



OFFICE OF THE
HAWAIIAN AMBASSADOR-AT-LARGE

Memorandum of the *De Facto* Recognition by the United States of America of the Restored Hawaiian Kingdom Government by Exchange of *Notes Verbales*

David Keanu Sai, Ph.D.
Ambassador-at-Large

21 March 2018

Office of the Hawaiian Ambassador-at-Large
P.O. Box 2194
Honolulu, HI 96805
interior@hawaiiankingdom.org
www.HawaiianKingdom.org

**Memorandum of the *De Facto* Recognition by the United States of America of the
Restored Hawaiian Kingdom Government by Exchange of *Notes Verbales***

In a manifesto, President Grover Cleveland, on 18 December 1893, told the United States Congress, that by “an act of war, committed with the participation of a diplomatic representative of the United States and without authority of Congress, the Government of feeble but friendly and confiding people has been overthrown [on 17 January 1893]. A substantial wrong has thus been done which a due regard for our national character as well as the rights of the injured people requires we should endeavor to repair.”¹ Cleveland, however, was unable to carry out his duties and obligations under an executive agreement, by exchange of *notes*, with Queen Lili‘uokalani of the Hawaiian Kingdom to restore the situation that existed before the unlawful landing of American troops.² The Hawaiian Kingdom has been under an illegal and prolonged occupation ever since.

The Government of the Hawaiian Kingdom, as it stood on 17 January 1893, was restored in 1995, *in situ* and not *in exile*.³ An *acting* Council of Regency comprised of four Ministers—Interior, Foreign Affairs, Finance and the Attorney General—was established in accordance with the Hawaiian constitution and the doctrine of necessity to serve in the absence of the Executive Monarch. By virtue of this process, a provisional government, (hereafter “Hawaiian government”), comprised of officers *de facto*, was established.⁴ According to United States constitutional scholar Thomas Cooley:

“A provisional government is supposed to be a government *de facto* for the time being; a government that in some emergency is set up to preserve order; to continue the relations of the people it acts for with foreign nations until there shall be time and opportunity for the creation of a permanent government. It is not in general supposed to have authority beyond that of a mere temporary nature resulting from some great necessity, and its authority is limited to the necessity.”⁵

Like other governments, formed under the principle of necessity in exile during foreign occupations in the Second World War, the Hawaiian government did not receive its mandate from the Hawaiian citizenry. The Hawaiian government received its mandate by virtue of the principle of necessity and Hawaiian constitutional law. Marek explains that, “while the requirement of

¹ Larsen v. Hawaiian Kingdom, 119 *International Law Reports* (2001) 566, Annexure 1, 608. “A manifesto... is a public announcement of a State to its subjects, to neutral States, or *urbi et orbi*, that it considers itself at war with another State.” See L. Oppenheim, *International Law*, vol. II, War and Neutrality (1906), 104.

² David Keanu Sai, “A Slippery Path Towards Hawaiian Indigeneity: An Analysis and Comparison between Hawaiian State Sovereignty and Hawaiian Indigeneity and Its Use and Practice Today,” 10 *Journal of Law & Social Challenges* (2008) 68, at 125-127.

³ David Keanu Sai, *Brief—The Continuity of the Hawaiian State and the Legitimacy of the acting Government of the Hawaiian Kingdom*, 25-51 (4 August 2013), available at http://hawaiiankingdom.org/pdf/Continuity_Brief.pdf.

⁴ *Id.*, at 40-48.

