

NO TO TAXPAYER FUNDED “SELF RULE” TO TUHOE

NO TO TAXPAYER FUNDED “SELF RULE” TO TUHOE

Tuhoe Confiscations Inevitable and Justified

Part One.

Due to the isolation of Tuhoe, the “1896 Urewera District Native Act” established some 650,000 acres of their land as a reserve – *but never gave them full autonomy*. It was no more than a “Maori local government” under the control of the Crown. The Government gained Tuhoe’s recognition of the Queen. All tribal powers had to be within the Law, devolved and approved by the Crown. The Crown intended that in due course it would impose “all the responsibilities, liabilities and privileges” of the other iwi that had signed the Treaty on the Tuhoe people. The Colonial Government would not have had the authority to give Tuhoe *full autonomy*. Britain would definitely not have given uncivilized natives autonomy to part of a British Colony! This “Maori local government” was revoked a few years later.



The media has published many articles to support the alleged Tuhoe claim with much of it based on selective research by the Waitangi Tribunal, Dr Paul Moon, Bruce Stirling and others. However, most importantly, as with many

of these claims, there is another side to this story that must also be told. While Tuhoe did suffer at the hands of the government troops and their Maori supporters, they brought it upon themselves by protecting the “rebels” that had violated both Maori and European. Below is a brief account of why the confiscated lands were “*inevitable and justified*”, as fully documented in New Zealand’s archives.

Tuhoe did not sign the Treaty largely because they were too isolated for it to be taken to them, read, discussed and given the opportunity to sign. Unlike Ngapuhi and other northern tribes, Tuhoe had very little contact with the Europeans, the missionaries or the British Crown and remained this way for many years after the Treaty was signed, when New Zealand was ceded to Britain, which was recognized and accepted by all the major nations of the world.

Rau

**Kereopa
Te Kooti**

In December 1864, Kereopa brought the Pai Marire religion to the East Coast but was told not to interfere with the Europeans. On the 2 March 1865, missionary Rev C S Volkner was

hanged from a willow tree near his church. His body was then decapitated and the head paraded around the village before Kereopa swallowed his eyes, calling one Parliament and the other the Queen and British Law. Kereopa and Mokomoko (whose rope was used to hang Volkner), instigated the killing, as they believed he had been spying for the Government, which caused the death of two members of Kereopa's family. Although this act outraged the Europeans, such an indignity to the head of an enemy conferred mana amongst Tuhoe. If the government was to honour the commitment Britain had made to all the people of New Zealand in 1840, then it was time a stand had to be taken to bring law and order to the people of the East Coast. Although Mokomoko helped instigate the hanging of Rev Volkner and it was his rope that was put around his neck, he claimed he had not taken part in the actual hanging. After he and three others' trial in Auckland, they were all hanged for Volkner's killing on the 17 May 1866.

After the killing of Völkner, Kereopa fled to the Ureweras under the protection of Tuhoe. In May 1865, he and a party of Tuhoe attempted to travel to Waikato, but were prevented from reaching the Kaingaroa plains by a force of Te Arawa – but not before killing two Te Arawa chiefs with Kereopa again eating their eyes. They were forced to turn back when a party of Te Arawa, led by W. G. Mair, arrived. Kereopa, under the protection of Tuhoe from the Government troops, returned to hiding in the Ureweras.

Kereopa had much mana in the minds of Tuhoe and thus obtained their continuing protection. The dense bush of the Urewera Mountains offered him protection from the Government troops, as it later would for Te Kooti and the Hauhau. Martial Law had been declared in the Opotiki and Whakatane districts after the killing of Völkner, and a reward was offered for the capture

of those responsible.

Over the next three years, the people of the Urewera were weakened, and their land devastated by the government's relentless pursuit of Kereopa for his involvement with Volkner's killing; Te Kooti for his massacres up and down the country and the Hauhau who were attacking and killing innocent settlers and their families and destroying their crops and buildings. However, Tuhoe continued to protect these "rebels". The government troops included Ngati Porou, Ngati Kahungunu and Te Arawa embarked on several campaigns to capture the "rebels". During these campaigns Tuhoe's pa were plundered, crops destroyed, people killed and land confiscated. This in itself is Maori custom, – revenge – plunder to avenge a wrong. There is no denying Tuhoe land was devastated, but they brought it upon themselves by protecting the "rebels" from being brought to justice.

By late 1870 several Tuhoe leaders had made their peace with the government, but they would not violate the sanctuary of the Urewera by giving up Kereopa, Te Kooti or the Hauhau. Eventually, however, seeing that their survival was now threatened, they withdrew this protection.

It was agreed amongst Tuhoe that neither European soldiers nor Ngati Porou forces should be allowed to capture the "rebels": as their protectors, they would deliver Kereopa themselves to the government. Kereopa agreed to give himself up as payment for the Tuhoe blood that had been shed for him.

