

## PSLU Committee

---

**From:** Ken Conklin <ken\_conklin@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 03, 2019 8:09 AM  
**To:** PSLU Committee; mike.white@mauicounty.us  
**Subject:** Rebuttal to David Keanu Sai.  
**Attachments:** Maui CC re Keanu Sai 60319 pdf.pdf

Aloha Maui County Council Chair Mike White, and members of the Planning and Sustainable Land Use Committee

Attached please find a pdf file which is a memorandum I am sending in rebuttal to the May 15 presentation by David Keanu Sai and in anticipation of his further appearance scheduled for June 5.

Please ensure that it gets distributed to members of the Council, and the Committee (many of whom have no listed email address). I was surprised to see the absence of any serious cross-examination of Mr. Sai on May 15 regarding the alleged historical facts he presented, and especially the facts he did NOT present; so when I saw that he is scheduled for an additional presentation I decided it's important for committee members to be prepared to cross examine him.

Thank you for your attention.

Kenneth R. Conklin, Ph.D.  
e-mail Ken\_Conklin@yahoo.com

To:

Maui County Council Planning and Sustainable Land Use Committee; and  
Mike White, Chair, Maui County Council  
[please distribute to the Council and Committee members]

From:

Kenneth R. Conklin, Ph.D.

46-255 Kahuhipa St. Apt. 1205

Kane'ohe, HI 96744-6083

tel (808) 247-7942

e-mail Ken\_Conklin@yahoo.com

Website: "Hawaiian Sovereignty: Thinking Carefully About It"

<http://tinyurl.com/6gkzk>

Book: "Hawaiian Apartheid: Racial Separatism and Ethnic Nationalism in  
the Aloha State"

<http://tinyurl.com/2a9fqa>

Re: David Keanu Sai presentation made on May 15, 2019 and followup  
planned for June 5

Date of this message: June 3, 2019, 8:00 AM HST

=====

Aloha Maui County Council, and Planning and Sustainable Land Use  
Committee members

I hope that the information in this memorandum will enable you to  
rigorously cross-examine the witness appearing before you on June 5.  
You have a responsibility to do so.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

David Keanu Sai gave a two hour presentation plus followup discussion period to Planning and Sustainable Land Use Committee of the Maui County Council on May 15, 2019 and is scheduled for another lengthy session on June 5. The present memorandum is a rebuttal to several important historical and legal issues he raised, or which he failed to mention but should have.

Mr. Sai has lied to you by omission of important facts of Hawaii's history. Mr. Sai's whole theory, which he summarized for you on May 15, is based on his assertion that Hawaii has been under a prolonged belligerent "occupation" by the U.S. which started with an armed invasion in January 1893 -- an occupation which has continued for 126 years. That is false. The U.S. never took over the government of the Kingdom, and never set up a puppet regime. 162 U.S. sailors were sent ashore temporarily (not as an "occupation force") from a ship in the harbor at the time of the Hawaiian revolution in 1893, to protect American lives and property against credible threats of violence and arson, as verified by 808 pages of sworn testimony in a U.S. Senate committee. After a few weeks, when they had taken no action, President Grover Cleveland's emissary ordered the few remaining sailors to return to their ship in the harbor. For the following five years, until annexation, there were no U.S. military men on duty in Hawaii. There was no "occupation." Indeed, late in 1893 President Cleveland and his emissary "ordered" Hawaii President Dole to stand down and restore the ex-queen; and the U.S. engaged in gunboat diplomacy with two warships trying unsuccessfully to intimidate the very strong and determined President Dole. This was clearly no puppet regime! Please read the memorandum below for details and proof regarding the alleged "occupation." Other items proved in the memorandum but never mentioned by Mr. Sai are that after the revolution the successor government -- the Republic of Hawaii -- was internationally recognized de jure (as the lawful, rightful government) by letters from the heads of state of at least 19 nations and by a loyalty

oath sworn by ex-queen Lili'uokalani; links are provided for you to view photographs of them. As the lawful government, the Republic had the right to offer a Treaty of Annexation; and as a sovereign nation the U.S. had the right to choose its own method (joint resolution) to decide to accept Hawaii's offer of annexation.

