

# **Past, Present, and Politics:**

*A Look at the Native Hawaiian  
Sovereignty Movement*

By:  
Amanda Pacheco  
Comparative History of Ideas  
Senior Thesis  
December, 2005

# Table of Contents:

<b>Introduction: Ea</b>	1
<b>Chapter One: Ku Kanaka</b>	7
-What is the native Hawaiian sovereignty movement?	8
-What tools is the movement using to achieve sovereignty?	12
<b>Chapter Two: Imua e na poki'i</b>	17
-Ka Lahui Hawaii	19
-The Nation State of Hawaii	24
-The Hawaiian Kingdom Government	28
<b>Chapter Three: Onipa'a kakou</b>	35
-Practicality and Feasibility	37
-Probability	46
-What faces the sovereignty initiative as a whole?	52
<b>Conclusion: Kuna'e</b>	56
<b>Endnotes</b>	62
<b>Resource List</b>	68

# Introduction: Ea

## *The Ruins*

*To choose the late noon*

*sun, running barefoot  
on wet Waimanalo  
beach; to go with all*

*our souls' lost yearnings  
to that deeper place  
where love has let  
the stars come down*

*and my hair, shawled  
over bare shoulders,  
falls in black waves  
across my face;*

*there, at last,  
escaped from the ruins  
of our nation,*

*to lift our voices  
over the sea  
in bitter songs  
of mourning.*

*- Haunani-Kay Trask<sup>1</sup>*

Like many other words in the native Hawaiian language, the term “Ea”<sup>2</sup> has several meanings that are dear to the hearts of those sympathetic to the native Hawaiian fight for self-determination: it means sovereignty, rule, independence; life, breath, vapor, air, spirit; it can also mean to rise up.<sup>3</sup> This term has been used by several native Hawaiian sovereignty groups in the past in regards to the movement, and I chose it as a beginning to this thesis, which will critically analyze and critique the current sovereignty movement. The participants and supporters of the movement want some form of independence or self rule; they want native communities to rise up and work towards the common goal of nationhood; and, perhaps most of all, they want to live in a place where native Hawaiians have been given, as much as possible, their ways and lives back, as it once was before colonization, assimilation, and acculturation took over their identities.

In order to critically analyze and critique the native Hawaiian sovereignty movement as completely as this discussion hopes to, we must first understand who the people the movement serves are. According to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary, Hawaiian is defined as being “A native or resident of Hawaii, especially one of Polynesian ancestry.” For the purposes of this paper we will concentrate our definition of a *native* Hawaiian as someone who is a native of Hawaii and is of Hawaiian Polynesian ancestry. I choose this definition because being Hawaiian, for many in the sovereignty movement, is about blood. Native Hawaiian sovereignty leader, lawyer and scholar, Mililani Trask, writes that “To be Hawaiian (for political and other reasons) you have to have the koko (blood). I don’t agree with, and do not support, the concept of being ‘Hawaiian at heart’...You never hear of someone being ‘Japanese at heart.’ There is a racial connotation to that phrase.”<sup>4</sup>

Haunani-Kay Trask, a Professor of Hawaiian Studies at the University of Hawaii, Manoa, sovereignty leader, and sister to Mililani Trask, writes that, “there is the claim [by non-natives] that Hawaiians, the Native people of Hawaii, are the same as settlers to Hawaii. Apart from denying Hawaiians their 2,000-year-old *indigenous*<sup>5</sup> history, this position also equates a *voluntary* status (settlers) with *involuntary* status (a forced change in nationality resulting from colonization). This argument often underlies state and federal policy.”<sup>6</sup> She goes on to emphasize that the difference between Kanaka Maoli in Hawaii today, and Hawaii residents who are not of native Hawaiian blood is simply that those residents settled in Hawaii and voluntarily gave up their homeland rights; native Hawaiians, the indigenous peoples, have had those rights taken from them.

Therefore, when the term native Hawaiian is used in the following Chapters, it will be in reference to the indigenous peoples of Hawaii who existed in the archipelago before Western contact, and also in reference to the people of native Hawaiian blood, whose histories are tied inextricably with the history of that place dating back 2,000 years. The name “native Hawaiian sovereignty movement” will be in reference to the purposes of the movement itself, not to those who participate in the movement, because although at its core the sovereignty movement is a fight to gain self-determination and self-governance for native Hawaiians, many non-natives are supporters of the cause as well.

### ***Why is this important to the sovereignty movement?***

The issue of being a native Hawaiian or simply a resident of Hawaii becomes part of the larger discussion of the sovereignty movement when we take into account what the

movement fights for and why it fights for it. This has to do completely with the history of native Hawaiians.

United States interests in Hawaii as more than a friendly neighbor became clear to the Hawaiian monarch as well as the people of Hawaii when white settlers began buying up a majority of the land, as well as asserting themselves in the national government, making it easier for themselves and other rich plantation owners to usurp power from the already dwindling native population and weakening monarchy. When Queen Lili'uokalani assumed the throne and attempted to establish a new constitution in 1893 which would rectify the dismal situation of native Hawaiians, businessmen such as Sanford B. Dole and American Minister to the Islands John L. Stevens, took it upon themselves to enlist the help of U.S. troops stationed at Pearl Harbor, march them to Iolani Palace, and under the threat of military power demand that the Queen step down from her throne, stating that American lives were in being put danger while she ruled.<sup>7</sup>

From this point on, the fate of native Hawaiians has been at the mercy of the U.S. government, the same government that imprisoned Queen Lili'uokalani in her bedroom at the palace for eight months before releasing her and forcing her abdication. The Hawaiian Kingdom was illegally annexed in 1898. The population of native Hawaiians had gone from an estimated 1 million in 1778—before white contact—to a diminishing 40,000 in 1892.<sup>8</sup> “Today there are a mere 8,244 [full-blooded native Hawaiians left]. That is 992,000 less people [than before Western contact], a decrease of more than 99%.”<sup>9</sup> This detrimental history, coupled with the continued results of Western colonization in the State of Hawaii today<sup>10</sup> spurred the official creation of the native

Hawaiian sovereignty movement in the mid-1970's that still remains true to its cause in 2005.

***What is this all about?***

Deep in the soul of all Hawaiians is a desire to speak our own language, to relate with the natural world publicly and unashamedly as our ancestors did, to think our own thoughts, to pursue our own aspirations, to develop our own arts, to workshop our own goods, to follow our own moral system, to see our own people when we look around us, to be Hawaiians again. We long to make contributions to the world as Hawaiians, to exist as a Hawaiian nation, to add 'a Hawaiian presence' to the world community. Establishment of a sovereign Hawaiian nation will give us that chance.<sup>11</sup>

Ea. Sovereignty. Independence. Life. Natives and non-natives alike have begun fighting for self-governance, for independence, and for justice by both participating in and through the support of the native Hawaiian sovereignty movement. They are mobilized and educated, and are ready to become players in the political arena that determines the future of Hawaii, the unwillingly and illegally colonized playground of the United States. The movement has been building strength, and the voices of its followers are now ready to be heard. What are some options that the people of Hawaii have regarding sovereignty? Are sovereignty, self-governance, independence, and justice feasible goals? Is the movement for sovereignty a practical and probable enough ambition to be achieved? And what do those who live in Hawaii today think of the movement? These are all questions this thesis hopes to answer.

As stated earlier, what follows will be a critical analysis and critique of the native Hawaiian sovereignty movement. Chapter One will include a background of the

sovereignty movement as a whole, highlighting especially the ways in which native and non-native Hawaiians have expressed their support of sovereignty within the passed century. In Chapter Two, I will explore three of the largest and publicly well-known sovereignty organizations by discussing what forms of sovereignty they propose for Hawaii, how they've gone about the struggle to achieve this goal, the structure and foundation of their organizations, and the amount of public support each organization has. Chapter Three will round out our discussion by continuing our exploration of the organizations and beginning a comparison and contrast of each, and citing both their strengths and weaknesses in the hopes of shedding some light on which, if any, of these forms of sovereignty and methods of lobbying would be successful for one day gaining self-determination and self-governance for native Hawaiians.

# Chapter One: Ku Kanaka

## ***Na 'Oiwī***

*How is it now*

*you are gone,  
our ali'i<sup>1</sup> dismembered,  
their mana<sup>2</sup> lost,*

*we are left*

*with broken bodies, blinded  
children, infected winds  
from across the sea.*

*How is it,*

*our bones cry out  
in their infinite dying,  
the haole and their ways*

*have come to stay.*

***- Haunani-Kay Trask<sup>3</sup>***

Stand tall, people of Hawaii—E Ku Kanaka. This is the call of the sovereignty movement.<sup>4</sup> Unfortunately, not everyone, even those in Hawaii, is aware of what supporting the sovereignty movement entails. With this in mind, and in the hopes of offering a more well-rounded analysis and critique, this Chapter will explore what exactly the native Hawaiian sovereignty movement is by expanding on the brief history found in the last section, and exploring the ways that resistance has manifested itself, both historically and contemporarily, in order to offer a field of reference when considering the path sovereignty has taken to get to its current state.

The first step in this discussion, however, is to define in clear terms what the accepted meaning of the word ‘sovereignty’ is. According to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary, ‘sovereignty’ refers to “supreme excellence or an example of it,” as well as “supreme power especially over a body politics; freedom from external control’ autonomy; controlling influence,” and can also be summed up to mean “an autonomous state.” With this in mind, let us begin by discussing what the native Hawaiian sovereignty movement is, at its root, and what it hopes to accomplish.

### ***What is the native Hawaiian sovereignty movement?***

When I think of sovereignty, sovereignty sounds like there’s a group of people—Hawaiians—who are living in a dominant culture—Western—who feel that some of the policies, attitudes or ways put a halt to some of their own goals. And when this group of people, Hawaiian people, come together and say: “Let’s form this community,” or nation, or whatever you call it; and say: “let’s draw up something that we can have a voice in how we want to govern our lives.” I know that’s a crude definition but that’s the

way I look at it, just a group of people who say: “Okay, this is what we want: we don’t want Joe Blow over there telling us what to do, we respect Joe Blow, but we would like that same respect in return.”<sup>5</sup>

The passage above is an interview in which a Wai’anae man and sovereignty leader articulates what many in the movement feel is at the root of sovereignty. Michael Kioni Dudley and Keoni Kealoha Agard chronicle the start of the sovereignty movement and offer a key reason for its inception when they state that, “After decades that saw Hawaiians denying and neglecting their cultural heritage, the early 1970’s brought a renewal of interest in traditional Hawaiian music, arts, and crafts...The time was right...It was okay to be Hawaiian again...And Hawaiians began to be *proud* of being Hawaiian again.”<sup>6</sup> This sense of pride in our culture and our history is, according to Dudley and Agard, what helped to facilitate the birth of the sovereignty movement. We are *proud* to be indigenous to this land; we are *proud* to have our own language, music, and society; and most of all, we are *proud* to have had our own government. The sovereignty movement is a fight to regain that government, that source of pride.<sup>7</sup>

This sense of pride manifested itself in grassroots organizations beginning to protest and rally publicly against further land dispossession suffered by native Hawaiians, and the continuing urbanization of *kaikua’ana o na kanaka*.<sup>8</sup> “Out of anti-eviction and other land struggles in rural areas threatened with urbanization was born a Native rights movement, similar to movements of other colonized Native peoples...[The] Hawaiian Movement evolved from a series of protests against land abuses, through various demonstrations and occupations to dramatize the exploitative conditions of Hawaiians, to assertions of Native forms of sovereignty based on indigenous birthrights to land and

sea.”<sup>9</sup> Specifically speaking, the protest movements that began in the 70’s were first known as anti-eviction efforts, or efforts to thwart the continued use of the island of Kaho’olawe for target practice by the United States military. “The movement [then] evolved both cultural and political demands that focused on the historical injury of the overthrow and annexation. The goals of [the native Hawaiian sovereignty] movement now include some form of self-government, the creation of a public educational system in the Hawaiian language, and legal entitlements to a national land base, including water rights.”<sup>10</sup>

What sets the native Hawaiian sovereignty movement apart from many other movements for indigenous rights is that, although many native and non-native Hawaiians have mobilized as a community in the name of sovereignty, they have taken that mobilization a step farther and organized themselves into more than 300 different factions.<sup>11</sup> These factions, while in agreement on the need for self-determination in a general sense, are vying for recognition, legitimacy, and in most cases, different forms of sovereignty in the name of Hawaiians. In a two-day sovereignty convention held in 1988, spokespersons from six of the major pro-sovereignty groups came together to clearly state their stances on a number of positions concerning the native community. What was made clear at this conference was that “it was not yet time [for sovereignty groups] to solidify on one stand. The Hawaiian people as a whole need to be presented with a number of possibilities for future nationhood, and have the time to explore them, so that when they are finally asked to vote, they will make the most enlightened choice.”<sup>12</sup>

In the years since the conference, these different groups have continued to take their views out to the people for consideration. Some groups, like Kokua Kalama, were formed in direct opposition to the further development of Hawaiian lands, and continue to focus on the dispossession and rights of native Hawaiians. Groups like ‘Ohana O Hawaii (The Extended Family of Hawaii), which was founded in 1974 and is one of the longest running native Hawaiian sovereignty organizations, focus primarily on the political aspects of sovereignty, “having taken the case of the illegally overthrown Hawaiian nation before the World Court at The Hague, and before a number of other international tribunals, calling for the decolonization of Hawaii, and laying the groundwork for recognition of an eventual declaration of actual sovereignty.”<sup>13</sup> And still other groups, like A.L.O.H.A. focus on reparations for the illegal overthrow and annexation of our monarchy and our kingdom.

