

PROOF THAT NEW ZEALAND'S APARTHEID REGIME IS BASED ON FALSEHOODS ...

By Kerry Butler

If you're reading this on a large screen, reduce the viewing size by clicking on (–) at the top of the File.

If not showing, hold down the **Ctrl** button on the keyboard; and tap the minus (–) button. Enlarge again when finished, as your Emails and Documents will've been minimised too.

Hold **Ctrl** and press **+**

Allow 5 minutes to read it.

Maori lived a cruel Stone Age existence, so colonisation was a godsend for them. And having a Treaty thrown in that they've been able to exploit, and abuse was the icing on the cake.

WAS THE TREATY INTENDED AS A PARTNERSHIP ?

The short answer is: **NO.**

The longer answer is: **DEFINITELY NOT.**

Former Judge and Law Lecturer, Anthony Willy clarified this, quote: "***It was, and is, constitutionally impossible for the Crown to enter into a partnership with her subjects. By definition, the Crown is supreme, and the people are subject to her laws.***"

Article 1. of the treaty ceded to the Crown "sovereignty"

"The chiefs of the confederation of united tribes and the chiefs who have not joined the confederation cede to the Queen of England forever the entire sovereignty of their country."

Another fact to be kept in mind, is that the instruction regarding the Treaty from Lord Normanby to Governor Hobson was: ***"Walk away if full sovereignty cannot be ceded; as without it, Britain will have no legal basis for bringing order and peace to New Zealand."***

I will also quote part of a speech to Maori in 1860 by Thomas Gore Brown: ***"It is right you should understand that in return for gaining the privileges as British subjects you must prove yourselves to be loyal and faithful subjects. It is necessary that all inhabitants acknowledge one Head."***

At the 1860 Kohimarama Conference, which was the largest ever gathering of Chiefs, their proposal was

"That this Conference takes cognizance of the fact that the Chiefs are pledged to each other to do nothing inconsistent with their declared recognition of the Queen's sovereignty."

The resolution was carried unanimously.

Sir Apirana Ngata, Lawyer and Member of Parliament (including Minister of Native Affairs) between 1905 and 1943, was a strong advocate for Maori interests within a unified nation. His words were, quote: ***"The chiefs placed in the hands of the Queen of England the sovereign authority forever, and the embodiment of that authority is now in the New Zealand Parliament. For that reason, any demands for Maori authorities, are nothing more than wishful thinking."***

Of course, another point is, a formal "Partnership" would have included clauses regarding Terms & Conditions. There are none in the Treaty ... simply because there was no partnership to require such clauses.

A genuinely decent politician who meant well, was former Prime Minister David Lange, who warned about the danger of pretending that there was a Partnership between the Crown and Maori, quote: "***It is extremely dangerous to proceed down a path involving any kind of dual sovereignty in New Zealand.***"

The truth is, nowhere in our recorded history is there even the merest hint of the treaty being intended as a so-called "partnership".

The same applies to the utterly false claim of there ever being any such thing as treaty ‘principles’.

Article **3** of the Treaty Agreement clearly stated: **“In return for the cession of the Sovereignty to the Queen, the people of New Zealand shall be protected by the Queen of England, and the rights and privileges of British subjects will be granted to them.”**

There are only three clauses in the Treaty. 1. and 3. you have read above ... and they certainly don't indicate the intent for partnership; or contain specific ‘principles’.

That only leaves Article **2** which simply states: **“The Queen of England confirms and guarantees to the chiefs and tribes, and to all people of New Zealand, the possession of their lands, dwellings and all their property.”**

Unbelievably, the word "property" has been twisted in its meaning. In the case of Maori it was obviously meant to mean personal possessions, such as precious heirlooms and artefacts that collectors would be after.

They were guaranteed their "**lands**" and "**dwelling**s". But the added word 'property' is misinterpreted by certain Maori who kid themselves (and gullible politicians) into believing that precious treasures (Toanga) include land, underground minerals, water, plant life, wildlife, and even the sky. So, the sky's the limit as far as their claims are concerned. You name it, they'll claim it. BUT just remember, the **guarantee** in Clause **2** re the possession of 'property' stipulates "**to all people of New Zealand**"

Clause **2** does go on to add what could be described as the only treaty "principle" to specifically benefit Maori, quote

“But, the Chiefs of the Confederation and the other chiefs grant to the Queen the exclusive right of purchasing such land as the proprietors thereof may be disposed to sell, at such prices as shall be agreed upon between them and the persons appointed by the Queen to purchase from them.”

This was to ensure that Maori wouldn't get ripped-off by unscrupulous buyers.

The irony is, non-Maori in this country are now in need of the security of a Treaty to protect *them* from being ripped-off in more ways than one !!

The fact is, the intent of the Treaty was **fairness**. What we've ended up with, is not.

The whole dishonest fiasco could be described as the most shameful rort in the history of this country.

It should be a case to be ruled on by the Supreme Court, or the UN and have it corrected before we go any further down the divided track we're lurching along.

Even the Document that is claimed to be the genuine Treaty Agreement has been proven to be the wrong one. The absolutely correctly dated version which was used for translating into Maori, was misplaced until discovered in 1989 – and it does **not** mention “forests” or “fisheries”. That wording was wrongly used by a secretary who made up his own version. When wondering why he would've added those words to his creation, it's obvious that they must have been considered by Governor Hobson and James Busby during discussions – but, were **not** actually in the final (subsequently lost) Draft that was used for translating into Maori.

Which of course, explains why “forests” and “fisheries” are absent on the Te Tiriti document.

Maori uncharacteristically chose to ignore Te Tititi in favour of the only English Document in existence (until 1989) ... simply because that unofficial version created by Hobsons Secretary wrongly includes “forests” and “fisheries”.

The **really** shameful thing about all this is that unscrupulous politicians ignored the new undeniable evidence in the previously lost **genuine** document ... because they realised it'd mean losing Maori political support ... if their gravy train was derailed.

Another falsehood benefitting Maori is the claim of being indigenous. Which gives them more ‘rights’ and undue power of ‘control’ over the 84% of other citizens.

The fact is, Maori, like the rest of us, are immigrants. The only difference is that they arrived here a little earlier. Although, we're only talking approximately 770 years ago. Unlike the Australian Aborigines who've been there for over forty thousand years.

To get your head around all this ... Maori were actually in New Zealand a mere 390 years before Abel Tasman.

The criteria indicating whether a race is indigenous to the country they are residing in, has in the past, always been that they have no knowledge of any other homeland from whence they came.

Maori spiritual belief proves that even they never really considered themselves as indigenous to this country – because at Cape Reinga there's a hillock that,

according to Maori lore (and the accompanying sign there) the spirits of dead Maoris leave from on their journey **home** to Hawaiki.

So anyway, the outcome of the Treaty debacle is that Maori have wrongly been allocated huge tonnages of fishing quota. As well as exclusive personal harvesting rights, plus control of fisheries at a whim. And going by the He Puapua agenda that Labour is determined to push through which stipulates an undemocratic Co-governance arrangement ... Maori are also likely to get ownership of all fresh water in this country. And, be gifted the entire foreshore. As well as being handed our publicly owned DoC Estate.

None of this should be happening.

The scandalous truth is . . .

Woke politicians are to blame for blithely changing the criteria regarding the status of indigenous ... in order to suit those New Zealand citizens with even so much as a miniscule drop of Maori ethnicity. And, besides continuing to honour the wrongly worded **bogus** treaty document, they're also responsible for dreaming up the **fake** concept of "partnership" and treaty "principles". Without considering future consequences, i.e. blatant racism and a rampant apartheid regime in NZ.
