sharp knives for processing, and the powerful and potentially crushing packaging machines). Until 2007, cannery workers in American Sāmoa were paid less than four dollars an hour for this grueling work.

The U.S. federal government used its historical accommodation of Sāmoan cultural practices as the pretext for not encouraging other industries in the region. The U.S. Navy “made no general request for bids for the establishment of industries in areas under its control because of its responsibility to insure that the economy and customs of the Sāmoans are not disturbed.”

For more than fifty years, the navy maintained minimal operations in Pago Pago harbor. Besides using the area as a coaling station and supply stop for military ships crossing the Pacific, the U.S. federal government did not invest any additional money or time in the region. Not until July 1961, when Clarence Hall wrote a scathing article about poverty-level conditions in American Sāmoa for Readers Digest did the United States focus on improving economic and social conditions in the region. But these projects only lasted until 1967 and focused on upgrading public infrastructure and social services. None of these programs aimed to diversify the economic base or industries in the region. Such circumstances resulted in American Sāmoa’s continued financial dependence on tuna canneries.

American Sāmoans also developed a dependent attitude toward the fish-processing plants over the years. As part of American Sāmoa’s neoliberal sub-
jugation to the canning industry, tuna companies in the region created and perpetuated fears that the local economy would collapse without the presence of these businesses. In March 1956, Vaiinupo J. Ala‘ilima testified at a U.S. House Education and Welfare subcommittee in Washington, D.C., to plead against any policy of keeping wages down to attract industries to American Sāmoa. He believed the application of the national minimum wage standard of one dollar an hour would “protect our people from being exploited for cheap labor and likewise slow down the industrialization of our little country.”

In the same newspaper article, the Van Camp Sea Food Company stated that it might need to leave the islands if required to pay one dollar an hour. As the only industry in American Sāmoa at that time, Van Camp employed three hundred island women for their tuna packing plant. The cannery’s casual comment about a potential shutdown if Ala‘ilima’s campaign succeeded in raising wages instilled fear among the general public and government officials alike. This subtle threat ended up convincing the federal government not to raise wages.

Fifty-four years later, in March 2008, the director of commerce and tourism, Falesiu Eliu Paopao, argued that if the canneries left, so would the majority of jobs. He explained that such changes would “be an impact, a great impact, to American Samoa because about 80 percent of the jobs, our economy is depending on those two canneries.” Throughout the existence of commercial fish processing in American Sāmoa, the fear of losing this industry has lurked in the back of people’s minds. Rumors or references to the closure of canneries could trigger panic and fear about the economy’s ability to function and survive. This fear also fostered anti–minimum wage talk throughout the last sixty years of cannery presence in the islands. Despite the environmental pollution caused by the canning process and the substandard pay of the industry, American Sāmoan residents viewed these tuna companies as essential to the stability of the region’s economy and the continuation of their own lifestyles. As a result, American Sāmoa has made many accommodations to tuna companies to retain their business.

Instead of focusing on the negative impacts of the canneries in the region, some American Sāmoans have engaged in exploitative actions and negative rhetoric toward immigrant cannery workers. In the oral histories I conducted in 2008, some American Sāmoans downplayed the animosity native groups had toward immigrant cannery workers. But there were also different reactions to Pacific Islander immigrants than to those from Asia. Most American Sāmoans I interviewed saw their cultural similarities with cannery workers from Western Sāmoa. One interviewee said, “We’re all one culture, we’re cousins.” Since
immigrants from Western Sāmoa share common cultural values and practices with American Sāmoans, their presence was seen as more tolerable than that of Tongans or Filipinos. Sometimes negative feelings toward Sāmoan immigrants were abated by familial, clan, or village connections. In fact, American Sāmoans often sponsored relatives from Western Sāmoa to work in the canneries. Despite such familial ties and common cultural backgrounds, Sāmoans from Western Sāmoa are still seen as outsiders, or subordinate to American Sāmoans.

