

# MAORI & THE TREATY

*The Truth Exposed*

Written by Kerry Butler due to concerns about the unjustified (and racist) policy of granting exclusive 'rights' to one category of New Zealand citizens.

If you're reading this on a large screen, hold the Ctrl keyboard button down, and press **minus** (—) to reduce the size.

With a Tablet, turn it on its edge so that the screen is taller.

**You'll be shocked by this  
revealing scrutiny.**

**Allow quarter of an hour to read it all.**

**It'll be the most enlightening  
fifteen minutes of your life.**

## CONTENTS

IS THE TREATY A PARTNERSHIP .....	3
MAORI ARE NOT INDIGENOUS .....	7
TANGATA WHENUA .....	9
THE TREATY AGREEMENT .....	11
TREATY PRINCIPLES .....	20
IS COLONISATION BAD FOR MAORI .....	22
PRIVILEGED PEOPLE .....	24
SOME FACTS TO MULL OVER .....	26
THE RACIST HE PUAPUA AGENDA .....	30

# WAS THE TREATY INTENDED AS A PARTNERSHIP

?

The short answer to the above question is:  
**NO.**

And the longer answer is: **DEFINITELY  
NOT.**

Former Judge, Anthony Willy clarified this, quote:

*"It was, and is, constitutionally impossible for the Crown to enter into a partnership with her subjects. By definition, the Crown is supreme, and the people are subject to her laws."*

The Treaty of Waitangi was intended to give all citizens of this country the same 'rights' as British Subjects. And after Maori signed it, Governor Hobson proclaimed ... *"He iwi tahi tatoa"* (we are now one people.)

He would not have said that if the treaty Agreement had intended for Maori to be in some sort of Partnership which enabled them to continue doing their own thing ... and live their lives under certain laws of their own ... whilst at the same time, gain protection from British Law. And, benefit from British 'rights'. Plus, take advantage of the advanced way of British life. Come on. Get real.

Britain, at the time, was the greatest Empire in the history of the world ... and did not go in for “partnership” agreements with Stone Age chiefs who had been unable to bring peace and order to their land. Thus, Article 1. of the Treaty of Waitangi ceded full sovereignty.

A fact to be kept in mind is that the instruction regarding the Treaty from Lord Normanby to Governor Hobson, was:

***"Walk away if full sovereignty cannot be ceded; as without it, Britain will have no legal basis for bringing order and peace to New Zealand."***

I will also quote part of a speech to Maori in 1860 by Thomas Gore Brown:

*"It is right you should understand that in return for gaining the privileges as British subjects you must prove yourselves to be loyal and faithful subjects. It is necessary that inhabitants acknowledge one Head.*

*New Zealand is the only Colony where the aborigines have been invited to unite with the Colonists and become one people under one law."*

So, it is patently obvious that a partnership was not the intention of the Treaty. When immigrants come to this country these days, they're united with all others, as joint citizens under one law.

The other thing is, a formal "Partnership" would have included Clauses regarding Terms & Conditions. There are none in the Treaty ... simply because there was no partnership to require such clauses. Thus, the whole thing is false.

But now: politicians, bureaucrats, academics, judges, Councils, greenies, DoC, schoolteachers, media and all other politically correct fools have accepted this lie ... due to ignorance, cowardice, or self-interest.

A genuinely decent politician who meant well, was former Prime Minister David Lange, who warned about the danger of pretending that there was a Partnership between the Crown and Maori, quote:

*"It is extremely dangerous to proceed down a path involving any kind of dual sovereignty in New Zealand."*

But this advice has been ignored. So, you do have to ask yourself: WHY?

The answer, of course, can be put down to unscrupulous tactics used by irresponsible politicians to keep themselves in power; albeit short-term ... without considering the long-term unintended consequences, i.e. decisions that are now being made which grant unjustified 'rights' and 'power' to one watered-down, so-called Race.

## MAORI ARE NOT INDIGENOUS TO NEW ZEALAND

Those of Maori lineage need to understand they're not indigenous. They, like the rest of us, are immigrants.

The only difference is that Maoris arrived here a little earlier. Although, we are only talking approximately 770 years ago. Unlike the Aborigines who've been in Australia for over forty thousand years.

To get your head around all this ... Maori were actually in New Zealand a mere 390 years before Abel Tasman.

