

Apartheid by stealth, in New Zealand of all places

By Dr Muriel Newman, NZCPR Weekly, 25 March 2016

President Thomas Jefferson once said, “Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone... I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves. And if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education.”

Those are wise words. Governments “degenerate” for a variety of reasons. They will often lose touch with the electorate and become arrogant. But here in New Zealand, one of the main causes is our Mixed Member Proportional voting system.

MMP makes it virtually impossible for a single party to govern alone. As a result, mainstream parties are forced into coalitions with minor parties that represent narrow interests and often have extreme views. Yet to the dismay of the public, MMP enables those parties to impose their radical ideas onto the country.

Helen Clark’s Labour Government was forced to coalesce with the radical Greens – as a result, society ended up with the abhorrent anti-smacking law.

In 2008, John Key’s National Party campaigned on abolishing the race-based Maori seats. But after the election it jumped into a bed with the Maori Party, which only exists because it holds race-based seats. Since then, a radical racial agenda, that only has the support of one or two percent of New Zealanders, has been forced onto the country.

It is indeed unfortunate that former Prime Minister Jim Bolger ignored the advice of the 1986 Royal Commission on the Electoral System to abolish the Maori seats, when he introduced MMP. The Commission had argued that candidates with Maori ancestry would be elected more readily into Parliament under MMP’s list seat system, than under First Past the Post. They warned that retaining the Maori seats would lead to an over-representation of Maori MPs.

They were right. Twenty-three percent of MPs in the current Parliament are of Maori descent - compared to the 15 percent Maori population base. If the seven Maori seats were abolished, and re-allocated proportionally, there would still be an over-representation of Maori in Parliament. This clearly demonstrates that the Maori seats are no longer needed and that, irrespective of vested interest views, the time is now right for their abolition.

The list of radical race-based policies that have been imposed on the country as a result of National’s liaison with the Maori Party is growing. They include the decision to fly the Maori sovereignty flag on Waitangi Day, to sign New Zealand up to the United Nation’s Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, to repeal Crown ownership of the foreshore and seabed in favour of private tribal title, and a \$4 million attempt to impose a new constitution based on the Treaty of Waitangi onto New Zealand.

The two latest race-based Maori Party policies, being proposed by National – that will give tribes the power of veto over local councils *and* control of the country’s fresh water - signal a major constitutional change for local government and for New Zealand. Policies that give

superior rights to the members of private tribal businesses, over and above those available to other citizens, are incompatible with the principle of equality that underpins the democratic control of local government.

While neither policy has yet been enacted into law, Maori tribal leaders will be chilling the champagne in anticipation, as each will take them closer to their goal of racial sovereignty.

Although submissions on the Resource Legislation Amendment Bill's *Iwi Participation Agreements*, giving tribes the power of veto over councils, are now closed, National still has the option of pulling the plug on the Bill - or at least on provisions that provide separate rights based on race.

Meanwhile, submissions on the tribal control of fresh water do not close until April 22nd. However, the public are largely unaware of the proposed change, and since the responsibility for negotiating tribal agreements will be carried out at arms length by Regional Councils and Unitary Authorities - which have the statutory delegation for fresh water management - National expects to avoid any backlash.

That is clever politics.

The reality is that as long as the race-based Maori seats remain in Parliament, the demands by their MPs for special rights and privileges will escalate.

Just last week Maori Party co-leader Marama Fox [called](#) for the Maori sovereignty flag to be given the same status as the New Zealand flag and be flown alongside it at the Olympic Games, on government buildings, outside war memorials, and at other official sites around the country.

She claimed, "This is not about separatism, this is about unifying our nation to accept actually that there is more than one predominant culture who lives here. Understanding Maori culture, having empathy towards Maori culture, and adapting some of its tikanga is actually just part of who we are as Kiwis... I think the New Zealand flag right now is separatist."

Former National leader Don Brash described her call as 'outrageous': "I won't say it's treasonous but it's certainly verging on treason to say the tino rangatiratanga flag should have the same status as the New Zealand flag, reflecting the so-called duality of nationhood. I don't think most New Zealanders will be at all comfortable with the idea that we have two flags as a country, one is a Maori flag and the other is a flag for the 'rest of us'. The Treaty doesn't talk about two nations...and Hobson makes the point ...we are now one people. It's a total reversal of what the Treaty of Waitangi implied."

Marama Fox has also called for the celebration of *Guy Fawkes Day* on November 5th to be replaced by the recognition of *Parihaka Day*. In a [speech](#) last year about the need for Maori to *reposition* "into the field of nation-building", she championed a "peace week", from 31 October to 5 November, "to honour the heroism and the peace-making heritage established at Parihaka".