⁵ Thomas M. Cooley, “Grave Obstacles to Hawaiian Annexation,” *The Forum* (1893), 389, at 390.

internal legality must in principle be fulfilled for an exiled government to possess the character of a State organ, minor flaws in such legality are easily cured by the overriding principle of [the occupied State's] actual uninterrupted continuity.”⁶ Therefore, the Hawaiian government provisionally represents the Hawaiian State.⁷

The continuity of the Hawaiian State, under international law, is confirmed so the Hawaiian government, established in accordance with Hawaiian constitutional law, is competent to represent the Hawaiian State internationally. Marek emphasizes that:

“[I]t is always the legal order of the [occupied] State which constitutes the legal basis for the existence of its government, whether such government continues to function in its own country or goes into exile; but never the delegation of the [occupying] State nor any rule of international law other than the one safeguarding the continuity of an occupied State. The relation between the legal order of the [occupying] State and that of the occupied State...is not one of delegation, but of co-existence.”⁸

“[T]he legal order of the occupied State continues to exist notwithstanding the absence of effectiveness. It can produce legal effects outside the occupied territory and may even develop and expand, not by reason of its effectiveness, but solely on the basis of the positive international rule safeguarding its continuity.”⁹

The actual exercise of that competence, however, will depend upon other States agreeing to enter into diplomatic relations with such a government. This was, in the past, conditioned upon recognition, but many States in recent years have moved away from the practice of recognizing governments, preferring all such recognition be inferred from their acts. The normal conditions for recognition requires the government concerned be either legitimately constituted under the laws of that State or be in effective control of the territory. Ideally, it should possess both attributes. Ineffective, but lawful, governments maintain their status as recognized entities during military occupations.

In 1999, a dispute arose between Lance Larsen, a Hawaiian subject, and the Hawaiian government. On its website, the Permanent Court of Arbitration (hereafter “PCA”) reported:

Lance Paul Larsen, a resident of Hawaii, brought a claim against the Hawaiian Kingdom by its Council of Regency (“Hawaiian Kingdom”) on the grounds that the Government of the Hawaiian Kingdom is in continual violation of: (a) its 1849 Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation with the United States of America, as well as the principles of international law laid down in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 1969 and (b)

⁶ Krystyna Marek, *Identity and Continuity of States in Public International Law* (2nd ed., 1968), at 98.

⁷ See Sai Brief, at para. 8.1 – 8.17.

⁸ See Marek, at 91.

⁹ *Id.*, at 102.

the principles of international comity, for allowing the unlawful imposition of American municipal laws over the claimant's person within the territorial jurisdiction of the Hawaiian Kingdom.¹⁰

The “unlawful imposition of American municipal laws” led to Mr. Larsen's unfair trial in the American State of Hawai'i's Third Circuit Court, Puna Division,¹¹ and his subsequent incarceration on 4 October 1999. After both parties entered into an arbitration agreement, Mr. Larsen filed a notice of arbitration on 8 November 1999 with the PCA, The Hague, Netherlands. *Lance Larsen v. Hawaiian Kingdom* was entered into the docket as case no. 1999-01. (Enclosure “1”). In 2001, Bederman and Hilbert reported in the *American Journal of International Law*:

“At the center of the PCA proceedings was ... that the Hawaiian Kingdom continues to exist and that the Hawaiian Council of Regency (representing the Hawaiian Kingdom) is legally responsible under international law for the protection of Hawaiian subjects, including the claimant. In other words, the Hawaiian Kingdom was legally obligated to protect Larsen from the United States' “unlawful imposition [over him] of [its] municipal laws” through its political subdivision, the State of Hawaii. As a result of this responsibility, Larsen submitted, the Hawaiian Council of Regency should be liable for any international law violations that the United States had committed against him.”¹²

The United States government, through its Department of State, explicitly recognized the Hawaiian government by exchange of *notes verbales* in March of 2000, which stemmed from these international arbitration proceedings.¹³ *Notes verbales*, the singular of which is a *note verbale*, are official communications between governments of States and international organizations.

Before the *Larsen* ad hoc tribunal was formed in 9 June 2000, Mr. Tjaco T. van den Hout, Secretary General of the PCA, spoke with the author over the telephone and recommended that the Hawaiian government provide an invitation to the United States to join in the arbitration. The Hawaiian government consented, which resulted in a conference call meeting on 3 March 2000 in Washington, D.C., between the author, Larsen's counsel, Mrs. Ninia Parks, and Mr. John Crook from the United States Department of State (hereafter “State Department”). The meeting was reduced to a formal note and mailed to Mr. Crook in his capacity as legal adviser to the State Department, a copy of which was submitted by the Hawaiian government to the PCA Registry for record that the United States was invited to join in the arbitral proceedings (Enclosure “2”). The

¹⁰ *Larsen v. Hawaiian Kingdom*, Permanent Court of Arbitration website, available at: <https://pca-cpa.org/en/cases/35/>.

