



# **He Whenua Taurikura**

New Zealand's Hui on Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism

---

## **HUI SUMMARY AND COMPENDIUM**

---

**30 October – 1 November 2022**

**Cordis Hotel**

**Tāmaki Makaurau**

## Contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Contents</b> .....   | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>Hui Background</b> .....   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Attendees and Speakers</b> .....   | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Session Summaries - Day One</b> .....                                    | <b>5</b>  |
| Words of Welcome .....  | <b>5</b>  |
| Session 1: Preventing Violent Extremism from a Te Tiriti perspective .....  | <b>6</b>  |
| Session 2: Responding to the changing threats in Aotearoa New Zealand ..... | <b>12</b> |
| Session 3A: He Aranga Ake .....   | <b>17</b> |
| Session 3B: Feeling safe in Crowded Places.....                             | <b>21</b> |
| Workshop Sessions.....  | <b>23</b> |
| <b>Session Summaries - Day Two</b> .....                                    | <b>24</b> |
| Opening Address.....  | <b>24</b> |
| Reflections and comments on Day 2 .....                                     | <b>25</b> |
| Session 5A: Making Online Spaces Safer .....                                | <b>26</b> |
| Session 5B: Disengagement from Radicalisation .....                         | <b>29</b> |
| Session 6A: Diversity in Democracy .....                                    | <b>33</b> |
| Panel 6B: Countering messages of hate.....                                  | <b>37</b> |
| Panel 7A: Crowded Places: Protecting our businesses .....                   | <b>39</b> |
| Session 7B: Rights, responsibilities, and relationships .....               | <b>42</b> |
| Closing Address .....   | <b>45</b> |
| <b>Feedback and Suggestions</b> .....                                       | <b>46</b> |
| <b>Appendix A: Engaging With Māori (Some Ideas)</b> .....                   | <b>48</b> |



## Hui Background

The name 'He Whenua Taurikura' means 'a country at peace'. The name was presented to the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPMC) by Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori (the Māori Language Commission). We are grateful to the Commission for this name, which encapsulates the overall aim of the hui.

The He Whenua Taurikura Hui responds to Recommendation 16 of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the terrorist attack on Christchurch masjidain: *that the Government... host an annual hui, to bring together relevant central and local government agencies, communities, civil society, the private sector and researchers to create opportunities to build relationships and share understanding of countering violent extremism and terrorism.*

He Whenua Taurikura Hui 2022 was New Zealand's second hui on countering terrorism and violent extremism.

A welcome reception was held for all attendees on the evening of 30 October, with words of welcome from the Honourable Kiritapu Allan, Minister of Justice, and Bernie O'Donnell, Chair of He Whenua Taurikura, National Centre of Research Excellence. This was followed by two full days of the hui sessions on 31 October and 1 November.

We acknowledge Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei as mana whenua who hosted the hui and provided manaakitanga to the attendees, establishing a kawa for the hui and creating a safe space to hold these challenging conversations.

Videos of most of the sessions were made publicly available live and after the event for those who were unable to attend. In addition, the kōrero from each session was captured in illustration form by [Visually by Interactionz](#). The videos and the illustrations from the hui can be found on the [He Whenua Taurikura hui 2022](#) website.

DPMC was the overall lead for the hui, supported by the Visits and Ceremonial Office (VCO) of the Department of Internal Affairs (DIA) as the delivery lead.

The He Whenua Taurikura Hui will be an annual event, to be held in future years at a variety of venues across Aotearoa New Zealand.

This hui summary and compendium has been produced by DPMC based on notes taken during the sessions. This record of the hui is not intended to fully capture all discussions and statements made by speakers. Videos of all public sessions are available on the DPMC website.

All statements should be attributed to the speakers that made them, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the New Zealand government or any other organisation.



**DEPARTMENT OF THE  
PRIME MINISTER AND CABINET**  
TE TARI O TE PIRIMIA ME TE KOMITI MATUA



## Attendees and Speakers

Terrorism and violent extremism are complex issues, with many aspects that are at times contentious. The hui aimed to create space for active participation by a diverse range of contributors and stakeholders, including but significantly beyond traditional national security perspectives, and to encompass a range of Māori, social sciences and humanities disciplines.

This year, the hui was focussed on all-of-society approaches to whakahōtaetae - prevention of violent extremism.

Almost 300 people attended the hui in person. Approximately 15 percent of attendees were from academia, 40 percent were from communities and civil society, and approximately one third were representatives of central and local government. We thank all of those who took the time to attend the hui and contributed their expertise and lived experiences.

In person attendees were invited based on their academic or professional experience in this subject matter across government, academia, the private sector, and civil society, and/or are community leaders or members with lived experiences that are vital to conversations designed to address this threat. The number of in-person attendees was limited to enable more interactive workshop or discussion-based sessions.

In considering who would speak on the panel discussions and other sessions, we sought to have a range of views represented. We had an obligation to ensure that participants not only brought expertise in the topics they would be discussing but also that a diversity of backgrounds and range of perspectives were represented. We also consulted directly with academia and communities in selecting speakers for the He Whenua Taurikura Hui 2022.

We sought to have a balance between different viewpoints, including across government (37%), academia (23%) and civil society (40%). We also aimed to ensure a gender balance and a cross-representation of different faiths and ethnicities. Of the 60 speakers at the hui: 50% publicly self-identified as non-male; 33% were from visible minority groups (of which 15% were Māori); and at least 1/5 were from non-Christian faith backgrounds.

The structure of the programme and the topics discussed were based loosely on the four thematic outcomes identified in Aotearoa Katoa, the draft strategic framework for preventing and countering violent extremism. Those outcomes are:

- Individuals that are down, or heading down, a path of radicalisation to violence are supported from further harm.
- Messages of hate and intolerance that promote violent extremism are countered.
- A safer online environment mitigating risks of radicalisation.
- Enhanced awareness and understanding of radicalisation and extremism.

Aotearoa Katoa outlines a shared path for all of society to contribute to preventing and countering violent extremism in Aotearoa New Zealand. The He Whenua Taurikura Hui is just one example of these efforts.



## Session Summaries - Day One

### Words of Welcome

**Professor Paul Spoonley** delivered apologies from Professor Joanna Kidman who was unable to attend. Prof Spoonley read Joanna's words of welcome on her behalf:

The co-directors of He Whenua Taurikura extend their welcome to attendees and acknowledged the many communities represented and tangata whenua. We note the importance of creating safety for our communities as we witness the rise of messages of hate and hostility. This annual hui brings together government and communities to build relationships and share our understanding of how we can contribute to a safer future. At He Whenua Taurikura | National Centre of Research Excellence, the voices of your communities drive our work. Together we must stand united against violent extremism and terrorism. We are manuhiri and as manuhiri we have responsibilities to engage peacefully with each other. Let us be at peace with each other through this hui.

Professor Spoonley delivered his own words of welcome to the hui. He recalled his work, beginning in the 1970s, trying to develop an understanding of the experience of communities targeted by acts of violence.

In academia the emphasis is increasingly on partnership, on working with communities. We don't do research on people – we do research with people. At He Whenua Taurikura the work is to identify the priorities, identify the gaps. When the March 2019 act occurred, it highlighted how little Paul felt he knew, even after 40 years research in this area. This event showed that Aotearoa New Zealand is not exceptional. We are all very much part of the ecosystem of extremism. We must work together to ensure all communities are safe in this country. He Whenua Taurikura is a centre that works towards making the promise of 'a land at peace' a reality. It requires the contribution of all of us.





## Session 1: Preventing Violent Extremism from a Te Tiriti perspective

Panel members: **Tracey McIntosh** (Moderator), **Tina Ngata**, **Te Huia Bill Hamilton**, **Dr Rawiri Taonui**



### *Discussion highlights*

**Tina Ngata** began by acknowledging Ngāti Whātua Orākei, the survivors of racist violence, gathered at the hui. Tina quoted Moana Jackson: the moral arc of the universe is long, but it bends towards justice.

She identified white identity extremism as an extension of a history of colonial violence, of an underpinning ideology of racist supremacy. The forces of colonial entitlement and colonial violence must be seen as part of the current conversation. Colonial violence exists as part of a continuum – from white identity extremism to colonial paternalism, racist policies, systemic blindspots, dishonouring of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

She said there is shared accountability for the power that ideologies of racialised supremacy hold today. The hallmarks of the ideology of domination continue – with refusal to share power equitably. Hope for solving this deeply entrenched wicked problem rests on solidarity with each other. The call for shared power has often resulted in being seen as extremist in itself.

Tina noted lack of targeted research on the assaults, harm, and harrasment of Māori online, stating that under Te Tiriti, Māori deserve an independent body to monitor threats.

**Bill Hamilton** paid tribute to the organisers of the hui for the central focus of Te Tiriti in the hui. Bill acknowledged the work (the late) Moana Jackson did to bring understanding that “Te Tiriti belongs to all of us”.

Bill said parties to the Treaty are commonly seen as tangata whenua (represented by Rangatira) and tau iwi (represented by the Crown). But this doesn't capture the relationships today. Tau iwi are the landed or landing people. A promise of two peoples to take the best possible care of each other.



Bill recalled the terrorist acts that occurred against tangata whenua: invasions, Parihaka, demonising of leaders, beating and taking our children. The impact of this was to destroy rangatiratanga, creating systemic inequalities, discrimination and racism and building a relationship of dominance. To right the waka, government must be encouraged to keep working to find solutions based on rangatiratanga.

What is rangatiratanga? Perhaps it would be better for Māori to form relationships not with the Crown, but directly with people – individuals, families and communities. Every person has the right of self-determination and self-government – Mana Motuhake. Tino rangatiratanga.

Tangata whenua haven't yet had the conversations with Muslim communities, the Pasifika community and other communities about Te Tiriti. Removing inequality, discrimination and racism requires national conversations.

Bill said there is a need for genuinely collaborative relationships, where we work on things in common and support each other in areas of difference. But the challenge is in building these relationships in a government structure that is very hierarchical with the Prime Minister at the head. Among Māori, everyone's the boss. After 182 years of colonial, hierarchical decision-making, it's not easy to form an equal partnership.

Bill explained his "mana-mometer", with an middle point between the Crown and rangatira where partnership can occur.

Going forward with Te Tiriti: Bill said there is a need to acknowledge the terrorism the State has inflicted on whānau. The State must apologise. Key values include: aroha, manaakitanga, kaitiakitanga.

Bill led the hui in singing Tūtira mai ngā iwi.

**Dr Rawiri Taonui** described his research – linking the findings of the Royal Commission regarding Te Tiriti to diversity to the identified need for stronger social cohesion. The report noted that social cohesion must be founded on upholding Te Tiriti. The Royal Commission made 15 recommendations on social cohesion, none of which provided a formal recommendation regarding Te Tiriti.

Dr Taonui noted limited understanding of the difference between the Principles of the Treaty and Ngā Mātāpono o Te Tiriti. This creates a challenge in projecting current Treaty frameworks into a vision of a superdiverse socially cohesive future. There is still a disconnect between Māori and new communities with similar shared histories of colonisation, racism and violence.

The default framework at present is to use Māori values at the beginning of a document, sometimes just by looking up the Māori dictionary without understanding the concepts.

What is required?

