

<b>COMPLAINT NUMBER</b>	21/402
<b>ADVERTISER</b>	1Law4All
<b>ADVERTISEMENT</b>	1Law4All booklet
<b>DATE OF MEETING</b>	1 February 2022
<b>OUTCOME</b>	Upheld Advertisement not to be distributed

### Summary of the Complaints Board Decision

The Complaints Board upheld complaints about a booklet advertisement for 1Law4All, calling for “one nation and not separatism or tribalism” and “the repeal of ALL race-based laws”. The Board said some content in the booklet was offensive and misleading. The Board said while a more liberal interpretation of the Code applied under Rule 2(e) Advocacy advertising, this did not save the advertisement.

### Advertisement

The advertisement was a 34-page booklet which was delivered to letterboxes in parts of Auckland. The booklet was titled “To ALL New Zealanders - Are we being conned by the Treaty industry? - Please consider the list of 24 common myths of the Treaty industry, and ask yourself why a growing number of New Zealanders are upset with this wealth and power grab by the newly created tribal elite. Let us have one nation and not separatism or tribalism.”

The first chapter of the booklet is headed “Some of the myths on which the treaty industry is based... we list below some of these myths and the written historical truths that demolish them” 24 “Myths” are then listed, and further detail provided for each. Other chapter headings are: “Legislation Dividing New Zealanders by Race” and “Attack on Private Property Rights”. Page 32 of the booklet says: Published by 1Law4All. Donations can be made to: 1Law4All - Rolling Thunder account: 03-0389-0770280-02 Website: [www.1Law4All.kiwi.nz](http://www.1Law4All.kiwi.nz) Email: [treatybooklet@1law4all.kiwi.nz](mailto:treatybooklet@1law4all.kiwi.nz)

### Summary of the Complaints

There were six complaints about this advertisement. The Complainants were concerned the booklet was offensive and misleading because it contained harmful stereotypes designed to perpetuate racism, and historical information which had not been substantiated. The Complainants also said the booklet did not clearly separate fact from the author’s opinion.

Specific concerns identified by the Complainants included the following: the description of Māori as “Stone Age” people, the use of the term “half-caste”, the suggestion that colonisation was good for Māori, phrases like “a result of several generations of Maoris preferring to breed with Europeans rather than with their own kind” and attributing to Māori: “lazy and indolent habits which keeps them at the bottom of the socio-economic heap.”

The full versions of the complaints can be found in Appendix 1.

### Issues Raised:

- Social responsibility
- Offensiveness
- Truthful presentation
- Advocacy advertising

### Summary of the Advertiser's Response

The Advertiser was initially sent the first three complaints. The Advertiser said the Complainants had not provided any evidence in support of their complaints. The Advertiser also said if they received satisfactory evidence to prove that they had made any errors in the booklet, they would amend it. The Advertiser said they would not enter into any further correspondence on the matter. The Advertiser was then sent the next three complaints and provided no additional response.

The full version of the Advertiser's response can be found in Appendix 2.

### Relevant ASA Codes of Practice

The Acting Chair directed the Complaints Board to consider the complaint with reference to the following codes:

#### ADVERTISING STANDARDS CODE

**Principle 1: Social Responsibility:** Advertisements must be prepared and placed with a due sense of social responsibility to consumers and to society.

**Rule 1(c) Decency and Offensiveness:** Advertisements must not contain anything that is indecent, or exploitative, or degrading, or likely to cause harm, or serious or widespread offence, or give rise to hostility, contempt, abuse or ridicule.

#### Guidelines

Grounds for offence include but are not limited to: gender; race; colour; ethnic or national origin; age; cultural, religious, political or ethical belief; sexual orientation; gender identification; marital status; family status; disability; occupational or employment status.

Advertisements must not exploit, degrade, denigrate, demean or objectify any person or group of people or any products, services, objects or places.

**Principle 2: Truthful Presentation:** Advertisements must be truthful, balanced and not misleading.

**Rule 2(b) Truthful Presentation:** Advertisements must not mislead or be likely to mislead, deceive or confuse consumers, abuse their trust or exploit their lack of knowledge. This includes by implication, inaccuracy, ambiguity, exaggeration, unrealistic claim, omission, false representation or otherwise. Obvious hyperbole identifiable as such is not considered to be misleading.

**Rule 2(e) Advocacy advertising:** Advocacy advertising must clearly state the identity and position of the advertiser. Opinion in support of the advertiser's position must be clearly distinguishable from factual information. Factual information must be able to be substantiated.