¹¹ *State of Hawai'i v. Lance Larsen*, case no. 1655984MH (1999).

¹² David Bederman & Kurt Hilbert, “Arbitration—UNCITRAL Rules—justiciability and indispensable third parties—legal status of Hawaii,” 95 *American Journal of International Law* (2001) 927, at 928.

¹³ *Larsen v. Hawaiian Kingdom*, 119 Int'l L. Reports 566, 581 (2001). The *notes verbales* are part of the arbitral records at the Registry of the Permanent Court of Arbitration.

letter was signed off by the author as “Acting Minister of Interior and Agent for the Hawaiian Kingdom.”

Under international law, this letter served as an offering instrument that contained the text of the proposal, to wit:

“[T]he reason for our visit was the offer by the...Hawaiian Kingdom, by consent of the Claimant [Mr. Larsen], by his attorney, Ms. Ninia Parks, for the United States Government to join in the arbitral proceedings presently instituted under the auspices of the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, Netherlands. ... [T]he State Department should review the package in detail and can get back to the Acting Council of Regency by phone for continued dialogue. I gave you our office’s phone number..., of which you acknowledged. I assured you that we did not need an immediate answer, but out of international courtesy the offer is still open, notwithstanding arbitral proceedings already in motion. I also advised you that Secretary-General van den Hout of the Permanent Court of Arbitration was aware of our travel to Washington, D.C. and the offer to join in the arbitration. As I stated in our conversation he requested that the dialogue be reduced to writing and filed with the International Bureau of the Permanent Court of Arbitration for the record, and you acknowledged.”

Thereafter, the PCA’s Deputy Secretary General, Mrs. Phyllis Hamilton, informed the author, as agent for the Hawaiian government, by telephone, that the United States, through its embassy in The Hague, notified the PCA, by *note verbale*, that the United States would not accept the invitation to join the arbitral proceedings but instead requested permission from the Hawaiian government to have access to the pleadings and records of the case. The Hawaiian government consented to the request. The PCA, represented by Deputy Secretary General Hamilton, served as an intermediary to secure an agreement between the Hawaiian Kingdom and the United States.

“Legally there is no difference between a formal note, a *note verbale* and a memorandum. They are all communications which become legally operative upon the arrival at the addressee. The legal effects depend on the substance of the note, which may relate to any field of international relations.”¹⁴ “As a rule,” according to Wilmanns, “the recipient of a note answers in the same form. However, an acknowledgment of receipt or provisional answer can always be given in the shape of a *note verbale*, even if the initial note was of a formal nature.”¹⁵

The offer by the Secretary General to have the Hawaiian government provide the United States an invitation to join in the arbitral proceedings, and the Hawaiian government’s acceptance of this offer constitutes an international agreement by exchange of *notes verbales* between the PCA and the Hawaiian Kingdom. “[T]he growth of international organizations and the recognition of their

¹⁴ Johst Wilmanns, “Note,” in 9 *Encyclopedia of Public International Law* 287 (1986).

¹⁵ *Id.*

legal personality has resulted in agreements being concluded by an exchange of notes between such organizations and states.”¹⁶ The United States’ request to have access of the arbitral records, in lieu of declining the invitation to join in the arbitration, and the Hawaiian government’s consent to that request to access arbitral records, constitutes an international agreement by exchange of *notes verbales*. According to Corten & Klein, “the exchange of two *notes verbales* constituting an agreement satisfies the definition of the term ‘treaty’ as provided by Article 2(1)(a) of the Vienna Convention.”¹⁷ Altogether, the exchange of *notes verbales* on this subject matter, between the Hawaiian Kingdom, the PCA, and the United States of America, constitutes a multilateral treaty of the *de facto* recognition of the restored Hawaiian government.