1. Greater understanding of the relationship – including the tensions – between Māori and the Crown.
2. A Te Tiriti framework that articulates the prevention of extremism.
3. A Te Tiriti framework that embraces diversity of explaining how we all belong.
4. A set of uara Māori derived from the way Te Tiriti engages with the prevention of extremism and the idea of a superdiverse society.

'Principles of the Treaty' are mainly derived from the text in English, in Courts and Government and hence reflect mainly a Pākehā view of Te Tiriti. Notes that 'consultation' with Māori by the



Crown is often at short notice, with an advisor or analyst, and usually occurs after the policy has been written.

By comparison, Ngā Mātāpono of Te Tiriti o Waitangi takes a Māori perspective. It is derived from the text in te reo, Tribunal reports, and international law. It includes:

- Requires real/equal/reciprocal mutually beneficial partnerships.
- Co design.
- Rangatira ki te Rangatira – leader to leader communication. By Māori for Māori
- Co-Governance/Aotearoa Katoa – Māori seek equality in governance and decision-making for the benefit of Māori and non-Māori.

### Questions and comments:

*[These questions were asked via the conference “app” and were put to the speakers for response after the hui]*

*Question: I love what Tina said about establishing an independent body to monitor threat against Māori. Can threats against Māori be measured in population impacts as well as threatening acts? How broadly do you imagine the work of the independent body?*

**BH:** Any entity set up under Rangatiratanga has a responsibility to care for everyone. That is tikanga. What such a body would do is to ensure Māori rights and responsibilities are not ignored or marginalised which is what happens under kāwanatanga. Māori issues are too often "added on" when enough noise is made. An independent body is a structural response which is what is needed to transform what happens when harmful behaviours are threatened or acted upon. Such a body is likely to have more credibility with parts of the population who have values similar to Māori.

**TN:** There are threats against high-profile Māori (MPs, Iwi Leaders and their advisors, news presenters/journalists, activists and academics), threats and harassment which target groups (such as the National Iwi Chairs Forum, Māori politicians as a collective, Māori academics as a collective), and threats and harassment toward Māori as a whole. Of all the expressions of kaitiekitanga (loosely translated as the right to protect) - the right to protect ourselves from harm is an obvious one. The state, as pointed out in my presentation, is not well equipped to provide the protection that comes through threat monitoring, because to an extent it has normalised harm against Māori throughout its own history, which creates significant blindspots. That said, even if this were not so, it is a basic Tiriti measure that the Crown hold an active duty to provide us with the tools to protect ourselves from harm, and that most definitely includes an independent monitoring body, resourced by the Crown and directed by Māori.

The rise of white supremacy, including the co-option of the Māori sovereignty movement by the far-right, has had a significant chilling effect upon our broad pursuit of Tiriti justice. Many of us who work in this space have had to pull back from public engagements and publishing our work because of the direct threats to ourselves and our families. There is also the added issue of co-option - people are reluctant now to question pharmaceutical companies, challenge government or interrogate science for fear of being cast as conspiracy theorists, when we should absolutely still be holding power to account. Every single one of our rights advancements (which have literally saved lives as well as securing quality of life) has happened as a result of Māori engaging in this struggle so this chilling effect will undoubtedly hold population level impacts that will be felt for years to come.





*Question: I'd love to hear more about how mana whenua would change border policies to eliminate colonial violence.*

**BH:** Tikanga is the first law of the land. Some tikanga that would apply at the border would include powhiri, manaaki, aroha and an understanding of mana motuhake/rangatiratanga and tūrangawaewae. This is a long conversation and is bound up in rights and responsibilities

**TN:** Borders are a flashpoint of the colonial project, constructed around racist concepts of nationalism and racial categorisation. As political scientist Wendy Brown notes, border regimes “do not simply respond to existing nationalism or racism. Rather, they activate and mobilize them”. In our own way we experienced this when we sought to establish “borders” around our rohe to protect ourselves from COVID-19 during lockdown. For us, it seemed common sense and was supporting the call from government for people to stay home (however the policing was not present here in our remote town to enforce that rule). Nonetheless, it drew a very strong response from conservative lobbyists, right wing media and right-wing politicians. It became very clear over that time that the issue of borders triggered nationalist anxieties, and that colonial interests were offended at the very principle that their movement could be limited by Māori \*even when\* it was in support of a government policy (and even when they never actually intended to come here in the first place). It often left me thinking how they would fare if they were more like the hundreds of millions of people around the world that have their movement strictly regulated by a colonial system.

Borders are a colonial construct, rooted in concepts of who belongs and who doesn't, whose agenda is served by admittance or refusal, and more often than not how those seeking access will serve the economic interests of those in power. Colonial violence, at a global level, occurs when our government participates in forcing people from their homelands, and then regulates whether they can come here to be safe, and then if we allow them in, treats them like coming here was their fault in the first place. Throughout that process, as a nation we do nothing to account for our role in removing their right to stay first, and then limiting their right to move. Te Ao Māori is a world based upon relationships and connections, achieving kotahitanga by honouring distinctiveness not excluding it. That connectedness is not just genealogical but thematic, geographic and temporal. Border policies that start with a consideration of our role in creating refugees is one place to start. Border policies based upon concepts of manaaki and whanaungatanga are further considerations. Considering how immigration can be handled in a way that responds to tangata whenua interests will be a step towards being Tiriti responsive, all of which will reduce colonial violence by Aotearoa in the domestic and international space.

**RT:** Primarily colonial racism exists within our borders in the form of the intergenerational assumptions, attitudes, and actions of members of the Pākehā-European population.

In 2011, Professor Margaret Mutu called for the screening of immigrants from white majority countries re: racism and their attitudes toward te Tiriti o Waitangi and other ethnicities. Professor Mutu was condemned by Race Relations Commissioner re: raising the issue of colour. Two well-known academics also minimised her concern. One on obtuse assumptions about Māori and Pākehā intermarriage; and the other on the basis that Māori supposedly held more negative attitudes toward immigrants than other New Zealanders without sufficiently addressing the main point of racist white immigration (see news link here).

Post-Christchurch, we know that the shooter was from “White Australia”, and that some/several leading figures promoting white supremacist racism in New Zealand like Lee Williams (UK) and Damien Dement (NZ citizen raised in the USA) are also from white-majority



countries with appalling track records on racism. Several white supremacist groups like the Right Wing Resistance, Argus Christi, Action Zealandia and the NZ Proud Boys also have links to far right groups overseas.

In summary, the critics minimised the risk presented by racist white immigrants entering Aotearoa; and Māori concerns about white racists entering our borders remain valid.

*Question: You have mentioned the word "Principles". Do we really want these to stay as principles or is it the time to move forward to another practical kaupapa such as "Obligations"?*

**RT:** The principles are also obligations which can be measured. I never use the "principles" except to explain that's what government uses so they do not have to do anything specific

It is important to retain to retain the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi because they provide a baseline legal guard re: Māori rights in the context of protection, participation, and partnership.

The principles are however limited by the Crown (1993 & 2000) and Court's (decisions made by Court of Appeal & Privy Council – all by white men) interpretation of the Principles as an unequal partnership. This is most obvious in the application of the principles of consultation and good faith where the Crown regularly falls, for example consultation is often late and fait accompli rather than early and including codesign.

Another reason the principles fail is because the Crown and government agencies treat the principles as tick box "obligations" (we spoke to Māori therefore we have met our obligations) rather than "commitments" (greater emphasis on good will).

The more recent emphasis on te Tiriti is a step in the right direction insofar as it seeks to recognise Māori views of the Treaty which derive from the Waitangi Tribunal and Māori interpretation of the Māori text (i.e., te Tiriti). This emphasises a more equal, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial partnership with early consultation, codesign, co-governance and Māori leadership of programmes to assist Māori.

A regular and recurring difficulty here is that government agencies apply the eurocentric Principles of the Treaty (English text) to the framework of what we could term Ngā Mātāpono (the Principles) o te Tiriti o Waitangi (Māori text).

Another is that, while all new government policy now refers to te Tiriti, after saying te Tiriti is important, government agencies never explain why. Rather they move to citing "Māori values" most often by re-framing well known Māori values with Pākehā influenced interpretations and/or a Pākehā member of staff translating European values into te reo.

*Question: As tau iwi people of colour aspiring to be, and do our part as tangata te tiriti, often most of our interaction/relationships operate or are facilitated within institutions eg, work. How can ethnic minority communities initiate spaces for ongoing dialogue and build bridges with tangata whenua to deepen whanaungatanga beyond tokenist mandated initiatives eg, staff marae visit, one off consultations, annual hui?*

**BH:** Once again a big kaupapa. Approach iwi in your rohe and begin to build a relationship with them. I have attached a paper I use in workshops that may help create the dialogue (Appendix A).

**RT:** Great question. I prefer using the term tau iwi to refer to Pākehā because the context of the term stems from their colonisation of Aotearoa. Working through government and processes in other institutions does not generally facilitate kōrero between new communities of colour and Māori. One of the reasons is that their Treaty approaches are shaped and led



by Pākehā based on Pākehā interpretations by the government and Courts of the Treaty relationship with Māori (see my reply to the question re: the Principles of the Treaty).

A second issue is that the bifurcation of Tangata Tiriti (all non-Māori) and Tangata Whenua (all Māori) places communities of colour with Pākehā as Tangata Tiriti while separating them from Māori as Tangata Whenua. This minimises the space in which we can come together to discuss te Tiriti and our shared experiences of prejudice and racism. Together these facilitate a Pākehā monopoly over the common ground concerns of Māori and other communities of colour. This model evolved unconsciously and without discussion in 2006, when Tangata Tiriti was used as a way to introduce new immigrants to te Tiriti. While useful at that time, the lack of consultation and discussion created the problem we now have re: the absence of a forum for new communities of colour and Māori to discuss racism. A better approach would include seeing Māori as Tangata Whenua and Tangata Tiriti Tuatahi (the first Treaty peoples vis Te Whakaputanga 1835), Māori and Pākehā as the Tangata Tiriti Tokorua (the first treaty Partners via te Tiriti) and post-treaty new communities as Tangata Tiriti Mahamaha (the many Treaty Peoples) and/or Tangata Tiriti Hou (New Treaty Peoples). This would reduce the Pākehā monopoly and lift the impediment that impedes discussion between Māori and new communities of colour. Longer term it will also open the doors for greater future Māori leadership in a whole of Aotearoa Katoa approach in politics.

**TN:** I think we have a lot of work to do in understanding how our stories intersect, particularly when it comes to our experiences within white supremacist contexts (be they government or societal). It's an unfortunate truth that nationalistic white supremacist narratives around immigrants AND Māori have entrenched themselves within the general NZ public psyche (including in our relative communities), so there is a lot of deprogramming work to do in that space, and that starts with education. Ignorance and the fear that it drives suits the colonial agenda. I think we are at a time now, with increased de-colonial education, to avail ourselves of the opportunity to learn about each other's stories, how they intersect, how they are the same and how they are different. I personally feel there is some groundwork to do in order for that space to be safe - but the education is available to provide us with that groundwork. Then it's important for us to come together on our own terms. It's also important that we vision past that context of the Crown as the facilitator - this is another important reason for our tauwiwi allies to get behind the constitutional transformation movement - which will center Te Tiriti in these contexts and enshrine a space for such an ongoing dialogue.