But perhaps the clearest and most concise reason for the creation of the native Hawaiian sovereignty movement comes from the legal testimony of international scholar, Professor Francis Boyle, who stated that,

The State of Hawaii, the federal government, are...the civilian arms of the military occupation authority, and...do not have sovereignty powers. The sovereignty resides in the people...An independent sovereign nation is one way a people who are threatened with extermination by means of [cultural] genocide can attempt to protect themselves...What is the best way to protect the existence of your people?...To proclaim your own state, [to restore the inherent sovereignty of the people] and then ultimately seek international recognition and finally United Nations membership...<sup>14</sup>

With this in mind, supporters of sovereignty hold to a saying that dates back to the time of Kamehameha I, which translates to: “So many Hawaiians are not surviving in the

world of the white man. Give us our lands and seas, and let us return to the ways of our culture. Hawaiians can survive if they can be Hawaiian and live Hawaiian.”<sup>15</sup>

***What tools is the movement using to achieve sovereignty?***

Since the early days of U.S. occupation in the islands, survival for Hawaiians has been synonymous with resistance to American oppression, and early forms of resistance are what Hawaiians now consider the first indications of the impending push for sovereignty.<sup>16</sup> In 1998, a committee wishing to educate the public on the 1897 anti-annexation struggle by native Hawaiians obtained 556 pages, that’s 21,269 signatures, of the official petition opposing annexation.<sup>17</sup> From then on, people would have physical proof that their grandparents or great-grandparents were activists for sovereignty. “The petition, inscribed with the names of everyone’s kupuna, gave people permission from their ancestors to participate in the quest for national sovereignty. More important, it affirmed for them that their kupuna had not stood by idly, apathetically, while their nation was taken from them. Instead, contrary to every history book on the shelf, they learned that their ancestors had, as James Kaulia put it, taken up the honorable field of struggle.”<sup>18</sup>

Contemporary native Hawaiians learned that their ancestors had not willingly allowed their country, their homeland, and their beloved leaders to be taken over. Instead, they had fought in a number of ways to stem off the flow of American colonization. One of the most common ways of proclaiming solidarity, both then and now, was through the use of ‘olelo Hawaii, or the Hawaiian language. “Songs, poems, and stories with the potential for kaona, or ‘hidden meanings,’ presented...opportunities

to express anticolonial sentiments. People made use of these forms, and they created and maintained their national solidarity through publication of these and more overtly political essays in newspapers.”<sup>19</sup>

For example, in the days following the overthrow of Queen Lili’uokalani, and the imprisonment of many of her followers, Hawaiian language newspapers used key phrases and morals in the stories and legends printed on their pages to encourage those who were fighting for sovereignty, and instill hope in those who felt as if it were a losing battle. The Queen regularly submitted songs and poems to their papers that spoke to her people in ways that she was not allowed to do vocally, reminding them that they were the rightful heirs of the land, that their monarch had not forgotten them, and that justice would prevail. “Four mele [(songs)] were apparently smuggled out of the queen’s prison room to the newspaper *Ka Makaainana*, where they were published in weekly installments. Her main message in these mele was that her heart was still with her people and her nation, and that contrary to the representation being made by the prorepublic papers she had not abandoned the *po’e aloha ‘aina* or the struggle for their nation.”<sup>20</sup> Today, those mele and stories are used as a source of pride and inspiration for participants in the native Hawaiian sovereignty movement.

As the occupation by America went on, those loyal to the Hawaiian Nation of the time signed petitions calling for the reinstatement of the Queen and the return of the kingdom. The Queen herself, once released from her eight-month imprisonment by the illegal Provisional Government, went to Washington in order to appeal to American government officials for justice to be done.<sup>21</sup> What is important to note here is that unlike many other struggles for decolonization, such as conflicts like the Northern Ireland

Troubles, the native Hawaiian struggle from its outset has been a non-violent one, with supporters of sovereignty who chose to use cultural and international politics, and trusted that those methods would be enough to restore a kingdom.

Today's sovereignty activists continue to fight in the same manner that their ancestors did. In Ka Lahui Hawaii's 1995 Master Plan, the organization includes a section entitled "Commitment to Peace, Disarmament, and Non-Violence" which reads:

The practice of peace requires that we resolve conflict in a non-violent manner. This commitment to non-violence relates not only to our undertakings in the political arena, but involves the seeking of non-violent solutions to family, personal, and community problems...Disarmament means that the Hawaiian Nation shall not engage in acts of militarism, nor shall it endorse military undertakings on its land or territories.<sup>22</sup>

This commitment to peace means that native Hawaiians have had to find ways of demonstrating their displeasure with the operating government while still maintaining law-abiding methods.

For example, much like the native Hawaiians of the annexation era, today's sovereignty activists use the hula to increase unity among the people, as well as create a more culturally political stance on which to state their case. This can be seen in the efforts of the community in opposing attempted legislation, Senate Bill 8, that would prohibit kumu hula<sup>23</sup> from gathering the necessary materials needed for dance by making even more land private property in Hawaii, and thus unavailable for use. Alone, this may not sound like such a drastic move on the part of the government, but this act follows nearly a hundred years of land dispossession and privatization suffered by native Hawaiians and would have been yet another attack against native Hawaiian culture at the hands of the government.

Prior to this bill, and “although the hula movement embodied practical aspects of native resistance to colonial domination, many kumu hula...did not perceive hula itself as political nor did they see the political resistance of Hawaiians as impacting or influencing hula.”<sup>24</sup> This was all about to change.

In the 25 hours of constant demonstration at the State Building in downtown Honolulu on February 25, 1997, along with sovereignty organizations, activists, and supporters, “Kumu hula throughout the Hawaiian Islands mobilized hundreds of their hula students in an extraordinary feat of grace and power never seen in modern colonial times...[it was] the politicization of hula...Thus, [the Hawaiian community] all agreed to allow the most sacred symbol of hula into a political arena and to use this cultural instrument for a most political purpose.”<sup>25</sup>

As a result of this mass demonstration, the pounding of 100 pahu<sup>26</sup> every hour on the hour, and the power that cultural force can wield, Senate Bill 8 was eventually shot down before the hula practitioners left the State Building. Since then, “Hula ku’e is the term now widely used in the hula community. It means a dance performed to resist, protest or oppose the status quo. Hula ku’e is resistance that is equated with endurance and survival.”<sup>27</sup> Hula ku’e is now the term for the use of hula in the sovereignty movement.

But the question remains as to whether a movement, any movement, can bring about real change and decolonization via cultural politics. Maybe, or maybe not. The Hawaiian sovereignty movement is not just cultural politics, however. Couple those politics with educated key players, and organizations that are willing to take their struggle to the international arena in the form of Indigenous Rights Conferences and World Court

cases, then yes, the Hawaiian sovereignty movement can bring about real change and decolonization.

Now that we have been introduced to a brief history of the sovereignty movement, as well as an overview of the general sense of what the movement is about, it is time to begin examining the vehicles of the movement much more closely. In the next Chapter, we will begin to look at specific organizations, their principles and ideas, their methods, and their goals, in regards to the native Hawaiian sovereignty movement.

# Chapter Two: Imua e na poki'i

## ***Dispossessions of Empire***

*An orphaned smell  
of ghettos in this tourist  
archipelago: shanties  
on the beach, slums*

*in the valleys, corruption  
and trash everywhere.  
in the city, immigrants  
claiming to be natives;*

*in the country, natives  
without a nation:  
The democracy of colonies.*

*For the foreigner, romances  
of "Aloha,"  
For Hawaiians,  
dispossession of empire.*

***- Haunani-Kay Trask<sup>1</sup>***

One of the most famed of all Hawaiian sayings was uttered by one of our greatest chiefs before he stepped into the worst battle of his life in his journey to building a unified Hawaiian Nation. It was a call for solidarity and courage among his warriors, and is still repeated among sovereignty activists today:<sup>2</sup>

Imua e na poki'i  
A inu i ka wai 'awa'awa  
A'ohe hope e ho'i mai ai.

Forward my brothers and sisters  
And drink the bitter water  
There is no turning back now.

In keeping with this, the native Hawaiian sovereignty movement has chosen to move forward, and since the early 1970's has begun forming factions within the movement as a whole with varied, and sometimes conflicting, positions on self-governance and self-determination. With so many

different organizations fighting for sovereignty, it's difficult to imagine what independence would look like, should pro-sovereignty native Hawaiians emerge victorious from the debate over American decolonization. Many questions emerge: What organizations are there? What are our options? What are the differences between these organizations?

In this Chapter we will examine three of the many different organizations, in the hopes of gaining a little understanding as to what a small number of these groups are

trying to achieve and how. These groups are Ka Lahui Hawaii, The Provisional Government of the Independent Nation State of Hawaii, and the Hawaiian Kingdom Government. Aside from these organizations proposing very varied forms of sovereignty in a new Hawaiian nation, I've chosen them for several different reasons: Ka Lahui Hawaii is arguably the largest and most mobilized of the native Hawaiian sovereignty organizations. It is also one of the most public and influential, as some of its key members hold positions in the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, as well as the Center for Hawaiian Studies at the University of Hawaii. I've chosen The Provisional Government of the Independent Nation State of Hawaii because, while it too is large in number, it is also regarded as one of the most radical of sovereignty organizations, with a very charismatic leader, and a land base they already consider the Nation of Hawaii. The Hawaiian Kingdom Government has been included because, unlike other organizations in the movement, this organization is very unique in that it operates on the foundation that the Kingdom of Hawaii is currently, and has always been, the government in power in Hawaii. The Hawaiian Kingdom Government also views itself, not as an organization, but rather as the official government of the rightful kingdom, for the time being.

The upcoming sections will take a closer look at each of these individual organizations, their methods, and their goals, in order to lay the groundwork for a critique of each group in Chapter Three. Some key concepts to note are:

1. The mission and purpose of each organization.
2. How the term sovereignty is used and defined.
3. The method of sovereignty proposed, and how the organizations plan to achieve it.

4. The support each organization has and who is allowed to participate.

***Ka Lahui Hawaii (The Hawaiian Nation)***

Ka Lahui Hawaii is most simply described as a native initiative for self-government.<sup>3</sup> Founded in 1987 by the organizations' former Kia'aina<sup>4</sup> Mililani Trask and several others as a consolidation of several Hawaiian rights groups, Ka Lahui's primary objective is securing recognition of a sovereign government for native Hawaiians.<sup>5</sup> The organization has also been described by Ka Lahui Hawaii's press secretary Haunani-Kay Trask, as a way to focus discontent felt by native Hawaiians "over continued state abuse of the trust lands and revenues, and [raises an issue that had previously been] ignored: inclusion of Hawaiians in federal Indian policy that recognized over 300 Native nations in the United States while not extending this recognition to Hawaiians."<sup>6</sup>

Exactly what sovereignty is, and the kind of sovereignty that will be implemented by the organization should it have the opportunity to do so, is an issue very clearly defined by Ka Lahui Hawaii. "Sovereignty is defined...as the ability of a people who share a common culture, religion, language, value system and land base, to exercise control over their lands and lives, independent of other nations,"<sup>7</sup> and furthermore, "an essential part of sovereignty and self-determination is the right of a native people, as a government, to define who they are."<sup>8</sup>

The five elements of sovereignty now agreed upon within Ka Lahui Hawaii are as follows:<sup>9</sup>

1. A strong and abiding faith in ke Akua.<sup>10</sup>
2. A people with a common culture.
3. A land base.
4. A government structure.
5. An economic base.

According to members of the organization, “When you assume responsibility for these elements of sovereignty, change occurs. We are not in a position where we can continue to point a finger at the State because there’s 20,000 people on a list for housing [(referring to the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands)]...Home-rule requires that we fashion the solution and that we demonstrate that we are capable of doing the job...Self-sufficiency is the goal of nationhood.”<sup>11</sup>

But how exactly does Ka Lahui Hawaii, an organization that advocates nation-within-a-nation<sup>12</sup> status for Hawaii according to Ka Lahui Lt. Governor Keali’i Gora,<sup>13</sup> propose to achieve sovereignty? To put it plainly, Ka Lahui would like U.S. recognition as an indigenous nation, and from there will begin to seek reparations, as well as native Hawaiian entitlements (such as native lands held in trust by the United States). They propose to go about achieving this by seeking inclusion for native Hawaiians in existing U.S. federal policy, which is the vehicle through which Native Americans have obtained the right to be self-governing. Through this, native Hawaiians will have access to the federal courts for judicial review on the overthrow, illegal annexation, and the current position and plight of the native Hawaiian community.<sup>14</sup>

However, federal recognition is not the end goal for sovereignty. “As a first step for the Hawaiian nation, Ka Lahui proposes achieving—through treaty—recognition as a

sovereign nation...with 'nation to nation' status like that of the Iroquois...Ka Lahui would then move to place the Hawaiian land base on the United Nations list of non-self-governing territories."<sup>15</sup> This strategic move of placing the Hawaiian land base, made up of trust lands that would have theoretically been returned to the Hawaiian nation as part of a reparations package by the U.S., back on to the U.N. list of non-self-governing territories would grant the new government "special guarantees" of security allotted to these types of nations. Furthermore, it would give the new nation the right to decide what type of relationship it wants with the U.S. in future dealings.<sup>16</sup>

Alongside the organizations' Lt. Governor, former Kia'aina, and press secretary, are some 23,152 adult members, more than 8,000 of which are native Hawaiians, who are committed to regaining native lands and re-establishing native Hawaiians as a self-governing people.<sup>17</sup> With such large numbers, Ka Lahui is considered the largest, and one of the most mobilized, of the sovereignty groups<sup>18</sup> with room to spare for anyone who wishes to join. According to Mililani Trask,

[non-native Hawaiians] should not be frightened. My advice to that person is to...work with us. There's a great deal of work that has [to be done]...I don't have time to deal with their guilt. [We] need help. I think you might find people who feel that way, but they don't want to help. They feel that they're not Hawaiians, they're not involved in it...To these people, my advice is, better educate yourself about sovereignty, better become involved, because this is not a fencepost you can straddle...Sovereignty is not an issue that just addresses the concerns of 20% of the population of this state. Sovereignty is going to impact everyone.<sup>19</sup>

