



SHAUN YEO

Cartoonist Shaun Yeo drew a Kiwi crying to convey his and other New Zealanders' feelings on the mass shooting in Christchurch.

Submission

**The Royal Commission of Inquiry
into the Attack on Christchurch Mosques**

December 2019

PART ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this inquiry. The Christchurch attacks led to an outpouring of concern for those involved and for the wider Muslim community.¹ It was an extremely shocking series of events. The question of how to deal with such events is a complex and fast-moving area of public policy; one that requires New Zealand to navigate terrorism, racism, social media, risk management and the interconnection between sociological and technological innovation.

The attacks were shocking for a number of reasons. What resonated with the Institute was the fact that New Zealanders tend to think of New Zealand as a small, isolated, tolerant and relatively well-liked country. This invited two questions; first, why would someone want to inflict so much harm on New Zealand and New Zealanders? Perhaps it was a combination of New Zealand's characteristics listed above that made the country a target.

Second, why Christchurch? This is perhaps more difficult to understand. The earthquakes had a terrible impact; people died, many were injured, and homes and offices were destroyed. Citizens who had lived through the ongoing shakes and uncertainty, to some degree, remain exhausted – and as someone said recently, 'emotionally empty' and unable to deal with yet 'another tragedy'. Further, although Christchurch has always been known to have an open and welcoming culture, it also has a reputation for attracting particular racist groups and sentiments.² It appears it was this latter group that the accused attacker was wanting to impress and support as this was clearly the audience he was trying to communicate to. Perhaps the goal was to prove that no country is safe or that the accused attacker believed that New Zealand would be easy to target because the country was not prepared for such an event. Whatever the reasoning behind the attack, the reality is that this attack proved that New Zealand is vulnerable, and this will not be its last terrorist attack. For this reason, the Institute strongly support this inquiry, and believes that going forward New Zealand needs to build up its expertise before, during and after such attacks.

1.2 Inquiry scope

The scope of the inquiry is set out in the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Attack on Christchurch Mosques on 15 March 2019 Order 2019. It states:

Section 4: Matters upon which findings are sought

The inquiry must report its findings on the following matters:

- (a) whether there was any information provided or otherwise available to relevant State sector agencies that could or should have alerted them to the attack and, if such information was provided or otherwise available, how the agencies responded to any such information, and whether that response was appropriate; and
- (b) the interaction amongst relevant State sector agencies, including whether there was any failure in information sharing between the relevant agencies; and
- (c) whether relevant State sector agencies failed to anticipate or plan for the attack due to an inappropriate concentration of counter-terrorism resources or priorities on other terrorism threats; and**
- (d) whether any relevant State sector agency failed to meet required standards or was otherwise at fault, whether in whole or in part; and
- (e) any other matters relevant to the purpose of the inquiry, to the extent necessary to provide a complete report.**

Section 5: Matter of public importance that is subject of inquiry

The matter of public importance that the inquiry is directed to examine is—

- (a) what relevant State sector agencies knew about the activities of the individual who has been charged with offences in relation to the 15 March 2019 attack on the Al-Noor Mosque and the Linwood Islamic Centre in Christchurch, before that attack; and
- (b) what actions (if any) relevant State sector agencies took in light of that knowledge; and

¹ Image on front cover by Shaun Yeo. See <https://www.stuff.co.nz/southland-times/111347867/shaun-yeos-cartoon-of-crying-kiwi-touches-the-hearts-of-millions-globally>

² For example, in the media: *It is time to talk about Christchurch's racist past, and present* (June 2019). See <https://thespinoff.co.nz/atea/18-06-2019/it-is-time-to-talk-about-christchurchs-racist-past-and-present> and *Is Christchurch the capital of white racism in New Zealand?* (June 2019). See https://www.waateanews.com/waateanews/x_news/MjE5ODk/Opinion/-Is-Christchurch-the-capital-of-white-racism-in-New-Zealand

- (c) whether there were any additional measures that relevant State sector agencies could have taken to prevent the attack; and
(d) what additional measures should be taken by relevant State sector agencies to prevent such attacks in the future. [Bold added].³

1.3 Disclaimer

It is important to note that the McGuinness Institute has no terrorism expertise or inside knowledge about the actions of the State sector at this time and instead make general recommendations based on our understanding of the attacks gathered from information in the public arena and from our past research and public policy work (see Appendix 1). Given the extent of this disclaimer, we also believe it is important for all citizens, and indeed think tanks, to share their thoughts on the issues raised in this inquiry, particularly since people lost their lives and the impacts need to be understood and acknowledged for future generations. Thank you for this opportunity.

