

Kupe Leadership Scholarship, The University of Auckland

Breakfast Event to Launch 2020 Cohort, 28 July 2020

Welcome from Acting Dean of Business Susan Watson

Transcript of the panel discussion:

**Rod Oram (RO):** Ata Marie, good morning. It is a great pleasure to be here for the first public event for the Kupe scholars. I know you had a fantastic orientation in February, at Waitangi, which is the perfect place to do so, and you have kept in close contact since. But it is wonderful to be able to gather the wider Kupe community here today with alumni from the first cohort, mentors and sponsors and supporters as well. I'm Rod Oram, and I'm a business journalist, and it's my great privilege and pleasure to be your MC this morning. We have a simple theme for this morning's discussion, it's the state of the world and what we're going to do about it. And we've only got until nine o'clock. This might just be a first cut for a continuing discussion.

It is a great pleasure for us to be here to have a go, because as we all know, the world is changing phenomenally in human society and physically, the planet, and we are having to learn a whole bunch of new things about how we might respond. And I think in that context, the Kupe scholarships are particularly important. It's obviously with great thanks to John and Marcy McCall McBain for being generous. I've always been intrigued by why they chose New Zealand to do this, and I have not had the discussion with John but I like to think it's because we on a smaller scale. We have that closely connected society, whereby we can have conversations. We can choose to do things together, should we want to, and thus make some progress. And to me it's incredibly important to note that in the annual democracy index, in the top 10 democracies in the world, eight of the 10 have populations of 10 million or less. So, in other words, it is more possible to run a country when it's small and, for the record, we are at number four, but caution there, we score on political participation the same as the United States which is now listed as a flawed democracy, down to 27 in the list. So we obviously have work to do.

The Kupe scholarship is so important because it is about helping people to progress. It's about passing the baton, it's about bringing on the next generation. As we are the ones where we don't quite fade away, but we change our roles in life. So, it's a huge pleasure to be here for that. I was a mentor last year, and it was a real privilege to have wonderful discussions with Audrey. I was thrilled that she was intensely interested in sustainable finance and is now back in London, working in that field. I'm sorry that she's not here but I know she, she will be in spirit. And now we've got for our discussion this morning four wonderful panellists. So I'd like to welcome them up please and then I'll begin a process for introducing them and getting the discussion going. So, May, KDee Marama, and Peter. If you'd like to come on up. Take whichever seats you fancy.

I'm always fascinated by how people introduce themselves. And so I'm not really going to say much about our panellists, but I'm going to go down the line and ask them to introduce themselves, and just talk briefly for a couple of minutes about the biggest change in their thinking, over these last four or five months of pandemic, and lockdown and life thereafter. So I'm just going to start simply on this end with Peter - Doctor, scientist, public intellectual and the like. Peter, how would you describe yourself, and what's been changing in your family over the last few months?

**Sir Peter Gluckman (PG):** A juggler. Too many hats, too many balls in the air, at any one time. Look, I am an ex-biomedical scientist, turned social scientist, turned political scientist, turned I'm not sure

what... What's changed in the last few months has been being stuck in New Zealand. I'm used to spending two weeks a month in New Zealand and now it full time. And it's the interesting thing of understanding how New Zealand maintains its connectivity to the world which we must do, from a distance. And it's possible but it's not easy, and there's lots of issues that emerge in that. The other thing that emerges is the reality that no one discipline has the answers. The issue, the reality is if we look at COVID, you can see, on one hand, you need biomedical science. On the other, we need social science, and even further on you need the normative disciplines of ethics, of philosophy to actually understand how we are to sustain our way through this world. And I think it's the move from thinking that there are magic bullets, to understanding that we really do need to integrate knowledge in a transdisciplinary way. And I mean that in a genuine sense, which is not just bringing disciplines together but actually framing the question together, which I think is the fundamental to all of the big challenges of the next 20 years, Rod, that you were alluding to in your introduction.

**RO:** Thank you very much indeed. And next up it is my great pleasure to introduce, Marama Davidson, politician, mother and revelling I'm sure in having a fabulous professional actor as a father, which I'm particularly envious of myself. So, over to you

**Marama Davidson (MD):** Kia ora koutou. I would firstly describe myself as a descendant of Ngati Porou from the east coast, Te Rarawa from the far north, and also Ngapuhi from Hokianga, and most relevant to this morning, a descendant of Hokianga nui a Kupe, the returning place of Kupe. So I find it very honourable to have that connection to everyone in this room and this programme. Over the past three or four months.... and it's always dangerous when you go behind these fabulous people. Sir Peter Gluckman also picked up on what I was thinking as soon as I walked into this room, and then as we were introduced to the Kupe scholars is that more now than ever, we need to acknowledge our ecosystem of wisdoms, and that, for far too long, we have undermined certain wisdoms. Nature understands the importance of ecosystems, nature understands that every single organism, microscopically small or ginormously large, contributes to the wellbeing of the whole community whether that is the forest, the ocean, the soils, the rivers, the air, and that humans need to return to the ancient wisdoms alongside our modern developments and our modern technologies and understand that all of our wisdoms make up a whole and need to contribute. Here in this room alone, you have a perfect example of that. You have an example of people researching and deep diving into many different disciplines, and I want to specifically acknowledge the wealth that is that indigenous knowledges from around the world, need to be essential in how things are laid out through the big crises we're facing of climate change, environmental degradation and inequality. And really, just to sort of finish off, the past three four months, for example, has shown particular global movements, uprisings, grassroots organized collaborative collectives. The Black Lives Matter movement is a climate justice movement , is an economic justice movement, is an environmental justice movement. And understanding that all of these people-powered movements are coming to the fore, because people are realizing for far too long, the rules have been set to undermine certain wisdom, certain knowledges and all along, we have needed everyone at the table, so that we can have better outcomes that are more enduring that connect us better to each other and to our planet.