However, the requirements of one becoming a citizen in Ka Lahui's sovereign Hawaiian nation is a little more complicated than they are to join the organization. While everyone, both native and non-native, is encouraged to be a part of and are welcome in the nation,

only those with native Hawaiian blood are allowed to become full citizens. Those who are residents of Hawaii but are not of native Hawaiian blood are allowed to become honorary citizens of the Hawaiian nation, and although they are not allowed to vote or to hold elective office, they are allowed to be members of island councils and are not excluded in debates and discussions surrounding the government and politics of the nation.<sup>20</sup>

In order to make every possible effort to ensure that this form of sovereignty becomes more than just a discussion, in the early 90's Ka Lahui began reorganizing itself into a firmly structured government. One of the ways it chose to do so was by drafting an organizational (and hopefully national) Constitution. "In 1994, Ka Lahui created the most comprehensive plan for the attainment of Hawaiian sovereignty yet devised...The inclusive vision of the Master Plan follows, at one and the same time the language of international law *and* the cultural precepts of Native Hawaiians."<sup>21</sup>

The *Ho'okupu a Ka Lahui Hawaii: The Master Plan 1995* includes eight sections that cover issues from an emphatic commitment to peace that the new nation would endorse, as well as plans for economic development and positioning within the international arena.<sup>22</sup> The Constitution also sets forth what the organization believes are native Hawaiian traditional and cultural rights, as well as providing that the native Hawaiian people have the right to elect their own government. Such a government will be, according to Ka Lahui, democratic in nature, with it's political process being the elective process, and its cultural process being Lokahi, or harmony. Under this plan, all residents and citizens in Hawaii exist under two Constitutions: The Constitution of the U.S. and the Constitution of the State of Hawaii—*Ho'okupu a Ka Lahui Hawaii*.<sup>23</sup>

With the *Ho'okupu* a hopeful constitution for a new nation, Haunani-Kay Trask states firmly that, "No other Hawaiian entity...has even approached the level of analysis and practical self-government that Ka Lahui Hawaii has attained."<sup>24</sup> With this level of practicality and structure, Ka Lahui keeps its main goal clearly in sight: "The primary objective of Ka Lahui is to secure recognition for a sovereign government for the Hawaiian people...Native Hawaiians are ready and entitled to govern their own lands."<sup>25</sup>

### **The Provisional Government of the Independent Nation State of Hawaii**

Formerly known as the Nation of Hawaii, then the Ohana Council, the Provisional Government of the Independent Nation State of Hawaii is the third incarnation of one of the most radical and high profile sovereignty organizations in today's current movement.<sup>26</sup> Headed by native Hawaiian activist and founder of Pu'uho'oua o Waimanalo,<sup>27</sup> Dennis "Bumpy" Kanahale and those who unanimously elected him as the Head of State organized themselves, educated the community, and became a powerful force fighting for sovereignty.

Kanahale envisions the Nation State of Hawaii as one day encompassing all of the Hawaiian Islands. Kanahale feels that this Nation, which will prosper on international trade and banking, free of control by the U.S. federal and state governments, will be a place where Native Hawaiians will have far more political and economic clout than they do now.<sup>28</sup> The current, comprehensive mission of the Nation State of Hawaii is that it

will continue to develop...educational programs for the people of Hawaii, develop its legislative, executive, and judicial infrastructure, begin to implement home rule on each of the islands, engage the illegitimate state of Hawaii in a smooth and peaceful transition, and seek formal international recognition to rejoin the world community of nations.<sup>29</sup>

This separatist-independent form of sovereignty is founded upon the Black's Law Dictionary (6<sup>th</sup> Edition) definition of sovereignty, which follows that,

[sovereignty is:] the supreme, absolute, and uncontrollable power by which any independent state is governed; supreme political authority; the supreme will; paramount control of the constitution and frame of government and its administration; the self-sufficient source of political power, from which all specific political powers are derived; the international independence of a state, combined with the right and power of regulating its internal affairs without foreign dictation...<sup>30</sup>

The Nation State of Hawaii also calls upon the *Restatement of the Law Third* in the context of Rights and Duties of States, which reads that sovereignty, in plain terms, “implies a state’s lawful control over its territory generally to the exclusion of other states, authority to govern in that territory, and authority to apply law there.”<sup>31</sup>

According to Kanahale, this independence is of the utmost importance when dealing directly with the unique case of native Hawaiian sovereignty. “Independence’ means more than just political independence. Right now, Hawaii is a very ‘dependent’ society, depending on outside sources, primarily the United States, to meet most of our needs...Therefore we are subject to the control of outside forces. We lack self-reliance and suffer from great vulnerability. Hawaii must become more independent in many ways to ensure the future stability of our land and people...The only true sovereignty is independence.”<sup>32</sup>

Therefore, the “true sovereignty” that the Nation State of Hawaii is vying for comes in the form of full independence from the U.S. government. A journalist and project coordinator for Holo I Mua, the Hawaiian Roundtable discussion on Hawaiian Sovereignty for The Honolulu Advertiser, described how “[Supporters of full

independence] reason that the 1959 vote for Hawaii statehood was invalid and believe the United States should recognize and support reinscription of Hawaii on the United Nations List of Non-Self-Governing Territories eligible for decolonization,”<sup>33</sup> which would in turn open up discussion for the creation of a completely independent Nation.

In agreement with the above sentiment, Kanahale stated that, as the Head of State and public representative of the Nation State of Hawaii, “I believe in independence, I believe [the U.S.] stole Hawaii, and that it is a crime to steal anyplace in the world...We cannot forget the violation they did...because that violation, under international law, allows us restoration of our government.”<sup>34</sup> In an email correspondence with Nation State of Hawaii’s Head of Security, Steve Toyama, he explained that “[The U.S.] cannot annex by internal ‘resolution’ nor make a territory or a state from something illegally taken. This is the crux of our argument...[Professor Francis Boyle] has advised us that under International Law we can restore our independent nation-state in any form we wish and need not ask anybody but ourselves for permission.”<sup>35</sup>

Those who are in full support of the Nation State of Hawaii reach numbers near to 7,000 citizens<sup>36</sup> and native Hawaiians as well as non-natives are invited to offer support. Kanahale sites one of the most common misconceptions about his pro-independence organization is that non-native Hawaiians would no longer be welcome or offered citizenship in the sovereign nation. “However, this fear is truly unfounded...Those non-Hawaiian residents who wish to become citizens in the nation will share the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, like any other country...There are many innocent people of all nationalities who care deeply about Hawaii. It is our responsibility to care for all these people, protect them, and include them as we develop our Country.”<sup>37</sup> Like other

nations, the Nation State of Hawaii makes no blood-quantum requirement for citizenship, and allows full citizenship to those who are not native Hawaiians but who are permanent residents of the Nation.

Development for this Nation has already been underway as the group, under its former name the Ohana Council, publicly announced its Proclamation of Restoration on January 16, 1994, the 99<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the overthrow of Queen Lili'uokalani. The proclamation, which encompasses the entire Hawaiian archipelago, reclaimed all land, waters, natural resources, and political status that once belonged to the Hawaiian Kingdom.<sup>38</sup> It also sites, in accordance with both previous Kingdom documentation, and contemporary international laws, that “The Independent and Sovereign Nation of Hawaii will establish procedures for according citizenship by means of naturalization to *all people* who are habitual residents of Hawaii as of today’s date (emphasis added).”<sup>39</sup>

Not only was the Proclamation of Restoration drafted and ratified, but the Nation State of Hawaii has already ratified a Constitution as well, which was made public on January 16, 1995, the 100<sup>th</sup> year anniversary of the overthrow. The Constitution of the Nation State of Hawaii lists first the history of subjugation of the native Hawaiian people, and then begins its Chapters and Articles which includes, but is not limited to, sections on<sup>40</sup>

1. Equal Protection of all citizens within the Nation
2. The Business of the Nation, both internally and internationally
3. Instructions on the formation of a Citizens’ Assembly to represent the people
4. The powers of the different bodies of government.

In keeping with native Hawaiian culture and tradition, the Constitution also lays the foundation of Na Kupuna Council, a council of elders to help with the affairs of running the government. Na Kupuna Council would be the equivalent to, but not in substitution of, advisors to the President of America.<sup>41</sup> Furthermore, “While the Constitution is based on the ‘inherent sovereignty’ of Kanaka Maoli people and is designed to protect and perpetuate the culture and rights of the original people of these islands, at the same time it is an inclusive document that recognizes the unique multi-cultural heritage of modern Hawaii, and provides for citizenship and participation in government for all the inhabitants of the [Nation State of Hawaii].”<sup>42</sup>

Aside from a Proclamation and a Constitution, Kanahele sites ‘patience’ as a fundamental aspect of obtaining sovereignty for the Nation State of Hawaii. “[We were] the rowdiest group [in the native Hawaiian sovereignty movement], so if anybody would make trouble, it would have been us...[but] we’ve learned you don’t have to fight [the government]. We just have to have patience, and we have to educate each other, and we have to be concerned about the non-Hawaiians as well as our own people as we develop this process.”<sup>43</sup>

One of Kanahele and the organizations’ current concerns is getting enough international acknowledgment by as many nations as possible as a prerequisite for acceptance to the United Nations.<sup>44</sup> Most recently, Kanahele has tried to rally his fellow sovereignty movement leaders in endorsing his call to retake ‘Iolani Palace. As of September 2005, no responses have been received. However, in an interview with Kanahele by SPASIFIK Magazine, a publication for New Zealand’s Pacific Islander and Maori communities, the Nation State of Hawaii leader stated firmly, “It is time...for us to

take our seat of government back. Then we can gather there, in the footsteps of our ancestors, to decide on our pathway back to independence.”<sup>45</sup>

### ***The Hawaiian Kingdom Government***

It is difficult to decide on a specific year that the Hawaiian Kingdom Government began, as this particular organization operates according to the claim that the original Hawaiian Kingdom never actually stopped existing and the organization is simply a continuation of that government in exile.<sup>46</sup> What is clear is that it wasn't until Keanu Sai and an associate embarked on a mission in 1995 to make public their claim of the Kingdoms' current existence that the organization, the Hawaiian Kingdom Government, came to be. Starting out as a co-partnership firm attempting to register with the proper governmental organization for operation rights, The Perfect Title Company, led by Sai, petitioned for registration under the annexed Hawaiian Kingdom. According to rules set forth by both international law and the Constitution of the Kingdom of Hawaii, in the absence of a governmental body present for the registration, The Perfect Title Company could serve in the *acting* position of the Regent or Council of Regency of the Hawaiian Kingdom until a permanent Regent or Council of Regency can be elected by a legally constituted Legislative Assembly.<sup>47</sup>

How this came to be is quite complicated, but in theory, according to the Constitution of the Kingdom of Hawaii, the Hawaiian Kingdom Government was established when the true government officials of the Kingdom were in absentia. The co-partnership firm becomes, by registering under the Hawaiian Constitution, the Perfect Trust Company, which registered another co-partnership firm named the Hawaiian

Kingdom Trust Company under the same Constitutional Act. This second company then became the acting body for the Hawaiian Government through the process of ascension under Hawaiian Kingdom Law, elected *acting* officials to the *acting* Council of Regency, elected Sai, a scholar of international law, as *acting* Regent, and became the Hawaiian Kingdom Government until such a time as the absent government can reconvene.<sup>48</sup>

According to Sai, all of this hinges on how one defines the term ‘sovereignty.’ Following Black’s Law Dictionary, Sai sights that sovereignty is ‘supreme authority’ over the territory of an independent state. Therefore, sovereignty is a legal construct while the government of an independent state is the agent that exercises this sovereignty. According to this definition then, governments are not sovereign and, as they are not the sovereign entity, can be legally or illegally overthrow, while the sovereignty of the state can remain.<sup>49</sup>

To put it plainly the sovereignty of the Hawaiian Kingdom, according to the Hawaiian Kingdom Government, never ended. Governments can be altered through constitutional means, internal revolt or by sanctioned foreign intervention, but the sovereignty of a recognized State, under international law, can only be affected through the consented merger with another sovereign state, political and social dismemberment in accordance with international law, or as the result of internal revolt.<sup>50</sup>

Sai took his case and the assertion that he was the *acting* Regent of the Hawaiian Kingdom Government, by way of a minor dispute on the Big Island of Hawaii, to the World Court of Arbitration in 1999. He argued that “when a nation, such as the United States, has a treaty with another nation, such as the Kingdom of Hawaii, the United States cannot impose its own domestic laws.”<sup>51</sup> Which is to say that it’s illegal (by way of the

established treaties) for one country to go to another country and overthrow the government of that country just because it has the military and economic might to do so.

