1	HAWAII STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
2	TO THE
3	UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	·
9	
10	
11	
12	PUBLIC HEARING
13	Held at the State Capitol, Beretania Street,
14	Honolulu, Hawaii 96813, commencing at 1:00 p.m., on
15	Wednesday, September 12th, 2007.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	BEFORE: PATRICIA ANN CAMPBELL, CSR 108
24	Certified Shorthand Reporter
25	Notary Public, State of Hawaii

Ralph Rosenberg Court Reporters, Inc. 2460 American Savings Bank, 1001 Bishop Street Honolulu, Hawaii 96822 (808) 524-2090

*

1	APPEARANCES:
2	HAWAII STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE BOARD MEMBERS:
3	Michael A. Lily, Chair
4	Amefil "Amy" R. Agbayani
5	Michelle Nalani Fujimori
6	Daphne Barbee-Wooten
7	William H. Burgess
8	Vernon F. L. Char
9	Rubellite K. Johnson
10	James I. Kuroiwa
11	Thomas J. MacDonald
12	Paul M. Sullivan
13	Wayne M. Tanna
14	Robert R. Alm
15	
16	STAFF MEMBERS:
17	Angelica Trevino
18	Barbara de la Viez
19	Derek Horne
20	
21	Participants (In order of participation):
22	David Rosen
23	Thurston Twigg-Smith
24	Kevin O'Grady
25	Su Yates

1	HAWAII STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
2	TO THE
3	UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	PUBLIC HEARING
13	Held at the State Capitol, Beretania Street,
14	Honolulu, Hawaii 96813, commencing at 1:00 p.m., on
15	Wednesday, September 12th, 2007.
16	
17	
17 18	
18	
18	
18 19 20	
18 19 20 21	BEFORE: PATRICIA ANN CAMPBELL, CSR 108
18 19 20 21 22	BEFORE: PATRICIA ANN CAMPBELL, CSR 108 Certified Shorthand Reporter

1	APPEARANCES:
2	HAWAII STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE BOARD MEMBERS:
3	Michael A. Lily, Chair
4	Amefil "Amy" R. Agbayani
5	Michelle Nalani Fujimori
6	Daphne Barbee-Wooten
7	William H. Burgess
8	Vernon F. L. Char
9	Rubellite K. Johnson
10	James I. Kuroiwa
11	Thomas J. MacDonald
12	Paul M. Sullivan
13	Wayne M. Tanna
14	Robert R. Alm
15	
16	STAFF MEMBERS:
17	Angelica Trevino
18	Barbara de la Viez
19	Derek Horne
20	
21	Participants (In order of participation):
22	David Rosen
23	Thurston Twigg-Smith
24	Kevin O'Grady
25	Su Yates

			·	
	1	APPEARANCES	(Continued):	
)	2		Kaleolani Kekoa	
	3		Chen Wei-Yuan	
	4		Marian Grey	
	5		Deanna Espinas	
	6		Charlene Cuaresma	
	7		Oswald Stender	
	8		Dexter Kaiama	
	9		Andre Perez	
	10		Kelii Collier	
	11		Marcia Linville	
	12		Milton Coleman	
$\overline{}$	13		Ikaika Hussey	
J	14		Anthony Sang, Sr.	
	15		Arvid Youngquist	
	16	, , 1	Renee Telona	
	17		Kaylyn Krael	
	18	1 1 1 3	Pomaika'ilani Miner	
	19		Rickey Kamai	
	20	ľ	Rusty Ko Kamai	
	21		Haunani Apoliana	
	22		Michael Daly	
	23		Juewels Ioka	
	24	4	Laverne Fernandes Moore	
$\overline{}$	25		Kaonani Malama	
_				

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Okay, this 3 meeting of the subcommittee of the Hawaii State 4 Advisory Committee to the US Commission on Civil 5 Rights shall come to order. For the benefit of 6 those in the audience, I will introduce myself and 7 ask my colleagues to introduce themselves, and I 8 will start after I introduce myself on my left here. 9 I am Michael A. Lily. I am the chairperson of the 10 Hawaii Advisory Committee, and I will start with Tom 11 McDonald, if you would please introduce yourself? BOARD MEMBER MCDONALD: 12 Tom McDonald. HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: And Ruby 13 Johnson? 14 15 BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON: Ruby Johnson. 16 BOARD MEMBER CHAR: Vernon Char. 17 BOARD MEMBER BARBEE-WOOTEN: Daphne 18 Barbee-Wooten. 19 BOARD MEMBER AGBAYANI: Amy Aqbayani. 20 BOARD MEMBER FUJIMORI: Michelle Nalani 21 Fujimori. 22 BOARD MEMBER BURGESS: Bill Burgess. 23 BOARD MEMBER KUROIWA: Jimmy Kuroiwa. 24 BOARD MEMBER SULLIVAN: Paul Sullivan. 25 HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Also present are

Barbara de la Viez. She is in the back, so if you have any questions at any time, talk with Barbara de la Viez or also with Angie Trevino or Derek Horne, all in the back. They are support staff provided by the US Commission on Civil Rights, and we appreciate the financial and staff assistance that the commission has provided to this committee.

2.2

The Commission on Civil Rights is an independent bipartisan agency of the Federal government charged with studying discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, age, disability or national origin, or administration of justice, and in each of the fifty states, an advisory committee such as ours has been established, and they are made up of responsible volunteers who serve without compensation to advise the commission on relevant information concerning their respective states.

Today we are here to conduct an open session to gather public input on the proposed legislation currently pending before Congress, the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act of 2007 also popularly known as the Akaka Bill. As most residents of Hawaii are aware, there is significant controversy surrounding this topic. In

order to gather as much input as possible about it, the members of this committee have conducted two briefings first on August 20 and another last week on September 5. We also held an open session on August 20 and another open public session on Maui on August 22.

(Discussion off the record re sound system.)

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Okay, so this is our third open session, and we will have two more on the neighboring islands. During the open session on August 20, we received several hours of public comment in this room, and it was standing room only indicating a significant community interest in the topic, and since one of our charters is to educate the public on the issues of civil rights issues, we are certainly fulfilling that part of our charter in conducting these sessions.

Tomorrow we will meet from twelve-thirty to four-thirty at the State office building conference room A, B, and C located at 75 Aukuni Street in Hilo, and the next day Friday we will meet from one to five at the Kauai Community College Performing Arts Center located at 3-1901 Kaumualii Highway, Lihue. Members of the public wishing to

make a statement at any open session can sign up when they attend.

I want to remind everyone present of the ground rules. This a public hearing, a meeting, open to the public and the media. We have a public stenographer who is taking down the proceedings, and we haven't actually set the time yet. I am going to stop at this point, and the suggestion is -- I am addressing the committee members -- is that because of the number of people here that we allot five minutes a speaker. Any other thoughts on that? If that's okay, five minutes?

BOARD MEMBER BARBEE-WOOTEN: I'm not sure. I think that we could allow a little bit of leeway.

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Well, what I am going to do is we will decide on the amount of time, but because of the number of speakers, the committee was thinking that afterwards those speakers who are willing to entertain questions after all the speakers have given their presentation, those willing to entertain questions to clarify their presentation from the committee, we would be willing to ask some questions of those presented. Would that be okay, Daphne, from your viewpoint?

1 BOARD MEMBER BARBEE-WOOTEN: Well, it's 2 just that I know that we have considerably less than 3 the last time, and the last time we limited them to five minutes --4 5 HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Three. 6 BOARD MEMBER BARBEE-WOOTEN: Okav. 7 HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: We are almost 8 doubling it. 9 BOARD MEMBER BARBEE-WOOTEN: Okay, but I 10 still feel that if someone has a pressing point, I 11 don't think we should cut them off --HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: I won't push it 12 too hard. 13 14 BOARD MEMBER BARBEE-WOOTEN: -- but I 15 don't think that we should go half-an-hour. 16 HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: I won't push it 17 too hard, so if there is no objection, we will have 18 five minutes, and if it takes us a little bit longer after that, I will let you know when five minutes is 19 20 up, and then you can wrap it up if you have a few 21 more comments to make. And those that are willing 22 afterwards to stay and entertain questions from the committee, if there's time, some of the committee 23 members would like that. 24 Bill? 25 BOARD MEMBER BURGESS: I would think

that if there is time enough for questions to not 1 2 wait until the end because you have forgotten or 3 maybe the speaker has forgotten what he has said. HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Write it down 4 5 because there are some people here, if we start 6 entertaining questions of every speaker in order, 7 some people are going to get discouraged and may 8 I mean, I want everybody who is here to be 9 able to make their presentation. Otherwise, it may take a long time for some people to be able to 10 11 speak. BOARD MEMBER BURGESS: Give and take is 12 13 valuable. 14 HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: I agree. 15 BOARD MEMBER BURGESS: It's happened at 16 previous meetings. 17 HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Take notes. 18 BOARD MEMBER BURGESS: I think it's a 19 good one. 20 HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Okay. BOARD MEMBER BURGESS: 21 Not taking notes. 22 Give and take, talking back and forth is helpful. 23 won't press the point. HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: 24 Okay, I'd like 25 that, but let's do it at the end.

1 2

We have a very full schedule, not as full as it has been, so we are going to try and adhere somewhat to the time schedules. I want to make sure that everybody has a chance to speak. My goal and one that I believe is shared by the committee is to insure that we have as broad a representation as possible from Hawaii's citizens on issues that come before us. All issues that do come before us are important, and we value the input from speakers and members of the public as well as from committee members.

I emphasize that this is a briefing -not a briefing. This is actually an open session.

It is not an adversarial proceeding. People have
strong views pro and con on this and other subjects.

I was gratified that at our last public session
hearing, even though it was standing room only, all
participants maintained a professional decorum while
views were being presented, even though it might
have been opposed to what some people felt.

Regardless of their views, every member of the public has a right to express themselves on issues coming before us. I ask that you address the issues, the merits of the Akaka Bill, that you be judicious in your statements, that no defamatory,

scurrilous, or personally derogatory material be presented. If it is, don't be offended if I ask you to please stop it, and let's get back on topic. I ask that everyone give due respect to each speaker and members of this committee to maintain the dignity of this proceeding as if you were in a court of law or before a government agency, Congress, or whatever. Please do not express audible or physical reactions or outbursts of emotions during these proceedings, and if at any time such conduct occurs, I will bring the room to order.

So without further ado, we will take the first speaker. I don't have the list. I think it is David Rosen. David Rosen, welcome.

MR. ROSEN: Thank you very much, members of the committee, and thank you very much for serving in this very important capacity. I know it hasn't been easy with the media criticism, but I think that it is important to note that the committee is represented by, I think, the community at large. There are members of every ethnic group in Hawaii on the committee. There are women and men, there are young people and old people.

This is an issue that I think that all of the people testifying before you have very strong

feelings about, but for the most part, I think those are honest feelings, and they come from concern, they come from fear, they come from anger in many situations, and I think that they are all equally important, but I think the committee needs to put behind it these emotions and look more towards the future, and I hope that the people who are testifying will do likewise.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

What is it that we see for our State and our people? Do we see them being divided into different ethnic groups, or do we see them being united and having equal rights irrespective of their ancestry and ethnicity? There was, you know, an editorial in today's paper where somebody raised the issue of are we going to look at two babies who are born today in a hospital and look at them differently because of their ancestry and ethnicity, or are they going to have equal rights and equal opportunities? I think that that's a very important thing for the committee to keep in mind, where do we see our State heading? And if it says two different groups, I think it's critical that we have a vote, that there be a public vote to decide whether or not we as a people decide that that's where we want to see our State heading.

Our country has already been through a civil war where the country divided over an issue involving race, and I would hate to see our State go through a similar situation. It's already started. It's been brewing. We need to have a resolution of this issue one way or the other. It can't continue to go on.

If the Akaka Bill is passed, we have started down one path. I think it's very important that a vote be held on the Akaka Bill, that this committee make a recommendation, that our people be allowed to vote on this and voice their own opinion as to in which direction we see our State heading.

I have submitted written testimony and in it identified a list of questions that I personally have about the Akaka Bill and about what path it would lead us down. I think that those questions need to be answered, and I don't think that public opinion polls one way or the other at this point are going to give the committee an accurate view of how people in this State feel, because I don't think that people in this State understand the path that the Akaka Bill would lead us down. They don't understand the economic and social implications, the issues involving

representation, and who would be a part of this new entity?

And they don't understand these issues, not because there hasn't been education on the Akaka Bill, but because the Akaka Bill doesn't address any of these issues with any specificity. It leaves all of them open. It asks us to vote to head down this path not knowing exactly where it's going to lead us, what it's going to cost us, what it will do to our State, what it will do to Hawaiians and the different segments of the Hawaiian community and how it's going to affect non-Hawaiians.