Moreover, the United States has entered into other treaties by exchange of *notes verbales*. In 1946, the United States and Italy entered into a treaty by exchange of *notes verbales* at Rome regarding an *Agreement relating to internment of American military personnel in Italy*.¹⁸ In 1949 the United States and Italy entered into another treaty by exchange of *notes verbales* at Rome regarding an *Agreement between the United States of America and Italy, interpreting the agreement of August 14, 1947, respecting financial and economic relations*.¹⁹ Both of these bi-lateral treaties remain in force as of 1 January 2017.²⁰

Since the United States’ *de facto* recognition, the following States and an international organization also provided *de facto* recognition of the Hawaiian government. On 12 December 2000, Rwanda recognized the Hawaiian government in a meeting called by His Excellency Dr. Jacques Bihozagara, Ambassador for the Republic of Rwanda assigned to Belgium, in Brussels with the author, together with the Minister of Foreign Affairs, His Excellency Mr. Peter Umialiloa Sai, and the Minister of Finance, Her Excellency Mrs. Kau’i Sai-Dudoit.²¹

On 5 July 2001, China, as President of the United Nations Security Council, recognized the Hawaiian government when it accepted its complaint submitted by the author, as agent for the Hawaiian Kingdom, in accordance with Article 35(2) of the United Nations Charter. Article 35(2) provides that a “State which is not a Member of the United Nations may bring to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly any dispute to which it is a party if it accepts in advance, for the purpose of the dispute, the obligations of pacific settlement provided in the present Charter.”²²

¹⁶ J.L. Weinstein, Exchange of Notes, 20 Brit. Y.B. Int’l L. 205, 207 (1952).

¹⁷ *The Vienna Conventions on the Law of Treaties, A Commentary*, Vol. I, Corten & Klein, eds. (2011), p. 261.

¹⁸ 61 Stat. 3750; TIAS 1713; 9 Bevans 194; 148 UNTS 323.

¹⁹ 63 Stat. 2415; TIAS 1919; 9 Bevans 342; 80 UNTS 319.

²⁰ United States Department of State, *Treaties in Force: A List of Treaties and Other International Agreements of the United States in Force on January 1, 2017*, 218.

²¹ See Sai, “A Slippery Path,” at 130-131.

²² David Keanu Sai, “American Occupation of the Hawaiian State: A Century Unchecked,” 1 *Hawaiian Journal of Law and Politics* (2004) 46, at 74.

By exchange of *notes*, through email, Cuba recognized the Hawaiian government when the Cuban government received the author at its embassy in The Hague, Netherlands, on 10 November 2017 (Enclosure “3”). Also, by exchange of *notes*, through email, the Universal Postal Union in Bern, Switzerland, recognized the Hawaiian government (Enclosure “4”). The Postal Union is a specialized agency of the United Nations and the Hawaiian Kingdom has been a member State of the Postal Union since January 1, 1882.

Since March of 2000, the United States has acknowledged the continuity of the Hawaiian Kingdom as an independent and sovereign State and provided *de facto* recognition of the restored Hawaiian government, as its organ, by an exchange of *notes verbales*.