**RO:** Thank you. And next up Mai Chen lawyer, Asian leaders founder and super-diversity centre, etc. Mai, over to you.

**Mai Chen (MC):** So it's lovely to be back here. I was an adjunct professor here. Can I acknowledge Professor Susan Watson and can I also acknowledge Vanessa Stoddart. I wasn't born in this country. And when I think about a global event, what that requires is a shift in the relationship between central and local government and citizens. So, BAU processes and timeframes don't work anymore.

And I think COVID has changed the levers for changing society. Look at what's happened with our legislation. A lot of it's been passed under urgency, and it's big, chunky legislation that tells you that you have to stay at home, that tells you that you can't work, that tells you that you have to close businesses, and that's fine, as long as we don't lose in that process, the importance of transparency and that we protect human rights. We've got the Borrowdale case going on at the moment in the courts. And there was a time during the lockdown when I was approached by people wanting to sue the government. And I must say it was a very brave person who did that, given a very high approval rating here for that to happen. But we love this country, because we love the rule of law. And so it is important that still those very draconian powers are exercised in a manner which is transparent and lawful. Of course this has had an impact on business and the economy. I sit as a director on the Bank of New Zealand board. I think our role has changed. I think we have a fundamentally different role as a good employer. It's important for us to look after our staff and ensure that they have jobs. It isn't just about the bottom line anymore. Also, there's no point, when half our customers are on some sort of government subsidy, and for companies who put their hands out and say actually we'd like millions of dollars of wage subsidy to then decide that they're going to give all of your senior staff and CEOs, a wage increase and bonuses. The role of regulators in the lives of business has fundamentally changed. Regulators are now saying, if you take any government assistance, you will not increase the salaries of your people, and you will not give them bonuses and for all those people who took wage subsidies, you're going to be audited very strictly now by IRD. This is about conduct, but it's also about looking after your vulnerable customers. And I think the way in which we look after our vulnerable customers as business has also fundamentally changed because of the role of government. They are now dictating much stricter requirements as to what you are proactively required to do. And it's interesting when you look at all of these and you look at the role of our leadership in taking wage cuts and showing solidarity with customers and staff to think to ourselves that COVID is global, and we've needed the government to intervene in a different way. But you know, the biggest crisis still is climate change. It's just that it didn't lock me up in my home. It hasn't made me lose my job yet. It didn't force me to put a mask on. And so, in terms of the leaders of change now. I think the big idea is this: You want to change things? It's different. There's more lobbying now than there was before, because the government has a role to play. It's muscular and it's got lots of money. So you actually have to go and say: 'Well hang on, we'd like some over here please'. Also, you can't just ignore legislation and policy, you need to be involved in it, because it can have such a devastating impact on your lives. Thank you.

**RO:** Thank you very much indeed. And it's my great pleasure to introduce KDee Mai'ai. KDee, I am pleased to say this of course is an alumna of the first cohort, but very, very importantly, and is about to be a Rhodes Scholar, and the first Pacific woman to win that huge honour. And so will be off to Oxford, to do her D Phil in international development. So KDee.

**KDee Ma'ia'i (KM):** Kia ora, Talofa Lava, Good morning. My name is KDee Aimiti Ma'ia'i and my whanaunga came here from Samoa and from Scotland. I am very blessed to live here on Ngati Whatua land and to whakapapa back to *\*inaudible* in Samoa. And so, thank you for the lovely introduction, I was a Kupe scholar last year very fortunately, and at the end of last year I became the first Pacific woman to win a Rhodes Scholarship. I'm going to Oxford to do my D Phil in International Development, trying to map the ways that indigenous pacific people conceive of their development in the current crisis of climate change as alluded to already. And when I was thinking of the things that I've most learned and the things that have made me think throughout the COVID period and the surrounding black lives matter movement. And I was thinking, somewhat uncharacteristically optimistically about the precedent-setting moment of change. So we've been told, when we've been knocking at doors and requesting for fundamental issues that are threatening our lives - obviously I

look to climate change that is already devastating homelands and people and incomes - we're being told that it costs too much money, that it makes too much change, that it will impact too many people's lives to change it. Obviously, it has been proven that that isn't true. So, when there has been both a need and a political will, of which COVID had both, there is the possibility for all encompassing change. And I think we can look to several key points throughout the world of where it's necessary because obviously climate change, within a domestic context there is an unequal and fairly prejudiced Treaty settlement process, there is rampant inequality, child poverty and intergenerational trauma. So I don't think we're short of places that need change and that we can grasp the opportunities of the, of the possibility of change that COVID has shown us.

**RO:** Thank you very much indeed. And I was very game to introduce myself in this spirit of the way I teach. My family and I are immigrants, and we are passionate citizens of Aotearoa, and everything I've ever learned, and continue to learn, I do so on one of my many bicycles. I could explain that afterwards if you're interested.