#### Excerpt from ASA "Guidance Note on Advocacy Advertising"

For a more liberal interpretation of the Codes to apply to advocacy advertisements, the following is required:

- The identity of the advertiser must be obvious and easily recognised. Where an advertiser is not well known, additional information such as a physical address, website address or phone number may be appropriate to include.
- It must be clear in the advertisement what view the advertiser advocates and ideally this should be clear in their identity.

The Complaints Board said the advertisement before it fell into the category of advocacy advertising and noted the requirements of Rule 2(e) of the Advertising Standards Code. This Rule required the identity of the advertiser to be clear; opinion to be distinguished from factual information and factual information must be able to be substantiated. The Advocacy Principles developed by the Complaints Board in previous decisions considered under Rule 11 of the Code of Ethics remain relevant. They say:

1. That section 14 of the Bill of Rights Act 1990, in granting the right of freedom of expression, allows advertisers to impart information and opinions but that in exercising that right what was factual information and what was opinion, should be clearly distinguishable.
2. That the right of freedom of expression as stated in section 14 is not absolute as there could be an infringement of other people's rights. Care should be taken to ensure that this does not occur.
3. That the Codes fetter the rights granted by section 14 to ensure there is fair play between all parties on controversial issues. Therefore, in advocacy advertising and particularly on political matters the spirit of the Code is more important than technical breaches. People have the right to express their views and this right should not be unduly or unreasonably restricted by Rules.
4. That robust debate in a democratic society is to be encouraged by the media and advertisers and that the Codes should be interpreted liberally to ensure fair play by the contestants.
5. That it is essential in all advocacy advertisements that the identity of the advertiser is clear.

*Role of the ASA when considering an advocacy advertisement.*

The Complaints Board noted its role is to consider the likely consumer takeout of an advertisement and complaints about advocacy advertising are considered differently to complaints about advertising for products and services.

The Board will consider whether the advertisement includes statements of fact or opinion and decide whether any factual claims have been adequately substantiated by the Advertiser and whether the advertisement clearly distinguishes between factual claims and opinion. The Complaints Board noted that a fact is something that is objectively true and can be verified as such whereas an opinion is a personal belief. Others may agree or disagree with an opinion, but they cannot prove or disprove it. Some statements contain both fact and opinion. The Board referred to the ASA Guidance Note on Advocacy which says:

“Evidence may be cited in support of the opinion, but it should be clear it supports an opinion rather than being the full factual position. Evidence in support of an opinion should be clearly cited and readily obtainable. Academic studies are often cited as evidence. Such studies are treated as expert opinion rather than the full factual situation...the Board will not determine which of competing academic studies or other

evidence is correct. The Complaints Board's only role is to determine whether there has been a breach of the ASA Codes, taking into account the Advocacy Principles."

The Complaints Board observed that in a free and democratic society, issues should be openly debated without undue hindrance or interference from authorities such as the Complaints Board, and in no way should political parties, politicians, lobby groups or advocates be unnecessarily fettered by a technical or unduly strict interpretation of the rules and regulations.

Under Rule 2(e) Advocacy advertising of the Advertising Standards Code:

- The identity of the advertiser must be clear
- Opinion must be clearly distinguishable from factual information, and
- Factual information must be able to be substantiated.

If the identity and position of the Advertiser is clear, a more liberal interpretation of the Advertising Standards Code is allowed.

### **Relevant precedent decision**

In considering this complaint the Complaints Board referred to a precedent decision, Decision 19/095, which was Upheld.

The full version of this decision can be found on the ASA website:

<https://www.asa.co.nz/decisions/>

**Decision 19/095** concerned a 1Law4All pamphlet titled "One Treaty, One Nation" which was distributed to households in an Auckland suburb. The pamphlet included statements such as: "The benefits of colonisation for Maoris, lifting them out of a violent Stone Age existence, far outweighed any negative consequences. The treaty put an end to cannibalism, slavery, infanticide, and the constant inter-tribal wars which had killed about a third of the population in the previous 20 years. With Western medicine Maori life expectancy has risen from 20 to 25 years (1840) to 75 years today", "An end to the stranglehold that one minority group has over the culture and life of a nation" and "The Maori people ceded sovereignty to Queen Victoria in 1840..."