Your land use committee utterly failed to cross-examine Mr. Sai on these matters. Perhaps you were unaware of them. I am sending this memorandum two days before the June 5 second event so that committee members can absorb the information in time to conduct at least the beginnings of a cross-examination which should have happened at the first event. The Maui County Council in general, and this committee in particular, have a legal and moral duty to the citizens you serve to ensure that the information you and they rely upon for decision-making is accurate and complete, and to avoid enabling con artists in furtherance of their scams. You have taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States and of the State of Hawaii. If you cannot uphold your oath -- if you fear you might be committing "war crimes" by continuing to participate in Council business -- then you should at least have the integrity to stop collecting your salary and to resign from office, unlike Jennifer Ruggles of the Hawaii Island County Council last year.

I watched Mr. Sai's entire 2-hour presentation on Akaku TV as it was happening on May 15, along with the followup discussion. I noticed that committee members did not cross-examine Mr. Sai about the historical or legal claims he asserted, and the followup discussion seemed almost fawning and obsequious. Maui County Council and its committees have a legal and moral obligation to ascertain facts and give careful consideration to more than one viewpoint on an important issue, and not to allow your forum to be used as a vehicle for unrebutted propaganda or self-promotion. I hope that the information in this memorandum will enable you to rigorously cross-examine the witness appearing before you

on June 5, and that you will do so. You should stop giving a forum and credibility to a scam artist.

For three decades Mr. Sai has (ab)used numerous institutions, turning them into forums for propaganda and self-aggrandizement. He has created an image of expertise enabling him to push political views favoring the secession of Hawaii from the U.S., and he has also used that image of expertise to lure many hundreds of gullible victims to spend thousands of dollars apiece as fees paid to himself and his associates for bogus land title searches and legal documents which the victims were led to believe would enable them to avoid mortgage foreclosure or to collect on title insurance. Evidence will be provided at the end of this memorandum showing Mr. Sai's track record of deception and the failure of his theories when actually put to the test.

But the most important part of this memorandum comes first, when I identify important facts about the history of Hawaii during the 1890s -- facts which Mr. Sai intentionally did not mention. You owe a duty to your constituents to rigorously cross-examine Mr. Sai about the historical facts provided in this memorandum, and about how his business practices enrich him through the continued spewing of his propaganda in venues such as the one you are providing to him.

Mr. Sai's whole theory, which he summarized for you on May 15, is based on his assertion that Hawaii has been under a prolonged hostile "occupation" by the U.S. which started with an armed invasion in January 1893 -- an occupation which has continued for 126 years. He says the Kingdom of Hawaii remains the rightful sovereign, while a fake puppet regime (now known as the State of Hawaii) has imposed its own laws, contrary to the (alleged) duty of an (alleged) occupier to uphold the laws of the occupied territory. He says that therefore all transfers of land titles for 126 years have been illegal, partly because there have been no duly authorized and sworn government officials such as notaries and recorders of deeds. During the early years of his scam he claimed to be

the acting Regent of the Kingdom, and/or the acting Minister of Interior, and/or the acting Foreign Minister; and claimed he had the authority to condone or "make perfected") the improperly transferred land titles. More recently he claims that clients can file in court the documents he provides them to defend against mortgage foreclosure, or to receive payment from the title insurance company for the value of the foreclosed property.

-----

1. Mr. Sai is correct about one thing -- that the nation of Hawaii was not overthrown in January 1893 -- all that was overthrown was the monarchical government. Hawaii remained an independent nation under a revolutionary Provisional Government and then a Republic, which had full rights to speak on behalf of the nation to negotiate a Treaty of Annexation.

The Hawaiian revolution of January 1893 was planned and led by a "Committee of Safety" of 13 local residents, of whom a majority were native-born or naturalized subjects of the Kingdom of Hawaii, while the remainder had substantial property interests in Hawaii. The revolution was carried out by many of the same militia of 1500 armed local men who had surrounded the Palace in 1887 and forced the corrupt King Kalakaua to sign the "Bayonet Constitution" under threat that he would be ousted if he refused (no U.S. personnel were involved in 1887). In 1893, 162 U.S. sailors came ashore as peacekeepers, to provide short-term protection of American and foreign lives and property in the face of credible threats of rioting and arson, as has been done many times elsewhere during periods of environmental disaster or political upheaval; for example in recent times Haiti (earthquake) and Liberia (civil war). The U.S. is always expected to protect its citizens and business interests abroad, and often to help sustain a measure of stability during the death-

throes of a failed state (like Hawaii in 1893). Let's remember that the administration of President Obama, with Secretary of State Clinton, came under severe criticism for failure to use military force to protect our diplomatic mission in Benghazi Libya which resulted in the murder of the U.S. ambassador and his bodyguards. Notice that U.S. forces entered Haiti and Liberia, provided the necessary protection for a while, and then left. There was no lingering U.S. "occupation" or puppet regime in those countries -- just as there was none in Hawaii.