It must be remembered that it was not only the government that

wanted law and order established on the East Coast. Ngati Porou, Ngati Kahungunu and Te Arawa also fought with the Government troops, as did many other tribes around New Zealand to enforce the Queens Law. These three iwi were instrumental in the 1870 and 1871 pursuit of the “rebels” that Tuhoe allowed to take refuge in Urewera Mountains after massacres in Poverty Bay.

There is no denying that Tūhoe, Te Whakatōhea and Ngāti Awa were out of step with the majority of New Zealand, both Maori and European at the time, which they eventually realised, releasing the “rebels” they had been protecting. By this time, the majority of Maori had realised that for the Maori race to survive, there had to be one government, one law for all the people of New Zealand and had put this law in the hands of the Britain Crown.

Due to the isolation of Tuhoe, the “1896 Urewera District Native Act” established some 650,000 acres of their land as a reserve – **but never gave them full autonomy**. It was no more than a “Maori local government” under the control of the Crown. The Government gained Tuhoe’s recognition of the Queen. All tribal powers had to be within the Law, devolved and approved by the Crown. The Crown intended that in due course it would impose “all the responsibilities, liabilities and privileges” of the other iwi that had signed the Treaty, on the Tuhoe people. The Colonial Government would not have had the authority to give Tuhoe **full autonomy**. Britain would definitely not have given uncivilized natives autonomy to part of a British Colony! This “Maori local government” was revoked a few years later.

Over the next 60 years, Tuhoe sold large tracts of their

underdeveloped wasteland to the Government. Later the Crown vested most of this land into the Urewera National Park for all the people of New Zealand to enjoy, including the people of the Eastern tribes.

The Waitangi Tribunal stated that Tuhoe had 24,147 ha of land confiscated, but Government figures show, in 1866, 448,000 acres (181,000 hectares) of land belonging to the tribes of the Bay of Plenty, Tūhoe, Te Whakatōhea and Ngāti Awa were confiscated by the government. Government documents show, this area was subsequently reduced to 211,000 acres (85,387 hectares), of which Tūhoe lost 14,000 acres (5,700 hectares).

The Waitangi Tribunal also claims Tuhoe were never compensated, but in Richard Hill's Justice Department report for the Lange Government in 1989, page 11 clause 31, shows Tuhoe received \$200,000 compensation in 1958. Tuhoe is also a party to the Waikaremoana Trust Board that receives \$124,000 per year in rental for Lake Waikaremoana.

The alliance of the Tuhoe with Kereopa, Te Kooti and the Hauhau and their resistance of the Crown to apprehend these "rebels" after killing many innocent Maori and European – meant military action was inevitable and justified – a fact admitted by the Waitangi Tribunal stating, *"The alliance of the Tuhoe people with Te Kooti and the attacks on the Crown's subjects, Maori and Pakeha that followed, meant military action was inevitable and justified"* – as was the confiscations. If New Zealand was to be civilised as the majority of the chiefs had asked for in 1840, then the action taken by the government of the day was inevitable and justified, especially when the compensated land was reduced to only 5,700 ha and Tuhoe received \$200,000 compensation in 1958

and the ongoing rental of Lake Waikaremoana– a fact not mentioned by the Waitangi Tribunal.

This “Kangaroo Court” method of determining our countries future by the Waitangi Tribunal and Government must stop. There must be a full public inquire were all the documented evidence is presented and scrutinised before more land and assets belonging to the people of New Zealand are given away without their, knowledge, authority or consent. **This is our sovereign right Prime Minister and the people also deserve balanced reporting from our media!**

Compiled by the One New Zealand Foundation Inc from files held in New Zealand’s Archives.

© Ross Baker.

Tuhoe – the untold facts.

Part Two.

The Waitangi Tribunal stated that Tuhoe had 24,147 ha of land confiscated, but no mention is made that this was reduced to 5,700 ha with a later compensation payment of \$200,000 in 1958.

Government figures show, in 1866, 448,000 acres (181,000 hectares) of land belonging to the rebel tribes of the Bay of Plenty, Tūhoe, Te Whakatōhea and Ngāti Awa were confiscated by the government. Government documents show, this area was subsequently reduced to 211,000 acres (85,387 hectares), of which Tūhoe lost 14,000 acres (5,700 hectares).

The Waitangi Tribunal also claims this land was never compensated for, but in Richard Hill's, Justice Department report for the Lange Government in 1989, page 11 clause 31, shows Tuhoe received \$200,000 compensation in 1958.

From this article by Steven Oliver published in the "Dictionary of New Zealand Biography" there is no doubt the Government of the day had every right to confiscate land from Tuhoe.

