1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	ADVANCED NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING
8	(ANPRM)
9	
10	
11	JULY 30, 2014
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	RUSHMORE PLAZA CIVIC CENTER
17	RAPID CITY, SOUTH DAKOTA
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

MR. DERRICK BEETSO: I guess we'll go ahead and get started today. Good morning, everyone.

My name is Derrick Beetso. I am a counselor to the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Kevin Washburn. Today's meeting is on Advanced Notice of Proposed Rule Making, on procedures for reestablishing a government—to—government relationship with the Native Hawaiian community.

This morning's meeting was initially scheduled as tribal consultation. It was closed to the press and it was supposed to be a government-to-government consultation from the government and their native tribes and their representatives. As of this morning we don't have any tribal leadership so this will not be tribal consultation.

But since we have folks in the room that are interested in this issue, we figured we'd go ahead and open it up as a public forum. So we will be taking comments today.

We have a court reporter right here. So please make sure any comments that you make, make sure you state your name clearly, make sure you speak clearly and precisely so that she can properly record your statements, okay?

So welcome, again, to the Rushmore Civic Plaza. We have a little roadmap of where we're going today. So we will start out with welcome, which we just went through and then we'll move on to introductions and we will introduce our federal panel. And since we have such a small group, we'll go ahead and introduce ourselves individually. And then we'll get into a group discussion of Native Hawaiian history and then 10 we'll review the ANPRM and then open it up to 11 comments afterwards, okay. 12 So, again, my name is Derrick Beetso and I'm

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

going to go ahead and pass it over to our other federal officials to introduce themselves.

MS. JENNIFER ROMERO: Good afternoon. name is Jennifer Romero. I am a Senior Adviser to Secretary Jewel in the Department of the Interior.

MS. VENUS PRINCE: Hi. I am Venus McGhee Prince. I am a member of the Poarch Band of Creek Indians in southern Alabama and I am a Deputy for Indian Affairs for the Department of Interior.

MR. DERRICK BEETSO: And we have Annette Romero in the front. She's with our Department of Regulatory Affairs. And we have Craig Dorsett here, as well.

So right now I'll go ahead and pass the 1 2 microphone around here and then I'll bring it over 3 there. MS. ROWENA AKANA: Aloha. I am Rowena Akana 5 representing the Office of Hawaiian Affairs in 6 Honolulu. 7 MR. KAWIKA RILEY: Aloha. Kawika Riley also with the Office of Hawaiian Affairs. 8 9 MR. BEN CARNES: Ben Carnes, Chahta Nation. 10 The call us Chahta. Obama calls us 11 Kahkta (phonetic) so hopefully he'll learn to 12 speak that right. My friends in Hawaii said to 13 say Aloha to all the relatives who are here. I'm 14 from Oklahoma so I came a long ways. 15 MR. JIM LEACH: My name is Jim Leach. I am a 16 lawyer in Rapid City. The Lakota would say that 17 I'm a member of the Wasicu Tribe. But I'm 18 actually here today on behalf of the Pacific 19 Justice and Reconciliation Group in Hawaii which 20 asked me to attend and observe on its behalf. 21 MS. LYNETTE ASPERIN: My name is Lynette 22 Asperin from Colorado. 23 MS. SUSAN BAME: Hello. I am Susan Bame, and 24 for the court reporter -- I used to be one -- it's 25 B-A-M-E. I come here from Sioux City, Iowa. My

business is called Full Circle Mediation and I 1 2 facilitate native family team meetings in Sioux 3 City. And I'm here just because I'm interested in 4 the -- in what's going on here. 5 MR. DERRICK BEETSO: Okay. Well, welcome 6 everyone. Like I said, we'll go ahead and kick 7 off today with a brief history of Native Hawaiians 8 and their relationship with the federal government 9 and how we got to where we are now in the Advanced 10 Notice of Proposed Rule Making process. 11 This is Jennifer Romero. She'll take it 12 away. 13 MS. JENNIFER ROMERO: Thanks, Derrick. 14 I'd like to just begin with a brief 15 background of Native Hawaiian affairs. 16 Can you hear me okay? THE COURT REPORTER: Can you -- can you turn 17 18 the mic somehow so it's a little more in front of 19 you at all. Perfect. Thank you. 20 MS. JENNIFER ROMERO: So like Native 21 Americans and Alaska Natives on the main land, the 22 Native Hawaiians are distinct Indigenous native 23 people who lived and exercised sovereignty over the Hawaiian Islands for centuries before there 24

being contact and the formation of the Federal

25

Government.

Native Hawaiians today continue to maintain their national identity as distinct people with a unique language, history, cultural and ancestral land base.

But despite these attributes, they are the only Indigenous people of the United States that do not have a government-to-government relationship with the United States. Currently there are no federal regulations that exist for recognizing a Native Hawaiian government.

So let me get into a very brief history of
Native Hawaiian people and the government. The
Polynesians settled the Hawaiian Islands thousands
of years ago. But by 1500, there were four High
Chiefs that emerged who competed for control over
districts and lands throughout the islands.

And by the end of that era, it was possible for one chief called Kamehameha to unite the islands, and that happened in -- in and around 1810. King Kamehameha united the kingdom, created a federal inter-island kingdom and he established a monarchy under his rule.

King Kamehameha was the first, and his heirs, ruled united Hawaii until about 1839 when a

constitutional monarchy was formed. The constitutional monarchy was overthrown by United States businessmen with the help of United States Marines in 1893.