## Session 2: Responding to the changing threats in Aotearoa New Zealand

Panel members: **Andy George** (Moderator), **Rebecca Kitteridge**, **Chris de Wattignar**, **Mervin Singham**, **Paul Spoonley**, **Chris Kumeroa**, **Hamimah Ahmat**



### *Discussion highlights*

Rebecca Kitteridge acknowledged the victims of 15 March 2019 and their families, and also others who have been victims of violent extremism. Rebecca's speech can be found [here](#).

The National Terrorism Threat Level has been at medium since 2019. This should be uncomfortable for New Zealanders. Lately there has been an increase in violent anti-political rhetoric. Most violent extremist threats are online and are difficult to find among mass of violent rhetoric online. The key differentiation is examining the capability and intent of the individual concerned.

Rebecca said the NZSIS is mandated to focus on prevention and NZSIS investigators are trained to look for indicators. The NZSIS sees lone-actor, low-sophistication attack as most likely scenario for New Zealand today (rather than by an organised group).

Knowing the behavioural signs that indicate someone is moving towards violence is very important. The release of the NZSIS's Indicators Framework provides a framework for thinking about mobilisation to violence and signs and features of concern. Important resource for community and others to understand possible indicators of violent extremism.

Rebecca said the NZSIS does not conduct mass collection of data. Tips and input from the public and communities are crucial to the work. Inputs from communities will be taken seriously and investigated. Some will amount to nothing, but others could be more serious and may indicate mobilisation or imminent planning.

Everyone can play an important role in National Security, just as the public help the police fight crime. Reporting observable behaviours set out in the guide could help prevent a terrorist attack.



**Chris de Wattignar** explained that NZ Police are also seeing more nebulous threats from violent extremism and extremist beliefs. Community policing is a problem-solving approach to safety, and like the NZSIS, Police require input from communities for leads and in terms of ensuring diversity in community policing.

Much of the information agencies receive is from whānau or associates of an individual or a group. In almost all cases, those with an intent to conduct an attack, will speak to someone about something – even their beliefs. Community input is most effective in terms of helping to prevent violent extremism.

Chris said Police continue to build partnerships with ethnic communities to make sure their voices are integrated into the eight streams of work relating to RCOI and preventing violent extremism. Reflecting on the roles of both community and police will be helpful throughout the conference.

**Chris Kumeroa** reminded the hui that the greatest threat to security is to think there is no threat. Being aware of the threat environment is crucial. Understanding drivers of violence and thinking about possible future scenarios is key. Data-driven solutions are likely important. Intelligence analysis is about evaluating information, assessing the confidence in the source, and producing a report.

Chris said New Zealand has witnessed an increase in violent rhetoric — members of the public and government are increasingly victims of hate speech. Māori and other ethnic minorities still bear the brunt of online threats, harassment and threats of violence – likely by those extremists who feel most threatened by these groups and the challenge they pose to the status quo. Māori rights activists are now being targeted.

There have been 108 instances since 2013 that could be considered race-based hate-crime. Many acts fall below the threshold of terrorism but help to create conditions where extremist violence is more possible.

Potential Māori approaches to preventing violent extremism begin with whānau and hapū and work outwards. Countering the threat with tikanga principals: whanaungatanga – essential to countering hate; manaakitanga – how we might care for others and host our visitors; kaitiakitanga - education about our natural world and upholding values.

**Paul Spoonley** talked about how He Whenua Taurikura, National Centre of Research Excellence is thinking about how best to engage communities in setting the priorities for the Centre. If we are going to involve communities in the development of the He Whenua Taurikura, what does that actually mean? Community and Iwi leaders across a diverse society all play an important role in keeping NZ safe. Trust and cohesion pre-pandemic in New Zealand were high but post-pandemic trust has almost evaporated.

What role are communities going to play? Very often the communities that are part of government engagement are not always the communities likely to have an extremist amongst them. This is why all communities need to be included in conversations on preventing and countering violent extremism.

Paul said the settings of radicalisation are often very intimate – families, peer-groups, and other close relationships which enable radicalisation based on trust (and which are harder for us to see from the outside or do much about). Having the research centre engage early with vulnerable communities from which extremists come may be key.





**Hamimah Ahmat** observed that since the recommendations to improve social cohesion, there have been so many hui seeking community input on strategies – but it is still unclear how these strategies will be realised and implemented in an authentic way.

Hamimah shared a video from the Sakinah Community Trust showing people across the motu describing what unity means to them. Unity Week (first week of November) is an initiative that has been supported by the Christchurch City Council, Ministry of Ethnic Communities and even META on the social media side.

She said the outpouring of support to the impacted community after March 15 was notable. The online campaign reached 310,000 New Zealanders. A Unity week will not end racism - but it is a start to countering ideologies of hate. Hamimah welcomed the announcement of the \$2 million Social Cohesion Fund that communities can access.

She finished by saying there is a real need to building partnerships between groups across the motu. A future generation should feel they belong. This can allow us to honour all who have lost their lives to violence.

**Mervin Singham** opened stating that where other speakers described the current threat environment, he was bringing the questions and concerns he is asked by communities. He said it is clear that that communities want to work with government – but the road is not always easy. Building trust between government and communities is essential - it is a two-way street. The burden to build trust must lie with government.

Mervin said there are concerns that the work on preventing and countering violent extremism will leave a perception of Islamophobia and securitisation of Muslim communities. This can be made worst if the issue is politicised. But other communities are also concerned about stigmatisation. There is also a concern about Islamophobia in the public service. People are concerned that officials may have stereotypes that affect their decisions.

Finally, there are some concerns that the drivers of PCVE are so complex and idiosyncratic that it is hard for government to tackle this.

How should we respond? Inclusively, with communities and in a way that fits with New Zealand's social norms and grounded in Te Tiriti. Combatting racism and discrimination against ethnic minorities, this is one of the drivers of violent extremism. We must not allow conflict to fester because unresolved conflict is a driver of violent extremism. Inter-cultural dialogue is really important, alongside women's empowerment and gender equality. Funding communities continues to be a challenge — ongoing kōrero on prioritisation is important.

Improving human rights laws, legislation and other official measures, such as the development of the National Action Plan Against Racism.

Finally, we need to focus on youth. The use of social media and how it is used is a key element of building inclusivity. Education is a fundamental premise.

Mervin said there has never been so much collaboration – now we are forming and storming before norming – but if we ride the wave together, we make Aotearoa a safer place to live.

### **Questions and comments:**

*Participants were asked to discuss at their tables the following question:*

*What are some of the ways we can respond to these threats with confidence and inclusion?*

*Responses (from the table and via the app):*



We need to listen to voices of grievance and/or hate and address issues with respect. Dialogue that is authentic can inform spaces of genuine ignorance and build social cohesion. Would it be helpful to invite some actual extremists here to kōrero with?

Feedback to communities about how reporting is being used. This would build trust. It can't be a one-way conversation. How do we ensure that the people who are reporting will not be disclosed? How are government agencies providing confidence in the process?

Building place-based empowered communities – understand the context/solutions at regional/local level. We need to disrupt familiar extremist views in non-extremist places by normalising language that is about unity, rather than difference. Use social media, such as TikTok to help change different perspectives. Connective initiatives, especially online. Short educational videos which change perceptions of the extremist narrative and drive a counter narrative.

We need to reduce fear in majority communities through local events that allow exchange and greater appreciation of difference. If the Govt is asking communities to play an active role in combating extremism, how are they supporting – and resourcing that? We must trust communities to do this through adequate resourcing.

We need to coordinate engagement with communities, all of whom are volunteers. Resourcing to participate is important to enable participation. Multi-level community engagement and investment in resourcing initiatives beyond volunteering.

Approaching government cohesively is difficult for civil society which leads to a siloed, disjointed approaches. Need a simpler way to consult with multiple agencies at once. Not just government but communities live in siloes. We need to continually have conversations like these (without waiting for next year). And at different levels of hierarchy. Crowded places given an opportunity for this

Communities and civil society lack visibility of what government is doing at an interagency level. Without clarity around who in government is doing what, it is hard for civil society to know where to begin their own mahi.

Diverse state sector leadership. We need a stronger recognition of the role of local government in delivering on the strategy alongside community.

Aotearoa New Zealand needs to establish checks and balances to ensure people with extreme views do not gain institutional power to further their ideology in New Zealand.

There is work to be done within the education sector – primary secondary tertiary - and recognise that universities can be where hatred grows. Education is key to breaking down ignorance or anxiety of differences. But how to give effect to that? We have to start doing something good at school age, but do we have to wait generations for change?

*Other questions asked by attendees [via the conference “app” and answered after the hui]:*

*Question: Are there interlinkages to explore family violence cases as source of community intelligence/insights. What are your organisations doing to respond to this link?*

The NZ Security Intelligence Service has recently released Kia mataara ki ngā tohu - Know the Signs: a guide for identifying signs of violent extremism, which sets out the common behaviours and activities most likely to be seen in someone on a violent extremist pathway. The Mindset and Ideology indicator describes behaviour in which someone believes violence is a valid way to support their cause. It also describes people with a hostile ‘Us versus Them’ worldview. Family violence may not necessarily be a direct indicator of violent extremism but



NZSIS is aware perpetrators of family violence may also demonstrate some similar behaviours. It's important to note that individual behaviours listed in the guide may only be concerning when they occur alongside other indicators.

*Question: In this new framework and context of a Te Tiriti CT approach, what are the practical steps we can take in our communities and roles to recentre our work?*

One of the principles in Aotearoa Katoa, the strategic framework for preventing and countering violent extremism, is that work in this area should take a uniquely Aotearoa New Zealand perspective and the work should be grounded in Te Tiriti o Waitangi. It recognises that whanaungatanga strengthens identity and is central to building strong connections between individuals, their families, and the wider community. Establishing a sense of whanaungatanga and identity allows the important discussions on CVE to take place where we can be open about the ways we can protect each other and identify signs of violent extremism etc. in a uniquely NZ way.

*Question: How do we deal with threat inflation? There are a lot of threats we need to sort out (not to allow that to determine our way of living and to not live a state of fear).*



## Session 3A: He Aranga Ake

Participants: **Fleur De Bes, Paula Attrill, John Zonneville, Janine Moss**

*Discussion highlights:*

**Fleur De Bes** set the scene for locating He Aranga Ake within the prevention spectrum: in between early intervention (all-of-society involvement) and high-risk violent extremism prevention (specific social sector and security agencies). He Aranga Ake provides targeted intervention and support to disengage individuals identified as being “at risk of radicalisation” and deemed to be “on a journey towards violent extremism”. The model draws upon support from family, friends, community, charities and non-government agencies in addition to the core government agencies involved.

Fleur described the principles and values of He Aranga Ake as recognising diversity, respect and care, developing a sense of belonging and self-confidence. The privacy and human rights of the individual are central to operational practice.

**Paula Attrill** described the current themes or characteristics of young people who would be referred to this kind of programme in Australia and New Zealand.