Enclosure #1



Larsen v. Hawaiian Kingdom

Case name	Larsen v. Hawaiian Kingdom
Case description	<p>Lance Paul Larsen, a resident of Hawaii, brought a claim against the Hawaiian Kingdom by its Council of Regency ("Hawaiian Kingdom") on the grounds that the Government of the Hawaiian Kingdom is in continual violation of: (a) its 1849 Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation with the United States of America, as well as the principles of international law laid down in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 1969 and (b) the principles of international comity, for allowing the unlawful imposition of American municipal laws over the claimant's person within the territorial jurisdiction of the Hawaiian Kingdom.</p> <p>In determining whether to accept or decline to exercise jurisdiction, the Tribunal considered the questions of whether there was a legal dispute between the parties to the proceeding, and whether the tribunal could make a decision regarding that dispute, if the very subject matter of the decision would be the rights or obligations of a State not party to the proceedings.</p> <p>The Tribunal underlined the many points of agreement between the parties, particularly with respect to the propositions that Hawaii was never lawfully incorporated into the United States, and that it continued to exist as a matter of international law. The Tribunal noted that if there existed a dispute, it concerned whether the respondent has fulfilled what both parties maintain is its duty to protect the Claimant, not in the abstract but against the acts of the United States of America as the occupant of the Hawaiian islands. Moreover, the United States' actions would not give rise to a duty of protection in international law unless they were themselves unlawful in international law. The Tribunal concluded that it could not determine whether the Respondent has failed to discharge its obligations towards the Claimant without ruling on the legality of the acts of the United States of America – something the Tribunal was precluded from doing as the United States was not party to the case.</p>
Name(s) of claimant(s)	Lance Paul Larsen (Private entity)
Name(s) of respondent(s)	The Hawaiian Kingdom (State)
Names of parties	
Case number	1999-01
Administering institution	Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA)
Case status	Concluded
Type of case	Other proceedings
Subject matter or economic sector	Treaty interpretation
Rules used in arbitral proceedings	UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules 1976
Treaty or contract under which proceedings were commenced	Other The 1849 Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation with the United States of America
Language of proceeding	English
Seat of arbitration (by country)	Netherlands
Arbitrator(s)	Dr. Gavan Griffith QC Professor Christopher J. Greenwood QC Professor James Crawford SC (President of the Tribunal)
Representatives of the claimant(s)	Ms. Ninia Parks, Counsel and Agent
Representatives of the respondent(s)	Mr. David Keanu Sai, Agent

Mr. Peter Umialiloa Sai, First deputy agent
Mr. Gary Victor Dubin, Second deputy agent and counsel

Representatives of the parties

Number of arbitrators in case 3

Date of commencement of proceeding [dd-mm-yyyy] 08-11-1999

Date of issue of final award [dd-mm-yyyy] 05-02-2001

Length of proceedings 1-2 years

Additional notes

Attachments **Award or other decision**

> [Arbitral Award](#) 15-05-2014 English

Other

> [Annex 1 - President Cleveland's Message to the Senate and the House of Representatives](#) 18-12-1893 English

> [Joint Resolution - To acknowledge the 100th anniversary of the January 17, 1893 overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii, and to offer an apology to the native Hawaiians on behalf of the United States for the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii.](#) 23-11-1993 English



Powered by the Permanent Court of Arbitration, All Rights Reserved.

Enclosure #2

March 3, 2000

Mr. John Crook
Assistant Legal Adviser for United Nations Affairs
Office of the Legal Adviser
United States Department of State
2201 C Street, N.W.
Room 3422 NS
Washington, D.C. 20520

RE: Letter confirming telephone conversation of March 3, 2000 relating to arbitral proceedings
at the Permanent Court of Arbitration, Lance Paul Larsen vs. The Hawaiian Kingdom

Sir,

This letter is to confirm our telephone conversation today at Washington, D.C. The day before our conversation Ms. Ninia Parks, esquire, Attorney for the Claimant, Mr. Lance Larsen, and myself, Agent for the Respondent, Hawaiian Kingdom, met with Sonia Lattimore, Office Assistant, L/EX, at 10:30 a.m. on the ground floor of the Department of State. I presented her with two (2) binders, the first comprised of an Arbitration Log Sheet, Lance Paul Larsen vs. The Hawaiian Kingdom, with accompanying documents on record before the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, Netherlands. The second binder comprised of divers documents of the Acting Council of Regency as well as diplomatic correspondence with treaty partners of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

I stated to Ms. Lattimore that the purpose of our visit was to provide these documents to the Legal Department of the U.S. Department of State in order for the U.S. Government to be apprised of the arbitral proceedings already in train and that the Hawaiian Kingdom, by consent of the Claimant, extends an opportunity for the United States to join in the arbitration as a party. She assured me that the package will be given to Mr. Bob McKenna for review and assignment to someone within the Legal Department. I told her that we will be in Washington, D.C., until close of business on Friday, and she assured me that she will give me a call on my cellular phone at (808) 383-6100 by the close of business that day with a status report.

