

TAKING STOCK ON MICRONATIONALITY AND ISLANDS

[Received January 16th 2026; accepted January 27th 2026 – DOI: 10.21463/shima.283]

Vicente Bicudo de Castro

Deakin University <v.bicudodecastro@deakin.edu.au>

ABSTRACT: This article takes stock of two decades of scholarship on micronationality and islands, tracing the evolution of the field from marginal curiosity to a conceptually rich interdisciplinary domain. Drawing on *Shima's Micronationality Anthology*, related special issues, and wider contributions, the review identifies six recurring motifs: identity and performance, governance and community, legal and political sovereignty, islandness and spatiality, tourism and branding, and digital micronations. Micronations are shown to enact sovereignty through performative artefacts (e.g., flags, constitutions, rituals) while islands provide bounded and legible stages for these experiments. Legal analyses highlight the paradox of contingent sovereignty, where recognition proves more decisive than criteria of statehood. Island Studies frames micronations as laboratories of scale, enclosure, and connectivity, while cultural and media perspectives emphasise their entanglement with tourism, art, and digital infrastructures. Methodological pluralism underscores the interdisciplinarity of the field. This article advances a synthetic framework of *performative relational sovereignty*, positioning micronations as sites for rethinking legitimacy, recognition, and the cultural practice of statehood.

KEYWORDS: Micronations, micropatria, Island Studies, islandness, sovereignty, performativity

Introduction

*It is quite true what philosophy says, that life must be understood backward.
But then one forgets the other principle, that it must be lived forward.*
(Kierkegaard, 2001, p. 179)

As *Shima* enters a new phase with the end of Series I in 2026, an opportunity arises to take stock of what the journal has published on micronationality and islands, the themes that have emerged, and the conclusions that might now be reached. Over the past two decades, scholarship on micronationality has moved from marginal curiosity to a conceptually rich interdisciplinary field. The first major cluster of contributions appeared in *Shima's* 2014 special issue on *Islands and Micronationality*; since then, *Shima* and other outlets have published work that treats micronations as sites where questions about sovereignty, identity, space, and performance converge.

Micronations (sometimes called *micropatria*, although the terms are generally used interchangeably) are territories declared independent by individuals or groups that lack recognition from established nation-states or international bodies. These territories are

usually located within existing nation-states, though some have been established on islands, sandbanks, platforms beyond national territorial waters, or online (Hayward, 2014a, 2019a, 2019b). Micronations are largely notional entities, as there is minimal likelihood of their claims to sovereignty being acknowledged by any recognised nation or international organisation (Hobbs & Williams, 2021). The term *micronation* is of comparatively recent coinage, dating from the 1960s, but has since been used to examine ventures at any time in history (e.g., Bicudo de Castro et al., 2023; Hayward & Khamis, 2015). The term itself has been labelled a poor choice to describe the phenomenon, as 'nation' is a complex concept; however, "the phenomenon presumably settled on micronation as their preferred term because the term *microstate* was already taken" (Streich, 2021, p. 120; Grydehøj, 2014).

The corpus for this review comprises *Shima's Micronationality Anthology*, which collates articles on the topic published in the journal, the 'Anomalous/Autonomous' theme issue of *Transformations* (#35, 2021), and additional articles published in other outlets that contribute substantially to analyses of micronationality and islands. While this review focuses on islands and micronationality, the corpus includes some material that examine micronationality more broadly.¹ Each article was read closely using an inductive-deductive hybrid approach. Initial readings identified emergent themes, which were then organised into six conceptual motifs. These motifs reflect both the explicit framing of individual articles and patterns across multiple texts. This method allows for synthesis of a heterogeneous literature while remaining attentive to the specific contributions of individual works. The limitations of this approach, particularly the focus on English-language, peer-reviewed scholarship, are acknowledged; micronational projects themselves generate substantial digital, artistic, and vernacular documentation that falls outside this review's scope but warrants future attention.