- Frequency of concerns being identified and responded to has increased
- The average age of those identified is decreasing
- The pathway to radicalisation is online
- There is a strong presence of neurodiversity
- No single profile fits all scenarios. The emergence of more mixed or unclear ideologies, combined with grievance issues. They often find themselves in a variety of interest groups online (lack of social cohesion/relationships/feeling uninvolved)
- Possession of child exploitation material – an area of increasing concern
- Desensitisation to gore online – Ukraine war, footage of death and destruction
- Constellation to adverse life events – life experiences and background is a factor towards violent extremism
- Young people are both ‘victims’ and perpetrators – vulnerability of children leading others and grooming

**Fleur** then gave some insights into what makes a difference in working with these young people.

- The need for a clear and comprehensive assessment – the whole picture, tamariki and whānau, clarity about risk and response
- Effective case co-ordination and role clarity – have the right people involved, agree who has the lead, organise to ‘manage the case’
- Take a trauma informed approach (Australia has mental health services leading) and look across the generations
- Intervene early – prevention is best practice and diversion is critical to getting them back on the right path
- Information sharing between the right agencies is important – what can be shared and how, while maintaining privacy?
- Tamariki say that social inclusion and belonging is really important - connection with/inclusion in education is a significant protective factor
- Avoid stigmatisation through labelling – always young people first

*Following the introduction to He Aranga Ake, participants were invited to participate in a workshop to brainstorm approaches that would complement He Aranga Ake in supporting young people down a path of radicalisation to violence from further harm.*



**Questions and comments:**

*[Some of these questions were asked via the conference app and were put to the speakers for response after the hui]*

*Question: What has come out of the youth 19 survey? The findings state that Māori or ethnic youth are more likely to experience racial discrimination in education and health. What strategies can be put in place for adults to not be racially discriminatory against young people?*

*Question: Education is very important in the work for children. They need to feel included and feel safe to practice who they are? (religion/faith/) to not feel as if though they are othered.*

*Question: There are articles/videos online of violent extremism against tamariki. There is no system in prevention or help for these children. The bullying that occurs outside of school there is no system in place to counter this. How to deal with the violence and bullying that occurs outside of school. This is where it begins, there should be a system here that holds the children/family accountable.*

Answer: The purpose of this workshop is to identify what kinds of prevention initiatives can be put in place at the different stages. For instance, what is the role of health system/police/education in order to prevent this?

Schools are a part of the community. Te Whāriki, early childhood learning curriculum documents that are evidence-based and help teachers to teach students about diversity and challenging biases. Bullying is something they do not tolerate.

Certain students enrol as a distance-learners and do not attend due to not feeling safe. Early education is doing quite well in this space. Microaggressions are still pertinent, from a prevention and social inclusion perspective, what is being done collectively to help solve this issue, especially in tertiary and high school level. Maybe more training can be done in this space to improve that.

*Question: Who was consulted on the design of this programme? What evidence base did you draw on?*

Answer: It comes from working with individuals (agencies and community providers) on how to work and offer support for individuals. Connections with communities, who are willing to work with individuals and offer services as mentors.

There are often no easy fixes, using information provided from each agency to provide the individual with the needs they may have (health, education etc...) These are individual packages and a wide range of needs to be met.

New Zealand's experience of working with persons, international research and programme experience have informed the development of He Aranga Ake. Research available and learnings of other jurisdictional experiences has been assessed and where appropriate adapted for the unique NZ context.

*Question: Need to ensure that young people feel included and belong. How can we uplift or empower these communities that shoulder this responsibility?*

Answer: This has been considered in the model of how community leaders can be supported to provide support and build capability.

*Question: What is being done to mitigate the risk associated with children who have neurodiversity? Diagnosis is often late, they do not receive the help they may need at school (understanding, travel/mobility/ they are often left out of the system at such an early age).*





Answer: As you will have heard in the profile of the young individuals, neurodiversity was mentioned and the concerns around that. Agencies have been talking to Autism NZ to see what they can come up with taking into consideration the different vulnerabilities involved (sexual grooming/autism spectrum etc) and how they interact with the world and utilising that to plan interventions and support.

*Question: Practically speaking, how will the seven government agencies involved refer individuals? Will you engage schools and social service agencies to refer? Who will actually deliver the services on the ground?*

Answer: Each agency will have its own referral pathway, recognising all agencies are structured differently. NZ will not have a mandatory referral system, with He Aranga Ake leads within the agencies responsible for submitting the referrals for consideration. This ensures He Aranga Ake is only working with the cohort of individuals the framework has been designed to address.

Services on the ground are coordinated by government agencies using contracted community providers and networks they regularly work with, in addition to the services agencies themselves provide. Where additional unique support is required, an agency will reach out and discuss with that provider, individual etc and determine what that assistance may look like and how He Aranga Ake could support that engagement.

*Question: What are the expected numbers of individuals identified?*

Answer: Providing expected numbers is challenging. Our world is changing at a rapid rate and international research is showing radicalisation can occur over a relatively short timeframe, in part because of the opportunities the internet presents. Once operational we will be able to start reporting on yearly numbers of those individuals accepted into, He Aranga Ake.

*Comment: Reports in school are being made but nothing is being done. An individual approach is alright, but when are you bringing a systemic issue, that is not going to be solved by an individual approach. The programme itself needs to build that systemic part in. We need more programmes that effectively impact as many people as possible in a meaningful way. That don't need to be a central government initiated but more community/locally initiated.*

Answer: He Aranga Ake is only one tool within the wider national security kete and designed for those who are radicalising towards committing or facilitating an act of violent extremism and past displaying early signs of hate or racism. The Social Cohesion work led by MSD and the Government's Preventing Violent Extremism Strategic Framework are the larger pieces driving prevention efforts. Larger pieces you are referring to sit within these two significant pieces of work.

*Comment: Tika and pono. Create a safe space for us to speak frankly about our differences. Safety must be paramount. Reduce oxygen to fear. Some of the radicalisation comes from people wanting to identify with something. Tikanga marae provides frameworks for this.*

Answer: We agree. This is applicable to the wider Government work programme. Creating safe spaces to discuss differences would likely have a positive impact on many individuals and prevent some from going onto radicalise. He Aranga Ake places safety at the centre of practice, with safety of the individual, providers of services and the wider community all important considerations.

*Comment: We need programmes and initiatives that shift culture, attitudes and sentiment. To that end, we need more measures of success that look at those elements.*



*Comment: Since much radicalisation takes place online, collective initiatives to make short educational videos to create positive perceptions and create a counter narrative to extremist views.*

Answer: Work is occurring across the wider National Security piece to look at options which are right for New Zealand.

Initiatives like you have suggested may be eligible for funding under [Te Korowai Whetū Social Cohesion Community Fund](#) and The Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism Strategic Fund announced recently to support the delivery of initiatives for building social cohesion and resilience to violent extremism and radicalisation.

*Question: Thank you. I feel I've learned a lot about what you are doing for individuals in this space and for ethnic and diverse communities, but what you are doing to combat the "white" elephant in the room?*

*Question: What has been done to engage the anti-authoritarian community around preventing extremism?*

Answer: He Aranga Ake is not yet operational and not able to comment on this area. He Aranga Ake is a disengagement framework for a small number of New Zealanders and not intended to provide a wider system response.

People who are becoming radicalised to violence need support to move them away from seeking to cause harm. Often, it is the people closest to an individual who are best placed to provide this support, particularly when it relates to challenging the harmful ideologies that a person possesses. Government has an active role to play in providing support to whānau and communities to undertake this disengagement

Providing support to disengagement from violence is a complex, sensitive and specialist area. There are few specialists with expertise in this area in Aotearoa New Zealand. Those who lead and deliver this work – whether inside or outside government – need expertise and to be appropriately trained, qualified and supported. We will continue to focus efforts to resource and build capability in this priority area of PCVE work. Whilst we grow this capability and capacity, we will prioritise work identifying, supporting and disengaging those who have a clear intent and are more likely to mobilise to physical violence.

He Whenua Taurikura National Centre of Research Excellence is at the heart of our approach to building this collective awareness and understanding of disengagement. The Centre was established in 2022 to bring together research organisations and institutes, iwi, civil society organisations, and government to research preventing and countering violent extremism, with a focus on understanding diversity and promoting social cohesion.



## Session 3B: Feeling safe in Crowded Places

Participants: **Mervin Singham** (moderator), **Paul Patel**, **Matthew Smith**, **Gresham Bradley**, **Aliya Danziesen**

*Discussion highlights:*

**Mervin Singham** introduced the session, noting that crowded places are dangerous due to the high volume of people in one place. The key message in a crowded place: escape, hide and tell. The basic premise is that all New Zealanders have a responsibility to prevent attacks in crowded places. The purpose of this session is to familiarise people with the tools to prepare a crowded place (<https://www.police.govt.nz/crowdedplaces>).

**Paul Patel** talked about his experiences of the NZ Indian Central Association (made up of 14 groups/organisations) completing the Crowded Places self-assessment. They had a presentation from NZ Police, who gave pointers and started on self-assessment tool. Community leaders, boards, security people needed to own this and work with Police District Community Liaison Officer and local Crowded Places person.

Paul read a definition of a crowded place from the Crowded Places Strategy. *A crowded place is not always crowded and can vary. We must always be vigilant.*

It has been a policy over the last four decades that their regular bimonthly newsletter gets sent to police - police are then aware of any gatherings that are coming up, and they can communicate – be prepared. Intelligence gathering by agencies is very important for crowded places preparedness.

Paul talked about the difficulty of speaking to communities about an 'imminent threat' – it is important to consider how to get this message across. Escape, hide, tell: This was formulated as it has to be something easy to tell crowds at the beginning of an event. This can also raise issues, especially within young people or senior people – again it is important to consider how to communicate this.

**Matthew Smith** shared the background of Jewish people, who have experienced antisemitism for some time. Jewish community security groups are mainly volunteer based. In the light of 15 March and other attacks internationally, it is clear that this approach is not adequate. All people of New Zealand should be able to participate in their own community without fear of attack.

Crowded Places Strategy is a positive initiative following RCOI recommendations. It provides a good framework and guidelines and tools to help people keep their places safe. With the support of police, the Jewish communities are taking a community wide engagement to better protect their places and events.

Want temples to feel safe, but also welcoming to others. Premises are not laid out with security at forefront in mind, and sometimes have high profile events/attendees. The Crowded Places Strategy complements existing community security measures – making them more effective, resilient and helping to build stronger relationships and partnerships. Matthew gave an example of hui organised by Wellington community police where trauma training was provided, which shocked but grounded attendees – they're in it together.

Matthew said it is important to be honest about the readiness and capability of your crowded space and people, and to not create a false sense of security. Appropriate resourcing is necessary – Crowded Places Strategy will help to identify which resources are required.



**Gresham Bradley** described how spaces for Rainbow events are usually different to other crowded spaces.

The largest group that Rainbow NZ Charitable Trust communicates with are the pride organisations – they're most likely to be doing things with crowded places. Pride organisations are usually run by volunteers.

The Big Gay Out – which is one of NZ's biggest events, is supported by NZ Police – this is how you secure and protect a crowded place. Also gave an example of the Rainbow Parade. Gresham pointed out that events in smaller and more conservative rural communities are still vulnerable. He noted that religion has been the enemy of the rainbow community for thousands of years. Spoke about the fact there are still countries that will put rainbow people to death or imprison them for being who they are.

