

From the Ocean to the Sea, Hawaii will be Free | Dr. Keanu Sai

After over 125 years of occupation, Hawaii is fighting a battle to free itself from the colonial occupiers. This is where Hawaii's struggle for sovereignty stands in 2026. I'm joined by Dr. Keanu Sai, senior lecturer in political science and Hawaiian studies at the University of Hawaii and chairman of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Together we track his law-first campaign, the Permanent Court of Arbitration episode, and the Kamehameha Schools lawsuit that he says forces US courts to face the occupation question. Links: Hawaiian Kingdom blog: <https://hawaiiankingdom.org/blog> Neutrality Studies substack: <https://pascallottaz.substack.com> (Opt in for Academic Section from your profile settings: <https://pascallottaz.substack.com/s/academic>) Merch & Donations: <https://neutralitystudies-shop.fourthwall.com> Timestamps: 00:00:00 Welcome and core claim 00:00:51 Lawfare and US court strategy 00:01:55 Hague arbitration and state continuity 00:14:48 US overreach and extraterritorial law 00:18:12 Three phase plan and exposure strategy 00:22:29 Kamehameha Schools lawsuit intervention 00:41:17 Pushback risks and public leverage 00:47:00 Following updates and resources

#Pascal

Hello, everybody, and welcome back to Neutrality Studies. My name is Pascal Lottaz. I'm an associate professor at Kyoto University, and today I'm joined once more by Dr. Keanu Tsai, a senior lecturer in political science and Hawaiian studies at the University of Hawaii, and the chairman of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Keanu, welcome to the show.

#Keanu Sai

Thank you, Pascal, for inviting me again. I appreciate it.

#Pascal

Very glad to have you back. You're one of the few voices working hard through various legal and publicity projects to raise awareness about the situation in Hawaii, which you say has been under occupation for 130 years. But your argument is that the Hawaiian Kingdom actually never ceased to exist. Before we get into the updates on what's been happening, can you give us, in a nutshell, what you've been working on and how your project is going?

#Keanu Sai

Well, you might say I'm a firm believer in lawfare, not warfare. We've been engaged in a federal case in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii. There's a lawsuit where a plaintiff

claims that a particular school established in the 19th century, called Kamehameha Schools, is subject to U.S. civil rights law. We intervened and made the point that American law—whether civil rights law or otherwise—has no application outside U.S. territory, because the Hawaiian Kingdom is an occupied state.

#Pascal

Right. The central claim of yours is that the Hawaiian Kingdom is currently, or should be, under the law of occupation, right? And not under local law. You actually had an important case in the past, right? You didn't win, but you managed to bring it before an international court. Can you maybe just recount that instance?

#Keanu Sai

Sure. So, very quickly, just to precede what took place at the Permanent Court of Arbitration in The Hague, or Den Haag, Netherlands: the Hawaiian Kingdom in the 19th century was an independent state. It had existed as an independent state since 1843. Prior to that, since 1794, the Hawaiian Kingdom was a British protectorate. Now, in 1893—on January 16th—U.S. Marines invaded Honolulu and illegally overthrew the government of the Hawaiian Kingdom, the following day, on January 17th. Under the law of occupation, or rather under international humanitarian law—the law of armed conflict—when you overthrow a government, sovereignty is not transferred to the occupier; it remains with the state itself, despite the government being militarily overthrown.

What happens is, according to the 1907 Hague Regulations—which were recognized as customary international law even before 1907 and 1899—Article 42 in particular says that territory is considered occupied when it is under the effective control of the occupier, right? On January 17, 1893, Queen Lili'uokalani, the head of state of the Hawaiian Kingdom, conditionally surrendered to the United States and called for an investigation into the U.S. invasion, which was unwarranted. The overthrow of the government through that surrender effectively transferred control to the U.S. military, which triggered Article 42—occupation, or effective control of territory. Then, under Article 43, the occupier is supposed to administer the laws of the occupied state. The United States didn't do that. The U.S. did complete an investigation, found that the queen was correct, and entered into an executive agreement to restore her—but they didn't follow through.