We are at a junction in our State's history, and those in the future will look critically back, I think, at the work of this committee and Congress as it considers this issue. I think the committee is not in a position at this point in time to decide one way or the other on whether or not it can support the Akaka Bill. I don't think there's enough information, and because there's not enough information, I think it's the committee's job to ask the hard questions, to demand answers, and until it has those answers and until it is confident that the community at large understands where we are going, its recommendation must be

against a vote and approval of the Akaka Bill at this time.

History teaches us in example after
example, Hutu, Tutsi, Muslim, Hindu, Turk, Armenian,
Germans and Jews, Jews and Arabs, that when you
create racial divides what you create is conflict.
You create a situation that is artificial and that
pits one group against another. Are we ready to do
that in Hawaii? Hawaiian versus non-Hawaiian? Are
we prepared to create a divide in our community, and
then let the chips fall where they may? Let those
groups fight it out, argue in the courts, argue in
the legislature, argue in Congress, argue in their
communities over the next decade, two decades,
century to resolve these issues?

I am born and raised in Hawaii. Hawaii is my home, and I have no other. While others may define me as they will, I consider myself a Hawaiian. I consider that I have a vested interest in the outcome of what's going to happen here both for myself and for my children and their children, and I would hope that the committee in furthering its goal of creating a situation where there is not discrimination would consider these issues and ask the hard questions. As I have said, I have

1	submitted written testimony with the list of those
2	questions, and I hope the committee will consider
3	them. Thank you.
4	HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Mr. Rosen, we
5	may have questions for you afterwards. Are you
6	willing to stick around?
7	MR. ROSEN: I will be around when the
8	committee finishes, yes.
9	HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Because there
10	are not too many speakers. Thank you.
11	MR. ROSEN: Thank you very much.
12	MR. KEKOA: I would like to speak.
13	HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: I am calling
14	Thurston Twigg-Smith as the next person to speak.
15	Have you registered?
16	MR. KEKOA: Yes.
17	HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Have you signed
18	up, sir?
19	MR. KEKOA: Yes.
20	HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Okay, you are
21	Mr. Kekoa?
22	MR. KEKOA: Yes.
23	HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Okay, I will get
24	to you.
25	Mr. Twigg-Smith was to be a speaker at a

presentation on September 5th before this committee. Unfortunately, he was unavoidably detained by a forest fire on the mainland?

MR. TWIGG-SMITH: Yes.

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: So,

Mr. Twigg-Smith, welcome back, and I'm glad to see you are healthy and none the worse for wear.

MR. TWIGG-SMITH: I am happy to be out of it, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak here. I am speaking in opposition of the Akaka Bill. My name is Thurston Twigg-Smith, and I was publisher of the Advertiser for about thirty years and in just about one hundred years after the revolution that brings us all here today together. I am a fifth generation member of my family to be a resident of Hawaii, the first three generations of whom were subjects of the Kingdom, fluent in Hawaiian language, and at the request of the kings advisors to seven monarchs.

I am the author of Hawaiian Sovereignty,
Do the Facts Matter, a history of the 1893
revolution, the creation of the Republic of Hawaii,
and its annexation to the United States five years
later.

In my opinion, passage of the Akaka Bill

would be the biggest threat since the Civil War to
the bonds that have held our United States together
because the bill would reintroduce race as a
divisive factor in our lives. Bypassing every
standard requirement for the recognition of Indian
tribes as sovereign nations, Congress would be
setting a precedent that could open the door for the
Latino residents of the former Republics of Texas
and California to seek similar recognition.
Residents of New Mexico and Arizona could well
follow. It could balkanize our nation.

A brief review of Hawaiian history during the transitional years of the 1890s makes clear that Native Hawaiians were not members of a tribe that ruled the islands or any part of them, nor were they ever treated differently than others. As individuals, they were indigenous in a political sense to the Republic, and like Latinos in the southwestern states, their former government, its lands and their previous loyalties did not pass directly from their own control or through their earlier nation to the United States. It was the Republic that was annexed, not the individuals.

Hawaiians, whose Kingdom ceased to be a recognized nation after the 1893 revolution, became

citizens or residents of the Republic of Hawaii after annexation. The Republic was recognized worldwide as an independent nation. It survived a counter-revolution in 1895 by supporters of the former queen and remained independent for over four years. Its legislature included many Native Hawaiians. Its Senate voted unanimously for annexation.

1.6

1.7

Its House, with a Hawaiian majority, was not required to vote on that matter, but the speaker of the House, a full blooded Hawaiian and confidant to past royalty, commented that as annexation was enacted, that it was, quote, the best thing that could happen for Hawaii, both for the native and foreign population. I rejoice heartily that it has come, unquote. All Native Hawaiians became US citizens when annexation was confirmed.

Debts of the Kingdom, taken over by the Republic, were in turn taken over by the United States, and the annexation document directed that proceeds of the former Kingdom and the Republic government lands be held in trust by the United States with those proceeds to be used by the new territory of Hawaii only for educational and other public purposes.

The Admissions Act for statehood in 1959 returned those same government lands to the new State and directed the proceeds now be used only in five areas, one of which was the betterment of the conditions of Native Hawaiians as defined in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920. The term Native Hawaiian was described as a person with at

least 50 percent native blood.

Significantly, in the intervening years proceeds were used by the State for these purposes until OHA was created in the late 1970's. Since then, one fifth, 20 percent, has been held by OHA with hardly any distributions helpful to Native Hawaiians with 50 percent native blood. Some 350 million dollars has been accumulated by OHA and used in large part for other purposes, including untold millions for lobbying for the passage of the Akaka Bill. At the same time, hundreds of millions of dollars in special bills passed in Congress have been earmarked only for persons with nothing more than a drop of Hawaiian blood.

Justification for this flood of race based bills is the assertion that the Hawaiians are at the lower end of the stick in all measures of social welfare. If that is true, they would qualify

for these government funds without the funds being 1 ear marked for one race only and thus violating the 2 civil and constitutional rights of all other 3 4 Americans. 5 The US Supreme Court in Rice versus 6 Cayetano ruled that Native Hawaiian and Hawaiian are 7 racial terms, not political. The Akaka Bill is full 8 of efforts to get around this. The result is a race based bill that will raise havoc in Hawaii and our 9 10 nation. Please help us to kill it. 11 HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Thank you, Mr. Twigg-Smith. Are you willing to stick around 12 and entertain questions at the end? 13 MR. TWIGG-SMITH: 14 Yes. 15

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Thank you.

Mr. Kevin O'Grady.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. O'GRADY: Good afternoon, members of the subcommittee. My name is Kevin O'Grady, and I testify today on behalf of myself only. The views I express are mine and may not necessarily belong to any agency with which I am affiliated.

I am here to speak in opposition to the Akaka Bill. I believe there are numerous reasons why the Akaka Bill is likely unconstitutional and also will have severely detrimental effects on the

people of the State of Hawaii.

The Akaka Bill proposes to set the groundwork so that an indigenous Hawaiian governing entity may come into existence, be recognized by the federal government, and then may negotiate to ascertain the entity's powers. I understand, and I don't claim to be an expert on the Akaka Bill, but I understand that the Akaka Bill proposes to recognize an indigenous Hawaiian entity similar to Indian tribes on the mainland, and thus Congressional authority to do this stems from the Interstate Commerce Clause which addresses Indian tribes.

I also understand that Senator Inouye has also stated that the Akaka Bill has nothing to do with Federal Indian law, and that Federal Indian law would not apply. If the latter is true, then Congress has no authority to pass the Akaka Bill because Congress has specific, enumerated, and limited powers, and the actions contemplated in the Akaka Bill are not within Congress' power, and besides, the essence of the bill was to create a government within the State of Hawaii, and it also creates benefits for people of one ethnicity in violation of the equal protection clause.

If, however, the former is true that the

Akaka Bill relies on Congress' power to handle
Indian affairs, there are still problems. Federal
Indian law has its basis both in the Interstate
Commerce Clause and also federal case law, including
the Marshall trilogy. Congress' relationship with
Indian tribes is the recognition that tribes either
acquiesce to submersion within the United States
recognizing the benefit of their incorporation or
the United States' conquest of the tribes with the
same result.

1.0

2.0

In either case, tribes were
unassimilated tribal bodies which were indigenous in
nature and which were insular and discrete
communities of indigenous people that had also
maintained some semblance of governance at the time
of their federal recognition.

The history of Hawaii is dissimilar and inapposite to the application of Congressional power . in this regard. Hawaii had no unified government until Kamehameha, with the assistance of the British and Americans, unified the Island chain in 1810.

Almost immediately, the Kingdom of Hawaii was awash in nonindigenous Hawaiians, mostly Europeans and Americans, who through successive constitutions stripped the monarchy of power while adding power to

an elected parliament. If there ever was an indigenous Hawaiian governing entity, it quickly disappeared. In fact, in 1843, the Kingdom of indigenous and nonindigenous Hawaiians was taken over without a shot being fired, Kamehameha III surrounding to the captain of a British ship.

It should also be noted that unlike

Indian tribes that remain separate and apart from

settlers on the mainland, in Hawaii interracial

marriage has been and continues to be prevalent.

The Hawaiian Islands have also enjoyed assimilation

from the time of their discovery by Captain Cooke,

thus even before the overthrow by the businessmen

in 1893, there was no discrete, insular,

unassimilated indigenous Hawaiian governing entity.

Even if there were, the overthrow broke any change

that existed.

For five years, approximately, the
Republic of Hawaii existed, and there wasn't even an
indigenous Hawaiian figure head monarch in charge of
the government. Even before this point, Congress
had no authority to recognize the tribal Hawaiian
government, and assimilation has continued and
progressed for the better, I think, to the extent
that there is no way that it can be argued that

Congress has that authority now.

Some may point to the Hawaiian Homelands
Act and other expenditures of money ostensibly for
ethnic Hawaiians as proof that Congress has such
authority or that those acts implicitly recognize
indigenous Hawaiians as a Federal Indian tribe.
Federal recognition is not dependent on
expenditures, and there is nothing to indicate that
even the Hawaiian Homelands Act does not run afoul
of the equal protection clause under current US
Supreme Court interpretation.

Even assuming that somehow the Akaka
Bill is constitutional and Congress has the
authority to perform those actions contained in the
bill, its potential passage is fraught with
difficulties. I should note that if Federal Indian
law does not apply, there are too many difficulties
to discuss here. I will assume that if it passed,
Federal Indian law would apply.

Indian tribes typically have a reservation of land held by the Federal government so that members of the tribe may reside upon the land. This was usually accomplished due to by treaty or executive order. Here there is neither. The first problem would be deciding what land base

constitutes the land for the yet to come indigenous Hawaiian governing entity. With the scarcity of land here, the battle would be enormous. Would Hawaiians, that is, citizens of the State of Hawaii, lose some State and natural preserves so that the indigenous Hawaiian governing entity gets a land base, or would be the military be forced to give up land or private landowners? No matter who gives up the land, where would it be?

1.8

I also note jurisdiction on Indian reservations especially problematic. Indian tribes do not have criminal jurisdiction over non-Indians ever. Part of this is a Supreme Court recognition that the United States Constitution and state constitutions occurred after the existence of any particular given Indian tribe and, therefore, do not apply on the reservation. Thus, there are no Federal or State constitutional protections.

An Indian may choose to enroll in a tribe and get the racial preferences and government money that accompanies that status, and in so choosing, apparently gives up those Federal and State protections in tribal court. A non-Indian does not give up those rights. Civil jurisdiction only lies over a non-Indian if the non-Indian agrees

1 2

2.2

in a business transaction or interferes with purely tribal governmental matters.

The question then arises what no man's land would spring into existence? Jurisdiction aside, the next entity would require money from taxpayers and/or landowners to provide for this tribal government, but to what end? Indigenous Hawaiians have an equal vote in the State and Federal processes now and have services provided for by local and national governmental agencies. An indigenous Hawaiian entity would only duplicate those services and would cost more as indigenous Hawaiians could receive the services from the tribe or the State while nonindigenous Hawaiians could

only receive from the State. So in addition to

being unduly expensive, it is discriminatory.

Finally, the effect of such an entity coming into existence, since none exists now to recognize, would be to separate us as Hawaiians and Americans by ethnicity which might be measured in as little as a drop of blood. Since additional monies would be available as well as voting rights, et cetera, indigenous Hawaiians would be separate and unequal, gaining privilege and money for merely existing. In America, one does not acquire rights

or money because of one's ethnicity. Rather, one's family, life, and individual choices influence their lives and their money, and we are all guaranteed the same rights.

2.0

The passage of the Akaka Bill would turn American equality on its head and would divide us as a state and a people. I believe the Akaka Bill is probably unconstitutional and fraught with problems and is extremely unwise to pass.