*Incidentally, the story of a 'great fleet' or 'waka migration' to NZ is a myth. Maori arrived intermittently over a period of time, i.e. seven or eight canoe-loads in total.*

One criteria indicating whether a race is indigenous to the country they are residing in, is that they've developed their language whilst being there. Well, Maori brought their language here with them.

Maori spiritual belief proves that even they have never really considered themselves as indigenous to this country; because at Cape Reinga there's a hillock that, according to Maori lore (and the accompanying sign there) the spirits of dead Maoris leave from on their journey **home** to Hawaiki.

The false belief that Maori are indigenous allows them to claim more 'rights' than everyone else in this country. And, undue power of control over all other citizens!

In 2010 the then National led government was black-mailed by its confidence and supply partner, the Māori Party, and rashly agreed to support the 'United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples' despite dire warnings from the previous Labour government about the document being incompatible with New Zealand's constitutional and legal systems.

The **present** Labour Government have now stated that they aim to be the first in the world to implement this extremely divisive 'Declaration'.

# TANGATA WHENUA

Tangata Whenua is a term used to describe "indigenous" people. Or more so, "**people of the land**".

Well, as already discussed, Maori are not indigenous. To be categorized as such, it is necessary that you should have no knowledge of any other homeland from whence you came.

And regarding being the people of the land; the point is, there's no such thing as an ethnic Maori, and there don't appear to be more than a few half-casts.

What we have now, is a successor race of part-Maoris with more European and other blood in them than Maori, thus **negating** the concept of Tangata Whenua.

Anyway, due to the false belief that part-Maori are, in fact, Tangata Whenua, they have ended up with unintended 'rights'.

Just one example (of many) is the spending by the politically correct 'Health Research Council' on grants, such as:

- \$1.2 million examining the lived experiences of intersectional ethnic minority youth.
- \$387,000 providing gay Maori teenagers with "decolonizing and matauranga Maori-informed bodies of knowledge."
- \$1.1 million using the lunar calendar to help Maori connect with the environment.

*For goodness sake ... !? & \* # @ !+!\* =!!*

# THE TREATY AGREEMENT

The true story about the Treaty Agreement is that Governor Hobson and James Busby drew up a draft known as the Littlewood Document; which was then translated into Maori by the missionary Henry Williams who spoke the language fluently (*this was to ensure Maori knew what they were signing*).

That was the real Agreement called 'Te Tiriti o Waitangi', which was signed by most of the chiefs (about 500 of them).

However, the English 'Littlewood' copy was misplaced after being translated.

Then, to confuse things, Governor Hobson's Secretary ... acting improperly, made his own English "version" of the Treaty, to send to dignitaries overseas. **But**, got the wording wrong and included *fisheries* and *forests* when they weren't meant to be there.

*It may have been considered in early discussions, but were not in the final Littlewood draft.*

The false 'version' that wrongly included *fisheries* and *forests* was neither a draft of the Treaty, nor a translation of it – however, as it turned out, that **unofficial** English document was signed by a few of the chiefs, because there was not enough space on the genuine 'Te Tiriti o Waitangi' document for all the signatures.

Of course, modern Maori have chosen to believe the false document that includes forests and fisheries ... even though it's not based on the "Maori" version that they'd normally have insisted on.

The simple reason being, because it suits them to. There's something in it for them to benefit from.

One thing that should be kept in mind, is the Chiefs would've known that forests and fisheries were not included in the Maori version of the Treaty Agreement that they signed. *And if it had been of importance, they would have refused to sign.*

In **1975** the Treaty of Waitangi Act was created; and the government was stupid enough to make the mistake of adopting the **incorrect** document that had been signed by only a few of the chiefs.

Thus, making it the "official" treaty – and so, displacing Te Tiriti that was signed by nearly 500 chiefs!

The reason being: they presumed that Rev Williams must have stuffed-up the job of translating the English version into Maori ... because Te Tiriti does not include fisheries and forests. Whereas the bogus English version did.

In the interim, the lost genuine (correct) "Littlewood" document that had been used for translating into Maori, was found in 1989. But, ignored as undeniable proof that fisheries and forests were not part of the Treaty Agreement.

The politicians who blithely ignored the new undeniable evidence in the previously lost Littlewood document, obviously must have thought it was too late to go through the procedure of correcting the mistake.