And five years later, in 1898, the United States Congress passed a law purporting to have annexed a foreign country. Since 1898, American laws have been imposed illegally in the Hawaiian Kingdom, in violation of the law of occupation, right? Now, this federal lawsuit—excuse me, let me back up. The Permanent Court of Arbitration case stemmed from the unlawful imposition of American laws. Lance Paul Larson, a Hawaiian subject, was alleging that the Hawaiian Kingdom, through its Council of Regency, which restored the government in 1997, was liable for allowing American laws to be

imposed, which led to his incarceration. So that became a humanitarian matter. He suffered an unfair criminal trial and then unlawful confinement. Those are two war crimes under the Geneva Conventions.

Now, when we entered into that agreement with him to go to binding arbitration, we knew—and I was the agent for the Hawaiian Kingdom as well as the chairman of the Council of Regency—that the Permanent Court of Arbitration would be tasked with determining whether or not the Hawaiian Kingdom is a state, an existing state. Not a nation with self-determination to choose to become a state, but rather a state in continuity since the 19th century, despite the government being overthrown in 1892. So I was in communication with their legal counsel at the Permanent Court, and she was asking for additional information beyond what she had already researched, because she had to determine whether or not the Hawaiian Kingdom was continuing to exist as a state, and whether the Hawaiian Kingdom would then be a contracting or non-contracting state to have access to the Permanent Court.

So all contracting states have access. But Article 47 of the 1907 Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes provides access to non-contracting states. So I'll give you an example: currently, there are 127 contracting states, but there are 193 members of the United Nations.

#Keanu Sai

That means you have a large number of states that are members of the United Nations but are non-contracting states. Again, they would have access. For the Hawaiian Kingdom, we're not a member of the United Nations, but rather a non-member of the United Nations—yet a state nevertheless. And she confirmed: they determined that the Hawaiian Kingdom existed as a state.

#Pascal

Hey, very brief intermission because I was recently banned from YouTube. And although I'm back, this could happen again at any time. So please consider subscribing not only here but also to my mailing list on Substack—that's pascallottaz.substack.com. The link's in the description below. And now, back to the video. Right, because of course the occupation of Hawaii started before the Permanent Court of Justice was founded, so naturally it couldn't be a member. But what was established in front of the Permanent Court of Justice is that the Court recognized the statehood—and the continuous statehood—of the Kingdom of Hawaii, right? And that was confirmed at that hearing, because they said you had, in fact, standing in front of the Court, right?

#Keanu Sai

Yes, that was confirmed. And that prompted Jaco van den Hout, the Secretary-General of the Permanent Court at that time—he was a Dutch national. He spoke to me on the phone and stated

that the secretariat had concluded they could find no evidence that the Hawaiian Kingdom ceased to exist as a state, and that the Hawaiian-Dutch Treaty had not been terminated. I believe that treaty was from 1863, a treaty of most-favored-nation status. He then recommended to me, as the head of the government, to provide a formal invitation to the United States to join in the arbitration—to answer for the unlawful imposition of American law within Hawaiian territory that led to the claimant's unfair trial and incarceration, Mr. Larson.

So that request prompted an exchange of notes between the Hawaiian Kingdom government and the United States to reach an executive agreement. The first note I delivered was after a meeting I had with counsel for Lance Larson in Washington, D.C., during a conference call with Mr. John Crook from the U.S. State Department—he's a legal advisor. I remember in our conversation he said, "And the Permanent Court accepted this case," because he knew what that meant—that they had verified the Hawaiian Kingdom was a state, not the 50th state of the United States.

So what we have there is, I provided the formal invitation to the United States, and I put that conversation into writing—that became the note, or the offering instrument. I sent that to Mr. Crook, and I also sent a copy to the Permanent Court for the record, showing that the United States had been given an invitation. A few weeks later, I received a call from the Deputy Secretary-General, Phyllis Hamilton—she's an American—and she said that the American embassy, the ambassador, had notified the Court that they had an answer. They respectfully declined to join in the arbitration, but they asked permission from the Hawaiian government to have access to all records and pleadings.

And I consented to that. What we have there is an executive agreement. Now, this executive agreement is important because it's a treaty under international law by exchange of notes. So, coincident with granting permission to the United States to access all records was the United States' recognition of the Hawaiian Kingdom and its Council of Regency as its government. That was important right there. It wasn't just that the Permanent Court had verified the Hawaiian Kingdom still exists under customary international law, but now we have a treaty. That treaty has come to be known as the Sai-Clinton Treaty—between myself, because I was in direct communication with the embassy, and the Permanent Court, which was brokering that agreement. And that embassy was representing President Clinton, who was the president at that time. So that was significant.