In Hawaii the U.S. sailors did not take over any buildings, did not patrol the streets, did not enter the Palace grounds nor disarm the royal guard nor participate in arresting the Queen, did not supply any arms or ammunition or food to the revolutionaries. Within two days after the revolution every local consul of foreign nations who had consulates in Honolulu (most or all of whom had treaties with Hawaii under the Kingdom government) gave written recognition de facto to the Provisional Government. De facto recognition was not permanent, but did officially recognize that the Provisional Government had taken control of Hawaii -- business (including fulfilling treaty obligations) would henceforth be conducted with the PG and not with the previous monarchical government. In the eyes of the consuls of those other nations, Lili'uokalani no longer held power, and could no longer issue official documents or statements. The text of those initial letters of de facto recognition were published in the Honolulu newspapers on January 18 and 19, 1893 and also in the Morgan Report (an official document of the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs) in February 1894 on pp. 1103-1111.

Full text of those letters can be seen at:

<https://tinyurl.com/9f4vh4>

The 808-page Morgan Report of the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs was filled with documents and testimony about U.S. behavior during the revolution. Testimony was under oath with severe cross-examination (unlike the Blount Report), and can be seen at

<https://morganreport.org>

through an outline with clickable links at

[https://morganreport.org/mediawiki/index.php?title=Outline\\_of\\_Topics](https://morganreport.org/mediawiki/index.php?title=Outline_of_Topics)

No reputable historian would try to claim that the U.S. used its military power to fight battles or take over buildings during the Hawaiian revolution (although at least one adventure movie portrays U.S. troops storming the Palace!). But even if such an absurd theory were to be accepted, the alleged U.S. involvement would pale by comparison with the role of French military actions during the American revolution against Britain. The American revolution could not have succeeded without the help of thousands of French troops on the battlefields, huge amounts of guns and ammunition, and many French ships. Yet nobody says the American revolution was somehow not legitimate and the British should have surrendered to the French. At the surrender field in Yorktown, October 19, 1781, the British general offered his surrender sword to the French; but the French refused to accept it and insisted he give his sword to American General George Washington. In the Hawaiian revolution the Queen wrote a protest claiming she was surrendering to the U.S., and only temporarily until the U.S. would undo it (She knew her friend Grover Cleveland had won the November election and would soon be inaugurated President on March 4). It was a clever political ploy, but absurd. She knew well enough to deliver her protest letter to the office of President Dole rather than to any U.S. official, because it was the PG and not the U.S. whose armed men might otherwise attack.

The 1893 revolution was not the work of Americans alone, nor Hawaii men of American ancestry. In 1893, Cleveland's "fact finder" to Hawaii, James H. Blount, wrote in his report that the 5,500 members of the city's Annexation Club at that time included 1,218 Americans (22 percent of the club); 1,022 Native Hawaiians (19 percent); 251 Englishmen (5 percent); 2,261 Portuguese (41 percent); 69 Norwegians (1 percent); 351 Germans (6 percent), along with 328 persons unclassified but making up the balance. Note that the Portuguese, not Americans, were



by far the largest group agitating for overthrow and annexation; while more than a thousand others were native Hawaiians.

2. U.S. President Grover Cleveland was inaugurated on March 4, 1893. A friend of ex-queen Lili'uokalani, he promptly sent his personal emissary James Blount under secret orders, naming Blount "Minister Plenipotentiary With Paramount Powers" to outrank Harrison-appointed Minister Plenipotentiary Stevens, despite Blount's not having Senate confirmation. Blount stepped ashore in Honolulu and immediately, on April 1, ordered the few remaining U.S. peacekeepers to return to their ship in Honolulu Harbor. Blount also ordered the removal of a U.S. flag which had been flying side by side with the Hawaiian flag to provide a feeling of stability for frightened American and European residents. FOR THE NEXT 5 YEARS THERE WERE NO U.S. MILITARY MEN IN HAWAII. Furthermore Cleveland and Blount, along with Blount's permanent replacement U.S. Minister Albert Willis, spent the Summer and Fall of 1893 trying their best to destabilize the Hawaiian revolutionary Provisional Government.

On December 19, 1893 Willis delivered a letter to Provisional Government President Dole ORDERING Dole to step down and restore the Queen, as though Willis had any authority over Dole! Sanford B. Dole was native-born at Punahou in 1844. Dole grew up in Hawaii and had previously been elected to the Kingdom legislature and served as Justice on the Supreme Court, appointed by King Kalakaua. Dole was a Hawaiian national, not an American.