A provisional government was established and eventually the queen, who ruled at the time, was forced to abdicate her thrown.

In 1898 the United States annexed Hawaii as a territory despite massive protest by Native Hawaiians still loyal to the monarchy. And despite no formal treaty of annexation, the United States annexed Hawaii at that time. And in 1959, Hawaii became the fiftieth state of the Union.

Native Hawaiians experienced massive social, economic and political upheaval during the 20th Century. The United States policy of assimilation caused Native Hawaiian language, culture and ways of life to become under threat. But Native Hawaiians in their traditions persisted and the United States continued to recognize Native Hawaiian people as an Indigenous people of Hawaii, enacting laws that formed the basis for the special and political relationship it has with the United States today.

In 1993, 100 years after the overthrow of the

Hawaiian Kingdom, the United States formally apologized for its participation in the overthrow of the kingdom explicitly acknowledging that the special relationship that exists between the Hawaiian -- Native Hawaiian people and the United States existed. The United States also acknowledged that Native Hawaiians will never relinquish sovereignty and that the overthrow was illegal.

So that kicked off a reconciliation process.

And in 1999 a federal team of officials from the Department of Interior and the Department of Justice conducted meetings in Hawaii to investigate the process of reconciliation with Native Hawaiian people. The meeting touched on topics including sovereignty, community and economic development, health and education and housing. The results of those meetings that were conducted throughout the islands in 1999 resulted in a federal report that recommended Native Hawaiian self-determination and self-governance through a federal recognition act its highest priority.

So in 2000, the United States Congress, under the leadership of Senator Akaka, introduced

legislation that would have recognized Native
Hawaiians and an institute of
government-to-government relationship with the
United States. Ultimately, however, Senator Akaka
retired without successfully passing any federal
recognition law that would have bestowed that
status upon Native Hawaiians.

And as a result of all of these attempts by
the United States Congress, by Hawaiian
Congressional Deligation, state and local
leadership, to advance the Native Hawaiian
community toward some type of
government-to-government self-determination, those
efforts have ultimately not resulted in any kind
of recognition.

So in June of this year, Secretary Jewel made the announcement that the Department of Interior was seeking comments in an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rule Making; whether the Secretary should propose a rule that would facilitate the reestablishment of a government—to—government relationship with the Native Hawaiian community. So the ANPRM is the first step in determining whether the Interior should actually file a rule.

And with that I'll turn it over to Venous to

discuss what the ANPRM is.

MS. VENUS PRINCE: Aloha. The ANPRM is a fancy way for the Federal Government to ask formal questions, and that's what this is. I mean, most people, when they hear of rule making, they — the draft rule has already been done and so there is something concrete out there that the government is considering, and that's when the notice and comment period in these types of meetings are usually launched.

So this is sort of a pre-rule effort, and it's a -- truly intended by the Department to ask formal questions and seek input from the Native Hawaiian community before the rule is even drafted because if the community says it doesn't need/want a rule, you know, then that's what -- the Department wants to hear that.

The ANPRM, if you have a copy of it -- and I know they are probably out by the front door -- there are 19 specific questions, when you flip to the back of it, which can seem very intimidating. I know they are a lot of very detailed questions. But, essentially, it boils down to five questions. And the very first one is the most important one which is -- right now, as Jennifer mentioned,

there is no process by which the Secretary could recognize a Native Hawaiian government if it were formed and came knocking on the door at the Department of Interior. And the first question really boils down to, should there be one and should the Secretary have one.

And if you think -- if you get past that threshold question, whether you think the Secretary should even consider it and have one, then the second and third questions really come down to what should be the Secretary's role be in facilitating a reorganization that could lead to federal recognition.

And that is -- for tribes there is a process -- it's called Part 81 -- that does allow them to ask the Secretary for assistance with elections and that kind of thing. But I think we recognize that that process would not be suited to the Native Hawaiian community because of its unique history, culture and values.

And also, right now, those of you who are following things closely, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, which is sort of a unique state agency that tribes don't have here on the main land, is engaged in trying to facilitate a nation building

process for the Native Hawaiian community.

So I think really what the Secretary wants to know in the second and third questions is, is there any role -- any helpful role for her in that facilitation and that reorganization process or would any federal involvement just be confusing in light of what is happening within the community.

But even if, you know, you say no, we think between the community efforts, it's being handled in Hawaii, the fourth and fifth questions really go to one I think a lot of people think of when they think of federal recognition and federal acknowledgment. Because if you -- I guess the fourth question is, you know, should the Secretary rely on the process that's going on; and then, really, we need to know what criteria the Secretary should have in place to know that whatever government is formed by the Hawaiian people that that government is actually the true representative of the people.

Tribes have Part 83 right now which is their federal acknowledgment process and it includes specific criteria that groups that are petitioning for federal recognition have to establish in order to establish that government-to-government

relationship. They have to prove, among other things, a distinct community, political authority over membership, have to have a membership list and some other things.

But, you know, some of those may or may not be suited to the Native Hawaiian people and the Native Hawaiian government that may be formed.

And we just really want to hear from the community as to what criteria should the Secretary have in place to know — because the Secretary could be faced with multiple governments that claim to represent all of the Hawaiian people coming to her. And we need to know what — what the people think would be good indications of which one is the right one.

So those are, essentially, the five sort of big-picture questions. The 19 questions that you see throughout the ANPRM are really fleshing out those. And my recommendation to people is -- I know even if people object and say no to the first question or no to the second and third, it still would be helpful for us to have feedback from people.

