H.E. DAVID KEANU SAI, PH.D.
Head, Royal Commission of Inquiry
P.O. Box 4146
Hilo, HI 96720
Tel: +1 (808) 383-6100
E-mail: interior@hawaiiankingdom.org
Website: http://hawaiiankingdom.org/royal-commission

May 11, 2023

Major General Kenneth Hara
State of Hawai‘i Adjutant General
Department of Defense
3949 Diamond Head Road
Honolulu, HI 96816

Re: Military Government of Hawai‘i

Dear Major General Hara:

This letter is to confirm our meeting held at the Grand Naniloa Hotel on April 13, 2023, at 1:30pm. I stated that I was the Chairman of the Hawaiian Kingdom Council of Regency and Head of the Royal Commission of Inquiry ("RCI") whose mandate is to investigate war crimes and human rights violations being committed in the Hawaiian Kingdom. I provided you copies of:

- The RCI's publication *Royal Commission of Inquiry* (2020);
- Council of Regency's memorandum on the formula to determine provisional laws (March 22, 2023);
- Council of Regency's memorandum on the role and function of the Military Government of Hawai‘i (April 7, 2023);
- Major Christopher Todd Burgess, *Monograph—US Army Doctrine and Belligerent Occupation* (May 26, 2004);
- Federico Lenzerini, Legal Opinion on the Authority of the Council of Regency of the Hawaiian Kingdom, 3 Haw. J.L. & Pol. 317 (2021);
- *Larsen v. Hawaiian Kingdom*, Permanent Court of Arbitration, PCA Case Repository (1999);
- *The Republic of Ecuador v. The United States of America*, Permanent Court of Arbitration, PCA Case Repository (2011);
- *Ilya Levitis (United States) v. The Kyrgyz Republic*, Permanent Court of

Arbitration, PCA Case Repository (2013);
- RCI War Criminal Report No. 22-0001;
- RCI War Criminal Report No. 22-0005; and
- RCI War Criminal Report No. 23-0001.

The subject of the meeting were the factual circumstances that established the existence of the United States military occupation of the Hawaiian Kingdom since January 17, 1893, and the omission by the United States to comply with customary international law by establishing a military government to provisionally administer the laws of the Hawaiian Kingdom until a peace treaty had been entered into between the Hawaiian Kingdom and the United States of America. This customary international law was later codified under Article 43 of the 1899 Hague Convention, IV, and later superseded by Article 43 of the 1907 Hague Regulations. There is no peace treaty.

On November 28, 1843, both Great Britain and France jointly recognized the Hawaiian Kingdom as an independent State making it the first country in Oceania to join the international community of States. As a progressive constitutional monarchy, the Hawaiian Kingdom had compulsory education, universal health care, land reform and a representative democracy.[1] The Hawaiian Kingdom treaty partners include Austria and Hungary, Belgium, Bremen, Denmark, France, Germany, Hamburg, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Switzerland, Sweden and Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States.[2] By 1893, the Hawaiian Kingdom maintained over ninety Legations and Consulates throughout the world.

Driven by the desire to attain naval superiority in the Pacific, U.S. troops, without cause, invaded the Hawaiian Kingdom on January 16, 1893, and unlawfully overthrew its Hawaiian government and replaced it with their puppet the following day with the prospect of militarizing the islands. The State of Hawai‘i today is the successor to this puppet government. However, despite the unlawful overthrow of its government, the Hawaiian Kingdom as a State would continue to exist as a subject of international law and come under the regime of international humanitarian law and the law of occupation. The military occupation is now at 130 years.

According to Professor Oppenheim, once recognition of a State is granted, it "is incapable of withdrawal"[3] by the recognizing State, and that "recognition estops the State which has

[1] David Keanu Sai, "Hawaiian Constitutional Governance," in David Keanu Sai, ed., *The Royal Commission of Inquiry: Investigating War Crimes and Human Rights Violations Committed in the Hawaiian Kingdom* 58-94 (2020) (online at https://hawaiiankingdom.org/pdf/Hawaiian_Royal_Commission_of_Inquiry_(2020).pdf).
[2] International Treaties with the Hawaiian Kingdom (online at https://hawaiiankingdom.org/treaties.shtml).
[3] Lassa Oppenheim, *International Law* 137 (3rd ed. 1920).

recognized the title from contesting its validity at any future time."[4] And the "duty to treat a qualified entity as a state also implies that so long as the entity continues to meet those qualifications its statehood may not be 'derecognized.'"[5]

Because international law provides for the presumption of the continuity of the State despite the overthrow of its government by another State, it shifts the burden of proof and what is to be proven. According to Judge Crawford, there "is a presumption that the State continues to exist, with its rights and obligations […] despite a period in which there is no, or no effective, government,"[6] and belligerent occupation "does not affect the continuity of the State, even where there exists no government claiming to represent the occupied State."[7] Addressing the presumption of the German State's continued existence despite the military overthrow of the Nazi government during the Second World War, Professor Brownlie explains:

> Thus, after the defeat of Nazi Germany in the Second World War the four major Allied powers assumed supreme power in Germany. The legal competence of the German state [its independence and sovereignty] did not, however, disappear. What occurred is akin to legal representation or agency of necessity. The German state continued to exist, and, indeed, the legal basis of the occupation depended on its continued existence.[8]