<http://www.angelfire.com/hi2/hawaiiansovereignty/doleusdemandrestorequeen12191893.html>

Dole's blistering 17-page reply delivered to Willis at midnight on December 23 refused; Dole said Hawaii wanted annexation to the U.S. (which Cleveland opposed), but said that in the meanwhile Hawaii remained an independent nation and the U.S. should stop interfering in Hawaii's internal affairs. Dole's letter is at

<http://www.angelfire.com/hi2/hawaiiansovereignty/dolerefusal12231893.html>

In December 1893, while Willis was ordering Dole to step down, the U.S. backed up its effort to intimidate and overthrow the Hawaiian government by engaging in gunboat diplomacy as two U.S. warships repeatedly fired cannons and staged mock invasions; but the Dole government stood strong. See "Black Week" at [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Black\\_Week\\_\(Hawaii\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Black_Week_(Hawaii)).

CLEARLY THERE WAS NO U.S. OCCUPATION OF HAWAII FROM APRIL 1 1893 THROUGH THE NEXT 5 YEARS. MR. SAI LIED TO YOU BY TELLING YOU THE U.S. STAGED A MILITARY OCCUPATION OF HAWAII BEGINNING JANUARY 1893 AND CONTINUOUSLY THEREAFTER, OR THAT THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT AND REPUBLIC WERE U.S. PUPPET REGIMES.

3. During Spring of 1894 the temporary revolutionary Provisional Government realized the need to create a permanent government in the face of continued hostility from Grover Cleveland, and the fact that he would never agree to the Hawaiian government's wish for annexation. They decided to create a permanent Republic of Hawaii that could be formally recognized by other nations as the rightful successor to the Kingdom government. A Constitutional Convention, including at least six ethnic Hawaiian delegates, produced a Constitution. The Speaker of the House of Representatives was former royalist full-blooded native John Kaulukou. President Dole delivered a copy of the Constitution to each of the local consuls of foreign nations, asking them to request their home governments to review the Constitution and to grant full-fledged diplomatic recognition to the Republic as the *de jure* (rightful) government of the still-independent nation of Hawaii. During Fall of 1894 letters from those nations arrived in Honolulu. Emperors, Kings, Queens, and Presidents of at least 19 nations on 4 continents personally signed letters in 11 languages addressed to President Sanford B. Dole formally recognizing the Republic of Hawaii. **THUS HAWAII REMAINED A**

SOVEREIGN INDEPENDENT NATION WHOSE GOVERNMENT, THE REPUBLIC OF HAWAII, WAS FULLY RECOGNIZED BY OTHER MEMBERS OF THE FAMILY OF NATIONS AS THE RIGHTFUL GOVERNMENT.

MR. SAI LIED BY OMISSION WHEN HE NEVER TOLD YOU ABOUT THESE LETTERS FROM HEADS OF NATIONS RECOGNIZING THE REPUBLIC, AND WHEN HE LED YOU TO BELIEVE THAT THOSE OTHER NATIONS CONTINUE TO RECOGNIZE THE KINGDOM OF HAWAII TO THIS DAY. Those letters are in the Hawaii archives, and I have photos of them on my website. Perhaps the most politically significant letter, and most devastating to the morale of the royalists, came from Queen Victoria who was a personal friend of Kapiolani, Lili'uokalani, and dowager Queen Emma, and godmother to Emma's baby Prince Albert (the crib sent from Victoria to Emma remains on display in the Queen Emma summer palace). Other letters came from Tsar of Russia (in Russian with French translation), the King and Queen of Spain, the President of France, the head of the Swiss federation, the Emperor of China (a 5-page fan-folded document in Mandarin with red "chop" stamps, accompanied by an English translation produced under the Emperor's supervision). See photos of those letters, and English translations of most of them, along with Lili'uokalani's letter of abdication and oath of loyalty to the Republic (January 24, 1895), at <https://historymystery.kenconklin.org/recognition-of-the-republic-of-hawaii/>

