

Fordham Law School

FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History

Crowley Mission Reports

Leitner Center for International Law and Justice

2008

"It's Not OK": New Zealand's Efforts to Eliminate Violence Against Women

Jeanmarie Fenrich

Executive Director, Leitner Center for International Law and Justice, jfenrich@law.fordham.edu

Jorge Contesse

Crowley Fellow 2007-2008

Follow this and additional works at: https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/crowley_reports



Part of the [Human Rights Law Commons](#), and the [Law and Gender Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fenrich, Jeanmarie and Contesse, Jorge, ""It's Not OK": New Zealand's Efforts to Eliminate Violence Against Women" (2008). *Crowley Mission Reports*. 1.
https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/crowley_reports/1

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Leitner Center for International Law and Justice at FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. It has been accepted for inclusion in Crowley Mission Reports by an authorized administrator of FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. For more information, please contact tmelnick@law.fordham.edu.



"It's not OK":

New Zealand's Efforts to Eliminate Violence Against Women



Leitner Center
for International Law and Justice

AT FORDHAM LAW SCHOOL, NEW YORK CITY

"IT'S NOT OK":

New Zealand's Efforts to Eliminate Violence Against Women



Leitner Center

for International Law and Justice

AT FORDHAM LAW SCHOOL, NEW YORK CITY

Jeanmarie Fenrich

Executive Director,
Leitner Center for International
Law and Justice
Fordham Law School

Jorge Contesse

Crowley Fellow 2007-08
Leitner Center for International
Law and Justice
Fordham Law School

Cover: Mural image usage by courtesy of Bream Bay Community Support Trust,
Ruakaka, Northland. Mural Artist Dan Mills.

Contents

Introduction	4
Acknowledgements	6
Part I: New Zealand's obligations under international law and domestic law regarding domestic violence & its responses	7
1. Domestic violence as a human rights violation	7
2. New Zealand's regulations and programs on domestic violence	9
Regulations	9
Programs	14
3. New Zealand's international obligations to Māori as indigenous people	16
International Law	16
The Treaty of Waitangi	18
Part II: Domestic violence in New Zealand: problems with current regulations and "implementation gaps"	20
1. Domestic violence in New Zealand: the current situation	20
2. Problems with the law as written	21
Access to programs	21
Access to legal aid	22
Lack of mandatory and adequate training	24
Failure to require data collection	27
Conclusions and Recommendations	29
3. Problems with implementation	31
Stopping violence programs	31
Problems with protection orders	31
Meeting the standards of the DVA 1995	35
Conclusions and Recommendations	37
Part III: Domestic Violence in Māori Communities	39
1. Socioeconomic indicators and disparities in New Zealand	39
2. Explanations for the disparities	40
3. Funding issues	43
4. Certification for service providers	45
5. Services in rural areas	48
6. Relations between the Police and Māori communities	48
7. Māori programs addressing domestic violence	49
8. The New Zealand government's obligation to consult with Māori	52
Conclusions and Recommendations	52
Conclusion	55

Introduction

Over the last decade, New Zealand has made significant efforts to address an acute social problem—violence against women. In New Zealand, it is estimated that one in three women has been a victim of domestic violence.¹ In an effort to combat the problem, New Zealand has enacted legislation and regulations which aim to prevent and eliminate domestic violence.² It has also created visible public education campaigns calling upon people to stop “family violence” as it is called in New Zealand.³

As a result, domestic violence is no longer circumscribed to the private sphere and it is not difficult to strike up a conversation on the issue. Nonetheless, the levels of domestic violence remain surprisingly high. Domestic violence affects all segments of the population and all ethnicities in New Zealand, however, the prevalence rates within Māori communities are even higher than the rates for the general population.⁴

The prevalence of violence against women persists despite New Zealand’s commitments under international law to secure equality for women, act with due diligence to prevent, investigate or punish acts of domestic violence and provide for effective remedies to the victims of domestic violence. New Zealand has signed and ratified the U.N. Charter,⁵ the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,⁶ the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,⁷ and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights.⁸ While none of these treaties expressly addresses domestic violence, they each prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex.⁹ New Zealand has also signed and ratified the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women¹⁰ (“CEDAW”), which imposes more specific obligations on states to ensure women’s equality.

This Report represents the culmination of a year-long project undertaken by the Leitner Center for International Law and Justice at Fordham Law

School to study violence against women in New Zealand in light of these international commitments. Violence against women, and domestic violence in particular, is a serious issue that has received a great deal of attention internationally over the last few decades. However, patterns of violence persist in both developed and developing countries, undermining the status and rights of women, and damaging the lives of women and children who are exposed to these situations. We acknowledge that the Labour-led coalition government in power from 1998-2008 in New Zealand made deliberate efforts to combat this problem. We maintain, however, that more can—and ought to—be done.

The Fordham delegation was led by Professors Jeanmarie Fenrich, Paolo Galizzi, and Chi Mgbako, and the 2007-08 Crowley Fellow in International Human Rights, Jorge Contesse, and included eight second-year law students, Justin Bernstein, Annie Chen, Abisola Fatade, Michelle Magbalon, Mani Mostofi, Sarah Stevenson, Anupama Sawkar and Emily Wei, and the Leitner Center’s Program Assistant, Elizabeth Mooers. Prior to the on-the-ground study, the delegation participated in an intense program of study throughout the academic year, including a seminar on human rights in New Zealand led by Mr. Contesse and Professors Jeanmarie Fenrich and Tracy Higgins. While in New Zealand, the delegation met with lawyers, judges, legislators, government officials, academics, local leaders, and ordinary

1 See *Infra*, note 153 and accompanying text

2 See, *infra*, Part I.2.A.

3 Although “domestic violence” or “family violence” may also include child abuse, this report considers only male partner violence against women and, as used in this report, “domestic violence” and “family violence” refer only to male partner violence against women.

4 See, *infra*, Part III.

5 U.N. Charter. The Charter was signed on June 26, 1945, and entered into force on October 24, 1945.

6 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, G.A. Res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc. A/180, at 71 (1948).

7 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 999 U.N.T.S. 171 [hereinafter ICCPR]. The Covenant was adopted on December 19, 1966, and entered into force on March 23, 1976.

8 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 999 U.N.T.S. 3 [hereinafter ICESCR]. The Covenant was adopted on December 19, 1966, and entered into force on January 3, 1976.

9 See *infra* Part I.

10 Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women, G.A. Res. 34/180, 34 U.N. GAOR Supp. (No. 46) at 193, U.N. Doc. A/34/46 (1980) [hereinafter CEDAW]. The Convention was adopted on December 18, 1979, and entered into force on September 3, 1981.

The prevalence of violence against women persists despite New Zealand's commitments under international law to secure equality for women, act with due diligence to prevent, investigate or punish acts of domestic violence and provide for effective remedies to the victims of domestic violence.



The Leitner Center teams traveled to several New Zealand cities and towns, including: Auckland, Ruakaka, Christchurch, Hamilton, Invercargill, Kaitia, Nelson, Whangarei, and Wellington.

women and men from Aotearoa/New Zealand. The delegation conducted approximately 165 interviews in all.¹¹

This Report presents the findings of this research effort. It consists of three parts. Part I sets out the normative framework on domestic violence, both at the international and national level, and explains the relevant norms that govern the relationship between Māori and the Crown. Part II begins with a background discussion regarding the level of domestic violence in New Zealand. It then proceeds to detail the problems with the domestic law and implementing regulations addressing domestic violence—both with the law as written and problems with the law and regulations as implemented or enforced, the “implementation gaps.” Part II presents the delegation’s findings with respect to a range of problems women face when they are victims (and/or survivors) of domestic violence. Similarly, Part II documents the

problems activists and workers face when they address these situations. Some of these problems relate to the existing law or government policy whereas others have to do with the way the law and policy has been implemented—or not implemented. Finally, Part III addresses domestic violence in Māori communities. While many of the problems presented in Part II also apply to Māori, this Part discusses some issues that affect Māori in particular. Both Parts II and III offer recommendations designed to address the documented problems. During the course of our research, the New Zealand government has apparently decided to adopt a number of modifications to the existing legislation and policies addressing domestic violence. We commend the government for its willingness to make necessary modifications and join the government in hoping that these changes will help reduce and ultimately eliminate violence against women.

Acknowledgements

The Leitner Center benefited from the contributions and assistance of many individuals and organizations in New Zealand and the United States. First, we would like to thank Di Grennell and Ani Pitman from the Amokura Family Violence Prevention Consortium in Whangarei; Holly Carrington from Preventing Violence in the Home in Auckland; Professor Ruth Busch from Waikato Law School in Hamilton; Senior Lecturer Janet Fanslow from the University of Auckland School of Population Health;

Cathy Robertson from the National Collective of Women’s Refuges in Invercargill, and Ruth Herbert, in Wellington, with whom we worked closely both in developing the project and during our stay in New Zealand. They facilitated our access to many of the individuals with whom we met and shared their knowledge, wisdom, and stories of strength with us. We also appreciate their willingness to comment on an earlier draft of this report. The findings included in this Report, however, belong to the authors alone and have not been endorsed by any individuals or organizations in New Zealand.