So if you said no to the first question, but a decision was to try to put together a rule, it

still would be helpful to have your input as to what those criteria would be for approving that the government is indeed reflective of the will of the Hawaiian community.

So the bottom line is, do you think there should be a door in place that the Native Hawaiian government, when formed -- and I say when because I am very optimistic and hopeful that it will be formed in the near future. When that government is formed, you know, what should that government have to prove to the Secretary of Interior when it comes to her door seeking federal recognition.

MR. DERRICK BEETSO: So, like Venus said, a lot of the materials that you have today speak directly to the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rule Making. So we have the press release which you have in your packet as well as the Power Point which we just went through and then the actual ANPRM with the facts and question/answer sheet.

So at this point, I want to reiterate, we'll open it up to statements so please state your name clearly and speak clearly and concisely if you'd like to make a statement.

So would anybody like to ask a question or make a statement?

MS. ROWENA AKANA: I'd like to ask a question. What would some of the rules be in a Part 83 for American Indians and could any of those rules be applied to Native Hawaiians?

MS. VENUS PRINCE: Some of the them, I think, would -- could be tailored and changed. I mean, I know there is, essentially -- although the

Part 83 regulations are being -- they're going through their own rule making and amendment process right now. So some of those could change, but I think -- I know I -- I believe the first one is sort of an external identification of the group as Indian tribes from historical times to the present. That one I know is being looked at and is being amended in the current process.

But I think it's -- that may be able to be tailored and be something that the Native Hawaiian community -- you have over 150 statutes with Congress that's, essentially, you know, acknowledging the Native Hawaiian people. So in some ways I think that would be something that would be easily met by any Native Hawaiian government that we form.

Distinct community, again, that's another one that I think is something that the Native Hawaiian

community would easily meet.

And then the political influence and authority, I think that's probably the one that is more challenging in some ways, I mean, primarily because what you're engaged in now is trying to have the formal government that I think is what a lot of tribes may have sort of had. And I know that there are ways and informal, you know, governments and informal leadership, you know, structures that exist right now in the community. But that one I think -- so I think that one probably would need to be tweaked to be more suited to the Native Hawaiian experience.

I mean, the other two criteria that I think -- Derrick, if you remember, correct me if I am mistaken. I know there is a membership list and I know that's, you know, something that the -- that's been worked on in Hawaii extensively over the past couple years.

And the other is sort of a genealogy and sort of -- sort of established a genealogy that the dissent from sort of the historic group which I think is -- it's similar -- it can be similar, but it's different. And I think those are the primary criteria. But, obviously it is -- it sounds

simple and -- you have to be able to show some of it continuously.

And so it certainly -- and I think we think there are aspects of Part 83 that can be very useful for the Native Hawaiian community and I just know that there are other aspects of it that need to be more uniquely tailored than they are right now. And I think it's -- right now that rule doesn't apply for Native Hawaiian government. So I think we just want to make sure that there is a rule there that would apply.

MS. JENNIFER ROMERO: And I just -- I would add that part of the reason why we're undergoing this process -- Secretary Jewel undertook this process under the Obama Administration is that we've learned -- we have acknowledged through Congress in these 150 statutes that the Native Hawaiians have a very unique history with the United States. They're not Indian tribes. There are certain aspects to assisting federal regulations that perhaps could be tailored to the Native Hawaiian community acknowledgment process. But the United States, through the Secretary of the Interior, has recognized that Part 83 doesn't apply and shouldn't apply to Native Hawaiians.

But there should be a form of any rule that's coming of this process.

MS. VENUS PRINCE: I didn't mean to interrupt
you.

What I was going to say, the other thing that I know that we mentioned in passing, but I would emphasize, the Part 83 regulations are founded upon, you know, sort of the idea that the petitioning group doesn't have a political and trust relationship or government-to-government relationship yet. And I don't think any of us quite know how --

You know, so the fact that Native Hawaiians already have a political and trust relationship, you know, just sort of fundamentally changes what you would think we would need, you know, for the Native Hawaiian government to prove in order to establish the government—to—government relationship.

So it's very -- it's not only unique historically -- the Native Hawaiian community not only has a unique history, but I think the legal framework for Native Hawaiians is very unique, as well.

MR. DERRICK BEETSO: I would just add that,

you know, two parts were mentioned, Part 81 and Part 83. Part 81 is a little bit different than Part 83. As was just mentioned, Part 83 is for groups that don't have the political trust relationship that are petitioning for a government-to-government relationship.

Whereas Part 81 has it's roots in the Indian Reorganization Act and -- so you have the Alaska and Indian Reorganization Act which would acknowledge a group of Alaska natives and Alaska as a governing entity. And then you have the Indian Reorganization Act which would acknowledge a group of Indians living on a reservation as a government entity. These are historic acts, like, from the 1930s and the 1920s.

We have the Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act, as well. And the reason behind that was a long time ago there were -- Oklahoma, itself, was all considered Indian territory -- Indian Country. So you have a lot of Indian tribes in Oklahoma. But in 1934 when they had the Indian Reorganization Act there were so many different tribes that the government looked at them and said that they needed some sort of a tribal governing organization. And so they had the Oklahoma Indian

Welfare Act which allowed them to organize as a tribe.

So that is kind of my analogy to the situation. It's definitely not the same. But if you had, in that sense, Indians in Oklahoma that the government definitely realized they had a political trust relationship with but they weren't organized as a government entity that the United States government could recognize a governmental relationship with. So that's Part 81.