Every immigrant to American Sāmoa must be sponsored by either an employer or an individual American Sāmoan, defined as someone of 50 percent or more Sāmoan blood and born in the region. The individual sponsor must pay a deposit large enough to transport the immigrant back home if necessary. The sponsor is also responsible and liable for immigrants who overstay their visas or break any laws. Sponsors are not supposed to accept any form of payment or compensation from their wards. Even with this rule, some sponsors have exploited their wards. In exchange for their legal support, some American Sāmoans expect their charges to provide services around the house, such as cleaning or cooking. Beyond the expectation of household work, some sponsors have pressured wards into giving them part of their cannery salary as compensation for acting as their guarantor. If workers refuse to pay their benefactors or provide domestic services, sponsors sometimes threaten to withdraw their petition of support, which would result in deportation. In this context, some immigrant cannery workers not only provide critical labor for the main industry in the region; they also supply domestic services and financial support to their sponsors.

In spite of their central roles in the regional economy and the domestic households of a number of American Sāmoan sponsors, Pacific and Asian immigrants are often viewed negatively in the region. The FPS Commission attributed the start of foreign entry into the region to the establishment and growth of the tuna canneries in the 1950s and 1960s. According to the commission’s report, “policy planners and lawmakers knew and accepted this heavy presence of Western Sāmoans and Tongans because it was critical to the success of both the canneries and the construction industry. There were groans about the growing number of aliens, but we had to have them in order to realize the opportunities in economic development. Today’s dilemma is different.” While migration was always frowned upon, earlier labor recruitment from other Pacific Islands was viewed as a natural consequence of the labor-intensive canning process. In more recent times, however, attitudes toward immigrants have been less accepting.
Current fears about immigration in American Sāmoa have focused on people from Asia and the Philippines. The FPS report stated that “Congress needs to be informed about the effects of the present growing situation on limited land and absence of natural resources, and the need to protect the customs and traditions of the Samoa people against the strong assault of foreigners and their cultures.”37 American Sāmoans worry that “if the present trend continues, the children of the native American Samoans may soon become a minority in their own home.”38 Like the fear over diminishing resources in the islands, American Sāmoans also worry about an invasion of foreigners who will take over their land and culture. Such apprehension drives anti-immigrant sentiment, alarmist rhetoric and calls for corrective action.

While foreign laborers have migrated from Western Sāmoa, Tonga, and the Philippines, there are also visible Chinese and Korean immigrant populations in American Sāmoa that work in the grocery and restaurant industries.39 Anti-immigrant rhetoric in newspaper reports, at government hearings, and in comments on newspaper articles rarely specify which groups they are discussing. The lack of distinction demonstrates the wide swath of people vulnerable to anti-immigrant sentiments in American Sāmoa.

As a result of the anti-immigrant perspectives that emerged from its hearings, the FPS Commission recommended that the ASG enact laws to “further restrict alien entry and residence in the territory.”40 The commission also recommended that U.S. national status be given only to children of American Sāmoan parents. Even though immigrants to American Sāmoa have contributed much to the daily functioning of the canneries and the general economy, such involvement is not acknowledged. As servants of neoliberalism, their labor has kept tuna plants running while their salaries have supported local business, such as restaurants, stores, and banks. Despite these important roles, foreigner cannery workers receive low pay, encounter dangerous working conditions, experience exploitation from some sponsors, and endure anti-immigrant rhetoric.

The fears of a swarming and unemployed immigrant population heightened on May 3, 2009, when COS / Samoa Packing announced the closure of its cannery on September 31, 2009. The shutdown cut about two thousand jobs in the region. In the three months after the announcement of the cannery closure, 627 Web posts were logged for the eighty-four Samoa News articles that discussed the demise of the fish-processing industry in the region. A variety of issues have developed from stories covering the shutdown of COS and subsequent implications. Many people expressed how they always knew the canneries would leave. One anonymous reader stated that
for years there have been rumors that the canneries may or may not move out . . . it’s like the entire economy of American Samoa are in the hands of the canneries and its owners. So in reality, the canneries have and always had the power to make or break the economy here in American Samoa. . . . The Governor was asked if there was an alternative government plan in place in the event the canneries do leave, including a way to help the laid off workers, the governor’s reply was, “We do not have an alternative plan. There is no way we can employ [all] these folks. We have no other cannery.”

