## Declarations and resolutions of the Ruawaipu indigenous people regarding New Zealand's abuse of Ruawaipu human rights

Made at Turanga this 28th day of April 2012

## **PREAMBLE**

Whereas Ruawaipu is a Maori tribe, indigenous to New Zealand, and separate and distinct from all other Maori tribes, including the Ngati Porou tribe;

And whereas Ruawaipu's traditional boundaries are from the Whangaparaoa river to the Reporua stream, seawards to the Pacific Rim, and inland to the Raukumara ranges;

And whereas Ruawaipu reigned supreme over their traditional lands for 200 years before the Ngati Porou tribe began its expansion into the Ruawaipu domain;

And whereas the authentic version of the Treaty of Waitangi 1840 which binds Ruawaipu is the version written in the Maori language bearing the signatures of Ruawaipu chiefs. That Treaty, by virtue of its laws, secured to the Queen of England (1) the authority to control Her Majesty's own subjects over British soil; and (2) the first right of refusal over such lands that Ruawaipu desired to sell. In exchange Ruawaipu would receive (1) the royal protection of Ruawaipu sovereignty over Ruawaipu lands and territorial seas (this includes natural resources such as gas and oil), communities, and all their treasures; and (2) the same rights and privileges as British subjects;

And whereas Ruawaipu were not exempt from the destructive effects of British colonization. The turning point for Ruawaipu was the advent of war on the East Coast in 1865 which was used as a pretext for the confiscation of land to expedite the colonial government's systematic program of colonization. In implementing its East Coast military strategy the government exploited Christianity to achieve its own military objectives by supplying arms and ammunition to loyal Ngati Porou affiliates of the Anglican Church, and promising them substantial reward for services rendered. The war was the catalyst for reshaping the iwi profile on the East Coast. In its aftermath Ruawaipu lost their distinct tribal identity, sovereignty, and lands;

And whereas in 1975 the Waitangi Tribunal was established as an arm to the settler establishment with the statutory purpose of inquiring into claims by Maori relating to the Treaty of Waitangi and its principles;

And whereas In 1987 Te Runanga o Ngati Porou, a corporate body, was established under Crown legislation even though Maori of the Waiapu north were opposed. The military alliance between McLean and Ngati Porou clergymen of 1865 was

institutionalized in 1987 and is manifest today in the political alliance between the Crown and Te Runanga o Ngati Porou;

And whereas in 1990 the right of Maori claimants before the Waitangi Tribunal to the observance of the principles of natural justice by the Waitangi Tribunal was recognized in the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act;

And whereas in 2003 the first claim was submitted to the Waitangi Tribunal on behalf of Ruawaipu;

And whereas Ruawaipu historical claims to the Waitangi Tribunal are founded on the following premises (1) Ruawaipu did not cede sovereignty over their lands to the British under the authentic version of the Treaty of Waitangi; and (2) Ruawaipu are the rightful owners of the lands and natural resources situated within their traditional boundaries;

And whereas a corrupt New Zealand settler government and the Ngati Porou political elite led by Dr Apirana Mahuika have colluded to enact the Ngati Porou Claims Settlement Act 2012 that removes the jurisdiction of the Waitangi Tribunal from inquiring into Ruawaipu historical Treaty of Waitangi claims so as (1) to defeat the legitimate challenges by Ruawaipu to British sovereignty over Ruawaipu lands; and (2) to defeat the legitimate challenges by Ruawaipu to Ngati Porou's false claims of traditional ownership of Ruawaipu lands;

And whereas the Waitangi Tribunal, the High Court, Prime Minister John Key, Treaty Minister and Attorney-General Christopher Finlayson, the Maori Affairs Select Committee that considered the Ngati Porou Claims Settlement Bill which included Parekura Horomia of the Ngati Porou tribe, Justice Minister Judith Collins, the Human Rights Commission, the Governor-General, and the New Zealand Parliament, each being empowered to take some special measure to protect Ruawaipu rights and interests from a bogus settlement process and the ensuing settlement Act, failed or refused to do so;

And whereas a public notice calling a Ruawaipu tribal meeting was advertised in the Gisborne Herald Newspaper on 21<sup>st</sup> April 2012 to commence this 28<sup>th</sup> day of April 2012 at 11 a.m. at 131A Rutene Road, Gisborne to consider the ratification by Ruawaipu of the draft "Declarations and resolutions of the Ruawaipu indigenous people regarding New Zealand's abuse of Ruawaipu human rights";