Te Rau, Kereopa ? – 1872

Ngati Rangiwewehi warrior, Pai Marire leader

Kereopa Te Rau was one of the five original disciples of Te Ua Haumene, the founder of the Pai Marire faith. He was a member of Ngati Rangiwewehi of Te Arawa. The date and place of his birth are not known, nor the names of his parents. Some time in the 1840s he was baptised by the Catholic missionary Father Euloge Reignier, and took the name Kereopa (Cleophas). He is believed to have served as a policeman in Auckland in the 1850s. In the early 1860s he fought in the King's forces in Waikato. His wife and two daughters are thought to have been killed at Rangiaowhia, near Te Awamutu, when it was attacked by government forces on 21 February 1864, and the following day he was at Hairini, a defensive position just west of

Rangiaowhia, where he saw his sister killed.

After the defeat of the King movement forces in mid 1864, Kereopa joined the new religion of Te Ua Haumene. In December 1864 Te Ua instructed Kereopa and Patara Raukatauri to go as emissaries to the tribes of the East Coast. They were told to preach the Pai Marire faith in the districts they passed through, to go in peace and not to interfere with Pakeha. Kereopa, however, demanded that a European be given up to him at Otipa, a settlement on the lower Rangitaiki River, and that a Catholic priest be handed over at Whakatane. These requests were refused, but at Opotiki the missionary C. S. Völkner was seized and ritually killed on 2 March 1865. Völkner was hanged from a willow tree near his church by members of his own congregation, Te Whakatohea. His body was then decapitated and Kereopa swallowed the eyes, calling one Parliament and the other the Queen and British law. Although this act outraged Europeans, such an indignity to the head of an enemy conferred mana on Kereopa.

Kereopa was widely believed to have instigated the killing of Völkner. Although he had agreed to it, in fact he did not take part in the actual hanging, and cannot be held responsible. The arrival of the Pai Marire party at Opotiki precipitated the tragedy, but there were complex reasons for Völkner's death. Principal among these was Te Whakatohea's anger at the missionary for his actions in spying for the government; in returning to Opotiki at that time Völkner had disregarded the explicit warnings of Te Whakatohea. Kereopa himself may also have sought to avenge the deaths of members of his family at Hairini and at Rangiaowhia, a plan of which Völkner had sent to Governor George Grey.

After the killing of Völkner, Kereopa, with his party of Pai Marire followers, went on to Gisborne, and to the Urewera where he preached the Pai Marire faith among Tuhoe. In May 1865 he attempted to travel to Waikato to preach to the Kingite tribes, but was prevented from reaching the Kaingaroa plains by a force of Ngati Manawa and Ngati Rangitihi. According to one account, in the course of this battle, in which Kereopa's party was supported by Tuhoe, Kereopa swallowed the eyes of three Ngati Manawa warriors who had been killed and decapitated; it was this repetition of his symbolic act at Opotiki which earned him the name Kaiwhatu (the Eye-eater). After a long siege Ngati Manawa and Ngati Rangitihi abandoned their defences at Te Tapiri and Okupu, in the western Urewera, but Kereopa was forced to turn back when a relief party of Te Arawa, led by W. G. Mair, arrived. He then returned to Opotiki but was driven from there by government troops, and fled into the Urewera.

Kereopa had much mana in the eyes of Tuhoe, as the bearer of the Pai Marire faith to that tribe, and thus obtained their protection. The dense bush of the Urewera Mountains also offered him protection from his pursuers, as it later would for Te Kooti. Martial law had been declared in the Opotiki and Whakatane districts after the killing of Völkner, and a reward was offered for the capture of those responsible. Kereopa concealed himself at Te Roau, on a densely wooded hillside, Te Miromiro, at Ohaua-te-rangi, a Ngati Rongo settlement north of Ruatahuna. Te Roau had never been occupied, and commanded an excellent view of anyone approaching. There Kereopa was able to elude his pursuers for the next five years.

From mid 1868 the Ringatu faith of Te Kooti gained popularity amongst Tuhoe, and the influence of Pai Marire correspondingly faded. The reverence in which Tuhoe held Kereopa also

diminished, but Tuhoe did not disclose his whereabouts. Over the next three years, however, the people of the Urewera were weakened, and their land devastated, by the government's relentless pursuit of Te Kooti and the remaining Hauhau leaders. Government troops, including a Ngati Porou contingent led by Rapata Wahawaha, embarked on several campaigns between May 1869 and early 1872, in which Tuhoe pa were plundered, crops destroyed and many people killed.

By late 1870 several Tuhoe leaders had made their peace with the government. But they would not violate the sanctuary of the Urewera by giving up Kereopa. Eventually, however, realising that their survival was threatened by Kereopa, they decided to withdraw their protection.

