Name of Person

Mailing Address

Phone: [*insert phone number with area code*]

Email: [*insert email address*]

Date

CERTIFIED MAIL [*insert certified mail number*]

Isaac W. Choy, Director

Department of Taxation of the State of Hawai‘i

Room 221  
830 Punchbowl Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813-5094

Dear Mr. Choy:

Re: Unlawful Collection of Taxes

When the government of the Hawaiian Kingdom was unlawfully overthrown by the United States on January 17, 1893, the Hawaiian Kingdom as an independent State continued to exist under the rules of international law, despite over a century of belligerent occupation.[[1]](#footnote-1) On February 28, 1997, the government was restored by a Regency under article 33 of the 1864 Constitution, as amended.[[2]](#footnote-2) And the Permanent Court of Arbitration, The Hague, Netherlands, prior to forming the arbitration tribunal on June 9, 2000, in *Larsen v. Hawaiian Kingdom*, acknowledged that the Hawaiian Kingdom continues to exist as a “State” and that the Council of Regency is its government.[[3]](#footnote-3) In these proceedings, the United States also acknowledged the continuity of the Hawaiian Kingdom and the Council of Regency as its government.[[4]](#footnote-4)

According to Judge James Crawford from the International Court of Justice, “there is a presumption that the State continues to exist, with its rights and obligations despite a period in which there is no effective government.”[[5]](#footnote-5) He also stated that “belligerent occupation does not affect the continuity of the State, even where there exists no government claiming to represent the occupied State.”[[6]](#footnote-6) “If one were to speak about a presumption of continuity,” explains Professor Matthew Craven, “one would suppose that an obligation would lie upon the party opposing that continuity to establish the facts substantiating its rebuttal. The continuity of the Hawaiian Kingdom, in other words, may be refuted only by reference to a valid demonstration of legal title, or sovereignty, on the part of the United States, absent of which the presumption remains.”[[7]](#footnote-7)

A legal title under international law would be a treaty between the Hawaiian Kingdom and the United States where the Hawaiian State would merge with the State of the United States. In other words, the question is not whether the Hawaiian Kingdom continues to exist, but rather can “the party opposing that continuity” establish factual evidence, *e.g.* treaty, that it doesn’t continue to exist. No evidence that it doesn’t exist, the Hawaiian Kingdom continues to exist as a State under international law and Hawaiian Kingdom tax laws remain in effect.

On May 20, 2021, the Hawaiian Kingdom, by its Council of Regency, filed a complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief against Federal and State of Hawai‘i officials, to include 30 foreign Consulates, in the United States District Court for the District of Hawai‘i, *Hawaiian Kingdom v. Biden*, case no. 1:21-cv-00243.[[8]](#footnote-8) An amended complaint was filed on August 11, 2021, where you were named as a defendant in your official capacity as Director of Taxation for the State of Hawai‘i.[[9]](#footnote-9) The Hawaiian Kingdom is seeking compliance by the United States and the State of Hawai‘i to begin to comply with international humanitarian law and the law of occupation, which is to administer Hawaiian Kingdom laws. On January 19, 2022, an entry of default by the Clerk of the District Court was filed against the State of Hawai‘i[[10]](#footnote-10) and yourself.[[11]](#footnote-11)

According to paragraph 56 of the amended complaint, “Defendant STATE OF HAWAI‘I includes all branches of government, their agencies and departments.” The Department of Taxation is a department of the State of Hawai‘i, and, therefore both you and your department affected by the entry of default. The default is an acknowledgment of the allegations in the amended complaint, which includes paragraph 76:

All Federal, State of Hawai‘i and County laws are not HAWAIIAN KINGDOM law but rather constitute the municipal laws of the United States. As a result of the continuity of the Hawaiian State and its legal order, the law of occupation obliges the United States, as the occupying State, to administer the laws of the HAWAIIAN KINGDOM, not the municipal laws of the Defendant UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, until a peace treaty brings the occupation to an end. Article 43 of the 1907 Hague Regulations provides that “[t]he authority of the legitimate power having in fact passed into the hands of the occupant, the latter shall take all the measures in his power to restore, and ensure, as far as possible, public order and safety, while respecting, unless absolutely prevented, the laws in force in the country.” Article 64 of the 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention also states, “[t]he penal laws of the occupied shall remain in force.”

Hawai‘i Revised Statutes and Hawai‘i Administrative Rules on taxation are municipal laws of the United States, and the imposition of these municipal laws within the territory of the Hawaiian Kingdom is the war crime of *usurpation of sovereignty*. Paragraph 130 of the amended complaint states:

Municipal laws of the Defendant UNITED STATES OF AMERICA being imposed in the HAWAIIAN KINGDOM constitute a violation of the law of occupation, which, according to Professor Schabas, is the war crime of *usurpation of sovereignty*. The actus reus of the offense “would consist of the imposition of legislation or administrative measures by the occupying power that go beyond those required by what is necessary for military purposes of the occupation.” All war crimes committed in the HAWAIIAN KINGDOM have a direct nexus and extend from the war crime of *usurpation of sovereignty*.

The entry of default against yourself and the State of Hawai‘i in *Hawaiian Kingdom v. Biden* acknowledges that you and your department are committing the war crime of usurpation of sovereignty. Until you or your department can provide rebuttable evidence against the presumption that the Hawaiian Kingdom continues to exist under international law, you and your department are committing war crimes against [*insert me or us*] and [*insert my or our*] personal property. [*Insert I am or We are*] only obligated to pay Hawaiian Kingdom taxes.

Consider this letter as evidence that you and your department have been made aware that your actions constitute the war crime of *usurpation of sovereignty*.

Sincerely,

Name of Person
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