Gresham asked the question, what is your religion doing to moderate homophobia in your community, and minimise the hate that the community receives? Called for people in the room to look internally, especially in terms of religion.

**Aliya Danziesen** spoke on how IWCNZ's engagement has changed following 15 March. They are rebuilding lives/communities/how they do things in places of worship.

Aliya described how this loss has changed crowded places and what it means for the community. She spoke about youth not wanting to go to school because they're targeted for who they are – since the attacks and school shootings, there is greater fear. They need to use the Crowded Places Strategy to prepare every time. Aliya spoke of the difficulties making people feel secure while at the same time securitising to prepare for potential attacks and gave an example of having to prepare Muslim women on security and what to do in an event.

There is a significant number of Muslim women who do not go to mosque as they don't feel safe. When people lost their lives, there was also a loss of innocence and security – IWCNZ is making sure their community doesn't also have a loss of hope, so life can get back to what it should be like, instead of what it has been.

### **Questions and comments:**

*Question: How can NZ Police help promote the message of Crowded Places?*

**Brent Register** (NZ Police) responded that everyone needs to inform people about the strategy, without inflaming it and driving people away from crowded places. Keen for people to understand strategy, use self-assessment tool to consider how safe/vulnerable you are.

*Question: Some communities have grown up with an understanding they can defend – what would you advise people to do?*

**Brent:** The human brain has a fight or flight reflex – some people will naturally want to fight when they see a threat. The strategy outlines that people should escape if they can, otherwise hide, and then tell (as soon as it is safe to do so). There is nothing wrong with people wanting to flight, but the strategy wants people to escape.

*Question: What constitutes a crowded place, and is there a population campaign so the burden doesn't fall on communities to talk about the strategy?*

**Brent:** Crowded places are relative to the size of the place. It is about making sure the community goes about their business feeling safe. There are no campaigns yet, but the two advisory groups (Business and Community) are getting the message out at the moment.





## Workshop Sessions

For the afternoon of the Day 1, participants were able to select between two workshops:

- The first was a scenario-based walk-through exercise on violent extremism in New Zealand and actions that sit with different parties. The output of the scenario workshop is published [here](#).
- The second was a workshop on Psychological Wellbeing and Resilience which discussed the importance of, and gave evidence-based strategies for, looking after your own and others' mental wellbeing when working with high workloads, moral fatigue/injury from exposure to sensitive information, or vicarious trauma from listening to, and working with, victims of trauma.

These sessions were not recorded.





## Session Summaries - Day Two

### Opening Address

**The Right Honourable Jacinda Ardern**, Prime Minister of New Zealand, provided the address to open Day 2 of He Whenua Taurikura. A summary of the Prime Minister's remarks is available at:

[Speech to New Zealand's Hui on Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism – He Whenua Taurikura | Beehive.govt.nz](https://www.beehive.govt.nz/speech-to-new-zealand-s-hui-on-countering-terrorism-and-violent-extremism-he-whenua-taurikura)



## Reflections and comments on Day 2

**Paul Spoonley** thanked the Prime Minister for attending the hui and for her speech. He also noted that three ministers involved in the hui indicates the commitment of the government.

There have been a number of disturbing developments and what undermines the security in our wellbeing is misogyny. Our mission as part of He Whenua Taurikura is to prevent and counter violent extremism.

It's good to keep reminding us that whatever we do, social cohesion should be part of what we consider. Recognition and respect and truth and equity are the absolutely the right things that we should be addressing. They provide the elements that ensure that we live in a healthy and safe society.

What are the enablers? Leadership and the willingness to take risks is one of them.

I want to acknowledge that we have a countering terrorism strategy and soon we are going to see a Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism strategic framework.

One thing that's been emerging is the safety and well-being of our rangatahi. They need to be in this room. We need youth to be front and foremost. We need to improve digital literacy and make sure that what happens online is healthy and mana respecting.

Paul said the online world is complex and changing. It's not always clear what the motivation is but it's clear that there are new communities involved in violent extremism and we need to understand them and react to them.

We all need to be part of what happens next, and we need to work together.



## Session 5A: Making Online Spaces Safer

Participants: **Marilyn Little** (moderator), **Chris Wilson**, **Muzharuddin Syed Ahmed**, **Ash Johnston**, **Nick Law**



### *Discussion highlights:*

**Marilyn Little** described the Department of Internal Affairs (DIA)'s responsibility for Online Digital Safety, operating under the Classification Act. There are high thresholds for state intervention online. The DIA agrees with these high thresholds. The government is aware that the Content Regulation under the Classification Act requires change as media has moved into an online paradigm.

Their role is to ensure content that is deemed objectionable by the Chief Censor (and is therefore illegal) does not stay on the internet. DIA investigated over 600 URLs (referred and found). Out of those investigated, 286 contained objectionable content. There has been an exponential rise of referrals.

DIA works with domestic and international partners. Many of the platforms are responsive however there are some platforms that are uncooperative and object to requests. They work with community and international partners to understand why extremist content is created and shared online.

**Chris Wilson** introduced Trends in [Online Extremism – Hate and Extremism Insights Aotearoa \(HEIA\)](#), which conducts data-led research to measure and analyse harmful online rhetoric within New Zealand.

He reported unprecedented levels of hate and extremist content online, and that the COVID-19 pandemic has amplified online narratives and the rise of extremist content. Internationally, violence has been glorified. The majority of people who engage in violent rhetoric do not go on to commit violent acts. However, the people exposed to the vitriol and hate are harmed.

In the New Zealand context, researchers have struggled to analyse the large data set to find the true threats in this sea of data. HEIA is trying to solve this problem by analysing trends emerging in platforms such as 4-Chan to understand the language that causes online harms to others and pulls people into extremist ideologies. They characterise ideologies in terms of



toxicity and negativity which means they are able to identify the emotion of the person posting and identify their real intention.

Through this research, Chris has found a subset of posts that can be classified as highly negative or toxic. These posts indicate: a higher level of engagement with extremist ideas; a high level of emotion involved on behalf of the people posting; and a greater risk of violent action.

While HEIA's focus isn't presently attuned to monitoring information disorder in Aotearoa, with funding and support the capability could be quickly scaled to produce these insights. HEIA, as an entity of the University of Auckland, does not seek to identify people but rather track trends, identify narratives and grievances. HEIA does not use fake accounts or access closed sources to obtain their data.

**Mazharuddin Syed Ahmed** is a survivor from the Mosque Attacks. He explained that a lot of data is needed to understand hate speech – and what his research is seeing is the surface – only about 10 -15% of the data. The rest is hidden and requires artificial intelligence to analyse.

Hate speech index:

1. Social media data mining
2. News media data mining
3. Hate incidents data mining

Social Media plays a large role. You would search twitter rather than google for breaking news. Twitter admits that their algorithm is biased. Facebook allows hate to go unchecked.

We have a lot of biases, and we need to understand our bias as these acts of bias put us on a spectrum towards hate.

*Mazharuddin shared a great deal of data in his presentation [\(available on the DPMC website\)](#).*

**Ash Johnston** asked how the gap between online and real world be bridged? The problem for Police is that they see disturbing information online a daily basis, and the most significant issues provoke the most serious response. However, there is so much harm online that doesn't make the threshold for a prioritised response.

Recommendation 12 (from the Royal Commission of Inquiry) creates a public reporting mechanism to report concerning incidents and behaviours to government. There are business as usual processes to manage the information that is reported but it needs to be strengthened. The work is a cross agency initiative that focusses on the scope, scale of information that causes harm and the system used to respond.

There is a myth that assumes the intel community is across the internet and all threats to be managed. What people see and have concerns about should be easily reportable. We are all responsible to keep NZ safe for example to report something we see online or potentially a loved one who has gone down the rabbit hole.

Rec 12 should be a uniquely NZ solution, easy to use and culturally sensitive without penalty.

**Nick Law** talked about the work he is leading to transform the outdated content regulatory system. The building blocks are based around the physical concepts of media – Classification Act, Broadcasting Act. These have had some updates over time, but they were not set up for high-speed user-generated content.



Nick talked about the key themes that emerged from DIA's consultation with community. Aotearoa communities are harmed by the use of social media to spread mis- and disinformation, bully and harass individuals and communities and amplify existing divisions. There is significant concern for children and young people as an at-risk group, and about mainstream and news media's portrayal and reporting.

The response requires flexibility because our society is constantly changing. We know that:

- there is a clear lack of media literacy and education;
- there is widespread acknowledgement of the need for government intervention; and
- objectionable material is illegal content. But below the threshold, this legal content is the problem and of the greatest concern. Groups were extremely concerned with the right to freedom of expression.

Nick described what other international jurisdictions have done to regulate online content.

Australia, UK and Ireland have taken a code-based approach that sets safety expectations for online service providers to make a safer content environment and help people navigate content safely. Their emphasis is on protecting children

The European Union has introduced the Digital Services Act, which includes a requirement of transparency reporting and auditing from platforms to address illegal content.

Ultimately the work is trying to achieve a safer online media environment. Sometimes this can feel like an impossible task for this country, but we have shown we can make change.

#### **Questions and comments:**

*Question: Internationally violent extremism in online gaming is a problem – how can we address this in NZ?*

We have not yet fully understood the implications of violent games. Agreed it had an impact because it softens our reaction to extreme violence. It is also important in terms of it being a pathway to radicalisation. The mosque shooter was inspired by a video game and the entire video looks like a video game.

There is a social element to online gaming, there are connections and friendships online. They can communicate with people all around the world. These sharing networks include the sharing of extremist content. It is a networking tool.

*Question: Are we as a country able to identify the content coming through in different languages?*

No, we are not. It's something we need to work on. It is a real challenge for our regulatory bodies.

*Question: How do we know whether content is trustworthy or not?*

This is concerning and difficult. There are cultural challenges. Some are more sceptical than others. The question is who you trust.

*Question: How do lay people know the difference between hate and free speech. And where do they go for support? What's the strategy to inform public about reporting?*





## Session 5B: Disengagement from Radicalisation

Participants: **Ian Lambie** (Moderator), **Sara Salman**, **Maja Whitaker**, **Arif Saeid**, **Jessica Borg**



### *Discussion highlights:*

**Sara Salman** gave an overview of radicalisation and deradicalization. She described radicalisation as typically characterised by rigid thinking, extreme ideas and othering of those considered an enemy. It is aimed at overturning the status quo and in the process denigrating or destroying another group

There are two schools of thought on processes of radicalisation: cognitive radicalisation as an opening whereby grievances find an outlet through radical ideas, and radicalisation based on emotional responses of belonging and community.

Sara said both of these views on the radicalisation process are underpinned by grievance and alienation from a particular social or cultural change. We see radicalisation in this context being about fighting back against the loss of certain status and the apparent rise of “others” (e.g. white supremacy as a response to multiculturalism). Motivation to radicalisation is often around maintaining power and social status against perceived outsiders.

Radicalised individuals don't always turn violent – but they can have a corrosive effect on trust in and the function of democracy.

Disengagement is typically thought of as more productive (and realistic) than deradicalisation. Disengagement is about stepping away from supporting the necessity of violence, while deradicalisation implies a shift in attitude and identity.

Disengagement measures can inadvertently securitise and harm the very communities they try to help, and there are many cases of this in the West post-9/11.