This review demonstrates that scholarship on islands and micronationality has coalesced around six interrelated motifs: identity and performance, governance and community, legal and political sovereignty, islandness and spatiality, tourism and branding, and digital micronations. These are not discrete categories but overlapping dimensions of micronational practice, each revealing different facets of how territorial claims, symbolic practices, and spatial conditions intersect. The following section presents these motifs systematically. A subsequent synthesis develops a framework of *performative relational sovereignty* that accounts for how micronations instantiate claims to statehood through symbolic artefacts while remaining embedded within networks of recognition, infrastructure, and material conditions. This framework helps explain the paradox at the heart of micronational projects: they succeed as cultural performances even when they fail as juridical claims, exposing the constructed, contingent nature of state sovereignty itself. The final section concludes the article and suggests future research directions.

¹ Some works on non-island micronations were included due to their contribution to defining micronationality (Hayward, 2019b; Streich, 2021), on micronations located on peninsulas (i.e., almost an island) (Bicudo de Castro & Kober, 2019; Hallerton & Hill, 2019), and on digital micronations (Hobbs et al., 2023). While published before *Shima's* 2014 special issue, Steinberg and Chapman's (2009) work on the Conch Republic provides theoretical concepts, particularly "sovereignties of connection", that have proven influential for micronational scholarship.

Islands and Micronations

Identity and Performance

Micronations enact sovereignty as a theatre of power. Rather than rejecting the state, they mimic it, revealing the state's dependence on symbols, documents, and ceremonies. A dominant strand of scholarship treats micronations as enactments of national forms: flags, stamps, constitutions, passports, language, and rituals (e.g., Lattas, 2014; Bicudo de Castro & Hayward, 2021; Karlander, 2025). Hayward (2019b) captures this insight in describing micronations as "like nations themselves [in that they] can be understood to be performed by rhetoric, by quasi-legal and administrative practices and/or by symbolism and symbolic acts" (p. 73). Island settings intensify this performativity because bounded landscapes provide legible stages for declarations and ceremonies; cases include Outer Baldonia (MacKinnon, 2014) and North Dumpling Island (Butkus, 2014).

Vexillology and other visual artefacts (e.g., flags, coats of arms, maps) operate as material technologies of entitativity, that is, as objects that signal and produce collective identity and cohesion (Bicudo de Castro & Hayward, 2021; Hayward, 2019b). This relationship between performance and identity creation works bidirectionally: symbols both represent and constitute the micronational community. Many authors link micronations to performance art and speculative design, where the boundary between aesthetic and political practice blurs (e.g., Hallerton & Hill, 2019; Hayward, 2018). Artistic projects such as Ladonia (Hallerton & Hill, 2019) and the Commonwealth of New Bayswater (Hayward, 2018) exemplify this intersection, deploying bureaucratic aesthetics (e.g., passports, ministries, embassies) as satirical tools to expose the absurdities of nationalism and neoliberal governance (Motum, 2025; Simpson & Sheller, 2022).

The frameworks of Anderson's (1983) concept of imagined communities and McConnell et al.'s (2012) performativity recur across the corpus, demonstrating their centrality to conceptualising how micronations produce collective identity through repeated symbolic acts. Performance theory more broadly conceptualises micronations as staged sovereignty: ritualised spectacles that generate political meaning through repetition and liminality (Hayward, 2018; Khosravi, 2019; Motum, 2025). Studies of island micronations illustrate how humour, art, and activism are woven into these performances of belonging and authority (Bicudo de Castro & Kober, 2019; Royle, 2014). The Gay and Lesbian Kingdom of the Coral Sea Islands exemplifies how performative sovereignty can become a tool of resistance, appropriating the very forms of statehood to challenge heteronormative power (Lattas, 2014). This intersection of performance, identity, and critique suggests that micronations function simultaneously as parody and prototype, revealing state sovereignty as theatrical construction while experimenting with alternative political imaginaries.