## DECLARATIONS

*Now therefore*, with our free, prior and informed consent, we the undersigned persons being over the age of 18 years who consider our tribal identity as Ruawaipu, assembled at Turanga (Gisborne) this 28<sup>th</sup> day of April 2012, having duly considered, debated, and contemplated the implications of the Ngati Porou Claims Settlement Act 2012 for us, and having considered and freely discussed the draft "Declarations and

resolutions of the Ruawaipu indigenous people regarding New Zealand's abuse of Ruawaipu human rights," are moved to declare and hereby declare the following:

- (1) Ruawaipu declare that at no time did Te Runanga o Ngati Porou have the mandate of Ruawaipu to negotiate the comprehensive settlement of all Ruawaipu historical Treaty of Waitangi claims on behalf of Ruawaipu; and
- (2) Ruawaipu declare that the Ruawaipu Iwi Te Tiriti Claims Settlement Authority established by Ruawaipu on 10 April 2010 is the organization duly mandated and authorized to represent Ruawaipu in respect of all aspects pertaining to the just settlement of Ruawaipu historical Treaty of Waitangi claims; and
- (3) Ruawaipu declare that signatures to a petition that the government relied on for its decision that Ruawaipu claims were appropriately included within the scope of Te Runanga o Ngati Porou's mandate were acquired under a false pretence and that the government has failed or refused to carry out a proper inquiry into the fraud allegations in order to avoid the political implications for the government if the fraud allegations were to be proved; and
- (4) Ruawaipu declare their rejection of the Ngati Porou Treaty settlement as a valid settlement of Ruawaipu historical Treaty of Waitangi claims as the settlement has the aim or effect of settling such claims without the free, prior and informed consent of Ruawaipu; and
- (5) Ruawaipu declare their refusal to recognize the Ngati Porou Claims Settlement Act 2012 as legally valid given that the Bill was unlawfully introduced to Parliament when Attorney-General Christopher Finlayson refused to comply with the mandatory requirements of section 7 of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990<sup>1</sup> so as not to interfere with his political objectives as Treaty Minister in charge of the Bill; and
- (6) Ruawaipu declare their historical Treaty of Waitangi grievances against the British Monarch (the Crown) as unresolved; and
- (7) Ruawaipu declare that the government's policy of settling historical Treaty of Waitangi claims with large natural groupings has been purposely misapplied in the East Coast district case in order to meet a political agenda, as the Ngati

Bill.

required him to do so as not to interfere with his political objectives and Treaty Minister responsible for the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Section 7 NZBORA required the Attorney-General Christopher Finlayson to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives at the time the Bill was introduced to the House of Representatives any provisions in the Bill that appeared to be inconsistent with any of the rights and freedoms contained in the NZBORA. Clauses 12 and 13 of the Bill, had the aim of blocking the Waitangi Tribunal from inquiring into Ruawaipu historical Treaty of Waitangi claims. Those provisions were therefore inconsistent with section 27(1) NZBORA which affirms the right of Ruawaipu claimants to the observance of the principles of natural justice by the Waitangi Tribunal when pursuing their claims. Christopher Finlayson did not do so. Christopher Finlayson refrained from doing something he reasonably ought to have known the law

Porou party to the settlement does not represent a large natural grouping. Instead it represents an artificial construct engineered in the aftermath of the 1865 East Coast war; and

- (8) Ruawaipu declare that the New Zealand government's refusal to recognize Ruawaipu as a distinct tribal entity separate from Ngati Porou, is a violation of the human rights of Ruawaipu to be different from Ngati Porou, to be considered different from Ngati Porou, and to be respected as such, such right being affirmed in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; and
- (9) Ruawaipu declare that the Ngati Porou Claims Settlement Act 2012 which, without Ruawaipu free, prior and informed consent, removes the jurisdiction of the Waitangi Tribunal from inquiring into Ruawaipu historical Treaty of Waitangi claims, abuses Ruawaipu rights to justice before the Waitangi Tribunal as recognized by section 27(1) of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990; and
- (10) Ruawaipu declare that the government's airing of grievances procedure which Member of the New Zealand House of Representatives Nanaia Mahuta advocates as a government 'innovation' does not restore to Ruawaipu their section 27(1) New Zealand Bill of Rights Act right and is nothing more than a government sham designed to trick James Anaya the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples into thinking that the government has adopted his recommendation<sup>2</sup> that it take special measures to address the concerns of Ruawaipu in the Waitangi Tribunal's East Coast District case; and
- (11) Ruawaipu declare that the Ngati Porou Claims Settlement Act 2012 abuses Ruawaipu indigenous rights enshrined in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as follows:
  - a. The Act is based on the incorrect and unproven assumption that Ruawaipu are not a distinct tribal people. This contravenes **Article 7** of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples ("UNDRIP") which affirms the collective right of indigenous peoples to live as distinct peoples; and
  - b. The Act dispossesses Ruawaipu of their lands, territories, and resources, and subjects Ruawaipu to forced assimilation or integration by a Ngati Porou culture or way of life imposed by legislative measures in violation of **Article 8** of the UNDRIP which affirms the rights of indigenous