Our terms of ‘radicalisation’ and ‘extremist’ are potentially problematic when it comes to youth. We don't want to label these individuals as threats and securitise them.

**Maja Whitaker** opened by making the point that radicalisation is a society-wide problem – not just one of minority ethnic communities. Apparent in Christian dominations as much as other faiths, especially in the context of Covid-19 and related disinformation



Conspiracy theories are part of the radicalisation process – they provide narratives that push people towards othering and the belief in the necessity of violence. Disengagement from radical ideas needs to be participatory and involve professionals – not just within communities

Maja said radicalisation is often initially an extension of otherwise productive seeking for meaning, identity and belonging. Forming a radical view is the negative side of this process, and is often driven by a sense of loss of prestige and unmet needs in terms of community and belonging

How to disengage someone in this situation? Dismissive approaches do not help, nor in most cases do countering with facts. Individuals will double-down on their belief system in the face of opposition. Maintaining relationships and encouraging other to learn to think is important.

Specific to New Zealand Pākehā Christian communities: focus on shared faith values that promote social cohesion and critical reasoning. In-group and out-group thinking is inherent with groups but needs to be overcome.

**Arif Saeid** talked about his experience working across government and communities to engage immigrants on issues of radicalisation. Engagement can be tough, particularly with those who view the Ministry of Social Development as part of the “other” group they oppose. This has come up particularly in relation to current and former prisoners – some of these individuals find themselves isolated from their communities and drawn towards old networks of radicals.

Arif suggested that proper resources are provided to communities to manage radicalised individuals from prison. Families, faith institutions and other institutions in the individual’s life need to be prepared to manage individuals who may hold radical views and have gone through the prison system.

There are concerns overseas (example from Indonesia – probably Surabaya attacks of May 2018) of family-based radicalisation, mobilisation and violence. Indonesia’s approach focuses on family disengagement<sup>1</sup>

The approach in Western Europe is to work with radicalised individuals within prisons, to avoid recidivist offending, which is likely to only lead to deeper radicalisation. Germany (at a state level, not federally) has programmes which aims to provide wrap-around services to prevent recidivist behaviour. The UK also has hotlines associated with prevention.

**Jessica Borg** began by setting out the focus of rehabilitation programmes for those in Corrections care, with a particular focus on psychological approaches and New Zealand-specific measures that draw on international examples and evidence. Evaluations are important, including recognising gaps and shortcomings in rehabilitation programmes.

Corrections does not yet have a specific programme for rehabilitation from violent extremism. In recognition of the fact that violent extremist offending, and the drivers of it, are so variable that an individualised and holistic approach is Corrections’ preferred framework. Ultimately, disengagement differs in form in every country and situation. There is no agreed model and any disengagement measures here must suit the NZ situation.

When someone is in Corrections care, a full psychological assessment is undertaken. Any engagement or rehabilitation is voluntary – inmates cannot be compelled to participate in a

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: it was unclear whether this was a state-organised programme or civil society programme: the latter are generally more successful, if usually quite small-scale



programme. Understanding an individual's personal grievances, worldview and target groups are key, as are understanding an individual's mindset and psychological idiosyncrasies.

Jessica said Corrections focuses on disengagement and encouraging individuals to reject the idea that violence is the answer. Deradicalisation is not the goal, as changing identity and attitudes is hard, and ultimately not the government's job.

### Questions and comments

*Question: What more can we do to forge a more cohesive society?*

The Royal Commission's focus on social cohesion is across faiths and groups – social cohesion matters to everyone.

The 2019 attacks were based in Islamophobia and fear of rise of "other" who threaten the dominant position of white supremacist views. But interesting to note that the Mosque communities that were attacked were very pluralistic, and the views of the attacker reactionary and anti-pluralistic.

Some of the language is problematic here – frequent popular narrative of immigrants as a strain on resources, or of indigenous communities as "over-represented". Important that those with power think about the language used to "other" minority groups

*Question: Are our disengagement models too much predicated on faith-based radicalisation, now that over a third of NZSIS's investigations are of IMVE individuals?*

The Corrections' individualised approach is ideologically agnostic and avoids undue focus on any one group or belief system, recognising that a previous focus on faith-groups was excessive.

*Question: Drivers of disengagement are reflective of a number of social, economic and political pressures – do we need new ways of doing things to deal with this situation?*

It's worth noting that social and economic drivers are not always major parts of radicalisation – some extremist-minded individuals are highly educated, in stable employment and knowledgeable. Radicalisation can happen to anyone

*Question: There is growing recognition of misogynistic violence and family violence as predators of violent extremism – this is something we should explore more?*

Agree. Grievances against women and objectification to justify violence are often a beginning of violent extremism. Keen to see a conversation about what it is in contemporary society that leads to fears, insecurity and willingness to engage in violence among males to maintain control over women.

Understanding a person's background, experiences and insecurity are key to designing programmes to disengage – violence against women is often in the mix when trying to understand drivers to radicalisation.

International examples of violent extremism are highly gendered – most lone actors or mass shooters have domestic violence in their background. ISIS also has a highly gendered and violent narrative around women (including institutionalised sexual slavery). The link in much of this is about asserting status against outgroups – women being the first and often most intimate outgroup for radicalising men.

*Question: Worth noting that the RCOI was about government counter terrorism activities, failures to 2019 and practices that contribute to violent extremism. Corrections still in its old ways in view of the speaker (noting Samsudeen example).*



Approaches are changing, with community input. Programme design requires continuous feedback, including from communities dealing with radicalised individuals in their midst. One challenge has been individuals who refuse to engage with Corrections for rehabilitation, leaving communities to bear the burden of managing potentially complex cases.

The RCOI has a wider remit, particularly around thinking about ideologies of violence in the broadest sense – not just two or three faith groups or ideologies.

*Question: Conversations about radicalisation need to happen where the radicalisation is occurring, and those engaging those communities need assistance to work with radicalisation individuals.*

*Question: Youth engagement is important. How can youth better utilise a space like the He Whenua Taurikura hui, and engage in these conversations nationally?*

DPMC has included youth in session with Classification Office [Session 7B]. We are likely to need more specific youth spaces in future hui.





## Session 6A: Diversity in Democracy

Participants: **Eddie Tuiavii** (moderator), **Edwina Pio**, **Duncan McLaggen**, **Jennifer Curtin**, **Efeso Collins**

*Discussion highlights:*

**Edwina Pio** started by recognising that diasporic peoples resonate with their source and home countries. She went on to identify three wicked problems in the democracy and diversity space.

Democracy and diversity are extremely complex terms – like a bowl of spaghetti, if you pull one strand, the others unravel. How do we bind the ‘me’ with the ‘we’ as we grapple with the changing demographics of Aotearoa? What are our levers to counteract politicisation, sectarianisation in the context of countering violent extremism?

Edwina said democracy means political access. It is not a spectator sport, we do not escape accountability, we must vote. There is an apathy in New Zealand’s democracy, noting the percentage who did not vote in recent local elections. We do not have to agree on everything, but we must agree on some things. We can live with radical democrats but not violent extremists.

New Zealand must move away from one-dimensional concepts. Unity is not the opposite of diversity. Diversity is not something carried solely by migrants.

Our kaupapa is rangimarie – to hold peace, act in peace, live in peace.

**Duncan McLaggen** acknowledged the challenge laid down on Day 1 to honour Te Tiriti. He also referenced the recent visible threats to democracy seen in attacks on the Prime Minister’s office in Auckland, and the attack on the husband of US House of Representatives Speaker.

Duncan called out the real threat to democracy locally and internationally. Democracy should be a core value of New Zealand, and New Zealanders need to talk about it – he referred to the saying that democracy dies in darkness. The New Zealand ‘she’ll be right’ attitude is not tenable.

Duncan acknowledged the impact of Dr Mona Krewel’s<sup>2</sup> work in raising awareness of what is happening on the online environment, and the importance of safety and political messaging online.

Auckland Council has a responsibility and works hard for the community, which includes keeping communities safe in face-to-face engagement. Duncan talked about the impact that anti-authority movements have had on Council staff targeted by these campaigns.

For a diverse democracy to succeed, everyone should listen to uncomfortable conversations and learn – especially Pākehā who are not usually consulted. He responded to Tina Ngata’s presentation on Day 1, noting that at this hui, the audience is receptive. But for a really diverse democracy to succeed, Tina should be able to make her remarks to [anywhere] and have heads nodding there too.

**Jennifer Curtin** talked about the issue of decreasing interest in democracy, especially among those who should be most involved. Volatility in voting isn’t necessarily a bad thing – in 2020 (and in other periods throughout history), volatility was increased, however there was an increase in voters (and younger voters).

---

<sup>2</sup> Dr Mona Krewel was originally to be a speaker in this session but was unable to attend



Poverty matters to democracy: there are communities that don't engage in the political process because they don't trust the political process. She suggested that we need to count other measures of participation in democracy, other than voting. And we need 16-year-olds to be able to vote as the first vote is habit-forming.

Jennifer explained Olkiverssmall parties don't do well in New Zealand's party representation due to the MMP system – despite having more small parties, the two major parties still have major control over our parliamentary process.

The New Zealand Election Study shows there is quite a low appetite for radical right populism in New Zealand, and that voters prefer more inclusive populism. Jennifer noted that it was important in 2023 to avoid a 'toxic race for power' with clickbait headlines.

**Efeso Collins** was worried that New Zealand is still in a majoritarian mindset. Diverse politicians need to have an honest conversation about who they really are and the troubles they face. It should be everyone's job to get people to engage in democracy.

Efeso referenced critical race theory and noted the challenge of the theory – conversations on race are often reframed to be palatable when they shouldn't be. He reflected on how New Zealand's current system deliberately marginalises certain communities.

He then shared his own personal experience with racism. After he advocated on behalf of his community, someone had sent death threats and the bomb squad came to his home. This is the cost of democracy for people that have been put in the 'other' category. Conversations on this need to be honest, because that is what diverse communities are facing.

Is there true diversity and inclusion in the way we think and the way decisions are made?

The key is humility, the ability to listen. How do we give up space so that someone else can sit at the table? And how do we create the conditions so that someone else feels they can speak when they are at the table? Some of us are going to need to make space, to back away from the table.





## Questions and Comments

*Eddie then asked the speakers how we can create safe spaces to facilitate a diversity of views, tension and conflict?*

**Edwina:** In order to create safe spaces we need to know when to act, when to listen and when to withdraw. This may involve self-reflection. Some people require more time and different time from the standard time that may be required by Pākehā people.

**Duncan:** It is important to create physical spaces that uphold the mana of the community and for communities to feel welcomed and valued – which was done through co-design with the community.

**Jennifer:** Noted that the Parliamentary space for debate is set up for oppositional politics rather than consensus politics. There are different spaces, and Pākehā need to cede spaces for others to have conversations. There is a need for alternative parliaments to sit alongside ours.

**Efeso:** Noted the importance of communicating in different languages – when it is left to communities, there is a much better outcome.