1.4 Key observations about the attacks

- Fifty-one innocent people died and 40 were wounded.⁴
- The Police responded quickly (19 minutes from start to finish) and were very courageous.⁵
- The overall process, from local and central government, as well as NGOs appeared fast, responsive and appropriate. Given the circumstances, everyone seemed to work extremely well, under significant duress.
- The Governor-General and the Prime Minister responded in a considered and timely manner.
- The Prime Minister choosing not to mention the terrorist by name (as he would have wanted the notoriety associated with his name, which would have reinforced his actions for some) was commended.
- There is a group of people in New Zealand that understood this event differently and supported, or at the very least, thought racist behaviour after the attacks was acceptable. Our team were extremely concerned about the abuse two sisters received in Auckland shortly after the attacks.⁶ Given the terrorist came from Australia (which is very similar to New Zealand), means the accused attacker could have been a New Zealander. There are two schools of thought about racism in New Zealand and whether it contributed at all to the events of March 15. On one hand, there was a rush to judge. An assessment was made that as Christchurch had long been the semi-mythical hotbed of white supremacy in New Zealand, an attack like this was an almost inevitable end result. On the other hand, it was clear that the accused attacker was an Australian based in Dunedin who picked Christchurch because it was an easy target. An attack of this nature really could have happened anywhere and since March 15 it has, with similarly motivated shooters operating in El Paso, Texas; Poway, California; and Baerum, Norway. These lone wolves often inspire and copy each other. Their true geography is online. But these two views do not contradict each other. They can both be true. The Christchurch shooting is an anomaly in our recent history that has also forced us to confront the very real possibility that New Zealand has not paid enough attention to the insults and threats directed at minorities – New Zealand’s Jewish and Muslim communities in particular.⁷
- The #headscarfforharmony movement took place on Friday March 22 with many women wearing headscarves ‘to support and acknowledge the pain the Muslim community is suffering, and the grief

³ Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Attack on Christchurch Mosques on 15 March 2019 Order 2019.

See <http://www.legislation.govt.nz/regulation/public/2019/0072/latest/LMS183988.html>

⁴ ‘Mr Manji told RNZ’s Nine to Noon that there were gaps in agency responses to the aftermath. He said a system that dealt quickly and practically with an extreme situation was needed.’ *New system needed to help Christchurch mosque shooting victims - fund manager* (Nov 2019). See <https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/chch-terror/404277/new-system-needed-to-help-christchurch-mosque-shooting-victims-fund-manager>

⁵ *Christchurch Mosque Shootings: Timeline of events 15 March 2019*. See <https://www.police.govt.nz/sites/default/files/publications/christchurch-shootings-timeline.pdf>

⁶ ‘On Sunday two Muslim sisters were told to “go back to your f***ing country” in an ugly incident at Mt Albert train station. Since telling their story in the *Herald* they say they have been contacted by many others who have also experienced racial abuse and, since Friday’s mosque shootings, feel even more unsafe when wearing their hijab.’

Christchurch mosque shootings: Muslim women afraid to leave the house despite outpouring of support (March 2019). See

https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=12214160.

⁷ *Is New Zealand racist as ...?* (Sept 2019). See <https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/114926642/is-new-zealand-racist-as-f>

New Zealanders share in the midst of tragedy' but it also raised some broader questions over whether this was an appropriate action.⁸

- Concerns raised that the accused attacker's mail from prison was posted in error. Better systems have now been put in place.⁹
- Large numbers of mourners gathered throughout New Zealand in a sincere and authentic way.
- The call to eliminate terrorist and violent extremist content was strongly supported. Two months after the attacks (15 May 2019), the Prime Minister and French President, Emmanuel Macron, brought together Heads of State and Government and leaders from the tech sector to develop a protocol. It is called the 'Christchurch Call'.¹⁰
- Concerns raised regarding the inquiry's 'terms of reference' and the level of transparency.¹¹
- Concerns raised over the gun buy-back scheme.¹²
- There are a number of stages including before, during, after and beyond an event; all need to be considered by the inquiry.