"If one were to speak about a presumption of continuity," explains Professor 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."[9] Evidence of "a valid demonstration of legal title, or sovereignty, on the part of the United States" would be an international treaty, particularly a peace treaty, whereby the Hawaiian Kingdom would have ceded its territory and sovereignty to the United States. Examples of foreign States ceding sovereign territory to the United States by a peace treaty include the 1848 *Treaty of Peace, Friendship, Limits, and Settlement with the Republic of Mexico*[10]

---

[4] Georg Schwarzenberger, "Title to Territory: Response to a Challenge," 51(2) *American Journal of International Law* 308, 316 (1957).
[5] Restatement (Third) of the Foreign Relations Law of the United States, §202, comment g.
[6] James Crawford, *The Creation of States in International Law* 34 (2nd ed. 2006).
[7] *Id*.
[8] Ian Brownlie, *Principles of Public International Law* 109 (4th ed. 1990).
[9] Matthew Craven, "Continuity of the Hawaiian Kingdom as a State under International Law," in David Keanu Sai, ed., *The Royal Commission of Inquiry: Investigating War Crimes and Human Rights Violations Committed in the Hawaiian Kingdom* 128 (2020).
[10] 9 Stat. 922 (1848).

and the 1898 *Treaty of Peace between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain*.[11]

The United States purportedly annexed the Hawaiian Islands in 1898 by a municipal law called the *joint resolution to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States*.[12] As a municipal law of the United States, it is without extraterritorial effect. It is not an international treaty. Under international law, to annex territory of another State is a unilateral act, as opposed to cession, which is a bilateral act between States. Under international law, annexation of an occupied State is unlawful. According to *The Handbook of Humanitarian Law in Armed Conflicts*:

> The international law of belligerent occupation must therefore be understood as meaning that the occupying power is not sovereign, but exercises provisional and temporary control over foreign territory. The legal situation of the territory can be altered only through a peace treaty or *debellatio*.[13] International law does not permit annexation of territory of another state.[14]

Furthermore, in 1988, the United States Department of Justice's Office of Legal Counsel ("OLC") published a legal opinion that addressed, *inter alia*, the annexation of Hawai'i. The OLC's memorandum opinion was written for the Legal Advisor for the Department of State regarding legal issues raised by the proposed Presidential proclamation to extend the territorial sea from a three-mile limit to twelve.[15] The OLC concluded that only the President and not the Congress possesses "the constitutional authority to assert either sovereignty over an extended territorial sea or jurisdiction over it under international law on behalf of the United States."[16] As Justice Marshall stated, "[t]he President is the sole organ of the nation in its external relations, and its sole representative with foreign nations,"[17] and not the Congress.

The OLC further opined, "we doubt that Congress has constitutional authority to assert either sovereignty over an extended territorial sea or jurisdiction over it under international law on behalf of the United States."[18] Therefore, the OLC concluded it is "unclear which constitutional power Congress exercised when it acquired Hawaii by joint resolution.

---

[11] 30 Stat. 1754 (1898).
[12] 30 Stat. 750 (1898).
[13] There was no extinction of the Hawaiian State by *debellatio* because the Permanent Court of Arbitration acknowledged the continued existence of the Hawaiian Kingdom as a State in *Larsen v. Hawaiian Kingdom*, PCA Case no. 1999-01.
[14] Dieter Fleck (ed.), *The Handbook of Humanitarian Law in Armed Conflicts*, Section 525, 242 (1995).
[15] Douglas Kmiec, "Legal Issues Raised by Proposed Presidential Proclamation to Extend the Territorial Sea," 12 *Opinions of the Office of Legal Counsel* 238 (1988).
[16] *Id.*, 242.
[17] *Id*., 242.
[18] *Id*.

Accordingly, it is doubtful that the acquisition of Hawaii can serve as an appropriate precedent for a congressional assertion of sovereignty over an extended territorial sea."[19] That territorial sea was to be extended from three to twelve miles under the United Nations Law of the Sea Convention and since the United States is not a Contracting State, the OLC looked into it being accomplished by the President's proclamation. In other words, the Congress could not extend the territorial sea an additional nine miles by statute because its authority was limited up to the three-mile limit. This is not rebuttable evidence as to the presumption of the continuity of the Hawaiian State. Furthermore, the United States Supreme Court, in *The Apollon*, concluded that the "laws of no nation can justly extend beyond its own territories."[20]

Arriving at this conclusion, the OLC cited constitutional scholar Professor Willoughby who stated the "constitutionality of the annexation of Hawaii, by a simple legislative act, was strenuously contested at the time both in Congress and by the press. The right to annex by treaty was not denied, but it was denied that this might be done by a simple legislative act. […] Only by means of treaties, it was asserted, can the relations between States be governed, for a legislative act is necessarily without extraterritorial force—confined in its operation to the territory of the State by whose legislature enacted it."[21] Professor Willoughby also stated, the "incorporation of one sovereign State, such as was Hawaii prior to annexation, in the territory of another, is…essentially a matter falling within the domain of international relations, and, therefore, beyond the reach of legislative acts."[22]

In 1906, the United States implemented a policy of denationalization through Americanization in the schools throughout the Hawaiian Islands and within three generations the national consciousness of the Hawaiian Kingdom was obliterated.[23] Notwithstanding the devastating effects that erased the Hawaiian Kingdom in the minds of its nationals and nationals of countries of the world, the Hawaiian government was restored *in situ* by a Council of Regency under Hawaiian constitutional law and the doctrine of necessity in 1997.[24] Under Hawaiian law, the Council of Regency serves in the absence of the Executive Monarch. The last Executive Monarch was Queen Lili'uokalani who died on November 11, 1917.