Governance and Community

Micronations serve as laboratories for testing governance arrangements and community formation. Scholarship documents a spectrum of internal structures, from monarchic to participatory, and highlights the genuine affective attachments participants develop to micronational identities (van Lessen & Petermann, 2021; Motum, 2025). Founder profiles, whether wealthy private owners, artists, activists, or sovereign-citizen litigants, shape institutional repertoires and political aims (e.g., Butkus, 2014; Hallerton & Leslie, 2015; Hayward, 2014b; Bicudo de Castro & Hobbs, 2024). The figure of the founder emerges as crucial: their resources, ideologies, and social networks often determine whether a

micronation emphasises artistic experimentation, libertarian withdrawal, tourism development, or legal challenge.

Rituals such as cabinet meetings, ceremonies, and flag design function as tools of community formation and governance experimentation. Some projects consciously trial alternative modes of decision-making and civic pedagogy, treating micronations as spaces for testing new forms of collective practice (e.g., Hayward, 2014b; Hallerton & Leslie, 2015). Hayward (2014b) documents how Lamb Island's consideration of a local representative body illustrates micronationality as a vehicle for exploring community governance alternatives within existing state frameworks. Similarly, Isonia emerged from livelihood concerns in rural areas, using micronational framing to experiment with local governance and community engagement (Hallerton & Leslie, 2015).

Several micronations explicitly experiment with governance models, cryptocurrencies, or libertarian principles, becoming laboratories for alternative political economies (e.g., Simpson, 2016, 2021; Simpson & Sheller, 2022). Operation Atlantis and Ocean Builders exemplify libertarian attempts to establish sovereignty beyond state jurisdiction, though both ultimately failed due to material vulnerabilities and host-state intervention (Simpson, 2016, 2021). Research consistently stresses micronations' structural dependence on existing state systems: even when asserting autonomy, such enterprises remain embedded within broader legal frameworks, supply chains, and infrastructural networks (Simpson, 2021). This creates a fundamental tension between ideological claims to independence and practical reliance on state-provided services, currencies, and protections, underpinning what might be termed contingent sovereignty, that is, a form of self-determination that exists rhetorically and symbolically, but not juridically or sustainably.

Legal and Political Sovereignty

Legal and political scholarship uses micronations to probe how statehood is constructed and contested. Hobbs and Williams (2021) describe them as exposing lacunae in law and serving as 'thought experiments' in legal ontology. Central to this analysis is the practice of legal mimesis: the drafting of constitutions, issuing of citizenships, and creation of quasi-administrative institutions that reproduce the forms of statehood while lacking juridical force (Bicudo de Castro & Kober, 2019; Buktus, 2014; Karlander, 2025). This mimicry is not mere imitation but a revelatory practice that highlights the constructed nature of Westphalian sovereignty, that is, the principle that legitimate political authority is organised through territorially bounded, mutually recognising states (Furnues, 2018).

A key tension in the literature concerns the criteria for statehood. The Montevideo Convention (1933) articulates a declaratory theory, listing objective criteria: permanent population, defined territory, government, and capacity to enter into relations with other states. Micronational case studies consistently reveal that recognition of social, diplomatic, and legal aspects proves more constitutive of statehood than these criteria alone (McConnell et al., 2012). This supports constitutive theories of recognition, which hold that statehood is brought into being through acknowledgment by the international community rather than through meeting formal criteria (Furnues, 2018).

Case studies illustrate these dynamics across diverse contexts. Island micronations such as Sealand appear to possess jurisdictional distinctiveness, occupying a former military platform (formerly) beyond territorial waters; however, their legal standing ultimately depends on the forbearance or intervention of parent states (Hayward, 2014a; Hobbs &

Williams, 2021; Khosravi, 2019). The Houtman Abrolhos micronation further demonstrates how courts, administrative actors, and public narratives jointly determine outcomes, with pseudo-legal rhetoric proving insufficient against state authority (Bicudo de Castro & Hobbs, 2024). Maritime disputes such as the Spratly/Truong Sa archipelago reveal how opportunistic personal claims can masquerade as territorial projects, blurring the boundary between myth, private assertion, and formal sovereignty (Tran, 2014).

These examples show that micronations function less as successful acts of secession than as demonstrations of sovereignty's fragility and performativity. By appropriating legal language and forms, they expose a fundamental paradox: juridical sovereignty requires recognition; notwithstanding, recognition is granted or withheld based on political calculations rather than objective criteria. This reveals statehood as achievement rather than condition, something continuously produced through practice rather than possessed as status.