Several other individuals graciously facilitated our work in New Zealand. In particular, we are grate-

ful to Pita Sharples, MP; Virginia de Joux, Child, Family and Community Policy, Ministry of Social Development; Sheryl Hann, former Outreach Coordinator, New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse; Matthew Palmer, Deputy Solicitor-General (Public Law) at the Crown Law Office, and Hayley Samuel, from Doctors for Sexual Abuse Care.

We would also like to thank the many women and men, judges, lawyers, scholars, and non-governmental organization representatives who took time off to speak with us and share their stories and perspectives on domestic violence, gender discrimination, and human rights in New Zealand. We learned from all of them beyond expectations.

I: New Zealand's obligations under international law and domestic law regarding domestic violence

This Part lays out the normative framework on domestic violence, both at the international and national level, and explains the relevant norms that govern the relationship between Māori and the Crown. First, it sets forth the international rules and standards whereby domestic violence is deemed a human rights violation. As a signatory to CEDAW and other major international treaties, the provisions of international human rights law are binding on New Zealand. Second, this Part explains the

main regulations and programs put in place by the New Zealand government to prevent and eradicate domestic violence, paying attention to provisions that aim at ensuring culturally pertinent approaches in the case of ethnic minorities, especially Māori. This section discusses the Domestic Violence Act 1995, the strategy on domestic violence prevention (Te Rito), the establishment of the Taskforce for Action on Violence Within Families, and the work of the Family Violence Clearinghouse. This Part closes with a description of New Zealand's international and domestic legal obligations towards indigenous people. Because domestic violence disproportionately affects Māori, and New Zealand's founding document is a Treaty celebrated by the Crown and Māori, it is important to lay out the normative framework for the protection of indigenous peoples' rights. This normative framework provides guidance for the recommendations made regarding additional measures that should be taken to eradicate domestic violence.

1. Domestic Violence as an International Human Rights Violation

Domestic violence is a form of prohibited discrimination under international law and states are obligated to act with due diligence to prevent, investigate or punish such acts and to provide effective remedies to the victims of domestic violence. This section will consider New Zealand's obligations with respect to domestic violence under international instruments.

International human rights law embodies a clear commitment to equal rights for women. New Zealand has signed and ratified the U.N. Charter,¹² the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,¹³ the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,¹⁴ and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights.¹⁵ Although these treaties do not expressly address domestic violence, they each prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex.¹⁶ New Zealand has also signed and ratified CEDAW, which

11 See annex I.

12 U.N. Charter. The Charter was signed on June 26, 1945, and entered into force on October 24, 1945.

13 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, G.A. Res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc. A/180, at 71 (1948).

14 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 999 U.N.T.S. 171 [hereinafter ICCPR]. The Covenant was adopted on December 19, 1966, and entered into force on March 23, 1976.

15 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 999 U.N.T.S. 3 [hereinafter ICESCR]. The Covenant was adopted on December 19, 1966, and entered into force on January 3, 1976.

16 U.N. Charter, art. 55 states:

With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote: ... (c) Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, *supra* note 13, art. 7 states:

All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law.

ICCPR, art. 26 states:

All persons are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to the equal protection of the law. In this respect, the law shall prohibit any discrimination and guarantee to all persons equal and effective protection against discrimination on any ground such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

Id. Article 2(1) of the ICCPR states:

Each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes to respect and to ensure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognized in the present covenant, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

ICESCR, art. 3 states:

The States Parties to the present Covenant undertake to ensure the equal right of men and women to the enjoyment of all economic, social and cultural rights set forth in the present Covenant.

imposes more specific obligations on states to ensure women's equality. CEDAW defines "discrimination against women" as:

any distinction, exclusion or restriction made on the basis of sex which has the effect or purpose of impairing or nullifying the recognition, enjoyment or exercise by women, irrespective of their marital status, on a basis of equality of men and women, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural, civil or any other field.¹⁷

CEDAW then requires states to "pursue by all appropriate means and without delay a policy of eliminating discrimination against women," including by legislation and other measures.¹⁸ It also requires that states take measures to "modify the social and cultural patterns of conduct of men and women, with a view to achieving the elimination of prejudices and customary...practices which are based on the idea of the inferiority or the superiority of either of the sexes or on stereotyped roles for men and women."¹⁹

Although CEDAW does not specifically address domestic violence, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women ("CEDAW Committee") has recognized that such gender-based violence is "a form of discrimination that seriously inhibits women's ability to enjoy rights and freedoms on a basis of equality with men."²⁰ In its General Recommendation 19, the CEDAW Committee interpreted CEDAW's definition of discrimination against women to:

include[] gender-based violence, that is, vio-

lence that is directed against a woman because she is a woman or that affects women disproportionately. It includes acts that inflict physical, mental or sexual harm or suffering, threats of such acts, coercion and other deprivations of liberty. Gender-based violence may breach specific provisions of the Convention, regardless of whether those provisions expressly mention violence.²¹

General Recommendation 19 further declares that gender-based violence violates a number of rights guaranteed by CEDAW, including the right to life; the right not to be subject to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment; the right to liberty and security of person; the right to equal protection under the law; the right to equality in the family; the right to the highest standard attainable of physical and mental health; and the right to just and favourable conditions of work.²² The Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women, an important policy instrument adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1993, similarly affirms that "violence against women constitutes a violation of the rights and fundamental freedoms of women and impairs or nullifies their enjoyment of those rights and freedoms."²³

Although the perpetrators in instances of domestic violence are typically non-state actors, such as spouses or partners, under international human rights law states may also be accountable for human rights abuses by private actors if states fail to take positive steps to promote and protect rights. With respect to domestic violence, "[s]tates may also be responsible

17 CEDAW, art. 1.

18 CEDAW, art. 2.

19 CEDAW, art. 5.

20 U.N. Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, *General Recommendation 19, Violence against Women*, ¶1 (1992) [hereinafter *General Recommendation 19*].

21 *General Recommendation 19* at ¶6.

22 *General Recommendation 19* at ¶7.

23 Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women, G.A. Res. 48/104, U.N. Doc. A/Res/48/104 (1994), at 2.

24 *General Recommendation 19* at ¶9 (emphasis added). The U.N. Declaration similarly states that States should "exercise due diligence to prevent, investigate and, in accordance with national legislation, punish acts of violence against women, whether those acts are perpetrated by the State or by private persons." Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women, G.A. Res. 48/104, U.N. Doc. A/Res/48/104 (1994), at art. 4(c). In-depth study on all forms of violence against women, Report of the Secretary General, U.N. Doc. A/61/122/Add.1 (2006), at para. 257.

25 *AT v. Hungary*, Communication No. 2/2003, 2005, Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women at 9.3, 9.4.

26 *Id.* at 9.6(e).

27 *Id.* at 9.6(f).

28 *Id.* at 9.6(g).

29 *Id.* at 9.6(h).

30 *Id.* at 9.6(d).

31 *See, e.g.,* Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women, G.A. Res. 48/104, U.N. Doc. A/Res/48/104 (1994), at art. 4(d)-(k) States should:

(d) Develop penal, civil, labour and administrative sanctions in domestic legislation to punish and redress the wrongs caused to women who are subjected to violence; women who are subjected to violence should be provided with access to the mechanisms of justice and, as provided for by national legislation, to just and effective remedies for the harm that they have suffered; States should also inform women of their rights in seeking redress through such mechanisms;

for private acts if they fail to act with due diligence to prevent violations of rights or to investigate and punish acts of violence, and for providing compensation.”²⁴ The standard of *due diligence* is one of reasonableness, it “requires a state to act with the existing means at its disposal to address both individual acts of violence against women and the structural causes so as to prevent future violence.”²⁵

There is a growing body of case law on domestic violence at the international and regional levels, which provides some additional guidance regarding what governments are obligated to do to comply with the *due diligence* standard. In *AT v. Hungary*, for example, the CEDAW Committee concluded that Hungary failed to comply with its obligations under CEDAW because it had not enacted specific legislation to combat domestic violence, and had failed to provide for protection orders or a shelter to protect victims of domestic violence.²⁶ In its decision, the CEDAW Committee also made general recommendations regarding measures the state party should take to comply with CEDAW. Among other things, the state party was advised to: enact legislation prohibiting domestic violence against women, which should include protection and exclusion orders as well as support services, including shelters;²⁷ “investigate promptly, thoroughly, impartially and seriously all allegations of domestic violence and bring the offenders to justice in accordance with international standards;”²⁸ “provide victims of domestic violence with safe and prompt access to justice, including free legal aid where necessary,” in order to ensure effective remedies;²⁹ provide offenders with rehabilitation programs;³⁰ and provide regular training on CEDAW

to judges, lawyers and law enforcement officials.³¹ The Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women provides a similar series of measures that governments should implement to prevent and eliminate domestic violence.³²

In sum, international law requires that New Zealand act with due diligence to prevent, investigate or punish acts of domestic violence and that it provides for effective remedies to the victims of domestic violence.