As the Republic government grew stronger and foreign heads of state sent letters formally recognizing it, Hawaiian royalists grew restless. They knew they must act soon or forever lose any hope of restoring the monarchy. In January 1895 native Hawaiian Robert Wilcox led a failed counterrevolution in which men were killed; hundreds were arrested, and several were sentenced to death (but later pardoned). Lili'uokalani was found guilty of (misprision of) treason because guns and ammunition had been hidden in her flower garden and she had already signed letters appointing her cabinet ministers for when Wilcox succeeded. On advice of her longtime private attorney she made a plea bargain agreeing to

abdicate any pretention to the throne and sign a loyalty oath to the Republic and live under house arrest in a huge room in the Palace with full-time maidservant (where she stayed for several months until pardoned by her erstwhile friend President Dole). Throughout the attempted counterrevolution and trials and imprisonments there were zero U.S. troops anywhere in Hawaii, as the Republic proved it was standing alone (no U.S. occupation, no puppet regime). The guns for Wilcox had been smuggled in from California past a U.S. blockade, and there were rumors the shipment had been approved by President Cleveland or at least his Navy secretary.

When the Tsar of Russia was overthrown 24 years later, in 1917, he never signed a treaty or document of surrender with Vladimir Lenin or the Bolshevik regime, and never signed a loyalty oath. The Tsar and his wife and children were shot, which put an end to the matter. The Republic of Hawaii was magnanimous to the ex-queen, even giving her a pension despite her efforts to sabotage annexation.

You should also take note that the method whereby foreign nations recognized the Republic was even more impressive than the method whereby foreign nations initially recognized Hawaii as an independent nation, and then continued to recognize new Hawaii governments when new monarchs came to power. For example, there will be lots of hoopla on November 28, a Kingdom holiday called Ka La Ku'oko'a (Independence Day) because on that date in 1843 Britain and France signed a joint declaration with each other agreeing to acknowledge that Hawaii was an independent nation with a stable government that neither France nor Britain would invade. Please note that Hawaii did not sign that agreement, and it was not addressed to King Kamehameha III. But the letters to President Dole from Queen Victoria and the President of France were specifically addressed to him, just as letters published in the Hawaiian language newspapers were sent by heads of foreign nations addressed to Hawaiian kings whenever a new one succeeded a former one; and just as heads of state today send congratulatory letters and

phone calls to newly inaugurated heads of other nations even when they are of an opposing political party.

Following the Hawaiian revolution only five government officials were ousted: the Queen and her four cabinet ministers. Nearly the entire government bureaucracy chose to remain in their posts and signed the loyalty oath to the new government, although a few demurred (most notably the Royal Hawaiian Band). For example: Colonel Curtis Pi'ehu 'laukea served in the inner circle of every Hawaii head of state from Kamehameha IV through Sanford Dole, personally witnessed at close quarters the most important personal and political events of Hawaii's leaders, and served as a Hawaiian diplomat in the United States, Europe, and Japan. Mr. 'laukea's autobiography made fascinating observations about the corruption, infighting, and political instability of the Kalakaua and Lili'uokalani regimes; and provided an insider's look at the death of Kalakaua, the ascent of Lili'uokalani, and the overthrow of the monarchy. Mr. 'laukea came to support the political efforts of Sanford B. Dole and to work as his ambassador during the Republic, and as an emissary for Governor Dole during the first years of the Territory. A modern-day sovereignty activist added a chapter to 'laukea's autobiography trying to portray him as forever a royalist -- that's what today's activist history-twisters like to do.

4. As discussed above, in Fall 1894 Emperors, Kings, Queens, and Presidents of at least 19 foreign nations on 4 continents personally signed letters in 11 languages addressed to President Dole formally recognizing the Republic as the rightful government of the still-independent nation of Hawaii. Therefore, under "international law" (if you believe in that), the Republic had the right to speak on behalf of the nation, including the right to offer a Treaty of Annexation to the United States. The Republic followed its own process to write the Treaty and to decide to offer it to the U.S., in 1897. In 1898 the U.S. Congress passed a joint resolution, signed by President McKinley, accepting the offer. In 1900 Congress passed the Organic Act creating a government for the

Territory of Hawaii; and President McKinley appointed Sanford Dole as Hawaii's first Territorial Governor, thus ensuring a smooth transition.

Today's Hawaiian sovereignty activists, including Mr. Sai, like to say there is "no Treaty of Annexation." But indeed it exists, and can be seen on my website. The activists don't like the method whereby the Treaty was ratified, so they say there is no Treaty. They say the joint resolution of annexation is merely an internal municipal law of the U.S. and therefore lacks any power to reach out and grab a foreign nation like Hawaii. They say it would be like Congress passing a law to annex Russia. Indeed Mr. Sai, in his opening remarks on May 15, compared what happened in Hawaii to what happened in Kuwait when Iraq invaded Kuwait, set up a puppet regime, and then annexed Kuwait as a province of Iraq. How silly! Because we have seen that there was never a U.S. "occupation" of Hawaii, and never a puppet regime here.