---

[19] *Id.*, 262.
[20] *The Apollon*, 22 U.S. 362, 370 (1824).
[21] Kmiec, 252.
[22] Westel Woodbury Willoughby, *The Constitutional Law of the United States*, vol. 1, 345 (1910).
[23] David Keanu Sai, "United States Belligerent Occupation of the Hawaiian Kingdom," in David Keanu Sai's (ed.), *The Royal Commission of Inquiry: Investigating War Crimes and Human Rights Violations Committed in the Hawaiian Kingdom* 114 (2020).
[24] David Keanu Sai, "The Royal Commission of Inquiry," in David Keanu Sai's (ed.), *The Royal Commission of Inquiry: Investigating War Crimes and Human Rights Violations Committed in the Hawaiian Kingdom* 18-23 (2020); see also Federico Lenzerini, "Legal Opinion on the Authority of the Council of Regency of the Hawaiian Kingdom," 3 *Hawaiian Journal of Law and Politics* 317-333 (2021).

There was no legal requirement for the Council of Regency, being the successor in office to Queen Lili'uokalani under Hawaiian constitutional law, to get recognition from the United States as the government of the Hawaiian Kingdom. The United States' recognition of the Hawaiian Kingdom as an independent State on July 6, 1844,[25] was also the recognition of its government—a constitutional monarchy. Successors in office to King Kamehameha III, who at the time of international recognition was King of the Hawaiian Kingdom, did not require diplomatic recognition. These successors included King Kamehameha IV in 1854, King Kamehameha V in 1863, King Lunalilo in 1873, King Kalākaua in 1874, Queen Lili'uokalani in 1891, and the Council of Regency in 1997.

The legal doctrines of recognition of new governments only arise "with extra-legal changes in government" of an existing State.[26] Successors to King Kamehameha III were not established through "extra-legal changes," but rather under the constitution and laws of the Hawaiian Kingdom. "Where a new administration succeeds to power in accordance with a state's constitutional processes, no issue of recognition or acceptance arises; continued recognition is assumed."[27]

On November 8, 1999, arbitral proceedings were instituted at the Permanent Court of Arbitration ("PCA") in *Larsen v. Hawaiian Kingdom*, PCA Case no. 1999-01, where Larsen, a Hawaiian subject, claimed that the government of the Hawaiian Kingdom, by its Council of Regency, should be liable for allowing the unlawful imposition of American laws that denied him a fair trial and led to his incarceration.[28] Prior to the establishment of an *ad hoc* tribunal, the PCA acknowledged the Hawaiian Kingdom as a non-Contracting State under Article 47 of the 1907 Hague Convention on the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes that brought the dispute under the auspices of the PCA. I served as lead agent for the Hawaiian Kingdom in this arbitration so I am very familiar with this case and the role of the PCA in verifying the Hawaiian Kingdom as a State before the arbitral tribunal was formed.

In determining the continued existence of the Hawaiian Kingdom as a non-Contracting State, the relevant rules of international law that apply to established States must be considered, and not those rules of international law that would apply to new States. Professor Lenzerini concluded that "according to a plain and correct interpretation of the relevant rules, the Hawaiian Kingdom cannot be considered, by virtue of the prolonged US occupation, as extinguished as an independent State and subject of international law. In

[25] U.S. Secretary of State Calhoun to Hawaiian Commissioners (6 July 1844) (online at: https://hawaiiankingdom.org/pdf/US_Recognition.pdf).
[26] M.J. Peterson, *Recognition of Governments: Legal Doctrines and State Practice, 1815-1995* 26 (1997).
[27] *Restatement (Third)*, §203, comment c.
[28] *Larsen v. Hawaiian Kingdom*, PCA Case no. 1999-01 (online at https://pca-cpa.org/en/cases/35/).

fact, in the event of illegal annexation, 'the legal existence of […] States [is] preserved from extinction,' since 'illegal occupation cannot of itself terminate statehood.'"[29]

Because the State is a juristic person, it requires a government to speak on its behalf, without which the State is silent, and, therefore, there could be no arbitral tribunal to be established by the PCA. On the contrary, the PCA did form a tribunal after confirming the existence of the Hawaiian State and its government, the Council of Regency, pursuant to Article 47. In international intercourse, which includes arbitration at the PCA, the Permanent Court of International Justice, in *German Settlers in Poland*, explained that "States can act only by and through their agents and representatives."[30] As Professor Talmon states, the "government, consequently, possesses the *jus repraesentationis omnimodae*, i.e. plenary and exclusive competence in international law to represent its State in the international sphere. [Professor Talmon submits] that this is the case irrespective of whether the government is *in situ* or in exile."[31]

After the PCA verified the continued existence of the Hawaiian State, as a juristic person, it also simultaneously ascertained that the Hawaiian State was represented by its government—the Council of Regency. The PCA identified the international dispute in *Larsen* as between a "State" and a "private entity" in its case repository.[32] Furthermore, the PCA described the dispute between the Council of Regency and Larsen as between a government and a resident of Hawai'i.

