

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. First, I strongly urge that the Secretary of the Interior not repeat NOT promulgate an administrative rule that would facilitate reestablishing a govt to govt relationship with the Native Hawaiian community. This would sow the seeds of hostile relationships between neighbors, risk civil disturbance and open the door for a plethora of new laws, statutes of regulations for American citizens living together with different ancestry. I feel that a race based government within the United States is patently unconstitutional. The last thing we need is for the DOI to take actions that would lead to hostilities and civil disturbances.

The following five threshold questions regarding whether the Federal Government should reestablish a government-to-government relationship with the Native Hawaiian community are commented below:

¥ Should the Secretary propose an administrative rule that would facilitate the reestablishment of a government-to-government relationship with the Native Hawaiian community?

Answer: No. A huge mistake for other indigenous connected groups within the U.S. may follow the Hawaiian govt to govt relationship and weaken the current USA position of “united we stand” for a house divided cannot stand. The fewer sovereign entities within the USA the stronger and more united we remain.

This may mean fewer lawsuits and less business for the lawyers.

¥ Should the Secretary assist the Native Hawaiian community in reorganizing its government, with which the United States could reestablish a government-to-government relationship?

Answer: No. In 1993, Senators Gorton and Brown warned their Senate colleagues that the apology resolution would be used to demand race based government handouts and to support a secessionist movement. Senator Inouye on the floor of the Senate promised his colleagues that the resolution would never be used in any such way. Twenty years later the Apology Resolution is often informally cited as legitimate authority to support Hawaiian claims the U.S. “stole” the Hawaiian land. A government to government

relationship is not a good idea.

¥ If so, what process should be established for drafting and ratifying a reorganized Native Hawaiian government's constitution or other governing document?

Answer: Any process would be racially motivated and against the U.S. Constitution. The formation of a Native Hawaiian Government should not be encouraged for it may lead to civil violence. This we do not need. A fake Indian Tribe would only be a vehicle for legal protection of corruption in Hawaii.

¥ Should the Secretary instead rely on the reorganization of a Native Hawaiian government through a process established by the Native Hawaiian community and facilitated by the State of Hawaii, to the extent such a process is consistent with Federal law?

Answer: A native Hawaiian organization to promote the highly respected cultural treasure of the Hawaiians is strongly supported but should be subject to the laws and regulations of the State and Federal governments.

¥ If so, what conditions should the Secretary establish as prerequisites to Federal acknowledgment of a government-to-government relationship with the reorganized Native Hawaiian government?

Answer: As a resident of the State of Hawaii, I beg the BOI to act in the best interest of all the people of Hawaii and not incite or encourage two governing entities within the State. We want the Aloha spirit and neighbor caring for neighbor not any racially biased government that would divide us. We do not need anyone to be inspired to promote civil disobedience in hopes of personal financial gain such as individual gifts of land ownership by the state.

**LET THE ALOHA SPIRIT PREVAIL WITH RESPECT FOR  
ALL.**