In July 1898 Congress passed a joint resolution to ratify the Treaty of Annexation. A joint resolution requires only a simple majority in both houses of Congress, but the resolution to adopt the Treaty of Annexation actually passed by 42-21 in the Senate and 209-91 in the House. President McKinley signed the annexation into law on July 7, 1898. The formal ceremony marking the annexation was held at Iolani Palace on August 12, 1898 because the Palace was the Capitol of the Republic of Hawaii and now would house the legislative and executive offices of the Territory of Hawaii. The U.S. did not reach out and grab Hawaii -- the offer first was made by Hawaii; Congress had a prolonged and heated debate, and finally accepted the offer. For details see "Treaty of Annexation between the Republic of Hawaii and the United States of America (1898). Full text of the treaty, and of the resolutions whereby the Republic of Hawaii legislature and the U.S. Congress ratified it. The politics surrounding the treaty, then and now." at <http://www.angelfire.com/big09a/TreatyOfAnnexationHawaiiUS.html>  
See also

"Is there a Treaty of Annexation between Hawaii and the United States? Dialogs between Williamson Chang and Ken Conklin" at <http://big11a.angelfire.com/DialogsChangConklinTreatyAnnex.html>

Activists say that a joint resolution is not allowed for ratifying a treaty. But that's not for Mr. Sai or even the United Nations or World Court to decide -- that's for the U.S. alone to decide. The Senators who opposed the Treaty could have filed a complaint with the U.S. Supreme Court claiming that using a joint resolution deprived them of the Senate's sole authority to ratify treaties, but they never filed any such complaint. They would have had "standing"; neither Keanu Sai nor any international court has any standing to complain about what method a sovereign nation uses for making its own decision about whether to ratify a treaty. Yes indeed, a joint resolution is an internal decision that has no power to reach out and grab a foreign nation. It is an internal decision whereby the U.S. decided to ratify the treaty offered by Hawaii; the joint resolution did not reach out or grab anything, it was an internal decision by the U.S. agreeing to accept the Treaty that had been offered by the Republic of Hawaii a few months previously.

The public lands of Hawaii (government lands and former crown lands) were ceded to the U.S. through the Treaty of Annexation, in exchange for the U.S. assuming (i.e. paying for) the entire accumulated national debt of Hawaii (which was greater than the ceded lands were worth at market value). Hawaii also insisted on a requirement that the U.S. would not merely add the ceded lands to U.S. inventory but would hold them in trust for the people of Hawaii with all revenue being used in Hawaii for education and other public purposes. Any lawyer can recognize the essential elements of a contract here: two competent persons (internationally recognized governments of two sovereign nations) freely sign an agreement where there is an offer (by Hawaii), an acceptance (by the U.S.) and an exchange of value (Hawaii's public lands in return for U.S. paying off Hawaii's national debt). One way to look at how the ceded

lands were transferred is that the U.S. purchased them for more money than their fair market value.

The legitimacy of land titles in Hawaii and the legitimacy of the Treaty of Annexation are both confirmed in a very important court decision which Mr. Sai and the sovereignty activists do their best to ignore and conceal. There is one and only one court case in which ex-queen Lili'uokalani sued the United States for any reason. On November 20, 1909, nearly 17 years after the overthrow and more than 11 years after the annexation, she filed a lawsuit in which she tried to get money for the Crown Lands, claiming those lands rightfully belonged to her but were illegally confiscated by the Provisional Government, Republic of Hawai'i, and United States. The case was decided May 16, 1910 and has the legal citation: Liliuokalani v. United States, 45 Ct. Cl. 418 (1910) The ex-queen lost the case. But in the process, many of the claims made today by the sovereignty activists were asserted by the ex-queen. After seeing all the evidence and hearing all the arguments on both sides, the Court of Claims became convinced that her claims had no merit. The decision itself is a valuable legal document. It is important not only because it contains these arguments concerning the Crown Lands, but also because of the very important appendices included by the Court as part of the evidence. Some of the material in these appendices is difficult or impossible to find anywhere else, and decisively refutes assertions raised by today's sovereignty activists on issues other than the Crown Lands. One of the appendices is the full text of the Treaty of Annexation. The Court cited the Treaty as evidence that the Crown Lands had been lawfully ceded to the U.S., and that the Court had jurisdiction to rule on this lawsuit because Hawaii is lawfully part of the U.S. Read Lili'uokalani's legal complaint, the Court's decision, and an analysis of the relevance to other topics, at <http://www.angelfire.com/hi2/hawaiiansovereignty/liliucrownlands.html>