That was significant. Now, what's also significant is that the Permanent Court—this is all before the proceedings were instituted, because the tribunal wasn't established until June of 2000, and this was March of 2000. What's important is that not only did the United States recognize the Hawaiian Kingdom's continued existence and the Council of Regency as a government by treaty, but also by **opinio juris**—an opinion of law or practice. So, all 127 countries today—but back then, I think it was fewer; I'm not sure how many, maybe around eighty-something contracting states—but no state, including the United States, protested or objected to the Permanent Court's designation and finding that the Hawaiian Kingdom tribunal was established pursuant to Article 47 for non-contracting states. That became an acceptance of the practice.

Now, the legal reasoning behind their not protesting or objecting—which is part of *opinio juris*—is that you have the “what,” which is the action, and the “why,” meaning there’s some legal requirement. Under international law, there is a presumption of continuity of a state despite its government being overthrown, and the internal laws of any state have no extraterritorial effect. So there was nothing the United States could protest against, because under international law, as the Permanent Court’s legal counsel verified, it still exists. So we have *opinio juris*, we have an executive agreement, and we have recognition by the Permanent Court as an intergovernmental organization. And actions taken by an intergovernmental organization—being that they are made up of representatives of states—are considered acts of a state as well.

#Pascal

Your case is highly fascinating to me because it kind of runs counter to the current development of international relations, where we see states just doing whatever they want with their militaries and claiming facts on the ground, right? You’re doing the exact opposite. You’re taking a legal route, saying, “No, no, no, wait—we have precedents, we have a case, and we can take this to court internationally, but also locally in the United States. We can use the legal system to establish at least the facts of the matter and what the case is. And we work there, in a long-term strategy, to use the legal system to get back what should be the case,” right?

Do you think—and we’ll get to the specifics of your new case in a moment—but the things the United States currently does, let’s say regarding Greenland, and especially regarding Venezuela, where the U.S. is basically trying to imply that its local laws, including gun ownership rights and so on, apply to the president of Venezuela—I mean, one of the charges against Nicolás Maduro is the illegal possession of firearms, right? Which is absolutely ridiculous when you think about what you just laid out. In the grand scheme of things, how do you think this approach by the U.S.—this blatant infringement on international law, and this really wild application of domestic law to foreign jurisdictions—how does that impact what you’re doing and how you’re approaching your case?

#Keanu Sai

Well, the blatant violations of international law being committed by the current U.S. administration only highlight the importance and significance of international law. In our case, the violence occurred on January 16, 1893, when U.S. troops invaded. Our Queen had to ensure that bloodshed would not take place because the Hawaiian Kingdom was a neutral country by treaty, so it had to be very careful in its approach. It was never a belligerent that would wage war, but we did have a defense force, right? So what was in the minds of Hawaiian authorities in the 19th century was how to use international law to preserve the Hawaiian Kingdom’s existence as an independent state.

And that’s what prompted policy decisions regarding neutrality, government reform, and those kinds of things. By the time we get to 1893, Hawaii is very progressive as a governing entity. The Queen then was faced with gunboat diplomacy by the United States, and she had to walk that very

carefully. She had some very good advisors, so she played the law to her advantage. But you can't stop a physical takeover—at least the law would preserve her position. So when we look at it from today's standpoint, we basically, in 1997, just picked up where they left off—but minus the troops, minus the threats. In fact, I have a military background; I served ten years in the Army as a field artillery officer. So we were trained in the law of occupation, right?

I knew about the law of occupation and sovereignty being intact not as a political scientist, but as an Army officer, because that's part of U.S. Army Field Manual 27-10, right? So it was an approach we needed to take in a very comprehensive way, without compromising the country any more than we had to. Our actions—in this case, what took place at the Permanent Court and what we'll cover later in the show regarding the federal lawsuit—are part of the broader strategy of the consular reGENCY. We've been operating on a strategic plan that was developed in 1997, when the consular reGENCY restored the government as a consular reGENCY. It's a three-phase plan. Phase one: verification that the Hawaiian Kingdom continues to exist as a state. Okay, phase one—Permanent Court of Arbitration got us past that.