2. New Zealand’s domestic statutory law, regulations and programs addressing domestic violence

A. STATUTORY LAW AND IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS

A.1. The Domestic Violence Act 1995

New Zealand has sound legislation on domestic violence. After a thorough review of the Domestic Protection Act 1982, in 1995 Parliament enacted the Domestic Violence Act, which came into force in 1996.³³

The 1982 Act protected persons from violence occurring within the family. Until its passage, domestic violence was viewed as a private matter; the 1982 Act allowed police to become involved in domestic disputes. The Act provided remedies for victims and survivors of domestic violence in the form of non-violence orders³⁴ and non-molestation orders.³⁵ Non-violence orders protected applicants from acts of violence by the respondent, whereas non-molestation orders essentially prohibited the respondent from entering or remaining on any property where the

(e) Consider the possibility of developing national plans of action to promote the protection of women against any form of violence, or to include provisions for that purpose in plans already existing, taking into account, as appropriate, such cooperation as can be provided by non-governmental organizations, particularly those concerned with the issue of violence against women;

(f) Develop, in a comprehensive way, preventive approaches and all those measures of a legal, political, administrative and cultural nature that promote the protection of women against any form of violence, and ensure that the re-victimization of women does not occur because of laws insensitive to gender considerations, enforcement practices or other interventions;

(g) Work to ensure, to the maximum extent feasible in the light of their available resources and, where needed, within the framework of international cooperation, that women subjected to violence and, where appropriate, their children have specialized assistance, such as rehabilitation, assistance in child care and maintenance, treatment, counselling, and health and social services, facilities and programmes, as well as support structures, and should take all other appropriate measures to promote their safety and physical and psychological rehabilitation;

(h) Include in government budgets adequate resources for their activities related to the elimination of violence against women;

(i) Take measures to ensure that law enforcement officers and public officials responsible for implementing policies to prevent, investigate and punish violence against women receive training to sensitize them to the needs of women;

(j) Adopt all appropriate measures, especially in the field of education, to modify the social and cultural patterns of conduct of men and women and to eliminate prejudices, customary practices and all other practices based on the idea of the inferiority or superiority of either of the sexes and on stereotyped roles for men and women;

(k) Promote research, collect data and compile statistics, especially concerning domestic violence, relating to the prevalence of different forms of violence against women and encourage research on the causes, nature, seriousness and consequences of violence against women and on the effectiveness of measures implemented to prevent and redress violence against women; those statistics and findings of the research will be made public;

(l) Adopt measures directed towards the elimination of violence against women who are especially vulnerable to violence....

33 Domestic Violence Act 1995, 1995 No. 86 (N.Z.) [hereinafter DVA 1995].

34 Domestic Protection Act 1982, § 4.

35 *Id.*, § 13.

applicant (or their children) lived, worked, or was present.³⁶ Non-molestation orders also prohibited “watching or besetting” these locations. However, non-molestation orders were only granted to applicants who had separated from the respondent and where the Court saw it “necessary for the protection of the applicant or any child of the applicant.”³⁷ These orders could be granted without notice to the respondent if the Court was satisfied that the delay might entail a risk to the applicant.”³⁸

Scholars and domestic violence experts had expressed concern that the 1982 Act left out several forms of domestic relationships, was “poorly implemented,” and that “non-violence and non-molestation orders were often breached repeatedly.”³⁹ The government initiated a review of the legislation which eventually led to the enactment of new legislation.

On July 1, 1996, the Domestic Violence Act 1995 (“DVA 1995”) came into force. The Act (1) expanded the definition of domestic violence to increase eligibility;⁴⁰ (2) created one protection order with standard non-violence and non-contact provisions;⁴¹ (3) introduced stiffer penalties for breaches of protection orders;⁴² (4) mandated rehabilitative programs for perpetrators;⁴³ and (5) made available voluntary support programs for survivors.⁴⁴ The Act also accounted for the protection of children,⁴⁵ child custody,⁴⁶ and property and residency needs.⁴⁷

The DVA 1995’s definition of domestic violence is highly inclusive, encompassing physical, sexual, and psychological abuse. Section 3 of the Act states:

- (1) In the Act, domestic violence, in relation to any person, means violence against that person by any other person with whom that person is, or has been, in a domestic relationship.⁴⁸

Furthermore, Section 3 clarifies that “a single act may amount to abuse” as well as “a number of acts that form part of a pattern of behavior...even though some or all of those acts, when viewed in isolation,

may appear to be minor or trivial.”⁴⁹

By incorporating psychological abuse, which includes intimidation, harassment, damage to property and threats (section 3(2)), and elevating it to the level of physical and sexual abuse, the DVA 1995 aims at providing uniform protection to victims for most, if not all, forms of abuse.⁵⁰ By also stressing that both single acts and patterns of smaller acts constitute abuse, the law makes clear that all degrees of domestic violence trigger legal protection.⁵¹

The DVA 1995’s expansive approach is mirrored in the definition of “domestic relationship.” Section 4 states:

- (1) For the purposes of this Act, a person is in a domestic relationship with another person if the person—
 - (a) Is a spouse or partner of the other person; or
 - (b) Is a family member of the other person; or
 - (c) Ordinarily shares a household with the other person; or
 - (d) Has a close personal relationship with the other person.⁵²

The Act further defines a family member as anyone related by “blood or through marriage, a civil union, a de facto relationship, by adoption [or] any other person who is a member of the person’s whānau or other culturally recognised family group.”⁵³ The Act also sets out factors for determining a “close personal relationship,” stressing the “nature and intensity” and “duration” of the relationship.⁵⁴

As laid out in Section 5 of the Act, “the Object of this Act is to reduce and prevent violence in domestic relationships by “(a) Recognizing that domestic violence in all its forms is unacceptable behavior; and (b) Ensuring that, where domestic violence occurs, there is effective legal protection for its victims.”⁵⁵ The Act aims to accomplish its object by

- (a) Empowering the Courts to make certain

36 *Id.*

37 *Id.*

38 *Id.* at 5.

39 Neville Robertson, Ruth Busch, Radha D’Souza, Fiona Lam Sheung, Reynu Anand, Roma Balzer, Ariana Simpson and Dulcie Paina, *Living at the Cutting Edge. Women’s Experiences of Protection Orders*, Vol. 1, August 2007, at 6, available at <http://research.waikato.ac.nz/CuttingEdge/>.

40 DVA 1995, § 3.

41 *Id.* § 19.

42 *Id.* § 5 (2) e & § 50.

43 *Id.* § 32.

44 *Id.* § 29.

45 *Id.* § 9.

46 *Id.* § 15 & § 19 (2) e (ii).

47 *Id.* Part 3.



Family violence training for service providers in Kaitia, New Zealand. In order to appropriately address domestic violence incidents and their consequences, public officials and frontline service providers need to be adequately trained.

- orders to protect victims of domestic violence;
- (b) Ensuring that access to the Court is as speedy, inexpensive, and simple as is consistent with justice;
- (c) Providing, for persons who are victims of domestic violence, appropriate programmes;
- (d) Requiring respondents and associated respondents to attend programmes that have the primary objective of stopping or preventing domestic violence;
- (e) Providing more effective sanctions and enforcement in the event that a protection order is breached.⁵⁶

The primary remedy under the DVA 1995 is the protection order. Protection orders prohibit the respondent from inflicting any type of violence onto the

applicant and from any non-consensual contact.⁵⁷ Protection orders are significant in that they trigger or make available all other remedies under the Act, such as access to programs or tenancy orders. The court's power to make a protection order is set out in Section 14 of the Act, which states:

- (1) The Court may make a protection order if it is satisfied that—
 - (a) The respondent is using, or has used, domestic violence against the applicant, or a child of the applicant's family, or both; and
 - (b) The making of an order is necessary for the protection of the applicant, or a child of the applicant's family, or both.⁵⁸

Applications to obtain a protection order can be "on notice"⁵⁹ or "without notice"⁶⁰ to the respondent. On notice protection orders are subject to a standard

48 *Id.* § 3.

49 *Id.* §3(4).

50 Neville Robertson, Ruth Busch, Radha D'Souza, Fiona Lam Sheung, Reynu Anand, Roma Balzer, Ariana Simpson and Dulcie Paina, *Living at the Cutting Edge. Women's Experiences of Protection Orders*, Vol. 2, August 2007, at 9, available at <http://research.waikato.ac.nz/CuttingEdge/>.

51 *Id.*

52 DVA 1995, § 4(1).

53 *Id.* § 2.

54 *Id.* § 4(4)(a), (b).

55 *Id.* § 5.

56 *Id.* § 5(2).

57 *Id.* § 19, § 20(2).

58 *Id.* § 14(1).

59 *Id.* § 7.