Well, all I have to say on that, is if the situation was reversed, i.e. it'd suddenly been discovered that Maori had been missing out on intended 'rights' ... then politicians would very quickly have found a way of correcting the mistake.

The fact of the matter is, politicians have known about the anomaly, but have let it continue. That is blatant dishonesty.

Therefore, the only way out of it, is for them to keep up the pretence until such time that the new so-called 'Constitution' regarding the future "*going forward*" of our country, is formed.

Maori will realise they've extracted all the spoils they can from the Treaty anyway so would allow it to be scrapped, as it'll now not be seen as applicable to them after all.

A 'Constitution' drafted strictly on their terms, is what would suit them best.

In the meantime ... we continue with an improperly translated Treaty that entrusts to Maori “*their lands and estates, forests, fisheries and other properties*”.

The whole dishonest fiasco should be a case to be re-opened and ruled on by the Supreme Court, or to the UN – and have it corrected before we go any further down the divided track we're lurching along.

The trouble is, when delving into it all, in order to get to the truth, you're up against the guilty, greedy, gullible, and/or gutless who're on the defensive ... so, you find lots of facts are ignored, fabricated or twisted.

Anyway, let's pretend, just for a moment, that fisheries and forests were intended to be 'rights' offered to Maori. And, we had better also pretend property was intended to mean minerals that would one day be valuable. What actually was listed were **lands, dwellings** and all other **property**. The word "property" has been distorted in its meaning.

It would have meant taonga (treasures) such as heirlooms and artefacts. **Personal property.** (*Their 'lands' were already guaranteed to them anyway*). But, 'property' has been twisted to mean Maori can share in riches.

How could it be interpreted as meaning future 'wealth' such as minerals and iron sands, when Maori were unaware such things would one day be valuable.

Then there's the guarantee to fishing. Even if it had been in the Agreement, it wouldn't have been intended to mean having huge tonnages of commercial quota allocated to Maori in the distant future.

The **original** intention would have obviously been to safeguard their ability to feed themselves back then. And, **if** that had been the case, there is now Welfare to cater to their needs instead.

The 'guarantee' to their forests was not needed, as 'lands' was listed ... so, that included their 'forests'.

So anyway, the outcome of the Treaty debacle is that Maori have wrongly been allocated huge tonnages of fishing quota. And are likely to get ownership of all fresh water in this country. And, be gifted the entire foreshore. Not to mention being handed our publicly owned DoC Estate.

**None of this should be happening.**

There are just three clauses (articles) in the Treaty:

### **Article First:**

The chiefs of the Confederation of the United Tribes and other chiefs who haven't joined the confederation, cede to the Queen of England forever, the entire Sovereignty of their country.

## **Article Second:**

The Queen of England confirms and guarantees to the chiefs and tribes, and to all people of New Zealand, the possession of their lands, dwellings and all their property.

But, the Chiefs of the Confederation and the other chiefs grant to the Queen the exclusive right of purchasing such land as the proprietors thereof may be disposed to sell, at such prices as shall be agreed upon between them and the persons appointed by the Queen to purchase from them.

## **Article Third:**

In return for the cession of the Sovereignty to the Queen, the people of New Zealand shall be protected by the Queen of England, and the rights and privileges of British subjects will be granted to them.

## **The response from the chiefs:**

Now we the chiefs of the Confederation of the United Tribes of New Zealand being assembled at Waitangi, and we the other chiefs of New Zealand having understood the meaning of these articles, accept of them and agree to them all. In witness thereof our names and marks are affixed.

Done at Waitangi on February the 4<sup>th</sup> 1840.

---

One of the reasons the "Treaty" was offered to Maori was to protect them from being ripped-off by rat-bag Pakeha swindlers.

Thus the 'Condition' within it, stipulating that as a safeguard, if Maori wished to sell land, then only an Agent of the Crown would be permitted to do the buying.

# TREATY PRINCIPLES

A devious trick the Labour Government pulled off in 1989, was dreaming up the so-called "Principles" of the Treaty ... specifically to advantage trace-element Maori of today; regarding policy to do with all Government Departments, and Health, plus Councils, and also Law.

With the consequence that the Treaty is now referred to in 62 separate Acts of Parliament – when in fact, there is no such thing as treaty Principles. It's a fabrication. False. Made up. And yet, nobody disputes that lie.