Tuhoe tradition gives the following account of the capture of Kereopa. It was agreed among Tuhoe that neither European soldiers nor Ngati Porou forces should be allowed to capture the Hauhau leader; as his protectors, they would deliver him themselves to the government, to ensure that their own mana was retained. Thus a Tuhoe party went to Te Roau, in September 1871, and laid their plans before him. Kereopa agreed to give himself as payment for the Tuhoe blood that had been shed for him. When he went to gather his possessions from his sleeping house, however, he attempted to flee. He was chased and captured by a warrior named Te Whiu Maraki, and taken to Ruatahuna. Because he had broken his word, he was handed over as a prisoner to Rapata and Captain Thomas Porter.

On 21 December 1871 Kereopa stood trial at the Supreme Court at Napier for the murder of Völkner. There was no direct proof of his responsibility for the killing, but a European witness, Samuel Levy, testified that he had seen Kereopa among those

who escorted Völkner to the willow tree. On the basis of this evidence Kereopa was convicted of murder and sentenced to death. William Colenso appealed unsuccessfully for clemency on the grounds that the crime had already been punished by executions and land confiscation. Mother Mary Aubert, of Father Reignier's mission at Napier, stayed with Kereopa during his last night. He was hanged on 5 January 1872 at Napier.

STEVEN OLIVER

Clark, P. 'Hauhau'. Auckland, 1975

Cowan, J. The New Zealand wars. Vol. 2, The Hauhau wars, 1864–72. Wellington, 1923

'Rev. C. S. Volkner and the Tai Rawhiti expedition, 1864'. Historical Review 7, No 2 (June 1959): 24–36

'Trial of Kereopa'. Daily Southern Cross. 2 Jan. 1872

'The trial of Kereopa: horrible disclosures'. Daily Southern Cross. 29 Dec. 1871

HOW TO CITE THIS BIOGRAPHY:

Oliver, Steven. 'Te Rau, Kereopa ? – 1872'. Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, updated 22 June 2007 URL: <http://www.dnzb.govt.nz/>

The original version of this biography was published in the Dictionary of New Zealand Biography Volume One (1769-1869), 1990 © Crown Copyright 1990-2009. Published by the Ministry for Culture and Heritage, Wellington, New Zealand. All rights reserved

The alliance of the Te Urewera people with Kereopa, Te Kooti and the attacks on the Crown's subjects, Maori and Pakeha that followed, meant military action was inevitable and justified – as was the confiscations. If New Zealand was to be civilised as the majority of the chiefs had asked for in 1840, then the action taken by the Government of the day were “inevitable and justified”, especially when the compensated land was reduced to only 5,700 ha and Tuhoe received \$200,000 compensation in 1958 – a fact not mentioned by the Waitangi Tribunal.

Compiled by the One New Zealand Foundation Inc from files held in New Zealand's Archives.

© Ross Baker.

Allan Titford Political Prisoner

ALLAN TITFORD



Innocent Political Prisoner.

1987. Alleged Treaty of Waitangi land claim place on his freehold title farm

1987/92. No Police or Crown protection from Maori claimants

1987/89. Many false charges by Police but acquitted on all.

1987. No Police protection from Maori claimants, squatters

1992. Family fled to Tasmania for protection and safety.

1995. Land stolen by the Crown for "alleged" claim

1995. Land sold under duress and without legal advice.

2009. Sale Agreement tampered with after being signed and witnessed.

2009. Susan Titford leaves her husband.

2010. Crown becomes involve in their matrimonial dispute

2010, Susan Titford is given immunity by the Crown.

2011. Crown gets involved in laying charges against Allan.

2013. Allan's Lawyer does not call one witness in his defence.

2013. Allan is jailed for 24 years without a fair trial.

*"A malicious prosecution of a political nature" to
"Pervert the course of justice".*

No man deserves how he has been treated by the
Crown!

Prepared and supported by the One New Zealand Foundation Inc.
Website: www.onenzfoundation.co.nz. Email: ONZF@bigpond.com.au

Honour the Treaty – Embrace the Royal Charter

By Ross Baker, Researcher, One New Zealand Foundation Inc.

Email: ONZF@bigpond.com.au. Website: www.onenzfoundation.co.nz

Until we give Queen Victoria's Royal Charter/Letters Patent dated the 16 November 1840 the recognition it deserves, part-

Maori, with the help of government, will continue to distort the Treaty of Waitangi to give them special rights not mentioned in the Treaty. By the 21 May 1840 the Treaty of Waitangi had fulfilled its purpose; New Zealand was declared British Sovereignty under the dependency of New South Wales.

There is no doubt, the chiefs knew they had given up their territories and governments in the Treaty as it was fully explained to them in the Preamble, *"Now the Queen has been pleased to send me, William Hobson, a Captain in the Royal Navy, to be Governor of all places of New Zealand which may be given up now or hereafter to the Queen"*, but the Preamble of the Treaty is completely ignored by government only using the three articles as our Treaty of Waitangi.