At 4:45 p.m., Ms. Lattimore contacted myself by phone and stated that the package had been sent to yourself as the Assistant Legal Adviser for United Nations Affairs. She stated that you will be contacting myself on Friday (March 3, 2000), but I could give you a call in the morning if I desired.

Today, at 11:00 a.m., I telephoned you and inquired about the receipt of the package. You had stated that you did not have ample time to critically review the package, but will get to it. I stated that the reason for our visit was the offer by the Respondent Hawaiian Kingdom, by consent of the Claimant, by his attorney, Ms. Ninia Parks, for the United States Government to join in the arbitral proceedings presently instituted under the auspices of the Permanent Court of Arbitration

at The Hague, Netherlands. You stated that litigation in the court system is handled by the Justice Department and not the State Department, and that you felt they (Justice Dept.) would be very reluctant to join in the present arbitral proceedings.

I responded by assuring that the State Department should review the package in detail and can get back to the Acting Council of Regency by phone for continued dialogue. I gave you our office's phone number at (808) 239-5347, of which you acknowledged. I assured you that we did not need an immediate answer, but out of international courtesy the offer is still open, notwithstanding arbitral proceedings already in motion. I also advised you that Secretary-General van den Hout of the Permanent Court of Arbitration was aware of our travel to Washington, D.C. and the offer to join in the arbitration. As I stated in our conversation he requested that the dialogue be reduced to writing and filed with the International Bureau of the Permanent Court of Arbitration for the record, and you acknowledged. The conversation then came to a close.

I have taken the liberty of enclosing Hawaiian diplomatic protests lodged by my former countrymen and women in the U.S. Department of State in the summer of 1897, on record at your National Archives, in order for you to understand the gravity of the situation. I have also enclosed two (2) recent protests by myself as an officer of the Hawaiian Government against the State of Hawai'i for instituting unwarranted criminal proceedings against myself and other Hawaiian subjects and a resident of the Hawaiian Islands under the guise of American municipal laws within the territorial dominion of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

If after a thorough investigation into the facts presented to your office, and following zealous deliberations as to the considerations herein offered, the Government of the United States shall resolve to decline our offer to enter the arbitration as a Party, the present arbitral proceedings shall continue without affect pursuant to the Hague Conventions IV and V, 1907, and the UNCITRAL Rules of arbitration.

With Sentiments of the Highest Regard,

[signed] David Keanu Sai,
 Acting Minister of Interior and
 Agent for the Hawaiian Kingdom

cc: Secretary General van den Hout, Permanent Court of Arbitration
 Ms. Ninia Parks, Esquire, attorney for Lance Paul Larsen
 Mr. Keoni Agard, Esquire, appointing authority
 Ms. Noelani Kalipi, Esquire, Hawai'i Senator Akaka's Legislative Assistant

Enclosure #3



Keanu Sai <keanu.sai@gmail.com>

Hawaiian Kingdom - Lance Larsen Int. Commission of Inquiry at the PCA

Keanu Sai, Ph.D. <keanu.sai@gmail.com>

Thu, Nov 2, 2017 at 3:20 PM

To: embacuba@xs4all.nl

To the kind attention of Her Excellency

Ms. Soraya Elena Alvarez Nuñez, Ambassador

Embassy of Cuba

The Hague, Netherlands

Excellency,

Please find attached a letter of correspondence requesting an urgent meeting for next week in The Hague with legal representatives of the Hawaiian Kingdom regarding the Hawaiian Kingdom - Lance Larsen International Commission of Inquiry proceedings that stem from the *Larsen v. Hawaiian Kingdom* arbitration held under the auspices of the Permanent Court of Arbitration from 1999-2001.

Sincerely,

David Keanu Sai, Ph.D.

Agent and Ambassador-at-large for the Hawaiian Kingdom

--

David Keanu Sai, Ph.D.