This post reflects the long-held fear over cannery closures and public consciousness of American Sāmoa’s dependence on this industry. While most were not surprised about the shutdown, many were shocked that the ASG had no plan to deal with the closure. Another reader named “The Maverick” stated that “we knew this was coming, but no safety net nor any alternative plans in place . . . What now? . . . Nothing was in place for these folks, what a catastrophe and a national nightmare, that for these 2000+ workers and possibly total 5000 will be no longer employed. They have failed, the Governor, ASG government Leaders, the Fono and the Congressman.”

Many other readers expressed similar kinds of disappointment with American Sāmoan officials. These people believed poor planning and lack of leadership by either the governor or the representative to the U.S. Congress resulted in the current situation. The federally mandated minimum wage increase of 2008 became another hotly debated issue connected to the cannery closure. American Sāmoa’s minimum wage was slated to increase fifty cents each year until reaching a level “generally applicable in the United States.” On May 25, 2009, salaries for cannery work were increased to $4.76. Both the ASG governor and the American Sāmoa Chamber of Commerce president believed the imposition of continental U.S. wage standards on this small Pacific Island region would have a negative impact on the fish-processing industry. Other Samoa News readers believed that minimum wage increases had nothing to do with the cannery closure. Instead, they blamed COS for taking advantage of better tax incentives in Georgia, as well as automation of the canning process. Regardless of the ultimate factors that resulted in the closure of the COS plant in Pago Pago, the loss of this cannery will have major long-term impacts on the region’s economy.

Soon after the announcement of the COS closure, rumors spread that the second cannery in the islands, StarKist, might also shut its doors. While Governor Togiola requested a meeting with this company’s leaders upon hearing about the COS closure, there was no immediate official statement about the future plans of this business in the islands. Then on July 23, 2009, StarKist
announced it would be laying off about 350 workers as part of their plan to make the Pago Pago cannery viable in the long term. These layoffs, combined with the closure of the COS cannery, motivated the governor and members of the private sector to develop a petition asking President Barack Obama to reverse minimum wage increases in the region, except for the initial fifty-cent increase in 2008, and to reinstate a Special Industry Committee to determine minimum wage rates in the territory. While much debate occurred about this petition, with vocal supporters and opponents, it garnered more than 12,000 signatures from American Sāmoan residents. This petition, in addition to letters written by Governor Togiola and American Sāmoan congressional representative Eni F. H. Faleomavaega requesting assistance from members of the U.S. Congress and Department of Interior, resulted in the visit of a congressional delegation to American Sāmoa on August 4 and 5, 2009. The six-member delegation examined the tuna fishing and processing industries and considered what needed to be done to keep StarKist in the territory. The petition and letters also resulted in an on-site visit from the Government Accounting Office (GAO) to conduct a study on the impact of minimum wage hikes in American Sāmoa. This three-member team conducted a series of hearings with the public, businesspeople, and the government between August 17 and August 31, 2009. After the earthquake and tsunami on September 29, 2009, GAO senior officials conducted a follow-up visit between January 25 and January 28, 2010, to see how conditions in the islands had changed since the natural disaster. This final report, which was published in April 2010, was more representative of the economic situation in the islands than the previous GAO report of 2007.