> 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 (emphasis added).[33]

Furthermore, the United States, by its embassy in The Hague, entered into an agreement with the Hawaiian Kingdom to have access to the pleadings of the arbitration. This

[29] Lenzerini, 322.
[30] German Settlers in Poland, 1923, PCIJ, Series B, No. 6, 22.
[31] Stefan Talmon, *Recognition of Governments in International Law: With Particular Reference to Governments in Exile* 115 (1998).
[32] Permanent Court of Arbitration Case Repository, *Larsen v. Hawaiian Kingdom*, PCA Case no. 1999-01 (online at https://pca-cpa.org/en/cases/35/).
[33] *Id*.

agreement was brokered by Deputy Secretary General Phyllis Hamilton of the Permanent Court of Arbitration prior to the formation of the arbitral tribunal on June 9, 2000.[34]

Usurpation of sovereignty during military occupation was listed as a war crime in 1919 by the Commission on Responsibilities of the Paris Peace Conference that was established by the Allied and Associated Powers at war with Germany and its allies. The Commission was especially concerned with acts perpetrated in occupied territories against non-combatants and civilians. *Usurpation of sovereignty during military occupation* is the imposition of the laws and administrative policies of the Occupying State over the territory of the Occupied State.

While the Commission did not provide the source of this crime in treaty law, it appears to be Article 43 of the 1907 Hague Regulations, which states, "[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 43 is the codification of customary international law that existed on January 17, 1893, when the United States unlawfully overthrew the government of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

The Commission charged that in Poland the German and Austrian forces had "prevented the populations from organising themselves to maintain order and public security" and that they had "[a]ided the Bolshevist hordes that invaded the territories." It said that in Romania the German authorities had instituted German civil courts to try disputes between subjects of the Central Powers or between a subject of these powers and a Romanian, a neutral, or subjects of Germany's enemies. In Serbia, the Bulgarian authorities had "[p]roclaimed that the Serbian State no longer existed, and that Serbian territory had become Bulgarian." It listed several other war crimes committed by Bulgaria in occupied Serbia: "Serbian law, courts and administration ousted;" "Taxes collected under Bulgarian fiscal regime;" "Serbian currency suppressed;" "Public property removed or destroyed, including books, archives and MSS (e.g., from the National Library, the University Library, Serbian Legation at Sofia, French Consulate at Uskub);" "Prohibited sending Serbian Red Cross to occupied Serbia." It also charged that in Serbia the German and Austrian authorities had committed several war crimes: "The Austrians suspended many Serbian laws and substituted their own, especially in penal matters, in procedure, judicial organisation, etc.;" "Museums belonging to the State (e.g., Belgrade, Detchani) were emptied and the contents taken to Vienna."[35]

[34] Sai, *The Royal Commission of Inquiry*, 25-26.
[35] *Violation of the Laws and Customs of War, Reports of Majority and Dissenting Reports*, Annex, TNA FO 608/245/4 (1919).

The crime of *usurpation of sovereignty during military occupation* was referred to by Judge Blair of the American Military Commission in a separate opinion in the *Justice Case*, holding that this "rule is incident to military occupation and was clearly intended to protect the inhabitants of any occupied territory against the unnecessary exercise of sovereignty by a military occupant."[36] Australia, Netherlands and China enacted laws making *usurpation of sovereignty during military occupation* a war crime. In the case of Australia, the Parliament enacted the Australian War Crimes Act in 1945 that included the war crime of *usurpation of sovereignty during military occupation*.

The war crime of *usurpation of sovereignty during military occupation* has not been included in more recent codifications of war crimes, casting some doubt on its status as a crime under customary international law. According to Professor Schabas, "there do not appear to have been any prosecutions for that crime by international criminal tribunals."[37] However, the war crime of usurpation of *sovereignty during military occupation* is a war crime under "particular" customary international law. According to the International Law Commission, "[a] rule of particular customary international law, whether regional, local or other, is a rule of customary international law that applies only among a limited number of States."[38] In the 1919 report of the Commission, the United States, as a member of the commission, did not contest the listing of the war crime of *usurpation of sovereignty during military occupation*, but rather only disagreed, *inter alia*, with the Commission's position on the means of prosecuting heads of state for the listed war crimes by conduct of omission.

The RCI views *usurpation of sovereignty during military occupation* as a war crime under "particular" customary international law and binding upon the Allied and Associated Powers of the First World War—United States of America, Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan, principal Allied Powers and Associated Powers that include Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Czech Republic, formerly known as Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Liberia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, South Africa, Thailand, and Uruguay.

In the Hawaiian situation, *usurpation of sovereignty during military occupation* serves as a source for the commission of secondary war crimes within the territory of an occupied State, *i.e. compulsory enlistment*, *denationalization*, *pillage*, *destruction of property*,

---

[36] *United States v. Alstötter et al.*, Opinion of Mallory B. Blair, Judge of Military Tribunal III, III TWC 1178, 1181 (1951).
[37] William Schabas, "War Crimes Related to the United States Belligerent Occupation of the Hawaiian Kingdom," in David Keanu Sai's (ed.), *The Royal Commission of Inquiry: Investigating War Crimes and Human Rights Violations Committed in the Hawaiian Kingdom* 156 (2020).
[38] Conclusion 16—Particular customary international law, International Law Commission's Draft conclusions on identification of customary international law, with commentaries (2018) (A/73/10).