A majority of the Complaints Board agreed a more liberal interpretation of the Code should apply. The majority agreed that the inclusion of the reference to the website for 1Law4All – [www.1Law4All.kiwi.nz](http://www.1Law4All.kiwi.nz) meant that the identity of the Advertiser was sufficiently clear, in the context of a pamphlet. The Board said the political position being advertised was also clear.

A majority of the Complaints Board said one of the statements in the pamphlet, which describes "the benefits of colonisation" for Māori, was likely to cause serious offence. The majority noted that while the pamphlet is advocating a certain political perspective, the examples used to illustrate this perspective are derogatory and likely to cause serious offence.

### **Complaints Board Discussion**

The Acting Chair noted that the Advertiser had responded to the first three complaints and then additional complaints had been received. These new complaints were also sent to the Advertiser. No response to these new complaints was received.

The Acting Chair noted that the Complaints Board's role was to consider whether there had been a breach of the Advertising Standards Code. In deciding whether the Code has been breached the Complaints Board has regard to all relevant matters including:

- Generally prevailing community standards

- Previous decisions
- The consumer takeout of the advertisement, and
- The context, medium, audience and the product or service being advertised, which in this case is:
  - Context: Ongoing political debate in New Zealand about how legislation can (or, in this case, should) be written to be consistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. Recent examples include the Three Waters and health sector reforms.
  - Medium: 34 Page Booklet delivered to suburban letterboxes
  - Audience: Household in central Auckland suburbs
  - Product: 1Law4All policies

### *Consumer Takeout*

The Complaints Board agreed the likely consumer takeout of the advertisement was it is a 34 page booklet promoting a particular political viewpoint, that New Zealand is “one nation”, Māori shouldn’t be given any special treatment, they have been given land and money they don’t deserve and all “race-based laws” should be repealed. The Board said this viewpoint is based on a particular interpretation of New Zealand history and the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi. The Advertiser also offered the reader the opportunity to make donations to support its organisation.

The Complaints Board noted the precedent decision, 19/095, regarding previous complaints about a two-sided pamphlet for 1Law4All, which was also delivered to households in the Auckland area. The Board noted this pamphlet was also advocacy advertising conveying political opinion.

### *Is the booklet an advertisement?*

The Complaints Board agreed that although the booklet was 34 pages long it was still an advertisement and the Advertising Standards Code applied. This is because the booklet met the definition of an advertisement as the content was controlled by the Advertiser and had the intent of influencing those to whom it is addressed, it also sought donations from readers.

The current ASA definition of advertisement states: “Advertising and advertisement(s)” are any message, the content of which is controlled directly or indirectly by the advertiser, expressed in any language and communicated in any medium with the intent to influence the choice, opinion or behaviour of those to whom it is addressed.

The Advertising Standards Code, under the heading Application of the Code states: “This Code applies to all advertisements placed in any media.”

When the ASA updated its definition of “advertisement” in 2016 it removed the list of media platforms, as that information dated as more platforms developed, so the focus is now advertiser control of the content.

### *Is the booklet advocacy advertising?*

The Complaints Board agreed the booklet was an advocacy advertisement calling for changes to New Zealand legislation.

The Complaints Board referred to the ASA Guidance Note on Advocacy Advertising, which includes the following definition of Advocacy Advertising: “Advocacy advertising is often characterised by parties having differing views that are expressed in robust terms. This is especially so when there is proposed legislation or a referendum on an issue. Examples include abortion, fluoridation, immunisation and legalisation of marijuana. Government

advertising on a range of health and safety initiatives are also likely to be advocacy advertising.”

*Did the advertisement meet the requirements of advocacy advertising:*

*Was the identity and position of the Advertiser clear?*

*Was opinion in support of the Advertiser's position clearly distinguishable from factual information, and*

*Was factual information able to be substantiated?*

A majority of the Complaints Board agreed the identity and position of the Advertiser was clear. The majority noted that p.32 of the booklet said “Published by 1Law4All. Donations can be made to: 1Law4All - Rolling Thunder account: 03-0389-0770280-02 Website: [www.1Law4All.kiwi.nz](http://www.1Law4All.kiwi.nz) Email: [treatybooklet@1law4all.kiwi.nz](mailto:treatybooklet@1law4all.kiwi.nz)”

A minority disagreed. The minority said the identity of the Advertiser was not sufficiently clear. This is because there is no mention of the name of the Advertiser on the front or back covers of the booklet or in the opening pages. It is not till the second Appendix, Appendix B, on p.32 of the booklet that the name and contact details of the Advertiser are mentioned.