In the meantime, Congressman Faleomavaega introduced a bill to the U.S. Congress on September 16, 2009, “to provide American Sāmoa with employment stabilization and economic development assistance.” Hearings for this legislation continued through the winter of 2010. On December 16, 2009, President Barack Obama signed a federal law postponing the next fifty-cent minimum wage increase from May to September 30, 2010. The remaining cannery, StarKist, also requested and received a three-month tax exemption from the ASG Tax Exemption Board between the months of January and March 2010. According to the senior manager of StarKist Corporate Affairs, the “minimum wage increase is one of several factors that are combining to make American Samoa no longer globally competitive for the tuna industry.” Depending on the outcome of the ASPIRE bill StarKist may or may not stay in American Sāmoa.
Coming Together

While the long-term prospects for the StarKist cannery remains unclear, the tuna-processing industry has presented an interesting contradiction in American Sāmoa. On the one hand, fish canneries have been the only successful major industry in the area. The American Sāmoa economy is largely dependent on the taxes, salaries, and other investments provided by these companies. On the other hand, most American Sāmoans see cannery work as beneath them, and so the majority of workers in the canneries are immigrants to the region from Western Sāmoa, Tonga, and the Philippines. These cannery workers are often spoken of and treated negatively. There are few alliances over the common devastation that the demise of the fish-processing industry will wreak on both immigrant cannery workers and American Sāmoans. All groups will face higher utility and food prices, unemployment, decreased revenue for social services, and a generally depressed economy. For everyone, these problems resulted from an imperially imposed, neoliberal ideology that encouraged the development of a single industry in American Sāmoa and deprived the economy of any resilience.

When the news of the cannery closure spread, many American Sāmoans reacted with anti-immigrant rhetoric. One Samoa News reader named “concerned AmSamoa citizen” said “just to make it plain and simple for the ASG. Send all those illegal immigrants back to their country of origin.”49 Other readers supported assistance only to American Sāmoans who were laid off. One anonymous reader stated

where is the great tragedy if the canneries close? . . . The first and foremost responsibility of the ASG and US Government is to AMERICAN Sāmoans, then our cousins and neighbors. It is not the sole responsibility of American Sāmoans or our Government to spend the time or taxpayer dollars (to our own detriment) to find new employment for workers who came here from another country to work for a local business that is now closing. Those businesses have responsibility along with sponsors and all the individuals who left their homes and came here of their own volition.50

Others urged the deportation of unemployed immigrants. In another anonymous post, one reader spoke about the 31,500 registered aliens from Western Sāmoa, wondering

how many came here originally to work for the canneries, don't any longer but found somebody to sponsor them, and remained? Of those 31,500 how many work “under the table” and don't pay taxes? How many have been or are on WIC and food stamps? How many have had
children born here out of wedlock and have their kids in and out of LBJ [Tropical Medical Center] or crammed into our schools? How many have cars on our roads? . . . I could go on about the physical burden on our local infrastructure but I'd be stating the obvious.”51

Regardless of their similar cultural backgrounds, these commentators spoke negatively about helping Western Sāmoan cannery workers above the needs of American Sāmoans.

But shared imperial repression could also unite American Sāmoans and immigrant laborers. Scholars such as Todd R. Ramlow provide some guidance on ways to start bridging indigenous and immigrant struggles in the same time and place. In his analysis of Gloria Anzaldúa’s classic work *Borderlands / La Frontera* and David Wojnarowicz’s *Close to the Knives*, Ramlow argues that groups should “reject the limitations of dualism and connect to others across fields of difference, rather than being immobilized by the fantasy of normate physical and national unity . . . rethink dominant ideals of singular, unitary, autonomous identity; in doing so they offer a revisioning of subjectivity that might produce a resistant politics of multiplicity.”52 Ramlow encourages different minoritized groups to move beyond identity-based distinctions and seek out connections among each other in the context of larger organizational forms of domination and control. Instead of speaking negatively about foreign cannery workers, perhaps the energy of anti-immigrant natives could be more productively channeled into figuring out how to, for example, diversify American Sāmoa’s economy while undoing the region’s dependence on the tuna industry fostered by imperialist neoliberalism.