And so a lot of that is -- a lot of the criteria there would get to the documents of the constitution of a tribe and it looks at how many individuals from the community ratified the constitution.

But as Venous said, one of the primary, I guess, facets of reorganization would be the membership list. And it has to be a base membership list, there has to be one base role that it kind of relates back — and it has to be unambiguous. You can't have — it has to be like a state membership list that you can derive how many of those members actually voted and ratified the constitution.

So in my mind I kind of look at the Indian

Reorganization Act as kind of analogous but not really directly on point.

So what the ANPRM was asking was for folks to read, you know, Part 81 and Part 83 and see if any of the sections make sense in regards to the Native Hawaiian community. That's why we want to try and seek public comments.

I hope that clarifies your question.

MS. ROWENA AKANA: Yeah, it does, but I have a follow-up question. And the follow-up question is, how much emphasis on the unique status that Hawaiians have with the Federal Government — how much of a difference would that make with the Secretary of Interior and the people making or suggesting the rules?

Because, as you know, we're not like the other 48. We're not like Alaska Natives and we're unique in the Pacific. And so in the past -- I'm just speaking from experience -- in the past when we tried to pass the federal legislation, many congressional people were very confused and they would question, you know, well, we don't fit in this box. You don't -- you don't have acres of contiguous land where all Hawaiians live as you know. You've been there. So we have Hawaiian

homesteads which could be described as reservations.

However, they're not reservations and they are the result of the overthrow. And our first representative to Congress who appealed to the Congress because Hawaiians had no land. So these set-aside lands were given to people who could prove that they were 50 percent blood or more.

My concern is that it would be very easy for the Federal Government to say, well, you know, let's just take these people who are 50 percent blood already and who live on these set-aside lands and that would be the start of your role or your -- or whatever they describe as, you know, your -- you have a section that describes the district where people have to live in a certain area.

And that's my real concern that the people looking at this in Washington don't have the experience to know what it's like in Hawaii and how unique it is. And so to put us in a situation that applies to other people would — we would not meet those criteria at all and so it would be very difficult. So, I guess, I'm very concerned as to how all of this will play out in the end when a

recommendation is made in terms of a rule and how you recognize Hawaiians.

We have only 7,000 Hawaiians who actually live on these homesteads. We have about 150,000 Hawaiians who live elsewhere. And they don't live on reservations. And we have more than the 7,000 who are 50 percent blood and more that do not live in reservation areas or in, you know, contiguous land areas. And so what happens to those people and — you know what I mean?

So it's a very -- I don't envy your job. I'm just saying that at the end of all of this, then I hope the people who are making the final decisions, you know, realize that some of the things that are going to be or would have been considered before cannot be considered in our situation.

MS. VENUS PRINCE: I would emphasize that -- and you had a lot in that comment and I'm going to try to address some of it and Jennifer will jump in, or Derrick, if there are other aspects that I'm missing.

This administration, in particular, is extremely focused on tribal self-determination and tribal self-governance. So I think when it comes

to -- I don't think any rule that would be drafted -- if this effort moves forward, I don't think any rule that would be drafted would be trying to prescribe the membership or trying to limit the membership to the homesteaders or anything like that because, you know, we very much believe in tribes and the Native Hawaiian community being able to define its membership.

Any rule that would be drafted would be setting basic parameters that we think would make it consistent with federal law. It would not be trying to micro manage how the Native Hawaiian government determines its membership.

I emphasized yesterday that tribes change membership requirements over time. And I expect that a Native Hawaiian government may do the same thing over time.

And I think the -- you are absolutely correct that there are a lot of unanswered questions, issues, how, because of the uniqueness of the Native Hawaiian community and any government that would be formed. Sort of how land issues and all of that would play out long term.

But I think that's one reason that I just am so hopeful that the government is formed because I

believe that is one of the major functions of the 1 2 governing entity is to be able to negotiate and 3 have that government-to-government relationship. Go talk to Congress, you know, about how those 5 issues should be handled or go talk to the 6 Department of Interior on a 7 government-to-government basis about, you know, 8 certain programs. You know, educational benefits 9 or things that -- and how they should be handled. 10 And I think having that government entity to 11 try to negotiate those issues an behalf of the 12 Native Hawaiian people would just be -- I think it 13 would be so empowering and critical to sort of the 14 well being of the community. 15 MS. ROWENA AKANA: I have just one more 16 question and I will let others speak. 17 MR. DERRICK BEETSO: Okay. Again, let's go 18 ahead and make sure everybody has the opportunity to make opening comments and then we'll circle 19 20 back for second comments. 21 So would anybody else like to make a 22 statement or a comment or have a question for the 23 panel? 24 MR. BEN CARNES: I've got a bunch.

Let's start with the first one. As I stated,

25

my name is Ben Carnes, C-A-R-N-E-S. Chahta Nation. From a place called Indian Territory. say this because I've learned my history. I feel like I'm very intelligent. I feel a lot of people really don't understand what I'm saying because I offer another perspective that the United States does not share with its people that's called Americans. And so when I speak to audiences, I explain that I am not an American Indian. not Native American. And I am not an American citizen. I'm a citizen of the Chahta Nation, you know, so I do get upset when you say, oh, you're a member. No, I am not a member of any club. I am not a member of an organization. I am a member of an Indigenous Nation whose homelands are here in this country here.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And for me, sovereignty has been a very painful thing to achieve here. I looked in our history to find out what happened to it. And I found it through the decisions that were made in the early 1800s where Indian Territory was known as the Trail of Tears.