A final note, several weeks ago, a group calling themselves the reinstated Kingdom of Hawaii temporarily took over for a weekend the Waimanalo Beach Park on the windward side of the island. I noticed that it did not make much news. This is without the Akaka Bill having been passed or any other ammunition being provided to individuals who would like to take the Akaka Bill and just proceed a lot farther than it was originally intended.

Thank you.

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Thank you. Now, are you willing to stay around for questions? We have two more speakers.

MR. O'GRADY: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER BARBEE-WOOTEN: We have many more.

1 HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: I beg your 2 pardon? 3 BOARD MEMBER BARBEE-WOOTEN: We have 4 many more. 5 HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Okay, I have two 6 on here. Anyway, Su Yates? 7 MS. YATES: Good afternoon, I appreciate 8 the opportunity to speak. I have a lot to say, so I 9 am going to talk fast. I only have five minutes. Ι 10 just wanted to give you a context of who I am. 11 grew up in Buffalo, New York, in an upper middle 12 class, staunch Republican, Leave It to Beaver 13 household, and so I am very familiar with the mind 14 set that informs a lot of the opinions behind this 15 issue. 16 While my mother was becoming Republican, 17 my father became a well-known civil rights activist 18 who offered his life up to go down south to help 19 black tenant farmers register to vote. He put his 20 life on the line every day for civil rights as a 21 freedom rider as well. Along the way, he married a 22 woman, a black woman from Louisiana, also a civil 23 rights activist. My stepmother and my father both 24 cried when they heard how the US Civil Rights 25 Commission is now being used to dismantle the very

reason it was established.

I would like to remind the community that you do have a legacy to uphold, that you do have a responsibility to many people who struggled for the Commission of the Civil Rights to be formed in 1964. Please do not forget their sacrifices and do not be limited to just one political agenda.

In the meantime, I have worked for senators, governors, Time Magazine, Gannett

Newspapers, all of which to let you know I am savvy about the political process. I have worked on

Capitol Hill. I moved to Hawaii to go to the

University of Hawaii to attain my master's degree in public health, and I am also very familiar with a number of East Coast Indian tribes on a very close level, so I know personally that a number of the claims being made are false because I know from experience otherwise.

I also have a fourteen year old part

Hawaiian son. I am very proud as a mother that he
has a heritage of Hawaiian background, but I also
grieve as a mother for the loss of their heritage.

His family, once a proud high ranking Hawaiian
family, is reduced to fighting over the scraps left
them, which for years has been happening to all

1 | Hawaiians.

1.8

Last but not least, I am the director of a nonprofit organization which conducts research and education, however, I haven't been given twenty minutes like Mr. Clegg, and my public health background as a researcher dictates, we always say, like mantra of Jerry Maguire show me the money, we always say show me the data. A political scientist would say show me the back up, show me the documentation.

On a lot of the claims being made, there is no back up being offered, there is no documentation being offered, and I would like to reverse some of that in the little bit of time that I have left. So everything should be backed up, and also as a researcher, you should cite your source of funding.

I would just like to take a moment to say that Mr. Clegg is the president of an equal opportunity center. Anybody can name anything they want. He should have disclosed the fact that it is a well known neo conservative think tank in the capitol beltway which receives money from neo conservative sources, so obviously he is biased. He admitted he has no background in Hawaiian matters,

so I believe his testimony was irrelevant and should be discredited. 2 However, he is an affirmative action 3 expert, and one wonders what does that have to do 4 5 with this? Well, let's be very clear. What's happening is that the far right republicans on the 6 7 mainland were ushered into office about twelve years ago on the premise of dismantling affirmative action 8 9 because many white Americans on the mainland do not 10 like it. Hawaii has become a test case, and they are using this committee and this commission and 11 12 members of this committee to further their own 13 aqenda. They know nothing about Hawaii, and they care nothing about Hawaii, and, in fact, they will 14 not care about you once this issue is resolved and 15 16 they have moved on. That is the way politics works. 17 In the meantime, you are fermenting 18 division among your neighbors which whom you have to live long --19 20 HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Ms. Yates, do 21 you have comments on the Akaka Bill? 22 Yes, I am getting there. MS. YATES: HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: We would like to 23 24 hear. I am getting right to the 25 MS. YATES:

fundamentals.

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: We would like to hear about your comments on the Akaka Bill.

MS. YATES: That's all germane.

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Well --

MS. YATES: I am also of Irish background, and my ancestors chose to come here, and unlike what has been claimed against the Akaka Bill, that everybody has had hard times, people who chose to come here do not have the same -- are not in the same category as people who were either forced to come here or who were already here and they were forced to receive people. So that's a very important point, I think a fundamental difference.

I would like to address a couple of fundamentals because I think they have been overlooked in all of the rooorahrah here, and what we have here is Hawaiians, basically, they would be racially segregation if -- racially segregated if the Akaka Bill is passed, and I would like to say right here we should examine the fact that Hawaiians are not a race, so a lot of legal issues are moot for that reason. In fact, sociologists and anthropologists are still debating what defines a race. So once this commission can define to me what

is a race, then I think you should be able to proceed with lawsuits, but not until then. In fact, the irony is that Hawaiians are the most racially diverse group in the world, so if you benefit Hawaiians, you benefit all races.

And last, the terrible irony of all this is that all of this is the result of racism of which Hawaiians are the victims, and you have the audacity to accuse them of being racist for pursuing some redress for the effects of past discrimination.

Secondly, I would like to take up the word tribe because that has been used quite a bit. That is like semantic foreplay. The question of where you were born, what word do you use? An African person does not describe his tribal members by using the word tribe. He would use a swahili word. Same with any other language. So that word, that's really kind of a moot point, the question of where you were born.

But what I have learned to think is important is the meaning behind the word, and the meaning as defined in the dictionary is a tribe is a group of people connected by common ancestry, culture, social customs, and usually the same political systems, much like the ancient Jewish

nation was comprised of twelve tribes. Tribe is also defined as a social group comprising numerous families, clans, or generations. Synonyms for tribe from the Websters dictionary: Folk, kin, kin group, kindred, kinship group. Definition of ohana:

Family, relative, kin group, related. They are all the same things. We should move on past that issue because it is moot.

2.2

I want to briefly address Hawaiians are indeed qualifying to become federally recognized tribes. They have satisfied the seven criteria.

I do not have the time I hoped, but they have formed a distinct community from antiquity until now.

Hawaii is the most geographically isolated place in the world, so obviously that qualifies them as a distinct community, and they are still here.

They have maintained political influence or authority over their members as an autonomous entity from historical times to present. They had a clearly defined chief system and then a monarchy. The fact they do not have that political system, the same system right now is what's the point of dispute, and obviously, they are still politically influenced because they are here.

I would like to close with affirmative

action as defined by the US Government refers to policies intended to promote access to education, employment, or housing. It has nothing to do with native rights and if the motivation was to address the effects of past discrimination. None of the legal milestones for affirmative action have ever been related to anything that is native rights, which is what the Akaka Bill addresses.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And whether you are a widely scattered group of people or not, it does not matter. I know Mohicans in Florida, Waggonage (phonetic), I know a lot of tribal members. Wisconsin. They do not have to live there, and I would like to say this. Of the 562 federally recognized Native American entities in the United States, they have resolved a lot of the issues that are being whipped up here for public hysteria. They have done a great job, and we can do a great job, and they have addressed the issue of people who have not lived here for a while, so we have a lot of models to choose from.

I think that there is a lot of hysteria and misinformation being whipped up at the perception of lost. You have not lost anything yet. It is merely the hint of that you might lose

something in the future that is the basis for all of this anti-Akaka Bill action, just the merest perception of loss, and yet you would tell the people who have lost so much, their own lands, their own culture, their own government, almost their own language and everything else, you would tell them that they do not have the right to pursue redress for past discriminations for their losses, and yet you have not even lost anything yet.

If the Akaka Bill ever gets passed, then you have a leg to stand op, but right now, this is all supposition, and it is divisive. The Akaka Bill is not divisive. It is already divisive here, and it needs to come to an end because we have much bigger issues facing us where we all need to come together to save this place because it's not going to matter your nationality pretty soon. We have much bigger overriding issues, and we need to work together to address those issues.

So as a person of good conscience, as a person representing many Americans who feel the same way that I do, because I speak across the mainland as well, I tell you that it is morally wrong, I believe and they do, to oppose the Akaka Bill, for this committee to be used the way that it is being

used, and it is not -- it is morally bankrupt, and it is just not right, but let's move on. Let's get it resolved, let's do the right thing, let's make it pono, and let's work together because we will need to in the future. Thank you. HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Thank you, Kaleolani Kekoa, and I have seven more Ms. Yates. after Mr. Kekoa. Ms. Yates, are you going to be around for questioning afterwards? MS. YATES: Yes. HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Okay. Well, you is. It's a growing list. Mr. Kekoa?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

know, it may be more than seven, whatever the list

My name is Kaleolani Kekoa, MR. KEKOA: and I came here by myself. I am here to testify. Ι wrote this short notice. It says I am a Native American. I am the root cause of this legislation, the Akaka Bill. I am currently rebelling against the County, State, and Federal governments to bring to pass the final passage of this bill. declare independence from the United States of America because I am not an American. I am a Hawaiian national, which goes to show that if you want to dissent and if you want your voice to be

heard, right now is the time.

I just want everybody to know that I am the root cause of the dissent in this community because I am not an American. I am a Hawaiian national, and that I support a Native Hawaiian Constitution or a Hawaiian Constitution that we used to have before the overthrow, and I just feel so sad about, you know, what happened to Queen Liliuokalani. Aloha.

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Thank you. Chen Wei-Yuan?

I am going to mispronounce things because of the way things were written on here. I think a doctor wrote this, so I'm sorry if I mispronounce your name.

MR. WEI-YUAN: It's Chen Wei-Yuan. I just want to make one point. Hawaiian is the nationality, and the Hawaii nation was multi-racial of which Native Hawaiians was just one of many. A case in point. At Mana ala, three ethnic haoles with no cocoa are interred there along with the Hawaiian royalty. First, it was the grandfather of Queen Emma, John Young; secondly, the prince consulate of Hawaii, Charles V. Bishop; and the third, Robert Wiley, a native of Scotland who for

forty years guided the foreign policy of the Hawaiian nation. They are Hawaiian. Furthermore, the co-founder of Halekulani Hotel, ethnically white so we call them haole, spoke fluent Hawaiian, and she was very loud when she protested against politicians at the time.

2.0

2.2

But most important, I hold this document before you. Let me read it to you. Government of the Hawaiian Islands. The undersigned are native of China lately residing in Oahu, Hawaiian Islands, being duly sworn upon the holy evangelist, upon his oath declares that he will support the Constitution and the laws of the Hawaiian Islands and bear allegiance to her majesty, Queen Liliuokalani, signed by Mr. Hassenger. This is my grandfather's naturalization certificate. I am proud to be Hawaiian.

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Thank you, sir.
Marian Grey?

MS. GREY: Thank you. After listening to the people before me, I really don't have a whole lot to say. I am here to express my feelings that any bill that is written that will divide us by race is wrong. I am opposed to the Akaka Bill and anything like it. We are one country, and we should

not be divided, and I hope you will take that into consideration when you make your recommendations. Thank you very much.

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Thank you,

Ms. Grey. We have a Deanna Espinas, Espinas? Hard
to read this.

MS. ESPINAS: Good afternoon. My name is Deanna Espinas, and I am here as a private citizen but also as a member of Hawaii's society. I am a member of various organizations, among them the Rice Plantation Committee. We believe in capturing the history of Hawaii's people because all of them have brought meaning and purpose to Hawaii's society today.

I also feel that my role in society, I have worked with the Department of Public Safety where I see a number of disenfranchised citizens of Hawaii, men and women. Many of them are part Hawaiian, pure Hawaiian, part Filipino. This Akaka Bill is needed in order to empower and enfranchise and marginalize, not to marginalize the minority of native people, but to give them their rights again. We need to focus on self-determination, self-governance, and federal recognition of Native Hawaiian sovereignty. All of Hawaii's people

benefit if this committee takes its responsibility seriously and goes forward in support of the Akaka Bill. Thank you.

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Thank you. I am not sure how this is pronounced but Iokoda Alii
Baker? Pau, gone? Charlene Cuaresma?

MS. CUARESMA: Thank you. My name is Charlene Cuaresma. I serve as the President of the Filipino Coalition for Solidarity. Since its inception in 2001, more than 45 Filipino community leaders representing various organizations have joined forces to work for equity and justice to empower our diverse Filipino communities to make socially responsible contributions to Hawaii and our global neighbors.

I am speaking today as an individual to strongly and proudly support the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act of 2007 which would provide Federal recognition to Native Hawaiians for self-determination, self-governance, and parities in Federal policies as do Native Americans, American Indians, and Native Alaskans.