**Eddie:** Noted Pākehā should design solutions with diverse communities rather than designing for communities.

*Question: For many years, communities have been oppressed by 'democracy' or the tyranny of the majority. Central Government had to undergo huge transformation (as a result, Māori party emerged), however local Government has not progressed. Officials have to have honest conversations and not feel personally attacked by conversations about diversity.*

*Question: There is a difference between the Crown and Pākehā – Pākehā are not in conversations to change in the same way the Crown now is. The work of He Whenua Taurikura is underpinned by tika and pono.*

*Question: How do we create safe spaces for diversity in all places?*

One of the key reasons for establishing the Pasifika success tank in the Auckland Council was to create a safe space to grow diverse communities in leadership positions

By being a 'token' representative for diverse communities, you have opportunities and can grow. However, the important thing to look at is intersectionality – people have multiple dimensions, and everyone is therefore diverse. Creating forums to discuss this is key to create these safe spaces.

When officials employ people of difference, workplaces need to create the ability for diverse communities to work in other spaces rather than only in the diversity space.

*Question: Ethnic businesses are often struggling to communicate with Council-controlled entities and are therefore being marginalised. What is being done to ensure diverse voices are heard?*

Work is being done by Southern and Western initiatives to encourage employment of local and diverse contractors – this will help to tackle this issue.

*Question: Democracy is as valuable as the participants in it. We should do more to increase quality of life for those who are hateful towards diverse communities.*

*Question: Acknowledged partnership and co-design is important, but communities do not have as much resource as the government. There is also a dangerous balance at the moment,*



*where diversity is not properly addressed because the Government is attempting to be representative while only having one voice to represent their communities. There is diversity in diversity.*

### **Final remarks from speakers**

**Edwina:** In democracy we have accountability – we use accountability to live a better life for ourselves and others.

**Duncan:** Polarities and tensions need to be managed – then we will be in a better place.

**Jennifer:** Values we aspire to have need to be modelled by those in powerful positions.

**Efeso:** It is okay to sit and listen – we should come to conversations with that level of humility.



## Panel 6B: Countering messages of hate

Participants: **Anjum Rahman** (Moderator), **Kate Hannah**, **Bex Fraser**, **Huhana Hickey**, **Vinod Bal**, **Lexie Matheson**

*Due to the sensitivity and deeply personal nature of this topic, specific comments from this session are not attributed.*

*Discussion highlights:*

**Anjum Rahman** posed two prompts for the presenters to speak to.

*This is our experience*

**Speaker A** explained that there is diversity within the Rainbow community itself. There is no one 'Rainbow' voice. Even within that community there is tension and conflict between those groups. This means distinct voices need to be sought and included from each.

Non-binary people face elevated rates of violence, especially sexual violence (1 in 5), given the sexualised narratives around bisexual individuals. The sexualisation and dismissal of Amber Heard's abuse claims in the Amber Heard / Johnny Depp trial is indicative of this.

**Speaker B** reiterated that hate doesn't just happen by non-Rainbow towards Rainbow. Hate exists within Rainbow community by LGBTQI+ white extremists against LGBTQI+ people of colour. Radicalisation of Rainbow individuals occurs – by and to the Rainbow community – noting the incidence of gay right-wing extremists.

There is rising violence internationally by extremists against LGBTQI+ - Slovakia / Bratislava attack and manifesto as example. International events can reach NZ audiences and inspire actions here. This is the concern of the community. Things like Slovakia attack will inspire NZ-based actions. Concerned that new Twitter ownership will only increase the permissive nature of the social media companies.

**Speaker C** spoke of the importance of working together and social cohesion. Authentic LGBTQI+ voices need to be heard – we need to speak by ourselves. Highlighted the online hate directed at LGBTQI+ people. Noted issues of trust with the Police and the importance of building it. Noted the issue of famous people with huge platforms making discriminatory comments and risk of radicalising others.

**Speaker D** noted experiences of sexual violence against LGBTQI+ people shared some of their own stories of abuse and violence in community – violence targeted towards them because they dared to claim elements of the masculine and step outside the norm of the feminine. Social media has brought a new type of abuse. Hate comes from fear of the unknown. We need to help people feel comfortable being who we are. The speaker is concerned about possible extensions of euthanasia laws – the speaker sees this as eugenics and has received abuse online when advocating from a disability community during political debate about this issue.

**Speaker E** explained that what the other speakers described is a combination of dangerous speech, hate speech, and hate-inciting speech. Misogyny has been around for a long time. What links homophobia and misogyny in extremist narratives is the fear of anything that challenges or breaks down accepted norm. The fear of women stepping out of their traditional roles and making claims to power is the same fear of people who do not fit within clear lines of sex and gender.

The motivation is “who gets to be”. At the moment this question is “who gets to be a New Zealander”. The rhetoric that we have heard so far acts as an initiation ceremony to become



the ingroup in certain online communities. Moving from “who gets to be in public” to “who gets to be at all”. The speaker linked this to Nazi Germany and noted that this comparison is increasing in online rhetoric.

*What needs to change?*

**Speaker B** said we need to take a stronger stance on Rainbow rights on the international stage. Gave example from Slovakia. Noted that Christchurch Call does not have rainbow organisations involved. Support and direction must be given to the Justice sector to increase cultural competency with Rainbow communities. Police are doing good work but need to be able to recognise hate crimes. Anti-rainbow hate crime data is important to monitor.

**Speaker E** expressed disappointment that three Pākehā men were speaking in the last session [5A: Making Online Spaces Safer] and would like to know why these decisions were made. The people who are being most impacted by this should have been heard.

**Speaker A** suggested that cross-group dialogue is needed. There are two places where this is beautifully productive: Firstly, families – Rainbow children born into families that do not identify this way – families are not ready for it sometimes but with love change happens – these families need support. Secondly, new members of the Rainbow community need more support to enable them to safely have difficult conversations and address the fears of those non-Rainbow community, as they are in a unique position. We need different campaigns to speak to different parts of the Rainbow community, and regional communities. Need to get media guidelines in place.

**Speaker D** recommended changing the hate speech laws to include and cover Rainbow. It's important to decouple the notion that free speech permits hate speech. Need to shift the conversation to the repercussions of the speech we choose.

The response to hate speech has to be love. We cannot respond in kind but with appreciation for the story behind why the person has come to that point, that language, that hate.

**Speaker C** agreed that the Human Rights Act needs to specifically reference transgender persons. The transgender community do not have representatives in government agencies or advisory groups. Would like to see agencies facilitating conversations about including transgender voices – look to broader community to look for voices you are not hearing.

There are many people of faith attending the hui. It's important to point out that Rainbow face the greatest hate and violence from people of faith – violence stems from certain religious views on sex and gender. Challenge posed to people of faith at the hui to confront the hate and intolerance that exists within their own communities.





## Panel 7A: Crowded Places: Protecting our businesses

Panel members: **John Yates** (Moderator), **Mathew Hellyer**, **Nick Sautner**, **Bruce Kenning**, **Simon Johnson**



### *Discussion highlights:*

**John Yates** acknowledged the report being released on the failures into the Manchester attacks. This will focus on the emergency services' response. There is still work to be done, and leaders have a duty and obligation to prevent attacks in the future.

**Mat Hellyer** gave an overview of the Crowded Places Strategy. It is an all-of-Government approach to enable business owners to protect people using their crowded place. Large concentrations of people are what make crowded places attractive to attackers. The key message is escape, hide, tell – what you should do in the event of an attack.

The strategy rests on 4 elements:

- Building stronger partnerships
- Enabling better sharing of information and guidance
- Implementing effective protective security (which is a layered approach – deter, detect, delay, respond)
- Increasing resilience

All New Zealanders have responsibility to help prevent attacks in crowded places.

Matt noted the strategy in the context of Sky Stadium – their first priority is keeping people safe. He noted that they have learned from past experiences (namely the Manchester attack) to change thinking on crowded places and that taking a coordinated approach with those surrounding the crowded place is necessary. The people capability is what provides the key protective layer in a crowded place.

The key challenges and barriers in crowded places is a lack of awareness (and lack of normalisation), proportionality to the threat, and limited budget and staffing.





**Nick Sautner** talked about Eden Park in the context of the 4 principles of the crowded places strategy and noted the importance of recognising and addressing vulnerabilities.

Eden Park conducts threat assessments before every event. Nick noted that protections of their cybersecurity system have recently been implemented alongside physical protections – now 90% of Eden Park is run online.

**Bruce Kenning** reiterated that the responsibility for implementing the crowded places strategy is the agencies themselves, however the Government Property Group has a role to play to work closer with agencies. Bruce noted that agencies are already weaving the strategy into their plans.

Bruce noted that there is now an opportunity to embed escape, hide, tell into common New Zealand practice – Police have received funding to get this messaging out.

**Simon Johnson** talked about the broad range of issues that a university faces when it comes to protecting a crowded place. Simon noted that there is a challenge in relaying the escape hide tell message to university staff. Simon acknowledged the Wellington protests and the lessons they had identified, and they now collaborate with agencies outside of the university on a much more effective scale.

### Questions and Comments

*Question: Has there been any pushback from corporate sponsors or others in promoting the crowded places strategy?*

It can be a tricky topic, particularly in the commercial environment. Sky Stadium took a soft approach at first – they didn't receive any pushback and are now gradually implementing it further. There is power in numbers, and this is how the strategy can be normalised.

It comes down to education – this education is building, and the message should be spread further.

*Question: What more would you like to see from Police/other Government agencies?*

There should be executive level sponsors for the crowded places strategy.

Good relationships with Police on a senior level is key and should be established early. It would be good to see more work around collaborative training.

*Question: How are you managing drone attack preparations on stadiums and other buildings?*

Working with other agencies to monitor and introduce new technology is key. Drone attacks became an emerging threat 5 years ago, and now emerging technology is introduced to prevent attacks.

*Question: What are the gaps in the current Business Advisory Group membership?*

BAG is very broad and covers several sectors, however some businesses aren't well resourced compared to large businesses. BAG has taken this on board to bring those sectors into the conversation and share resources to help lift resilience in their sectors.

*Question: Does the panel have a view on legislation for crowded places? What would it be expected to cover?*

I don't think the crowded places strategy needs legislation – it is more about education and getting the messaging across. Currently they have the resources they need.



It is important to carefully manage information to prevent the public from getting information that could create vulnerabilities.

*Question: It is important to train people through simulation/experience and staff should be refreshed regularly.*

Ongoing training is certainly important, and they often use tabletop exercises for staff. Victoria University runs regular scenario events (where they engage with police).

*Question: Are there any plans to launch a see something say something campaign?*

At this stage there are no plans to run this campaign – they should ensure the messaging around escape hide tell is embedded before introducing more.

*Question: What in your view is making the biggest difference in the crowded places strategy?*

Mainly the BAG, but now the number of people talking about it is making a big difference. Eden Park is proud of the action they have taken to mitigate vulnerabilities and implement the strategy.

The additional resourcing and support organisations will get to roll out the strategy will really help.

The messaging of escape hide tell is most important. As is having strategic conversations with agencies.

*Question: What is keeping you awake at night?*

Worries about whether they are doing enough to protect people, but this is motivating.

The FIFA Women's Cup 2023 – they need to ensure they have done the necessary work to safely deliver the event. They are relentlessly planning for this event.

It is not a matter of if, but when. We need to be as well prepared as they can.



## Session 7B: Rights, responsibilities, and relationships

Participants: **Dylan Sofa** (Moderator), **Paul Hunt**, **Caroline Flora**, **Eden**, **Katie**.