Article 3 of the Treaty Agreement clearly stated that everyone in NZ would be equal citizens.

So, any 'arrangements' that specifically influence public policies ... in order to exclusively advantage those of Maori descent, breach the ideal of equality.

Arguments about whether there were any treaty Principles to exclusively advantage Maori can be settled simply by reading what is actually written in the genuine "Treaty" . . .

### **Article Second.**

*The Queen of England confirms and guarantees to the chiefs and tribes, and to all people of New Zealand, the possession of their lands, dwellings and all their property.*

Note the inclusion: *to all people*. (End of dispute).

Meaning ... nobody can logically claim the Treaty was intended in any way to advantage Maori, over and above other New Zealanders. Equal rights is what it was all about.

As an adjunct, lets reverse the scenario; i.e. just imagine the fuss that'd be going on now if the British had been arrogant enough to designate exclusive 'rights' in the Treaty for Pakeha only!

The fact is, the intent was **fairness**. But what we've ended up with, is not.

# WAS COLONISATION BAD FOR MAORI

?

A misconception is that colonisation was bad for Maori. The truth is, the Treaty was the catalyst that brought them from a state of war and anarchy.

Between 1800 and 1840 about one third of the Maori population (43,500) had been killed as a result of tribal warfare – and all lived in constant fear of being attacked by a stronger tribe.

A lack of any form of law and order had led to slavery, cannibalism, female infanticide, and ritual human sacrifice.

The Treaty freed all the chief's slaves (about 10,000 of them) who were then able to get jobs and earn money that they could spend as they liked.

So, for a society that had not invented the wheel or the ability to write, colonisation brought advanced inventions, comforts and modern medicine.

In 1840 the average life expectancy of a Maori was less than 30 years. In 2013 it was 73 years for men and 77 for women.

NZ has the second highest imprisonment rate in the developed world, due largely to crime committed by Maori (*which you can witness with your own eyes*). Of course, the blamers say it's the result of colonisation.

Well, the simple truth is, people are imprisoned for things they themselves have chosen to do. By 1936, Maoris/part-Maoris made up just **11%** of the prison population. This, by the way, was much closer to the period of colonisation than now.

The fact that 85 years later, part-Maori make up around **51%** of the prison population, even though they are only 16% of the population, is due not to colonization, but to bad choices.

# PRIVILEGED PEOPLE

When trying to understand why it is that some Maori consider that they are disadvantaged in their own country, it simply doesn't stack up.

Of course, they'll explain away their failings by playing the blame card, i.e. there aren't the opportunities for them to succeed, because they're a dispossessed race.

But hang on, how come so many people from countries like India, China, Taiwan, and the Philippines make a success of their lives when they come to this country and start a business from nothing. They don't get special privileges over and above everyone else.

The difference is nothing more than the fact that they are **not** burdened with an 'attitude' problem ... so, they just knuckle down and make something of their lives, through sheer hard work and sacrifice.

Regarding privileged people ... it could rightly be said that Maori were privileged to have the British come along and offer them the security of a Treaty Agreement – because, the French had arrived before the British, and the Maori killed some of them – so were paranoid about the French coming back in force, to wreak revenge (*utu*) *which of course was a feature of Maori culture (mentality)*.

Some chiefs begged the British to save them from being taken over by the French (*who were not known for fair treatment such as was on offer from the British Crown.*)

While on the subject of "privilege" . . . Pakeha school children are allegedly being forced to stand up in class and admit they are privileged because they're white.

Those kids are humiliated into feeling guilty of the fact that they're white. *Bloody hell.*

The irony is, it's Maori who are 'privileged' ... with more 'rights' and hand-outs. Not to mention having some of their failed businesses ventures bailed out.

## SOME FACTS TO MULL OVER

### **Is the Treaty a "living document"?**

The fact is, the Treaty was merely the pre-condition for establishing British rule, which Governor Hobson did by proclamation later in 1840.

By the end of 1840 the Treaty had performed its function, i.e. acceptance by the chiefs of British sovereignty, in exchange for full British citizenship.

It is only a living document for those who want to expand its meaning to give ever more questionable rights to tribal elite ... so denying other citizens their equal rights.