1.5 Key questions that the attacks raise about democracy

In preparing this submission, the attacks raised the following questions for the Institute:

- (a) How do you ensure representation for minority groups? In particular, how can we ensure Muslim voices are heard?
- (b) The difference between democracy and being undemocratic? In particular, are there any aspects of our democracy that do not meet the needs of our Muslim New Zealanders?
- (c) The difference between envy and jealousy? In particular, what drives hate and what is the terrorist afraid of losing and how will they benefit?
- (d) The difference between a blame to an accountability culture? See Appendix 2. In particular, how can we ensure we move New Zealand towards an accountability and innovation culture?
- (e) The difference between being ignorant and being naïve? In particular, we believe it is acceptable for New Zealand to be naïve but never to be ignorant. How can we ensure New Zealand is not ignorant or complacent going forward?

1.6 Specific areas of focus

The 5 September 2019 invitation to submit listed four suggestions for areas of focus for submissions to the inquiry. We respond to these below, but our main focus has been on the package of recommendations in Part Two of this submission.

1: 'Suggestions for how government agencies should engage with New Zealanders on issues like safety and security'

We believe that government agencies should develop a set of principles and guidelines across the public sector to help them engage with New Zealanders on safety and security issues.

⁸ 'The leaders of the Islamic Women's Council of New Zealand said "the gesture of solidarity and support will be very much appreciated by our community"?' *Kiwis encouraged to wear headscarves to support Muslim community* (March 2019). See <https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/christchurch-shooting/111411345/kiwis-encouraged-to-wear-headscarves-to-support-muslim-community> *Shamima Writes: On wearing the hijab after Christchurch* (May 2019). See <https://www.metromag.co.nz/society/society-society/shamima-writes-on-wearing-the-hijab-after-christchurch>

⁹ 'The review found that too many individuals were involved in outgoing mail processes and some prisons were not well-resourced to manage the huge volume of mail. It also found some improvements in the legislation and regulations governing this area that could be made.' *Prison mail changed after Christchurch attack blunder* (Nov 2019). See https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=12285143

¹⁰ 'The events of Christchurch highlighted once again the urgent need for action and enhanced cooperation among the wide range of actors with influence over this issue, including governments, civil society, and online service providers, such as social media companies, to eliminate terrorist and violent extremist content online.' *The Christchurch call: full text* (May 2019). See <https://thespinoff.co.nz/politics/16-05-2019/the-christchurch-call-full-text>. See the Christchurch Call website at <https://www.christchurchcall.com/call.html>

¹¹ 'The Muslim community was not consulted on the inquiry's terms of reference, and many say the investigation is unduly opaque and lacks respect for the community's fears of further persecution in New Zealand.' *Christchurch shootings: 'real issues' not being heard by inquiry, critics say* (August 2019). See <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/aug/08/christchurch-shootings-real-issues-not-being-heard-by-inquiry-critics-say>

¹² *New Zealand struggles to enforce gun-control law* (July 2019), see <https://www.straitstimes.com/asia/australianz/new-zealand-struggles-to-enforce-gun-control-law>

2: ‘What do you see as the biggest risk to the security of communities in New Zealand?’

In our view, having a poorly informed and disengaged society is the biggest risk to our security. The second is an under-resourced Police force and security service that does not engage in foresight, seek information or undertake independent reviews and scenario development. New Zealand was lucky that there were not more deaths as a result of the attack. The bravery of the attendees at the Mosque and the police is to be highly commended.

3: ‘When do you think government agencies should share information to ensure the safety of New Zealanders – whose information should be shared, when, how and why?’

Transparency delivers trust. Information needs to be clear, concise, timely and from one central body. The only reason that information should not be public is if its release may cause harm. If there is uncertainty, that uncertainty needs to be stated. New Zealand Police appear to have a good protocol in terms of communicating uncertainty.

Our greater concern is where and for how long this information is made available. The importance of learning from history is so important to ensure both mistakes and successes may be learnt from.

Firstly, public information should be made public and should be easy to find and access. Secondly, information should be accessible over the long term. With the advent of social media we need to ensure trusted information is accessible for all, forever, to counter fake or incomplete news.

The sharing of information for the public good is essential. Today, in our view, younger people (with a few exceptions) accept that information about them is public. If the government is going to share data, it is very important to do so in a caring and transparent manner. In our view government agencies will need a protocol and that the threshold needs to be quite low – in that it should be easily accessible and without too many sign offs.

4: ‘What additional measures should be taken by relevant State sector agencies to prevent such attacks in the future?’

See our recommendations in Part Two of this submission.

PART TWO: RECOMMENDATIONS

This section sets out our principles, assumptions and recommendations.