The Preamble is the most important part, as in any document of this nature, it explains the articles or clauses of the Treaty. It's very difficult to distort the Treaty if we referred to the Preamble but since the Waitangi Tribunal was established, the Preamble has been completely ignored in virtually every government publication, including Te Papa, which has allowed the Treaty to be continually distorted. **The Preamble is part of the Treaty of Waitangi and must be read in conjunction with it to fully understand the meaning of the Treaty!**

Queen Victoria or Lt Governor Hobson did not have the authority or instructions to give tangata Maori advantage or privilege not already enjoyed by the people of England and none were given.

Sir Apirana Ngata confirmed this in his book, "**The Treaty of Waitangi – An Explanation**", "*The chief's place in the hands of the Queen of England, the Sovereignty and authority to make laws*".

Queen Victoria's Royal Charter/Letters Patent, completely ignored by our governments, ratified the Treaty by making New Zealand into a British Colony with its own Governor and Constitution to form a Government to make laws with court and judges to enforce those laws. The Royal Charter being written in English cannot be distorted as the Treaty written in Maori has been for over 170 years.

Lt. Governor Hobson was sworn in as our first Governor on the 3 May 1841 and the first sitting of the Legislative Council (Government) was held on the 24 May 1841.

The Gazette Notices and Proclamations that followed the Royal Charter set out exactly how New Zealand was to be governed; under one flag and one law, irrespective of race, colour or creed.

Unfortunately, the more books written about the Treaty of Waitangi the more powerful and distorted it becomes. While we must **honour** the Treaty of Waitangi for giving Great Britain sovereignty over all the Islands of New Zealand and tangata Maori the same rights as the people of England, we must **embrace** Queen Victoria's Royal Charter/Letters Patent that separated New Zealand from New South Wales making New Zealand into a British Colony with its own Governor and Constitution to form a Government to make laws with court and judges to enforce those laws, irrespective of race, colour or creed.

Queen Victoria's Royal Charter/Letters Patent, our true Founding Documents and first Constitution.

The 3 May, the day we must all celebrate as our Independence Day!

For further information, Click on "Royal Charter" in the column on the right.

Customary Rights to Indigenous People But Maori are not Indigenous to New Zealand

The Ministry of Justice book entitled, "Recognising Customary Rights" is based on Maori being the Indigenous people or tangata whenua of New Zealand but there is no explanation or definition of these people in the Glossary.

The Glossary on page 24 states, "***Customary marine title (CMT)***. Comes from a common law concept that recognises property rights of indigenous people that have continued since or before the acquisition of Crown sovereignty to the present day. It is inalienable – the land cannot be sold – and cannot be converted to freehold titled Recognises the relationship that exists, and will continue to exist, between iwi, hapu and whanu and common marine and coastal areas".

After many years of research by the One New Zealand Foundation Inc and many others, we can find no information to support Maori are the indigenous people or tangata whenua of New Zealand. In fact all the information and evidence we have on file confirms Maori were not the indigenous people of New Zealand.

The evidence we have on file that Maori are not the indigenous people of New Zealand or tangata whenua.

1. When Rev Henry Williams and his son Edward translated Lt. Governor Hobson's final English draft of the Treaty into the Maori language, they use the term, "tangata Maori" to define the people that sign the Tiriti o Waitangi. Both Rev Henry Williams and his son must have known after living in New Zealand for 23 years, that Maori were not the indigenous or tangata whenua. All 500 plus chiefs that signed the Tiriti o Waitangi as tangata Maori as they knew they were **not** tangata whenua! This is only a modern concept by part-Maori to claim Customary Rights!
2. In the, "**1986 New Zealand Year Book**" on page 18, Professor Ranginui Walker, past head of Maori Studies at Auckland University had this to say about the canoe people that arrived in the 14 century, "*The traditions are quite clear on one point, whenever crew disembarked there were already tangata whenua (prior inhabitants). The canoe ancestors of the 14-century merged with these tangata whenua tribes. From this time on the traditions abound with accounts of tribal wars over land and its resources. Warfare was the means by which tribal boundaries were defined and political relations between*

tribes established. Out of this period emerged 42 tribal groups whose territories became fixed after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi and the establishment of Pax Britannica". (Pax Britanica – British Peace). While Professor Walker make a clear distinction between the canoe people of the 14 century and the tanagat whenua, he makes no mention of who the tangata whenua were for the simple reason, we are not allowed to know!

3. After the Minister of Maori Affairs, the Hon Pita Sharples had signed the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People on behalf of the people of New Zealand, the One New Zealand Foundation Inc. wrote under the Official Information Act to the following Ministers asking them for the official document defining, "Who are the indigenous people of New Zealand.