5. For three decades Mr. Sai has (ab)used numerous institutions, turning them into forums for propaganda and self-aggrandizement. He has created an image of expertise enabling him to push political views favoring the secession of Hawaii from the U.S., and he has also used that image of expertise to lure many hundreds of gullible victims to spend thousands of dollars apiece as fees paid to himself and his associates for bogus land title searches and legal documents which the victims were led to believe would enable them to avoid mortgage foreclosure or to collect on title insurance. Evidence is provided below showing Mr. Sai's track record of deception and the failure of his theories when actually put to the test.

One small sample of Mr. Sai's lack of credibility came in his opening remarks to this land use committee on May 15 when he took considerable time to describe the alleged rigor of his dissertation committee in Political Science, and he insisted he's an expert on international law and not a Hawaiian Studies activist -- yet his "academic" affiliation is a position as part-time lecturer at Windward Community College IN THE HAWAIIAN STUDIES DEPARTMENT, not in Political Science or History or Law. By contrast I should add that my own Ph.D. is in Philosophy, specializing in epistemology in relation to teaching and learning; that I published 43 articles in refereed scholarly journals, and rose to the rank of Associate Professor at Boston University, building on earlier positions as Assistant Professor at a branch of Michigan State and at Emory University (Atlanta). My masters degree is in Mathematics, which gives me a special appreciation for logic and intellectual rigor, which I find sorely lacking in Mr. Sai's numerous performances. Is it necessary for me or Mr. Sai to tout our academic credentials? No, but it sure is fun! I believe facts and logic should be used to judge validity, not ad hominem appeals to authority. People who become experts in a particular field often earned degrees in other fields of study until their research or inclinations led them to their new area: For example, the renowned Haunani-Kay Trask earned her Ph.D. in Womens Studies but later changed her focus and rose to the rank of full professor and department chair in Hawaiian Studies.

NOW PAY ATTENTION you members of the Planning and Sustainable Land Use Committee of the Maui County Council. Mr. Sai and his attorney Dexter Kaiama are reported to be currently under investigation, and might be charged with fraud, by the Office of Consumer Protection of the Hawaii Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs. It's because they collect fees (thousands of dollars) from clients who rely on documents they provide for use in court to defend against mortgage foreclosure, based on Sai's theories about U.S. "occupation" of Hawaii and illegal land title transfers.

On May 13, 2019 retired Honolulu newspaper reporter Ian Lind wrote a blog entry entitled "Two sovereignty advocates hit with allegations of mortgage rescue fraud"

<https://www.ilind.net/2019/05/11/two-sovereignty-advocates-hit-with-allegations-of-mortgage-rescue-fraud/>

Mr. Lind stated: "In a series of legal filings in both state and federal court since the beginning of 2018, the consumer protection agency alleges the scheme involves David Keanu Sai, an activist scholar who has vigorously promoted his own theory that the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom invalidates subsequent laws and land titles; attorney Dexter Kaiama, who has defended a number of sovereignty activists with arguments based on Sai's theory; and Rose Dradi, a former Kapolei resident. ... The agency alleges homeowners facing imminent or threatened foreclosure were told, both explicitly and implicitly, that a legal defense based on Sai's sovereignty beliefs would result in the foreclosures actions being dismissed and their homes being saved. According to OCP: Sai, who claims to be an expert on sovereignty issues, maintains that the continued existence of the Kingdom of Hawaii means that the State of Hawaii does not exist. According to Sai, there are no state laws, and there are no state courts. Sai claims to know all of this first-hand because Sai claims to be an acting minister/diplomat for the Kingdom, and Kaiama is supposedly the Kingdom's acting attorney general. Sai, the agency alleges, has a standard written contract that

clients are asked to sign which requires them to pay a fee before services can be provided. ... Once fees are collected, Sai then allegedly provides a written answer to the foreclosure lawsuit or a "motion to dismiss" that contests the court's jurisdiction based on his theory that all U.S. or Hawaii law is unenforceable here because Hawaii remains an independent state. The motion is provided in a standard format which the property owners are advised to sign and file in court "pro se," without the benefit of an attorney. The agency alleges this scheme "in which Sai's supposed expertise on Hawaiian sovereignty issues is packaged as part of a motion to dismiss, has been shown to be of no benefit....No judge presiding over a foreclosure case has yet to be convinced that the case must be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction based upon the continued existence of the Kingdom of Hawaii, and yet Sai keeps offering his services and illegally collecting his fees in advance." And when the sovereignty argument fails in court, as it consistently has, the agency says the home owners have incurred additional costs and delays, and as a result "have essentially squandered any meaningful chance they had to save their property...."