Islandness and Spatiality

Island Studies provides a crucial conceptual lens for understanding why islands repeatedly host micronational projects. Scholars employ relational island thinking and archipelagic perspectives to reframe islands not as isolated microcosms but as nodes within wider networks of mobility, exchange, and power (Grydehøj, 2014; Hayward & Khamis, 2015). This perspective challenges romantic visions of islands as naturally bounded and autonomous, revealing instead their constitutive connections to mainlands, trade routes, digital infrastructures, and global environmental systems. Central to this reframing is the "island laboratory" heuristic (Grydehøj, 2014; Hayward, 2014a; Simpson & Sheller, 2022; Steinberg & Chapman, 2009). Islands apparent remoteness and manageable scale enable projects that test the limits of sovereignty and belonging, while their material geography, surrounded by water, often small, frequently peripheral, shapes political imaginaries in distinctive ways. The laboratory metaphor operates on multiple registers: islands as controlled experimental spaces where variables can be isolated, as sites of revelation where sovereignty's mechanisms become visible, and as prototypes where alternative arrangements can be tested before scaling.

Case studies demonstrate how material geography and imagined independence intertwine. The Conch Republic illustrates how geographic separation becomes a resource for sovereignty claims when that connection is disrupted, transforming material isolation into symbolic independence (Steinberg & Chapman, 2009). Operation Atlantis sought to construct sovereignty on floating platforms in Caribbean waters, treating oceanic space as blank canvas for libertarian utopia (Simpson, 2016). Tavolara in Sardinia claims royal lineage and deploys heritage narratives to attract tourists while asserting symbolic autonomy (Farinelli, 2021). The Kingdom of North Dumpling illustrates how private island ownership enables play with sovereignty when backed by substantial resources (Butkus, 2014). The contested sovereignty of the Minquiers and Écréhous demonstrates how even tiny uninhabited islands can become stages for competing national and micronational claims (Bicudo de Castro et al., 2023). The literature also links island micronations to Anthropocene anxieties. Small, precarious territories surrounded by rising seas become allegories of planetary vulnerability and ironic commentaries on governance at small scales (Hayward, 2018; Hobbs et al., 2023). Islands thus serve as metaphors for political enclosure, ecological precarity, and experimental sovereignty simultaneously.

Debates about scale prove central to this motif. Smallness emerges as both constraint and empowerment: limited size restricts resources and population but also enables autonomy,

visibility, and manageable governance (van Lessen & Petermann, 2021). Quasi-micronational formations such as Lundy (Hayward & Khamis, 2015), Forvik (Grydehøj, 2014), various Channel Islands (Johnson, 2014, 2015, 2021; Dawes, 2015a, 2015b), and some Japanese islands after World War II (Long, 2014) blur boundaries between microstate, quasi-state, and micronation. These cases reveal how sovereignty operates along continuums rather than as binary presence/absence, with islands occupying various positions along spectrums of autonomy, recognition, and integration.

Tourism and Branding

A growing body of scholarship examines micronations through the lens of place-branding, cultural economy, and heritage studies, highlighting how micronational forms are mobilised to attract visitors, stimulate rural economies, and generate local revenue (Vargas-Sánchez, 2025). Nami Island's reinvention as the "Naminara Republic" exemplifies this entrepreneurial turn, leveraging fictional sovereignty to create a themed tourism location (Lee, 2021). Ladonia's sale of noble titles, memorabilia, and ceremonials creates a hybrid economy where symbolic capital converts to material resources to maintain its artworks (Bicudo de Castro & Kober, 2019). And the Conch Republic uses playful sovereignty claims to attract visitors and assert local identity (Steinberg & Chapman, 2009).

Some articles examine how micronationalism itself has been depicted through media. The US TV series *Republic of Sarah* dramatises small-town secession, revealing popular cultural fantasies about local sovereignty (Hayward, 2022). The Australian television series *Micro Nation* treats micronationality as comedy, highlighting how these projects circulate through entertainment industries (Giuffre, 2015). These studies further underscore how rituals and symbols are commodified as attractions, embedding micronations within broader circuits of tourism and cultural consumption.

