

# The Nature and Origins of Racial Subversion. Reuben P. Chapple

## **The Nature and Origins of Racial Subversion – Reuben P. Chapple**

The notion that particular groups of people meet together secretly or in private to plan various courses of action, and that some of these plans actually exert a significant influence on particular historical developments is typically rejected out of hand and dismissed as the figment of a paranoid imagination.

In this case, the evidence is clear, and overwhelming. “Group rights” aka “identity politics” were invented and promoted by revolutionary Marxist-Leninists seeking the overthrow of our existing society and its replacement with a model of their own choosing.

Karl Marx married Charles Darwin’s Theory of Evolution with German philosopher, Hegel’s Theory of the Dialectic (change through struggle of opposites). Marxist-Leninists thus believe that society is evolving inexorably toward socialism through a process called dialectical materialism. An existing condition (thesis) comes into conflict with a new condition (antithesis) that is attempting to emerge. Out of the dialectical struggle between these two opposing forces a new, higher condition (synthesis) emerges. This is then put through the process again as the new thesis, until socialism is achieved.

Lenin expanded Marx’s dialectical analysis from its early focus on economic relationships to take in social and political relationships, thus widening the role of the revolutionary as a change agent. The task of the revolutionary was now to identify and exploit pressure points for dialectical conflict, thus undermining the legitimacy of the existing social and political order, and hastening the eventual triumph of socialism.

The Maori Sovereignty agenda actually originated in the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century writings of Lenin and Stalin on a topic they called “The National Question.”

Around 1905, Lenin and Stalin identified the fact that Czarist Russia consisted not only of ethnic Russians, but upwards of 80 formerly tribal subject peoples, who’d been conquered by the Czars over the preceding 500 years and forcibly Russified.

In order to expand the Bolshevik support base, Lenin and Stalin promised these groups “the right to manage their own affairs,” “the right to self-determination,” “the right to speak, read, write, use, and be taught in their own language” etc. This currently fashionable sloganeering is actually over 100 years old.

After World War I the multi-ethnic empires of Austro-Hungary and Czarist Russia to which the National Question was first applied to stir up revolution were no more. Lenin and Stalin then directed “The National Question” to undermining the hold of European nations over their colonial possessions, so as to deprive them of their sources of cheap labour, raw materials, and markets for finished goods.

In the 1930s, Lenin devised a strategy for weakening and subverting democratic societies that changed the nature of revolutionary politics forever, while profoundly increasing the threat that revolutionaries posed.

Until then, Communist parties in non-Communist countries had openly declared their anti-capitalist, anti-Western and anti-democratic agendas. They called for the “dictatorship of the proletariat” and advocated “civil war” in the western democracies to bring this about. Because most people in free societies remained unconvinced of the need for a violent socialist revolution, Communists remained a fringe minority with little political clout.

In 1935, the Communists adopted a new tactic, which they dubbed “the Popular Front.” The agendas of the Popular Front were framed in terms of the fundamental values of the societies the Communists meant to destroy. In place of the “dictatorship of the proletariat” and “international civil war,” the Communists organised coalitions for “democracy, justice and peace.”

Nothing changed in the philosophy and goals of the Communists, but by seemingly advocating “democracy, justice and peace” they were able to forge broad alliances with individuals and groups who had no inkling of their true agendas, or believed them to be less sinister and dangerous than they were.

Communists initially selected as prime targets various racial, religious and national minorities, and intellectual groups that exerted a direct effect on public opinion. Working through the Popular Fronts they formed with “liberal” factions, the Communists were able to hide their conspiratorial activities, form “peace,” “human rights” and “anti-racism” movements, and greatly increase their effectiveness by mobilising non-Communists to do their work for them. Lenin referred to these people as “useful idiots.”

Groups who can be helped by Communists to see that they are “marginalised” from capitalist society due to their race, gender, class and sexual preference have long proved particularly fertile ground for those looking to promote dialectical conflict. Marxist-Leninists, worldwide, have practised for decades a process of agitating amongst such groups in order to achieve a breakdown of social cohesion leading to eventual socialist control.

