

12-8-99
 MIB-DC by fax
 sent to HI
 12-9-99

Facsimile Cover Sheet

To:	M. John Berry
Company:	
Phone:	
Fax:	(202)208-3230
From:	DUAL ENTERPRISES
Company:	
Phone:	+1(808)595-2404
Fax:	+1(808)595-2404
Date:	12/8/99
Pages including this cover page:	3

Comments:

TO:
 Assistant Secretary M. John Berry,
 c/o Document Management Unit
 Department of the Interior

December 8, 1999
TO:

Assistant Secretary M. John Berry,
c/o Document Management Unit
Department of the Interior
1849 C Street, N.W. Mailstop 7229
Washington, D.C. 20240

RE: RECONCILIATION WITH NATIVE HAWAIIANS

Participant Data:

Neil B. Dukas
2567-B Liliha Street
Honolulu, HI

(808) 595-2404
ndukas@aloha.net

I am a self-defined student of history and neutral party in this discussion. I would like to make the following written submission, for the record, as an individual of non-native descent, with respect to the political relationship between the United States and native Hawaiians

The mere fact that the United States government has sent a delegation to the Islands to seek avenues for "reconciliation with native Hawaiians" is in itself recognition of a historical injustice. Throughout his mission to Hawaii the Assistant Secretary has listened to repeated calls for restoration of the Hawaiian monarchy. Yet many states have been brought into this union under similarly questionable circumstances, particularly with regard to the rights of native Americans. Americans, moreover, have made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of Hawaii nei. Hawaii has been granted the ultimate honor, so to speak, by winning statehood—recognition as a full and equal partner in a union proud of its achievements and liberties. Realistically speaking, there is little likelihood that a vote for succession would ever be well received or understood by a majority of Americans, let alone championed by any serious Washington politician. Is there realistic common ground? What is achievable? What are viable scenarios for a reconstituted political relationship between the United States and native Hawaiians?

I have heard suggestions for granting native Hawaiians a status similar to native Americans—recognition of sovereign status, but only as a "state within a state." I do not intend to delve into the substantive differences between native Americans and native Hawaiians in this submission, but it is apparent that native Hawaiians are not a tribe and do not subscribe to a tribal structure of government. This proposal would require substantial modification to meet the practical needs of native Hawaiians.

Instead, I would suggest that there is constitutional and historical precedent to accommodate the following scenario: an acknowledgment of dual citizenship (de facto recognition of the illegal overthrow and the interregnum) and the "realignment" or "adjustment" of state boundaries to facilitate the creation of a territorial entity subject to the sovereign authority of a native Hawaiian government (to lend credibility and provide a financial base). The State of Hawaii would continue to exist, albeit reduced in size and native Hawaiians could move forward with "restoration," if that is what they wish, free of constitutional incumbrance and within the confines of their own territory.

Obviously, this would require some very difficult compromises by both parties. The United States government would have to deal with some very real security issues and native Hawaiians would have to settle for a formal division of Hawaii nei. The negotiations for a peaceful settlement in Northern Ireland and

Israel-Palestine have proven successful and are comparatively no more daunting. I would propose the election of a federally sponsored constitutional assembly of native Hawaiians followed immediately by the creation of a "regency" cabinet with whom a detailed international treaty could be negotiated.

George Washington in his farewell address stated:

The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the constitution which at any time exists till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people is sacredly obligatory upon us all."

Change is possible, but it must be "authentic," it must also represent the will of the people, and it must respect the established laws of the land. Native Hawaiians have unquestionably respected the established government of these Islands, but this should not be construed as an indication of having either acquiesced or relinquished their right to alter their constitution. In this case, they seek to restore a recognition of sovereignty seized from them by force of arms, under protest, and in contravention of international treaty.

A reasonable political settlement is limited only by our imaginations. Otto von Bismark once said, "The main thing is to make history, not write it."

Thank you for your time and consideration.