Since 2000, we've been in phase two—exposure of the Hawaiian state, legally, politically, through education. Just expose, expose. This exposure would naturally force compliance with the law of occupation, where the state of Hawaii, as the governing body of the Hawaiian Kingdom, still operates from that 1893 infrastructure—it's just a name change. They have to transform themselves into a military government in order to begin administering the laws of the occupied state. That's the goal, that's the objective. And phase three is when the occupation comes to an end by a treaty of peace, right? So here we are, speaking about the Permanent Court, which was so critical in ensuring that a reputable body verified the Hawaiian Kingdom continues to exist as a state—not a political movement, not a matter of self-determination.

In fact, as an occupied state, self-determination is applied differently than in a case of colonization, right? Self-determination means you have the right to choose. In the case of an existing state under occupation, that right is deprived because you're not able to select your own leaders or control your own resources. So when the occupation ends, that's when we can exercise self-determination, right? That was an important aspect. So here we are in the exposure phase, dealing with not just misinformation and a false narrative that became accepted as true, but also having to adjust the terms.

We had to apply the right terminology, the right law, the right theoretical framework, right? So one thing we use to get people to do something they wouldn't normally do—I like to draw from realist theory, Hans Morgenthau—at the national level: self-help, self-interest, self-preservation. Okay, well, at that level, they're kind of echelons above reality, right? But we're getting closer. What's happening on the ground is that you have that same self-help, self-interest, and self-preservation, where, let's say, individuals in the state of Hawaii who are mindful and made aware of the factual circumstances—that it's always occupied—which is a critical element in a war crime called *mens rea*, the guilty mind.

Once they can see that, then we can hold them accountable and say, "If you're going to go this route, this is what's going to happen to you." And that starts from the bottom up. But the ultimate compliance has to take place from the top down, not the bottom up. So it's a very unique approach that we've engaged ourselves in. But this strategy, the engagement, and the making of tactical decisions—meaning face-to-face responses to a crisis, adjustments—it's all rule-based. And we become part of controlling the narrative because we have the standing of a real government, a state under international law.

#Pascal

And now, what happened recently? You have a federal case now, right, under U.S. law. Can you explain that one and how it fits into your broader strategy—which, I should emphasize, is a long-term strategy? You're not trying to have this implemented tomorrow or in 2027; you're working on the long-term plan of getting out of the occupation, even if it takes another hundred years. But maybe not about the case itself.

#Keanu Sai

I'm not waiting for a hundred years. We actually have many things in place—triggers already there. We just have to hit them. So this isn't happening in isolation. A lot has taken place during phase two, when we returned from The Hague. It's just that what's visible on the radar right now would be, in this case, the federal lawsuit. So, the issue in this lawsuit is *Students for Fair Admissions*. They're basically proponents of civil rights law in America. The argument is that affirmative action, which gives preference to groups with a history of oppression or slavery—that's where it originally came from—gives them a head start. But by giving those students a head start, you're preventing other students who may be more qualified from getting in.

In the case of *Students for Fair Admissions*, they filed a lawsuit against Harvard, representing Chinese students who were denied admission because of affirmative action. They argued that this was illegal because it was race-based. In 2023, the case went to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Court ruled that affirmative action is illegal. This is the same plaintiff that has now filed a lawsuit in federal court in Honolulu against the Kamehameha Schools, which were established in 1887 during the kingdom era. According to the will and intent of Bernice Pauahi Bishop, a high-ranking princess, the school stated that preference would be given—not just for tuition but also for admission—to Aboriginal Hawaiians, meaning natives, both pure and part. That policy has been in place since 1887.

#Pascal

Yes, and now we're talking about a school that was founded even before the legal government of the Kingdom of Hawaii was overthrown. That school still exists today, and they already had

something like affirmative action back in 1887. And now this student group has sued the school, right?

#Keanu Sai

Because their argument is that they're...