And so it is a great privilege though, to be a journalist in times like this, because of the great array of issues that we have in front of us. I've got a few more questions to put to the panel, but we're very, very keen to hear what's on your mind. So very shortly I'm going to be looking for questions and comments from you all. And this is a technology challenge room, two microphones is the maximum for the system. So you're going to have to speak up when you do want to ask something.

The first question I want to put to us is a recurring theme here, about needing to be able to engage people in the discussions, in the debates, in the progress, but are there some new and better ways that we're starting to see that we can do that? Let's go down the line.

**PG:** Philip Kitcher, one of the great American philosophers, talks about vulgar democracy. And what he means by that is democracy where you have an uninformed or misinformed electorate. And we live in a world at the moment with a lot of misinformation and a lot of disinformation, and where one of the forms of disinformation we have is to argue that there's some magic bullet to very complex problems. And I think the issue that we have in a world of Twitter and the world of very short, social media editing, it is how to have conversations, which are complex, which by definition are going to involve contesting ideas, both the knowledge and contesting ideas and values. And how one as a constructive consultation and compensation in a country like New Zealand, which, as Rod points out in his introduction is small, and probably more cohesive easily than many other countries, is critical. But we actually don't know how to do it. My own centre Koi Tu, or the centre for informed futures, is doing a lot of work or starting a lot of work, on new ways to have deliberative consultation over complex issues with diverse populations. Mind you, the future of any form of democracy, cannot be a vulgar democracy as Kitcher talked about, but needs to be a democracy, that is capable of making consensus decisions on these complex issues, and we need new ways of doing it. How much involves technology, how much involve face to face is one trivial aspect. The bigger aspect is how we have conversations about complexity. Trade offs. What are the trade offs, what are the spillover benefits, and so forth. So we work a lot of new ways of doing that.

**MD:** Gosh. Brilliant, relevant, timely question. One thing that I'm very clear on is, is we all are trying to counter the misinformation. What we have to.. what is very easy and very tempting is to dismiss people who you think even your own people and your own family and networks who can see falling down a rabbit hole of misinformation, but in fact to counter misinformation we need to stay connected to each other and to all of our people, especially those who we think are going off into margins of harmful misinformation. Maintaining those connections is going to be key, and that is difficult, because it can take energy, capacity and spirit to maintain connections with discussions,

which should draw from you, which deplete you. But that is going to be one of the first things we all have to do and I and I know personally how difficult that is. I think, what Peter picked up on as how we do that how we maintain connected, is the common ground of values. In actual fact, most of us have very similar values. In actual fact, the misinformation are organized campaigns, they are not random appear. They are proactively organized campaigns who are exploiting the disconnection that is already present. And so, but in actual fact, when we talk about human values, human decency, that is where our common ground does matter. And that is how we can stay connected to each other, and overcome the misinformation and harmful agendas of misinformation, which seek to separate us, which seek to divide us and keep us separated from each other. That is going to be really difficult. We have a fantastic case study here in Tamaki Makaurau with the Ihumātao movement. What they showed is that over years, using both face to face and technology, they concentrated on building networks and relationships, right from the very beginning - at least six years ago now - they started reaching out to people, key people across different communities across the country. They started giving those key people the background to the complexity of what justice they were seeking. They started opening up their whenua for discussion, for accessible visits, and they started drawing people in and, because of their values which are common human decent values, they managed to allure people into the movement from across the country and indeed the world. By taking time to build up those relationships to tell a cohesive human narrative story based on values, and to maintain their energy and connection, and most of all the dignity of that campaign, so that when the smears started coming in, they were united, remained focused and dedicated and disciplined to what they were wanting to achieve. There are case studies in Aotearoa, we are here on right next to *\*inaudible*. We are here on Ngati Whatua whenua and we have a strong history of building progressive movements to take action for justice.

**MC:** I think we need to adopt a super diversity framework when we think about community and communication and engaging people. Auckland in particular now is already 50% more Asian and Pacifica. We are the biggest Pacifica country in the world. Super diversity is defined is 25% of the population not born in the country, or more. That means that we can't just presume that we're going to communicate, engage in the way that we've always done. We also can't presume that values are going to be the same because different cultures have different approaches. I sometimes think about what it is to be Chinese and how I was brought up and how it's really odd, in many ways. I mean, in the culture I came from the important thing was success. And in this culture, the important thing is being nice. It's just different. Very different. And of course I was brought up to persevere and I was brought up to believe that hardship was important. I found it very difficult to inculcate that in my kiwi son. So, I think we do need to think about engagement in different parts of New Zealand particularly because these minorities are no longer minorities. If you look at the predictions from Stats New Zealand to 2038 we're talking about 51% of the population by then being predominantly, Asian, and then Maori and then Pacifica, but also 65% of us still being Anglo Saxon because of mixed race marriage. My son has Scottish parents on the grandparents on the one hand, and Taiwanese grandparents, on the other hand. That's my first point. My second point is that we're about to go into an election, with two referenda, which are going to be carried out by government. The information and the engagement has been undertaken by government. It's been undertaken by government funded organizations, and the Electoral Commission. And the question is, it's a very big question, does the government have more of a role in that area and how do we do that in a way that ensures that it remains independent and neutral and not adapted to nudge you in a particular direction, which is politically motivated. They're big questions, really important questions, particularly if we're going to have an increased number of referenda going forward. Thank you.