And I noticed in our history they imposed the American Indian Citizenship Act on us in 1924. I discovered about four or five years later the

United States Government pardoned 40 some Apaches. For all intents and purposes made, our people were forced onto reservations and forced, basically, to be prisoners of war. We have never been pardoned from their custody. But instead they imposed the American citizenship upon us. And they created so many programs for our people that they went along with it.

So with those things in mind, we have five questions, these threshold questions. And to each and every one of those I will say no. Because the Interior Department has no business discussing government-to-government relationship with a sovereign nation. If this government wants to do that it needs to go through the State Department.

In August of 2001, 2002 (unintelligible) I
was there. And I was in Kauai visiting with some
friends. And I'm very passionate about it. It's
one of the reasons I made this effort to be here
today. But I listened to them. They showed me
videos of their homes being tore down by the
Hawaiian Office of Hawaiian Homelands because they
didn't build their homes according to code. These
are sovereign people. One man built his home and
didn't have the right permits so it had to be torn

down. So he barricaded his doors before the cops got there and he poured gasoline everywhere and he sat in a chair and lit hisself on fire. His brother was telling me this.

And I promised him that I'll keep speaking on behalf of your people and do whatever I can. This man died before he could share that truth. So by perpetuating this falsehood — because you admitted, it's right here, the overthrow of the lawful Hawaiian kingdom by the United States
Military and its agents. So how dare the United States decide to keep us subjugated to its laws.

The United States will to do the right thing, recognize its freedom. Protect those people there while they decide for themselves how they're going to reorganize because that was the question that was posed to me when I was there in Honolulu and I testified. Because they had brought in Susan Mathis (phonetic) from the National Congress of American Indians and another lady from the Alaska Corporation telling everyone how good it would be to be recognized under this. When I testified the next day, I apologized for what my sisters had said because they have become American in this. They believe in this.

But if you ever accept this, you will no longer have a voice for your sovereignty because this is what's happened to us through all these treaties, through the decision, and we cannot go to the United Nations and get anything done. If we do, they side with the United States. Take it up with them under the fox guarding the hen house.

The most recent chance we had was when I went to Washington, D.C. to make my objections and I understand what all happened in that case, how they changed judges, and the rulings that were favorable and the statements that started changing and coming undone. Their attorney wanted their \$99 million so they convinced her and went around the country like snake oil salesmen and convinced us all this was a good thing.

But when we talk about any sort of relationship between the United States Government and our people, you know, a guardian to a warden. Any time the guardian mismanages the trust of its ward, they are usually investigated, removed and probably sent to prison.

What happened to the Interior Department?

They told the attorneys, we'll agree if we have peace with the Indian people. So here is our

wanted their money. And they left. This case was about accounting. It wasn't about money, it was an accounting. Who stole the money. But that settlement went and we lost that.

So this is how they treated the Native

Hawaiian people. This is wrong. Don't do this.

Because the relationship -- stick a knife in our

back and you pull it out 8 inches and that's

supposed to be a victory? I don't want that for

my relatives in Hawaii.

And I ask you to reconsider and think about what you can do in your positions where you can make these changes. But I'd like to come here and speak the truth as I know it on behalf of the people and keep my promise to them and Kenneth.

Remember, you've been there. You heard them.

I heard them in Honolulu for five days.

99 percent were opposed to it. Newspaper media said they were in support of it. That was a lie.

I watched the videos during the hearings recently.

They don't want this. They want to be free. They want to create their own kingdom. And if we can do this and give -- because that '93 apology resolution had that disclaimer. Well, take away

the disclaimer. Create some declarations.

Recognize them. Help them stand up on their own.

Thank you.

MR. DERRICK BEETSO: Thank you.

Would anybody else like to make opening comments?

MS. VENUS PRINCE: I just wanted to emphasize one more thing that we emphasized yesterday which is if there were a rule, it could be a rule that sits there, you know, indefinitely because it would have to be the Native Hawaiian government's choice to use it. And I think that is a little bit of a misunderstanding.

I think we've heard when we've been out on the road that it is really just an option. It is not a -- if a rule went forward, and if it were put in place, it is essentially a door that's sitting there whether it's there two years from now or, you know, the rest of the people's lives it is never used.

I think really what we're trying to ask is should there be an option there if the Native Hawaiian government chooses to use it at some point in time.

And the other thing I wanted to emphasize is

that this administration is perhaps one of the most friendly administrations to Indigenous peoples that, you know, we've ever seen and they've ever seen in some of our lifetimes. So we have a little over two years — and the wheels of the Federal Government, you know, turn very, very slowly so getting anything done takes a little bit of time.

But I think this administration very much wants to do something, if it can, and if the Native Hawaiian people want it to give the people an option. And so that is why, you know, we're proposing this and asking these questions and seeing whether the Hawaiian people want an option.

MS. ROWENA AKANA: I want to thank the gentleman for speaking. And I was thinking, as he spoke, sounds like you're back in Hawaii, right?

You know, a lot of what he said is true. But for Hawaiians like myself, we wonder, you know, what other alternative we have at this time to try to turn the tide back. And I see that rule making as a possible step. Who knows what can happen after this rule is made. If it is made with the consideration that Hawaiians will at some point in time reinstate their own government and have a

government-to-government relationship with the United States.