4. I have attached the replies from the Prime Minister, Hon John Key; the Attorney General, Hon Christopher Finlayson; the Minister of Maori Affairs, Hon Pita Sharples; the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Hon Murray McCully and a letter from the Attorney General in response to our OIA request to the Minister of Justice, Hon Simon Power.

5. When the Hon Pita Sharples signed the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People in New York, he stated to the United Nations, "*Maori hold a distinct and special status as the indigenous people, or tangata whenua, of New Zealand*", but when asked, he could not supply a definition of who these people where.

6. We are extremely concerned that the Ministry of Justice has taken for granted that Maori are the Indigenous

People of New Zealand or the tangata whenua when all the evidence we have on file, including the Tiriti o Waitangi and the attached Minister's letters say the Government does not have a definition of the Indigenous People of New Zealand or tangata whenua.

If Maori were the Indigenous People of New Zealand, which there is no evidence to prove they were, how can they honestly claim to be today when they have continued to intermarry with other race of their own free will until most now only have a minute trace of Maori ancestry and no longer live by their Maori culture?

Before the Customary Rights debate proceeds, the people of New Zealand must have an "official" definition of the Indigenous People of New Zealand, supported up with forensic evidence.

Compiled by Ross Baker, One New Zealand Foundation Inc.
www.onenzfoundation.co.nz (12/8/2015)



Office of the Prime Minister

Prime Minister
Minister of Tourism

Ministerial Services
Minister in Charge of the
NZ Security Intelligence Service
Minister Responsible for the GCSB

15 MAR 2010

Ross Baker
Researcher
One New Zealand Foundation Inc.
Email: rossbaker@austarnet.com.au

Dear Ross Baker

Official Information Act Request Relating to Legal Definition of Māori

I refer to your email correspondence of 14 February 2010 in which you requested *"the 'legal' (The ACT) definition of a Māori person today."*

I am not aware of any information held by this Office that is within the scope of your request. In addition, all New Zealand Acts, Bills and Regulations are available publicly at the website produced by the Parliamentary Counsel Office at: <http://www.legislation.govt.nz>. Accordingly, your request is declined under s 18(d) of the Official Information Act as it is publicly available, if in fact such information exists.

You are entitled to ask the Ombudsman to review this response, under section 28(3) of the Official Information Act.

Yours sincerely


Wayne Eagleson
Chief of Staff



Office of Hon Christopher Finlayson

Attorney-General
Minister for Treaty of Waitangi Negotiations
Minister for Arts, Culture and Heritage

3 June 2010

Mr R Baker
by email: rossbaker@austarnet.com.au

Dear Mr Baker

I write in response to your request under the Official Information Act 1982 received by email on 7 May 2010.

Your request states:

"Could you please supply the Government's official definition of the Indigenous People of New Zealand referred to in the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People that the Crown has just signed with the United Nations"

I am declining your request under section 18(e) of the Official Information Act 1982 as this office holds no document that contains this information.

Under section 28(3) of the Act you may, if you wish, write to the Ombudsman seeking an investigation and review of this decision.

Yours faithfully

R.F. May
Senior Private Secretary



Office of Hon Christopher Finlayson

Attorney-General
Minister for Treaty of Waitangi Negotiations
Minister for Arts, Culture and Heritage

7 April 2010

Mr R Baker
by email: rossbaker@austarnet.com.au

Dear Mr Baker

I write in response to your request under the Official Information Act 1982 sent to the office of Hon Simon Power on 2 March 2010, and transferred to, and received by, the Attorney-General's office on 8 March 2010.

Your request states:

"Please supply the "official" definition used by Government today to define who is "Indigenous" to New Zealand to claim against the Crown – the people of New Zealand for alleged injustices."

I am declining your request under section 18(e) of the Official Information Act 1982 as no document exists that contains this information.

Under section 28(3) of the Act you may, if you wish, write to the Ombudsman seeking an investigation and review of this decision.

Yours faithfully

R.F. May
Senior Private Secretary



Office of Hon Murray McCully

Minister of Foreign Affairs

24 June 2010

Ross Baker
Researcher, One New Zealand Foundation
rossbaker@austarnet.com.au

Dear Mr Baker

Official Information Act Request

I refer to your email of 13 June in which you requested the following under the Official Information Act: *"on what grounds, documented or otherwise, did the National Government give Maori the status of being the indigenous People of New Zealand?"*

I am declining your request under section 18(e) and 18(g) of the Official Information Act, on the basis that this office holds no such information, and I have no grounds for believing this information is held by another Minister or department.

Under Section 28(3) of the Act you are entitled to request the Ombudsman to investigate and review the decisions to withhold this official information.