deprivation of fair and regular trial, *deporting civilians of the occupied territory*, and *transferring populations into an occupied territory*. The reasoning for the prohibition of imposing extraterritorial prescriptions or measures of the occupying State is addressed by Professor Eyal Benvenisti:

> The occupant may not surpass its limits under international law through extra-territorial prescriptions emanating from its national institutions: the legislature, government, and courts. The reason for this rule is, of course, the functional symmetry, with respect to the occupied territory, among the various lawmaking authorities of the occupying state. Without this symmetry, Article 43 could become meaningless as a constraint upon the occupant, since the occupation administration would then choose to operate through extraterritorial prescription of its national institutions.[39]

In the situation of Hawai‘i, the *usurpation of sovereignty during military occupation* would appear to have been total since the beginning of the twentieth century. This is an ongoing crime where the criminal act would consist of the imposition of legislation or administrative measures by the occupying power that goes beyond what is required necessary for military purposes of the occupation. Since 1898, when the United States Congress enacted an American municipal law purporting to have annexed the Hawaiian Islands, it began to impose its legislation and administrative measures to the present in violation of the laws of occupation.

Given that this is essentially a crime involving government action or policy or the action or policies of an occupying State's proxies such as the State of Hawai‘i and its Counties, a perpetrator who participated in the act would be required to do so intentionally and with knowledge that the act went beyond what was required for military purposes or the protection of fundamental human rights. *Usurpation of sovereignty* has not only victimized the civilian population in the Hawaiian Islands for over a century, but it has also victimized the civilians of other countries that have visited the islands since 1898 who were unlawfully subjected to American municipal laws and administrative measures. These include State of Hawai‘i sales tax on goods purchased in the islands but also taxes placed exclusively on tourists' accommodations collected by the State of Hawai‘i and the Counties.

The Counties have recently added 3% surcharges to the State of Hawai‘i's 10.25% transient accommodations tax. Added with the State of Hawai‘i's general excise tax of 4% in addition to the 0.5% County general excise tax surcharges, tourists will be paying a total of 17.75% to the occupying power. In addition, those civilians of foreign countries doing business in the Hawaiian Islands are also subjected to paying American

[39] Eyal Benvenisti, *The International Law of Occupation* 19 (1993).

duties on goods that are imported to the United States destined to Hawai‘i. These duty rates are collected by the United States according to the United States Tariff Act of 1930**,** as amended, and the Trade Agreements Act of 1979.

The Council of Regency's strategic plan entails three phases.[40] Phase I—verification of the Hawaiian Kingdom as an independent State and a subject of international law. Phase II—exposure of Hawaiian Statehood within the framework of international law and the laws of occupation as it affects the realm of politics and economics at both the international and domestic levels. Phase III—restoration of the Hawaiian Kingdom as an independent State and a subject of international. Phase III is when the American occupation comes to an end. After the PCA verified the continued existence of Hawaiian Statehood prior to forming the arbitral tribunal in *Larsen v. Hawaiian Kingdom*,[41] Phase II was initiated, which would contribute to ascertaining the *mens rea* and satisfying the element of awareness of factual circumstances that established the existence of the military occupation.

Implementation of phase II was initiated at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa when the I entered the political science graduate program and received a master's degree specializing in international relations and public law in 2004 and a Ph.D. degree in 2008 on the subject of the continuity of Hawaiian Statehood while under an American prolonged belligerent occupation since January 17, 1893. This prompted other master's theses, doctoral dissertations, peer and law review articles, and publications about the American occupation. The exposure through academic research also motivated historian Tom Coffman to change the title of his 1998 book from *Nation Within: The Story of America's Annexation of the Nation of Hawai‘i*,[42] to *Nation Within—The History of the American Occupation of Hawai‘i*.[43] Coffman explained the change in his note on the second edition:

> I am compelled to add that the continued relevance of this book reflects a far-reaching political, moral and intellectual failure of the United States to recognize and deal with the takeover of Hawai‘i. In the book's subtitle, the word Annexation has been replaced by the word Occupation, referring to America's occupation of Hawai‘i. Where annexation connotes legality by mutual agreement, the act was not mutual and therefore not legal. Since by definition of international law there was no annexation, we are left then with the word occupation.

[40] Council of Regency's Strategic Plain (online at https://hawaiiankingdom.org/pdf/HK_Strategic_Plan.pdf).
[41] David Keanu Sai, "Backstory—Larsen v. Hawaiian Kingdom at the Permanent Court of Arbitration (1999-2001," 4 *Haw. J.L. Pol.* 133-161 (2022).
[42] Tom Coffman, *Nation Within: The Story of America's Annexation of the Nation of Hawai‘i* (1998).
[43] Tom Coffman, *Nation Within: The History of the American Occupation of Hawai‘i* (2nd ed. 2009). Duke University Press published the second edition in 2016.