**KM:** I think when we're discussing these things, ideas of how to engage people to understand or appreciate or to sympathize with what we're trying to say, as we've already sort of been saying, we need to recognize that everyone has different priorities, everyone has a different outlook and lens through which they see the world and see the problems. I think, in that is, you know, are you trying to engage and convince people who are oppositional to you, and that they should align with your views or are you trying to reach the people who aren't necessarily not empathetic, but just aren't participating or have other priorities, day to day living priorities. And I think that's important to recognize so when we're talking about democracy and low participation rates and as you were saying earlier, you know that our participation rates in democracies and with the referendums coming up is that people aren't necessarily not participating because they don't care, or because they're apathetic or that they're not interested; people just have different daily priorities. So it's important for us to meet people where they are, recognize the things that they're carrying, and what they're wanting to see in their future. Because as we're all sitting in this room, there are countless generations before us, that have been trying to articulate what future they wanted for themselves. And that was either removed, or the possibility, somewhat diluted. So, for those who are who are oppositional, and who are against what you're trying to navigate for, I think it's important that we.... So in the case when people are, you know, apathetic, for lack of a better word, for the people that are oppositional, it's important that you create a human face, that you create human connection. Because with COVID we had buy in from people you wouldn't think would be saying yes Labour government, Green government, let's lock down the country. So it's important that we're creating human connections, and how can people recognize that these threats that might not affect them are affecting the world and are affecting people. So, creating a space in which people can become allies, without feeling as if they're giving up something of themselves.

**RO:** Thank you very much indeed. So another warm up. We are coming to you for a question very soon so I'm looking at twitching hands. But here's a thought, and it just occurred to me that we are all citizens of Aotearoa and yet we represent five different mother cultures, as it were, whether it's an Asian – Taiwan - whether it's tangata whenua, whether it's a native pakeha Jewish or in my case, immigrant pakeha. And if we reach back into those mother cultures, is there something that resonates for us that helps us communicate with others and to build bonds. And that is something that we can take into these discussions that we have to have?

**PG:** That's a really hard question to answer in a sense we can take an, I guess an, idealistic view of it. The anthropologists have looked at this in quite some detail actually. Harvey Whitehouse is the professor of social cohesion in Oxford and he has done a lot of work in the Pacific cultures and looked across 100 different cultures. What are the common values that might exist across cultures, even though they may be embedded in very different rituals and custom? And it comes down to a very small number of features of cooperative activity within the in-group. And of course the issue is the in-group has is changing. We evolved in very small groups to live in groups of 50 people, 100 people. And now we live in groups of infinite size, with both physical and virtual connectivity. And we live in multiple identities at once. We no longer just a singular identity of being a Jewish boy living in a shtetl in Lithuania or whatever it was called in those days, living with a narrow world, and now living globally. Last night I was on the phone with two UN groups for most of the night, discussing human centred development needs, and then thinking about what COVID means for the Sustainable Development Goals. So quite different world one lives in that sense. And now the issue for human behaviour is, when are we working within our narrow identity, whatever that identity is? And when are we living in a broader identity beyond which we evolved within our brains. And so we have this constant conflict between, when we're working for ourselves a selfish sense, if you like. And when we're working collectively, with the out-groups at the same time. And this is a very hard

thing which our brains were actually not designed for, but which is the world we've now created for ourselves here to live in. And navigating our way through this very interconnected society with the super-diversity Mai Chen talked about is a difficult journey, and we're on our way through it now. The issues that have caught up in the referenda around marijuana actually reflect that. Why do we need another drug? What was wrong in our society that we need another drug to lift their mood on one hand? I'm serious. And the other deep issue, why are there these families, disadvantaged intergenerationally, disadvantaged people who have been living against the rules of the society? And the real referendum is actually in some ways about helping those people. That means it's complicated.

**MD:** Kia ora. I was thinking about mother culture which I think is.. well, that in itself is a thing. So, we have for a long time lived in a patriarchal society and patriarchy is not good for any gender. But one of the things I was thinking about, what do I try and connect myself to and anchor myself to every single day, in a world that pushes against connectivity is... wanting to get to an understanding where all of us, no matter what cultural background we come from, think of our homeland mountain, or our homeland river as quite literally part of our whakapapa. So that when we stand up and say, Te Ramaroa is my maunga, we are actually saying Te Ramaroa is my ancestor, not Te Ramaroa is like my ancestor, but in actual fact that mountain is a literal part of my DNA, is a literal part of my whakapapa. And I have to acknowledge that not all maōri and not all tangata whenua can even stand and say, who their maunga is, can even stand and find that connection in their vocalizing and acknowledging the colonial processes, and the deep intergenerational trauma, that has resulted in that for many of us today. But, and I want us to all aspire to reconnecting ourselves with our places whatever and wherever they are in the world, including here, talking about being connected to a mountain is also about accountability and resisting the separation, that modern inhumane capitalism has put on all of us. And reconnecting us to long term, seven generation minimum accountability to what we need our world to function like long after we are gone and resisting the immediate short term gratification, that has been imposed upon all of us, which sets us up in competition against each other, against other communities. You know I think back to what we were saying, yes we all have different ways and different views of the world, but for example I think of you could have the Klu Klux Klan on this side and you could have indigenous peoples on this side. And both of them recognizing that they need a home to live in. And people on both sides, who don't have a home to live in, can absolutely agree that everyone needs a home to live in. But we have been set up to blame that group and that group and that group here on the ground level for not having the things we need to survive. And that has distracted us away from the systemic disconnection and the systemic issues. The laws and the rules that have been created to leave a lot of people out. And a lot of people fighting each other. So I go back to the simplicity of connecting ourselves to our mountain and better having a collective accountability back to that mountain, which also helps to draw us groups together, and sidesteps the systems which want to fight us against each other.