Many cases demonstrate that economic playfulness and political critique are not mutually exclusive; rather, they often coexist in hybrid cultural economies where tourism, performance, and sovereignty are entangled. The commodification of sovereignty through tourism raises questions about authenticity and exploitation, but it also reveals how territorial claims can be sustained through economic rather than juridical means. Micronational tourism thus represents a form of what might be called post-judicial sovereignty, that is, where economic viability substitutes for legal recognition, and visitor engagement legitimates territorial claims in the absence of diplomatic acknowledgment.

Digital Micronations

The rise of digital micronations extends sovereignty experiments into cyberspace, raising new questions about territoriality, community, and jurisdiction (Hobbs et al., 2023). Online micronations dispense with physical territory entirely, constructing sovereignty through websites, wikis, forums, and virtual currencies. Media and platform studies show that even in cyberspace, micronations reproduce enduring metaphors of insularity, revealing the persistence of islandness as a cognitive model for bounded political community (Bicudo de Castro & Kober, 2019; Hayward & Khamis, 2015).

Lundy's contemporary reconfiguration on MicroWiki demonstrates how historical territorial claims can be transformed into virtual entities, maintaining a continuity of nomenclative identity while abandoning physical jurisdiction (Hayward & Khamis, 2015). Digital platforms enable forms of participation impossible in territorial micronations: instant global

membership, distributed governance, and experimental institutional arrangements. Crypto-secessionist projects together with seasteading initiatives combine digital sovereignty with aspirations toward material territorialisation, treating blockchain technologies as foundations for post-state governance (Simpson & Sheller, 2022).

While articulated in conventional analogue media, the establishment of the Sultanate of Occussi-Ambeno as a virtual micronation with no connection to the actual East Timorese enclave of Occussi-Ambeno illustrates risks inherent in digital micronational representation. Hayward's (2019a) analysis of the micronational sultanate illustrates how virtual projects might also misrepresent pre-existing communities, raising ethical questions about who has standing to declare symbolic sovereignty over territories associated with Indigenous or colonised peoples. Digital micronations thus inherit and amplify dilemmas of representation and appropriation that plague territorial projects.

Digital micronations reveal that territoriality is not essential to sovereignty claims; rather, community, symbolism, and governance can be enacted in virtual spaces, suggesting that bounded physical territory may be historically contingent rather than ontologically necessary for political organisation.

Towards Performative Relational Sovereignty

The six motifs traced across two decades of scholarship can now be synthesised into a conceptual framework that accounts for micronationality's distinctive characteristics while illuminating broader dynamics of state sovereignty. Island micronations instantiate what can be termed *performative relational sovereignty*: a mode of political claim-making that operates simultaneously through symbolic performance and relational embedding.

Performativity refers to how sovereignty is enacted and sustained through repeated symbolic acts rather than possessed as inherent status. Drawing on Austin's (1962) speech act theory and Butler's (2015) work on performative identity, this dimension recognises that sovereignty emerges through doing rather than being. Micronations perform statehood through the same repertoire employed by recognised states. What distinguishes micronations is not that they perform sovereignty while "real" states simply possess it, but rather that micronational performances render visible the constructed, iterative nature of state sovereignty itself.

Relationality emphasises that sovereignty exists within networks rather than in isolation (Grydehøj, 2014; Hayward, 2014a). A micronation's sovereignty is not self-contained but contingent on relations with parent states (forbearance or intervention), audiences (tourists, media, citizens), and infrastructures (internet, shipping, currency). This relational dimension explains why micronational sovereignty can succeed culturally even when it fails juridically: recognition from publics, scholars, and participants sustains projects and even absent diplomatic acknowledgment.

Sovereignty names the specific political claim being performed and embedded. Traditional theories treat sovereignty as supreme authority within a territory, but micronational cases reveal sovereignty as claim rather than possession, as aspiration rather than achievement (Furnues, 2018). Micronations demonstrate that sovereignty is scalar (operating at multiple levels), contingent (dependent on recognition and conditions), and separable (symbolic sovereignty can exist without juridical sovereignty). This understanding challenges Westphalian assumptions about sovereignty's indivisibility and absoluteness.

