

Hi Julian,

Well done on the campaign so far. You have surely won support, not only with the arguments you raise, but with your attitude towards the provocations.

I have had a couple of opportunities to speak with Maori I know re. Co-governance, and these guys are moderates, but I think they are reluctant to speak up publicly for fear of relationships they don't want trouble with. But I'm still working on getting some video of a supportive response. I saw Brad Flutey's video, and I think some of those of the Freedom movement would come on board.

I read Chris Trotters report on you and Stop Co-Governance and felt Trotters references to "fascism" were not only an utter joke, he was in fact describing his own team. He uses the word "fascism" the way a university student does, quite inaccurately, and in accordance with the "woke" dictionary of distortion. For what its worth here's my take on his blog post. I also read John Robinsons measured report as well which was good. My take is more on the whole irony of him calling you a fascist, when those agitators opposing you answered the true description of fascism.

Anyhow good work and pass on my congratulations to your team.

I have posted the following on over 25 different fb groups.

Kind regards,
Kerry Campbell.

Chris Trotter. Fascism And "Stop Co-Governance"

While I have agreed with Chris Trotter on some issues, I have always done so warily, with the understanding that in some fundamental ways, I have deep disagreements with the man. Mostly because of his Left leaning viewpoint. Chris has been quite vocal condemning some of the political machinations of this latest iteration of the Labour party, and some of that comes from the reality that his is a more moderate, more liberal leaning political perspective, more of an old school Leftie.

But this is one of those occasions where my deep disagreement surfaces.

His recent opinion piece "Checking The Left: The Dreadful Logic Of Fascism" I'd like to unpack this a little.

His opening salvo is to characterize Julian Batchelor's "Stop Co-Governance" roadshow as a sign of the "growth of fascism". "[F]ascism is almost always a response to what the Right regards as the dangerous strength – or even the imminent triumph – of the Left."

Is that a fair comment? To answer that raises another question:" What is fascism?"

Like the now ubiquitous word "racism" its constant use is rendering its original meaning almost useless as a means of informing people about some real state of affairs. "Racist" and its common counterpart "fascist" simply means someone the Left disagrees with. It's a convenient label, for diminishing respect for the one it supposedly describes.

However, if we refuse to allow this to happen to these good descriptors, let's see how well "fascist" describes Ju-

lian Batchelor and his band of merry men - and women. (Covering my bases here).

According to Merriam Webster dictionary - Fascism is: a political philosophy, movement, or regime ... that exalts nation and often race above the individual and that stands for a centralized autocratic government headed by a dictatorial leader, severe economic and social regimentation, and forcible suppression of opposition.

It seems to have conveniently escaped Trotter's notice that many would characterize Ardern's government as answering very neatly that description.

Fascism "exalts ... race above the individual". We have seen a great deal of race based issues balloon up in the last 5 years.

Fascism "stands for a centralized autocratic government headed by a dictatorial leader. We've seen an autocratic government headed by a dictatorial leader like never before. Just think of the morning sessions from "the podium of truth", lockdowns, shutting down the whole country, centralizing health services, attempting to take power from local councils and centralizing this as well.

Fascism - "Severe economic and social regimentation" ? Think of the mandates, think of masks, think of no travel, no visiting loved ones, no vaccine/no job. Think of advice not to talk to your neighbour, and dobbing them in for indiscretions.

Fascism - "Forcible suppression of opposition?" Think of how anyone of the Right, gets vilified in the press. Think of the extreme Left wing bias of the press and how that impacts public perception. It may not be "force" in the most extreme sense of the word, but when the media is controlled so adeptly, not by force - except in the sense of controlling the education system which makes any deviation from leftist politics almost impossible for any graduating out of that system. And these graduates enter the "fourth estate" with a mindset that naturally predisposes them to see through a Leftist lens. Think of the attempt to muster in draconian hate speech laws, and the characterization that anyone on the Right is more likely to be a terrorist, and their speech and actions "divisive" and anti-State. Think of trotting out the ideologically compromised "experts" like Professor Spoonley in front of all the media cameras spouting unquestioned vitriol regarding "banning the Right" altogether!

But wait, there's more to fascism than this and it smacks of the sort of irony that impresses me of the erroneous projection of Trotters remarks.

Dinesh D'Souza, lecturing in a public university campus setting, made clear to a student, (who, like Trotter, labelled him a fascist), even while the student, attempted to disrupt, shout down, and ultimately cause the cancellation of the meeting.

D'Souza spoke words to the effect: "Are you aware of the Black shirts in Italy" (the home of fascism), "and the Brownshirts in Germany? Do you realize that they would go to meetings, goons that would stand at the back of the room, and when someone attempted to make an intelligent presentation and answer questions they would shout them down, yell at them, try to intimidate them, and count it as success if they could get the event cancelled, and the speaker threatened."