I thank you for the opportunity to provide this statement of support for this far reaching and long overdue law, but I would also like

to offer feedback on the commission's public hearing process. I believe it is important for this commission to establish credibility with the community by insuring that ample time is allowed for public preparation, to submit comments, especially from our limited English proficient communities.

It is also discouraging that at the previous hearing, as important as this was, that this was scheduled at a time when key commissioners and others were out of town or unable to attend. The reorganization of the commission state advisory council and new direction of civil rights seems to be undermining the intent of safeguarding marginalized groups and indigenous peoples in America from constitutional discrimination. I appreciate this chance to present my strong support of not only this bill, but also of an accessible commission that fosters a climate of trust and good will. Thank you very much.

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: OHA Trustee Oswald Stender, welcome.

MR. STENDER: Mr. Chairman and committee members, my name is Oswald Stender, and I am a Native Hawaiian. I currently serve as a trustee of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs. For Mr. Rosen's

benefit and those of you on the committee who don't know, I am also a graduate of the Kamehameha Schools.

At your hearing of August 20th, I presented the statement which I have attached to this statement for the record. In that statement, I expressed my concern that the US Commission on Civil Rights manipulated the selection of members appointed to the Hawaii State Advisory Committee and stacked the committee with individuals who are currently engaged in court cases challenging programs that benefit Hawaiians. These same people oppose the Akaka Bill.

Once these appointments were made, the US Commission on Civil Rights hastily called for hearings by the new Hawaii State Advisory Committee to address the proposed Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act of 2007, better known as the Akaka Bill. The commission went so far as to dispatch Mr. Gerald Reynolds, chairman of the commission, to attend the hearings in Hawaii to pronounce that these hearings have no bearing on the fact that the commission has already taken a position on the matter.

These hearings then and the opinions

expressed here will have no bearing on the decision that's already been made. If this is true, why bother to have these hearings? Having served on the Hawaii State committee for nearly twenty years, this is a most unusual chain of events for the commission.

2.

2.0

In my opinion, the only reason these hearings are being held by this stacked committee is because the commission wants to erase the stand that has already been taken by the committee's previous members. The previous committee supported the Akaka Bill after conducting an investigation that lasted several years and involved several community forums. The results of that comprehensive HSAC review are available in the HSAC written report on file with the commission.

I ask, again, I would like to know truthfully why Mr. Reynolds came all the way to Hawaii? David Shapiro noted in his Honolulu Advertiser column on August 29th that US Senators Akaka and Inouye, along with US Representatives Abercrombie and Hirono said, I quote, it would almost appear that the commission has its own agenda and its own timetable. I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Shapiro's statement and that the current

hearings are not an intellectually honest attempt to arrive at the facts but a political power play to find the most expedient path to a preconceived outcome for this matter.

This I believe has nothing to do with civil rights or justice. I would ask those of you who sit on this committee that have a direct conflict of interest regarding Hawaiian programs to declare your conflicts and do the honorable thing and recuse yourself of voting on this matter. Thank you.

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Thank you,
Mr. Stender. Dexter Kaiamo?

MR. KAIAMO: Hi, good afternoon,
Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the
commission. My name is Dexter Keelamoku Kaiamo. I
stand here before you today on the shoulders of my
kupuna who signed the Ku'e petitions which were
significant in the defeat of the treaty of the
annexation at that time.

I testify here today in opposition to the Akaka Bill, but for reasons vastly different than the reasons given by those like

Mr. Twigg-Smith. I wish to read portions of US

Public Law 103-150 into the record and then comment

1 | on

1.7

on them.

Whereas from 1826 until 1893, the United States recognized the independence of the Kingdom of Hawaii, extended full and complete diplomatic relations to the Hawaiian government and entered into treaties and conventions with the Hawaiian monarchs to govern commerce and navigation in 1826, 1842, 1849, 1875, and 1887.

Whereas in a message to Congress on

December 18, 1893, President Grover Cleveland

reported fully and accurately on the illegal acts of

the conspirators, described such act as an act of

war committed with the participation of a diplomatic

representative of the United States and without

authority of Congress, and acknowledged by such acts

the government of a peaceful and friendly people was

overthrown.

Whereas President Cleveland further concluded that a substantial wrong has thus been done, which a due regard for our national character as well as the rights of the injured people requires we should endeavor to repair and call for the restoration of the Hawaiian monarchy.

Whereas the indigenous Hawaiian people never directly relinquished their claims to their

Ralph Rosenberg Court Reporters, Inc. 2460 American Savings Bank, 1001 Bishop Street

Honolulu, Hawaii 96822 (808) 524-2090

2

1

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

inherent sovereignty as a people or over their national lands to the United States either through their monarchy or through a plebiscite or referendum. The Congress on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the illegal overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii on January 17th, 1893, acknowledges the historical significance of this event which resulted in the suppression of the inherent sovereignty of the Native Hawaiian people.

Mr. Chairman, I am here to question the authority of Congress, US Congress, as well as the authority of this commission to pass on the measure such as the Akaka Bill. As recognized by this Public Law 103-150, there were treaties that were in existence including the treaty of peace and friendship of 1849. That treaty guaranteed that the United States would treat the Kingdom of Hawaii with peace and amity or peace between nations. treaty was never terminated and is still in existence today, and as your own US Constitution states, the treaty is the supreme law of the land, therefore, it's my position that this Congress, the Akaka Bill, nor this commission has authority to pass the Akaka Bill.

I also would invoke or ask that this

commission enter into discussion and reinstate the call by President Grover Cleveland, in order to correct your national character, it requires that you should endeavor to repair and restore the Hawaiian monarchy. Thank you. HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Thank you, sir. Andre Perez? Andre Perez? Kelii Collier?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Andre is here.

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Okay, Mr. Andre

Perez?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PEREZ: Sorry about that. Aloha ino kakou.

> AUDIENCE: Aloha ino kakou.

MR. PEREZ: My name is Andre Perez, and I am here to speak on this issue of the Akaka Bill. I am here to tell you, Civil Rights Commission, that the issue of reconciliation between the United States and the Hawaiian people is not an issue of civil rights, and it is not an issue of race based programs. It is an issue of justice. Therefore, this issue is really not the right forum for you guys. We are not asking for civil rights. We are not asking to ride in the front of the bus. asking for our bus back. We are not asking to drink from the same water fountain. We are asking for our

| waterfalls back.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So this is not a civil rights issue.

This is an executive level issue nation to nation.

I don't think you have any authority to preside over this, but I would like to take the time to speak to my people who are in the crowd here in the hopes of sort of breaking some of these mental chains that have been placed on our brain tearing down some of this colonized forced assimilation mentality that us Hawaiians have been trained to believe.

I want to remind everyone that America was founded on some principles that were documented in their Declaration of Independence, and I want to read a few sentences from that. When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them a decent respect to the opinions of mankind, requires that they should declare the causes which compel them to the separation. We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, and among these are life,

liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

My pursuit of happiness is having the sovereignty of my country restored. I want to talk to the people in the crowd here and remind you folks about the Akaka Bill and what it would do. It would attempt to place us under the Department of Interior like Native American Indians, and I want to point out that the Department of Interior was sued by Native American Indians in a very high profile case called the Cobell case. I want to read to you what one judge wrote about the Department of Interior and how they treat Native American Indians.

He writes, after all of these years, our government still treats Native American Indians as if they are somehow less than deserving of the respect that should be afforded to everyone in society where all people are supposed to be equal. For those harboring hope that the stories of murder, dispossession, forced marches, assimilation policy programs, and other incidents merely echoes the horrible bigoted government past that has been sanitized by the good deeds of more recent history, this case serves as an appalling reminder of the evils of this result.

This is the judge talking about the

Department of Interior. The judge goes on to say that it is undeniable that the Interior has failed in its duties as a trustee delegate for Native Americans. It is, nevertheless, difficult to conjure a plausible hypothesis to explain Interior's default. Perhaps the Interior's past and present leaders have been evil people deriving their pleasure from inflicting harm on society's most vulnerable.

So we have to think about this before we voluntarily place ourselves under the Department of Interior. The judge says that negligence and incompetence in government are beyond judicial remedy, that bureaucratic recalcitrants have outpaced and rendered obsolete our bonded system of checks and balances, and that people are simply at the mercy of governmental whim with no chance of salvation.

We can't just go and dive into the Akaka Bill and throw ourselves on Uncle Sam's doorstep and think that it's going to give us justice. As George Helm said, we have got to do our homework. We have to understand the issue. I want to point out to our people here in the crowd a couple of very important things.

A very important national song written by our kupuna, Kaulana Napua, and I will say it, I will quote it in English, two verses that say no one will fix a signature to the paper of the enemy with its sin of annexation and sale of native civil rights. We do not value the government sums of money. We are satisfied with the stones, astonishing food of the land.

Have our Hawaiian people forgotten this manao from our kupunas as we sit here and beg the Civil Rights Commission to give us a couple of bones back after the United States has overthrown our country? We were once a free people. We come from a native -- not a native. We come from a sovereign national identity, a country just as legitimate as any country in the world at that time, but yet we seem to have abandoned that legacy, and now we just want to throw ourselves at the feet of Uncle Sam and ask him for some crumbs back. Where is our dignity? Where is our commitment to our aina, to our queen? Or have we become so assimilated that America is now inside our mind?

A lot of our people here are concerned about programs, programs, that we need Federal funding for our programs, and I say what about the

aina? What about our country? What about the dignity of our people?

In closing, I want to quote Puerto Rican independent poet Piri Thomas. He writes that there is no way that the United States can celebrate its bicentennial with an untroubled conscience while it continues to occupy our land. The only honest way that the United States can celebrate its anniversary of freedom and independence from England is by not standing in the way of our right to be free, the right to be free citizens, the right to independence and self-determination that the US won for itself at such great human sacrifice in 1776.

Hawaii must be free so that we can come into our own as a people, so that our children can be born into a free sovereign country, an unoccupied aina, a demilitarized aina. There is wisdom in our people. We are not cowards. We are not slovenly. We are not lazy. Our sons and daughters have died in many of America's wars for so-called other people's freedoms, yet us Hawaiians here in Hawaii are still waiting for justice, for the US to rectify the wrongs committed against our country and our people.

We are not slovenly or lazy or in a

state of apathy. We know our rights. We have reached a level of consciousness now where unlike in the '70's, we are no longer asking for access rights. We don't want Hawaiian rights. We want our land back. We want our sense of dignity and self-determination back, the ability to determine our future for ourselves.

The Akaka Bill has never been put forward to the people on a broad based level and allowed them education on what the bill has to offer and what it doesn't have to offer and then allowed a majority hearings or vote from the Hawaiian people. We have never had that. How can anybody in their right mind think to move forward on the Akaka Bill when you have not heard from the Hawaiian people? There has been only one hearing on one island. What about the other seven islands? I think it's a disgrace to American democracy and principles to try to force this bill through when there are Hawaiians here who are saying we have never had a voice in this. We have never had a choice.

I think the Office of Hawaiian Affairs has been misled and misguided and has put in so many millions and millions of dollars into forcing this bill forward when they have never taken the time to

find out if this is what their people want. The millions of dollars that have been spent on the Akaka Bill thus far by the Office of Hawaiian Affairs could have been put to good use by having state or island wide hearings to truly find out what Hawaiians want.

The truth is neither myself or any proponent of the Akaka Bill can truly say that this is what the Hawaiian people want because we have never been afforded a chance to vote, to say, hey, this is what we want. We can't even say that there's even half.

So I want to close in saying to the Civil Rights Commission, sorry, but this is not your kuleana. Go back to your bosses and tell them that we need to send somebody with more authority to provide the reconciliation.

And to my people here in the crowd, I want to say to you how many of you have read the bill? You say that people think that the bill is going to protect Kamehameha Schools, it is going to protect programs. Where does it say that in the bill? I have read it line by line. Where does it say that it is going to do anything for us? It is very clear in the bill what we can not do. They

tell us we can't have gambling. They tell us the 1 2 military has certain exemptions. It tells us that the US is indemnified. We can not sue them. 3 4 Well, what can we do with the Akaka 5 Bill? What will it give us? The right to 6 negotiate? Are we going to throw ourselves on the 7 doorstep of Uncle Sam for the right to negotiate? 8 HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Mr. Perez, I 9 have to ask you to wrap up. 10 MR. PEREZ: Thank you. Mahalo aloha. HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Kelii Collier, 11 is Kelii Collier here? 12 MR. COLLIER: Aloha mai kakou. 13 14 AUDIENCE: Aloha. 15 MR. COLLIER: I am Kelii Collier. 16 Before I begin, I would like to clearly and 17 definitely declare that I do not support the likes 18 of Grass Roots Institute, Aloha for All, Color Blind 19 America, The Heritage Foundation, and other groups 20 and organizations that promote racist ideologies 21 wrapped in assimilative and homogenous rhetoric. 22 To my fellow kanaka maoli who 23 ambitiously support this Akaka Bill, I know we are 24 all fighting against the same issues that face us 25 every day. They are not empty declarations of

suffering. They are very real. However, we have just chosen different ways in order to resist and eventually liberate ourselves from the oppression of a foreign nation and its culture. With that said, I have to respectfully disagree with you today on the Native Hawaiian Reorganization Act.