The six motifs each illuminate different facets of this framework. Identity and performance shows how sovereignty is constituted through symbols and rituals; flags, anthems, and ceremonies do not merely represent sovereignty but enact it. Governance and community reveals the laboratory dimension: micronations test alternative arrangements while remaining embedded in existing infrastructures, demonstrating both the possibilities and limits of reimagined sovereignty. Legal and political sovereignty exposes the gap between criteria and recognition, supporting the framework's insight that acknowledgment is constitutive rather than merely declaratory. Islandness and spatiality provides the material and metaphorical foundation: islands literalise boundedness while demonstrating connectivity, mirroring the tension between territorial claims and relational conditions. Tourism and heritage demonstrates how economic relations sustain sovereignty claims in the absence of legal recognition, showing that performativity and relationality have material economic dimensions. Digital micronations extend the framework into virtual space, revealing that physical territory is contingent rather than essential, while the persistence of island metaphors online indicates deep cultural associations between sovereignty and bounded enclosure.

This framework accounts for several puzzles. It explains why micronations succeed culturally even when they fail juridically: because sovereignty is performed for audiences and embedded in networks, micronations generate actual communities, economic value, and political critique without achieving legal status. It illuminates the paradox of contingent sovereignty: micronations assert absolute independence while depending on parent states, with no inherent conflict between performed absoluteness and relational contingency. It reveals why islands recur as micronational sites: islands provide both literal stages for performance and material exemplars of the interplay between boundedness and connection. Finally, it clarifies what micronations reveal about state sovereignty generally: by rendering sovereignty's mechanics visible through exaggeration and dysfunction, micronations expose what successful states obscure; that all sovereignty rests on performance and recognition rather than natural inevitability.

Conclusions and Future Research

Over two decades, scholarship on islands and micronationality has moved from descriptive accounts toward analytically rigorous engagements, coalescing around six interrelated motifs that illuminate how territorial claims, symbolic practices, and spatial conditions intersect. This review has synthesised these findings into a framework of *performative relational sovereignty* that accounts for how micronations instantiate claims to statehood through symbolic performance situated within networks of islands, parent states, audiences, and infrastructures.

The scholarship demonstrates that micronations are neither frivolous diversions nor potentially successful states-in-waiting, but rather revealing cases that expose sovereignty's constructed, contingent, and performative nature. Micronational studies may anticipate broader transformations in how sovereignty will be imagined and enacted: as territorial sovereignty becomes increasingly difficult to maintain in the face of transnational flows, environmental change, and digital connectivity, micronations offer provocations for thinking otherwise about political organisation.

Island Studies has made crucial contributions to understanding micronationality, providing both conceptual frameworks and empirical sites. The journal *Shima* has been instrumental in legitimating micronational studies, offering publication venue and intellectual community for scholars working on these themes. The relational turn in Island Studies, i.e., the reconceptualisation of islands as networked nodes rather than isolated microcosms, has proven particularly productive for micronational analysis, enabling scholars to theorise how bounded sovereignty claims remain embedded within broader systems.

As *Shima* concludes Series I and enters its next phase, the journal's contributions to micronational studies stand as testament to the productivity of bringing islands and sovereignty into conversation. The field that has emerged is conceptually rich, methodologically diverse, and globally relevant. In this sense, the study of micronationality has succeeded where many micronations themselves have not; it has performed itself into existence as a recognised domain of knowledge.

A recurring tension throughout the corpus concerns whether islands function primarily as material spaces or metaphorical constructs in micronational projects. North Dumpling Island, Outer Baldonia, and Sealand are literally islands (or island-like platforms) where physical geography enables particular sovereignty performances. The boundedness, remoteness, and scale of these territories matter materially: they provide defensible space, enable withdrawal, and create visible stages for declarations. Yet "islandness" also operates metaphorically, structuring how sovereignty is imagined even in non-island contexts. Digital micronations reproduce island metaphors despite lacking physical territory. Terrestrial micronations embedded within nation-states imagine themselves as islands of autonomy within larger jurisdictions. The cognitive association between islands and bounded political community appears culturally deep, suggesting that islands shape sovereignty imaginaries beyond their physical presence.