Yours sincerely



Hon Murray McCully
Minister of Foreign Affairs



Office of Hon Dr Pita R Sharples

MP for Tamaki Makaurau
Minister of Māori Affairs
Associate Minister of Corrections
Associate Minister of Education

02 APR 2012

Ross Baker
ONZF@bigpond.com

Tēnā koe Mr Baker

Thank you for your email of 18 March 2012 requesting information under the Official Information Act 1982, about the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the New Zealand Government's definition of the indigenous peoples of New Zealand.

I understand that you have previously asked the Attorney General, Hon Christopher Finlayson, for such a definition and were advised that no document exists containing this information. I do not hold a document that defines the New Zealand Government's definition of the indigenous peoples of New Zealand, therefore your request is declined under section 18(g)(i) of the Official Information Act 1982.

However, I would like to reiterate the Government's position of support for the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. This was outlined in my statement to the United Nations on 19 April 2010, whereby I noted that Māori hold a distinct and special status as the indigenous people, or tangata whenua, of New Zealand.

If you are not satisfied with this response you have the right under section 28(3) of the Official Information Act 1982 to make a complaint to an Ombudsman. Kāti mō tēnei wā.

Heoi anō

nā Hon Dr Pita R Sharples
Minister of Māori Affairs

NEW ZEALAND'S FIRST POLITICAL PRISONER



NEW ZEALAND'S FIRST POLITICAL PRISONER

Why Allan Titford was jailed for twenty four years without a fair trial

ONE NEW ZEALAND FOUNDATION INC.

P.O.Box 7113, Pioneer Hwy, Palmerston North. Email: ONZF@bigpond.com.au

Detective Senior Sergeant Rhys Johnston,
Kerikeri Police Station,

Kerikeri.

Dear Rhys,

Open letter.

Re: Why Allan Titford was jailed for 24 years without a fair trial.

Allan Titford was a completely innocent man when he had an "alleged" Treaty of Waitangi claim place on his freehold titled farm at Maunganui Bluff by Te Roroa in 1987. This claim had previously been fully investigated by Chief Judge Shepherd in 1939 and it was found there was no evidence to support the claim and it was rejected by Parliament in 1942. No new evidence was presented to the Waitangi Tribunal but they recommended in 1992 this land be returned to Te Roroa, "At whatever the cost"!

Since this claim was placed on his farm, the Police, the Crown, the Rural Bank and the claimants colluded to harass, intimidate and threaten Allan and Susan Titford and baby Alyssa until they had to flee to Tasmania for safety. Under duress, without legal advice and corrupt documents drafted and executed by the Crown Law Office he was forced to sell his farm to the Crown in 1995 to help settle Te Roroa's "alleged" Treaty of Waitangi claim or declare bankrupt with his father losing his farm as it was held as collateral by the Rural

Bank. We also have a statement from Allan's father where the Crown had offered Allan's father and brother half a million dollars to declare Allan insane and become Power of Attorney to sell Allan's farm. They both refused.

For 25 years, Allan, Susan, the One New Zealand Foundation Inc. and many others have continued to research this claim and the corrupt methods used by the Crown to acquire his free hold titled farm at well below its true value until Susan had had enough, the stress became too much and she and the children decided to leave Allan in 2009 hoping to stay on the farm and take control of his Trust if he was jailed.

In July 2009 Susan submitted a list "Strictly Confidential" to Barrister Greg Denholm alleging Allan had abused her and the children. Greg Denholm said that from this list Allan would possibly get 6 months' jail. While she alleges Allan abused her and the children, she blamed this abuse on the Crown and Police for their continued harassment putting Allan under extreme stress and in ill health.

Once the Crown found Susan was having matrimonial problems in 2009 they became involved giving her immunity and "*Took over changing charges, throwing some out, adding new ones or whatever they think right*", which included rape, arson and sabotaging farm machinery to testify against her estranged husband to clear the Crown of any wrong doing when it "stole" his farm at Maunganui Bluff. These new charges made no mention of the blame Susan had placed on the Crown and the Police in her original list of charges. Susan stating in an email, "*And when they get him they are going to get him for as much as they can*"!

Allan was then charged and acquitted on false charges over the next two years as he was at Maunganui Bluff, his bail conditions stopping him from travelling north of Hamilton to farm his properties in Northland. This resulted in his properties being vandalised, equipment and stock stolen and the value reduced considerably. The Crown were once again stressing him out and trying to bankrupt him but he remained in control, only breaking his bail to help find his children when they ran away from Susan' care.