1.0

Now, to the advisory committee and the larger audience, I would like to address two major points tied to the Akaka Bill. There are, of course, much more than two, but time is limited. First, the Akaka Bill is symbolic of a sharp knife held in the hand of the Department of Interior that will slice open our lands, our skies, our oceans, our waters, and our people, and remove our na'au to make room for further military expansion, the same military that landed January 16th, 1893, and pointed there at the time high end weapons at the palace in a form of intimidation to our Queen and our Hawaiian Kingdom and all its people.

Remember, the term Hawaii comes from a mo'oku'auhau of language, and that language belongs to the Hawaiian people and the larger Pacific Polynesian, so this independent nation that we are talking about has been started by Native Hawaiians and during the 1800s open to all, open to all,

inclusive of everyone who wanted to become a

Hawaiian national regardless of ethnicity, so let's

get the two terms straight. Ethnicity, nationality,

very different.

I want to read and go back to, you know, my claim about how the Akaka Bill will open up further military expansion in Hawaii. I am quoting from the 2007 Akaka Bill, the most current one, section five, United States Office for Native Hawaiian Relations, a US Federal agency, section five A, establishment, there is established within the Office of the Secretary the United States office for a Native Hawaiian relations.

Within that section, I go to section five C, specifically addressing the Department of Defense. Applicability to Department of Defense. This section shall have no applicability to the Department of Defense or to any agency or component of the Department of Defense, but the secretary of defense may, key word may, designate one or more officials as liaison to the office. We already know the history of the US military in Hawaii and the Hawaiian Kingdom.

Next, section six, Native Hawaiian interagency coordinating group, section six B,

composition, the interagency coordinating group shall be composed of officials to be designated by the President. Another Federal agency, section six C one, in general, the Department of Interior shall serve as the lead agency of the interagency

1.7

coordinating group.

Section six E, again, applicability to
Department of Defense, this section shall have no
applicability to the Department of Defense or to any
agency or component of the Department of Defense,
but the secretary of defense may designate one or
more officials as liaison to the interagency
coordinating group. Again, calls for military
exemption and expansion. I mean, we are still
living with Makua, Kahoolawe, Waiahole, Mokapu,
Puuloa, Pohakuloa, Nohili. I mean, this is -- you
know, we don't have the time for that.

My second and final point, did the independent country of Hawaii ever legally cede itself to the United States? Does the Akaka Bill answer this question? We know about 1893, US Marines come on shore on January 16th in violation of international law and its own treaties with the Hawaiian Kingdom at the request of US Minister John L. Stevens, who was in collusion with Sanford B.

∥ Dole.

I read section two findings from the Akaka Bill, number four, under the treaty making power of the United States, Congress exercised its constitutional authority to confer treaties between the United States and the Kingdom of Hawaii, and from 1826 until 1893 the United States, A, recognized the sovereignty of the Kingdom of Hawaii; B, accorded full diplomatic recognition to the Kingdom of Hawaii; and C, entered into treaties and conventions with the Kingdom of Hawaii to govern commerce and navigation in 1826, 1842, 1849, 1875, and 1887. It's in the State archives.

Why does section two finally stop at 1893 as far as treaties between the two independent countries? Hawaii still maintained its recognized sovereignty when it was admitted into the family of nations through the Anglo-Franco proclamation on November 28th, 1843. La Kuokoa, the independent nation of Hawaii, the Hawaiian Kingdom's official independence day. It's at the State archives.

The government was in turmoil, and the landing of the US Marines made this an international issue, yes, but the independence of Hawaii remains in tact even to this day. Why? Because there has

never been a treaty of annexation, and the Akaka
Bill does not address this major issue and nor can
it.

The first and only attempt of such a treaty, which is the only way one country can absorb another, was in 1897. It was defeated by the US Senate because they could not get the two-third majority vote to ratify that said treaty because of the work of both native and non-Native Hawaiian nationals to what is commonly known today as the Ku'e petitions. Our kupuna refused to become a part of the United States, and we refuse to this day.

1898, President McKinley,
pro-annexationist, pro-imperialist, pro-American
empire, Spanish American War on the horizon, Hawaii
is needed for geopolitical and military purposes.
In violation of US Constitution law as well as
international law, a joint resolution designed to
circumvent the US Senate's authority illegally
annexes Hawaii.

That's like saying today that the US

Congress and Washington, DC, made some kind of law,
a bill, to make Iraq the 51st state. It just

doesn't work. Today we have CNN, we have Internet,
we have a really media saturated environment where

those kinds of things can't really happen because they are recorded so instantly. That's a violation of international law. The entire world community would be up in arms if they made Iraq the 51st state with a joint US resolution, which is also a violation of US constitutional law.

As a result of this historical, political, and legal fact of no treaty of annexation, US laws have no legal jurisdiction over the sovereign territories of Hawaii nor its citizens. It's a big lie. A historical, political, and legal mythology created to maintain the current illegal occupation of Hawaii and ongoing violations under the rules of occupation.

One of the major rules of occupation is to administer the laws of the occupied state. That means Hawaiian Kingdom law, not US domestic law. Therefore, the Civil Rights Commission and the advisory committee has no jurisdiction and should not even be hearing this issue.

In conclusion, I would like to recommend to the commission and the advisory board that the US Department of State and the US secretary of State in discussion with the people of Hawaii begin dialogue to create a time line for withdrawal from the still

sovereign territories of Hawaii, thereby allowing our government to live and breathe again so that we can take care of the land and its people the right way, not at the exclusion of others, but together.

I want to close with the last verse from Kaulana Napua also known as mele ai pohaku.

(Speaking in Hawaiian.) We support Liliuokalani to this day. Until we get the rights of the land, the story is to be told of the people who love the land. Mahalo.

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Mahalo. Marcia

MS. LINVILLE: Right here. Aloha, I am Marcia Linville, and I just followed a very impassioned and persuasive argument, however, in spite of that very impassioned and persuasive argument, I am still speaking in support of the Akaka Bill for the recognition.

The bill has been changed a great deal in the time that it went to Washington and got renegotiated and all, but the basic thing is to recognize the rights of the Hawaiian people. Now, many people have given you the history facts and the politics of this situation. I will be brief.

In summation, the Hawaiian people

_

existed as a nation. When that nation was overthrown, the people remained. They were the Hawaiian people. They are the Hawaiian people. The very basis of Hawaii's tourist industry, the core industry of this state, is based on the fact that the Hawaiian culture is distinctive, distinct, unique, and it has a separate identity from the rest of the United States.

There is something intrinsically arrogant in the belief that the Hawaiian people do not exist as a separate and distinct people without the recognition of the US Congress. They exist, they are here, they have been here as a country and as a nation. They were recognized by countries around the world. It is the same argument as saying a child is not legal unless he is legitimized by recognition of his father. The child exists, quote, legitimate or not. So do the Hawaiian people. If you do not give them legitimacy on this issue, it will not go away. We will be seeing this to come back for decades and for centuries to come.

My heritage is relevant in this matter too. My people are from the Mayflower people, and I do not know whether you know this, but in Puritan communities, status was dependent upon a

transcendent experience, a unique experience and an identity of an experience with God. Now, your rights in the community, your status in the community, what you ate, what you wore, how you lived, depended on whether or not you had this unique experience, and it was for this experience that when their homes were broken into and their beds were chopped up and their dishes were broken and their sheets were torn and they were expelled from England, it was an unique necessary experience

to them.

However, when they arrived in the new world and they established the Puritan colonies, it still existed as the most basic of their standards, but yet when their children grew up, they grew up in America, they grew up surrounded by Indians, they were surrounded by a totally different environment, and their children did not have this unique experience with God, and so it was for them necessary to show that they had the favor of God by the acquisition of possessions, land, money, status, things.

Now, those people who came from New England and who overthrew the queen really believed that by doing so they had the favor of God.

However, the people who are presently trying to take away the rights of Hawaiians, their property, their heritage, their inheritances, do not have this driving need. For you, that reason no longer applies. The desire to deprive the people of Hawaii of their inherited rights and property is simply greed and a political desire to destroy the rights of minorities.

1.8

2.4

This is a political, very strong drive in the country. We must have equality forever for everyone, but equality does not seem to come with the same property rights, the same respect, the same belief and equality for those, quote, minorities they are trying to say are the same as everyone else. They do not deserve the benefits that they derive from being who they are. It is like saying that I do not believe -- I do not deserve the rights that I have from being who I own.

Hawaiians are not a minority who are a political football. If you want to find a minority to say, oh, well, you are black, but you shouldn't be allowed to have access to college on a different basis from whites because that is not really a redress, that is depriving our children of the rights that you should have, Hawaiians are not such

a minority. Hawaiians have their own rights, their own schools, their own beliefs, their own identity, their own culture.

This bill is not divisive as people who know very little about the Hawaiian culture have said. It is you who are being divisive, this commission and the way in which it has been created, and I have known some of you for over thirty years. How can -- I am surprised, that is all. People I have known who have spoken for unity, people I have known who have spoken for amity, who have spoken for education, how can you do this? Thank you.

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Thank you. Milton Coleman?

MR. COLEMAN: Aloha. I just would like to inform all of you that I am deeply unable to support this Akaka Bill on the fact that our Hawaiian people had no real input in the drafting of such a bill, and let me use food as a metaphor. We have a lot of hungry Hawaiians, hungry for independence and for sovereignty and for their inherent rights, and so people want to feed them. Well, let's just go to the drive through and pick up some burgers for them, bring the food to the Hawaiians, and that's not very good for them.

You did not ask them, can I get you something to eat? What would you like to eat? went ahead without checking with the person that you thought you were going to feed, but you didn't ask them what they wanted. The intention might have been, you know, to do some good, but you should always check with the people themselves, and that was not done in this case. The Hawaiian people did not have any real input in the drafting of this bill that really lays a lot in the balance for us, and so I can not support such a bill, and that's pretty much all I have to say.

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Okay, thank you.

MR. COLEMAN: Mahalo.

AUDIENCE: Mahalo.

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Okay, Ikaika

Hussey?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

MR. HUSSEY: Aloha kakou. Thank you very much, members of the committee, for allowing me to testify in person on this very important legislation, and also aloha to all of our brothers and sisters in the struggle for Hawaiian justice. It's good to see all of you here.

23

We are gathered here in the wake of great civil rights leaders such as Reverend Martin

Luther King, Jr., to mourn the death of his dream. Under our watch, we have allowed his words to be contorted and disfigured with meaning swapped for their opposites and historical trajectory of an expansion of rights replaced by a foreclosure.

1.1.

I say this because we are confronted with profound contradictions. The long-standing opponents of kanaka maoli human rights, including the fundamental right of self-determination, have ascended to a committee which has the ostensible mission to protect our basic civil rights. This is a tragedy for all peoples, particularly citizens of the United States who cherish social justice and believe in the rights of man. The selection of these individuals should be met with the strongest denunciation and condemnation as an affront to the legacy and life of Reverend Martin Luther King and all of those who fought for human and civil rights.

When men and women such as Dr. Martin
Luther King and Rosa Parks walked with us, they
articulated a dream for society that was always one
step beyond where we are now, thus pushing us
forward to ever widening visions of justice and
humanity. Those ideas first proposed by a group of
nobles confronting King John of England, have

expanded with each generation from running to the march in Washington, from the abolitionists to the suffragettes, from the trade unionists to the freedom riders, to our own Hawaiian movement for

cultural freedom and independence.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Rights both human and civil is about opening up the conditions and possibilities of being more human, and yet today we see that this expanding humanity is now in retrograde under attack by members of this committee who misuse and abuse the language of the civil rights to prevent the full blossoming of the Hawaiian people as self-determining participants in an interconnected world, and, of course, I must add that the Hawaiian nation, like all nations, has many perspectives about the ultimate expression of the right of self-determination, but our differences lie more in an assessment of what is possible, not about what is By contrast, the opponents of Hawaiian self-determination on this panel seem to obliterate both the possibilities and the rights.

There are some who argue, and I also am sympathetic to this view, that civil rights should be limited to the narrow domain of racial equality and segregation. We should recall, however, that

Dr. King himself opposed imperialism and militarism in southeast Asia in his historic address at the Riverside Church in 1968. Remember also that Dr. King's own community of faith urged him to cool off, to go slow, because he was stepping out of the more comfortable conversation about race and was beginning to confront race and imperialism. He may have been as well have been talking about Hawaii, which is state governed by those same giant triplets of racism, imperialism, and militarism.