In accordance with the majority, the Complaints Board ruled a more liberal interpretation of the Advertising Standards Code therefore applied.

The Complaints Board agreed that opinion in support of the Advertiser's position was not clearly distinguishable from factual information. Although the booklet presented a particular political interpretation of New Zealand history, this was presented as “written historical truths” which contradict the commonly believed “myths”. Examples of this lack of clarity between factual statements and opinion include: “There is only one treaty”, “Cannibalism, ritual human sacrifice, slavery, female infanticide, witch-doctory and a lack of any form of law and order were features of their Stone Age existence” and “...even the Maoris don’t believe that they are indigenous”.

The Complaints Board noted that no substantiation for any factual claims made in the advertisement had been provided by the Advertiser.

The Complaints Board ruled the advertisement was in breach of Rule 2(e) as the advertisement did not clearly distinguish fact and opinion and no substantiation had been provided.

*Was the advertisement offensive?*

The Complaints Board agreed the advertisement was likely to cause serious offence. This was due to the overall takeout of the advertisement and the use of certain terms which denigrated Māori. The Board referred to specific examples from the advertisement, such as the use of the terms “half-caste”<sup>1</sup>, “Stone Age”, “lazy and indolent”, all terms which are generally regarded as offensive.

The Complaints Board also referred to the text: “There is no such thing as an ethnic Maori and there do not appear to be even more than a few half-castes – a result of several generations of Maoris preferring to breed with Europeans rather than with their own kind”, and the text “a lack of any form of law and order were features of their Stone Age existence”.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/half-caste>

The Complaints Board said the fact the booklet was delivered to letterboxes without the invitation or authorisation from the householder increased the likelihood of it being found offensive by the untargeted audience.

The Complaints Board said the advertisement was not saved by advocacy. The Complaints Board acknowledged the protection granted to freedom of expression under the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act and noted this freedom is not absolute. One of the fetters on freedom of expression is the Advertising Codes of Practice. Although the advertiser is entitled to advertise their political views, the Advertising Standards Code requires them to do so in a way which is not likely to cause harm, or serious or widespread offence.

With regard to context, the Complaints Board referred to a recent Broadcasting Standards Authority (BSA) decision, which found an exchange between stand-in Magic Talk host John Banks and a caller, including denigrating comments about Māori culture, breached broadcasting standards. The decision said the comments broadcast had the potential to cause significant harm within society, particularly among Māori communities.

*Was the advertisement misleading?*

The Complaints Board agreed the advertisement was misleading. This is because the Advertiser did not clearly distinguish opinion from factual information, nor did it provide any substantiation for any factual statements made in the advertisement.

The Complaints Board noted the advertisement referred to certain historical events and then interpreted them in a manner which was influenced by a particular political perspective. The Board said the Advertiser did not make it clear that the views expressed were opinions. The Board noted the Advertiser described its opinions on the interpretation of historical events as “truths”.

*Was the advertisement prepared and placed with a due sense of social responsibility to consumers and to society?*

The Complaints Board agreed the advertisement had not been prepared and placed with a due sense of social responsibility to consumers and to society. This is because it was misleading and likely to cause serious offence.

The Complaints Board ruled the advertisement was in breach of Principle 1, Rule 1(c), Principle 2, Rule 2(b) and Rule 2(e) of the Advertising Standards Code.

## **Outcome**

The Complaints Board ruled the complaint was **Upheld**.

Advertisement not to be distributed.

### **APPEAL INFORMATION**

According to the procedures of the Advertising Standards Complaints Board, all decisions are able to be appealed by any party to the complaint. Information on our Appeal process is on our website, [www.asa.co.nz](http://www.asa.co.nz). Appeals must be made in writing with notification of the intent to appeal lodged within 14 calendar days of receipt of the written decision. The substantive appeal application must be lodged with the ASA within 21 calendar days of receipt of the written decision.

## APPENDICES

1. Complaints
  2. Response from Advertiser
- 

### Appendix 1

#### COMPLAINT 1

The pamphlet (enclosed in the attached PDF) was put through the letterbox this week which contains serious misinformation intended to incite hate towards Māori and divisiveness between racial groups based on antiquated stereotypes (ie. cannibalism) and selective readings of Te Tiriti. I believe it to breach the standards as follows in rule 1c: Advertisements must not contain anything... likely to cause harm, or serious or widespread offence, or give rise to hostility, contempt, abuse. as well as rule 2b as follows: Advertisements must not mislead or be likely to mislead, deceive or confuse consumers, abuse their trust or exploit their lack of knowledge. This includes by implication, inaccuracy, ambiguity, exaggeration, unrealistic claim, omission, false representation or otherwise.