Another way American Sāmoans and immigrant workers could come together would be to acknowledge and address the similar oppressions they both face from either U.S. or corporate domination. American Sāmoans are subject to the will of the U.S. federal government in a similar way that immigrant cannery workers are subject to the will of the fish-processing industry. The legal status of both groups is dependent on the continued cooperation of U.S. officials and big business, respectively. The withdrawal of support for either the cultural preservation of American Sāmoans, or the employment of foreign laborers, would place each group’s way of life into a tailspin. American Sāmoans would be extremely upset if their traditions were ruled illegal by the U.S. administration and consequently banned. In the same way, immigrant workers were devastated to learn that they were losing their jobs and means of living. Each group engages in significant struggles with macro-structural institutions, and the lives of both are rendered precarious as a result of these institutions’ powers. Each group could benefit from acknowledging the challenges facing...
the other and thinking of ways to join together to rally for more equitable relationships with the United States and big business in the islands.

Some Samoa News readers have already expressed compassion and sympathy for cannery workers. The response of one reader, “SATANI 4M SCO DA SCO,” to anti-immigrant sentiment was: “So what if more foreigners are in AS? We need to start pointing out the similarities b/n the foreigners and the indigenous ppl instead of separating them. These foreigners need to be able to vote and have their voices heard as well because all you have in AS is a bunch of corrupt ppl running the whole show while the rest of the people just settle with meager, unfulfilling lifestyles. They struggle in a situation they almost have no way to escape. Now can you tell me if that is fair.” An emphasis on similar forms of oppression has the potential to unite indigenous and immigrant groups to fight for more beneficial economic and social practices for all people in the region.

A focus on human rights could also help unite the multiple exploited groups in American Sāmoa. Rosa Linda Fregoso’s definition of human rights is useful for the American Sāmoan context. She states that “the more progressive formulation is linked to a global justice project that considers human (civil) rights to be indivisible and inseparable from economic rights to food, health care, and shelter. It is a perspective that calls for the transformation of social structures, and that defines the ‘global problem’ facing human beings as both ‘suffering and systematic disenfranchisement from collaborative self governance.’” Hannah Arendt provided another useful definition of human rights when she said, that “the right to have rights, or the right of every human being to belong to humanity, should be guaranteed by humanity itself.” Overall, human rights can be defined as “‘substantive and indivisible’: the right to work and the right to a life free from violence and torture.” Whether indigenous or immigrant, people of all races, classes, ages, genders and sexual orientations should have access to the same basic rights for living. This focus is not so much political as it is humanist. As one Samoa News reader named “Sole” stated, “we are all of the Human race. Let’s pull each other up, it’s our God given humanity.” Sole provides a glimpse into how a humanist approach could unite American Sāmoans and immigrant workers in the region.

Fregoso also suggests strategic ways to merge local and global human rights concerns. She explains how in the Mexican border town Ciudad Juárez, Las Muertas de Juárez campaign incorporated human rights discourse into symbolic actions, “integrating emotive with cognitive understandings,” as well as “choreographed cultural politics of visibility.” The campaign combined
Catholic religious imagery and ideas with Mexican fears of shame and activated “a discourse of global human rights in a locality by giving voice to rights violations.”59 In a similar way, the deep religiosity of Sāmoans could be used to think more broadly about human rights for all people in American Sāmoa. According to the CIA World Factbook, 100 percent of the American Sāmoan population claims affiliation with some form of Christianity.60 Pointing out the contradictions between anti-immigrant sentiment and biblical passages proclaiming God’s concern for immigrants, temporary laborers, and the exploited could encourage some native people to seek more cooperation with foreigners in the islands.61 Another powerful concept in American Sāmoa is that of fa’a sāmoa, or the Sāmoan way of life. This practice includes the prioritization of “the ‘āiga (kin group) . . . and principles of tautua (service), fa’alavelave (obligations), alofa (love, compassion), and fa’alaloalo (respect) in kinship relations.”62 Fa’a sāmoa is a central tenet of Sāmoan culture and the lack of fa’a sāmoa could be a great source of shame. Combining Christian beliefs with the love, respect, and compassion of fa’a sāmoa could be a potential symbol for unifying immigrants and indigenous groups in American Sāmoa.