> In making this change, I have embraced the logical conclusion of my research into the events of 1893 to 1898 in Honolulu and Washington, D.C. I am prompted to take this step by a growing body of historical work by a new generation of Native Hawaiian scholars. Dr. Keanu Sai writes, "The challenge for … the fields of political science, history, and law is to distinguish between the rule of law and the politics of power." In the history of the Hawai'i, the might of the United States does not make it right.[44]

As a result of the exposure, United Nations Independent Expert, Dr. Alfred deZayas sent a communication from Geneva, Switzerland, to Judge Gary W.B. Chang, Judge Jeannette H. Castagnetti, and Members of the Judiciary of the State of Hawai'i dated February 25, 2018.[45] Dr. deZayas stated:

> I have come to understand that the lawful political status of the Hawaiian Islands is that of a sovereign nation-state in continuity; but a nation-state that is under a strange form of occupation by the United States resulting from an illegal military occupation and a fraudulent annexation. As such, international laws (the Hague and Geneva Conventions) require that governance and legal matters within the occupied territory of the Hawaiian Islands must be administered by the application of the laws of the occupied state (in this case, the Hawaiian Kingdom), not the domestic laws of the occupier (the United States).

The exposure also prompted the U.S. National Lawyers Guild ("NLG") to adopt a resolution in 2019 calling upon the United States of America to begin to comply immediately with international humanitarian law in its long and illegal occupation of the Hawaiian Islands.[46] Among its positions statement, the "NLG supports the Hawaiian Council of Regency, who represented the Hawaiian Kingdom at the Permanent Court of Arbitration, in its efforts to seek resolution in accordance with international law as well as its strategy to have the State of Hawai'i and its Counties comply with international humanitarian law as the administration of the Occupying State."[47]

---

[44] *Id*., xvi.
[45] Letter of Dr. Alfred deZayas to Judge Gary W.B. Chang, Judge Jeannette H. Castagnetti, and Members of the Judiciary of the State of Hawai'i (25 February 2018) (online at https://hawaiiankingdom.org/pdf/Dr_deZayas_Memo_2_25_2018.pdf).
[46] Resolution of the National Lawyers Guild Against the Illegal Occupation of the Hawaiian Islands (2019) (online at https://www.nlg.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Hawaiian-Subcommittee-Resolution-Final.pdf).
[47] National Lawyers Guild, *NLG Calls Upon US to Immediately Comply with International Humanitarian Law in its Illegal Occupation of the Hawaiian Islands* (13 January 2020) (online at https://www.nlg.org/nlg-calls-upon-us-to-immediately-comply-with-international-humanitarian-law-in-its-illegal-occupation-of-the-hawaiian-islands/).

In a letter to Governor David Ige, Governor of the State of Hawai‘i, dated November 10, 2020, the NLG called upon the governor to begin to comply with international humanitarian by administering the laws of the occupied State. The NLG letter concluded:

> As an organization committed to the mission that human rights and the rights of ecosystems are more sacred than property interests, the NLG is deeply concerned that international humanitarian law continues to be flagrantly violated with apparent impunity by the State of Hawai‘i and its County governments. This has led to the commission of war crimes and human rights violations of a colossal scale throughout the Hawaiian Islands. International criminal law recognizes that the civilian inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands are "protected persons" who are afforded protection under international humanitarian law and their rights are vested in international treaties. There are no statutes of limitation for war crimes, as you must be aware.
>
> We urge you, Governor Ige, to proclaim the transformation of the State of Hawai‘i and its Counties into an occupying government pursuant to the Council of Regency's proclamation of June 3, 2019, in order to administer the laws of the Hawaiian Kingdom. This would include carrying into effect the Council of Regency's proclamation of October 10, 2014 that bring the laws of the Hawaiian Kingdom in the nineteenth century up to date. We further urge you and other officials of the State of Hawai‘i and its Counties to familiarize yourselves with the contents of the recent eBook published by the RCI and its reports that comprehensively explains the current situation of the Hawaiian Islands and the impact that international humanitarian law and human rights law have on the State of Hawai‘i and its inhabitants.

On February 7, 2021, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers ("IADL"), a non-governmental organization (NGO) of human rights lawyers that has special consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council ("ECOSOC") and accredited to participate in the Human Rights Council's sessions as Observers, passed a resolution calling upon the United States to immediately comply with international humanitarian law in its prolonged occupation of the Hawaiian Islands—the Hawaiian Kingdom.[48] In its resolution, the IADL also "supports the Hawaiian Council of Regency, who represented the Hawaiian Kingdom at the Permanent Court of Arbitration, in its efforts to seek resolution in accordance with international law as well as its strategy to have the State of Hawai‘i and its Counties comply with international humanitarian law as the administration of the Occupying State."

[48] International Association of Democratic Lawyers, *IADL Resolution on the US Occupation of the Hawaiian Kingdom* (7 February 2021) (online at https://iadllaw.org/2021/03/iadl-resolution-on-the-us-occupation-of-the-hawaiian-kingdom/).

Together with the IADL, the American Association of Jurists—Asociación Americana de Juristas ("AAJ"), who is also an NGO with consultative status with the United Nations ECOSOC and accredited as an observer in the Human Rights Council's sessions, sent a joint letter dated March 3, 2022 to member States of the United Nations on the status of the Hawaiian Kingdom and its prolonged occupation by the United States.[49] In its joint letter, the IADL and the AAJ also "supports the Hawaiian Council of Regency, who represented the Hawaiian Kingdom at the Permanent Court of Arbitration, in its efforts to seek resolution in accordance with international law as well as its strategy to have the State of Hawai'i and its Counties comply with international humanitarian law as the administration of the Occupying State."