I've given some examples below - page numbers correspond to the PDF uploaded to the original complaint. I find the below statements to enforce harmful stereotypes and to be of a racist nature designed to perpetuate racism towards indigenous communities, as well as historical misinformation.

- Claims of cannibalism and ritual human sacrifice p. 2
- Describing Māori as 'Stone Age' people p. 3
- Affirmations of the idea that colonisation was good for Māori and reinforcements of the white supremacist idea that Western ways of life are better p. 4-5
- Misinformation about the Waikato war that invalidates the large-scale loss of life and horrors that occurred.

(As laid out in the following, for reference O'Malley, Vincent. Te Rohe Potae War and Raupatu: A report commissioned by the Waitangi Tribunal. Wai 898, #A22. Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal, 2010.

[https://forms.justice.govt.nz/search/Documents/WT/WT\\_DOC\\_791880/Wai%20898%2C%20A022.pdf](https://forms.justice.govt.nz/search/Documents/WT/WT_DOC_791880/Wai%20898%2C%20A022.pdf))

- Use of the offensive term "half-caste" and racist phrases like "a result of several generations of Maoris preferring to breed with Europeans rather than with their own kind." p. 7
- Attributing to Māori, "lazy and indolent habits which keeps them at the bottom of the socio-economic heap." p. 27

#### COMPLAINT 2

This unsolicited, 36-page glossy booklet by the organisation 1Law4All appeared in my letterbox in Herne Bay, Auckland today, 19/07/21. From a 2019 media article (NZ Herald, 23/07/19), I understand that you may have previously ruled on this publication (or a similar one), requiring it to be removed from circulation. Apparently, it has not been. Title: "To ALL New Zealanders, Are we being Conned by the Treaty Industry?" Front cover information: "Please consider the list of 24 common myths of the Treaty industry, and ask yourself why a growing number of New Zealanders are upset with this wealth and power grab by the newly created tribal elite". "Let us have one nation and not separatism or tribalism." The pamphlet is racist towards Māori and offensive.



### COMPLAINT 3

We received a 32 page pamphlet in our letter box titled "Are we being conned by the treaty industry?". The pamphlet is full of racist discourses that clearly aims to promote racism and hate towards Māori. It is deeply offensive and dismissive of the immense harm caused by colonisation. The pamphlet details "myths" about te tiriti o waitangi and the impact on society. The information provided in the pamphlet is divisive and incorrect. Promotion of such racist rhetoric should not be permitted to be widely distributed as advertising. I understand that previous versions of this groups pamphlet have been complained about through the ASA. I hope that the ASA can review this brochure swiftly to prevent further harm caused by the offensive material. I am happy to write a more detailed complaint outlining the key issues.

### COMPLAINT 4

The authors hateful recommendations are definitely not welcome in my mailbox and they should have known not to peddle their unsolicited mail by the very obvious sign upon it.

I am very disturbed to find that this 32-page diatribe of racist rhetoric has been circulating since at least August '21, please see this story by Rukuwai Tipene-Allen: 'Are we being conned by the Treaty Industry'

Below are a few of the statements which I believe will cause widespread offence by their inflammatory and derogatory nature. I will not list everything I find offensive as there is no point because I find the entire booklet highly offensive. It is filled with divisive language and false statements which do not clearly separate fact from the authors opinion. I am sending you the copy of the booklet I received in my letterbox - which incidentally has a label clearly stating 'no advertising material'.

I will not write beside every comment below why I find it offensive because I think it is so obvious. If need be I will endeavour to elaborate. To be honest, I cannot even find the words right now to describe my anger and disappointment that literature such as this is allowed to be distributed freely.

Page 1

Para 1. "In order for one minority group of New Zealanders - part-Maoris - to get special privileges..." [because they and their advocates misrepresent NZ history so that Maori are portrayed as victims]. The authors accusing Maori advocates of misrepresentation and insinuates that 'part-Maori's' are not actually Maori. Throughout the booklet the author refers to Maori and 'Part-Maori', and explains that there are not any 'actual' Maori left.