3.1 Principles driving our recommendations

In setting a context for this discussion, we have identified the following principles:

- (a) Everyone must be heard;
- (b) No one should be left behind;
- (c) No one may be harmed; and if harm happens:
 - (i) Those that harm, must be punished in a fair, timely and just manner; and
 - (ii) Those that are harmed, must be acknowledged and supported in a respectful manner, be the primary focus and never be forgotten (this means seeking out ways to support and nurture on their terms).

3.2 Assumptions underlying our recommendations

Given the above principles, the Institute makes the following assumptions:

- (a) ‘Culture eats strategy for breakfast’;
- (b) ‘Transparency is the best disinfectant’;
- (c) ‘To be heard requires an audience’;
- (d) ‘Sociological innovation is at least as important as technological innovation’; and
- (e) ‘Be curious, reflective and observant’ – we can and should learn from everything.

3.3 Key recommendations

The Institute’s recommendations focus on s 4 (c) of Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Attack on Christchurch Mosques on 15 March 2019 Order 2019: whether relevant State sector agencies failed to anticipate or plan for the attack due to an inappropriate concentration of counter-terrorism resources or priorities on other terrorism threats and specifically s 5 (d): what additional measures should be taken by relevant State sector agencies to prevent such attacks in the future.

Our five recommendations are listed below under the four key phases of a significant event:

Stage 1: Prevention (before the event)

Stage 2: During the event (in this case the 19 minutes)

Stage 3: After the event (managing the aftermath)

Stage 4: Beyond an event (the inquiry)

Stage 1: Prevention (before the event)

Recommendation 1: Develop a national strategy for civics and citizenship education in schools and in the community.

Background

New Zealand needs to build its social capital to help prevent a terrorist attack, manage an attack when it is happening and support those harmed after an attack.

We believe that civics education and in particular a civics strategy would contribute to building New Zealand’s social capital. This idea aligns directly with the recommendations of the 2013 report *New Zealand’s Constitution: A Report on a Conversation*.

The Panel recommends the Government:

1. invites and supports the people of Aotearoa New Zealand to continue the conversation about our constitutional arrangements
2. **develops a national strategy for civics and citizenship education in schools and in the community, including the unique role of the Treaty of Waitangi, te Tiriti o Waitangi, and assign responsibility for the implementation of the strategy**
3. note the implementation of the strategy could include the co-ordination of education activities; resource development, including resources for Māori medium schools; and professional development for teachers

and the media. [Bold added].¹³

Such a strategy should include citizens understanding social media, its strengths and weaknesses and where to engage if social media is being used for hate. It should also deal with penalties for poor business practices. For example, social media platforms that publish material they know is wrong and is full of hate is worth investigating. Penalties could include fees, requiring public reports by such platforms on poor management (e.g. in their annual report) and asking them to no longer operate in New Zealand.

Recommendation 2: Develop a culture of foresight and in particular scenario development in the public service.

Background

Foresight and scenarios help explore potential interconnections and consequences so that government can engage early and prevent terrorist events happening and minimise their impacts.

Many people often think that scenarios are about predicting or minimising probable outcomes but scenarios are about exploring low probability/high magnitude events, such as these attacks. Most importantly, they identify missing information and make people ask ‘what if’ questions. We believe the New Zealand government needs to establish a public foresight unit to help upskill the public service in foresight tools. This is needed not just for terrorist attacks but also for climate change impacts and other situations where high levels of uncertainty exist.

Recommendation 3: Develop a response strategy (and a responsive) terrorism strategy.

Background

We are sure the New Zealand Government has a terrorism strategy in place, but below are our thoughts on what we would expect to be included in such a strategy:

(a) Improve risk identification, assessment, management

- (i) Risk management requires ongoing risk assessment, and that requires a resourced and ethical public service that seeks out new insights and information.
- (ii) New Zealand needs an informed and engaged public (one that knows how to engage). This relates to Recommendation 1. New Zealand needs a durable and successful democracy to cope with terrorism and that means we need an informed, engaged, curious and empowered public.
- (iii) Understanding and engaging with risks before they happen not only reduces risks occurring but if they do happen, reduces their impact and often delivers a timelier and more considered response.

(b) Communication

- (i) Identify vulnerable communities.
- (ii) Prepare a ‘who’s who’ of leaders who have a mandate/authority to speak on behalf of the vulnerable community.
- (iii) Meet with these leaders regularly to understand any issues or concerns they may have and the best ways the community would like help/support/systems improved. ‘Best’ in this context means appropriate to the beliefs and values of that community.