**MC:** So if you look at the studies that the super-diversity Institute have undertaken show that in general Maōri, Pasifika and Asian cultures have a great deal in common. And unlike the pakeha culture or Australian European culture. We tend to be highly collective and high power distanced, so we are all about status, looking after elders, looking to our ancestors. And we also tend to be group oriented. It affects the way that we view things, and it affects the way we relate to things and it affects our behaviour. So for example, I did work for both WorkSafe and ACC and found that the health and safety laws in this country don't work, actually, because it's built on a particular pakeha culture of whistleblowing, which is complete anathema to the cultures that we come from, actually, we don't operate on that basis. The second point I want to make is that when people don't come from here, they often come from a really different rule of law culture. They come from cultures

without a rule of law. They come from a culture where there may be a party that is in charge. And in certain countries in Asia, unless you are part of a particular political party you can't be a lawyer, and they don't have an independent judiciary. So I think that when we are looking at people and their values and where they come from, we just need to understand that they come from very different places. Otherwise when we're seeking to engage them on values, they can't find a way in and you won't be able to find them because they're not where you think they are. And even sometimes people say to me, you know, Mai, you just need to toe the line. And I say to them, 'well you tell me where the line is!'

**KM:** Touching on your first point. Again, I think to me as a Pacific person navigating the world, it's impossible for me not to discuss the future without recognizing the fluidity of what has happened before. I think when we talk about Pacific indigenous cultures, there's a tendency to think that there's this thing that suddenly appeared, and then it's remained the same the entire way through, and that isn't true. So as we are in this new world that is connected differently, that looks differently, and is made up of different demography, that we can sort of take strength in the fact that things have changed before, that we have had self driven change along with imposed change. And within that imposed change we have been able to indigenize the process. We can look at religion throughout the Pacific, that was in many ways an unwelcome introduction that was indigenized for Pacific needs. We can look in New Zealand throughout multi prophetic movements and the indigenisation of Judaism, for example. There are ways in which we have been able to embrace and make the best out of the situation that we may not have requested in the first place. And that's not to suggest that we shouldn't be saying we're fine with every and all changes, but recognizing that we do have some agency and power, in the relationship, being willing to go with with change and making the change for ourselves and for our communities. Obviously underlying that is a platform of connection, of recognition of land and recognition of our own indigenous knowledge systems. And that has to be, I think, not only our own propellant, but our national and global propellant. It's not something that I have ever or that my family has ever taught me to safeguard. And I think that it's something like that is being shared, and hopefully received, with good grace.

**RO:** Fine, thank you very much indeed. And I feel the least I could do is try and answer the question I posed, and it is very difficult because it gets rather personal about one's own life and thus blurred. And looking back at those early years those early decades. And of course, where the disintegrating United Kingdom is today is not where I was growing up. But I think one thing that was very powerful for me was sort of a quest for knowledge and for learning. And the most remarkable group of people, were where I grew up in Birmingham. And so in the late 18th century early 19th century there was this amazing group of industrialists and scientists and philosophers and artists, and people like Charles Darwin's grandfather, Wedgwood, Bolton. Extraordinary people, that were all great amateur scientists, in the days before there were professional scientists, and it was that extraordinary pursuit of knowledge. But the most amazing thing about them was that as a group, they disagreed, quite strenuously about things about politics, even about the science they were doing, everything else, but they still managed to maintain some sort of community. So, that's something I hang on to.

And now I turn to questions and somebody already has their hand up.

**Question from audience (Anita Baldauf):** I strongly believe in having values as your guiding star. And the discussion has been very insightful. And we are a very diverse country here in New Zealand but I ask myself, what are the common commonalities? Shouldn't we be trying to concentrate on what we really all feel strongly about? I would think about truthfulness or integrity. What are the common



values we want to be guided by, and to be chosen because we speak about diversity, which is wonderful. But what does bring us together. And, and I would ask myself, how can we help not only a small group of people to be guided. But one nation.