Although the World Court refused to rule in the case due to the absence of the United States at the hearings,<sup>52</sup> Sai maintains the validity of the position of the Hawaiian Kingdom Government. “We don’t need to get Hawaiian sovereignty re-recognized, it already exists. What we don’t have is diplomatic recognition of a government. This is OK because under the laws of occupation, the United States, as the occupier, must administer the laws of the occupied State whether we get diplomatic recognition or not.”<sup>53</sup> In the eyes of the Hawaiian Kingdom Government, the lapse of time between the illegal overthrow and the 21<sup>st</sup> century means nothing more under international law than that the United States has held Hawaii under prolonged occupation. “We already have sovereignty...We are working to end the occupation.”<sup>54</sup>

Because the Hawaiian Kingdom Government functions in the absence of the lawful Hawaiian Kingdom government, the form of sovereignty they endorse is full independence from the United States. The difference between this form of absolute independence and other forms supported by sovereignty movement organizations is that the Hawaiian Kingdom Government is not working towards establishing a new nation, but rather is trying to re-establish an already existing nation. With this in mind, the primary objective of the Hawaiian Kingdom Government is cited as exposing the occupation of the rightful Hawaiian Nation, as well as to providing a catalyst for the transition and the ultimate end of the occupation of the Hawaiian Kingdom.<sup>55</sup>

After this transition takes place, the Hawaiian Kingdom Government intends to continue overseeing governmental affairs for the nation until such a date as the people of

the Hawaiian Kingdom can elect an appropriate leader. At this time, however, the government will continue to be overseen by the *Acting* Regent and Council, as they are under the firm belief that an election of a Monarch is presently premature.<sup>56</sup>

Aside from leadership roles, the Constitution followed by the Hawaiian Kingdom Government also provides the groundwork for who is allowed citizenry in the Kingdom. When asked how many citizens were currently enrolled under the Hawaiian Kingdom Government,<sup>57</sup> Sai answered that the number comes directly from the 1890 government census done in the Kingdom, in addition to “anyone born in the Hawaiian Islands prior to August 12, 1898, the date of the second American occupation...”<sup>58</sup> According to both census, the number of subjects the Hawaiian Kingdom Government considers as citizenry is a minimum of 164,225.<sup>59</sup>

The Constitution of the Kingdom, however, also provides the stipulations as to who can be *made* citizens:

States who regained their former independence are called restored States, and as these States are not new there would be no need to redefine a new body of citizens, but rather utilize the laws that existed before the occupation to determine the citizenry...The Hawaiian citizenry of today is comprised of descendants of Hawaiian subjects and those foreigners who were born in the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1898. This exclusion of the Hawaiian citizenry is based upon precedence and law, but a restored Hawaiian government does have the authority to widen the scope of its citizenry and adopt a more inclusive model in the aftermath of prolonged American Occupation.<sup>60</sup>

This also allows, therefore, that citizenry be offered to anyone born in Hawaii, not just those of native Hawaiian blood. Furthermore, these non-native citizens, much like non-native citizens in the latter part of the 1800's, are allowed the benefits of full citizenship, including voting rights and the option of running for political office.<sup>61</sup>

All legal decisions for the organization are made in accordance with the Constitution of the Kingdom of Hawaii, which is, as stated earlier, still considered the lawful and just Constitution of Hawaii. “[The Constitution of 1864] still has legal effect in the Hawaiian Kingdom, due to Article 78, which provides that, ‘laws now in force in this Kingdom, shall continue and remain in full effect, until altered or repealed by the Legislature; such parts only excepted as are repugnant to this Constitution. All laws heretofore enacted, or that may hereafter be enacted, which are contrary to this Constitution, shall be null and void.’”<sup>62</sup>

Aside from their Constitution, the Hawaiian Kingdom Government sites as one of its articles of reference the *Strategic Plan of the acting Council of Regency*. Made up of three phases, the Strategic Plan serves as a guide for the organization and was developed in order to address the long-term occupation of Hawaii, and the effects of that occupation on the politics, economics, and mentalities of the native Hawaiian population and the national population of Hawaii as a whole, as well as the international community. The three phases of the Strategic Plan are as follows:<sup>63</sup>

1. Verification of the Hawaiian Kingdom as an independent State and a subject of International Law
2. Exposure of Hawaiian Kingdom Statehood within the framework of international law and the laws of occupation as it affects the realm of politics and economics at both the international and domestic levels
3. Restoration of the Hawaiian Kingdom as an independent State and a subject of International Law

Currently, Sai places the Hawaiian Kingdom Government in phase two. “The exposure phase...is clearly education. And as such, we need to understand the terminology associated with prolonged occupation...Hawaii can’t be decolonized if it

was never colonized, but Hawaii can be de-occupied because it is presently occupied. Phase two of the strategic plan will expose the occupation in order for the de-occupation to begin.”<sup>64</sup>

## So what exactly are Sai and the Hawaiian Kingdom Government working towards?

Queen Lili’uokalani protested [annexation] at home and in Washington, D.C., and entered into an estoppel agreement with President Grover Cleveland, wherein the president asked the queen effectively to pardon the traitors who were calling themselves the provisional government. In return for this, the United States would support the reinstatement of the Hawaiian monarchy. She agreed; however, to this day, the United States has not lived up to its end of the agreement.<sup>65</sup>

The Hawaiian Kingdom Government is seeking recognition and the implementation of this agreement, and will continue to function as the “true” government of the Hawaiian Kingdom until such a time comes to pass.

# Chapter Three: Onipa'a kakou

## **Aloha, Lili'uokalani**

*Do you, Queen Lili'uokalani,  
hold back tears for what you lost?  
Did you carry your grief into heaven?  
Paradise falls to us in pieces,  
pieces governed by the highest bidders.  
Their blueprints cover sacred land with walls.  
Walls to protect investments.  
Walls to exclude the less fortunate.  
Walls to keep Hawaiians out.  
Kapus make Hawaii a land of strangers...  
Dear Lili'uokalani, Hawaii is fee simple.  
Hawaii is fair market value.  
Hawaii is for sale and already sold.  
A shadow falls on Iolani Palace.  
Now Kalakaua is an avenue  
ruled by stoplights and crosswalks.  
Likelike and Kamehameha  
are remembered as highways.  
The majority encourages progress.  
The majority is no longer Hawaiian.*

*- Kirby Wright<sup>1</sup>*

Queen Lili'uokalani was arguably an activist for native Hawaiian sovereignty. As evidenced in many native Hawaiian newspapers of her time, she was one of the first people to formally oppose annexation and was an extremely passionate supporter of her people.<sup>2</sup> Today, sovereignty for Hawaii can mean many things including continuing the fight of Hawaii's beloved Queen for the freedom of her people and country. "Onipa'a kakou," Lili'uokalani's call to both native and non-native Hawaiian residents to remain steadfast in times of struggle was a motto she lived by, and remains in wide use today by Hawaiian sovereignty activists.<sup>3</sup>

Unfortunately, much like Lili'uokalani a century ago, the current native Hawaiian sovereignty movement has come up against many obstacles in its three and a half decades of activism. Some of these obstacles will be covered in the following section, in which we will examine the chances, if any, that the movement has of succeeding. Some key concepts under discussion will be:

1. Practicality and Feasibility: Realistically speaking, which organization, if any, has the most comprehensive proposal for achieving sovereignty?
2. Probability: How much of a factor is the support each organization has in its ability to achieve sovereignty? How does the U.S. feel regarding the organizations or their sovereignty proposals?
3. What faces the sovereignty initiative as a whole?

By taking a closer look at the three organizations covered in the previous Chapter—Ka Lahui Hawaii, The Provisional Government of the Independent Nation State of Hawaii, and The Hawaiian Kingdom Government—and comparing these key ideas, I hope to offer an argument in favor of certain methods, practices, structures, and

an organization that perhaps embodies all of these aspects in a manner conducive to success.

### **Practicality and Feasibility**

As stated above, this section will ask the important question of whether or not the proposal of each organization is in fact one that could actually be successfully implemented to achieve sovereignty. This includes examining whether or not the organization has a firm explanation of how a new government and new nation will be created, and if these explanations address issues from political, economic, social, and realistic perspectives. Is the proposed idea for sovereignty something that the people would theoretically support? Why or why not? And finally, if the organization did achieve sovereignty for Hawaii, has it considered where the new nation would go from that starting point?

### **Ka Lahui Hawaii**

“The drafting of a constitution which incorporates traditional, cultural and spiritual values and practices with current processes and which can be altered to accommodate the need of the indigenous people to change,”<sup>4</sup> is sighted as one of Ka Lahui Hawaii’s major accomplishments. In terms of practicality, this offers an overview of Ka Lahui’s Constitution, which states that the organization has successfully bridged native Hawaiian culture with aspects of contemporary practices. Haunani-Kay Trask has also claimed that Ka Lahui’s Constitution is the most comprehensive plan for the attainment of Hawaiian sovereignty that any organization has yet devised.<sup>5</sup> This plan and Constitution, named *Ho’okupu a ka Lahui Hawaii*, was the first step an organization took

at pro-actively tackling both questions of feasibility and practicality, and bringing those two concepts together coherently in one document that laid the foundation for the creation of a new Hawaiian nation. Broken down, what Ka Lahui has done is to create somewhat of a blueprint, both clear and public, for what they propose for sovereignty.

This Constitution is practical in that it addresses issues that a sovereign nation would have to deal with in the process of becoming independent from the United States, as well as creating a new government.

Section III of *Ho'okupu a ka Lahui Hawaii*, entitled "Dealing with the United States" highlights its main points as being:

1. The Evolution of the United States Policy Relating to Hawaii and its Indigenous People: Here, Ka Lahui lays out the basis for their argument for sovereignty, citing treaties and international policies that the United States had with the Kingdom of Hawaii, and has violated by continued colonization.
2. The Current Policy of the United States Towards Hawaiians: The Policy of Non-Recognition, Denial, and State Wardship: Ka Lahui provides evidence for the claim that continued colonization of Hawaii has been detrimental to native Hawaiians.
3. Ka Lahui Hawaii's Position Regarding United States Policy: The organization rejects the illegal and continued actions of United States Policies regarding native Hawaiians, accepts the Apology Bill offered by the United States, and begins a proposal for reconciliation.<sup>6</sup>

This third notation regarding reconciliation is where Ka Lahui will have to argue their case of practicality and feasibility. According to this section, reconciliation for Ka Lahui will bring about final resolutions to the overthrow, misuse of native land trusts, violations of human and civil rights of Hawaii residents, and will require the U.S. to recognize Ka Lahui as the legal and governmental representative for the Hawaiian people.<sup>7</sup> "Probably the most controversial point in Ka Lahui's bill is a commitment from the United States to

decolonize Hawaii through the United Nations process for non-self-governing territories...Decolonization is seen by many as an extreme move that will receive little federal support.”<sup>8</sup> However, Mililani Trask has stated that she thinks achieving sovereignty is “very feasible, and I think the appropriate way to pursue it is through...a multifaceted approach and strategic plan for moving the issue of federal recognition and status through the U.S. Congress.”<sup>9</sup>

By endorsing federal recognition, Ka Lahui takes a position that perhaps offers the most practical avenue for achieving sovereignty: engaging the United States as well as international bodies in the discussion, and allowing the colonizing power to be included in debates that will eventually result in a decision made by that power. Ka Lahui has also stated that, after the initial phase in which the organization will assume leadership of the new nation, the new government will hold a democratic election in which citizens of the nation will be able to elect their own representatives to serve in office.<sup>10</sup>

Aside from actions outlining what sovereignty would mean for Hawaii, Ka Lahui’s Constitution also offers suggestions for economic and educational development programs that would form the support system of the new nation brought about by decolonization by the United States.<sup>11</sup> Both feasible and practical, Ka Lahui proposes that, once the United States honors the reparations package and native land trusts are once again under native Hawaiian control, the nation will have sole jurisdiction over revenues received from those land trusts, and will use such revenues (such as taxes from lands leased to the United States) “in order to support economic initiatives for housing,

employment, education, and the development of [the nations] own businesses and those of its citizens.”<sup>12</sup>

So, while Ka Lahui may be asking the United States for a lot, the avenues that the organization is taking in order to bring about sovereignty and change in Hawaii are arguable very practical and feasible. Boasting upwards of 23,000 adult members,<sup>13</sup> one could infer that more than 23,000 people agree.

### ***The Provisional Nation State of Hawaii***

“It is time...for us to take our seat of government back. Then we can gather there, in the footsteps of our ancestors, to decide on our pathway back to independence.”<sup>14</sup> For Kanahale and other members of The Provisional Government of the Independent Nation State of Hawaii, native Hawaiians are justified in their desire to take their government back from the United States. Still, other members of the sovereignty movement are skeptical about the practicality, feasibility, and perhaps reasonability of the plans the Nation State of Hawaii has, and therefore, “[Kanahale’s] call for a recapture of [‘Iolani Palace] has not yet been endorsed by the entire coalition.”<sup>15</sup>

However, storming the palace isn’t the only plan Kanahale’s group has for beginning to pro-actively seek nationhood. In fact, Kanahale may be a perfect example of proof that independence is within his grasp: In a place called Pu’uhonua o Waimanalo, on the island of O’ahu, Kanahale and his followers have planted the seeds of the self-proclaimed Nation of Hawaii. There are more than two-dozen sheds and huts occupying the sloping foot of the Ko’olau’s, where villagers work in restored taro paddies and drive cars that carry Nation of Hawaii license plates. An estimated 60 to 80 citizens populate Pu’uhonua, where children are educated on-site, and much of what is

used on the premises is either produced there or donated, making it an almost completely self-sustaining township. The land itself is leased from the state as part of an agreement between the two organizations to “get rid of a 200-resident tent city” the group had used to occupy beachfront, as well as to put an end to members passing out leaflets on the beaches of Waikiki asking non-native Hawaiian tourists to leave the islands.<sup>16</sup>

“Kanahele’s nation [numbering around 7,000 citizens, both within Pu’uhonua and elsewhere] has adopted a constitution, claimed the right to try a federal fugitive, and embarked on an education campaign that blends radical politics, right-wing economics, and Hawaiian [culture].”<sup>17</sup> Through this the Nation State of Hawaii has at least begun to show that independence is possible through their organization, much more than other organizations at this time.

Unfortunately, some sovereignty activists and leaders are convinced Kanahele and the radical nature of his organization are less practical than they may seem. Mililani Trask has previously stated that, “Everything [Kanahele’s] done has been detrimental to sovereignty. His approach has been to basically tap into the [U.S. State] system by using sovereignty as an excuse to avoid responsibility.”<sup>18</sup> Others, such as sovereignty leader and international law scholar Kekuni Blaisdell, worry that the groups “tourists-go-home” tactics could discredit the entire sovereignty movement as a whole, as well as cause those who are on the fence to shy away from supporting native Hawaiian causes.<sup>19</sup>

Furthermore, the Nation State of Hawaii, unlike Ka Lahui Hawaii, has not offered any plan for actually going about achieving sovereignty. The organization gained control of Pu’uhonua o Waimanalo through an agreement with the State for the lease of that land, but the organization has not yet breached the subject of attempting an agreement with the

United States for control over Hawaii as a whole. While the organization offers validation that its methods have worked in the past, it has not offered a plan of what those methods are and how it will play out on a federal and international level.