On March 22, 2022, the author delivered an oral statement, on behalf of the IADL and AAJ, to the United Nations Human Rights Council ("HRC") at its 49th session in Geneva. The oral statement read:

> The International Association of Democratic Lawyers and the American Association of Jurists call the attention of the Council to human rights violations in the Hawaiian Islands. My name is Dr. David Keanu Sai, and I am the Minister of Foreign Affairs *ad interim* for the Hawaiian Kingdom. I also served as lead agent for the Hawaiian Kingdom at the Permanent Court of Arbitration from 1999-2001 where the Court acknowledged the continued existence of my country as a sovereign and independent State.
>
> The Hawaiian Kingdom was invaded by the United States on 16 January 1893, which began its century long occupation to serve its military interests. Currently, there are 118 military sites throughout the islands and the city of Honolulu serves as the headquarters for the Indo-Pacific Combatant Command.
>
> For the past century, the United States has and continues to commit the war crime of usurpation of sovereignty, under customary international law, by imposing its municipal laws over Hawaiian territory, which has denied Hawaiian subjects their right of internal self-determination by prohibiting them to freely access their own laws and administrative policies, which has led to the violations of their human rights, starting with the right to health, education and to choose their political leadership.

None of the 47 member States of the HRC, which includes the United States, protested, or objected to the oral statement of war crimes being committed in the Hawaiian Kingdom by the United States. Under international law, acquiescence "concerns a consent tacitly

[49] International Association of Democratic Lawyers, *IADL and AAJ deliver joint letter on Hawaiian Kingdom to UN ambassadors* (3 March 2022) (online at https://iadllaw.org/2022/03/iadl-and-aaj-deliver-joint-letter-on-hawaiian-kingdom-to-un-ambassadors/).

conveyed by a State, unilaterally, through silence or inaction, in circumstances such that a response expressing disagreement or objection in relation to the conduct of another State would be called for."[50] Silence conveys consent. Since they "did not do so [they] thereby must be held to have acquiesced. *Qui tacet consentire videtur si loqui debuisset ac potuisset.*"[51]

At the United Nations World Summit in 2005, the *Responsibility to Protect* was unanimously adopted.[52] The principle of the *Responsibility to Protect* has three pillars: (1) every State has the Responsibility to Protect its populations from four mass atrocity crimes—genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing; (2) the wider international community has the responsibility to encourage and assist individual States in meeting that responsibility; and (3) if a state is manifestly failing to protect its populations, the international community must be prepared to take appropriate collective action, in a timely and decisive manner and in accordance with the UN Charter. In 2009, the General Assembly reaffirmed the three pillars of State's Responsibility to Protect their populations from war crimes and crimes against humanity.[53] And in 2021, the General Assembly passed a resolution on "The responsibility to protect and the prevention of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity."[54] The third pillar, which may call into action State intervention, can become controversial.[55] The Council of Regency acknowledges its duty and responsibility under the first pillar.

Rule 158 of the International Committee of the Red Cross Study on Customary International Humanitarian Law specifies that "States must investigate war crimes allegedly committed by their nationals or armed forces, or on their territory, and, if appropriate, prosecute the suspects. They must also investigate other war crimes over which they have jurisdiction and, if appropriate, prosecute the suspects."[56] This "rule that States must investigate war crimes and prosecute the suspects is set forth in numerous military manuals, with respect to grave breaches, but also more broadly with respect to war crimes in general."[57]

---

[50] Nuno Sérgio Marques Antunes, "Acquiescence", in Rüdiger Wolfrum (ed.), *Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law* para. 2 (2006).
[51] See International Court of Justice, *Case concerning the Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia v. Thailand)*, Merits, Judgment of 15 June 1962, *I.C.J. Reports* 1962, p. 6, at 23.
[52] 2005 World Summit Outcome A/60/L.1
[53] G.A. Resolution 63/308 The responsibility to protect, A/63/308.
[54] G.A. Resolution 75/277 The responsibility to protect and the prevention of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, A/RES/75/277.
[55] Marjorie Cohn, "The Responsibility to Protect – the Cases of Libya and Ivory Coast," *Truthout* (16 May 2011) (online at https://truthout.org/articles/the-responsibility-to-protect-the-cases-of-libya-and-ivory-coast/).
[56] Jean-Marie Henckaerts and Louise Doswald-Beck (eds.), *Customary International Humanitarian Law*, vol. I: Rules, 607 (2009).
[57] *Id*., 608.

Determined to hold to account individuals who have committed war crimes and human rights violations throughout the Hawaiian Islands, being the territory of the Hawaiian Kingdom, the Council of Regency, by *Proclamation* on April 17, 2019,[58] established the RCI in similar fashion to the United States proposal of establishing a Commission of Inquiry after the First World War "to consider generally the relative culpability of the authors of the war and also the question of their culpability as to the violations of the laws and customs of war committed during its course."[59] Professor Federico Lenzerini from the University of Siena, Italy, serves as its Deputy Head.