60 *Id.* § 13.

procedure before a Family Court, whereby the respondent has the right to contest the applicant's request for the order and the judge decides whether or not to grant it. One of the key features of the DVA 1995 is the significantly lowered threshold for without notice orders.⁶¹ Without notice applications are to be granted "if the Court is satisfied that the delay that would be caused by proceeding on notice would or might entail (a) a risk of harm; or (b) undue hardship—to the applicant or a child of the applicant's family or both."⁶² Once a without notice application is granted, a temporary protection order is put in place, which becomes final by operation of law after three months "unless discharged."⁶³ Once the temporary protection order is issued, respondents are served, and if they fail to successfully challenge the order or fail to do so in a timely manner, a final protection order is issued.⁶⁴ Likewise, once a protection order becomes final it is permanent, although it "may" be discharged on the application of the applicant or respondent should the Court see it "fit" to do so.⁶⁵

The DVA 1995 increases the punitive sanctions against perpetrators as well as the sanctions for breaches of protection orders. In addition to the injunctive and punitive approaches of the protection orders, the DVA 1995 incorporates rehabilitative and social work elements. These elements come in the form of mandatory programs for respondents and voluntary programs for applicants. Section 32(1) of the Act dictates that "[i]n making a protection order, the Court must direct the respondent to attend a specified programme, unless the Court considers that there is good reason for not making such a direction."⁶⁶

The approval process, general content, goals and structure of these programs are regulated by the Domestic Violence (Programmes) Regulations of 1996 ("1996 Regulations").⁶⁷ Section 32(1) of the Regulations states that programs for respondents "must have the primary objective of stopping or preventing

domestic violence on the part of the respondent."⁶⁸ Furthermore, these programs also "must have the goal of changing the behavior of the respondent,"⁶⁹ by (1) "increasing understanding" about the "effects," "impact," and social, "cultural and historic context" of domestic violence; (2) increasing understanding about the DVA 1995 and the legal consequences of breaching protection orders; and (3) "developing skills to deal with potential conflicts in non-abusive ways."⁷⁰

It is a breach of the protection order for a respondent not to attend the program as directed by the Family Court, unless the program provider excuses them.⁷¹ On completion of the program by the respondent, the program provider must provide the court with a report on attendance and participation. If a respondent fails to attend, program providers are required to notify the registrar, which will bring the matter to the judge's attention.⁷² The judge may call the respondent before the court.⁷³ If summoned, the respondent is asked to explain his non-attendance and may face criminal prosecution.⁷⁴ The DVA 1995 also makes voluntary programs available to protected persons (applicants). These programs are made available to the applicant on the issuance of a protective order. The 1996 Regulations set out guidelines for the programs including: content and presentations, goals, and structure. Regulation 26 provides that every program must:

- (a) "...be consistent with the object of the [1995] Act [“to reduce and prevent violence in domestic relationships and to provide appropriate programmes for persons who are victims of domestic violence”];
- (b) be designed to be presented in a manner that—
 - ...
 - (ii) Respects the cultural values and beliefs of the people attending the programme;
 - ...

61 Robertson et al., *supra* note 39, at 59 (quoting the New Zealand Law Society's Standing Committee on Domestic Violence's remarks on the decrease of the threshold for granting protection orders 'without notice').

62 DVA 1995, § 13.

63 *Id.* § 13(3).

64 *Id.* § 13.

65 *Id.* § 47.

66 *Id.* § 32(1).

67 The Domestic Violence (Programmes) Regulations of 1996, 1996 SR 1996/174 (N.Z.) [hereinafter, Regulations 1996].

68 *Id.* § 32(1).

69 *Id.* § 32(2).

70 *Id.*

71 Ministry of Justice, *A Review of the Domestic Violence Act 1995 and Related Legislation: A Discussion Document 45* (Dec. 2007), available at <http://www.justice.govt.nz/pubs/reports/2007/domestic-violence-act-review/discussion.pdf>.

72 DVA 1995 § 39.

73 *Id.* § 42.

74 Ministry of Justice, *A Review of the Domestic Violence Act 1995 and Related Legislation: A Discussion Document 45* (Dec. 2007), available at <http://www.justice.govt.nz/pubs/reports/2007/domestic-violence-act-review/discussion.pdf>.

- (g) ... provide for the assessment and ongoing review of the needs of people attending the programme.⁷⁵

Regulation 28 outlines the goals every program must adopt, such as promoting the protection of protected persons from domestic violence; empowering protected persons to deal with the effects of domestic violence; increasing understanding about domestic violence, and presenting information about the operation of protection orders.⁷⁶

While the DVA 1995 does not have strong cultural components relating to Māori, the 1996 Regulations directly provide for and mandate culturally tailored programs for Māori adult protected persons (applicants with protection orders in place). Hence, the Ministry of Justice and the Department of Courts select and contract with non-governmental Māori program providers based on parameters set out in the 1996 Regulations. Pursuant to Regulation 27:

Every programme that is designed for Māori or that will be provided in circumstances where the persons attending the programme are primarily Māori, must take into account Tikanga Māori, including (without limitation) the following Māori values and concepts:

- (a) Mana wahine (the prestige attributed to women):
- (b) Mana tane (the prestige attributed to men):
- (c) Tiaki tamariki (the importance of the safeguarding and rearing of children):
- (d) Whānaukatanga (family relationships and their importance):
- (e) Taha wairua (the spiritual dimension of a healthy person):
- (f) Taha hinengaro (the psychological dimension of a healthy person):
- (g) Taha tinana (the physical dimension of a healthy person).⁷⁷

Some program providers adopt a Kaupapa Māori approach, which “is about thinking critically, including developing a critique of Pākehā i.e., New Zealanders of European descent] constructions and definitions of Māori and affirming the importance of Māori self-definitions and self-valuations.”⁷⁸

A.2. Other relevant statutes

The DVA 1995 intersects with several other pieces of New Zealand legislation including the Care of Child Act 2004, the Family Proceedings Act 1980, and the Immigration Act 1987.⁷⁹

The Care of Child Act 2004 (CCA 2004),⁸⁰ which replaced the Guardianship Act 1968, promotes child welfare particularly as it relates to protection from abuse, parental guardianship and access. Both the DVA 1995 and CCA 2004 prohibit or curtail a parent's access to a child in cases of family violence (abuse of partner or child). Section 52 of CCA 2004 supplies a set of child custody orders to be considered during DVA 1995 proceedings.⁸¹ Furthermore, the CCA 2004 makes a presumption against respondents under the DVA 1995 when approving additional guardians (secondary guardians appointed by the primary guardians).⁸²

The Family Proceedings Act 1980⁸³ encourages couples counseling before an application for a separation order is made to the Court.⁸⁴ However, when an application is made, a judge may rule against counseling when the respondent has used violence (within the meaning of Section 3(2) of the DVA 1995) against his partner or child.⁸⁵

The Immigration Act of 1987⁸⁶ sets out the standards, framework and process for determining who may enter and remain in New Zealand on a temporary or permanent basis.⁸⁷ The specific policies under the Immigration Act of 1987 are set out in the Immigration Operations Manual.⁸⁸ One such policy is the Department of Labor's Victims of Domestic Violence

⁷⁵ Regulations 1996, § 26.

⁷⁶ *Id.* § 28.

⁷⁷ *Id.* §27. See also Fiona Cram et al., *Evaluation of Programmes for Māori Adult Protected Persons Under the Domestic Violence Act 1995* (June 2002), at 113-14, available at <http://www.justice.govt.nz/pubs/reports/2002/maori-domestic-violence/index.html>.

⁷⁸ Fiona Cram et al., *of Programmes for Māori Adult Protected Persons Under the Domestic Violence Act 1995* (June 2002), at 11, available at <http://www.justice.govt.nz/pubs/reports/2002/maori-domestic-violence/index.html>.

⁷⁹ See Ministry of Justice, *A Review of the Domestic Violence Act 1995 and Related Legislation. A Discussion Document*, 56-63 (December 2007).

⁸⁰ Care of Child Act 2004, 2004 No. 90 (N.Z.).

⁸¹ *Id.* § 52.

⁸² *Id.* § 22(2)(d).

⁸³ Family Proceedings Act 1980, 1980 No. 94 (N.Z.).

⁸⁴ *Id.* § 9(1).

⁸⁵ *Id.* § 10(3).

⁸⁶ Immigration Act of 1987, 1987 No. 74 (N.Z.).

⁸⁷ See Ministry of Justice, *A Review of the Domestic Violence Act 1995 and Related Legislation. A Discussion Document*, Appendix One (December 2007), available at <http://www.justice.govt.nz/pubs/reports/2007/domestic-violence-act-review/chapter-6.html>.

⁸⁸ *Id.*

(VDV) policy that:

enables people temporarily in New Zealand who have been living together in an established relationship with a New Zealand citizen or resident, and who had intended to seek residence in New Zealand on the basis of that marriage or relationship, to apply for a work or residence permit:

- If that marriage or relationship has ended due to domestic violence by the New Zealand citizen or resident, and
- If they returned to their home country, they would be disowned by their family and community as a result of their relationship ending, and have no means of independent support.⁸⁹

VDV applies to both women and men and utilizes the broad definition of domestic violence found in Section 3 of the DVA 1995.⁹⁰ In April 2007, the VDV was strengthened to include a protection order under DVA 1995 “as evidence of domestic violence for the purposes of the policy.”⁹¹

B. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE STRATEGIES AND PROGRAMS OF ACTION

Along with the DVA 1995 and the above-mentioned relevant statutes, the New Zealand Government has published three strategy documents pertaining to domestic violence in recent years. Each of these strategies contains a range of new programs and initiatives to better address domestic violence. This section explains the main characters of three relevant strategies: *Te Rito*, the Family Violence Taskforce, and the Family Violence Clearinghouse.

B.1. *Te Rito*

In 2002, the New Zealand government launched *Te Rito: New Zealand Family Violence Prevention Strategy*, defined as “an integrated, multi-faceted, whole-of-government and community approach to preventing the occurrence and reoccurrence of violence in families/whānau.”⁹² *Te Rito*’s development and implementation is guided by a set of nine principles.⁹³ The strategy comprises five key goals and objectives (objectives are intended to help focus goals) to be implemented within a five-year time-frame. Lastly, *Te Rito* has 18 areas of action. These actions direct the strategy’s implementation and stress improving “inter-agency co-ordination, collaboration and communication.”⁹⁴ Many of the principles, goals and objectives, and areas of action emphasize a need for culturally and ethnically relevant approaches with specific reference to Māori and Pacific Islanders.