Yet the Nation State of Hawaii remains convinced of achieving sovereignty and has continued to discuss several practical provisions for the success of a sovereign nation in educational lectures given by the charismatic Kanahale throughout the State of Hawaii. Also regarding practicality, aside from the group actually declaring independence from the United States in 1994, and continuing to live as an independent nation, Kanahale and other members of the group have devised an economic plan for the Nation State of Hawaii. “We could take advantage of our unique global position in the center of the Pacific Rim, controlling our 200 mile Exclusive Economic Zone, and becoming a center for international trade and development of global ethical banking, while...investing in the diversification of our local economy with innovative community based projects for meaningful employment and self-sufficiency.”<sup>20</sup> This plan, however, seems almost theoretically impossible, and the Nation State of Hawaii has yet to put into practice, support by way of action, or explain the position of the United States in this proposal for partial Pacific Rim control.

Perhaps it’s most viable option for an economic base then is Kanahale’s support for the creation of a Native Hawaiian Bank, owned and operated by native Hawaiians, which will initially provide the majority of, if not all, financial and economic support for native Hawaiian programs that are currently poorly funded by the federal government. This practical, and perhaps feasible plan, though we are yet to see this, will eventually

also provide the initial economic base for the new nation, should the group achieve the form of sovereignty they propose.<sup>21</sup>

### ***The Hawaiian Kingdom Government***

The Hawaiian Kingdom Government tackles the idea of practicality through their Strategic Plan, as previously discussed in the last Chapter. The first Phase of the Strategic Plan states that the Hawaiian Kingdom Government's role is to achieve "Verification of the Hawaiian Kingdom as an independent State and a subject of international law."<sup>22</sup> This is the avenue through which the Hawaiian Kingdom Government proposes to achieve sovereignty, as they site that under international law Hawaii remains a kingdom and is rightfully already sovereign.<sup>23</sup> This is unique in that it's the major basis for the entire organization; sovereignty isn't simply a theoretical and idealistic goal, but it's the practical solution to an issue within the international arena.

The second Phase of the Strategic Plan is the "Exposure of Hawaiian Kingdom Statehood within the framework of international law and the laws of occupation as it affects the realm of politics and economics at both the international and domestic levels."<sup>24</sup> As a continuation of Phase 1, Phase 2 speaks to the education and public involvement required if the Hawaiian Kingdom Government wishes itself to succeed. Rather than simply publicly protesting U.S. occupation, the Hawaiian Kingdom Government is using education to make the general public, much of whom aren't well-informed on the subject, more aware of the international violations the U.S. has committed against the Nation of Hawaii, and more importantly, what can and should be done about those violations.

The Hawaiian Kingdom Government has gone as far to prove the feasibility of sovereignty as to file a complaint with the United Nations' Security Council in 2001. The complaint was a request from the Hawaiian Kingdom Government to the Security Council to "investigate the Hawaiian Kingdom question, in particular, the merits of the complaint, and to recommend appropriate procedure or methods of adjustment."<sup>25</sup> The complaint also gained media coverage for, and called international attention to, the illegality of continued U.S. occupation within the rightful Hawaiian Kingdom.<sup>26</sup>

Phase 3 of the organizations plan to achieve sovereignty in a straightforward, practical sense, is akin to its end goal: "The restoration of the Hawaiian Kingdom as an Independent State and a subject of International Law."<sup>27</sup> From this Phase onward, the new Government would take it's place as a restored State among the Nations, reactivate the Hawaiian Constitution as the operating constitution, and continue to decide Hawaii's position in the international arena and its relationships with other Nations through the *de jure* government already participating in the Hawaiian Kingdom Government.

Organization leader and *acting* Council Regent of the Nation of Hawaii according to the Hawaiian Kingdom Government, Keanu Sai, has shown how practical and feasible it is for the organization to attempt achieving sovereignty by continuously engaging in the international arena. In 1997, Sai and his organization sued President Clinton in the Supreme Court, "asking the justices to compel Clinton to honor the 1850 treaty between the Hawaiian Kingdom and the United States,"<sup>28</sup> which, had he succeeded, would have set a precedence for the people of Hawaii to operate under a Kingdom Government once more. Then, in 1999, the Hawaiian Kingdom Government was taken before the Permanent Court of Arbitration by a citizen who claimed that the Hawaiian Kingdom

Government failed to protect him against legal action taken by Hawaii State police. The Kingdom held their position that they were unable to protect him due to United States law.<sup>29</sup>

However, the practicality of The Hawaiian Kingdom Government has been challenged, specifically by anti-sovereignty leader and former Office of Hawaiian Affairs trustee candidate, Kenneth Conklin. Conklin has stated that the case taken to the Court of Arbitration was a “fraudulent...use of the international court at The Hague for a propaganda circus.”<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, although Sai has achieved in taking cases regarding the Hawaiian Kingdom to international courts, he has yet to win a case, or gain substantial support from international bodies that will force the United States into discussions about sovereignty. Realistically speaking, while the law may be on the side of the Hawaiian Kingdom, the United States is the most powerful government in the international arena, and as such, has decisive power on any debates surrounding the sovereignty of Hawaii. If the Hawaiian Kingdom Government is adamant about achieving sovereignty, perhaps there needs to be a greater effort at engaging the United States itself in these debates, instead of relying on international law to force the U.S. into compliance.

However, although there are obviously some, like Conklin, who disagree emphatically with the reasonableness of the politics of the Hawaiian Kingdom Government, the international arena has in fact taken notice and has listened to several of these cases. Sai considers this proof that sovereignty is possible.<sup>31</sup>

## **Probability**

This section will highlight issues of probability within each of the three organizations. Discussion will focus on the methods used by the organizations covered in the previous section in regards to public support. What are the organizations doing to rally more support for their particular model of sovereignty? What are they doing to discourage support? What is the United States

position regarding the form of sovereignty proposed by each organization? Now that we have examined the practicality and feasibility of each organization, what is the probability that it will create a sustainable government?

#### Ka Lahui Hawaii

As previously noted, Ka Lahui numbers more than 23,000 members, and is the consolidation of several grassroots sovereignty organizations who have joined forces to create a strong, coherent option of government for Hawaii. Two key figures and founding members in the movement are sisters Mililani and Haunani-Kay Trask, both highly educated in law and politics.<sup>32</sup> Under their leadership, Ka Lahui has become a faction of the Hawaiian sovereignty movement much like a political party. They have represented native Hawaiians in the World Council of Indigenous People's at the United Nations, given lectures at Universities around the country educating people on Hawaiian affairs, and have also assisted in the organization of the initial native Hawaiian vote for or against sovereignty.<sup>33</sup>

But high media coverage and an organization base within the University of Hawaii system has lead Ka Lahui members to suffer accusations of blatant racism and discrimination in the past,<sup>34</sup> which in turn may reflect unkindly on Ka Lahui by association. In fact, several news articles have been published which clearly connect politically and culturally radical statements made by Haunani-Kay Trask as being directly linked to the ideology of the sovereignty movement as a whole, a mentality that, if strengthened, could lessen the probability of sovereignty for the organization.

One of the clearest, and perhaps impacting, statements made concerning Haunani-Kay Trask and Ka Lahui via the sovereignty movement has been that, “Even more chilling than Professor Trask and her movement’s vision of an independent and racially segregated Hawaii, is their open sympathy for the terrorists who murdered thousands on September 11th. Speaking to crowds after the 9/11 attacks, Trask proclaimed, ‘Chickens have come home to roost. . . . What it means is that those who have suffered under the imperialism and militarism of the United States have come back to haunt in the 21st century that same government...Why should we support the United States, whose hands are soaked with blood?’”<sup>35</sup>

Alongside complaints of racism against Ka Lahui members comes skepticism from fellow sovereignty activists regarding the level of nationhood Ka Lahui endorses. According to Ka Lahui Lt. Governor Keali’i Gora, Ka Lahui Hawaii endorses a nation-within-a-nation status much like Native Americans for the native Hawaiian nation.<sup>36</sup> Activists like Bumpy Kanahele, his followers, and other native Hawaiian factions, find nation-within-a-nation status an unsatisfactory solution to a larger problem. According to Kanahele, “[Agreeing to federal recognition] could be a trap...You know, that sticky trap

they catch all the rats inside?...That's what we feel we're walking into. Now unless somebody can convince me that we will never lose the right to independence, because there's no other example out there that has gone into a nation-within-a-nation that came out an independent country [I won't endorse federal recognition]."<sup>37</sup>

If recent polling on the Akaka Bill, legislation currently under debate in the Senate which would grant native Hawaiians a status much like Native Americans, is any indication, federal recognition much like the status endorsed by Ka Lahui Hawaii isn't favored among Hawaiian residents, both native Hawaiian and non-native. According to a statewide survey taken by the Grassroots Institute of Hawaii, there is a 2 to 1 ratio of opposition for federal recognition of a native Hawaiian nation, with more than 60% of those polled disagreeing with the Bill.<sup>38</sup> This mentality among Hawaii residents could prove to lower the probability Ka Lahui Hawaii and their nation-within-a-nation form of sovereignty has of succeeding.

## The Provisional Nation State of Hawaii

Kanahele's group is commonly known as one of the most radical organizations in the Hawaiian sovereignty movement, as well as the most militant. The groups' occupation of a beachfront on O'ahu before moving to Pu'uhonua village gained Kanahele an arrest and gained the group a somewhat soiled reputation in the media.<sup>39</sup> However, Kanahele's organization sought out to achieve a land base to begin a Hawaiian Nation, and as a result Pu'uhonua o Waimanalo was formed. Whether or not this alludes to sovereignty being within reach for Kanahele's group, if they want it, is anyone's guess.

Unfortunately, other well-known sovereignty activists such as Mililani Trask distrust Kanahele's work, and have claimed that Kanahele and his organization do not

represent the majority of Hawaiians.<sup>40</sup> Furthermore, in regards to the Nation State of Hawaii fighting for full independence, Mililani Trask states that, “If we woke up tomorrow in an independent Hawaii, none of our problems would have gone away...[Most Hawaiians] are not worried about independence. They’re worried about paying their bills.”<sup>41</sup> The former leader of Ka Lahui has also said that the declaration Kanahale’s group made asserting their independence from the United States was “merely a statement, not a form of government. At least three similar declarations have been issued [by other groups] during the past 20 years, none of them resulting in any substantial change for native Hawaiians.”<sup>42</sup> And although the statements infer that Kanahale’s group will not gain the needed support by “most Hawaiians,” such an attack against the politics of the organization could also infer that the Nation State of Hawaii has become a strong source of competition for Ka Lahui Hawaii in the struggle over a form of sovereignty to represent the new nation.

Aside from the criticisms of rival groups on the probabilities of the Nation State of Hawaii gaining sovereignty, one must examine the actions such a group has or has not taken, and what these could mean for the future of the organization. Of the three organization researched, the Nation State of Hawaii has done the least to engage in the international arena, participating less often in indigenous affairs in the United Nations, as well as gaining little publicity for Hawaiian affairs in international law. One of Mililani Trask’s main critiques of Kanahale’s group is that it uses the state to further internal matters, while ignoring what will gain sovereignty for the Hawaiian people: international agencies.<sup>43</sup>

However, Kanahale has managed to create the foundation for an independent Hawaii in Pu'uhonua, and with it has begun to tackle the next step, what many believe to be the crucial step, in maintaining a successful nation: the formation of an economic base in the form of his proposal for the Native Hawaiian Bank.<sup>44</sup>

Unfortunately, according to federal officials, when it comes to the official U.S. position on Hawaii becoming the independent nation Kanahale claims it will, "There is nothing the president, Congress or any federal agency can do to allow Hawaii to secede from the union and be led by a native Hawaiian government...The only way that could occur is if two-thirds of the 50 states voted to amend the U.S. Constitution to allow the secession...But that's an unlikely scenario at best..."<sup>45</sup> And, as stated in the previous section, although the Nation State of Hawaii may have a proposal for an economic base of a Hawaiian Nation, they have yet to make public the initial step of a comprehensive plan for achieving that Nation.

## The Hawaiian Kingdom Government

If the Nation State of Hawaii avoids the international arena to a point where it could harm their politics, the Hawaiian Kingdom Government may do the exact opposite. The organization, which operates in an official capacity as though the Hawaiian Kingdom were still in effect, fights its battle for independence completely in the international arena, using international law as it's biggest, and perhaps only, supporter.

*Acting* Council Regent, Keanu Sai, has stated that, "the important issue between the Hawaiian Kingdom and the United States is really that of an international dispute, dealing with treaties. We're talking [recognition] of these treaty violations [to begin] working towards reconciliation and possible reparations."<sup>46</sup> Because the Kingdom

operates at a completely international level, it is Sai's position that "Laws passed by Congress affect the other 49 states but not Hawaii, because Hawaii remains a nation with standing among other nations and was never part of the U.S....In pleadings and oral arguments before the international court, the United States, in its occupation of Hawaii, has violated international law by administering its laws instead of kingdom laws."<sup>47</sup> Sai remains convinced of the probable success of reclaiming the Hawaiian Kingdom with the law on his side.

A note of interesting support for his claim is the award issued by the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, at which Sai represented and defended the Hawaiian Kingdom Government against legal action taken by a self-proclaimed "Hawaiian Kingdom citizen." The courts went so far in their award as to acknowledge the continued existence of the Hawaiian Kingdom, under international law, regardless of a century of U.S. occupation.