While the Crown were putting together alleged charges of abusing his children, raping his wife and arson etc. against Allan, Susan was allowing her 14 year old daughter Ulanda to sleep in the same room as her 23 year old boyfriend for nine months before she ran away from home with him. When the Police found her they decided with CYFS to let her stay with the 23 year old boyfriend at his mother's house and she became pregnant. While this was a crime under Section 134 of the Crimes Act, the Police closed a blind eye. Could this be because the Police would look stupid if they laid charges against their main witnesses while they were putting together alleged charges of rape and child abuse against Allan? This sexual violation of a minor far outweighed any of the alleged charges against Allan Titford, so why was it overlooked Rhys? Ulanda has since laid a complaint against the Police for failing to following up on a Protection Order she had against her boyfriend!

At Allan Titford's trial starting on the 2 September 2013 two fundamental principles of our legal system were breached.

1. The criminal justice system must be, and must be seen to be, free from political interference.
2. One of the most crucial aspects of a fair legal trial is the right to call witnesses on both sides.

From the research Allan, Susan, the One New Zealand Foundation Inc. and many others have undertaken over the 25 years since Te Roroa's "*alleged*" Treaty of Waitangi claim was placed on his property at Maunganui Bluff, we can only find Allan Titford standing up for his rights under the laws of New Zealand. The Crown and the Police failed to protect his free hold titled farm, instead using corrupt documents to forcibly take it under duress and without legal advice at well below its true value to help settle Te Roroa's "*alleged*" Treaty of Waitangi claim.

Rhys, the disgraceful acts by the Crown and the Police to acquire Allan Titford's property would be the worst corruption ever seen in New Zealand's history. The Crown and the Police failed to protect an innocent young family and their free hold titled farm, then continued to harass them for another 20 years until they destroyed the family and jailed Allan for 24 years to clear the Crown and Police of any wrong doing.

The Crown and the Police have given the media false information on many occasions to discredit Allan Titford, especially after his recent "kangaroo court trial" but the documents from those involved at the time will never let the truth go away and the One New Zealand Foundation Inc. certainly will not until he gets a fair trial without political interference and he is allowed witnesses in his defence.

The only evidence that Allan Titford had abused his family came from his estranged wife and brother hoping to get control of his Trust and her children that were forced, *"to write stuff about their father they did not understand"*, therefore until he has a fair trial without political interference and he is allowed witnesses in his defence, we will never know the truth.

When Susan's sister-in-law and friend Sheryll Titford found out Allan had been charged for burning down the family home, she phoned Detective Eddie Evans and gave a statement that when she had gone to pay her respects to Susan after her father died, Susan and Alyssa told her Susan's father Graham Cochrane had burnt the house down to get Susan and his granddaughter Alyssa away from the hostilities at Maunganui Bluff. Detective Evans immediately rang Susan to confirm this and when she denied ever saying it, he failed to follow it up or inform Allan's lawyer. Rhys, how many other people could have cleared Allan of any wrong doing if he had been allowed witnesses at his trial?

Rhys, please send this letter to your superiors because no family should go through what the Government and Police put Mr and Mrs Titford and their young family through. A young innocent family destroyed by a Government more interested in settling an *"alleged"* Treaty of Waitangi claim than protecting its citizens. A Government that was prepared to harass the Titford's until they forced Allan to sell his freehold titled farm at Maunganui Bluff at well below valuation, under duress, without legal advice and corrupt documents drafted and executed by the Crown Law Office, then continued to harass them, finally jailing Allan for 24 years to clear the Crown of any wrong doing. We believe the public of New Zealand has a right to know, **Why Allan Titford was**

jailed for 24 years without a fair trial!

While we have already sent you many of the documents to support this letter, please do not hesitate to ask for further copies if required.

Yours sincerely,

Ross Baker.

Researcher, One New Zealand Foundation Inc.

1. To all the people of New Zealand interested in the truth!

P.S. The One New Zealand Foundation Inc. has produced two books, "Stolen lands at Maunganui Bluff" and "Why Allan Titford was jailed for twenty four years". Both books can be purchased from the ONZF, P.O.Box 7113, Pioneer Hwy, Palmerston North. \$10-00 ea. including p&p.

HOW CAN YOU HELP?

You can help restore our justice system by writing an Official Information Act Request to your Member of Parliament or the Minister of Justice,

Below is a sample letter and remember, you do not have to put a stamp on letters to Members of Parliament or Ministers.

The Hon. ????????

Minister of ??????????

Parliament Building,

Wellington.

Dear Sir,

Re: Official Information Act Request.

I have just read the attached "open" letter to Detective Senior Sergeant Rhys Johnston from Ross Baker, Researcher of the One New Zealand Foundation Inc. I have followed Mr Baker's research for many years and have found he is very thorough and always supplies documented evidence to support his research.

Under the Official Information Act,

If Mr Baker's allegations against the government and Police are correct, what action will the government be taking to investigate these very serious allegations supported with documents from those involved at the time?

Yours sincerely,

???????????????