Te Rito roots the strategy’s intention to operate in culturally relevant social spheres in the Treaty of Waitangi noting that “[t]he Treaty of Waitangi provides for a unique relationship between Māori and the Crown.”⁹⁵ This unique relationship recognizes the Māori as “tangata whenua” [people of the land] and as such *Te Rito* stresses, “it is important that approaches to family violence prevention are constructed and implemented with the special interests and needs of whānau, hapu and iwi in mind, and strengthen [their] ability to control their own development and achieve their own aspirations.”⁹⁶ Furthermore, *Te Rito* emphasizes that approaches to family violence should be “culturally relevant and effective for (a) whānau, hapu, iwi; and (b) Pacific

89 *Id.*

90 *Id.*

91 *Id.*

92 Ministry of Social Development, *Te Rito: New Zealand Family Violence Prevention Strategy 6* (2002), available at <http://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/publications/sector-policy/te-rito.pdf>.

93 *Te Rito*’s guiding principles are:

All people have a fundamental right to be safe and to live free from violence

The unique customary and contemporary structures and practices of whānau, hapu and iwi must be recognised, provided for and fully engaged

Family violence prevention is to be viewed and approached in a broad and holistic manner

Perpetrators of violence in families/whānau must be held accountable for their violent behaviour

There must be a strong emphasis on prevention and early intervention with a specific focus on the needs of children and young people

Approaches to family violence prevention must be integrated, co-ordinated and collaborative

The community has a right and responsibility to be involved in preventing violence in families/whānau

The diverse needs of specific populations must be recognised and provided for when developing and implementing family violence prevention initiatives

Family violence prevention initiatives should be continually enhanced as information and better ways of working are identified. *Id.* at 12-13.

94 *Id.* at 5.

95 *Id.* at 12. On the special relationship the Treaty of Waitangi sets between Māori and the Crown, see *infra* Part I.3.B.

96 Ministry of Social Development, *Te Rito: New Zealand Family Violence Prevention Strategy 6* (2002), at 12, available at <http://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/publications/sector-policy/te-rito.pdf>.

97 *Id.* at 14.

98 For instance, area of action 5 demands the development of a “plan of action for preventing violence in Māori communities.” Thus, Te Puni Kokiri (Ministry of Māori Development) and its Māori Task Force on Family/Whānau Violence is tasked with area of action 5’s implementation.

peoples and other ethnic populations.”⁹⁷

Since *Te Rito*’s launch in 2002, the Ministry of Social Development, through its *Te Rito Small Executive Group*, has periodically reviewed the progress of all areas of action. Implementing *Te Rito* as an umbrella national strategy often equates to macro forms of implementation such as making funding allocations to other programs, or drafting policies for other departments.⁹⁸ The New Zealand government has not made available any *Te Rito Progress* reports after 2004.

B.2. Taskforce for Action on Violence Within Families

In 2005, the Ministry of Social Development established the *Taskforce for Action on Violence Within Families* (hereinafter, “the Taskforce”) “to advise the Family Violence Ministerial Team on how to make improvements to the way family violence is addressed, and how to eliminate family violence in New Zealand.”⁹⁹ The Taskforce is a joint initiative that brings together governmental and non-governmental agencies, independent Crown entities and the Judiciary “to work together and provide leadership to end family violence and promote stable, healthy families.”¹⁰⁰

The Taskforce develops specific programs for Māori and Pacific peoples, as well as initiatives to address child abuse. It also launched the Campaign for Action on Family Violence—“It’s not OK!”—featuring “community leaders, engaging community partners and underpinned by awareness-training packages for media.”¹⁰¹ The Taskforce has also overseen police training in family violence investigation and

risk assessment. Drawing from the experience of the Manukau (South Auckland) and Waitakere (West Auckland) Courts, it advised the government to establish four more Family Courts in Auckland and Wellington, and plans on establishing still more courts in the rest of the country. Starting in 2008, the Taskforce “will focus on the quality and diversity of approaches to eliminating violence in Māori and Pacific families, with a workforce trained in prevention, early intervention, protection and accountability.”¹⁰² The brochure, however, does not specify how the Taskforce will carry out this work.

Most Taskforce members are chief executives. The government has stressed the importance of having high-level officials so as to “swiftly implement” improvements and policies across government agencies.¹⁰³

B.3. Family Violence Clearinghouse

Initially based at the University of Canterbury’s Te Awatea Violence Research Centre, the *Family Violence Clearinghouse* “is the national centre for collating and disseminating information about domestic and family violence in Aotearoa New Zealand.”¹⁰⁴ In September 2008, the Ministry of Social Development, which provided the funding for the launch of the Family Violence Clearinghouse, in 2005, took over the administration of the website. The Family Violence Clearinghouse’s purpose is to centralize the information on domestic violence to be consulted by both non-governmental organizations as well as state agencies. Despite the large number of resources contained in the website, it is not clear whether it was created to share information with

TPK has drafted—and funds the implementation of—a Māori specific domestic violence prevention framework called *Transforming Whānau Violence—A Conceptual Framework* (which replaced *Whānau Violence: A Māori Conceptual Framework* in October 2004). See Small Executive Group of the Te Rito National Executive, Ministry of Social Development, *Te Rito: New Zealand Family Violence Prevention Strategy—Progress Report 8* (April, 2004); Small Executive Group of the Te Rito National Executive, Ministry of Social Development, *Te Rito: New Zealand Family Violence Prevention Strategy—Progress Report 2* (November, 2004).

99 Information from the Ministry of Social Development’s website, available at <http://www.msd.govt.nz/work-areas/families-whanau/action-family-violence/taskforce-info.html>.

100 *Id.* Members of the Taskforce include the Chief Executive of the Ministry of Social Development (Chair), the Chief Executive of the Accident Compensation Corporation, the Secretary for Education, the Director-General of Health, the Secretary for Justice, the Chief Executive of the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, the Commissioner of the New Zealand Police, the Chief Executive of Te Puni Kōkiri, the Chief Executive of the Ministry of Women’s Affairs, the Chief District Court Judge, the Principal Family Court Judge, the Children’s Commissioner, the Chief Families Commissioner, the Deputy Chief Executive, Social Services Policy, Ministry of Social Development, a representative from the Taskforce’s Māori Reference Group, a representative from the Taskforce’s Pacific Advisory Group, the Chief Executive of CCS Disability Action, the Chief Executive, Strategic Relationships, Jigsaw, the Chief Executive of the National Collective of Independent Women’s Refuges, the Chief Executive of Relationship Services, and the Chief Executive of the Tamaki Community Development Trust.

101 Ministry of Social Development, *The Ongoing Programme of Action*. Summary (December 2007), available at <http://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/work-programmes/initiatives/action-family-violence/taskforce-ongoing-programme-of-action-summary.pdf>.

102 *Id.*

103 Taskforce for Action on Violence within Families, *The First Report 13* (July 2006), available at <http://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/work-areas/sector-policy/te-rito/taskforce-report-action-on-violence.pdf>.

104 See Family Violence Clearinghouse’s website, available at <http://www.nzfvc.org.nz/>. Te Awatea Violence Research Centre was established “to foster research [on family violence], disseminate it, and make it available.” Interview with Annabel Taylor, Deputy Director, Te Awatea, Christchurch (May 12, 2008).

NGOs or with the government or to monitor and follow-up the situation and studies on domestic violence in New Zealand.¹⁰⁵

The website hosts studies and evaluations on the different regulations and programs on family violence explained above. As such, the Clearing-house allows researchers and policy-makers to access up-to-date information as well as to make informed decisions.

3. New Zealand's obligations to Māori as indigenous people

This section analyzes the obligations under both international and domestic law that New Zealand has toward the indigenous Maori people. The section provides the normative framework against which domestic violence programs that affect Māori ought to be designed, implemented and evaluated.

A. INTERNATIONAL LAW

As noted above, New Zealand is a party to most major international human rights treaties, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,¹⁰⁶ the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights,¹⁰⁷ the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination,¹⁰⁸ CEDAW,¹⁰⁹ the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment,¹¹⁰ the Convention on the Rights of the Child,¹¹¹ the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court,¹¹² and the Geneva Conventions I-IV.¹¹³ New Zealand is usually regarded as a nation committed to the promotion of the international human rights regime.¹¹⁴

Despite its adherence to most major treaties, New Zealand has not ratified the two most important international instruments addressing the rights of indigenous peoples, namely, the International Labour Organization Convention on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries (ILO No. 169)¹¹⁵ and the Universal Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, adopted in September 2007.¹¹⁶ The former, adopted in 1989, is a fully binding instrument, whereas the recently adopted Declaration contains, according to the UN, “non-binding,” aspirational provisions.¹¹⁷

Both the Convention and the Declaration lay out a normative framework that seeks to promote and protect the rights of native peoples. ILO Convention 169 provides for self-management and the right of indigenous and tribal peoples to decide their own priorities;¹¹⁸ the right of indigenous peoples to be consulted whenever any measure that may have a direct effect on them is being explored, planned or implemented, and the right to “be fully involved in all relevant processes.”¹¹⁹

For many years, ILO Convention 169 set the highest standard for the protection of indigenous peoples’ rights. With the adoption by the United Nations’ General Assembly of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, in September 2007, international human rights law has set up new and stronger standards in areas including land and resources, self-determination, participation, and social and economic rights. Notwithstanding the Declaration’s non-binding character, it raises indigenous peoples’ right from consultation to “prior and informed consent,” and “emphasizes the rights of indigenous

105 Interview with Nick Fahey, Project Manager & Chief Researcher, Family Violence Clearing House, Christchurch (May 12, 2008).