1.3

1.7

2.0

Members of the committee, I oppose the Akaka Bill. I oppose it because the Hawaiian people as well as the indigenous peoples of North America deserve better than to be mistreated at the hands of the Department of Interior and the Federal proceedings of congressional plenary power. I oppose the bill because it contains specific language to exempt the US military from its responsibility as Hawaii's largest and most toxic polluter and as a voracious machine which is turning our sacred land into a single vehicle for militarism and war. That is not our calling. We are people of aloha which demands of us an orientation towards justice and peace.

I also oppose the Akaka Bill because it

will not protect our institutions against the people who attack us. They will find other avenues to do so and no doubt are planning that as we speak. The Akaka Bill will be used to sweep 114 years of illegal actions and deeds under the rug, hidden under the first paragraph of the bill which asserts that Native Hawaiians are, quote, indigenous peoples of the United States.

And to get deeper into the text of the bill, I find that it is deeply flawed and unjust in its representations. For instance, in section two, subsection sixteen, it asserts that, quote, Native Hawaiians have also given expression to their rights as native people to self-determination, self-governance, and economic self-sufficiency. This subsection proceeds to list a host of activities: Health care services, educational programs, conservation programs, immersion schools, et cetera. This list is used to describe the ongoing sovereignty of an indigenous community which would be required in order to justify the extension of Federal plenary power over Native Hawaiians.

However, the list is deceptive for several reasons. It ignores the fact that the United States is the single largest impediment to

self-determination for the Hawaiian people. It also leaves out our longstanding, nonviolent resistance to US occupation of Hawaii, which is an ongoing exercise of our self-determination. And finally, it seduces the reader into believing that these federally funded programs represent the exercise of self-determination and self-governance.

This is not the case. They rather should be part of the compensation for the long term occupation of our lands by the United States.

Self-determination, rather, is a fundamental human right, and I quote, by virtue of which people's freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, and cultural development, that's the language from the UN declaration of human rights.

Here is another writer speaking of self-determination. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty, the interests of the population concerned must have equal weight with equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined. That is US President Woodrow Wilson in

his 1420 speech given at the close of the first World War.

The United States in Hawaii has violated these principles by preventing a free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of our claims which we witnessed in the run up to the vote in 1959 and also this process today.

Members of the committee, the people of Hawaii do not need this bill. We do, however, need to resume the conversation that began with the passage of the Apology Bill in 1993. We need to discuss what a real process for reconciliation would entail. At a minimum, the United States must stop any further actions to increase the militarization of our homeland which is a threat to our legitimate quest for self-determination. The US should institute a commission to return lands and resources which were stolen from individuals and families in the previous century taken to make plantations and military bases. The US must also not stand in the way of a UN decolonization process here.

If this body is to be true to its name and to a legacy of civil rights, it must stand in solidarity with the people of our land who are fighting against tremendous odds to defend our

Ι

homeland from the vociferous attacks of an extremist 1 2 political minority and its empire. This committee is investigating the 3 The problem is not the Akaka Bill. 4 wrong topic. 5 The problem is the men and women motivated by a 6 misplaced sense of white victimhood who are lashing 7 out at the Hawaiian people and the peoples of color throughout the United States. We are all endangered 8 9 in an era in which US democracy has withered in a 10 towering shadow of militarism and imperialism. 11 If the civil rights commission can not 12 muster the spiritual fortitude to turn its investigation towards those folks, then Dr. King's 13 dream has truly died. 14 15 HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Thank you. 16 Okay, we have got six more people so far. Anthony 17 Sanq? Welcome. 18 MR. SANG: Aloha kakou. 19 HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Aloha. 20 MR. SANG: My name is Anthony Sang. 21 am a citizen of the United States of America, a resident of the State of Hawaii and a beneficiary of 22 23 the Hawaiian Homestead Act as you recall in 1920 was 24 enacted by the Congress of the United States, and I

am glad to say that I am proud to be a Native

25

1 Hawaiian.

Today I stand before you to bring you an issue which I believe has never been talked about over the six or seven years that I have been involved for the advocacy of the Akaka Bill. Before you is a beneficiary that will be impacted by some of the decisions and recommendations that you may make pertaining to the people who qualify under the act of 1920 to become a lessee for certain parcels of land that were given to us by the United States Congress in 1920 and was so bitterly fought for by our Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole.

I stand here to let you know I am a graduate of Kamehameha Schools for boys. I served my time in the military service. While some of you had the opportunity to go to college, I didn't have that opportunity. I went into the military to defend our country. I came back and served and tried to become a proud citizen as a resident of the State of Hawaii. I got my lot. I married, and I got my lot of 7,500 square feet of land, a piece of property I never thought I would have.

I'm a third generation, third generation homesteader. My grandfather moved to the Island of Molokai. He was one of the first homesteaders that

moved to Molokai with his thirteen children. And ai pohaku, they talk about ai pohaku, he was one of them with his thirteen children, you know, picking up keawe beans so that they can survive. No more water. He raised his thirteen children. It was hard. And one of those thirteen children was my mother. She had four children. She became a single parent. She raised us, my two brothers and my sister. We lived on Hoolehua, Molokai, as children, and we moved to Papakolea. When you move to Papakolea, during those days, it was survivorship over there. When I came back from the military, I met my lovely Hawaiian girl. We got married. children I bore and she bore for me was seven children who have more Hawaiian blood than I have, and I am proud to say that.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Today they are proud citizens and residents of the State of Hawaii. I am proud that I have seven children that I can say that we raised together. I just recently lost my wife, but I am proud to say that I have got all of my children, and we were able to raise them to become productive residents of the State of Hawaii. Productive, okay? Whether you Hawaiian, Japanese, Portugese, Filipino, whatever, okay, they are productive.

I am a third generation homesteader. In the have four children now who are fourth generation homesteaders, and they are going to be impacted maybe by some of the decisions that you people sitting on this panel and some of the recommendations that you make pertaining to the Akaka Bill that may impact us. We have kupuna. If am a kupuna already. We been on Molokai. We have kupuna living on Makuu. We have people living on Kawailoa. We're homesteaders, our kupuna.

1.7

2.2

Now, if this lawsuit that has been going through the trail for seven years that has been opposed by certain members of this panel, if it is ruled in favor of them, all of us, 30,000 plus

Native Hawaiians with 50 percent Hawaiian and their children and their spouses who maybe are only one-eighth Hawaiian, the rest is haole, Japanese,

Portugese, whatever you like call them, eh, but they all Hawaiians, we're all going to lose our land.

Do you know why? When the first case, the Barrett lawsuit, came up, me and the homesteaders said, oh, watch out. It's like it was before the 14th Amendment, before the 15th Amendment when Mr. Freddy Rice thought he had the right to do this, he had the right to do that. What? Why?

Civil rights? Go ahead and go for 'em, we got 'em.

So we knew they was gonna come for us. We knew they wanted our piece of the pie.

1.7

Because why? All the hard work pau.

All the toiling and suffering and working on the land alongside the rest of the community was finished. Now the land is beautiful. You go all over the islands from Kauai to Waimea, the Hawaiian homelands that are available to the Native Hawaiian people, our lands, they have value now. Our lands that people want, our lands people want, and those people include those who oppose the Akaka Bill.

Right now the Native Hawaiians who live on the land, we got two enemies running in two different canoes. One is the haole canoe in the opposition canoe who oppose the Akaka Bill, and the other one is our Native Hawaiian brothers who oppose the Akaka Bill. I respect their belief, but you turn around and look at us Native Hawaiians, the 30,000 that live on the homestead, right, you guys gonna lose your land. You guys go, yeah, yeah, yeah, we need the Akaka Bill, yeah, yeah, we need this. But us, the kupunas, we are going to lose our land.

You know why? Because one person out

there sitting on that panel called me up when I was advocating for the Akaka Bill, he called me up by telephone, he identified himself to me, and he makes me an offer. He said, you know, you guys gonna lose the lands because the Akaka Bill going down. Our lawsuit is going forward. I said what? He said, yeah, you people, the Native Hawaiians, are going to lose the lawsuit, therefore, too big, I forgot the word.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who that?

MR. SANG: I'm not going to tell you his name, but he is sitting up there.

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Okay, wait.

Mr. Sang, you are way over your time, so wrap it up.

MR. SANG: Well, now, I understand, I understand, Mr. Lily, but I have never had an opportunity over these seven years to speak as an individual beneficiary representing what I am going to lose. I am going to lose it if I don't speak because they need to understand both sides where we at as far as the homesteaders are concerned. If you don't understand that, then that's going to make a big impact on the decision for you guys. We are going to lose our lands thanks to you guys who say the Akaka Bill no good, and we are going to lose our

lands because you guys say it's not the law, it's raced base, it don't belong here. We need to be given a piece of the pie. The 14th Amendment say we should get a piece of Hawaiian homelands. therefore, when you lose the land, we are going to talk to the courts, and we are going to be your friends, we are going to talk to the courts, and we are going to say, listen, why don't we sell the land, sell the land back to the Native Hawaiians who live on the land now, sell it back to the kupuna at the value of the land. A'ole. You know what I told I said you know what? There's someplace you can take this and shove 'em because you gonna get in huge trouble. But all I am saying is that I'm coming from an area where nobody spoke about before, 16 and I'm talking about the canoes, yeah? I been there with you guys with the people, I respect your 18 beliefs, but you know, you oppose the Akaka Bill, that's maika'i, but think about us, think about the families that you come from that live on the homestead, eh? We live in Nanakuli or Waiahuli, 22 Keokea --HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: Mr. Sang, you 24 need --MR. SANG: Well, I hope that you guys

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

19

20

21

23

25

will take this into consideration, and my viewpoint is something that is very, very personal. Thank you.

HEARINGS OFFICER LILY: You made it loud and clear. Thank you very much. I am going to take a five-minute break. When we start up again, we have five students we are looking forward to, and three other people have signed up, and maybe more after that, so to give the stenographer a break and the committee, five minutes.

(Recess was taken.)

HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: Okay, we are going to get the hearing started. My name is Michelle Nalani Fujimori. I am the vice chair of this committee. Chairman Lily had to leave the meeting, so we are going to be proceeding. We do have a number of speakers that are still to speak, and as Chairman Lily has spoken earlier, we will be starting back up with the list from the beginning speakers and then having committee members ask those speakers questions to try to complete the day.

The first speaker is Arvid Youngquist that I have next on the list.

MR. YOUNGQUIST: Chair lady, members of the advisory committee, my name is Arvid Youngquist,

and I want to thank the committee for holding a second downtown Honolulu hearing and providing a four hour time frame for us to express in some respects our manao.

First of all, I speak for myself.

Second, I am not a kanaka maoli. I come from an island nation, Japan. I was a candidate last year on the November ballot, a non-Hawaiian candidate for OHA, and garnered 14,664 votes. Number of votes roughly is equivalent to the membership of the Grass Roots Institute, which does some good work. I see them testify at the City Council on the fixed rail issue and other matters. I have sent an e-mail roughly repeating some of my comments, but I will skip over the salutation and such.

May I express myself both for voting out of the US Senate subject matter committee the legislation often referred as the Akaka Bill and that the US Senate as a whole vote on it without further amendments. If amendments do occur in the Senate, that will needlessly delay any action because of the US House of Representatives' requirement for concurrence.

It is hoped earnestly that the US
Attorney General's solicitor general and the White

House enact the Akaka Bill into law as soon as possible without putting it off until the reconvening of the Congress in 2008 during the election cycle for many even in the Senate.

The deliberative discussions such as the public hearing where both positions and those in between as can be aired is an ideal forum for the people of Hawaii as well as the various interested segments of the kanaka maoli and the civic clubs as well as those who are part of the OHA and Kamehameha kukui ohana. It is without saying that all and any civil and constructive expressions feel the same for the record and be made part of the report for the US Civil Rights Commission.

And may I digress momentarily? Even if the decision to support the Akaka Bill is not unanimous, I request that the minority report from this advisory committee be included. You have a sizeable number of people who may comprise the minority. Who knows? In the course of the public hearings, minds may be changed. And that the executive branch in Washington, D.C., be advised as to the balance of your opinions expressed during the various hearings.