The relationship between material and metaphorical islandness remains incompletely theorised. Do physical islands enable certain sovereignty performances that non-island sites cannot? Or does islandness function primarily as cognitive model, such that any bounded space can serve island-like functions? The literature suggests both operate simultaneously: physical islands provide stages and resources for micronational projects, while the metaphor of islandness structures how boundedness, autonomy, and sovereignty are conceptualised regardless of physical geography. Future research should attend more carefully to how material and metaphorical dimensions interact, reinforce, or contradict one another in specific cases.

REFERENCES:

- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
- Bicudo de Castro, V. & Hayward, P. (2021). The metamorphosis of Madeira's Ilhéu do Diego into Forte de São José and the short-lived Principado do Ilhéu da Pontinha. *Transformations*, 35, 40-51.
- Bicudo de Castro, V. & Hobbs, H. (2024). The Prince of the Abrolhos, 2020–2023: On micronations and pseudolaw in Western Australia. *Shima*, 18(1), 149-160.
- Bicudo de Castro, V. & Kober, R. (2019). The Royal Republic of Ladonia: A micronation built of driftwood, concrete and bytes. *Shima*, 13(1), 115-135.

- Bicudo de Castro, V. Fleury, C., & Johnson, H. (2023). Micronational claims and sovereignty in the Minquiers and Écréhous. *Small States & Territories*, 6(1), 35-48.
- Butkus, C. M. (2014). North Dumpling Island: Micronationality, the media and the American dream. *Shima*, 8(1), 84-94.
- Butler, J. (2015). *Notes toward a performative theory of assembly*. Harvard University Press.
- Dawes, G. (2015a). Brecqhou's autonomy: A response to Henry Johnson's 'Sark and Brecqhou: Space, politics and power' (2014). *Shima*, 9(1), 85-88.
- Dawes, G. (2015b). Sark and Brecqhou (Continued). *Shima*, 9(2), 118-119.
- Farinelli, M. A. (2021). The Kingdom of Tavolara and the Republic of Malu Entu: Micronations, tourism and sub-state nationalism in two Sardinian near islands. *Transformations*, 35, 22-39.
- Furnues, D. (2018) The rise of non-territorial sovereignties and micronations. United Nations University – Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies (UNU-CRIS), Working Paper Series W-2018/10.
- Giuffrè, L. (2015). Micro nation — micro-comedy. *Shima*, 9(2), 23-33.
- Grydehøj, A. (2014). Captain Calamity's sovereign state of Forvik: Micronations and the failure of cultural nationalism. *Shima*, 8(1), 34-48.
- Hallerton, S. & Hill, M. (2019). Soundtracking a micronation: Neurobash's engagement with Ladonia. *Shima*, 13(1), 136-145.
- Hallerton, S. & Leslie, N. (2015). Isonia: Micronationality as an expression of livelihood issues. *Shima*, 9(2), 34-46.
- Hayward, P. (2014a). Islands and micronationality (v2). *Shima*, 8(1), 1-9.
- Hayward, P. (2014b). In a stew: Lamb Island's flirtation with micronationality and the related consideration of a local representative body for the Southern Moreton Bay Islands. *Shima*, 8(1), 95-103.
- Hayward, P. (2018). Secessionism, submergence and site-responsive art: The Embassy of the Commonwealth of New Bayswater at the 1st Fremantle Biennale. *Shima*, 12(1), 160-171.
- Hayward, P. (2019a). Oecusse and the sultanate of Occussi-Ambeno: Pranksterism, misrepresentation and micronationality. *Small States & Territories*, 2(2), 183-194.
- Hayward, P. (2019b). Under the mermaid flag: Achzivland and the performance of micronationality on ancestral Palestinian land. *Coolabah*, 27, 72-89.
- Hayward, P. (2022). Small town secession: Representations of micro-statehood in the US TV series Republic of Sarah (2021). *Small States & Territories*, 5(1), 215-224.
- Hayward, P. & Khamis, S. (2015). Fleeting and partial autonomy: A historical account of quasi-micronational initiatives on Lundy Island and their contemporary reconfiguration on MicroWiki. *Shima*, 9(1), 69-84.
- Hobbs, H. & Williams, G. (2021). Micronations: A lacuna in the law. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 19(1), 71-97.
- Hobbs, H., Hayward, P., & Motum, R. (2023). Cyber micronations and digital sovereignty. *Digital Society*, 2(3), 44.
- Johnson, H. (2014). Sark and Brecqhou: Space, politics and power. *Shima*, 8(1), 9-33.
- Johnson, H. (2015). The Sark/Brecqhou dyad: Jurisdictional geographies and contested histories. *Shima*, 9(1), 89-108.
- Johnson, H. (2021). Performing jurisdictional politics in the Bailiwick of Guernsey: A study of anthems and stamps. *Transformations*, 35, 1-21.
- Karlander, D. (2025). The art and politics of micronational language planning. *Language & Communication*, 104, 82-96.
- Khosravi, H. (2019). Sealand and the architecture of the sea: From counter-space to counter-culture. *Architecture and Culture*, 7(2), 219-233.