If -- if I thought for one minute that Hawaii could return to its kingdom, I would support that. But I don't believe that that can happen at this point in time -- maybe never -- because there are too many people in Hawaii now. In fact, I think the population is about 1.4 million and out of the 1.4 million you have 200 plus Native Hawaiians. So we're outnumbered in our own homeland as I'm sure you all are.

So what is the possibility of returning our kingdom?

We certainly have monarchies that are still alive. We have descendants of Kalakaua (phonetic) and our king and queen. But, you know, how would that work?

How would we go back to that kind of kingdom? We had a constitutional monarchy pretty much set up like England does. We had a House of Nobles, House of Commons, we had a king and a queen, and we had royalty. And at the time of the overthrow our king and queen didn't have that much power, just like England. It was mostly the Congress, this illegal Congress.

And even though the people didn't have much power at that time because the sugar planters were in charge and they made our king sign a constitution allowing only people with land to vote. So we were not in a great situation. Maybe better than now.

But how would this all happen? How can we go back to our kingdom? So for young leaders like myself, my job, I think, is to protect all the trusts that we have for our people, to look forward to the future, and I see this rule making as the first possible step that eventually may be getting back a lot of what we've lost.

Our cultural is alive. Our people and language is alive. We have so much to be grateful for. We have not been annihilated as a people. But if we can, I think, establish that we're not going anywhere and we are determined to form our government, it will be the very first step. And this is what I see this to be.

I do not see a future of hoping that we can go back to our kingdom because that's not possible. But I thank you.

MS. JENNIFER ROMERO: Thank you. Thank you, Rowena, for that very powerful statement. I would

just respond and just add, really, that the federal team that was in Hawaii in June and July, we canvased the state. We had 15 meetings and recorded over 45 hours of testimony from Native Hawaiians in their own communities. We were -- we thought that it was critically important to hear from the people. And, yes, a majority of the people that came to those meetings expressed their outrage and their feelings of injustice with regard to the overthrow and the United States rule in that overthrow. We heard that loud and clear.

But we also felt that it's also critically important to hear from those who did not speak or could not speak at those hearings. Those that felt intimidated by the majority that did show up to those hearings, to speak their truth.

So we have a comment period that's open until August 19. And we want to hear from more people, Native Hawaiians on the main land. Native Hawaiians back in Hawaii, non-Native Hawaiians, interested parties, stakeholders from all over. We want to get this feedback on how this process could move forward or give us some ideas on how -- if we do move forward, how we can assist the community in reorganizing and support that

reorganization in a way that does preserve the benefits that Rowena just spoke of and advance in the community so that a government-to-government relationship can and will support the future goals of the community as a whole.

MR. DERRICK BEETSO: Would anybody like to makes a first statement or a follow-up statement at this point?

We're scheduled to go here from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m., but we definitely don't have to go to 4:00 p.m. Would folks like to take, maybe, a five-minute recess and come back and then we can see if there is any more comments and statements? And if not, then we will just see is everybody is okay to adjourn early.

Let's take five and then come back.

(A recess was taken from 1:55 to 2:03 p.m.)

MR. DERRICK BEETSO: Okay. Well, I guess
we'll go ahead and get started again.

Before we get started, I just wanted to kind of clarify our role here as federal folks. I know this is a Federal Government meeting. We set it and so a lot of folks, maybe, don't understand how the federal government works. We're, basically, all representatives of different agencies. Here

we're representatives of the Department of
Interior. So the scope of the ANPRM has to be
things that are within our right.

I know there was some issues that were brought up that were in the state department's lane and international issues and that's not what the ANPRM is. It's not us speaking to those issues.

So any time the Interior comes out and meets on a rule that, you know, we're considering, in this instance, or say it was a proposed rule, it has to be something that we have the authority to do. So the ANPRM, you know, in our minds is within the authority of the Department of Interior.

And so it's really important when we have these public meetings to try to get the public to speak to those questions that we're asking within the context of what we're asking. And so, you know, as much as we can, when you make statements today, try to keep it within the framework of the ANPRM and that would be very helpful for us because the comments that we receive, we have to make sure that it fits within our lane and some other lane. And it's just -- it helps with the

federal rule making process.

With that being said, I'd like to open it up for more comments and questions. Maybe during the break time you have had a chance to think about some of the comments made earlier or have a follow-up clarification on some point. So at this point if you would like to make a comment, raise your hand and I'll come to you and give you the microphone.

MR. BEN CARNES: Okay. Based upon my comments earlier. If you chose to go through this -- and I believe you said something about membership, citizenship. How would the Interior Department determine citizenship?

And what I guess I'd like to hear is what happened to us as Native people. They found sellouts within authority and got them drunk and got them to sign a paper. That is my concern.

How will you be able to determine whose voice you will hear? And will that just be also based upon -- and I don't -- that's another issue.

MR. DERRICK BEETSO: Thank you. Let me take a crack at it. So right now at this point, the Advance Notice of Proposed Rule Making, we haven't made any decisions or choices at this point. And

it's kind of an optional process ahead of a formal review. We haven't drafted a rule at this point. We haven't proposed a rule. It's questions that are kind of asking those same questions.

So if you have suggestions -- I know that was a good question -- within the scope of what we're asking, we have a written comment deadline on August 19. If you have suggestions within the framework, you know, some criteria that might be considered, that would be the place to put it. So take it out of a question format and propose something and let us know your thoughts on that and let us know concerns that you have regarding that.