## **If Tribes didn't sign the Treaty are they bound by it?**

Yet another misconception to do with the Treaty is that Tribes such as Tuhoe and Tainui didn't sign – so, are not bound by it.

The obvious answer to this is that such tribes should return to the taxpayer their recent substantial treaty settlements – as how can you take a treaty settlement from a Treaty that the forebears of your Tribe did not sign?

However, by the mere fact of living peacefully under the law for several generations ... paying taxes, receiving welfare, fighting in the armed services, etc. these and other tribes have, by their actions, accepted the sovereignty of the Crown.

Whether or not their forebears signed is totally irrelevant.

*Of course, even with the obvious advantages being offered, the reason some chiefs were hesitant about signing the Treaty would've been due to the concern about losing their mana; by having to be subservient to a higher Chiefess i.e. Queen Victoria. That would not have sat well in their minds.*

### **Is co-governance a good idea?**

Regarding any so called "co-governance agreements" between Crown and Maori ... that concept is a violation of democracy and national sovereignty.

Co-governance undermines the power of democracy to make decisions for the general good – if unelected Tribes have effective veto powers and see things only from their self-centered interests.

Which means we should be abiding by the Treaty Agreement, which clearly stipulated that we're one people under one law. So, the tribal elite need to stop dreaming about regarding themselves as a nation apart ... while existing on the largesse of others.

## **Do Maori get preferential treatment?**

They very obviously do – in all manner of ways. I know of **95** discriminatory legislative "provisions" set in law – that have been specifically designated for those with even a smidgen of Maori heritage. Not to mention the **23** being sprung on us in the extremely racist He Puapua agenda.

I don't wish to bore you with a description of the 95 official statutes favouring Pakeha-Maori that are already in place. But I will mention a couple of very unfair racist practices:

For one, hospitals have visiting hours and restrictions on visitor numbers, but yet, will allow part-Maori patients to have unlimited visitors at any time.

Another example being Victoria University's School of Design ... which has limited computers and space for its students, but has an entire working area of computers for Maori and Pacifica only; which all other students are forbidden to use.

## MORE RACIST AGENDAS ARE ON THE WAY

It would appear that our seemingly dangerous Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern has become a puppet for the tribal elite. She deliberately concealed the He Puapua **agenda** for tribal **co-governance** from voters during the last election campaign. This can only be seen as an orchestrated, and sneaky abuse of power.

As a result of the rollout of this racist agenda, a cultural takeover of NZ's most fundamental social and constitutional values is now underway. Thus, our established democratic order is being swept aside by an incoming tide of race-based tyranny.

To prove that co-governance should never be a consideration, I will quote again part of a speech to Maori in 1860 by Thomas Gore Brown:

*"It is right you should understand that in return for gaining the privileges as British subjects, you must prove yourselves to be loyal and faithful subjects.*

*It is necessary that all inhabitants of New Zealand should acknowledge only one Head."*

Following are just a few samples of what is in the racist He Puapua plan. Some parts have already been enacted.

### **A separate Maori Health Authority:**

- Funded by the Taxpayer.
- With veto rights over the entire health system.

### **Dept of Conservation Land:**

- Government documents show a plan to transfer ownership and control of the entire Conservation Estate to Tribal Authorities.

- DoC have formed an “Options Development Group” (ODG). This group (*being as PC as they come*) readily made a recommendation to give control and governance of DoC to Maori.

## **Land & Business:**

- Exempting Maori land from the requirement to pay rates.
- Iwi businesses worth several billion dollars do not pay tax.
- Taxpayer to fund Marae upgrades.

## **Education:**

- Rewriting the history of this country to suit a Maori agenda in the education curriculum.

*And won't that be a sanitised (and twisted) version of Maori history.*

*But, one that will show the very worst of the British.*

## **Local Government:**

- The abolition of the right of local communities to hold a binding referendum on Maori Ward Seats on Councils.
- Minister Mahuta is now undertaking a review, and it appears likely that 50% of Council seats will be held by Maori.

## **Governance:**

- Two complete Governments that overlap.
- A written Constitution based on a completely new (and even falser) interpretation of the Treaty of Waitangi.
- At least 5% of all Govt procurement contracts must now go to Maori businesses.