- Kierkegaard, S. (2001). *Kierkegaard's journals and notebooks: Volume 2: Journals EE-KK* (N. J. Cappelørn, A. Hannay, D. Kangaset al., Eds.; G. Pattison, Vol. Ed.). Princeton University Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.cttdr35nh>
- Lattas, J. (2014). Queer sovereignty: The Gay and Lesbian Kingdom of the Coral Sea Islands. *Shima*, 8(1), 59-71.
- Lee, S.-A. (2021). Place-branding and (constructed) intangible heritage: The manufacture of ostensible and virtual Korean micronations in Naminara and Hotel Del Luna. *Transformations*, 35, 104-117.
- Long, D. (2014). Shards of the shattered Japanese empire that found themselves as temporary micronations. *Shima*, 8(1), 104-108.
- MacKinnon, L. (2014). "Give me fish, not federalism": Outer Baldonia and performances of micronationality. *Shima*, 8(2), 105-119.
- McConnell, F., Moreau, T., & Dittmer, J. (2012). Mimicking state diplomacy: The legitimizing strategies of unofficial diplomacies. *Geoforum*, 43(4), 804-814.
- Montevideo Convention on the rights and uties of states. (1933). <https://www.ilsa.org/Jessup/Jessup15/Montevideo%20Convention.pdf>
- Motum, R. (2025). Scripted borders: Constructing "nation" through the performance of micronationhood. In Talpaz S & Needham A (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Cultural Text and the Nation* (pp. 427-438). Routledge.
- Royle, S. A. (2014). "This mere speck in the surface of the waters": Rockall aka Waveland. *Shima*, 8(1), 72-83.
- Simpson, I. (2016). Operation Atlantis: A case-study in libertarian island micronationality. *Shima*, 10(2), 18-35.
- Simpson, I. (2021). Performing freedom: An examination of Ocean Builders' successful failure in Thailand. *Transformations*, 35, 65-87.
- Simpson, I. & Sheller, M. (2022). Islands as interstitial encrypted geographies: Making (and failing) cryptosecessionist exits. *Political Geography*, 99, 102744.
- Steinberg, P. E., & Chapman, T. E. (2009). Key West's Conch Republic: building sovereignties of connection. *Political Geography*, 28(5), 283-295.
- Streich, P. (2021). The Japanese experience with micronations. *Transformations*, 35, 118-128.
- Tran, G. T. H. (2014). Contested space: National and micronational claims to the Spratly/Truong Sa Islands – A Vietnamese perspective. *Shima*, 8(1), 49-58.
- van Lessen, J. & Petermann, S. (2021). Peripheries – Playgrounds of society. *img Journal*, 3(5), 216-237.
- Vargas-Sánchez, A. (2025). Exploring micronations as emerging tourism destinations: Factors, policies, and impacts. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 50(5), 1074-1087.