In mid-November of 2022, the RCI published thirteen war criminal reports finding that the senior leadership of the United States and the State of Hawai'i, which includes President Joseph Biden Jr., Governor David Ige, Hawai'i Mayor Mitchell Roth, Maui Mayor Michael Victorino and Kaua'i Mayor Derek Kawakami, are guilty of the war crime of *usurpation of sovereignty during military occupation*, and subject to prosecution. All of the named perpetrators have met the requisite element of *mens rea*.[60] In these reports, the RCI has concluded that these perpetrators have met the requisite elements of the war crime and are guilty *dolus directus* of the first degree. "It is generally assumed that an offender acts with *dolus directus* of the first degree if he desires to bring about the result. In this type of intent, the actor's 'will' is directed finally towards the accomplishment of that result."[61]

Professor Schabas states three elements of the war crime of *usurpation of sovereignty during military occupation* are:

1. The perpetrators imposed or applied legislative or administrative measures of the occupying power going beyond those required by what is necessary for military purposes of the occupation.
2. The perpetrators were aware that the measures went beyond what was required for military purposes or the protection of fundamental human rights.
3. Their conduct took place in the context of and was associated with a military occupation.
4. The perpetrators were aware of factual circumstances that established the existence of the military occupation.

With respect to the last two elements of war crimes, Professor Schabas explains:

---

[58] Proclamation: Establishment of the Royal Commission of Inquiry (17 April 2019) (online at https://hawaiiankingdom.org/pdf/Proc_Royal_Commission_of_Inquiry.pdf).
[59] *Violation of the Laws and Customs of War,* 69 (1919).
[60] Website of the Royal Commission of Inquiry at https://hawaiiankingdom.org/royal-commission.shtml.
[61] Mohamed Elewa Badar, *The Concept of Mens Rea in International Criminal Law: The Case for a Unified Approach* 535 (2013).

1. There is no requirement for a legal evaluation by the perpetrator as to the existence of an armed conflict or its character as international or non-international;
2. In that context there is no requirement for awareness by the perpetrator of the facts that established the character of the conflict as international or non-international;
3. There is only a requirement for the awareness of the factual circumstance that established the existence of an armed conflict that is implicit in the terms "took place in the context of and was associated with."[62]

The evidence of the *actus reus* and *mens rea* or guilty mind were drawn from the perpetrators' own pleadings and the rulings by the court in a United States federal district court case in Honolulu, *Hawaiian Kingdom v. Biden et al.*, civil no. 1:21:cv-00243-LEK-RT. The perpetrators were being sued not in their individual or private capacities but rather in their official capacities as State actors because the war crime of *usurpation of sovereignty during military occupation* involves "State action or policy or the action or policies of an occupying State's proxies" and not the private actions of individuals. The perpetrators are subject to prosecution and there is no statute of limitation for war crimes.[63]

The 123 countries who are State Parties to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court have primary responsibility to prosecute war criminals under universal jurisdiction, but the perpetrator would have to enter the territory of the State Party to be apprehended and prosecuted. Under the principle of complementary jurisdiction under the Rome Statute, State Parties have the first responsibility to prosecute individuals for international crimes to include the war crime of *usurpation of sovereignty during military occupation* without regard to the place the war crime was committed or the nationality of the perpetrator. The ICC is a court of last resort. With the exception of the United States, China, Cuba, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Thailand, the Allied Powers and Associated Powers of the First World War are State Parties to the Rome Statute.

In the situation where the citizens of these countries have become victims of the war crime of *usurpation of sovereignty during military occupation* and its secondary war crimes such as *pillage*, these citizens can seek extradition warrants in their national courts for their governments to prosecute these perpetrators under the passive personality jurisdiction and not universal jurisdiction. The passive personality jurisdiction provides countries with jurisdiction for crimes committed against their nationals while they were abroad in the

[62] *Id*., 167.
[63] United Nations General Assembly Res. 3 (I); United Nations General Assembly Res. 170 (II); United Nations General Assembly Res. 2583 (XXIV); United Nations General Assembly Res. 2712 (XXV); United Nations General Assembly Res. 2840 (XXVI); United Nations General Assembly Res. 3020 (XXVII); United Nations General Assembly Res. 3074 (XXVIII).

Hawaiian Islands. This has the potential of opening the floodgate of criminal proceedings from all over the world.

The commission of the war crime of *usurpation of sovereignty during military occupation* can cease when the State of Hawai'i complies with Article 43 of the 1907 Hague Regulations and administer the laws of the Occupied State—the Hawaiian Kingdom. The State of Hawai'i and not the Federal government is in effective control of the majority of Hawaiian territory in accordance with Article 42 of the 1907 Hague Regulations. At present, this is not the case, and the Hawaiian Kingdom has now entered 130 years of occupation being the longest occupation in the history of international relations and war crimes continue to be committed with impunity.

As you are aware, the State of Hawai'i Legislature met from January 18, 2023 to May 4, 2023, enacting American laws to be executed by Governor Josh Green. This war crime of *usurpation of sovereignty during military occupation* continues to be committed with impunity even after Attorney General Anne E. Lopez was notified that she and others were the subject of the RCI War Criminal Report No. 23-0001 and subject to prosecution, which you have in your possession.

In our meeting at the Grand Naniloa Hotel, I recommended that you have your Staff Judge Advocate do his due diligence regarding the information I provided you. His task would be to provide rebuttable evidence that the Hawaiian Kingdom does not continue to exist as a State under international law. Considering the severity of the situation, I am allowing three weeks from this date for your Staff Judge Advocate to complete his due diligence by June 1, 2023. If an extension is required, we can discuss this subject further.

Sincerely,

David Keanu Sai, Ph.D.
Head, Hawaiian Royal Commission of Inquiry

cc: Professor Federico Lenzerini, Deputy Head, Royal Commission of Inquiry

enclosures