### *Discussion highlights*

**Dylan Sofa** presented the first question to the speakers - how do you see the key factors of Te Tiriti o Waitangi incorporated in your role/of the Office?

**Paul Hunt** responded recognising that various communities are not homogenous groups and that diversity exists within. His office has prepared a paper on a [human rights approach to preventing and countering violent extremism](#). He provided an historical overview of measures take to address the human impact of violent extremism and other prohibitions. These instruments also addressed the causes of violent extremism and toxic unfairness and injustice. Includes the wide variety of human rights and civil liberties. These human rights are not slogans but draw on understandings from around the world. Human rights provide an ethical code and a legal conduct for states.

Paul closed saying values and cultures are not set in stone, human rights need to evolve as well – they need to be refreshed. Possible features of post-colonial human rights framework:

- Recognition of values
- Civil rights, Indigenous peoples' rights
- Responsibilities of people, states and companies (especially powerful ones)
- Recognition of intergenerationally
- Process of truth telling and peaceful reconciliation – violence, racism and white supremacist have been part of the British Colonial project in NZ.

**Caroline Flora** acknowledged that she is new to the role, and it is still not clear. She said there were four potential commitments to Te Tiriti:

- Governance in the context of the Act she operates within
- The significance of the decisions made at the Classification Office that impacts on people around the world
- The Public Service's PS understanding of tikanga and te reo
- Research - there hasn't been much research from a Te Reo Māori perspective in the work they have been doing and this impacts all the other key areas (such as decision making and governance).

**Dylan** talked about "re-Māorification", something that will be led by our tamariki. He asked **Eden** and **Katie** *how present has Te Tiriti o Waitangi been in your education?*

**Katie** was given a good grounding of the history of Te Tiriti, however didn't think it was explained from a legal perspective and for our time now.

**Eden** never really understood Te Tiriti, only knew of it in English.

**Paul Hunt** spoke about equity and Te Tiriti and human rights. They are told in the legislation to explore the three articles in their work. How to properly respect tino rangatiratanga in their work Human Rights Commission (HRC). The HRC is on a journey and they are committed to carry this out so that all communities in Aotearoa can benefit from it.



**Katie:** Was online since 12 years old – from Minecraft videos to Jordan Peterson. She now realises that the content she was exposed to at a younger age was toxic/violent. She still mostly gets her news online – Youtube, Twitter, Twitch – mostly from individuals on these platforms she trusts.



**Eden:** TikTok – depends on what you like and the algorithm – she is concerned about this as you can fall into rabbit holes without realising. Short clips on TikTok (e.g., Ben Shapiro arguing with a liberal). Cannot see the full story in 15 seconds – the context is not fully explained (increasing misinformation).

*When did you realise you are going down this rabbit hole?*

**Katie:** When they begin or you notice they have complete disregarded others' opinions, like women.

*There is a need for critical thinking and education for rangatangi. What is the information they are seeing? Is it propaganda, is it created for a greater reason? Thumbnails and misleading outline of videos. Need for critical thinking. Minecraft with read overs – descriptions of abuse or reddit threads. Caroline, can't we just ban this?*

**Caroline:** No – the bar needs to be higher, lowering bar only inflames those people. With the rules in place they are unable to ban all information. Need to take holistic approach to this approach.

**Eden:** are you having these conversations with media companies like TikTok

**Caroline:** Yes, DIA have the closest relationships with the companies.

**Katie:** Social media companies still show these harmful contents to consumers. Social media threats are bigger than what government are equipped to handle. To pocket the money and allow these companies to carry on their 'work'.

**Paul:** Corporations have HR responsibilities. What are the standards they are to be held by and who holds them to account? Work needs to be done and a system needs to set up to hold them to account. This has been affirmed by the Human Rights Council and the New Zealand government has affirmed this.

### Questions and Comments

*Strongly commend the work that is being to counter violent extremism/violent extremism. Looking at the wide spectrum of Human Rights not just looking at the bill of rights but the other things that underpin that.*

*The education system is letting us down. In terms of platforms, the information being received is disturbing. The intermediate / lower high school needs to have oversight over what young people are seeing. Social media creates siloes where this information is being repeated. Social*





*media is unfiltered but also unmonitored. We don't know a lot about what youth are getting up to and where they are getting their information from.*

*We talk about youth, but we are not talking to youth. Talking to them and understanding where this information is coming from is very important.*

*This hui has made it clear there is a lack of young people in decision making/advisory roles. Gave an example of people making decisions are asking about what Be Real is. Exam season for Uni, cost for high school – need to make the conference/hui environment available and accessible for young students/professionals.*

*The young people here are highly educated and privileged and there is an issue with reaching youth who are marginalised – we have heard about young people with risk factors being more likely to be radicalised. Speaking about them but they are not in the room – need to invite them and make the space safe.*

The organisers recognise the need to include youth in the hui, and this session as an attempt to bring a youth voice into the conversation, and address feedback from last year. We acknowledge there is more to do.





## Closing Address

**The Honourable Andrew Little**, Lead Coordination Minister for the Government's Response to the Royal Commission's Report into the Terrorist Attack on the Christchurch Mosques, provided the closing address.

Minister Little acknowledged the Co-Directors and Chair of He Whenua Taurikura, National Centre for Research Excellence for taking on their roles and leading the important and intellectual work underpinning this important kaupapa.

He acknowledged his Ministerial colleagues, and National and Green party representatives. New Zealand has a bipartisan approach to National Security.

The Minister reflected that there was a different mood at the hui this year – noting a level of constructive engagement that is a step up from what it was last time. Participants feel their feedback from last year has been heard and was integrated to make this year's event successful.



Minister Little acknowledged the genesis of this event was in the tragic events of the 15th of March 2019 and talked about the recommendations in the Royal Commission of Inquiry report and the journey towards implementing them.

The Ministry of Social Development's Social Cohesion Strategy recognises the importance of belonging. He said that striving for social cohesion in New Zealand should be easier – but it also might be near impossible. New Zealand is founded on Te Tiriti o Waitangi – partnership, with protection and underlying principal of equality for all. Yet there is a history of suppression or raupatu (confiscation) of violence, or virtual elimination and it has taken the last 50 or 60 years for New Zealand to realise that Te Tiriti means something and that inside it is actually where our future lies. We must continue on the journey to give it legal force, but it actually contains a spirit that ought to draw in us and be our loadstar for the future.

New Zealand is now way more diverse than it was. We need to keep moving towards our aspiration. In preventing and countering violent extremism, how our communities and institutions function will determine how much people belong and feel that New Zealand is a safe place. If we don't get this right, we will see rising levels of anxiety, with people feeling marginalised and disowned. This leads to anti-social and violent behaviours.

The importance of this hui and all that will follow is that we are having a dialogue – and we also now have scholars providing the research. We won't make progress unless we are talking. We need a country that embraces difference, respects human rights, and allows for contradictory views to be expressed.

The conversation is essential, but we need to take it from this whare into our communities, into the halls of power and academe, into our homes and whānau. Respect and understanding will lead to a stronger nation where people feel secure and can face the world. Thank you to everyone for making a contribution.



## Feedback and Suggestions

Following the first He Whenua Taurikura 2021, we sought feedback from participants to inform the planning and development of the 2022 hui. This is how we addressed that feedback:

- *Ensure that tikanga is fully embedded into the design of the hui.* We worked closely with mana whenua, Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei, to ensure the hui was underpinned by principles of tikanga and manaakitanga to establish a kawa of safe and respectful engagement.
- *Consider the order of panels, to ensure that voices of tangata whenua and people with lived-experiences of terrorism and violent extremism are prioritised.* The hui opened with a session on Te Tiriti o Waitangi to reflect the government's commitment to taking a uniquely Aotearoa New Zealand approach to preventing and countering violent extremism. He Whenua Taurikura 2021 appropriately and necessarily focussed on the lived-experiences of the terror and tragedy of the March 15 attack in Christchurch. Two of the speakers at the hui this year were survivors of that attack.

The programme for the 2022 hui also made space for a different group of people to speak about their lived-experience of the consequences of violent extremism. This was not to detract from the experiences of the survivors and families of Christchurch. Rather it reinforces the fact that dehumanising and hateful ideas that are part of ideologies that include hate and intolerance toward specific groups or communities promote or enable violence and that these ideas may indicate a path toward violent extremism.

- *Ensure space is provided for youth voices.* We specifically identified youth organisations (and individuals) as part of the engagement plan and also invited stakeholder groups to identify and recommend youth representatives to participate. The Classification Office's Youth Advisory panel was invited to lead a session in the hui. The organisers acknowledge there is more to do to engage youth.
- *Have more time for active participation, through workshops and break-out sessions.* Participatory and interactive sessions (e.g. workshops, concurrent sessions) were prioritised and encouraged in the programme design. Unfortunately, the format of some sessions was necessarily changed due to respond to time pressures or participant feedback, the degree of interaction was not as great as intended. The organisers will take this into future hui planning.
- *Focus in future years on specific aspects of countering terrorism and violent extremism, rather than trying to cover a wide range of issues at a single hui.* The scope of the He Whenua Taurikura hui 2022 was narrower than last year, focusing on whakahōtaetae, the prevention of terrorism and violent extremism. Prevention is just one part of the [Countering Violent Extremism Strategy](#).
- *Linking sessions directly to the work undertaken by the National Centre of Excellence for preventing and countering violent extremism, for example by having researchers from the Centre reporting back on their findings.* We were very mindful of this feedback as we developed the hui programme; however, the timing was not right for the researchers to present their findings this year.



We will continue to improve and take on feedback from all of our participants, as He Whenua Taurikura hui does not belong to one organisation or sector of society, it belongs to Aotearoa New Zealand.

Feedback from this year's hui includes:

- There was an obvious building on the last hui and a sense of moving forward. This could be strengthened by showing how the strategy/response is moving forward each year.
- Be clear about the purpose and outcome for the hui. A stronger focus on practical solutions for preventing and countering violent extremism is needed.
- Ensure that there is more time and opportunity for discussion and dialogue between participants.
- Include more youth in the organisation and running of the event.
- Would be good to hear more about what is happening at grass roots of civil society.
- Continue to have mana whenua involvement in the planning and delivery of the hui.

Additional feedback, suggestions and contributions can be provided to [HWT@dpmc.govt.nz](mailto:HWT@dpmc.govt.nz).



## Appendix A: Engaging with Māori (some ideas)<sup>3</sup>

*Clarify why you want to engage with Māori.*

- What do we want from the engagement?
- How will it add value to what you do?
- What are your shared intended outcomes?
- Find common ground

*Consider what type of engagement you want:*

- Long term? (collaborative? cooperative?)
- Specific project/short term
- Levels? (Structural, institutional, operational)
- Service
- Involving tikanga?

*Consider who you will/may engage with:*

- Research to understand who Māori in your rohe are, what they do and how they may participate in your organisation
- What support you may need?
- Who will advise you?
- What value will you add to what they do?

*Consider how you want to engage*

- Usual rules for engagement apply (respect etc).
- Be prepared to apply tikanga. Embrace it.
- Learn some reo mihi
- Meet at the right level
- 100 cups of tea
- Listen to understand their world view
- Formal agreement?
- What will you bring to the relationship?

---

<sup>3</sup> Courtesy of Te Huia Bill Hamilton