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In his 31 May 2011 Addendum report on the situation of Maori people in New Zealand (AHRC/18/35/Add.4) James Anaya recommended (at para 73) that the government should take special measures to address the concerns of the Ruawaipu, Ngati Uepohatu and Te Aitanga-a-Hauiti iwi, in relation to the East Coast District settlement case.

peoples and individuals not to be subjected to forced assimilation or destruction of their culture; and

- c. The Act results from a settlement process that has allowed for only Ngati Porou participation. Ruawaipu tribal members who wished to participate to express their opposition to the process, had to give up their Ruawaipu tribal identity and pretend they were Ngati Porou. This situation contravened **Article 9** of the UNDRIP which affirms the rights of individuals to belong to a Ruawaipu indigenous community in accordance with Ruawaipu traditions and customs; and
- d. The Act propagates a false history to the detriment of the Ruawaipu people. The powerful write out the powerless by denying their agency and the legitimacy of their beliefs or actions. This contravenes **Article 15** of the UNDRIP which affirms the right of the Ruawaipu people to the dignity and diversity of their culture, traditions, histories and aspirations, and the right to have their culture, traditions, histories and aspirations appropriately reflected in public information; and
- e. The Act results from a settlement process that has denied Ruawaipu participation in a process that has affected their rights. Only Ngati Porou were allowed to participate in the process of mandating Te Runanga o Ngati Porou, and the process to ratifying the deed of settlement. After the Ruawaipu people had established the Ruawaipu Iwi Te Tiriti Claims Settlement Authority ("the Authority") to represent Ruawaipu in respect of the settlement of Ruawaipu claims, Treaty Minister Finlayson refused to recognize the Authority. This contravened **Article 18** of the UNDRIP which affirms the rights of indigenous peoples to participate in decision-making in matters which would affect their rights, through representatives chosen by themselves in accordance with their own procedures; and
- f. The Act results from a settlement process where at no stage did the New Zealand government consult and cooperate in good faith with the Ruawaipu people through their own representative institutions in order to obtain their free prior and informed consent before introducing the Ngati Porou Claims Settlement Bill to the House of Representatives intended to remove the jurisdiction of the Waitangi Tribunal to inquire into Ruawaipu historical Treaty of Waitangi claims. This contravenes Article 19 of the UNDRIP which provides that States shall consult and cooperate in good faith with the indigenous peoples concerned through their own representative institutions in order to obtain their free, prior and informed consent before adopting and implementing legislative or administrative measures that may affect them; and
- g. The Act legalizes a settlement that does not provide just and fair redress to the Ruawaipu people for Crown acts and omissions done in breach of

Treaty principle that has deprived them of their subsistence and development. This contravenes **Article 20** of the UNDRIP which provides that indigenous peoples deprived of their means of subsistence and development are entitled to just and fair redress; and