Unfortunately for the organization, due to the United States' refusal to recognize the Hawaiian Kingdom Government as a legal body to which the lawsuit was applicable, the Court of Arbitration could not conduct a hearing on the matter of Hawaiian national independence.<sup>48</sup> This brings to the foreground the reality that the United States has the power to decide the fate of Hawaii, and therefore must be addressed as the political entity in control of the State of Hawaii rather than simply an obstacle taking illegal actions against a sovereign kingdom

The probability of the organizations' success may also be doubted when taken into account that the Hawaiian Kingdom Government has taken several claims before U.S. and World Courts in previous years, and each case has been overturned, denied, or

ruled in favor of the opposing argument. When Sai attempted to sue former President Bill Clinton, the Supreme Court's action came in a one-line order stating that Sai's petition for a writ of mandamus was denied, due to the inability of the courts to recognize the Hawaiian Kingdom Government as a nation, as it still existed within the United States.<sup>49</sup>

The question remains as to whether engaging in the international arena is enough to ensure the probability of sovereignty. The Hawaiian Kingdom Government has shown by example that, as legal scholarship follows that Hawaii has never relinquished control over its sovereignty to the United States, there can be no legal justification for the century that the United States has remained in power in Hawaii. In light of this, one can propose that what first must happen, before an organization such as this can gain its full momentum in order to actively and successfully achieve sovereignty, is that it must deal with the legal issues of nationhood and self-determination within the boundaries of the United States and their occupation. Although Sai is of the impression that "Hawaii can't be decolonized if it was never colonized,"<sup>50</sup> one cannot simply by-pass state and federal laws and deal directly with international laws. Perhaps the United States is too powerful for that in this day and age. Perhaps the attempts to do so by the Hawaiian Kingdom Government lessens the organizations chances of achieving sovereignty altogether.

### **What Faces the Sovereignty Initiative as a Whole?**

Aside from the challenges each organization faces on an individual level—be it debates of principles, issues of representations, conflict over methods, etc.—there is one challenge that most movement activists and participants can agree on: the need for more

support and unity.<sup>51</sup> According to Keali'i Gora, "Ka Lahui and [other sovereignty organizations] are really calling upon all Hawaiians to unite. And we really believe that it's time for us to put down our spears and come together, stand in solidarity, and seize this tremendous opportunity. This is a once in a lifetime chance for us to build this nation by uniting our people."<sup>52</sup>

The people of Hawaii, however, have concerns of their own that call into question the practicality, feasibility and probability of the sovereignty movement becoming a success. The last section of this Chapter will be comprised of some of the voices of the people of Hawaii as they shuffle through the ideologies and theories, much like this thesis did, that make up the Hawaiian sovereignty movement.<sup>53</sup>

*"I support recognition, but not all of the movements' politics. It's calling for self-governance and I don't agree with that. I also don't agree with native Hawaiians trying to get the [U.S.] military out of Hawaii. I absolutely support OHA and I know a lot of organizations don't. Ka Lahui hasn't done anything great really except unite Hawaiians and make them aware of sovereignty issues. The Nation of Hawaii began as one of the most radical groups. They abandoned their cause to occupy ceded lands, refused to pay rent and taxes, gave sanctuary to some other people that refused to pay taxes, and [Kanahele] ultimately ended up in jail! This organization was an embarrassment and a lost cause. Its methods were not justified and resulted in nothing." – native Hawaiian, 24*

*"There are too many organizations to choose from. And I don't particularly feel like now is the time during which change can be effected—the world isn't ready to accept and recognize us as an independent nation, and our people are not ready or able to govern ourselves. I fully support the movement, though I agree that it is not one movement, but rather separate entities pushing for variations of one goal in different ways. It must become a unified fight if anything is to be accomplished, and the movement itself lacks direction and people aren't sure what they would be getting themselves into if they were involved." – native Hawaiian, 21*

*"I don't support the movement because it is too far to the right, in most parts. I feel Hawaiians should have some form of sovereignty though, maybe some sort of government within a government. I feel they should have some compensation for the land that was taken, be it financial or re-instatement of the land. I also feel that Hawaiians should have some form of recognition from the U.S. But I think the movement has too many groups though, and they are unable to agree on one concept. The groups are pushing*

*their own agendas instead of the agenda which is best for all the Hawaiian people.” – native Hawaiian, 47*

*“[I don’t support the movement] because I’m not convinced of its efficacy. I think the feelings behind it are justified, but the organizations are too divided to bring about constructive change. Radical groups that want complete independence from the U.S. and banning of all foreigners do not have my support. I will support groups that are not purely racist and have a comprehensible idea of how to restore rights to Hawaiians and incorporate old ideals and ways to improve general economic strife resulting from the capitalistic nature of the U.S.” – non-native Hawaiian, 21*

*“I support sovereignty. I am a representative of my people. However, I’m not entirely supportive of the facilitators of the movement and their methods. Currently, a lot of people running the show are misinforming those who are/should be eligible to participate in a sovereign entity. I don’t feel that a race-based nation will benefit anyone. But I’m all for an independent nation...I don’t think it’s fitting for the people of Hawaii to be governed by individuals halfway around the world who can’t even pronounce our name correctly.” – native Hawaiian, 19*

*“I feel that sovereignty is a fight only for native Hawaiians. It’s their right to fight for what they think is right, and what they deserve. Other people can empathize with them, but you have to be Hawaiian in order to fully understand what it’s like to lose something and then fight for it. That’s a problem with the movement, I think. Non-native Hawaiians don’t feel they have the right to fight with and for the cause.” – non-native Hawaiian, 44*

*“I think sovereignty is a scary concept. Some people may feel that it’s not needed, but others may also feel that they’ll lose everything once sovereignty happens. I think the main thing is that people end up happy, and I’m not sure sovereignty can do that for everyone.” – native Hawaiian, 21*

*“I think the struggle for sovereignty is futile. I think it’s not a possibility, but an ideal, and not much of an ideal at that, because no matter how much I agree with the historic facts...I know that not only would any attempt to achieve our past government system be chaotic and dangerous, but the U.S. would simply never let it happen. Sovereignty is impractical and unfeasible.” – native Hawaiian, 21*

*“I believe the struggle for sovereignty is headed in the right direction, but have witnessed too many instances of race discrimination between the native Hawaiians and the ‘haoles’...I disagree with the kind of hatred portrayed by the natives towards the whites in [sovereignty] meetings. I believe compromise is the only answer. The movement is justified and long overdue, but I question the qualifications of the native people that will run the new Republic. Also, there is not enough support...most people feel it’s a losing battle.” – native Hawaiian, 43*

*“I find the idea of sovereignty frightening, and I don’t feel it’s wise to try and ‘undo’ Hawaiian history. But I believe my ideal outcome for sovereignty would be a compromise between the Hawaiian people and the U.S. government that would ensure both parties having a fairly equal share in the decision making for the islands. Also for native Hawaiians to have a louder voice in socio-political happenings in the islands. But I’m not sure about the forms of sovereignty that are our options right now.” – native Hawaiian, 21*

*“I support sovereignty. And I think the organizations need to motivate these natives so that they play a more active role in the movement and it can be more effective. Until then we’re just going to be going in circles and it’s just going to seem like a bunch of complaining. Plus, I don’t think anything is really going to change. I feel we’re going to be fighting this for decades to come. There needs to be more support. There isn’t enough because we’re lazy and some people don’t want change. We need 100% from our natives, and even non-natives have shown more support at times.” – native Hawaiian, 21*

*“I support the movement to a point. There are a lot of issues I don’t agree with. But I think the Hawaiian people need to be recognized as the indigenous natives of Hawaii and receive compensation for what the Americans have done throughout Hawaiian history. I feel that the U.S. government should be recognized for the faults that they have done to Hawaii and it’s people.” – native Hawaiian, 43*

*“I am all for sovereignty, but not cutting off all connections with the U.S. Hawaii as a whole would not be able to handle it. I’d like to gain sovereignty but still have the protection of the U.S. Sort of like Puerto Rico, I guess. But I think more native Hawaiians aren’t involved in the movement because they don’t know the facts of the sovereignty movement. Knowing there is a movement isn’t enough, people need to be more educated regarding what it’s about.” – native Hawaiian, 20*

# Conclusion: Kuna'e

## ***Kaulana Na Pua***

*Kaulana nâ pua a`o Hawai`i  
Hawaii*

*Kûpa`a mahope o ka `âina*

*Hiki mai ka `elele o ka loko `ino  
comes*

*Palapala `ânunu me ka pâkaha*

*Pane mai Hawai`i moku o Keawe  
Kôkua nâ Hono a`o Pi`ilani*

*Kâko`o mai Kauga`i o Mano*

*Pa`apû me ke one Kâkuhihewa*

*`A`ole a`e kau i ka pûlima  
Maluna o ka pepa o ka `enemi*

*Ho`ohui `âina kû`ai hewa*

*I ka pono sivila a`o ke kanaka*

*`A`ole mâkou a`e minamina*

## ***Famous are the Flowers***

*Famous are the children of*

*Ever loyal to the land*

*When the evil-hearted messenger*

*With his greedy document of extortion*

*Hawaii, land of Keawe answers  
Pi`ilani`s bays help*

*Mano`s Kauai lends support*

*And so do the sands of Kakuhihewa*

*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*

<i>I ka pu`ukâlâ a ke aupuni</i>	<i>The government's sums of money</i>
<i>Ua lawa mâkou i ka pôhaku</i>	<i>We are satisfied with the stones</i>
<i>I ka `ai kamaha`o o ka `âina</i>	<i>Astonishing food of the land</i>
<i>Mahope mâkou o Lili`ulani</i>	<i>We back Lili`ulani</i>
<i>A loa`a e ka pono o ka `âina</i> <i>(A kau hou `ia e ke kalaunu)</i>	<i>Who has won the rights of the land</i> <i>(She will be crowned again)</i>
<i>Ha`ina `ia mai ana ka puana</i> <i>Ka po`e i aloha i ka `âina</i>	<i>Tell the story</i> <i>Of the people who love their land</i>

*- Ellen Keho`ohiwaokalani Wright Prendergast<sup>1</sup>*

The term Kuna`e translates to “stand firmly and unyielding against opposition.”<sup>2</sup> One of the ways native Hawaiians chose to stand against U.S. occupation and subsequent annexation of the Hawaiian Kingdom was by composing na mele<sup>3</sup> in support of the reestablishment of Queen Lili`uokalani to her thrown. “Kaulana Na Pau,” was written and composed in honor of the Royal Hawaiian Band, who refused to sign oaths of allegiance to the illegal Provisional Government, and instead remained loyal to the Queen. This song is still sung by Kanaka Maoli today as a call to sovereignty.<sup>4</sup>

Many people, Kanaka Maoli and those from other ethnic and racial backgrounds, have answered the call to sovereignty, and indeed, as I discussed in previous Chapters, different factions number into the hundreds. This point has often been one of contention around the Hawaiian sovereignty movement, and interviews in the last section show that

many of those who are not part of the movement choose not to do so because of the lack of unity within the movement.

This lack of unity has given birth to my thesis on the Hawaiian sovereignty movement. Growing up as a native Hawaiian, I have always been exposed to the “truth” about my culture: we were illegally occupied by the United States, our Queen was illegally dethroned, we “deserve” to have our rights recognized and respected. But there has always been a plethora of choices as to the form the resolutions to these issues would take.

With this thesis, I have chosen three organizations, which I feel represent a large majority of participants within the sovereignty movement, and whose ideas on sovereignty, whether through principle, method, or representation, vary enough to offer a widespread look at the movement as a whole. While these groups in no way represent all of the different viewpoints that the movement puts forth, I had hoped that, given their public involvement and the media attention they draw to themselves and one another, they would allow me to firmly grasp the theories, principles, and problems behind the movement today.

## **The Organizations**

As we have seen with Ka Lahui Hawaii, they are the largest of all three organizations, and the most vocal at the federal level. The group engages both the U.S. government, and the international arena in issues concerning native Hawaiians as an indigenous group, and are constantly lobbying and educating within the walls of the University of Hawaii at Manoa, where members of Ka Lahui are professors and students

in the Center for Hawaiian Studies. Ka Lahui has also proposed the most comprehensive Master Plan the sovereignty movement has to date, and continues to educate residents of Hawaii about the purposes of the Master Plan and the contents of the Ka Lahui Constitution.

However, the group has gained the reputation of being racially discriminating, and key members of Ka Lahui have been accused in the media as using sovereignty to create a race-based nation, despite their commitment to allowing non-native Hawaiians to become honorary citizens of Ka Lahui, and their proposed nation. Ka Lahui has also been challenged by rival sovereignty organizations that claim that the nation-within-a-nation status Ka Lahui endorses is *necessary*, but not *enough* of a resolution to satisfy native Hawaiians.

On the other hand, The Provisional Government of the Independent Nation State of Hawaii, which proposes a completely independent Nation of Hawaii, has been criticized by sovereignty activists as being too radical. Our interview answers also show us that previous actions taken by the organization in a more militant manner than current practices may have damaged their reputation permanently in the eyes of the general public. Furthermore, activists also feel that engagement on the international level is key to achieving sovereignty, and while the Nation of Hawaii agrees, they have yet to engage themselves in the international arena.

The Nation of Hawaii, however, is the only organization to successfully implement an actual “nation” within the current state of Hawaii. Pu’uhonua serves as evidence that the proposals of the organization, at least on a smaller scale, are practical,

feasible, and possible. The organization is also currently involved in perfecting a plan for an economic base of the Nation, with their proposal of the Native Hawaiian Bank.

Finally, we come to the Hawaiian Kingdom Government, an organization that continues to function and operate as the *acting* government of the Hawaiian Kingdom, despite U.S. annexation. If nothing more, this particular organization has shown how difficult the fight for sovereignty is when one considers the political power wielded by the United States. Though the Hawaiian Kingdom Government has engaged the U.S. in several legal battles, the organization has yet to gain any headway worth speaking of in the international or national level.

However, one of the largest accomplishments of the organization to date is that, through rallies and lectures, members of this organization, far more than others, have begun spreading the word throughout the State of Hawaii about the legal basis for the restoration of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Unfortunately, there seems to be much more criticism than support of the Hawaiian Kingdom Government.