#Keanu Sai

They are not Native Hawaiians, and they were denied access to the schools. For myself, I'm a graduate of the Kamehameha Schools, so it's personal for me as an alumnus. The problem with that case, though, is that when they filed the federal lawsuit and applied American law, it was precisely the same situation as with Lance Larson in his criminal trial—except this is a civil trial. What's constant, or consistent, is that American laws are being illegally imposed in Hawaii. Now, what I also want to mention with regard to **opinio juris** is that the action or practice taken by the Permanent Court wasn't just the recognition of the Hawaiian Kingdom as a state in their annual reports, which every contracting state received, but also the case description on their website.

That is their app, and it says that Larson is alleging the consular agency is liable for the unlawful imposition of American laws within the territory of the Hawaiian Kingdom. The United States did not object to that, meaning they accepted it as true and factual, right? As part of **opinio juris**, that's a practice. So here we are: the United States government, by treaty and by **opinio juris**, recognizes the Hawaiian Kingdom as still existing, and the imposition of American law—which would include the Civil Rights Act—is unlawful, right? So that becomes the premise.

So Kamehameha is not going to raise any of these issues because they're a private entity, and they're not experts in international law or as well-versed in it as we are, right? And Students for Fair Admissions will never raise these issues. So that prompted a meeting I had with the leadership of the Kamehameha Schools to see where they stood regarding the Hawaiian Kingdom's interests as a government. They said they took no position. Okay. Students for Fair Admissions objected to our proposed intervention. We're going to intervene in the case, so we're going to file a motion to intervene as a non-party.

So we're not intervening as a defendant or as a plaintiff. We're going to intervene as a non-party because we're the Hawaiian government. We're going to make sure that history is understood by the court accurately and that the right law is applied. That was our opening to file the motion to intervene. Now, in the United States federal system, there's this doctrine called the political question. In a federal court, if there's an issue of sovereignty involving a country that the U.S. executive branch has not recognized—like in the case of Palestine—anyone raising a Palestinian issue as a state under international law would have their case denied for lack of jurisdiction, because it's considered a political question until the executive branch acts on it.

And then once they act upon it, the courts are bound by that, right? They can't question it. So we anticipated that Students for Fair Admissions would raise the political question doctrine when we filed our motion to intervene—not Kamehameha, but Students for Fair Admissions. What we did was leave out of our motion to intervene the executive agreement recognizing the Hawaiian Kingdom and the *opinio juris* that binds the United States. We held that back because we wanted to respond to their denial, which we expected. What we didn't anticipate was that the judge would deny the motion to intervene, invoking the political question doctrine. He filed that order denying our motion just two days after we submitted it.

So I don't know if the judge, or even the judge's clerk, actually read it, but I believe they assumed that because we're talking about the Hawaiian Kingdom—and they're not fully well-versed in the particulars—they just said the motion to intervene is denied because it's a political question. So what we did was, we had 14 days to file a motion for reconsideration. The main basis we're relying on for that motion is that the court committed a manifest error in its judgment regarding the Hawaiian Kingdom. That's when, in our motion for reconsideration, we laid out the executive agreement showing that the Hawaiian Kingdom was recognized under President Clinton, as well as the Council of Regency and the *opinio juris*.

It appears that the judge hit the pause button because no decision has been made, and we're going on 14 days, right? So it's an issue that's there, but it's not one to be litigated with regard to the Hawaiian Kingdom's existence. It's about the impact that the so-called Clinton agreement would have as a treaty upon the court, because the court is in foreign territory—they're in the Hawaiian Kingdom—which means they're not properly constituted. And if a court isn't properly constituted, any action it takes deprives a person of a fair and regular trial. So now comes in the Fourth Geneva Convention, right? That's the opening that brings these issues to the forefront. And that's been a very foundational point that's raising eyebrows here in Hawai'i because it's so legally grounded.

#Pascal

And you're forcing that consideration upon the court now, right? I mean, you're using the court system to go after these detailed legal questions. But with each one, you're creating new building blocks to take the next step—to prove that the Hawaiian Kingdom is still very much here, still a legal entity, and never ceased to exist, even if people ignored it. So now you're at the point where you're waiting for the judge's decision, because once that's given, I suppose the Students for Fair Admissions would then have the next chance to apply for the denial of your request to intervene, right?