Some posts to the Samoa News already illustrate this potential. J. Kalepo Fanua stated, “I would like to respond to the writer who brought up the issues of immigration. Let’s not ourselves practice racism. Let’s not be exclusionary and be God-toting in the same breath. It’s not becoming of the Sāmoan hospitality that we try and market to the world. It’s also not Sāmoan, at least from where I’m sitting.”63 Another reader claimed that

without our SAMOAN CULTURE we are practically nothing before the eyes of the good Lord. Of course, God, not the United States of America, created Sāmoan as one of the group of peoples in the universe. Needless to say, and, as you well know, Tutuila, Manu’a, Upolu and Savaii or Sāua to Falealupo, have the same culture, language, skin color, thinking pattern or human characteristics, all of which are God’s creation in His own image. Are you complaining about this? . . . It does not mean that you have to point one finger to Upolu, Savai’i, Koreans, Vietnamese and other human race. We ought to make the best out of the world we live in before our last breath . . . and we must always thanks the Lord for even allowing us to be here.”64

From these examples, we can see how Sāmoan cultural traditions and religiosity could merge with larger human rights concerns to unite the struggles of American Sāmoans with immigrant workers in the region.

On the flip side, there were some highly charged negative responses to these humanistic suggestions. One anonymous reader reacted to Sole’s comment by saying
Sole . . . it’s not a matter of ancient ancestry (you only need to go back to 17 Apr 1900/14 Jul 1904), compassion and charity, it’s a matter of citizenship and laws and why they exist. “Send them home mode” is not about lack of compassion it’s about survival and quality of life. Wake up and smell the coffee Sole, American Sāmoa has been more than charitable it’s been taken advantage of and it’s about to implode.65

Once again, this comment demonstrates the strong belief that resources are limited in the region and that the needs of American Sāmoans should take priority over all others.

Even those who acknowledged the important role of immigrants in the region still expressed anti-immigrant beliefs. Pio Tulouma agreed that foreigners “contributed to the island’s economy. However, if alternate work opportunities are not available, and their permit does not allow them to remain, then they have to go.”66 American Sāmoans have valid concerns about scarce resources and violations of immigration laws. However, anti-foreigner sentiment does not resolve the greater institutional issues that caused such problems in the first place. It will be a difficult and lengthy struggle to persuade indigenous groups to consider a multigroup unification against larger economic and social structures. Yet such a struggle is essential if either group is to truly reckon with the forces of domination and control in the region.

By highlighting the negative impact of U.S. colonialism on the economic situation in the region, American Sāmoans do not have to give up their connections to the United States. Instead, they could tap into the dual patriotism discussed by Michael Elliott, wherein American Indians can be both anti-American and patriotic because of their historical colonial history with the United States. He explained how “American Indians are “outraged at the U.S. history of colonization while still supporting contemporary efforts to protect the United States.”67 In the same way, American Sāmoans can justly call out the United States for subjecting their region to underdevelopment while still maintaining ties with the region. Criticizing U.S. imperialism could also be seen as exercising their rights to freedom of speech and dissent, fundamental tenets of U.S. democracy.

While American Sāmoans have been subjected by the United States, they can also subject others. As an oppressed group with ties to the land, they possess powerful ideological tools for acknowledging the need to act justly toward non-Samoans in their region. The current economic environment will provide a long and tough road for both American Sāmoans and foreign cannery workers. But there is great potential for a strong and unified movement of all residents in American Sāmoa if they can work together against macro-structural issues to remove the imperial and colonial constraints that impact their daily lives.
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