**PG:** That's a hard question, because I think the issue is that everybody in this room, does have somewhat different ways we use the word values, worldview. You can debate that as a philosopher but the point is we all do come with different histories and different ambitions and different exposures. The issue that we've got to get to is how does New Zealand have good conversations on complex methods that are consensual and don't be degraded by ad hominem attacks. Twitter attacks. Political one liners, zingers just to get on TV. And how do we actually have conversations about how we're going to manage the three or four big challenges we have. Those challenges are obviously the environment, all aspects which Rod writes about so well and so often, all the issues that were raised around the inter-generational disadvantage, disempowered people that Marama and others talked about so eloquently, the issues of how we sustain economic growth as good for the standards of well being that we want, the issues of mental health that we've not discussed here today, that which I write a lot about - wellbeing. Because we know that in this very rapidly changing world, the other big existential threat is loss of well being, loss of social cohesion that comes with that. And then the last challenge is going to be the challenge of technology, the disruption of technology is going to be enormous. If I just take one minute to tell a frightening anecdote. I once spend two hours in the car traveling from a conference to the airport with the former chief philosopher of Facebook, he had just resigned as chief philosopher and ethicist at Facebook. I was actually surprised that they had a philosopher at Facebook, and I understood why he resigned. He made the point and it's a really important point. And he was looking at me from the conversation we've been in which is about technology and society. There are a number of values, which most western people think are relatively the constant. And they might be seen as privacy, they might be seen as agency and might be seen as autonomy, they might be seen as a relationship between you as a citizen and the state that it within you live, and you can break it up and obviously the problem is you think that constant. But for most people they didn't exist 200 years ago. And in the minds of the technologists, they may not exist in 20 years time. And we're actually in a very rapid change in what technology might do to well being. At the level of individual, the levels of social interactions is changing dramatically. At the level of the institutions of social life. And at the level of the institutions of civic life including law, including the way governments operate. We've already lost the power to regulate pornography, to regulate libel slander others. And probably the Reserve Bank will lose its power to maintain currency in the next decade. There's a lot going on out there which is fundamentally changing us, and we haven't worked out how to work with technology.

**MD:** I'm trying to make sure I understand your question, and I'm not sure if I do, but I think you are getting to the fact that, understanding the reality that there are there are different experiences different perspectives, different worldviews how do we bring people together? And I think... And I deal with us every single day, as a politician and just as a human citizen of the planet. I think it's always going to be confronting for people, when you have lived in a reality - that our world has privileged certain groups. And it has privileged certain groups. And I think that can be confronting when people think that their entire livelihood depends on sustaining that privilege. So I think we can reduce the fear, all of us together in that when we stop for privileging only certain groups that actually we will all be better off that as I said at the beginning, in an ecosystem of knowledge systems, leadership systems and peoples. The reality is that we are all different. And we are all diverse. We can't actually change that. We have to welcome it and embrace it. And we have to start being open to an array of voices and an array of ways of living and an array of seeing the solutions to the world. And that is actually going to lead us to be more committed. We have been sadly pushed

into corners and told that the only way that we are going to maintain our livelihood is to make sure that those other groups don't get the don't get over us, and that is an unfortunate completely slanted way of looking at the world. We have to understand that there is enough on this planet that everyone to live good lives as they are. To be able to value and cherish each other's heritage's and backgrounds, and that there is a way for us all to be connecting and enriching each other's lives, rather than having any dominant worldviews, any dominant world approaches, which is what we have been living with for a long time. And yes, it will be hard, and it will be confronting. That is where the maintaining the compassion at the core of our discussions is going to be key, having some kindness and understanding that for some people it is going to be difficult to face up to the fact that we have had privilege and oppression of certain groups in communities, and that we can all do better, and we will all be better off - our children and our grandchildren - as we start to dismantle that. And as we start to enrich and welcome each other's diversity, which does actually connect our human values. Actually, we do all agree. I think everyone knows that our rivers need to be saved. I think everyone knows that water literally is life and we need to protect it. And among us all we do have some core values – that might not be the word but it's the word I use - we do have some core understandings that we all agree on. And that there is a lot for us to work on together.

**MC:** New Zealand is unusual because we don't have a written constitution. Ultimately in a country, I could argue that the values, the freedoms, the rights that we must value should be protected in a higher law entrenched doctrine documents. So maybe what you are arguing for is the need for a formal written constitution with a higher law status, which we don't currently have. And to date we haven't needed it because supposedly we haven't had a crisis, which has forced us in that direction. Although I think Marama would say that we have had one, but they just haven't been in the majority to be able to enforce that. And a constitution is so important because the rule of law, ultimately, is what breaks down, when you get narcissism and all of those things that we don't like in terms of a lack of values. And so, of course, Rod and I had a chat before about where government currently is. And we need to make sure that emergency situations don't also result in a lack of transparency and a lack of the rule of law. So, ultimately, that's where it is. And I think you think more about those things because of course, you sound as if you are an immigrant to this country and as a consequence of that, I think you think more about what it is you like about the country you go to and what you would not want to be compromised. So we have a journey to go yet.

**KM:** Values is interesting because we think of them as being something tangible. I think that behaviour that follows a particular value or a particular outlook are tangible but values aren't necessarily, and I think values are subjective so one thing like truth could mean something to many different people. One thing integrity as you're saying, may be something different to a lot of people, and I think that's the difficulty and achieving common ground or getting some sort of unification, and that things mean different things to different people. I don't think that should stop us from trying to get some sort of unification, some idea that collectivity is important and that we all recognize that. But it requires two parties, multiple parties, but it requires people to be willing to come to the table to reach some sort of commonality. I think a lot of people, a lot of people aren't. And so, as you know, we can debate over the, the sort of finalities of what particular things are, I think as Marama was saying, there are some certainties. I think everyone thinks there should be equal opportunities for everyone. Everyone thinks that every child should have food. So there is some common ground. And I think that those are fine. And I think that values don't necessarily have to be profound. I don't think it has to be a philosophical sort of lightbulb moment where we all agree that truth means something good and that accepting that duality and the, you know, the multiple positions that everyone holds might be enough in terms of getting common values.