Yes, that too characterizes fascism.

But he didn't stop at pointing out that the young person was fascist herself. He went on to say some pointed remarks about Socialism, in regards to National Socialism (Nazi Germany). Asking if she knew the 25 point platform of Hitler's National Socialist goals and whether she knew that Hitlers deadly opponent was capitalism. He went on to allude to some of his policies: The State control of Banks, State control of Healthcare, State control

of Education, ending with the observation that “fascism” is historically a Left leaning aberration.

Do you see the pattern here? If you haven't I will add a portion of a video from one of Julian Batchelor's meetings.

Finally, I would add to the defining characteristics of fascism, is that historically it conspires with large private corporations to restrict and exploit the people. It is Big Government in bed with Big Business. It is interesting to note that many people perceive an uncomfortable relationship with Maori corporations winning large and perhaps uncontested contracts and tenders with the Government along with questions raising the spectre of nepotism. A recent directive is that a certain proportion of all government business, in the name of “equity”, must go to Maori interests. The whole “Treaty Framework” is providing not only grants to bolster elite Maoris, but consultation fees which must amount to astronomic figures on the basis of the “necessity to honour the Treaty”, which accordingly necessitates “consulting with Iwi”. Colloquially named the “gravy train”, or “troughers”.

My next beef with Trotter is his disingenuous characterization and reference to the “meeting organised by the Christian evangelist Julian Batchelor.”

What is Trotter attempting here? Batchelor doesn't bring his private, religious views into these meetings, at least not any overt way that might be construed as an attempt to convert anyone to religion. No, Trotter here is using an old media trick. He is in fact playing on the prejudices of a largely secular public to “turn the tide of public opinion” against him. He is hoping that if people know he's “religious” that will turn them off coming to listen, or paying him any real attention. This is Trotter the Leftie in full demonstration, flying the flag, making his colours known.

First characterizing him as “fascist” then as a “religious nutter”. Character assassinations are in fact the sign of a weak argument, a last ditch attempt to put people off from taking anything he says as authoritative, or worth the investment of time and effort to hear him out.

I can agree with Trotter that “the explicit purpose of Batchelor's roadshow is to build a mass political movement of Pakeha New Zealanders, not only to stop co-governance, but also to halt what he sees as the state-sanctioned elevation of Māori over European culture.”

This raises the question: Is that concern justified? As a political candidate in the 2017 general election I was stunned to hear a Maori party candidate spell out the specific aim of appropriating 50% of government revenue towards Maori. When only 17% or so, are in fact identifying as Maori, that's not even proportionate “Co-Governance” (which I would oppose at any rate), that's effectively dominance.

The return to “tribalism” is indicative of many nations exemplified - especially in Africa, who having shrugged off the “Colonialism” of the past, (admittedly with its own history of injustices towards those who were there before), but then plunged into anarchy, destabilization and ultimate economic and social collapse. That is a pattern that bears not repeating here. Trotter's remark that Batchelor's crusade is to thwart what Batchelor envisages as “transforming New Zealand into “the Zimbabwe of the South Pacific”. This in my view is not an unwarranted observation.

Who wants it to get to that extreme?

Trotter's next comment is also typical of a Leftie journalist wishing to dictate the terms of the engagement to put the opposing view in the worst terms possible, to frame the opponent in terms that will put him in the worst, or most unfavourable light.

How does he do that?

“For Batchelor to succeed, he would need to awaken a huge, and so-far undetected, strata of angry Kiwi racists.” Do you see the assumption there? Ipso facto, according to Trotter, if you agree with Batchelor, you must be a racist...

But this raises another interesting issue. What if Maori agree with Batchelor? Are they then racist? In conversations with Maori I am confident that many, at least in private, are feeling that they are not represented well by those elitists that are behind co-governance. They are themselves expressing some dismay at this push for separatism and “Co-Governance”. But in a very community oriented, close knit population - it is a mark of courage to stand up in public and say so - a step too far for some.

By framing the issue here in terms of race and racism, he’s attempting to tar not only Batchelor with that brush - but all who might throw in their lot with that cause. But Batchelor didn’t make it an issue of race, those who use the Treaty as a lever to divide along the lines of identity politics did that. And then - with no shame - play the racist card for all its worth. I would warrant that if the same Treaty was used as a lever to force the redistribution of wealth along any other social class, it would evoke the same response.

Further manipulation of the facts regarding the Dargaville “Stop Co-Governance” meeting seem to be evident in Trotter’s hit piece. At the very least - the facts are contested. Trotter, seemingly oblivious to the irony of characterizing Batchelor’s movement as “Fascist” then goes on to assert “predictably, Māori and their anti-racist Pakeha allies are threatening to turn up to shout down Batchelor’s “hate speech”.