Does the scam described above remind us of the same sort of scam regarding land titles previously perpetrated by the same Keanu Sai during the 1990s? Here we go again! Mr. Sai was found guilty of felony attempted grand theft. See a lengthy compilation of news reports documenting "The Perfect Title Scam -- Self-Proclaimed Regent of Hawaiian Kingdom Collects Huge Fees, Causes Grief to Property Owners, Messes Up Land Titles, Escapes With Probation and \$200 Fine" at <http://www.angelfire.com/hi2/hawaiiansovereignty/fraudperfecttitle.html>

Does the Maui County Council and its Planning and Sustainable Land Use Committee really want to rely on this same man who continues to put forward the same sort of historical and legal nonsense that led to his felony conviction? Do you really want to provide him with a government-sponsored forum to spew his nonsense, that will give him prestige to

encourage citizens of Maui to waste their money on schemes doomed to failure?

Mr. Sai's "Perfect Title" scam was followed immediately by his next one -- his adventure at what he called "The World Court" at the Hague, partly financed by a televised multi-hour infomercial from the Palace where he raised money for the trip and also to pay \$10,000 to each of three members of an arbitration panel to decide a trumped up bogus lawsuit in which Lance Larsen, a subject of the still-living Hawaiian Kingdom, claimed that Keanu Sai, Regent Pro-Tem, owed him compensation for failing to protect him against the U.S. puppet regime "State of Hawaii" which had imprisoned Larsen for repeatedly failing to have a State driver license and car registration. Please read "Fraudulent Hague Arbitration -- The Use of "the International Court at the Hague" for a Propaganda Circus" at <http://www.angelfire.com/hi2/hawaiiansovereignty/fraudhague.html> At his sentencing in the Perfect Title case, the bleeding-heart judge (perhaps similar to some County Council members) had told Mr. Sai that she sympathized with his civil rights activism, and she was happy to grant Sai's request for permission to travel to Europe, even while on probation, to pursue his "case."

But wait! There's more! [as the huckster salesman says on TV]

Ken Conklin Ph.D. vs. Keanu Sai Ph.D. -- Dialog regarding a theory that Hawaii Queen Liliuokalani and U.S. President Grover Cleveland had executive agreements, still binding today, which would require the U.S. to disgorge Hawaii and recognize its continuing sovereign independence. [Conklin used facts and logic to attack Sai's theories; Sai then merely repeated his theories without trying to respond to Conklin's actual criticisms of them, and repeated his credentials while questioning the legitimacy of Conklin's credentials]  
<http://www.angelfire.com/big09/DialogConklinVsSaiReExecAgreemnts.html>

Keanu Sai's Hawaiian history fantasies underlying his adventures with the International Criminal Court, the community of diplomats, and the Hawaii mortgage market. The alleged Liliuokalani Assignment, and the alleged Executive Agreement of Restoration [Mr. Sai's presentation to a group of Swiss diplomats in Zurich, and Conklin's prebuttal sent to them ahead of time]

<http://www.angelfire.com/big09/SaiFantasiesSwissDipl111113.html>

The latest nonsense from Keanu Sai (April 2015). Does an 1864 treaty between Switzerland and the Kingdom of Hawaii remain in force? Can the treaty be used as a basis for charging a Swiss banker with war crimes for foreclosing on a mortgage in Hawaii? Can the treaty be used by a Swiss citizen residing in Hawaii to demand that the Swiss government seek restitution from the private entity State of Hawaii for the war crime of pillaging regarding taxes it forced the Swiss citizen to pay and for rendering his property deed valueless?

<http://www.angelfire.com/big09/SaiSwissTreaty1864WarCrimes.html>

Helping foreign diplomats understand the history of U.S. sovereignty in Hawaii and the legitimacy of the relationship between their nations and Hawaii. [Lawsuit against U.S. by a Hawaiian independence activist seeks to add foreign nations as defendants]

<http://www.angelfire.com/big09a/SaiForeignDiplomats.html>

Is there more? Time will tell. Go ahead Maui County Council and become Mr. Sai's accomplice!