#Keanu Sai

Okay, so again, when you're in a fight, you don't show all your combinations, right? When we filed that motion to intervene, our strategy was to show the court what the laws are, what the facts are, and that it has to administer Hawaiian Kingdom law—to get the court to begin applying Hawaiian

Kingdom law in this lawsuit. That was the basis of our intervention. So we're not the Students for Fair Admissions, taking another bite at the apple with Kamehameha. The difference is that affirmative action under American law is illegal, but the Hawaiian Kingdom, under its own laws, has a form of affirmative action where the policy of Kamehameha is in line with Hawaiian Kingdom law.

And we have a court case from 1863, *Rex v. Booth*, that clearly articulates that with regard to the native population. So, you know, it's like—make sure the playing field is fair. Don't deny students free admission. You can't do that. No, you can make any allegation you want, but you have to apply the right law. Now, what has happened, though, as a consequence of the judge's decision to deny our motion—and now our motion for reconsideration—is that we've taken it to another level. The executive agreement, the treaty, basically says the United States recognizes the Hawaiian Kingdom, and this federal court does not exist. Does not exist. Not that it needs to administer Hawaiian Kingdom law.

So now it raises the issue of legalities—not just with Students for Fair Admissions, but also with Kamehameha Schools. What's happening now in my meetings with Kamehameha leadership is that Kamehameha, as an estate—a probated estate, which is a legal person under Hawaiian Kingdom law, not a physical person but a juridical person—is under Hawaiian Kingdom law. But the current administration of that estate is under American law. That's a problem. We have a collision, because you cannot be under American law in the Hawaiian Kingdom when the United States has already recognized the continued existence of the Hawaiian Kingdom and the Council of Regency.

So we were trying to get the Kamehameha leadership—the trustees and the CEO—to take affirmative steps to show that they have allegiance to the Hawaiian Kingdom, the country. Because allegiance has not changed despite a prolonged occupation, since sovereignty is still intact. Now, during occupation, you can argue the occupier may demand obedience, but not allegiance. Because if they demand allegiance, that's a war crime, right? So we need to understand that aspect of how this law impacts private people today. And that's where it gets into self-help, self-interest, and self-preservation. So if I'm going to look at the issue here with the current administration—which is really just a microcosm of everything in Hawaii, right?

It's not just the leadership of Kamehameha; it's the direct nexus to an estate—a legal person under Hawaiian Kingdom law. And the only way that estate can speak is through representatives by virtue of the will of that estate. The will is not being properly applied because it's all under American law. So here we have a situation where the assets of this estate are paying the salaries of the leadership of the estate today under American law. There's a disconnect. So now, I can say, as the head of the Royal Commission of Inquiry—which investigates war crimes—that possibly the current leadership could be committing the war crime of usurpation of sovereignty, which is the imposition of the occupier's law, as an accessory after the fact.

Because after the fact they were made aware—what triggers the “accessory after the fact” part—is that they were informed through the pleadings in this case that Hawaii is occupied and that

Hawaiian Kingdom law applies. So the continued receipt of money from this estate becomes the accessory after the fact: usurpation of sovereignty, in how they became trustees under American law, which itself is usurpation of sovereignty. Another aspect of the impact of war crimes would be pillage, because that's a private estate from the 19th century, and these are private people. Now we're talking about appropriating assets without the consent of that other private person. So then we also get into, under Hawaiian Kingdom law, theft.

Because you are receiving funds from an entity without consent. The implication here, as it always has been, applies to everyone in Hawaii to a certain degree. What has to happen now is that the trustees and the chief executive officer need to come under Hawaiian Kingdom law. Under our laws, that would be by virtue of Section 430 of the Hawaiian Civil Code—signing an oath of allegiance. That's the evidence that you're under Hawaiian Kingdom law. What's interesting is that in 1893, when the insurgents took over the Hawaiian Kingdom government and were being protected by U.S. Marines, they forced everyone to sign oaths of allegiance to them. They were protected by the U.S. Marines, but they maintained the governmental infrastructure.

So what we put together in our operational plan, well before this federal lawsuit even took place, is to bring the status quo back to what it was in 1893, before the U.S. invasion. There are essential and implied tasks. Basically, what we're doing is a form of reverse engineering—it's reversing everything that occurred in 1893. We're not coming up with new ways of looking at it; we're just reversing it legally. The oath of allegiance that would need to be signed by individuals in certain positions—in this case, it revealed itself because of the federal lawsuit—is just part of that reverse engineering, bringing it back under the Hawaiian Kingdom, under its umbrella of sovereignty. And that's when it gets people here in Hawaii very uneasy.