**RO:** Thank you very much. Right behind us.

**Question from audience (Chloe Wright):** I would just like to pair this right back to where it actually is. So Peter says it's, it can be simple, but it's very complicated. But I'll go back to the simple image, just a simple grassroots person, and within the last week I've been in a prison situation, I've been at the birth of a baby, I'll be with a group of homeless people tomorrow night. There is a common thing that we're not talking about. We're talking about us and having conversations and how do you fix certain problems, but really it all begins at the beginning of life. We're talking recently about teaching ethics in the workplace, teaching all sorts of things that actually can come from the home, should come from the home. My beginning... I'm the last of nine children and we didn't have a great deal. But we had strong parents, we had books, we had things that actually mean something and most of all, we had security. And the first thing a child needs is security, and what security do we have in this world at the moment? Very little because we don't know what's happening. But if we have had that beginning, that is secure, we build resilience we build the ability to be able to deal with things as they happen, and just move on and look to the future. The past is the past and so many people have been hurt from it. So many of us, not just particular groups but individuals are being discriminated against, have been marginalized, and it's the resilience we learn from the first teachers which are parents that get us through all of these things. So I say that we really need to look at that, we need to recognize that, we need to talk about that. It's not bodies having discussions and how we fix things or how we bring things together. It's actually recognising parents as first teachers, and the child who becomes the adult is going to be affected by their experience for ever. No matter what else happens. Everybody needs somebody to love them, and it may not have been those parents. But with that love, or mentoring, or whatever they need... I hear story after story of people who have had difficulties and one person in the life, often a teacher, is the one that actually empowers, and lets them see that they can have aspirations. So, you know, putting on my hat as anthropologist medical anthropologist, I've worked with, and studied groups all over the world, indigenous cultures, who have a way of teaching, that is universal, that is absolutely marvellous. And I don't see any group as being victims, I see particular groups within New Zealand, especially as being teachers, and I've written about this. That if we have the people who have traditional teachings, as they actually... instead of seeing people as victims but looking at them as teachers, we could gain so much. So there's my sort of grassroots trying to pass it out very quickly.

**PG:** I think you've actually hit on an issue which is.... you know I worry about an awful lot, which is individual psychological resilience. We live in a world of very rapid change. And in the middle of it are humans. And it's the psychological resilience to change which will determine how each of us makes our journey through the world. We know that is under enormous threat. In every western country where it's been studied the rates of mental health morbidity in teenagers have doubled in the last decade. The best outcomes are from Denmark and 25% of young women between 15 and 25, do not have optimal mental health, that's a similar rise in boys. Sorry I meant to add that was 16% a decade ago. Now 25% similar in boys but at lower levels. In New Zealand Richie Poulton and Arlene Hayne tell me it's doubled in the last same period. We know the pillars of individual psychological resilience. It's the first five years of life. We know that, but we don't in this country think properly about early childhood education, we don't think about the need to be focused on building those skills, it's been used largely as a workforce maintenance toolkit rather than as an individual child development toolkit. We're not using the education system properly, in terms of reinforcing that in primary schools and secondary schools, and quite frankly if we don't deal with this issue, the other issues will pale into insignificance if we do not have psychological resilience to change. And so there's a big shift needed in understanding the value of a healthy start to life. And it's not just about the biological aspects, it's the emotional, social, economic, there's many dimensions

to it, which would again come back to my initial point, you can't look at this through one lens of biology or sociology or economics or whatever, they all come together. But the most valuable resource we have in this country gets the least investment in many ways.

**MD:** Yeah, absolutely agree Chloe and Peter. If I can go back to what I said at the beginning and one of the examples of a patriarchal world. We have not valued female dominated professions such as nurses, midwives and early childhood education. And that in itself as undermining a good start for babies and families. And we do want all families and parents to be able to be strong to keep every child safe and thriving, but we are undermining that when we do not invest properly, when we do not understand the value, or how important those support systems are. For example, you know, midwives and nurses have been fighting for decades to be recognized as key to the best early start for all of our families. But, how we collectively value, and what we consider to be the most worthy has undermined many professions that actually contribute to the best start that we can collectively provide, that we can make sure that we are valuing parents to be the strongest parents, the most loving and safest parents that they can absolutely be. So I think you're absolutely right Chloe. We need to get our tools right to support those families and yes, again, we have diminished, those wonderful systems, which include indigenous systems of he taonga te mokopuna, which, you know, should be how we run our world. He taonga te mokopuna, is an ancient, eons old understanding that the most precious, the most precious people we have are our babies. That knowledge, as part of the ordinary colonial system has, we have lost it ourselves and there are researchers, programs, tangata whenua-led, kaupapa māori-led work that has been happening for decades to restore that, to restore our traditional knowledge of he taonga te mokopuna. Things like something as simple but as life saving as breastfeeding and how we transmit that generationally and how we also, for example, when there were people who couldn't... how we shared that responsibility, so that the baby could still get fed and nourished. When you recognize that it doesn't just rest on one individual mother that in actual fact we all have to jump in and support. So we are, there's a lot of work that has been done and I know Sir Peter has in his previous role as well, has been alongside those different researchers to restore those strengths. To come at everything from a strengths-based position is absolutely critical Chloe, and I hope we all can continue to support the restoration of that work that is still happening, it's a re-indigenizing of the way that we live.