## **The Decision**

Based on the arguments covered in our discussion, I have come to the conclusion that there is not one single organization which, at this moment, has an “ideal” plan of achieving sovereignty. Like most residents of Hawaii, a closer look at the organizations of the Hawaiian sovereignty movement has lead me to believe that a consolidation of the three would be most successful in the fight for sovereignty. Each organization has key concepts that I feel are necessary to the struggle:

1. Ka Lahui Hawaii: The support Ka Lahui has from the public is the largest in the sovereignty movement, and for good

reason. The organization is the most practical and feasible. By beginning the fight for sovereignty on the national level with a push for nation-within-a-nation status, the organization makes sovereignty achievable in steps, rather than in one fell swoop, an option less likely to succeed.

2. The Nation State of Hawaii: This organization alone has shown that independence is possible, with the creation and success of Pu'uhonua o Waimanalo. As a self-sufficient village, Pu'uhonua has begun to expand into researching economic self-sufficiency on a practical and very real level, as they are depending on it in order to continue their lifestyle. Also, independence would be the next logical step for sovereignty, and the transition to independence would be made smoother beginning with a nation-within-a-nation status, as proposed by Ka Lahui Hawaii.
3. The Hawaiian Kingdom Government: In order for an independent Nation to occur, the sovereignty movement must be aware of, and use to its advantage, the legal precedence of Hawaii's right to nationhood. The Hawaiian Kingdom Government has show the most proficiency in international law as it concerns Hawaii.

For these reasons, I support not the individual organizations, but the sovereignty movement as a whole. Through our discussions, and through critiques given by sovereignty activists and scholars of Hawaiian issues, I hope to have offered an argument after which you would have been able to draw your own conclusions. After all, that is what activists within the movement are currently working towards: offering the people of Hawaii enough options and information so that they are better equipped to make a sound decision once the time arrives.

## Endnotes:

---

### Introduction:

- <sup>1</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. Night Is a Sharkskin Drum. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002: 14.
- <sup>2</sup> I deliberately chose not to italicize any of the Hawaiian language words in this thesis, as most English-written papers do when encountering foreign speech. My reasoning comes from the written work of Noenoe K. Silva's, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism*, in which she states that "[She has] not italicized Hawaiian words in the text in keeping with the recent movement to resist making the native tongue appear foreign in writing produced in and about a native land and people," (Silva, 13). This is my own personal contribution to the resistance of the colonization of my people.
- <sup>3</sup> Pukui, Mary Kawena, Elbert, Samuel H. New Pocket Hawaiian Dictionary. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1992: 15.
- <sup>4</sup> Decambra, Ho'oiipo. "An Interview with Mililani Trask." He Alo A He Alo: Face to Face, Hawaiian Voices on Sovereignty. Honolulu: The Hawaii Area Office of the American Friends Service Committee, 1993: 113.
- <sup>5</sup> defined as "having originated in and being produced, growing, living, or occurring naturally in a particular region or environment."
- <sup>6</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999: 30.
- <sup>7</sup> Act of War: The Overthrow of the Hawaiian Nation. Dir. Joan Lander Pihupau. Native American Telecommunications, 1993.
- <sup>8</sup> Act of War: The Overthrow of the Hawaiian Nation. Dir. Joan Lander Pihupau. Native American Telecommunications, 1993.
- <sup>9</sup> Dudley, Michael Kioni, Agard, Keoni Kealoha. A Call for Hawaiian Sovereignty. Honolulu: Na Kane O Ka Malo Press, 1993: 87.
- <sup>10</sup> According to the 2002 Native Hawaiian Data Book, native Hawaiians have the highest percentage of abortions by teens under the age of 17, the highest percentages of drug abuse by teens in the 9<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> grade level, the highest percentage of State offenders and third highest percentage of murder victims, the highest rate of arrests among youths, and the second highest percentage of homelessness.
- <sup>11</sup> Dudley, Michael Kioni, Agard, Keoni Kealoha. A Call for Hawaiian Sovereignty. Honolulu: Na Kane O Ka Malo Press, 1993: ix.
- <sup>1</sup> chief, ruler, king or queen.
- <sup>2</sup> power, usually in a spiritual sense.
- <sup>3</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. Night Is a Sharkskin Drum. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002: 30.
- <sup>4</sup> Kana'iaupuni, Shawn Malia. "Ka'akalai Ku Kanaka: A Call for Strengths-Based Approaches from a Native Hawaiian Perspective." American Educational Researcher Journal Jun./Jul., 2005: 36.
- <sup>5</sup> Decambra, Ho'oiipo. "An Interview with Lyle Kaloi." He Alo A He Alo: Face to Face, Hawaiian Voices on Sovereignty. Honolulu: The Hawaii Area Office of the American Friends Service Committee, 1993: 94.
- <sup>6</sup> Dudley, Michael Kioni, Agard, Keoni Kealoha. A Call for Hawaiian Sovereignty. Honolulu: Na Kane O Ka Malo Press, 1993: 107.
- <sup>7</sup> Dudley, Michael Kioni, Agard, Keoni Kealoha. A Call for Hawaiian Sovereignty. Honolulu: Na Kane O Ka Malo Press, 1993: 107.
- <sup>8</sup> Literally translates to: "the older sibling of the Hawaiian people." Refers to the historical *Kumulipo* (the genealogical legend of Hawaii and natives), which names the land as the older sibling of the people. It instills in the people a sense of familial connection with the land, and requires them to care for it, as it cares for them.
- <sup>9</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999: 66.
- <sup>10</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. "Native social capital: The case of Hawaiian sovereignty and Ka Lahui Hawaii." Policy Science Volume 33, 2000: 375-385
- <sup>11</sup> Wood, Daniel. "Hawaii's Search for Sovereignty." Christian Science Monitor 17 Oct., 1994.

- 
- <sup>12</sup> Dudley, Michael Kioni, Agard, Keoni Kealoha. A Call for Hawaiian Sovereignty. Honolulu: Na Kane O Ka Malo Press, 1993: 125.
- <sup>13</sup> Dudley, Michael Kioni, Agard, Keoni Kealoha. A Call for Hawaiian Sovereignty. Honolulu: Na Kane O Ka Malo Press, 1993: 113.
- <sup>14</sup> Boyle, Francis. "Restoration of the Independent Nation State of Hawaii Under International Law." St. Thomas Review Volume 7 Summer, 1995.
- <sup>15</sup> Dudley, Michael Kioni, Agard, Keoni Kealoha. A Call for Hawaiian Sovereignty. Honolulu: Na Kane O Ka Malo Press, 1993: 93.
- <sup>16</sup> Silva, Noenoe K. Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004: 4.
- <sup>17</sup> Silva, Noenoe K. Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004: 4.
- <sup>18</sup> Silva, Noenoe K. Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004: 4.
- <sup>19</sup> Silva, Noenoe K. Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004: 5.
- <sup>20</sup> Silva, Noenoe K. Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004: 180-203.
- <sup>21</sup> Silva, Noenoe K. Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004: 5.
- <sup>22</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999: 211-212.
- <sup>23</sup> teachers and practitioners of native Hawaiian dance.
- <sup>24</sup> Kamahale, Momiala. "'Ilio'ulaokalani: Defending Native Hawaiian Culture.'" Amerasia Journal 26.2, 2000: 38-65.
- <sup>25</sup> Kamahale, Momiala. "'Ilio'ulaokalani: Defending Native Hawaiian Culture.'" Amerasia Journal 26.2, 2000: 38-65.
- <sup>26</sup> sacred drum used exclusively for the hula.
- <sup>27</sup> Kamahale, Momiala. "'Ilio'ulaokalani: Defending Native Hawaiian Culture.'" Amerasia Journal 26.2, 2000: 38-65.

## **Chapter Two:**

- <sup>1</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. Night Is a Sharkskin Drum. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002: 35.
- <sup>2</sup> Office of Hawaiian Affairs. "Kau Inoa: A Native Initiative." Official Website: [http://www.oha.org/cat\\_content.asp?contentid=174&catid=79](http://www.oha.org/cat_content.asp?contentid=174&catid=79)
- <sup>3</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999: 37.
- <sup>4</sup> Governor, President, Head of the Executive Branch.
- <sup>5</sup> Trask, Mililani. "Ka Lahui Hawaii: A Native Initiative for Sovereignty." Turning the Tide: Journal of Anti-Racist Activism, Research & Education. Volume 6, #5-6, Dec., 1993.
- <sup>6</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999: 71.
- <sup>7</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999: 71.
- <sup>8</sup> Decambra, Ho'oipo. "An Interview with Mililani Trask." He Alo A He Alo: Face to Face, Hawaiian Voices on Sovereignty. Honolulu: The Hawaii Area Office of the American Friends Service Committee, 1993: 117.
- <sup>9</sup> Trask, Mililani. "Ka Lahui Hawaii: A Native Initiative for Sovereignty." Turning the Tide: Journal of Anti-Racist Activism, Research & Education. Volume 6, #5-6, Dec., 1993.
- <sup>10</sup> God.
- <sup>11</sup> Decambra, Ho'oipo. "An Interview with Mililani Trask." He Alo A He Alo: Face to Face, Hawaiian Voices on Sovereignty. Honolulu: The Hawaii Area Office of the American Friends Service Committee, 1993: 115-117.

- 
- <sup>12</sup> According to Mililani Trask, 'Nation to Nation,' or 'Nation within a Nation,' "is a term used to describe how America relates to its Native people. Under the existing U.S. policy, America wants to establish government to government relations with its Native people. This is why over 500 Indian and Native Alaska governments (councils) have been established. When the U.S. gives money, land, or programs to the Sioux or Navaho, federal representatives meet with Indian governments to work out the details. Right now Hawaiians have no such government." Taken from: Trask, Mililani. "Ka Lahui Hawaii: A Native Initiative for Sovereignty." Turning the Tide: Journal of Anti-Racist Activism, Research & Education. Volume 6, #5-6, Dec., 1993.
- <sup>13</sup> Donnelly, Christine. "No Legal, Moral or Historical Basis: One opposer of sovereignty says, 'This isn't about righting some wrong; it's about getting power and money and land.'" Honolulu Star-Bulletin 20 Mar., 2000: Special Section.
- <sup>14</sup> Trask, Mililani. "Ka Lahui Hawaii: A Native Initiative for Sovereignty." Turning the Tide: Journal of Anti-Racist Activism, Research & Education. Volume 6, #5-6, Dec., 1993.
- <sup>15</sup> Dudley, Michael Kioni, Agard, Keoni Kealoha. A Call for Hawaiian Sovereignty. Honolulu: Na Kane O Ka Malo Press, 1993: 135.
- <sup>16</sup> Dudley, Michael Kioni, Agard, Keoni Kealoha. A Call for Hawaiian Sovereignty. Honolulu: Na Kane O Ka Malo Press, 1993: 135.
- <sup>17</sup> Donnelly, Christine. "Holo I Mua: The Hawaiian Roundtable." Honolulu Star-Bulletin 20 Mar., 2000: Special Section.
- <sup>18</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999: 74.
- <sup>19</sup> Decambra, Ho'oiipo. "An Interview with Mililani Trask." He Alo A He Alo: Face to Face, Hawaiian Voices on Sovereignty. Honolulu: The Hawaii Area Office of the American Friends Service Committee, 1993: 121-122.
- <sup>20</sup> Decambra, Ho'oiipo. "An Interview with Mililani Trask." He Alo A He Alo: Face to Face, Hawaiian Voices on Sovereignty. Honolulu: The Hawaii Area Office of the American Friends Service Committee, 1993: 121.
- <sup>21</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999: 74.
- <sup>22</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999: 211.
- <sup>23</sup> Trask, Mililani. "Ka Lahui Hawaii: A Native Initiative for Sovereignty." Turning the Tide: Journal of Anti-Racist Activism, Research & Education. Volume 6, #5-6, Dec., 1993.
- <sup>24</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999: 78.
- <sup>25</sup> Trask, Mililani. "Ka Lahui Hawaii: A Native Initiative for Sovereignty." Turning the Tide: Journal of Anti-Racist Activism, Research & Education. Volume 6, #5-6, Dec., 1993.
- <sup>26</sup> Wood, Daniel B. "Hawaii's Search for Sovereignty." Christian Science Monitor 17 Oct., 1994.
- <sup>27</sup> A native homestead in Waimanalo, where residents enjoy a subsistence living much like that of their ancient Hawaiian ancestors.
- <sup>28</sup> Matsunaga, Mark. "The Birth of a Nation in Pu'uhonua." Honolulu Advertiser 9 Jul., 1995: A1.
- <sup>29</sup> The Provisional Government of the Independent Nation State of Hawaii. "Nation of Hawaii Ratifies New Constitution." Official Website: <http://www.hawaii-nation.org/conprom.html>
- <sup>30</sup> The Provisional Government of the Independent Nation State of Hawaii. "Sovereignty." Official Website: <http://www.hawaii-nation.org/sovereignty.html>
- <sup>31</sup> The Provisional Government of the Independent Nation State of Hawaii. "Sovereignty." Official Website: <http://www.hawaii-nation.org/sovereignty.html>
- <sup>32</sup> Kanahele, Dennis. "Voices on Sovereignty: Sovereignty is Coming Soon." Honolulu Advertiser 11 Oct., 1994.
- <sup>33</sup> Donnelly, Christine. "Holo I Mua: Several Ways to Approach Sovereignty." Honolulu Star-Bulletin 20 Mar., 2000: Special Section.
- <sup>34</sup> Donnelly, Christine. "Holo I Mua: Official Transcript." Honolulu Star-Bulletin 20 Mar., 2000: Special Section.
- <sup>35</sup> Toyama, Steve. "Sovereignty Questions." E-mail to Amanda Pacheco. 30 Sept., 2005.
- <sup>36</sup> Matsunaga, Mark. "The Birth of a Nation in Pu'uhonua." Honolulu Advertiser 9 Jul., 1995: A1.