Para 2. "The distortion of history is a necessary pre-condition for the tribal grab for wealth and power that has insidiously taken place since 1975".

Para 3 is the prelude to "clear the air with a few truths" including 'outing' no less than 24 'Myths' in subsequent pages. This paragraph clearly states the authors opinions are 'truths', which is misleading. The author depicts major events as 'Myths' which is offensive in itself, such as Myth #1 - Maori are not indigenous people of New Zealand.

Myth # 4 suggests that Tahoe and Tainui, received settlements by way of default and "should return to the taxpayer their recent substantial Treaty settlements..."

Myth #5 labels the Maori of 1840 "Stone Age chiefs". This is clearly intended to be derogatory.

Myth #9 "For a society that had not even invented the wheel or writing..." - this suggests that in 1840 Maori were not yet intelligent humans!

Myth #14 states the Maori name for NZ is not Aotearoa. All languages evolve over time. Aotearoa is universally known to be, and is the Maori name for New Zealand.

Myth 15 states Tuheitia cannot possibly or legally be a Maori King because he is a subject of Queen Elizabeth II. This statement is insensitive and offensive and derides Maori culture.

Myth #16 "...there do not appear to be even more than a few half-casts - a result of several generations of Maoris preferring to breed with Europeans rather than with their own kind." Preferring to Breed? Their own kind? This is a vile statement.

Myth #24. "The truths contained in this booklet are a threat to the multi-billion dollar Treaty industry which is enriching the small tribal elite without doing anything meaningful for ordinary Maoris." What truths? And Settlements do nothing meaningful?

Page 13, Paras 1 & 2 suggests that laws which protect Maori customs "strips others of the right to full and equal citizenship", then follows on with fourteen pages of what he calls an 'incomplete list' of examples which are aimed at belittling Maori history, culture and language.

Page 27 "part-Maoris who, by receiving so many rights and resources without having to work for them, too often develop lazy and indolent habits which keeps them at the bottom of the socio-economic heap..."

I cannot believe this racist twat gets away with publishing this demeaning propaganda, delivers it to me against my wishes, and is offering me an account number to donate money for his cause.

Regardless of my own opinion, as you have pointed out a previous ASA ruling for complaint no. 19/095 relates to some identical material by the same publisher. I therefore assume this version of the booklet is also in breach of Principle 1 and Rule 1(c) of the Advertising Standards Code.

## **COMPLAINT 5**

This booklet contains inflammatory misinformation. This information is presented in a pseudo academic manner

## **COMPLAINT 6**

There have been two deliveries of the same pamphlet peddling myths around Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Maori rights and sovereignty to a relative's property in Herne Bay, Auckland. This pamphlet contains highly offensive and incorrect information including claims that: - Maori are not indigenous to New Zealand - Maori were cannibals, archaic and lived a "Stone Age existence" - Full sovereignty was ceded through Te Tiriti - this is a myth and due to historical inaccuracies in translation. - There is only one version of Te Tiriti - see note above. This is not true. - Colonisation was "good" for Maori - Maoridom has produced only one "great thinker". - There is harm in having co-governance agreements between Crown and Maori. - Maoris "preferred" to breed with Europeans. This is a disgusting claim based on zero evidence. - Having Maori lineage negates the concept of one being tangata whenua. - The Waitangi Tribunal is biased and "the enemy of truth". - There is a "wealth and power grab" from a "tribal elite" - sounds pretty similar to what happened to Maori in the 1800s. Not one of these claims is backed up by a reputable source or substantial evidence. Further, these claims are from an entirely biased and privileged Pakeha perspective. I find these "claims" from a faceless and cowardly organisation disturbing and abhorrent and request the organisation 1Law4All (Rolling Thunder) immediately cease any publication and distribution of any such documents.

## Appendix 2

### RESPONSE FROM ADVERTISER, 1LAW4ALL

The society notes that the complainant mainly utilises logical fallacies. I.e. Provides no evidence in support of her claim.

E.g. Argument by assertion.

>The pamphlet . . . contains serious misinformation . . .

Where is the complainant's credible evidence that would support of such a bald assertion?

E.g. Fallacy of Presumption

>The pamphlet . . . [is] . . . intended to incite hate . . .

How can the complainant know that? Such an assertion can be no more than a prejudicial, personal-belief presumption.

If there are any errors in the information booklet, the society will make any requisite amendments, subject to satisfactory empirical proof of the error being provided.

Those points observed, the society will not enter in to any further correspondence on the matter.