(c) Identify, manage and regulate tools of terrorism

- (i) Reduce access to guns (preventing people from gaining access to guns and other ways to bring about mass murder). The focus on guns was appropriate, but it is not the only way to kill a large group of people. Identifying, managing and regulating all terrorism tools is an important discipline that should form part of the strategy above.

¹³ Page 8. See <https://www.justice.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Publications/Constitutional-Advisory-Panel-Full-Report-2013.pdf>

- (d) **Reduce benefits to the terrorist from distributing photos and footage and harm to families**
 - (i) Prevent terrorists connecting with others and spurring them on to a culture of hate.
- (e) **Review the strategy regularly by independent experts**
 - (i) Update the strategy regularly by (i) learning from how other countries work to prevent and manage terrorist attacks and (ii) by seeking out new information on potential terrorist individuals/groups operating in New Zealand.
 - (ii) Have the strategy externally reviewed frequently; ideally by international experts.

Stage 2: During the event (in this case the 19 minutes)

Background

See Recommendation 3 (ii). When it comes to organising a response, central government needs to know who are the best people or organisations to interact with.

Stage 3: After the event (managing the aftermath)

Background

See Recommendation 3(b). Communicating with the community effected in the way that works ‘best’, but it must be managed in the way that meets their needs and values.

Recommendation 4: Review the law for apprehending, holding, going before the courts, sentencing and imprisoning terrorists.

We understand some work has already been done to improve our law, but that may have been done in a rush. There may be value in revisiting how terrorists (and potential terrorists) should be punished.

Importantly, the attack on the Christchurch mosques is not New Zealand’s first terrorist attack, though it is the largest. The Rainbow Warrior is a worthwhile case study to consider in terms of New Zealand’s response then and New Zealand’s response now.¹⁴ We wonder whether the justice system that was in place then delivered ‘justice’. For example, whether the perpetrators who were returned to be jailed in France was appropriate given they became free citizens shortly afterwards¹⁵ and whether this may set a precedent today.

Stage 4: Beyond an event (the inquiry)

Recommendation 5: Learning from the attacks – the inquiry.

Thoughts include:

1. Having a broad depth of representation in the inquiry.
2. Explaining the process so that no community members feel left out of the inquiry.

¹⁴ ‘Rainbow Warrior crew-members who survived the bombing said [...] that they were still angry about the terrorist actions of the French government, but accepted that Cabon and her co-conspirators will never face justice. First mate Martini Gotje said he would never shake Cabon’s hand. “I will never forget.” *We’re the terrorists: Rainbow Warrior spy speaks out after 32 years* (July 2017). See <https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/94404471/were-the-terrorists-calls-to-bring-rainbow-warrior-undercover-agent-to-justice-after-32-years> “The French secret agent who admitted to planting the Rainbow Warrior bomb will not face extradition to New Zealand. [...] “For us it was just like using boxing gloves in order to crush a mosquito,” he said, “it was a disproportionate operation, but we had to obey the order, we were soldiers.” *Rainbow Warrior bomber’s apology echoes around the world*. (Sept 2015). See <https://www.tvnz.co.nz/one-news/new-zealand/rainbow-warrior-bomber-s-apology-echoes-around-the-world-q09346>

¹⁵ ‘Mafart was transferred to serve his sentence on Hao Atoll under a controversial deal struck in the middle of 1986. He was released early after complaining of stomach troubles [and] Prieur was a French intelligence specialist in European peace movements. She did reconnaissance for the Rainbow Warrior bombing. She pleaded guilty to manslaughter and was sentenced to 10 years in jail but served only three in French Polynesia.’ *Rainbow Warrior: Where are they now?* (July 2010). See https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10656664

3. Working hard to ensure affected communities can participate in the inquiry. Barriers to participation may include having no experience with how an inquiry is run, and the respective roles of people in the process.
4. Engaging with the leaders who would provide those affected with a sense of how best to participate in the process.

Recommendation 6: Supporting those who have been harmed in the longer term.

Thoughts include:

1. Supporting those who have had their income reduced or require additional financial support (e.g. wife who lost their husband's income).
2. Supporting those that might require emotional support (e.g. children who lost a parent).
3. Supporting the community.

Recommendation 7: Commemorating those who have lost their lives.

Thoughts include:

1. A sculpture, place of prayer or commemoration of some sort that the community would like.

Appendix 1: Relevant research and public policy work by the McGuinness Institute

As noted earlier, this submission draws on previous McGuinness Institute publications. These are set out below. They cover risk management, civics and foresight; these being the three tools we see as helping prevent future events like the attacks.