This kind of gets to the discussion earlier about membership criteria. The membership criteria — the Supreme Court has said that's something that is inherit in government function.

Santa Clara vs. Martinez said that a tribe has the authority to decide who their members are, not the United States Government.

So, you know, from our perspective, when we get petitions for federal acknowledgment or if we get a petition to recognize an entity, what we look to is, you know, it's -- every case is

individual. You know, every tribe has a unique circumstance and we'll -- you know, definitely we look to whether or not there is ambiguity. We cite several different roles so somebody could be a member if they're enrolled in the 1910 census lists and also, like, the 1934 list -- something like that wouldn't pass because it's not -- it doesn't relate back to one sort of definition. It kind of creates different, I guess, avenues. That's just with Indian Affairs.

You know, with Indian Affairs, that's how we've done it. And the reason why the Interior has Indian Affairs here is because of all the folks in the Department of Interior, we have a history of dealing with these types of petitions and these types of organizations and reorganizations.

And so almost in a sense we're here in a technical assistance capacity because we realize that Native Hawaiians are different. They're definitely not American Indians, they're definitely not Alaska Natives. But at the same point — at the same time if we're looking at potentially developing regulations or acknowledging a government—to—government

relationship, Indian Affairs has a history in the way we've done it with tribes. You know, we looked to whether or not there is ambiguity, we've looked to see whether or not it passes that sort of test. Like, are all folks genetically related back to Native people. So we look at that.

And if there is ambiguity, you know, sometimes we reach out to the tribe and we work with them and we say we have a concern about, you know, your base membership rule. You cite three different base membership rules and we really need you to pick one and make sure that all your memberships relate back to that one list, you know. So that's how we've done it.

But, definitely, the questions and the scope of the ANPRM, we haven't made any choices at this point. So we're really seeking feedback. So if you have questions, it would be better as a statement -- if you have solutions, write to us and let us know what your comments are on these different questions.

Let me see if Venus and Jennifer have anything.

MR. KAWIKA RILEY: Thank you, Derrick. Thank you, Venous. Just on the topic of membership,

what I wanted to clarify -- I'm sorry. Kawika
Riley, Chief Advocate, Office of Hawaiian Affairs.
The position of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs is
that membership, or as I like to think of it,
citizenship criteria, is the -- should be the
sovereign right of the Native Hawaiian government
entity. That is something that it should
determine consistent with federal law, consistent
with international law, the Native Hawaiian
people's right.

And what we also describe in our official comment is that there is a process under way for Native Hawaiians to commence, on a nation building, a broad-base democratic process that utilizes the Native Hawaiian Rule Commission's work in gathering an official role of verifying Native Hawaiians so that we can show that whatever emerges from that process came from those Native Hawaiians who wanted to participate and exercise their inherent sovereignty as a people.

Thanks to law that was passed in 2013, there is an official rule that not only includes all of those Native Hawaiians who signed up directly through the Native Hawaiian Rule Commissions process, but it also includes Native Hawaiians who

signed up for previous verification processes,

(Native language spoken) the Hawaiian registry

program, Operation Ohana (phonetic).

So what I want to stress is that that process, the official rule as it stands now, is an inclusive process. It incorporates the work of various different entities verifying the ancestry of Native Hawaiians for over 14 years at this point. There is no blood quantum restriction.

The only question is whether or not the Native Hawaiian wants to step forward and be counted in that process.

What the Office of Hawaiian Affairs has committed to doing is co-facilitating and supporting the funding that nation building process where any and every Native Hawaiian who has been verified by any of those enrollment efforts can participate in an election, can run for office themselves, can vote for the delegate that reflects their values, and those elected delegates would then convene at what we're calling a government aha (phonetic), some would think of it perhaps as a Native Hawaiian constitutional convention.

Whatever we call it, that is the place where

Native Hawaiians would create that principle governing document. Bring our government to life, tell it what to do. State the kinds of things that need to be in a constitution. What are our guiding values and how do we put that into our preamble. How do we select our leadership. What is our citizenship criteria. Again, that being our right to determine that for ourselves.

And I, as a Native Hawaiian, believe that our elected representatives will have a citizenship criteria that reflects our values of inclusiveness and for all of us, like myself who signed up, I know that there are other family members who did not for various reasons. We don't want to leave our families behind. So I think that we'll have an inclusive citizenship criteria for our people.

So -- and then I guess just speaking as a young father, one of the things that inspires me in the work that I have the privilege of doing is I think about my son. I think about my daughter on the way. And I look forward to the day where they're not like me where I have trouble envisioning what the native Hawaiian governing entity will look like, what our government will do, how it will represent us, how it will make it

possible for us to exercise our self-determination in the appropriate way.

I look forward to the day when my kids ask me, what was it like when our nation wasn't recognized and they will have trouble imaging that. Because, ultimately, what we're trying to do here, as Trustee mentioned, we're trying to take what we still have, the Hawaiian trusts, the Hawaiian programs, our lands, our rights, our resources that have been passed down that have been protected by the (Native language spoken) generations before us. We're trying to protect that right now.

But we also want there to be a way for us to not just protect we have but pursue what we deserve and I am hopeful that this rule making process can get us in that direction and I look forward to the day when my children can't imagine a world without our nation being recognized.

Thank you.

MS. ROWENA AKANA: For the record, my name is Rowena Akana, Trustee with the Office of Hawaiian Affairs. And I have been elected to serve our people for the last 24 years.

