

Auckland Council, last minute, cancelled our Auckland meeting. The way they did it, and how it happened, wreaks of corruption. It was a graphic display of how co-governance works. How so?

First, Claudia Wyss of Auckland Council left it to the last minute to give us minimum time to find an alternative venue. Julian received an email at 11:47am on Monday 27 March, the day before the event. They gave us a 1:30pm deadline in which to reply. That's 1.75 hours to answer. You can read her email [HERE](#).

What if Julian had been in a meeting away from his phone and email? We know what would have happened – they would have replied '*We did our best to get hold of you. Because you missed the deadline, sorry your meeting is cancelled.*'

In other words, right from the get go, it was obvious they were setting traps. It was obvious they were going to cancel the meeting. They had a pre-determined the outcome. A set up. Claudia Wyss's was just game playing.

Second, I have been in communication with the police during the morning of the 27th. When the Wyss email arrived in Julian's in box, he carefully formulated a reply, phoned the police, explained the Wyss email to them, read his reply to Wyss over the phone to the police, then sent the police his reply to Wyss BEFORE sending it to Wyss, just to make sure he and the police were on the same page. They were, so Julian fired the email off to Wyss, having had it approved by the police.

You can read Julian's reply to Wyss [HERE](#)

Third, you'll notice that Julian wrote at the bottom of his email "*If you have further suggestions, we welcome them.*" Why did he write this? So that if the Health and Safety plan Julian detailed to council was deficient in some way, the council could say so, and Julian would have done what they suggested to avoid a cancellation. But no. The council did not want to make suggestions. They did not want to help. They just wanted to cancel.

You can read the council's cancellation letter [HERE](#)

Fourth, notice the reason given for the cancellation "*on the basis that the council considers that the management and control of your event is deficient.*" Oh really Ms Wyss? In what way? No detail is given as to how or why it is 'deficient'. It just is. In other words '*we just want to cancel your event.*' If Ms Wyss and her little team of activists had been sincere with their first email, the 11:47am email, they would have offered suggestions, things Julian and his team could have done to amend or beef up the security plan. After all, Julian invited this, didn't he? Yes he did. Did the activists in council response appropriately? Helpfully? Genuinely? No, they did not. It's obvious their entire communication stream was BS, just spin.

But that is not all.

Fifth, notice the paragraph "*Council has reached this decision following advice (from Police, security, health and safety advisers and others) as to significant and unmanageable health, safety and security risks associated with your event proceeding tomorrow.*"

So Ms Wyss, someone is lying here. How do we know? Well, the police were satisfied our arrangements for security were appropriate and workable. We know this for certain. Yet Ms Wyss said the police said our security arrangements were unmanageable? Who is lying? The police, or Ms Wyss? You know the answer.

Furthermore, who, exactly, were these "security, health and safety advisers?" We want names, addresses, phone numbers. What was their advice? Why did you not, Ms Wyss, afford us the opportunity to hear their advice, put into practice their advice, (i.e. give us the opportunity to act on it), before you cancelled the event? Answer? You

were never not going to cancel the event. You are just playing games.

Then she goes on *“In making the decision to terminate your booking I have been particularly mindful of council’s health and safety obligations and the significant public interest in your event. I have also carefully considered the importance of human rights (particularly freedom of expression and assembly) and balanced the protection of those rights with the risks to public safety.”* Nauseating, isn’t it.

What she writes is all so deliberately vague and cloudy. For example, what exactly are the council’s ‘health and safety obligations?’ She does not tell us, deliberately so. We can only presume that they are to keep people and buildings safe. It’s worth noting that in all our meetings so far, not one person had been hurt or injured in any way whatsoever. And nor have any building been damaged in any way. So Ms Wyss is not going on precedent. She is simply making a case out of thin air about ‘health and safety obligations’. She is fear mongering.

Then she says *“I have also considered whether the risks could be sufficiently mitigated if Auckland Council were to find a suitable alternative community venue to hold your event. Unfortunately, given the nature and level of the risks involved at this point in time, this is not possible in the short timeframe before the event.”*

OK, this event has been advertised for two months. Why did Ms Wyss not come to us earlier? She could have. She should have. Any decent person would have. What ‘alternative venues’ would have been better? For what reason? We’ll never know. She is just driveling. And what about *‘in the short timeframe?’* Well, whose fault is it that the time frame was so short Ms Wyss? You decided to kick into gear to communicate with us 48 hours from our event, instead of two months out. Why did council not start “working with us” two months ago? Spin.

And what about *“I have also carefully considered the importance of human rights (particularly freedom of expression and assembly) and balanced the protection of those rights with the risks to public safety.”* This is just spin, trying to sound like Nelson Mandela. She is not Nelson Mandela. She is an activist working inside Auckland council to shut down people and groups that she does not agree with.

Finally, we were notified at 5:37pm. The protest group the Aotearoa Liberation League were very quickly on their social media platforms announcing a victory. We did not publicise the cancellation. So who told the Aotearoa Liberation League? You know the answer.

Conclusion?

Free speech has been crushed. Again. This is not even the fault of the protesters. They are a push over. They are insignificant. Making our meeting private and not public, which allowed us to keep protesters out of our buildings, was a brilliant move, a police advice move, ensuring the safety of people and property. Ms Wyss and Auckland council did not want to know or hear about that. For her, such information was irrelevant.

What’s significant here is that Auckland council is marinating in co-governance ‘arrangements’ which means that any group or entity or person who speaks out against the approved narrative, the Maorification of New Zealand, the takeover of New Zealand by elite Maori, will be cancelled.

The council is playing games, and dealing in spin, which they did here, for all to see. But ultimately the public will see through this to what this incident was really all about. Our cancellation by the Auckland City Council was simply another graphic display of co-governance at work. The message? This is tribal rule in action. If you disagree with the approved narrative, we will cancel you. We will deny you the right to free speech, and we’ll use lying, game playing, and spin to do it. Welcome to the world of co-governance.