Articles¹⁶

1. Article: *Civitas: Aligning technological and sociological transformation* (May 2016)

Workshops¹⁷

1. Booklet: *Proceedings of The Civics and Media Project: A report on the three workshops held in 2015* (May 2016)

Think Pieces¹⁸

1. Think Piece 31: *Navigating the Future With Foresight* (December 2018)
2. Think Piece 29: *Civics and citizenship education in New Zealand: A case for change?* (May 2018)
3. Think Piece 27: *The Family So'otaga: connection between home and school* (February 2018)
4. Think Piece 26: *Doing Something About Poverty in New Zealand* (May 2017)
5. Think Piece 25: *The changing purpose of tertiary education* (May 2016)
6. Think Piece 24: *Towards a Strategy of Freedom* (September 2014)
7. Think Piece 18: *'For me ... it is not enough'* (September 2013)
8. Think Piece 13: *The Day They Decided That Sneetches Are Sneetches* (October 2010)
9. Think Piece 12: *Magnifying Hope and Reducing Fear* (December 2008)

Submissions¹⁹

1. *Submission on new models of tertiary education* (May 2016)
2. *Submission on Update of the Education Act 1989* (December 2015)
3. *Submission on the consultation on the draft revised Guide to the National Civil Defence Emergency Management Plan 2015* (September 2015)
4. *Submission on the Inquiry into Parliament's legislative response to future national emergencies* (July 2015)
5. *Ensuring New Zealand's Constitution is Fit for Purpose: Submission to the Constitutional Advisory Panel* (July 2013)
6. *Electoral Commission Review on the Mixed Member Proportional (MMP) Electoral System* (May 2012)
7. *Electoral Referendum Bill* (June 2010)
8. *Electoral Finance Bill* (September 2007)
- 9.

Project 2058 Reports²⁰

1. *Report 8 – Effective Māori Representation in Parliament: Working towards a National Sustainable Development Strategy* (July 2010)

Discussion Paper²¹

1. *Discussion Paper 2019/01 – The Climate Reporting Emergency: A New Zealand Case Study* (October 2019)

¹⁶ See <http://www.mcguinnessinstitute.org/articles>

¹⁷ See <http://www.mcguinnessinstitute.org/workshop-booklets>

¹⁸ See <http://www.mcguinnessinstitute.org/think-pieces>

¹⁹ See <http://www.mcguinnessinstitute.org/submissions>

²⁰ See <http://www.mcguinnessinstitute.org/project-2058-reports>

²¹ See <http://www.mcguinnessinstitute.org/discussion-papers>

Infographics and Newspapers²²

1. *Revisiting Tomorrow Newspaper* (October 2019)

Worksheets, Exercises and Quizzes²³

1. *TCFD Strategy Exercise* [Scenario development] (October 2019)

²² See <http://www.mcguinnessinstitute.org/infographics>

²³ See <http://www.mcguinnessinstitute.org/worksheets>

Appendix 2: The difference between a blame culture and an accountability culture

Figure 1 outlines the critical differences between a blame and an accountability culture. To bring about change it is important to focus on building an accountability and innovation culture. Dealing with the aftermath of the attacks requires a considered approach and direction that works with the values and goals of those harmed.

Figure 1: The difference between a blame culture and an accountability culture²⁴

	Culture of Blame	Culture of Accountability
Believes	People are the problem	People are problem solvers
	Problems are headaches	Problems are learning opportunities
	Admitting weakness is career limiting	We are all still learning
Focused on	Who is wrong	What is wrong
	The individual	The process
	Fault-finding	Fact-finding
	The past	The future
	Assigning punishment	Improving future results
Results in	Making assumptions	Considering alternatives
	Hoarding decision-making authority	Delegating decision-making authority
	Hiding problems	Surfacing problems and solutions
	Finger-pointing and CYA behaviour	Learning from mistakes
	Distrust	Trust
	Turf wars	Cross-functional cooperation
	Risk adverse	Calculated risk taking
	Wait until told	Taking initiative
	Lack of innovation	Innovation

²⁴ 'Cultures of blame are inherently inefficient. Countless dollars are essentially thrown out the window (think stacks of \$100 bills) from the three self-destructive cycles that are put into motion as soon as someone in the organization is blamed. These three cycles are the Cycle of Inaction, the Cycle of Ignorance, and the Cycle of Infighting.' *Creating a Culture of Accountability, Not Blame*. See <https://availeadership.com/culture-of-accountability>