- 
- <sup>37</sup> Kanahele, Dennis. "Voices on Sovereignty: Sovereignty is Coming Soon." Honolulu Advertiser 11 Oct., 1994.
- <sup>38</sup> The Provisional Government of the Independent Nation State of Hawaii. "Proclamation of Restoration of the Independence of the Sovereign Nation State of Hawaii." Official Website, 16 Jan., 1994: <http://www.hawaii-nation.org/proclamall.html>
- <sup>39</sup> Kanahele, Dennis. "Voices on Sovereignty: Sovereignty is Coming Soon." Honolulu Advertiser 11 Oct., 1994.
- <sup>40</sup> The Provisional Government of the Independent Nation State of Hawaii. "Nation of Hawaii Constitution." Nation of Hawaii, 16 Jan., 1995.
- <sup>41</sup> The Provisional Government of the Independent Nation State of Hawaii. "Nation of Hawaii Constitution." Nation of Hawaii, 16 Jan., 1995.
- <sup>42</sup> Kanahele, Dennis. "The Truth of Independence: An Essay on Hawaii's Future." Official Website, Jan., 1995: <http://www.hawaii-nation.org/sovessay.html>
- <sup>43</sup> Beecher, Joan. "Series on Hawaiian Sovereignty: What's Next?" Voice of America. 15 Nov., 1996: #4-09460.
- <sup>44</sup> Wood, Daniel B. "Hawaii's Search for Sovereignty." Christian Science Monitor 17 Oct., 1994.
- <sup>45</sup> Kelly, Gretchen. "Hui Pu: Hawaiians Unifying for Independence?" SPASIFIK Magazine. Sept./Oct., 2005.
- <sup>46</sup> Sai, Keanu. "Re: Further Information?" E-mail to Amanda Pacheco. 12 Oct., 2005.
- <sup>47</sup> The Hawaiian Kingdom Government. "The Establishment of the First Co-partnership Firm under Kingdom Law since 1853." Official Website: <http://www.hawaiiankingdom.org/govt-reestablished.shtml>
- <sup>48</sup> The Hawaiian Kingdom Government. "The Establishment of the First Co-partnership Firm under Kingdom Law since 1853." Official Website: <http://www.hawaiiankingdom.org/govt-reestablished.shtml>
- <sup>49</sup> Sai, Keanu. "Re: Further Information?" E-mail to Amanda Pacheco. 12 Oct., 2005.
- <sup>50</sup> Sai, Keanu. "Re: Further Information?" E-mail to Amanda Pacheco. 12 Oct., 2005.
- <sup>51</sup> Kelly, Anne Keala. "Kingdom Come." Honolulu Weekly. 18-24 Apr., 2001: International Section.
- <sup>52</sup> The Hawaiian Kingdom Government. "Arbitration Award." Lance Paul Larson v The Hawaiian Kingdom: <http://www.AlohaQuest.com/arbitration/index.htm>
- <sup>53</sup> Sai, Keanu. "Re: Further Information?" E-mail to Amanda Pacheco. 12 Oct., 2005.
- <sup>54</sup> Kelly, Anne Keala. "Kingdom Come." Honolulu Weekly. 18-24 Apr., 2001: International Section.
- <sup>55</sup> The Hawaiian Kingdom Government. "The Chairman's Welcome." Official Website: <http://www.hawaiiankingdom.org/index.shtml>
- <sup>56</sup> Sai, David Keanu. "The Vision of the acting Council of Regency." Focus on Hawaiian History. Official Website: <http://www.hawaiiankingdom.org/info-nationals.shtml>
- <sup>57</sup> In our e-mail correspondences, when asked repeatedly how many supporters he felt his organization had, he also offered a citizenry count. Thus, one can infer that the Hawaiian Kingdom Government considers an individual a citizen of its nation, regardless of whether that citizen chooses to be or not. This is, however, just an observation.
- <sup>58</sup> Sai, Keanu. "Re: Further Information?" E-mail to Amanda Pacheco. 12 Oct., 2005.
- <sup>59</sup> The Hawaiian Kingdom Government. "Hawaiian Subjects in the Islands Estimated at a Minimum 164,225." The Polynesian. Oct., 2000.
- <sup>60</sup> Sai, David Keanu. "Hawaiian Nationality: Who Comprises the Hawaiian Citizenry?" Focus on Hawaiian History. Official Website: <http://www.hawaiiankingdom.org/info-nationals.shtml>
- <sup>61</sup> Sai, David Keanu. "Hawaiian Nationality: Who Comprises the Hawaiian Citizenry?" Focus on Hawaiian History. Official Website: <http://www.hawaiiankingdom.org/info-nationals.shtml>
- <sup>62</sup> The Hawaiian Kingdom Government. "Constitutional History." Official Website: <http://www.hawaiiankingdom.org/constitutional-history.shtml>
- <sup>63</sup> The Hawaiian Kingdom Government. "Strategic Plan of the *acting* Council of Regency." Official Website: [http://hawaiiankingdom.org/pdf/HK\\_Strategic\\_Plan.pdf](http://hawaiiankingdom.org/pdf/HK_Strategic_Plan.pdf)
- <sup>64</sup> Sai, Keanu. "Re: Further Information?" E-mail to Amanda Pacheco. 12 Oct., 2005.
- <sup>65</sup> Kelly, Anne Keala. "Kingdom Come." Honolulu Weekly. 18-24 Apr., 2001: International Section.

---

### **Chapter Three:**

- <sup>1</sup> Wright, Kirby. "Aloha Lili'uokalani." Official Website:  
<http://www.hawaiistories.com/kirby/archives/000929.html>
- <sup>2</sup> Silva, Noenoe K. Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004: 5.
- <sup>3</sup> The Queen Lili'uokalani Trust. "Deed of Trust." Official Website: <http://www.onipaa.org>
- <sup>4</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999: 215.
- <sup>5</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999: 74.
- <sup>6</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999: 216-221.
- <sup>7</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999: 222-223.
- <sup>8</sup> Omandam, Pat. "Bills draw outlining status of Hawaiians." Honolulu Star-Bulletin 21 Jun., 2000.
- <sup>9</sup> Donnelly, Christine. "Holo I Mua: Official Transcript." Honolulu Star-Bulletin 20 Mar., 2000.
- <sup>10</sup> Trask, Mililani. "Ka Lahui Hawaii: A Native Initiative for Sovereignty." Turning the Tide: Journal of Anti-Racist Activism, Research & Education. Volume 6, #5-6, Dec., 1993.
- <sup>11</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999: 232.
- <sup>12</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999: 233.
- <sup>13</sup> Donnelly, Christine. "Holo I Mua: The Hawaiian Roundtable." Honolulu Star-Bulletin 20 Mar., 2000: Special Section.
- <sup>14</sup> Kelly, Gretchen. "Hui Pu: Hawaiians Unifying for Independence?" SPASIFIK Magazine Sept./Oct., 2005.
- <sup>15</sup> Kelly, Gretchen. "Hui Pu: Hawaiians Unifying for Independence?" SPASIFIK Magazine Sept./Oct., 2005.
- <sup>16</sup> Wood, Daniel. "Hawaii's Search for Sovereignty." Christian Science Monitor 17 Oct., 1994.
- <sup>17</sup> Matsunaga, Mark. "The Birth of a Nation in Pu'uuhonua." Honolulu Advertiser 9 Jul., 1995: A1.
- <sup>18</sup> Matsunaga, Mark. "The Birth of a Nation in Pu'uuhonua." Honolulu Advertiser 9 Jul., 1995: A1.
- <sup>19</sup> Wood, Daniel. "Hawaii's Search for Sovereignty." Christian Science Monitor 17 Oct., 1994.
- <sup>20</sup> Kanahale, Dennis. "Voices on Sovereignty: Sovereignty is Coming Soon." Honolulu Advertiser 11 Oct., 1994.
- <sup>21</sup> Kanahale, Dennis. "Follow the Money: Native Hawaiian Economics." Official Website:  
<http://www.bumpykanahale.com/>
- <sup>22</sup> The Hawaiian Kingdom Government. "Strategic Plan of the *acting* Council of Regency." Official Website: [http://hawaiiankingdom.org/pdf/HK\\_Strategic\\_Plan.pdf](http://hawaiiankingdom.org/pdf/HK_Strategic_Plan.pdf)
- <sup>23</sup> Sai, Keanu. "Re: Further Information?" E-mail to Amanda Pacheco. 12 Oct., 2005.
- <sup>24</sup> The Hawaiian Kingdom Government. "Strategic Plan of the *acting* Council of Regency." Official Website: [http://hawaiiankingdom.org/pdf/HK\\_Strategic\\_Plan.pdf](http://hawaiiankingdom.org/pdf/HK_Strategic_Plan.pdf)
- <sup>25</sup> The Hawaiian Kingdom Government. "Strategic Plan of the *acting* Council of Regency." Official Website: [http://hawaiiankingdom.org/pdf/HK\\_Strategic\\_Plan.pdf](http://hawaiiankingdom.org/pdf/HK_Strategic_Plan.pdf)
- <sup>26</sup> Sai, Keanu. "Re: Further Information?" E-mail to Amanda Pacheco. 12 Oct., 2005.
- <sup>27</sup> The Hawaiian Kingdom Government. "Strategic Plan of the *acting* Council of Regency." Official Website: [http://hawaiiankingdom.org/pdf/HK\\_Strategic\\_Plan.pdf](http://hawaiiankingdom.org/pdf/HK_Strategic_Plan.pdf)
- <sup>28</sup> Perez, Rob. "Perfect Title Co-Founder Sues Clinton in High Court." Honolulu Star-Bulletin 18 Dec., 1997.
- <sup>29</sup> The Hawaiian Kingdom Government. "International Proceedings." Official Website:  
<http://www.hawaiiankingdom.org/intl-proceedings.shtml>
- <sup>30</sup> Conklin, Kenneth. "Fraudulent Hague Arbitration." Official Website:  
<http://www.angelfire.com/hi2/hawaiiansovereignty/>
- <sup>31</sup> Perez, Rob. "Perfect Title Co-Founder Sues Clinton in High Court." Honolulu Star-Bulletin 18 Dec., 1997.

- <sup>32</sup> Trask, Haunani-Kay. From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999.
- <sup>33</sup> Speak Out. "Hawaiian Sovereignty and Indigenous Rights." Official Website: <http://www.speakoutnow.org/People/HaunaniKayTrask.html>
- <sup>34</sup> O'Donnell, Ryan. "Hate America Professor." FrontPageMagazine.com 25 Feb., 2003.
- <sup>35</sup> O'Donnell, Ryan. "Hate America Professor." FrontPageMagazine.com 25 Feb., 2003.
- <sup>36</sup> Donnelly, Christine. "Holo I Mua: Official Transcript." Honolulu Star-Bulletin 20 Mar., 2000.
- <sup>37</sup> Donnelly, Christine. "Holo I Mua: Official Transcript." Honolulu Star-Bulletin 20 Mar., 2000.
- <sup>38</sup> Grassroots Institute of Hawaii. "Statewide Survey." 14 Jul., 2005 Official Website: <http://www.grassrootinstitute.org/Akaka/PollResultsLarge.htm>
- <sup>39</sup> Wood, Daniel. "Hawaii's Search for Sovereignty." Christian Science Monitor 17 Oct., 1994.
- <sup>40</sup> Burlingame, Burl. "10 Who Made a Difference in 1994." Honolulu Star-Bulletin 2 Jan., 1995.
- <sup>41</sup> Podgers, James. "Greetings from Independent Hawaii." American Bar Association Journal Jun., 1997.
- <sup>42</sup> Yoshishige, Jon. "Group Declares Hawaiian Independence." Honolulu Advertiser 17 Jan., 1994.
- <sup>43</sup> Matsunaga, Mark. "The Birth of a Nation in Pu'uuhonua." Honolulu Advertiser 9 Jul., 1995: A1.
- <sup>44</sup> Kanahale, Dennis. "Follow the Money: Native Hawaiian Economics." Official Website: <http://www.bumpykanahale.com/>
- <sup>45</sup> Omandam, Pat. "Official: Hawaiian independence unlikely." Honolulu Star-Bulletin 11 Dec., 1999.
- <sup>46</sup> Sai, Keanu. "Supreme Court, International Courts." Aloha Quest Official Website: [http://www.alohaquest.com/scripts/supreme\\_court\\_international.htm](http://www.alohaquest.com/scripts/supreme_court_international.htm)
- <sup>47</sup> Chang, Lester. "Kingdom advocates predicts World Court victory." The Kauai Garden Island 5 Feb., 2001.
- <sup>48</sup> The Hawaiian Kingdom Government. "Arbitral Award Verifies Continued Existence of Hawaiian Kingdom." The Polynesian Newspaper Feb., 2001.
- <sup>49</sup> Perez, Rob. "Court won't hear case of title firm's co-founder." Honolulu Star-Bulletin 23 Mar., 1998.
- <sup>50</sup> Sai, Keanu. "Re: Further Information?" E-mail to Amanda Pacheco. 12 Oct., 2005.
- <sup>51</sup> Donnelly, Christine. "Holo I Mua: Official Transcript." Honolulu Star-Bulletin 20 Mar., 2000.
- <sup>52</sup> Donnelly, Christine. "Holo I Mua: Official Transcript." Honolulu Star-Bulletin 20 Mar., 2000.
- <sup>53</sup> These interviews were conducted by myself, Amanda Pacheco, by either phone conversation or email, between the months of July and October, 2005. All participants are, or have been, residents of the state of Hawaii for a majority of their lives, although some have recently moved out of the state. They are both native Hawaiians, and non-native, as cited below their answers.

### **Conclusion:**

- <sup>1</sup> Silva, Noenoe K. "Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism." Durham: Duke University Press, 2004: 135.
- <sup>2</sup> Pukui, Mary Kawena, Elbert, Samuel H. New Pocket Hawaiian Dictionary. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1992: 72.
- <sup>3</sup> songs.
- <sup>4</sup> Silva, Noenoe K. "Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism." Durham: Duke University Press, 2004: 135.