
Lotus cc:Mail for Karen Sprecher Keating

Date: 8/25/00 8:13 PM
Sender: Bob Gould <gould@lava.net>
To: KAREN SPRECHER KEATING
Priority: Normal
Subject: From Mauka to Makai

Author: Bob Gould <gould@lava.net> at DOI
Date: 8/25/00 8:13:21 PM
Priority: Normal
To: KAREN SPRECHER KEATING at ~SOLHQ
Subject: From Mauka to Makai

I read the Apology Resolution in the draft report for the first time. Does the Apology Resolution define the accurate and correct history of the events leading up to and following the 1893 revolution in Hawaii by act of Congress, or is that history open to further investigation and error correction?

It appears to me that sweeping generalizations in the apology resolution were made with dubious historical accuracy.

No mention seems to be made in either the summary or the apology resolution that the people involved in the overthrow of the monarchy in 1893 were primarily citizens of the Kingdom of Hawaii, and some were 'Native Hawaiian People'.

Were the Crown lands held in trust held in trust ONLY for 'Native Hawaiian People', or were they held in trust for ALL citizens of Hawaii?

Does the United States Government currently support foreign governments' discrimination by law for or against its citizens based on race or ethnic background?

If the Crown lands were held in trust for ALL the citizens of the Kingdom of Hawaii, does not current and proposed United States law, the apology resolution, and this draft report unconstitutionally promote discrimination for a group of a certain ethnic background to the detriment of other citizens?

Was not the annexation of Hawaii to the United States passed by popular vote of the citizens of the Republic of Hawaii?

Was not the issue of statehood for the Territory of Hawaii passed overwhelmingly by popular vote of all the citizens of the Territory of Hawaii?

If the government of a foreign country with a US Embassy on the territory is overthrown by a coup of its citizens and thereafter surrenders

its authority to
the 'superior force of the United States of America', and
states that its
ambassador has stated that he supports the new government, are
those statements
sufficient to hold the United States responsible for the coup?
Have other
nations reacted similarly, and how have we treated them?

Is there any evidence that any citizen of the Kingdom of Hawaii
has lost title
as a result of the overthrow of the monarchy, the institution
of the Republic of
Hawaii, the Territory of Hawaii, or the State of Hawaii to any
land which he or
she personally held prior to the overthrow?

How does the United States justify discrimination based on
ethnic background,
and how will it protect the rights and property of its citizens
of other ethnic
backgrounds?

Am I personally in danger of losing title to the land which I
own in Hawaii
based on my racial or ethnic background as a result of any
aspect of the
reconciliation process, and if so, how will the United States
recompense me for
that loss?

If my land decreases in value as a result of the reconciliation
process, how
will the United States recompense me for that loss?

What voting rights will I have vis a vis people of other ethnic
backgrounds in
the State of Hawaii as a result of the reconciliation process?

What tax effects will accrue to me vis a vis people of other
ethnic backgrounds
in the State of Hawaii as a result of the reconciliation
process? What voice
will I have in those potential tax effects?

If further research finds that the historical basis for the
apology resolution
is flawed, how will that affect the reconciliation process, and
what means will
be in place to reverse the process if it is found to be based
on flawed data?

Without satisfactory answers to these questions, I must oppose
any special
rights or benefits to any ethnic group in Hawaii, and I urge
Congress to withhold
passage of any bill that would grant such rights until further
historical and
judicial research is done.

Robert Gould