106 ICCPR, *supra* note 3.

107 ICESCR, *supra* note 4.

108 International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 660 U.N.T.S. 195. The Convention was adopted on December 21, 1965, and entered into force on January 4, 1969.

109 CEDAW, *supra* note 6.

110 Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, 1465 U.N.T.S. 85. The Convention was adopted on December 10, 1984, and entered into force on June 26, 1987.

111 Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1577 U.N.T.S. 3. The Convention was adopted on November 20, 1989, and came into force on September 2, 1990.

112 Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, 2187 U.N.T.S. 90. The Rome Statute was adopted on July 17, 1998, and came into force on July 1, 2002.

113 The Four Geneva Conventions were adopted on August 12, 1949. Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field (First Geneva Convention), 75 U.N.T.S. 31, entered into force on October 21, 1950; Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of the Armed Forces at Sea (Second Geneva Convention), 75 U.N.T.S. 85, entered into force on October 21, 1950; Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (Third Geneva Convention), 75 U.N.T.S. 135, entered into force on October 21, 1950; Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (Fourth Geneva Convention), 75 U.N.T.S. 287, entered into force on October 21, 1950.

114 In May 2008, New Zealand became the tenth recipient of the United Nations’ Franklin Delano Roosevelt International Disability Award, recognizing the country’s role as “a leading proponent of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities” and its “deep commitment to disability issues domestically.” See United Nations, Secretary General, Press Release, SG/SM/11551, May 6, 2008, available at <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2008/sgsm11551.doc.htm>.

115 Convention concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries (1989) (ILO Convention No. 169) 328 U.N.T.S. 247. The Convention was adopted on June 27, 1989, and entered into force on September 5, 1991.

116 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, adopted by the General Assembly Resolution 61/295 on September 13, 2007. While the Universal Declaration was adopted with the vote of 143 nations, only 19 countries—mostly from Latin America—have ratified ILO Convention 169.

peoples to maintain and strengthen their own institutions, cultures and traditions and to pursue their development in keeping with their own needs and aspirations.”¹²⁰

With “deep regret,”¹²¹ New Zealand voted against the Declaration. The government alluded to difficulties with four provisions that were found to be incompatible with New Zealand’s constitutional and legal system, the Treaty of Waitangi and the principle of governing for the good of all its citizens.¹²² Despite these contradictions, the New Zealand government emphasized that it “fully supported the principles and aspirations of the Declaration...[and that] the country had been implementing most of the standards in the Declaration for many years.”¹²³ To the extent that New Zealand made no objection against the Declaration’s provisions on self-determination, consultation, consent, and participation it is possible to conclude that the government agrees with the Declaration’s provisions on these matters. Moreover, UN treaty-based bodies have explicitly referred to the duty of states to seek consent, grounded, *inter alia*, on the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD), to which New Zealand is a signatory.¹²⁴

As a party to the main international human rights instruments, New Zealand submits periodic reports on its adherence to the treaties and thus subjects its human rights record to scrutiny by the treaty-based bodies. While observations by the treaty-bodies have generally been positive, some treaty-based bodies have been critical of New Zealand’s human rights record in certain areas. In particular, in 2007, the CERD Committee issued con-

cluding observations noting concern over the realization of rights by the Māori population. Commendation was offered for the decrease in socio-economic disparity between Māori (and Pacific Islanders) compared with European New Zealanders,¹²⁵ but the Committee expressed concern over other aspects of the law affecting Māori disproportionately, including the non-incorporation of the Treaty of Waitangi,¹²⁶ the 2008 cut-off of the Waitangi Tribunal’s jurisdiction for historical claims,¹²⁷ the over-representation of Māori in the prison population, and the Foreshore and Seabed Act.¹²⁸ New Zealand is expected to respond to these concerns and, as a country that takes international law seriously, it is expected that measures will be implemented to address and show results in these areas.

Through different means, international law has proved crucial for the advancement and protection of indigenous peoples’ rights.¹²⁹ Today, with the adoption of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the agreement among the community of nations is unequivocal: states must take positive measures in a wide range of areas to ensure that the rights and interests of their native populations are guaranteed. In spite of voting against the Declaration, New Zealand is still obliged to observe the community of nations’ norms and understandings on the rights of native peoples. But this obligation does not only derive from New Zealand’s international obligations; at the domestic level, perhaps unlike most other countries with significant indigenous populations, New Zealand is bound by political and legal obligations, in particular, those set in *Tiriti o Waitangi* or the Treaty of Waitangi.

117 The UN press release stated: “A non-binding text, the Declaration states that native peoples have the right “to the recognition, observance and enforcement of treaties” concluded with States or their successors.” See United Nations, General Assembly, Press Release, September 13, 2007, GA/10612, available at <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2007/ga10612.doc.htm>.

118 ILO Convention on Indigenous and tribal peoples, 1989 (No. 169): A manual, Geneva, International Labour Office, 2003, at 15.

119 *Id.* at 18.

120 “United Nations adopts Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples,” UN News Centre, September 13, 2007, available at <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=23794&Cr=indigenous&Cr1>.

121 See New Zealand’s explanation of vote, September 13, 2007, at <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2007/ga10612.doc.htm>.

122 The government’s representative cited article 26 on lands and resources, article 28 on redress, and articles 19 and 32 on a right of veto over the State as being in tension with domestic provisions or plainly impossible to be implemented. *Id.*

123 *Id.*

124 CERD Committee’s General Recommendation 23 urges states to ensure “that no decisions directly relating to [indigenous peoples’] rights and interests are taken without their informed consent.” See U.N. Comm. on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, *General Recommendation No. 23: Indigenous Peoples*, U.N. Doc. CERD/C/365, in A/52/18, Annex V, Aug. 18, 1997, at ¶ 4(d).

125 U.N. Comm. on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, *Consideration of Report of New Zealand*, U.N. Doc. CERD/C/NZL/CO/17, Aug. 17, 2007, at ¶ 7.

126 *Id.* at ¶ 13.

127 *Id.* at ¶ 21.

128 *Id.* at ¶ 19.

129 As Wiessner observes, “virtually all indigenous peoples share a common set of problems resulting from the tortured relationship between the conqueror and the conquered...Five basic claims of indigenous peoples arise from this condition: (1) traditional lands should be respected or restored; (2) indigenous peoples should have the right to practice their traditions and celebrate their culture and spirituality with all its implications; (3) they should have access to welfare, health, educational and social services; (4) conquering nations should respect and honor their treaty promises; and (5) indigenous nations should have the right to self-determination. Sigfried Wiessner, *Rights and Status of Indigenous Peoples: A Global Comparative and International Legal Analysis*, 12 HARV. HUM. RTS. J. 57, 98-99 (1999).

B. THE TREATY OF WAITANGI

In 1840, over 200 Māori chiefs and the representatives of the Queen of England signed a treaty that would set the framework for the relationship between the settlers and the native Māori population. The Treaty, signed in Waitangi, is “widely held to be New Zealand’s founding document,”¹³⁰ and is considered applicable to all Māori as official policy.¹³¹ In the words of the Waitangi Tribunal,

[t]he Treaty represents the gift [by Māori] of the right to make laws in return for the promise to do so so as to acknowledge and protect the interest of the indigenous inhabitants... That then was the exchange of gifts that the Treaty represented. The gift of the right to make laws, and the promise to do so so as to accord the Māori interest an appropriate priority.¹³²

Despite the Treaty of Waitangi’s brevity—it only contains three articles—there is wide disagreement on its interpretation, particularly, on the extent of sovereignty that Māori ceded to the Crown. The debate is grounded on the different English and Māori versions of the Treaty: in the English version, Māori chiefs cede “sovereignty,” whereas in the Māori version the term used is “kawanatanga,” which is translated as “governorship.”¹³³ It is argued that Māori could not cede “sovereignty” because no such notion existed in their language. Similarly, Article II of the Treaty’s English version guarantees to Māori the “full, exclusive, and undisturbed possession of their

Lands and Estates Forests Fisheries and other properties which they may collectively or individually possess,” whereas in the Māori version the chiefs retain “te tino rangatiratanga”—which is translated as ‘full chieftainship’—of “taonga,” that is, ‘treasures, properties or precious things,’ a notion that is broader than “full, exclusive, and undisturbed possession” of lands and resources.¹³⁴ Article III guarantees to all Māori the same rights as all other British subjects.¹³⁵

In any event, despite the disagreement over the different meanings in the English and Māori versions there is consensus that the Treaty sets a particular kind of relationship between the Crown and Māori. This relationship is generally understood as a ‘partnership,’¹³⁶ which, according to the interpretation given by courts and the Waitangi Tribunal, imposes on the parties the obligation “to act reasonably, honourably, and in good faith.”¹³⁷ The partnership between Māori and the Crown entails the duty to consult Māori before adopting any measure that could affect them.¹³⁸ The obligation to consult parallels the standards on consultation and participation established in ILO Convention 169 in 1989.¹³⁹

Furthermore, legislation passed in the 1990s and its case law have established as a good practice consultation with indigenous peoples when preparing plans or policy statements, or changes to plans or policy statements.¹⁴⁰ Lately, in 2002, the Local Government Act (LGA) 2002 imposed “new requirements for local authorities on consultation and to undertake capacity-building for Māori,”¹⁴¹ thus

130 See PHILIP A. JOSEPH, CONSTITUTIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE LAW IN NEW ZEALAND § 3.1 (2nd ed. 2001); Douglas Graham, *The New Zealand Government’s Policy*, in RECOGNISING THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES 5 (Alison Quentin-Baxter, ed. 1998); Noel Cox, *The Treaty of Waitangi and the relationship between the Crown and Māori in New Zealand* 28 Brook. J. INT’L L. 123, 125 (2002-2003) (stressing that “[t]he Treaty of Waitangi... has long been regarded as New Zealand’s founding document”).