As far as the ANPRM, I personally support

one, four, and five. I think that two and three ought to be left to our people when that time comes. As Kawika has said, our office is instrumental in helping to make this process a reality. And simultaneously we are engaged in helping to create this role that would be the beginning of the establishment of citizens for our native government. At the last count we had 112,000 Hawaiians who have signed up on this Hawaiian role. We're leaving the role open until January, and hopefully we will get more people.

But the role has been extended because there has been this emphasis — anybody who is on the role has been cleared as far as blood — native blood. And so we do look at their birth certificates, their family's birth certificates, to identify them as Hawaiians. So we have done that. So this list of 114,000 people has been verified as being Native Hawaiian. So our office will continue to do this and hopefully when this process is over and a rule is created, we will have the start of the beginning of our nation, hopefully.

Thank you.

MR. DERRICK BEETSO: Thank you. Any more

comments?

MS. SUSAN BAME: I am Susan Bame from Full Circle Mediation in Sioux City, Iowa. And I came here just to listen and to be here. I wasn't going to say anything. I really wasn't. But listening to your comments has brought up a few things that I'd just like to put out there. And it may not be in the right pathway, so excuse me if I'm not speaking in the right mode here, but this is what came up to me.

The process that I use when I do mediation is called the transformative model. And the -- one of the basic ideas of that model is that I see two people in front of me who sit there as capable. I believe that they can do it. And, basically, they don't need me there. So I -- I am -- it's an opposite view point that is, oh, I'm the mediator, I'm here to save you and you don't handle your own conflicts so I'm going to fix it for you. See, I have a totally opposite way of looking at things.

When people come to me I basically say, you don't need me here. You're capable of doing this for yourself.

But when I think about the Native Hawaiians and what I've heard and what I've read on the $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$

internet about this situation is the Native

Hawaiians say, questions one, two, three, four and

five, no. And I've heard a statistic here today,

99 percent no.

Are you listening to the "no" that's being said?

Do you believe that the Native Hawaiian people can come up with their own way of governing themselves?

Do you look at them and say, you're capable,

I know you've got it in you? Or are you looking

at them saying, you need me here because you can't

do it for yourself because you're pathetic?

Is that the way you're looking at people or are you looking at people and saying, all I have to do is stand back and let you work it out for yourselves and it's going to be great.

Another thing that came to me as I was
listening to these comments, when the people came
and spoke, and they spoke passionately and they
were very angry and outraged, I think was the word
I heard, at some of the things that have happened
since 1893, they needed a forum to express their
outrage. Very much like the truth and
reconciliation commission in South

Africa needed -- they needed that chance to express themselves. And then when the air was cleared, then it was obvious what needed to happen next. I see that in the mediations I do, too. People come to the meetings and they're just confused and angry and don't quite know why, they're very unclear and they've got lots of questions and they're blaming everybody and the history and, oh, you did that to me, your son did that to my son. It's horrible. They have to have a place and a time to be able to express that. And when they express that, the answer comes up in two minutes and you're done.

You have to have -- you have to give people a chance to speak and eventually through that speaking the answer is right there. It doesn't come from another person. It doesn't come from a government entity. It doesn't come from anybody outside. It comes from the spirit that is within each one of us. The part of every one that I look at and say, you're capable. You can do this. I know -- I know you've got that in you. You've got the spark within you and I trust that and it's going to be great. That's what I wanted to say.

Trust the Native Hawaiian people to come up with their own government. Allow them to express themselves.

I would set up something like a truth and reconciliation commission to allow more expression, not less. But to allow -- and you were saying that there were some people who felt intimidated, like they couldn't speak for themselves because there were other angry people there who dominated the discussion. Obviously. Okay. So let -- set up a way for everyone to express themselves and then trust that they can come up with their own form of government. Allow that to happen. I have faith that they can do it.

MR. DERRICK BEETSO: Thank you.

MS. VENUS PRINCE: I just wanted to add, I don't -- this federal team, I know, very much wants that. And I think what we want to do is we just want -- I know I said this before, but we want there to be a process that that government, when it is formed, and when it is formed by the Native Hawaiian people, is a process by which they can come to the Federal Government and ask for that government-to-government relationship.

And I wanted to emphasize one other thing. I

know earlier you had asked what we might be looking for. And I think it goes back to my earlier point of wanting to be sure that the constitution, you know, that Kawika was mentioning, like when it is drafted, when it is voted on, is something reflecting the will of the people.

I'm not saying that it has to be the same thing. Like in Part 81 there is sort of a 30 percent requirement -- you know, like 30 percent of the eligible voters voting on it. And then it's sort of a majority of whoever votes, you know, on it. But, you know, something along those lines might be something that we would kind of have as a condition. So just making sure that that constitution reflects the will of the people.

MR. DERRICK BEETSO: Any other comments?

Okay. Well, maybe we'll have an opportunity for closing comments if anybody wants to make any closing comments or statements. Maybe we'll do that before we adjourn.

Okay. Well, I thank you guys again. I know it's Wednesday afternoon. I know it's a workday so I appreciate you guys all being here, coming to Rapid City, South Dakota for this meeting. And we

thank you again for your time and appreciate all the comments and statements that we received. And just for clarification, we have a court reporter here and we're going to have a transcription of everything that was stated here. And I don't know how fast we'll be able to make it available but we will try and get it up as quick as we can on the website. So thank you. (Whereupon, the hearing was then concluded at 2:25 p.m.)