P.O. Box 4146

Hilo, HI 96720

Website <http://www2.hawaii.edu/~anu/>



HK to Cuban Ambassador (11-1-17).pdf

6234K



Keanu Sai <keanu.sai@gmail.com>

Hawaiian Kingdom - Lance Larsen Int. Commission of Inquiry at the PCA

Secretaria Embacuba Países Bajos <embacuba@xs4all.nl>

Tue, Nov 7, 2017 at 3:25 AM

To: "Keanu Sai, Ph.D." <keanu.sai@gmail.com>

Dear Mr. Keanu,

Thank you very much for your message. It is my pleasure to announce you that our Third Secretary Katia Aruca Chaple will meet you on November 10 at 10:00 am.

Kind regards,

Deyanira Rodríguez Hernández

Secretary to the Ambassador

Embassy of the Republic of Cuba to the

Kingdom of [the Netherlands](#)

[Scheveningseweg 9, 2517KS The Hague](#)

T: 070 360 6061

<http://misiones.minrex.gob.cu/en/netherlands>



De: Keanu Sai, Ph.D. [mailto:keanu.sai@gmail.com]

Enviado el: viernes, 03 de noviembre de 2017 2:20

Para: embacuba@xs4all.nl

Asunto: Hawaiian Kingdom - Lance Larsen Int. Commission of Inquiry at the PCA

[Quoted text hidden]



Keanu Sai <keanu.sai@gmail.com>

From Katia

Oficina de Cultura Embacuba Países Bajos <cultcu@xs4all.nl>

Fri, Nov 10, 2017 at 11:34 AM

To: interior@hawaiiankingdom.org

Cc: bbissen@gmail.com

Your excellency Davis Keanu Sai,

Thank you so much for your visit and for all the information that you provide us. I really appreciated if you can keep our meeting in a bilateral level, which mean not to mention it in other stage or meetings regarding with your request and situation. I also kindly request to keep it by your own records, as well, the pictures that you took of our courtesy meeting, which means that it will not be published or distributed.

Thank you so much again.

Best regards,

Katia

Ms. Katia Aruca Chaple

Third Secretary

Embassy of Cuba

Kingdom of [the Netherlands](#)

Scheveningseweg 9, 2517 KS

The Hague

Telephone: 070 360 60 61

<http://misiones.minrex.gob.cu/es/paisesbajos>



Keanu Sai <keanu.sai@gmail.com>

From Katia

Council of Regency <interior@hawaiiankingdom.org>
To: Oficina de Cultura Embacuba Países Bajos <cultcu@xs4all.nl>
Cc: Blaise Bissen <bbissen@gmail.com>

Fri, Nov 10, 2017 at 1:24 AM

Dear Ms. Chaple,

On behalf of the Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Kingdom, I acknowledge and concur with your recommendations. Rest assured these matters remain bi-lateral and the pictures will be kept in confidence. We look forward to your government's thoughts on these matters regarding our request to [REDACTED] and our second request to [REDACTED].

Sincerely,

David Keanu Sai, Ph.D.
Hawaiian Ambassador-at-large

[Quoted text hidden]

--

David Keanu Sai, Ph.D.
P.O. Box 2194
Honolulu, HI 96805-2194
Website: <http://hawaiiankingdom.org/>

Enclosure #4



Keanu Sai <keanu.sai@gmail.com>

Letter to UPU Deputy Director General

Hawaiian Ambassador-at-large <interior@hawaiiankingdom.org>

Wed, Feb 28, 2018 at 12:44 PM

To: RAKOTONDRAJAO brigitte <brigitte.RAKOTONDRAJAO@upu.int>

Cc: "Dr. Max Schweizer" <mail@drmaxschweizer.ch>, Niklaus Schweizer <niklaus@hawaii.edu>, Blaise Bissen <bbissen@gmail.com>

Dear Madam.

Please find attached a letter to the honorable Deputy Director General regarding our meeting with you on the ground floor of the UPU headquarters on 23 February 2018.

Furthermore, any further communication with you will be through my attaché, Mr. Blaise Bissen, whose email is bbissen@gmail.com.