131 See E.M. Brookfield, *Waitangi & Indigenous Rights: Revolution, Law & Legitimation* 105-06 (2nd ed. 2006).

132 Waitangi Tribunal, *Motunui-Waitara Claim Report: Wai 6* (2 ed., Waitangi Tribunal, Wellington, 1983) cited in GEOFFREY PALMER & MATTHEW PALMER, *BRIDLED POWER. NEW ZEALAND’S CONSTITUTION AND GOVERNMENT* 334 (4th ed., 2004).

133 See Treaty of Waitangi, U.K.-Māori, adopted in Feb. 6, 1840, Article I: “The Chiefs of the Confederation of the United Tribes of New Zealand and the separate and independent Chiefs who have not become members of the Confederation cede to Her Majesty the Queen of England absolutely and without reservation all the rights and powers of Sovereignty which the said Confederation or Individual Chiefs respectively exercise or possess, or may be supposed to exercise or to possess over their respective Territories as the sole sovereigns thereof.” The Māori version reads as follows: “Ko nga Rangatira o te wakaminenga me nga Rangatira katoa hoki ki hai i uru ki taua wakaminenga ka tuku rawa atu ki te Kuini o Ingarani ake tonu atu - te Kawanatanga katoa o o ratou wenua.”

134 Article II: “Her Majesty the Queen of England confirms and guarantees to the Chiefs and Tribes of New Zealand and to the respective families and individuals thereof the full exclusive and undisturbed possession of their Lands and Estates Forests Fisheries and other properties which they may collectively or individually possess so long as it is their wish and desire to retain the same in their possession; but the Chiefs of the United Tribes and the individual Chiefs yield to Her Majesty the exclusive right of Preemption over such lands as the proprietors thereof may be disposed to alienate at such prices as may be agreed upon between the respective Proprietors and persons appointed by Her Majesty to treat with them in that behalf.” In Te Reo: “Ko te Kuini o Ingarani ka wakarite ka wakaee ki nga Rangitira ki nga hapu - ki nga tangata katoa o Nu Tirani te tino rangatiratanga o o ratou wenua o ratou kainga me o ratou taonga katoa. Otiia ko nga Rangatira o te wakaminenga me nga Rangatira katoa atu ka tuku ki te Kuini te hokonga o era wahi wenua e pai ai te tangata nona te Wenua - ki te ritenga o te utu e wakaritea ai e ratou ko te kai hoko e meatia nei e te Kuini hei kai hoko mona.”

135 Article III: “In consideration thereof Her Majesty the Queen of England extends to the Natives of New Zealand Her royal protection and imparts to them all the Rights and Privileges of British Subjects.” The Māori version states: “Hei wakaritenga mai hoki tenei mo te wakaetanga ki te Kawanatanga o te Kuini - Ka tiakina e te Kuini o Ingarani nga tangata māori katoa o Nu Tirani ka tukua ki a ratou nga tikanga katoa rite tahi ki ana mea ki nga tangata o Ingarani.”

136 See *New Zealand Māori Council v. Attorney General* [1987] 1 N.Z.L.R. 641, 644 (CA) (“the Treaty signified a partnership between races”; Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975, 1975 S.N.Z. No. 114, Art. 4(2A)(a) (referring to the Treaty parties as in a partnership relation). See also Ann Sullivan, *The Treaty of Waitangi and Social Well-being: Justice, Representation, and Participation* in WAITANGI REVISITED: PERSPECTIVES ON THE TREATY OF WAITANGI 123, 123

In 1840, over 200 Māori chiefs and the representatives of the Queen of England signed a treaty that would set the framework for the relationship between the settlers and the native Māori population. The Treaty is “widely held to be New Zealand’s founding document,” and is considered applicable to all Māori as official policy.

raising the standard much in the same way as it has occurred in international human rights law. Indeed, the New Zealand government equates one of the most important provisions in the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples—the principle of informed consent—with the provisions enshrined in the Treaty of Waitangi.¹⁴² In Article 10, the Declaration states

Indigenous peoples shall not be forcibly removed from their lands or territories. No relocation shall take place without the *free, prior and informed consent* of the indigenous peoples concerned and after agreement on just and fair compensation and, where possible, with the option of return.

Thus, notwithstanding New Zealand’s no vote on the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, to honor the Treaty of Waitangi the government must seek prior and informed consent from Māori whenever a decision that may affect them is to be adopted. Furthermore, this principle has application in a wide range of issues, from lands and resources, to political participation and, as shown in this report, addressing domestic violence.

(M. Belgrave, M. Kawharu and D. Williams eds., 2005) (“there is considerable agreement between the courts and the [Waitangi] Tribunal that Treaty principles refer to a partnership between Māori and the Crown...”).

137 Sullivan, *supra* note 117, at 123.

138 Sullivan notes, “[the] duty to make informed decisions...implies that within the principle of partnership there is an obligation to consult and to provide adequate time for the consultation process. *Id.*”

139 Article 6 of ILO Convention 169 proclaims that “Governments shall:

(a) Consult the peoples concerned, through appropriate procedures and in particular through their representative institutions, whenever consideration is being given to legislative or administrative measures which may affect them directly;
(b) Establish means by which these peoples can freely participate, to at least the same extent as other sectors of the population, at all levels of decision-making in elective institutions and administrative and other bodies responsible for policies and programmes which concern them;
(c) Establish means for the full development of these peoples’ own institutions and initiatives, and in appropriate cases provide the resources necessary for this purpose.

2. The consultations carried out in application of this Convention shall be undertaken, in good faith and in a form appropriate to the circumstances, with the objective of achieving agreement or consent to the proposed measures.

140 The main statute where consultation has been required is the Resource Management Act 1991. The New Zealand Ministry for the Environment has stated that “[a]pplicants have a duty to report on consultation when constructing an assessment of environmental effects, but this does not amount to a legal duty to consult...Despite this, it is recognized good practice that applicants for resource consents should engage in consultation with tangata whenua [i.e., the people of the land] where their proposals may affect” the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, waters and other sites, the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, and the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. See *Guidelines for Consulting with Tangata Whenua under the RMA. An Update on Case Law*, Ministry for the Environment, 2003, at 3, available at <http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/rma/guidelines-tangata-whenua-dec03/case-law-tangata-whenua.pdf>.

141 *Id.*, at 7 (“Section 81 of LGA 2002 requires local authorities to establish processes to provide opportunities for Māori to contribute to decision-making. Section 82 sets out standard principles for local authorities to follow when undertaking consultation, and specifically requires local authorities to adopt processes to consult with Māori in accordance with these principles.”)

142 One day after the vote at the United Nations, Māori Affairs Minister, Parekura Horomia, affirmed that New Zealand has “some of the most extensive consultation mechanisms in the world.” Horomia specifically referenced to “the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, including the *principle of informed consent*,” as being enshrined in New Zealand’s domestic law. See “Māori Party’s head in the clouds,” *Scoop*, September 14, 2007, available at <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PA0709/S00272.htm> (emphasis added).

II: Domestic violence in New Zealand: Problems with the existing law and regulations and “implementation gaps”

1. Domestic violence in New Zealand: the current situation

Domestic violence is a significant issue in New Zealand. Despite the government's effort to tackle it, the levels of violence within the family, particularly violence against women, remain surprisingly high. Information regarding domestic violence—or “family violence,” as it usually called in New Zealand—is everywhere. A large media campaign airs TV ads and radio announcements along with posters and flyers saying “It's not OK!” to use violence.¹⁴³ Even bank teller machines flash messages about the need to combat family violence in New Zealand.¹⁴⁴ The news often reports incidents of domestic violence.¹⁴⁵ Many governmental agencies' websites have links to emergency services for victims of domestic violence. A large network of non-governmental organizations, mostly funded by the government, also provide frontline services and support, advocate for victims and survivors, and conduct studies on domestic violence. The level of awareness is thus fairly high.

Some of New Zealand's most noticeable art and literature directly speak about domestic violence—or, more generally, about violence and discrimination against women. The characters of the award-winning novel *The Bone People* are locked in violent and unhealthy relationships, despite their love for each other.¹⁴⁶ Paikea, the 12 year-old character of the acclaimed film *Whale Rider*, struggles with her grandfather's refusal to allow her become the tribe's leader, in a film that offers a fine discussion of gen-

der roles within Māori tribes.¹⁴⁷ Domestic violence is the major theme of the widely acclaimed film *Once Were Warriors*, a crude depiction of an urban Māori family's marginalization and resort to alcohol, drugs and abuse.¹⁴⁸ The two films received praise both nationally and at the international level.