I wonder if they will wear brown shirts?

Adding to the irony Trotter then drops this: “Batchelor’s opponents are planning to contact local councils around the country and urge them not to allow the “blatant racist” to hire their facilities for his public meetings. If some local councils, perhaps worried that Batchelor’s meetings might become unruly, or, even worse, attract threats of serious violence, decide to deny him access to their facilities, then as sure as eggs-are-eggs, the Free Speech Union will become involved.”

He can say this with reasonable confidence because the Free Speech Union has already become involved. (Remember the furore over Sport Northland?) And why not? Why should they not get involved? It is after all an issue of Free Speech when the agitators continually turn up to his meetings to provoke, disrupt and attempt to shut down this discussion, and I’ve seen for myself their self-congratulatory remarks at having successfully put several prospective venue administrators off from having his meeting in their town. Kaiwaka is one such example. It would indeed be remiss of the Free Speech Union to ignore such a challenge to free speech. Again, Trotter is using this Leftie tactic of “pre-empting” events and framing them in such a way as to predispose people to think poorly of Batchelor and resist, or be passive and not be involved.

But our political leaders are saying New Zealand needs this discussion rather than simply have it foisted upon us. David Seymour’s Act party is calling for a referendum, Chris Luxon is opposing certain policies along these lines as he made reasonably clear at the Ratana event. Winston Peters is on record as appealing to the commonsense perception that it is a blatant social engineered strategy to empower certain elites. Matt King’s “Democracy NZ”, spokesperson on this, Lee Smith says it’s time we reverted to being color blind in our political and social discourse.

So why is there not more positive media coverage of this tour? The media coverage he does get - is so blatantly opposed to his stance, that much is clear.

The last thing Trotter wants, and he expresses this fear very clearly, as with those many who sympathize with his views - is that Batchelor's cause becomes not only a clarion call against separatism, but invokes more support by it becoming an issue of free speech, freedom of expression, and all that follows - as a threat to democracy itself. Free speech being as it is, an absolute imperative in a real democracy.

But again, Trotter fails to recognize, deliberately I would warrant, that this is not Batchelor's doing. He didn't invite the protesters to try to dissuade or threaten those who administered the venues, those that cowed before the threats of disturbance, trouble and possible damage to their venues. In a word, the protesters themselves are causing this to become a much wider issue. Neither did Batchelor "force" in any way, their responses to his meetings. Responses such as drowning him out with singing, interrupting, speaking loudly with those that were there to listen, taking the focus of Batchelor with any means possible short of physically accosting him.

Here are some comments of Trotter's that take on a more serious, even sinister tone: "People who may not be as hostile to co-governance as Batchelor, but who are extremely hostile to the angry crowds who turn up to shut his meetings down, may feel obliged to, at least, defend his freedom of speech. There may even be an element who feel strongly enough to offer themselves as "security" for Batchelor's meetings. Naturally, they will wear uniforms - to assist both the Police and the public in distinguishing them from the "extremists".

Again he is preemptively attempting to steer this discussion in order to dictate the terms that will be employed to the advantage of his own cause. His use of scare quotes around the word "security", is in fact a thinly veiled reference to the "brown shirts" of the National Socialists of Nazi Germany. But note they were Socialists, Lefties, not of the Right at all. He is speaking as if Batchelor's obvious need for security, presently handled by Police, as it should, might migrate to an entourage of vigilantes. This is Trotter at his worst and perhaps most mischievous.

It is no surprise then, that his next sentence is this: "With unnerving speed, Batchelor's movement will begin to acquire all the historical hallmarks of fascism."

But criticism of Trotter aside, (for the moment), I do recognize his astute political intuition.

Trotter: "Observing the rapid growth of Batchelor's far-right pressure group, the National and Act parties will find it very difficult to resist the temptation to range themselves alongside it. Neither of these "official" representatives of the Right will want to be caught opposing Batchelor, for fear that their rivals will immediately come out in support. It is equally hard to see NZ First and the other, even smaller, right-wing parties turning down the chance to piggy-back on what Batchelor's opponents are angrily calling New Zealand's shameful "white supremacist" movement."

It is, sadly, entirely possible for the worst to happen. If Batchelor becomes the voice of aggrieved Pakeha. If National, Act, NZ First, and all the others rally to his cause - for fear of being lumped in with the "treatyists", the "cultural Marxists", and all the other manifestations of the "Woke Left" - then a great, 100,000-strong, gathering of the right-wing clans in the Auckland Domain on Election Eve suddenly becomes a "live" proposition."

If that's fascism Chris, not only am I a monkey's uncle, I say "Bring it on"!