Seven years is a very long time in a

political life in Washington, D.C. Presidential candidates are running on a resume with less than two years of congressional experience in some instances. They know that the enemy of a good piece of legislation is the perfect legislation. Those of you who have followed the career of Senator Ted Kennedy may have heard of that quite often. know that the enemy of a good piece of legislation is to delay, for example, for seven years asking for concessions, sacrifices. One of the major concessions was to prohibit legalized gambling and any kind of sovereignty claim by the kanaka maoli. Critique for work in progress should occur after enactment which provides for normal adjustments, amendments as well as repeal.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Currently in this State, whether you are kanaka maoli or not, the government, because of the consent, in union speak, silence is consent. Here, people come, and they speak now. Whether it is unfair to the committee or not, whether it is emotional or not, I would express my appreciation to Chair Lily as well as members of the committee for providing your full attention and letting all sides express their opinion. Thank you again on this opportunity to address the members of the Hawaii

State advisory committee. Mahalo. 1 HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: 2 Thank you, Mr. Youngquist. Renee Telona? 3 MS. TELONA: Aloha mai kakou. 4 AUDIENCE: Aloha. 5 MS. TELONA: First and foremost, I would 6 7 like to acknowledge my kanaka maoli in the crowd. 8 I, Renee Telona, am a direct descendent of my people 9 who came before me and left my future, the land in 10 which I am from. As I stand before you today with my flag (speaks in Hawaiian), I lay out to you, 11 those of you who make the decisions for my people, 12 my generations to come, I say to you, I say to you 13 that this is who I am, this is who I am choosing to 14 15 be. 16 I as an educated Hawaiian stand before 17 you this very moment to say that I do not think that 18 it is right that this bill sit upon the desk of those who think they know what we want. I have not 19 20 once heard those of you come to each and every place in which kanaka maoli reside and ask what we want. 21 I did not once hear it. 22 23 I would like to quote from a song entitled (speaks in Hawaiian) by Ed Pohaku, (speaks 24 25 in Hawaiian.) This is saying that (speaks in

Hawaiian), for whom, for what is this thing?

(Speaks in Hawaiian), that flies above our native

land. (Speaks in Hawaiian), for what is this? For

what is this that we say yes to? (Speaks in

Hawaiian), above us all. (Speaks in Hawaiian), that

flag. (Speaks in Hawaiian), pull it down. (Speaks

in Hawaiian), that flag. (Speaks in Hawaiian), that

flag, that flag. (Speaks in Hawaiian), pull it

down. (Speaks in Hawaiian), pull it up. (Speaks in

Hawaiian), pull it up higher above that flag.

(Speaks in Hawaiian), pull it up. (Speaks in

Hawaiian), pull it up above that flag that thinks

that this flag has supremacy above our land.

1.5

In closing, I would like to say I, Renee (speaks in Hawaiian) Telona, a direct descendent of this Island, do not support the Akaka Bill. Hawaii is my mainland, and that is my statement. Mahalo.

HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: Okay, next to testify will be Kaylyn Krael.

MS. KRAEL: Aloha, everybody, my name is Kaylyn Krael. I would like to say that I do not support the Akaka Bill, first of all, because I am a young woman that is still in high school, and I am not educated about it. I don't think that anybody ever has been educated about it.

And the decisions that you make, I hope you know that they lie on top of our future. the people that have to live with it, and we are the people that are going to have to put up with the decisions that you make. I am the future, we are the future of Hawaii, your future leaders. Why not educate the children on what's going on in those decisions that you make for us? How do we know what to expect without the education that we need? You educate us about American history and all of this in our regular public schools, but you don't educate us about our own history. We know nothing about it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I am not for the Akaka Bill. I refuse to be blinded from the truth. When will you truly begin to not only open up your own eyes but help me to open up my own? You need to see the future in your kids. You need to help your children see it too. You can not be blinding everybody, and you can't -- you can't hide it from us. If you hide it from us, how will we know? How will we know? That's all I would like to say. Mahalo.

HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: Thank you. Next is Pomaika'ilani Miner.

MS. MINER: Aloha mai kakou.

THE AUDIENCE: Aloha.

MS. MINER: My name is Pomaika'ilani 1 Miner. On behalf of myself, I clearly do not 2 support the Akaka Bill. The reason why I do not 3 4 support the Akaka Bill is because as a Hawaiian, the 5 government did not educate me or my people about this Akaka Bill. The civil rights needs to be 6 7 equal, therefore, this is not an equal right for us Hawaiians who did not have say in this. 8 9 I am the future, and I want what is best 10 for me and my people, not for others to tell us what to do. It is time for us to say what can or can't 11 be done, so for my closing, I would like to once 12 13 again state that I do not support the Akaka Bill. 14 Mahalo. 15 HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: Okay, Rickey 16 Kamai? 17 MR. KAMAI: Aloha mai kakou. 18 THE AUDIENCE: Aloha. 19

MR. KAMAI: My name is Rickey (speaks in Hawaiian) Kamai, and I am proud to say that I oppose the Akaka Bill. I, first of all, was not introduced to the Akaka Bill or informed about the Akaka Bill.

20

21

22

23

24

25

I am worried about my future and how it will come to be. I plan on having a family, going out somewhere, raising my family. Kids, I hope that

my kids will look back to me and say how proud they are of me. And I would really love to go to college, but if not, I am proud to say that I will be ready for whatever comes to me as I learn how to work the land, work the sea.

I really don't like the -- I don't like the idea of explaining my future without me present to talk about it. I think that nobody knows about

the idea of explaining my future without me present to talk about it. I think that nobody knows about my future better than myself, and nobody knows about the future of our people better than ourselves. But I thank you, not for the Akaka Bill, but for making our nation strong for we have gone through a lot of stuff in a lot of years that has passed, but after all, we have survived, and I thank you for that. I am not for a decrease in my Hawaiian culture, but for increase, a lot of increase.

As I close, I would just like to say that, as people have said it before, it is our kuleana and not yours. I am against the Akaka Bill. Mahalo.

HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: Okay, Rusty Kamai?

MR. KAMAI: Aloha mai kakou.

THE AUDIENCE: Aloha.

MR. KAMAI: My name is Rusty Kamai.

That there is my brother, and I come to you now as an individual Hawaiian, a proud one at that, and I am here to just bring up a point to you. I was not educated on any of this by the government and not asked personally if I supported it or not.

2.0

And now I would like to ask the people if they know what this is? To me, this is not just any ordinary Hawaiian flag. This, this, this stands for my nation, what I believe, and what these Hawaiian people believe. This is me, and after hearing every speech from every person in this room, that's telling me you just would take this flag and burn it, and I will tell you personally I would rather eat rocks than to see this flag along with this aina burn, and to tell you that I do not, I do not support this bill. Mahalo nui loa.

HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: Thank you,
Mr. Kamai. We have Trustee Haunani Apoliana.

MS. APOLIANA: Aloha kakou. I just have two points to make relative to some of the information and comments made this afternoon.

My first point, the remarks about the

Department of Interior and the Cobell case, the

Cobell case, the distinction that I want to make

relative to the Cobell case is the Cobell case was a

case brought by American Indians for breach of trust by the Department of Interior who has direct trust responsibilities and holdings over American Indian On page, I would say in section, section lands. nine, subsection A, B, it is clear, which is part of the Akaka Bill, notwithstanding any other provisions of law including but not limited to part 151 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations, the secretary, meaning the secretary of the Department of Interior, shall not take land into trust on behalf of individuals or groups claiming to be Native Hawaiian or on behalf of the Native Hawaiian governing entity. There will be no trust holdings by the Department of Interior under the language of the Akaka Bill as is distinct from the circumstances of the Cobell case when the Department of Interior had direct trust responsibility for American Indian lands.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

My second point and final point, in
1917, there was a statement attributed to Queen
Liliuokalani since she is our beacon and model for
many things we talk about in reconciling the wrongs
for going forward in the future, and this statement
was provided by her hanai, her hanai daughter, Lydia
K. Aholo, at the time of the publishing or writing

of the book called the Betrayal of Liliuokalani by Helena G. Allen.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Lydia Aholo attributes a very long statement of the queen, but it begins by saying, and it's a quote, I could not turn back the time for political change, but there is still time to save our heritage. You must remember never to cease to act because you fear you may fail. The way to lose any earthly kingdom is to be inflexible, intolerant, and prejudicial. Another way is to be flexible, tolerant of too many wrongs without judgment at all. It is a razor's edge. It is the width of a blade of pili grass. To gain the kingdom of heaven is to hear what is not said, to see what can not be seen, and to know the unknowable. That is aloha. All things in this world are two. In heaven is there is but one.

Queen Liliuokalani, 1917, her statement begins, I could not turn back the time for political change. To me, that is a clear acknowledgement by our queen that the political times had changed as a result of all the trauma, turmoil, disregard, hewa that she experienced, and it is time now for our Native Hawaiian community to right and to make the change and to move the political change forward for

Native Hawaiians. Because we used her as a beacon, for the record, I wanted to have this embodied in your recording. Thank you.

HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: Thank you, Chairman Apoliana. Michael Daly?

MR. DALY: Hello, committee. My name is Michael Daly. I am an Australian citizen. I actually decided not to become a US citizen while I was living in Hawaii because of the occupation of Hawaii. I have lived on the Island of Kauai for over twelve years, and I am currently living in Honolulu, and I work in a restaurant as a wage earner, and I have come to support those Hawaiians and other people who spoke to oppose the Akaka Bill, those who oppose the Akaka Bill on the grounds that it is not aligned with their aspirations and then their values of a sovereign nation.

Those Hawaiians that you have listened to today have a deep regard for their nation. They understand that it still exists today. It is impaired. It's being -- the land and territory is being occupied. Their queen is in distress. So the fact of the matter is that this is an international issue that's probably not going to be resolved by this hearing today whereby the occupiers come to

listen to the victims.

1.1

1.2

1.5

The overthrow of the palace was an act of war instigated by a bunch of thugs, businessmen, and others with the support of the US Government.

Annexation was an instrument of that same war, statehood was an instrument of that same war, and it appears that those who are pushing for the Akaka Bill want to produce another instrument of war to continue the occupation. From what I can see, it is just layers and layers of corruption and deceit and disregard for international law.

Hawaii still exists under international law, that the nation of the USA is equally a nation, but the US has trodden on the land, disregarded the people and the monarch. The nation of Hawaii exists as an impaired state, and the US is an unlawful occupier of this territory. It is as if the USA like a young puppy that it was or a teenager nation that didn't understand or realize what it was doing back in 1893. Both the United Kingdom and Russia had occupied these territories prior to your occupation, and both had decided that they would withdraw. The United States never did that.

You know the United Kingdom was one of

the greatest colonizers of the whole world. If I was speaking in India prior to the time of Ghandi and told the united -- and I was addressing a group of United Kingdom people at a panel such as this and told them that these lands, this territory, this soil will return to its people and its rightful nation, I would be laughed at. But, indeed, India did return to its people, and the United Kingdom, despite all of the infrastructure that they put in, the millions of dollars spent in developing that country, railroads across a huge continent, they had to leave.

I believe that you will leave. I believe that the Akaka Bill, whether it goes ahead or not, will be overridden by international jurisdiction, and I believe that if it is not, we are in a world of global -- a global jungle with a rule of militarism and terrorism is the rule, and you can not -- the United States can not afford while it's in Iraq to be disregarding international law. You would not even be in Iraq if the -- just let me finish this sentence, Madam Chairperson. You would not be in Iraq if in 1893 you did the right thing in the Pacific. Thank you.

HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: Thank you,

Mr. Daly. Juewels Ioka.

MS. IOKA: Aloha.

THE AUDIENCE: Aloha.

MS. IOKA: (Speaks in Hawaiian). First of all, I would like to say I am proud to be a Hawaiian, and I oppose the Akaka Bill. I am a Native Hawaiian. I am not a native Indian, nor am I a Native American, and I would not like to be known as any of these things.

I would like to address my people by asking have we not forgotten what our Queen has done for us? Everything she has gone through? All the trials and tribulations, everything she has fought for her people, have we forgotten what she has done for us? If not, then why is it that we have to deal with all of these things? These issues that come about?

My future is not in your hands. My future has nothing to do with you people here. My future is mines, and I will not have that taken away from me because of some people who think that they can control all these things around them, the people around them or anything that has to do with this.

I would just like to ask you as the board, how would you feel if someone came into your

home and started taking things from your house? I'm pretty sure you would be upset. I'm pretty sure you would call the cops if somebody stole stuff from your house. Having people from America, America, come here into our home and start claiming things that is theirs, it's not right. This is not their land. We are not their people.

I would like to mahalo you for this time and mahalo all my people here, and I would just like you to know that I am against the Akaka Bill.

Mahalo.

HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: Thank you,
Ms. Ioka. Last to testify today is Laverne
Fernandes Moore. After Ms. Moore's speech, we will
be going through questions from the individuals who
provided testimony to the committee.