- h. The Act legalizes the illegitimate transfer of lands and resources to the Ngati Porou people which under customary law belong to the Ruawaipu people. This violates the rights of the Ruawaipu people to maintain and strengthen their distinctive spiritual relationship with their traditionally owned or otherwise occupied and used lands, territories, waters and coastal seas and other resources and to uphold their responsibilities to future generations of Ruawaipu people in this regard as affirmed in **Article 25** of the UNDRIP which provides that indigenous peoples have the right to maintain and strengthen their distinctive spiritual relationship with their traditionally owned or otherwise occupied and used lands, territories, waters and coastal seas and other resources and to uphold their responsibilities to future generations in this regard; and
- i. The Act fails to recognize the right of the Ruawaipu people to the lands, territories, and resources which they have traditionally owned. The Act fails to accord legal recognition and protection to Ruawaipu lands, territories and resources with due respect to Ruawaipu customs, traditions and land tenure systems, in violation of **Article 26** of the UNDRIP which affirms the right of indigenous peoples to the lands, territories and resources which they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used or acquired and provides that States shall give legal recognition and protection to these lands, territories and resources. Such recognition shall be conducted with due respect to the customs, traditions and land tenure systems of the indigenous peoples concerned; and
- j. The Act fails to provide the Ruawaipu people with redress for the lands, territories and resources which they have traditionally owned which have been taken without their free, prior and informed consent in violation of **Article 28** of the UNDRIP which affirms the rights of indigenous peoples to redress, by means that can include restitution or, when this is not possible, just, fair and equitable compensation, for the lands, territories and resources which they have traditionally owned or otherwise occupied or used, and which have been confiscated, taken, occupied, used or damaged without their free, prior and informed consent; and
- k. The Act illegitimately transfers lands and resources to the Ngati Porou people which under customary law belong to the Ruawaipu people. This impedes the right of the Ruawaipu people to determine and develop strategies for the development or use of their lands or territories and other resources in contravention of **Article 32** of the UNDRIP which affirms the rights of indigenous peoples to determine and develop priorities and

> strategies for the development or use of their lands or territories and other resources; and

- The Act is based on the incorrect government assumption, without any evidence, that a Ruawaipu tribal identity does not exist. The Act therefore contravenes Article 33 of the UNDRIP which affirms the rights of indigenous peoples to determine their own identity in accordance with their customs and traditions; and
- (12) Ruawaipu declare that there is a pressing need for the United Nations to sanction and coordinate the establishment of the New Zealand Maori Protectorate, being an institution independent of the settler government and mandated by Maori to protect Maori rights, given the reality that New Zealand's Human Rights Commission is not an effective intervening mechanism for protecting the human rights of vulnerable Maori.

Motion that the above declarations be made:

Moved: (Name) Conrad Vates Signature: Seconded: (Name) Christine Beach Signature: Beach

Motion carried by majority vote / unanimously

## RESOLUTIONS

As a consequence of the above declarations, being determined more than ever to bring the ends of justice for ourselves and future Ruawaipu generations, and to ensure that New Zealand's settler establishment is held to account for its human rights abuses against us and other vulnerable Maori tribes, we are moved to resolve and hereby resolve the following:

- Ruawaipu resolves to fight the Queen of England and Her Majesty's New Zealand settler administration forever and ever and ever, until justice to Ruawaipu is seen to be done; the authentic Treaty of Waitangi is duly recognized and honoured; and Ruawaipu human rights enshrined in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples are realized and respected; and
- Ruawaipu resolves to do everything within its power to expose New Zealand's human rights abuses of vulnerable Maori to the international community of nations; and

- Ruawaipu resolves to endorse and support the submitting of a human rights complaint to the United Nations by the Ruawaipu Iwi Te Tiriti Claims Settlement Authority on behalf of Ruawaipu, in accordance with the United Nations complaints process; and
- Ruawaipu resolves to champion the drive to establish the New Zealand Maori (4)Protectorate as an institution independent of the settler government and mandated by Maori to protect Maori rights.

Motion that the	above	resol	lutions	be	made:
-----------------	-------	-------	---------	----	-------

(Name) JUNE PAPUNI Signature: Sig

Motion carried by majority vote / unanimously

Dated at Turanga this 28<sup>th</sup> day of April 2012

Name and address (or contact telephone or email)	Signature
1 Christine Beach 0277868415	Begiel
2 June Parkini O210451984	fole.
3 Sharm Harmy 022 1229505	Stern
4 consadyates @ gnail.com Consad Jates 0226 423186	(2)R.
5 Rayrod Trongson 8689903	Raymothanon
6 Henry Koia 8670606	
7 Bob KAA 068648120	RELA
8 KRANA KOPUA KAA 068648120	EKW Kra
MEHLIA PAPLINI 06-8633 601	Mr. La pienie
10 Jasen Koja 8684371	T.
11 Katring Koig 8686732	KNOW

12 JURY KOTA	Justos
12 JURY KOIA 13 MARU KOIA	4 Kara
14 Long Cross	0600
14 (ona Cross 15 Ellen Koig 021 1716/22	EDED.
16 Reg Rangehurg	RIND
17 January	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	