#Pascal

Are you getting pushback—not just on the legal front, but from people? I mean, you're really scratching at a surface where you might trigger powerful people—people with money and people in office—to start noticing you and maybe want to shut the whole thing down. Is that already happening?

#Keanu Sai

No, no. It's so legally and historically based that our protection really is the fact that what we're doing is just following the law. Right. So, take a look at the benefits of this. Okay, let's look at it from a realist standpoint. If I'm living in Hawaii and the cost of living is killing me—the majority of Native Hawaiians live in America now because they can't afford to live in their own country, their own home. Not that they even know it's their country, right? Under Hawaiian Kingdom law, every Native Hawaiian gets free healthcare at Queen's Hospital. That was the law in 1893, since 1859, okay?

Also, property—every Native Hawaiian, because of vested rights in the land—can get up to 50 acres at 50 cents an acre, which, according to the inflation calculator, is about \$17 an acre, right? We're looking at these issues that hit home for people—meaning self-interest, self-preservation. So that kind of gets them thinking. And then, if you take a look at it from a tax standpoint, taxes in Hawaii—they're being triple taxed: federal, state, and county. Under Hawaiian Kingdom law, it's just one tax, right? So when you look at it from a business standpoint, you don't pay IRS taxes in a foreign country called the Hawaiian Kingdom. You pay Hawaiian Kingdom taxes, which are currently being collected by the State of Hawaii.

We just have to get them to transition. So the driving force here—the law is the basis—but it's really economic factors. It's where individuals start to look at themselves and go, "Wait a minute, wait, wait, what's going on here?" Not that they need to fully comprehend the scope of what you and I are talking about, but what they want to see is something real, something different. And in the case of the federal lawsuit, it's bringing that to fruition—it's like, this is real, this is not speculative. But for me, you know, as a former Army officer, it's mission-task, task-oriented, and a methodical approach. So the long-term aspect of this is that what we're dealing with is our enemy here.

Because we're in a state of war. We're occupied—that's a state of war. We're not in a state of peace yet, not until we get a treaty. But the enemy—the enemy for us—is ignorance. Nobody knows. So how we deal with ignorance is through education and critical research publications. My recent publication with Oxford University Press on the Hawaiian Kingdom's continued existence as an unconquered state has taken our story to the highest level of academia worldwide. My forthcoming chapter on Hawaiian neutrality, in your folks' volume two on neutrality studies, addresses the Hawaiian Kingdom's approach to preserving itself in the 19th century as a neutral state.

So the conversations have to be normalized. And that's why I'm not into rhetoric, but constructive dialogue—and also addressing a lot of ignorance here in Hawaii. I'm a senior lecturer, and I teach political science and Hawaiian studies. In every class, for over 20 years, they all see it—it's like the light bulb goes on. Then they also realize that the Council of Regency has a plan. It's understandable; I can understand it. I'm looking at my children and my possible grandchildren. So there are so many aspects here beyond just the law, but it is legally based.

#Pascal

What I find very important about your example is that you're proving that if you don't agree with the state of affairs—how things are running—there are options for what can be done. We're not condemned to just fold our hands and say, "Oh no, everything's so bad, boo-hoo." There are things that can be done. And your way is a very, very interesting one, using a combination of international law, domestic law, and legal reasoning—not just legal theories, but the application of the law in order to do something. So I encourage everybody to study your case of the Hawaiian Kingdom and

the Council of Regency, to see how it can be used as an inspiration for other cases where we don't agree with what's going on, but we wonder what can be done. Keanu, for people who want to follow your case, who want to see what's going on in the federal lawsuit and so on, where should they go?

#Keanu Sai

Real-time, up-to-date stories are posted on the blog—the Hawaiian Kingdom blog. I think it's HawaiianKingdom.org/blog. It'll prompt you to subscribe, and that way, whenever something new is posted, you get notified. You don't have to keep checking for the latest updates. That's really the one place people should go if they want to see what's happening. There's also a search function, and there are many blog posts going back years. It's a good teaching resource as well.

#Pascal

I'll put the link to the blog in the description of this video below. Dr. Keanu Sai, thank you very much for your time today. Thank you as well.