MS. IOKA: Good afternoon. Speaking on behalf of the National Education Association Asian and Pacific Islander Caucus as their chairperson and as a 22nd generation Native Hawaiian, the National Association Education at its 2000 national convention in Chicago with its 9,000 plus voting delegates passed legislative amendment two which is the recognition of Native Hawaiians as an indigenous people who have a special relationship with the

United States and a right to self-determination under the Federal law. I want to read to you my speech given on that floor at the 2000 NEA

1.8

convention.

As a Native Hawaiian, my heritage is one of harmony with self, family, and the environment. My ancestors lived off the land, had our own religion, had our own form of government, and took care of each other. We were self-sufficient. After the illegal overthrow of our government, everything changed. Our land was taken away, our religion was taken away, and our government was taken away. Hawaiians' self respect was taken away.

Like the American Indians, our culture was in danger of extinction. It was against the law to speak Hawaiian. Even the government degenerate, whatever, downgraded Hawaiians asserting that we were only good enough to become common laborers. We were labeled stupid, lazy, good for nothing, and told we would amount to nothing. It was no surprise that our Native Hawaiian children, myself included, were embarrassed to call ourselves Hawaiian. In the past decade, there has been a resurgence of the Hawaiian culture. We are once again proud to call ourselves Hawaiian.

Now winding its way through Congress is a bill that will give Native Hawaiians another reason to stand tall. This bill will establish four things. Number one, it will clarify the political relationship between Native Hawaiians and the Federal government. Two, it will create an office to effectuate and enforce a trust responsibility of the United States to promote the welfare of native peoples, including Native Hawaiians. Three, it will create a group that will coordinate Federal policies and programs among agencies ending a long history of disjointed and uncoordinated efforts to serve Native Hawaiians, and the bill also creates a process for Native Hawaiians to form an entity for government to government relationship within the United States.

In a matter of speaking, this simple bill will set the stage for Federal recognition. We have received favorable support from the White House and Federal officials, and this tells us that we have a window of opportunity that we can not pass up. The time is now.

As our distinguished Native Hawaiian

Senator Daniel Akaka said, for far too long, efforts
to resolve long-standing issues for Native Hawaiians
have been delayed. We have been told we need more

input. We have been told the time is not right. We have been told we will not succeed. We will never move forward unless we try. We must not be afraid to help ourselves and ask others to support our endeavors.

So I stand before you a keiki o ka aina, a Native Hawaiian, to ask for your support in our efforts to become a federally recognized native people. I ask you to help us help our Hawaiian children to be proud and to stand tall. Please vote yes on legislative amendment two, and the 9,000 plus delegates overwhelmingly passed this at our national convention, and the National Education Association works effortlessly to help pass this bill, and I ask for your support in this, and thank you for the opportunity to testify today. Mahalo.

HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: Thank you,

Ms. Moore. I am getting ready to start, but I see

another sheet of paper coming which might be another

testifier. Kaonani Malama?

MR. MALAMA: Good afternoon, committee members. My name is Kaonani Malama. I have this opportunity to speak. Technically, I am for the Akaka Bill. Due to the situation that the United States Congress has some education to do, I propose,

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

actually, my mother proposed it years ago in the legislature, you have educational packets given to the 111th or the 112th Congress in the coming years to be educated on the issues about the Native Hawaiian plight starting with the overflow of the Kingdom of Hawaii.

This Kingdom had a treaty, a sovereign state, with the United States of America. overthrown by local businessmen who may or may not have a lineage, a blood quantum, with the Native Hawaiians or the kanaka maoli. These are businessmen who coerced people from the United States Congress into having displaced a republic. Therefore, after the republic, you know what happened afterwards. It became a state.

Now, I know and history shows that in 1898, I believe, or in 1893, there was a petition sent forth to the United States of America, and these people are all people of native blood and non-native, these are not people who have the kokua, the blood of Native Hawaiians. These are both people of Native Hawaiians and non-Native Hawaiians who had a petition set up to go to the Congress. This is before the 20th Century at the end of the 19th century. I saw the petition. There's a name

from Kauai, and that's where my family is from.

I believe that the United States

Congress, even this governor, this present governor,
has no pull as a Republican governor with the

Republican President. This Republican President
right now doesn't care about our status in this
situation. He has got bigger problems.

This government, this President and this Congress, I believe that they should be educated first. I don't need the education. You don't need the education. You're not from Washington. The advisory committee, the commission should be educated up in Washington. Give each member of your commission a packet explaining the situation of what happened, what occurred prior to the overthrow, and the 111th and the 112th Congress should be educated.

Now, if by some reason we have a President of the United States, whether it be a she or a he who is a Democrat, God, hopefully, since this Republican Congress for the past six-and-a-half or seven years has not even moved one inch, and this President who kept his mouth shut until last year of 2006 who did not say one word until the United States solicitor general made an opinion to the United States Congress, therefore, we are in a hold

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

situation. That's why the Akaka Bill is not going to go through.

I believe deep down that if there's a Democratic President, and we have a Senate that's controlled by the Democrat Party, we have a chance to move the bill to go through. You don't need the education. They don't need it. The United States Congress, both houses, should be educated of what happened to this Kingdom over here, what happened to the people in Hawaii. That's all I got to say. Thanks a lot.

HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: Thank you, Mr. Malama. For the audience, what we will be doing right now is I am going to be going through the list of 27 of you that testified today and asking the committee members as I go through each name if they have questions for the particular speaker. hoping to get through this process fairly quickly, and for those of who have stuck around from the beginning of the hearing, we really do appreciate it.

So we are going to be going through the list of the speakers that came here today. We have 27 speakers that spoke. When I go over each name of the person who spoke, I will be looking to our

committee members to see if they have questions. 1 2 Each committee member will be allowed one question 3 and one clarifying follow-up. After that, we will 4 continue to move through. I ask the committee members to please be 5 6 aware that it is currently five to four, and that we 7 have some members of the public that have been here 8 since one o'clock this afternoon. 9 I am going to start first with David 10 Rosen, if any committee members have any questions 1.1 for Mr. Rosen? Okay. Mr. Twigg-Smith, does anyone have any questions for Mr. Twigg-Smith? Mr. Kevin 12 13 O'Grady? Ms. Su Yates? 14 BOARD MEMBER BARBEE-WOOTEN: I have a 15 question. 16

HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: Ms. Su Yates, can you please step forward to the microphone?

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BOARD MEMBER BARBEE-WOOTEN: My name is Daphne Barbee-Wooten. My question, Ms. Yates, I think you ran out of time when you were testifying, and so I wanted to provide you with a little time, but you at the very end of your testimony, you stated that there are other overriding issues which the advisory committee should consider in Hawaii.

1 What are the overriding issues that you feel we 2 should be exploring? 3 MS. YATES: Well, actually, I have to 4 say that I am meant overriding issues, not necessarily that the committee has to. I wasn't 5 6 speaking specifically of the committee, but that all 7 of us are going to be facing whether it's global warning, or I just meant kind of universal issues 8 9 that we all need to work on, not specific to the 10 committee. I'm sorry. 11 HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: Any others 12 for Ms. Yates? Thank you, Ms. Yates. Kaleolani 13 Kekoa, any questions? I am asking if anyone has any 14 questions of you. 15 MR. KEKOA: William --HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: 16 No, no, no, 17 not for you to ask questions, but for us to ask you 1.8 questions. 19 MR. KEKOA: Okay. 20 HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: I think no 21 one has questions I think of you. Thank you. 22 Chen Wei-Yuan? Marian Grey? Deanna Espinas? 23 Charlene Cuaresma? Trustee Oswald Stender? Trustee Stender is still here? 24 25 BOARD MEMBER AGBAYANI: I have one. May

I ask you a question, Mr. Stender? Am I understanding that you are a member of a past advisory committee?

MR. STENDER: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER AGBAYANI: And I think with the exception of one person here, we are all new, and would you describe the process that your committee went through to identify and get information from the community and vote on the Akaka Bill?

MR. STENDER: The HSAC committee was requested by the Justice Department to look into that issue, the Akaka Bill, and we had a number of hearings. I remember the one that lasted the longest was at the Hawaiian Village. Then after the hearings were over, it took, I think, nearly a year to write the report because it had to float between ourselves, the attorneys for the Justice Department, and I think it was finished in 2001.

BOARD MEMBER AGBAYANI: Okay, and that report had recommendations that you gave to the US Commission, and then what happened to that report?

MR. STENDER: It was forwarded to the United States, to the commission, and it's, I imagine, filed. I have not heard anything more

about it, and I know it is on file, which I checked 1 2 on it the other day. BOARD MEMBER AGBAYANI: Thank you very 3 4 much. So this comprehensive report is on file, and 5 it represents a number of hearings? 6 MR. STENDER: Yes, it is on file. Ιt 7 was finished in June of 2001. BOARD MEMBER AGBAYANI: Thank you very 8 9 much. 10 HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: Ι 11 understand, Trustee Stender, that Mr. Burgess also 12 has a question for you. 13 BOARD MEMBER BURGESS: Mr. Stender, do 14 you think that if the seven mandatory criteria that 15 apply to recognition by the United States Native 16 American groups as a tribe, if those criteria -- are 17 you familiar with those criteria? 18 MR. STENDER: No, I'm not. 19 BOARD MEMBER BURGESS: Okay. Do you 20 understand that those criteria require that there be 21 an existing tribe before you can recognize a tribe? MR. STENDER: I can only explain it this 22 23 way. We have engaged the services of attorneys, and 24 these are attorneys who have extensive backgrounds 25 in Indian law and issues such as what needs to be

addressed on the constitutional questions, that issue has been raised from time to time, and they advised us that the Akaka Bill meets the criteria that we, our objective is to receive recognition, and they tell us it is so, and, of course, we accept that interpretation.

BOARD MEMBER BURGESS: Well, do you

BOARD MEMBER BURGESS: Well, do you think that if the criteria applicable to Native Americans were applied to Hawaiians that Hawaiians would qualify --

MR. STENDER: We are not an Indian tribe, and people keep trying to associate us as being a tribe. We are the indigenous people of this land, and that's who we are. We are not Indians, we can not be compared to Indians, other than the Indians and Alaskan Americans who like the Hawaiians are indigenous to this land in Hawaii. The Hawaiians are indigenous to Hawaii, the Indians are indigenous to the United States, to the continent, and Alaskans are indigenous to Alaska.

BOARD MEMBER BURGESS: So that --

HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: Mr. Burgess, we said there would be one question plus one follow-up.

BOARD MEMBER BURGESS: Okay, all right.

HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: 1 Okay, Mr. Sullivan, you had a question? 2 3 BOARD MEMBER SULLIVAN: If I might, just 4 one question on the term indigenous as it applies to 5 living people today, what is the definition of that? 6 How do you decide whether an individual or even a 7 group of individuals is indigenous as you are using that word? 8 9 MR. STENDER: The bill spelled out the definition of indigenous. 10 11 BOARD MEMBER SULLIVAN: Thank you. 12 HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: Any other 13 committee members have any questions of Mr. Stender? 14 Thank you, Trustee Stender. 15 MR. STENDER: Thank you. 16 HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: All right, 17 do committee members have questions for Dexter 18 Kaiama? Andre Perez? Marcia Linville? Milton 19 Coleman? Ikaika Hussey? Anthony Sang? Barbara 20 Youngquist? Renee Telona? Kaylyn Krael? 21 Pomaika'ilani Miner? Rickey Kamai? Rusty Ko Kamai? 22 Trustee Apoliana? Michael Daly? Juewels Ioka? 23 Laverne Fernandes Moore? Kaonani Malama? 24 With that, we will be concluding the 25 hearing. Can I entertain a motion to close the

$\overline{}$, 1	hearing?
	2	BOARD MEMBER AGBAYANI: I move the
	3	motion.
	4	BOARD MEMBER BURGESS: I second the
	5	motion.
	6	HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: All in
	7	favor?
	8	UNIDENTIFIED BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
	9	HEARINGS OFFICER FUJIMORI: That would
	10	conclude our open hearing on this. Thank you.
	11	(Hearing concluded.)
$\overline{}$	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
$\overline{}$	25	

1	CERTIFICATE
2	STATE OF HAWAII)
3) ss.
4	CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU)
5	I, PATRICIA ANN CAMPBELL, CSR 108, Notary
6	Public, State of Hawaii, do hereby certify:
7	That on September 12th, 2007, the hearing
8	was taken down by me in machine shorthand and was
9	thereafter reduced to typewriting under my
10	supervision; that the foregoing represents to the
11	best of my ability, a true and correct transcript of
12	the proceedings had in the foregoing matter.
13	I further certify that I am not an
14	attorney for any of the parties hereto, nor in any
15	way concerned with the cause.
16	DATED this 1st day of October, 2007,
17	in Honolulu, Hawaii.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	Paricia am Campbell
23	PATRICIA ANN CAMPBELL, CSR 108
24	Notary Public, State of Hawaii
25	My Commission Exp: March 8th, 2010