**MC:** So the hardest court case I've ever argued, was when I acted for all of the independent midwives to try and argue that they were suffering from sex discrimination because they were in a female dominated profession, because the difficulty is you're trying to make visible something that is invisible. People say oh yeah but they've always been paid on average 35k, even if they're very senior. So it's good now, we've got a pay equity act. But it's still hard, you still have to use that tool. So we're here because it's a Kupe scholarship. This is about Wayfinding. So, it's a way of struggle, it always says, because what you're trying to do is make something that's invisible visible. And these invisible things are important.

**KM:** I think just quickly returning back to your statement and the idea, perhaps of your personal sort of anecdote. So when I won the scholarship last year there was this big sort of 'hurrah', sort of "look how amazing, she's managed to climb above the rest and she's doing better than everyone", which I think people thought that I would find that nice and that I would be complimented by that. But it's actually.... it was actually quite offensive and I felt sort of uncomfortable about the idea that people were saying that I was somehow better than my Pacific peers because I had managed to reach a particular point. And I think in discussions about deciding whether victimhood is appropriate or whether a strengths-based approach is appropriate, it's not necessarily on us, those who are here, those who are doing well within, you know, whatever system

we're viewing it within to decide how people should feel about the positions, or how people should feel about the position that they are in society. Because I agree with you. I think they, you know, the people who have had, unlinear projections in life are those we can learn the most from, but whether as a whole, as an entire society we all agree on that is a different story.

**RO:** Thank you. Susan.

**Question from audience (Susan Watson):** I know we're running out of time very fast. A final question I guess from the floor and that's around when we think of Kupe being the great navigator, who was kind of the wayfinder for others, because everyone knows he came to Hokianga and then he left and he said I will not come this way again. So in a sense, I guess the people sitting at the front here are wayfinders and leaders and Kupe scholars are beginning their journey. So as wayfinders who are somewhere along your different ways along your journey, what is one piece of really good advice would you give our new Kupe scholars?

**PG:** Probably two bits. First is, use your mentors, select your mentors, use their networking, because at the end of the day, in this interconnected world, it is still who you know and how you connect to it that determines the luck that you will have. The second thing is be resilient. You're going to get knocked back, you're going to get people insult you, attack you on Twitter or whatever. You're going to get jobs you want that you don't get, you know. There's always a chance in adversity to find opportunity. And I mean we've seen this with COVID. I mean look at New Zealand in the COVID crisis. Look at us after the Christchurch terror attack. There have been good things in a strange way that have come out of it in terms of our collectivism and an understanding and a willingness to rethink New Zealand's future (which I thought was what we're really going to be talking about today). But, but, so there are things that come out of it. It's not a matter of just sustaining optimism, it's actually being innovative in context that really matters.

**MD:** Wow. I often have to think about how I survive a political world and a political system which goes 100% every day against everything I believe in, and operates in an individualistic competitive manner, rather than as a collaborative collective focused manner. And it is set up to operate like that, so that I always... the hard lessons I have learned is when you think you can do the things by yourself. And that's actually where you're most vulnerable and that's actually where you will be attacked. So, constantly having a support network. I find it very difficult to be a political leader because I come from an upbringing of collective movements and having individuals out and front dismisses the fact that we are connected. There's a whole lot of support that goes on to keep any one person afloat, and stable and grounded and able to function at the thousand percent functionality that is required in a high paced political leadership job. But what doesn't get seen in the public and when I'm on media every single day is the support network, the people you need to trust, the people you need to trust to be able to be human. And look I'm coming at it from a from a very political leadership perspective because we're not actually allowed to be human. That, and we have got to change that yes, I understand, but we're not actually allowed to be vulnerable and human. But you are a human so you need the space to do that every day, you need the trusted circle of advice because also you're not always right, you are, you definitely are not always right. In fact, I'm wrong several times a day. And so you need your advisors, you need to gain your clarity and your pathway from a network of support people that you trust and to throw things against back and forth. And you also need to get over yourself.

**MC:** Kupe was a pioneer. You only pioneer when no one else has thought of it. If they've thought of it, you're pioneering. So people say to me, "no one is supporting me and everyone thinks I'm stupid".

And people will say that it's not going to work. Well, yes, it's because you're pioneering. Now sometimes it's just because you are a loser. Sometimes it's difficult to tell that. But to change the world, at least you come up with something which is unique because of your journey. And that you would do even if the world turned against you and walked out the door. That's how all the pioneers did it. So if you're doing it hard, that's how it's supposed to be. And that's the best advice I can give you because every time I've pioneered something, it's never, ever got easier. I thought oh well maybe the second or third time people might say "okay well we thought she was stupid the last time but actually, this time we think she's really bright and able". No, they still think you're stupid. You just have to decide that it's the right thing to do, you have to put your hand to the plough, and you have to not look back.

**KM:** I think having just come out of the Kupe program last year, the two biggest learnings that I had was that it's okay to be sort of headstrong and to feel like you're being the annoying person babbling on about the same thing and singing the same tune all the time. If that is what you truly believe in. And I think, you know, that sounds sort of airy fairy but I think having those principles, your own principles guiding the way that you interact with people is the single most important thing. The other part is also leadership isn't sort of this big profound thing that exists in theories and textbooks and these, you know, different you know "if you do this, this, this you'll be this type of leader". And I think if you get too caught up in the academic side of what being a leader means we miss the point of what being a leader actually is.

**RO:** Thank you very much indeed.

Vote of thanks etc.