Communists all over the world were thus instructed to promote the independence aspirations of minority ethnic groups in order to bring them into violent conflict with the status quo, thus undermining national consensus and creating the conditions for a socialist revolution to occur.

Locally, the Communist Party of New Zealand (“CPNZ”) soon identified a minority strand of Maori opinion favouring race separatism dating back to the late 1840s. These sentiments were initially centred on the Tainui and Tuwharetoa tribes that never signed the Treaty of Waitangi.

As we have already seen, Communist strategy is to find a group with a grievance, then promise to help them to get what they want. The CPNZ ran in the 1935 General Election on a platform that included “self-determination for the Maoris [sic] to the point of complete separation.” Here was the point at which this catch-cry first entered our national discourse.

At first, the CPNZ had little success with this line. Maori were primarily a rural people and had little contact with Communists, who were mostly found in urban areas with a substantial manufacturing

base. This was soon to change. Over the period 1945 – 1975, Maori underwent what University of Waikato demographers Pool and Pole describe as “the most rapid urbanisation of any group of people, anywhere.”

This brought Maori flooding into the universities and trade unions, the CPNZ’s main recruiting grounds. As well, the Marxist-Leninists who’d begun colonising the nation’s universities in the 1930s had by the early 1970s achieved critical mass in many departments, particularly those specialising in the study of society. Their growing dominance on faculty hiring committees allowed them to exclude anyone not sharing (or at least sympathetic to) their views.

Meet Antonio Gramsci, yet another disreputable Communist held up as an intellectual icon by the academic Left. In the 1920s, Gramsci realised that the western democracies were too attached to the benefits of individual rights, patriotism, and faith in God as a source of transcendent moral authority. These ideas were deeply engrained and would not be easily surrendered. Instead of violent Marxist revolution, Gramsci advocated a “long march through the institutions before socialism and [moral] relativism were victorious.”

Gramsci believed that “capitalist bourgeois society” could be gulled into accepting Communism through the gradual seduction of the western mind. Accordingly, his adherents sought control over culture, organised religion, media, education, and other areas where intellectual discourse takes place.

Since the 1930s, western university students have been subjected to mass-scale academic brainwashing by disciples of Gramsci who have embedded themselves in the academy with the express purpose of using it as a factory of ideological reproduction.

Graduates of this indoctrination programme were absolutely convinced they belonged to an intellectual elite. How did they know this to be true? They were constantly told how smart they were for accepting the programming. The students were told they were learning “progressive” new ideas instead of Marxism. They were programmed with all the principles of Marxism without the label. If you told them they were Marxists or Communists, they’d respond with a pitying smile, eye-rolling, and accuse you of “seeing Reds under the bed.”

Having internalised the system of values upon which their membership of “Club Virtue” depends most university graduates over the last forty years display a strong emotional resistance to having it questioned. If you disagree with them you are racist, sexist, fascist, misogynist or just plain stupid. Rational discourse with people whom Lenin once referred to “useful idiots” is impossible.

After graduating, these “useful idiots” slithered forth from the academy into the media, education system, trade unions, Labour Party, entertainment industry, churches and other institutions that shape society’s governing ideas. As a result, the political centre of gravity has moved steadily leftward over several generations. This is clearly no accident.

The origins of “Maori Sovereignty” lie in Marxist National Question theory, which the Marxist-Leninists and their “useful idiot” enablers have now moved into the centre of respectable public discourse. Thirty years ago anyone pushing this line would have been regarded as dangerously deluded. Now, through the process outlined above, it has been successfully “mainstreamed.” Support for “Maori Sovereignty” is today regarded in many intellectual circles as a badge of

“progressivism.”

In “Preferential Policies: An International Perspective” Black American academic, Thomas Sowell records the downstream effect of government policies promoting identity politics. Sold to the public as promoting inter-group harmony, Sowell found that wherever such policies had been tried, they invariably expanded over time in scale and scope, benefited already advantaged members of the preference group (those able to work the system), and led to increased rather than decreased inter-group polarisation. In many places they have brought about decades-long civil wars.

Can anyone else see where we might be headed should we not act now to derail the “Maori Sovereignty” gravy train?

**ENDS**