But her *repositioned* 'nation-building' version of history is very different from the traditional accounts – as explained by Mike Butler in his blog, [Nursing the Parihaka grudge](#).

And that's the problem. Maori separatists are now re-writing history to 'reposition' the next generation's perception of our past. All references to cannibalism are being systematically eliminated from modern records of early history, tribal rebellions are becoming land wars, rebels and murderers are now being called prophets and heroes, and a rosy picture is being painted of a peace-loving people, who were victimised, their lands stolen, by a ruthless colonial government.

It is this revisionist version of history that is now being used in schools to indoctrinate children.

With calls for a national celebration of Parihaka failing to gain traction, advocates saw a new opportunity late last year in a petition to Parliament by a couple of Otorohanga College students.

The 12,000-strong petition of Waimarama Anderson and Leah Bell, which calls for a national day of commemoration for the 'land wars' and for the history of those events to be taught at schools, is now being considered by the Maori Affairs Select Committee - and is gaining some support from inside the Beehive.

The Prime Minister isn't ruling it out a land war commemoration day: "I haven't said no, I just haven't seen any advice or any particular recommendations made."

Labour leader Andrew Little supports the idea saying a proper commemoration is needed "and if we can find space to have a public holiday, I wouldn't disagree with that either".

Several of his colleagues have suggested ditching Queen's Birthday to make way for it - or using anniversary days, which are marked at different times of the year for different provinces.

This week's NZCPR Guest Commentator, journalist and historian Mike Butler, is very concerned at these developments and believes a "land wars day" would be a misnomer:

"The sporadic armed conflict that accompanied the settlement of New Zealand from 1840 should be regarded as tribal rebellions instead of land wars. Our recorded history remained uncontroversial until the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1985 sparked a new process of spinning history into a tale of woe to justify compensation.

"According to early 20th century historian James Cowan, 2,899 lost their lives in the armed conflicts in New Zealand during the 19th century, and this includes Maori on both sides as well as non-Maori. This compares with over 18,000 killed in World War 1, 12,000 killed in World War 2, a total of 71 in the Boer Wars, and 36 in Vietnam. A day to commemorate those who lost their lives in conflict is a memorial day and we already have a memorial day on April 25 each year.

"A 'tribal rebellions day' would trap us into a yearly repetition of lies and half-truths that would be drummed into children at school to make them feel guilty. We have already had enough of the other grievance day, at Waitangi every year on February 6."

In their report on the schoolgirls' petition, Radio New Zealand [explained](#), "The college is spearheading the bid to get a National Day of Remembrance for those killed in wars between

government forces and Maori. They want those who died in the conflicts to be remembered in the same way as those who died in overseas wars.”

Are supporters of the petition angling for “official recognition” in order to justify taxpayer-funded compensation for Maori who died during tribal rebellions?

It seems so.

In a 2014 [interview](#) about the Waitangi Tribunal’s Military Veterans Inquiry - which began hearing evidence this week - the co-chairman of the Maori Council, Maanu Paul, explained that he is seeking redress for *all* veterans - from the *Land Wars* through to Vietnam. He explained it was not just “physical pain” that was being felt: “There’s been a psychological effect on Maori who were in the *Land Wars*...” And, it was not just the servicemen who had suffered from the wars, but their whanau as well: “The effects they had on their families and their communities have lasted for generations.”

If this petition to Parliament for recognition of tribal rebellions is really a bid by the ancestors of those who were killed for compensation, the Veterans Inquiry is providing an example of what’s in store.

Veterans themselves are [revealing](#) that some claims are filled with fabricated evidence. Others appear opportunistic: “The Claimant seeks the following relief... that the Crown award compensation to appropriately reimburse the Claimant for the prejudice caused by the Crown’s breaches and suffered by the Claimant and the whanau” – for the “diminution of reputation and mana” as a result of feeling “culturally unsafe” and being “overlooked for promotion” during a one year stint in the army in 1968.

The sooner the Waitangi Tribunal - and its gravy train - is abolished the better.

Parliament is now calling for public submissions on the petition for a national day of commemoration for the New Zealand Land Wars. The closing date is 21st April 2016.

But do the 12,000 people who signed the petition represent the views of all New Zealanders? We have doubts, so we have set up a [petition](#) to give voice to those who are opposed. Let’s see whether there are 12,000 people who do *not* support a new commemoration day to mark the land wars.

Keeping in mind the point that Thomas Jefferson was making, that democratic governments can only be held to account by the public speaking out, if you are opposed to a New Zealand Land War commemoration day, then please do two things:

- Firstly, sign our [petition](#) - and help spread the word.
- Secondly, send in a quick [submission](#) to Parliament before the April 21st closing date.