## Justice:

- A Maori Court system where offenders with a Maori ancestor will be treated differently from all other offenders.
- Maori jails where inmates with a mere trace of Maori ancestry will be treated differently to all other inmates.
- Our Western Common Law to be replaced by Maori "titanga" (Maori customary practices)
- People of Maori ancestry will have greater legal rights.

## Water:

- Granting Maori rights to **ALL** fresh water.

- Giving Maori access to funding for legal costs to claim the Seabed & Foreshore, from mean high tide out to twelve nautical miles.  
**But**, opponents to Maori claims must pay their own legal costs.

## **Media:**

- Maori language and culture are being forced into Government Departments, Local Authorities, and State funded media.
- The guidelines enforced on the media in the government's latest funding of \$55 million now prevents them giving an opposing point of view to the race-based program being aired.

The above is just a sample of what's in the extraordinarily racist He Puapua Plan.

---

So anyhow, I've set the record straight ... because the next generation are likely to ask the question as to why we allowed an apartheid system to become established; especially considering that much of what it's all based on, is blatantly false.

But of course, some people won't be able to handle the truths exposed. Most of it will be ignored anyway, due to the 'closed mind' syndrome.

Another thing about it is, Pakeha are often despised for the perceived wrongdoings of their forbears ... but, any of that which might have taken place, was in the past. And Maori have been well compensated.

What I'm talking about is the racist goings-on today advantaging one so-called race ... to the exclusion of all others in NZ. This unjust inequity shouldn't be tolerated in modern times.

So, I've exposed the **truth** (*which cannot be disputed, no matter how much twisting and fabricating there is*).

My message is: for all of us to succeed, we need to stand united as one. Which, of course, was the actual intention of the Treaty. Let's keep that in mind.

What's needed, is strong and honest leadership from our Politicians ... whose task should be to insist on equal rights for **all** citizens of this country.

Because, the worrying thing is, the imbalance in equality favouring those of Maori ancestry, is encouraging a sense of arrogant superiority to creep in.

For example, there was a part-Maori woman being interviewed on National radio ... when she was asked if she'd be happy for her children to marry Pakeha. This woman replied that it'd certainly not be acceptable, because Maori bloodlines need to be kept pure.

Can you imagine if the situation was reversed, and a Pakeha had said that. All hell would've broken loose.

Another outcome of everything going the Maori way, is the demand that Town and City names be changed to Maori.

What everyone overlooks is that places of settlement with European names were built by early Europeans. And thus, are part of this country's history. It's not all about Maori.

It's even getting to the stage where some won't be happy until this country has a name change to Aotearoa ... despite the massive cost; including our hard-earned international NZ marketing brand.

The problem is, the PC mentality prevents anyone from daring to stand up to Maori. And if you do, you're written off as a "Racist".

With the **irony being** that reverse racism is now rife. And yet accepted – because no matter how blatantly racist someone might act – they are somehow not deemed a Racist – as long as their skin colour isn't white.

# TO SUMMARISE

The fact is, everything going on in this country regarding separatist "rights" and "privileges" is based on falsehoods.

1. Maori are indigenous to NZ.

**False.**

2. The Treaty is a Partnership.

**Fraudulent.**

3. Fisheries, Forests, Water and underground Riches are all part of the Treaty.

**Fake.**

4. There're many treaty 'Principles' specifically to advantage Maori.

**Fabricated.**

So therefore, there's no justification for part-Maori (*liquorice allsort*) citizens to get any special **rights, entitlements, privileges, favours**, powers of 'control' or positions on Councils. And, definitely **no** reason to be granted any sort of racist co-governance arrangement.

**IF** the intention had actually been for Maori to be bestowed special rights above others; then surely a DNA test proving the percentage of Maori lineage as being over 50% would **now** have been a requirement.

The fact is, the whole unfair sham should be stopped immediately ... because you shouldn't have people with just a mere hint of Maori heritage being advantaged at the expense of all other New Zealanders.

**We are meant to be one people with equal rights.**

**There is no other democratic way.**

I don't actually hold any of this against those of Maori ancestry. You try to gain out of life what you can.

Politicians are to blame.

Please feel free to forward this email with attachment on to those whom you consider may be concerned about the way things are heading in our country ... due to those of Maori ethnicity having an **unjustified** sense of entitlement.

Kerry Butler

[publisher.nz@gmail.com](mailto:publisher.nz@gmail.com)