Thank you so much and I sincerely hope that you enjoyed the Hawaiian chocolates.

Also my very best regards to Mr. Clivaz, Deputy Director General, and that he had a speedy recovery.

D.K.S.

--

David Keanu Sai, Ph.D.

Hawaiian Ambassador-at-large

P.O. Box 2194

Honolulu, HI 96805-2194

Website <http://hawaiiankingdom.org/>



HK to UPU Deputy Director (28-2-18).pdf

1753K



Keanu Sai <keanu.sai@gmail.com>

Fwd: URGENT

Drmaxschweizer <mail@drmaxschweizer.ch>
To: "Keanu Sai Ph.D." <keanu.sai@gmail.com>

Thu, Feb 22, 2018 at 5:35 PM

Von meinem iPhone gesendet

Anfang der weitergeleiteten E-Mail:

Von: RAKOTONDRAJAO brigitte <brigitte.RAKOTONDRAJAO@upu.int>
Datum: 21. Februar 2018 um 09:29:12 MEZ
An: "Dr. Max Schweizer" <mail@drmaxschweizer.ch>
Betreff: URGENT

Dear Dr Schweizer,

Please be informed that Mr Clivaz is sick, he will be staying at home, and will not be able to receive you and the Hawai delegation at 2 pm today.

We are very sorry for this last minute inconvenience that goes beyond our control.

Please contact me in order to fix another appointment, if it's still possible for the Hawai delegation.

With apologies and best regards,

Brigitte Rakotondrajao

Secrétariat du Vice-Directeur général



Bureau international

Weltpoststrasse 4

Case postale

3000 BERNE 15

SUISSE

T +41 31 350 33 01

F +41 31 350 35 55

www.upu.int

De : RAKOTONDRAJAO brigitte

Envoyé : vendredi, 2 février 2018 09:37

À : 'Dr. Max Schweizer' <mail@drmaxschweizer.ch>

Objet : RE: Hawai'i: Delegation - the forthcoming visit

Dear Dr Schweizer

Thank you very much for the list of visitors for 21 February.

With my best regards,

Brigitte Rakotondrajao

Secrétariat du Vice-Directeur général



Bureau international

Weltpoststrasse 4

Case postale

3000 BERNE 15

SUISSE

T +41 31 350 33 01

F +41 31 350 35 55

www.upu.int

De : Dr. Max Schweizer [<mailto:mail@drmaxschweizer.ch>]

Envoyé : jeudi, 1 février 2018 08:11

À : RAKOTONDRAJAO brigitte <brigitte.RAKOTONDRAJAO@upu.int>

Cc : Niklaus Schweizer <niklaus@hawaii.edu>

Objet : Hawai'i: Delegation - the forthcoming visit

Dear Madam

Please find below the discussed delegation for the meeting with the honorable Deputy Director General:

Dr. David Keanu Sai, Ambassador-at-large, Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Kingdom

Mr. Blaise Bissen, Attache to the Ambassador

Professor. Niklaus R. Schweizer, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Swiss Federal Council

Furthermore:

Dr., Dr. h. c. Max Schweizer, former Diplomat, President of SwissDiplomats - ZuerichNetwork

Any further information will be directly sent to you via Prof. Niklaus Schweizer: we both have the same name and we both are from Zuerich, but we are not from the same family...! (...)

Thank you very much! - With my very best regards, also to Mr. Clivaz, Deputy Director General.

Max Schweizer

DR. MAX SCHWEIZER

FOREIGN & ECONOMIC AFFAIRS
Advisory - Lectures - Research

www.maxundmax.ch

Susenbergrasse 174
CH-8044 ZÜRICH
Mobile +41 79 248 59 32

mail@drmaxschweizer.ch

www.drmaxschweizer.ch

Are you passionate about Foreign Affairs?

Consider joining the *SwissDiplomats* – *Zurich*Network!

--- >>> www.swissdiplomats.net<<<---



UPU

UNION
POSTALE
UNIVERSELLE

image001.jpg

3K