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Kalani Young asks, “Can one be a US citizen and a Hawaiian Kingdom subject at the same time?” The discussion seems to have meandered to many interesting places and focus seem to be lost. Much of the focus has turned to “would you want to be” rather than “can.” Other areas of focus have gone away from the question of a Hawaiian Kingdom subject to other “nations” drawing into the topic the Navajo nation, Tonga, and even the United Nations.

Let us go back to the question: “Can one be a US citizen and a Hawaiian Kingdom subject at the same time?” These are two separate matters, both addressing what “can” be done, not what one would hope will be done. One’s citizenship to a state is defined by the domestic laws of that state. The domestic laws of the United States define who its citizens are. Those domestic laws would address how it wants to treat individuals who are citizens of another country and whether it will accept such citizens to become citizens of the U.S. The general rule of states is that one should be a citizen of only one state. There is some slippage to this rule, especially when a child is born to a citizen of another country, usually the child is recognized as a citizen of where he/she was born and the option of also being a citizen of the state of the foreign parent.

The second matter this question raises is with regards to one being a subject of the Hawaiian Kingdom. This matter is more problematic because one must first address whether the Hawaiian Kingdom is now in existence, and if so, what are the domestic laws of the kingdom presently? There is somewhat a variation of answers to that question. Some could argue that the Hawaiian nation exist, but the state or the “Kingdom” has collapsed and no longer meet the international definition of a “state” in international law. From this point, a long line of argument and reasoning could wind its way into the question of the legitimacy of the loss of the attributes of a “state” when the crime of aggression by the U.S. and the “Committee for Public Safety” was committed, the argument that the jurisdiction of the U.S. over Hawaii is not one of De Jure jurisdiction but only one of De Facto jurisdiction, and many more complaints of the delinquency of the United States to the domestic law and constitution of the U.S., of Hawai`i, and of international laws. It is not my intention to try to answer all those questions here, but merely to point out how the original question creates such great uncertainty.

It seems to me that original question raises a number of other questions without being explicit. Would one want to be a citizen of the U.S. and of the Hawaiian Kingdom? What should or would the future Hawaiian Kingdom status be, one which is subservient to the U.S. Constitution and its jurisdiction, similar to most native American nations, or should its status be as it had before the aggression by the U.S. in 1893? As a truly sovereign independent state, equal in status in international law as all other states, would we devise domestic laws allowing for multiple citizenships, and if so, under what conditions and what other states in the world? Are we obligated to restore the domestic laws of the Kingdom before the U.S. aggression or do we have the freedom to create our own laws to reflect our present will, especially in the face of the past over 100 years under U.S. occupation and colonization?

While all the King’s horses and all the King’s men couldn’t put Humpty Dumpty together again, are we entitled to gather our pieces together again, shout out that we are not Humpty Dumpty but a unified people rising to the call of sovereignty and are defining our nation and reconstructing our state through our devotion to pono for our Hawai`i?
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