Domestic violence studies may adopt different perspectives. They may examine domestic violence using a public health approach, as the most-cited study on the subject in New Zealand does.¹⁴⁹ Public health analyses may be complemented with cost-based perspectives, which put emphasis on the heavy economic burden a state must bear when dealing with domestic violence.¹⁵⁰ Such economic costs not only relate to the wellbeing of women who are victims of domestic violence (and their children) but also “the costs associated with political and social instability through intergenerational transmission of violence.”¹⁵¹ Finally, one can also adopt an international human rights framework to analyze the problem, that is, a perspective that examines a state's response to violence against women as a form of discrimination and the existence of larger structures of subordination.¹⁵² This report embraces such an approach.

In New Zealand, it is generally stated that one in three women has been a victim of domestic violence. More precisely, according to Fanslow's and Robinson's prevalence study,

For those women aged 15 and over, at least one act of physical violence inflicted by non-partners was reported by approximately 1 in 6

143 See <http://www.oneyouok.org.nz/>.

144 Upon landing in New Zealand, a member of the Leitner Center's delegation retrieved money from a teller machine and caught a picture of the machine's screen message once she had made the withdrawal. The screen showed the following message: “Stop for New Zealand's Biggest Morning Tea and help prevent domestic violence, 9-20 June 2008.”

145 See, for instance, *Gisborne Herald*, “We should be outraged,” Nov. 26, 2007 (reporting on the outrage following the murder of a woman killed by her former partner); Moana Tipu, “When enough is enough. Breaking the cycle of domestic violence,” *NZine magazine* (reprinted from the *Ngai Tahu magazine*, “Te Karaka,” Sep. 19, 2003) (reporting on the prevalence of domestic violence across race, religion and socio-economic background in Aotearoa New Zealand). International press has reported on domestic violence, labeling it as New Zealand's “dark secret.” See *BBC News*, “New Zealand faces its dark secret,” Jan. 29, 2007 (reporting on the high levels of violence against women, especially within Māori communities).

146 KERI HULME, *THE BONE PEOPLE* (1984). The novel was awarded the Booker Prize for Fiction and the Penguin Prize for Literature in 1985.

147 “*Whale Rider*,” directed by Niki Caro, 2002.

148 “*Once Were Warriors*,” directed by Lee Tamahori, 1994.

149 See Janet Fanslow and Elizabeth Robinson, *Violence against women in New Zealand: prevalence and health consequences*, Vol. 117 No 1206 JOURNAL OF THE NEW ZEALAND MEDICAL ASSOCIATION (Nov. 2004), available at <http://www.nzma.org.nz/journal/117-1206/1173/>.

150 Scholars in New Zealand conducted this type of study in the early 1990s. See Suzanne Snively, *The New Zealand economic cost of family violence in* SOCIAL POLICY JOURNAL OF NEW ZEALAND Vol. 4 (Jul. 1995), available at <http://www.msd.govt.nz/publications/journal/04-july-1995/index.html#8>.

participants, while sexual violence was reported by approximately 1 in 10 women. Approximately 1 in 3 ever-partnered women reported that they had experienced at least one act of physical and/or sexual violence by an intimate partner, and experience of physical and/or sexual violence by a current or previous intimate partner within the previous 12 months was reported by approximately 5% of respondents.¹⁵³

As the same study explains, its findings are consistent with official data at the time: the 2001 New Zealand National Survey of Crime Victims (NZNSCV) reported that 26.4% of women had been physically abused by an intimate partner at least once in their lifetime.¹⁵⁴ Despite the level of assaults and threats being “so high” and “unusual compared to other crime surveys”—assaults accounted for 26% of all crimes and threats accounted for 22%—the survey acknowledges that, by including “partners or people well known”—which the survey aims not to include—there could be double counting of offenses.¹⁵⁵ Moreover, the crime survey states that “it is difficult to be more precise about the proportion of Victim Forms that related to partners or people who were well known,” thus leaving the number of domestic violence incidents largely unknown.¹⁵⁶ As we discuss below, the lack of available data on domestic violence is a serious, and largely unattended, problem in New Zealand.

There is consensus that New Zealand has sound legislation on domestic violence. Yet, New Zealand still has a serious problem eliminating violence against women. As the Governor-General has observed, New Zealand has “some of the best legislation in the world (the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989 and the Domestic Violence Act 1995) and among the worst of performances.”¹⁵⁷

The following sections detail some of the problems that New Zealand faces when dealing with domestic violence. First, we examine areas in which the law as written should be modified to better address the concerns and needs of victims, survivors, perpetrators and the community at large. Second, we focus on the lack of implementation of some of the law’s provisions.

2. Problems with the law and regulations as written

Although the current legislation and regulations on domestic violence are generally considered good, there are areas in which improvement should be made. The following section details some of the problems that the current law “as written” presents. The information we present here was mostly gathered through interviews while the Leitner Center delegation visited the country in May 2008.

A. ACCESS TO PROGRAMS

As mandated by the DVA 1995, once a Court grants a protection order it must direct respondents to attend stopping violence programs, “unless the Court considers that there is good reason for not making such a direction.”¹⁵⁸ As stated on the National Network of Stopping Violence Services’ website, violence programs aim to help people “wanting to resolve problems in their lives caused by violence: women who are wanting to leave or have left violent relationships, children and young people affected by violence, men who want to get in charge of violent and abusive behavior and become better partners, dads, friends and workmates.”¹⁵⁹ The importance of these programs in helping to prevent and eliminate domestic violence cannot be underestimated. Therefore, it is important to scrutinize both their availability and their effectiveness.

151 United Nations, *In-depth study on all forms of violence against women*, UN Gen. Ass., A/61/122/Add. 1, Jul. 6, 2006, para. 107.

152 See, *supra*, Part I.1.

153 See Janet Fanslow and Elizabeth Robinson, *Violence against women in New Zealand: prevalence and health consequences*, Vol. 117 No 1206 JOURNAL OF THE NEW ZEALAND MEDICAL ASSOCIATION (Nov. 2004), available at <http://www.nzma.org.nz/journal/117-1206/1173/>.

154 New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey 2001 (2003), at 139, available at <http://www.justice.govt.nz/pubs/reports/2003/victims-survey/index.html>. Fanslow and Robinson observe that “[t]he slightly lower rates obtained by the NZNSCV may be due to inclusion of women aged over 65 years, who may be less likely to disclose [intimate-partner violence], and/or methodological differences (eg, use of a computer-based survey), and inclusion of questions about IPV in a ‘crime’ context.” *Id.* The study also mentions the 1995 Hitting Home Survey, which found that “35% [of men reported having] been physically violent to an intimate partner in their lifetime.” *Id.* The 2005 NZNSCV failed to report specifically on intimate partner abuse.

155 New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey 2006. Key Findings, § 2.3, available at <http://www.justice.govt.nz/pubs/reports/2007/crime-safety-survey-2006/key-findings/chapter-2.html#22a>.

156 *Id.*

157 Ian Hassall and Janet Fanslow, *Family violence in New Zealand; we can do better*, JOURNAL OF THE NEW ZEALAND MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, Vol. 199 No. 1228 (2006), available at <http://www.nzma.org.nz/journal/119-1228/1830/>.

158 DVA 1995, § 32(1).

159 See <http://www.nnsvs.org.nz/aboutus/index.aspx>. The NNSVS is comprised by 53 member agencies across the country. Interview with Brian Gardner, National Manager, NNSVS, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

Poor support for self-referrals

Generally, only men who are referred to stopping violence programs through the courts are eligible to attend such programs free of charge. As the coordinator of a Family Court observed, there is “not equality of access” to these services.¹⁶⁰ According to the current legislation and regulations, there are (mandatory) programs for respondents and (voluntary) programs for applicants. As a result, the government provides funding to the specialized agencies that provide such services.¹⁶¹ The law, however, does not actively support self-referrals, that is, there is little (or no) funding for men who voluntarily seek help through these programs. As officials from the Ministry of Justice acknowledged, they provide funding “only if [men are] referred through courts, as well as other court mandated programs.”¹⁶²

Because men who voluntarily attend stopping violence programs may be more likely to change violent behaviors, the government should give special attention and support to these cases. In reality, the opposite tends to happen. Frontline service providers consider the lack of funding for self-referrals a problem. The National Network of Stopping Violence Services’ (NNSVS) National Manager, Brian Gardner, remarked that there is “not enough [funding] to cover the entire costs” for men who self-refer to the programs.¹⁶³ One service provider complained that “the government only funds 20 non-mandated self-referrals, but I get approximately 5 times more than that!”¹⁶⁴ Similarly, the manager of another stopping violence program observed: “for self-referrals there is a charge of 30 [NZ] dollars per session and the vast majority don’t pay. If they can’t afford it then we wear the costs. It’s not good business but we have to ask ourselves what our intention is.”¹⁶⁵ He further remarked that if the purpose is to reduce violence then the programs have no choice but to absorb the costs of non-paying clients.¹⁶⁶ Finally, there is a cost-based consideration: stopping violence programs are cheaper than incarcerating a person. As one provider remarked, “it costs about \$60,000 per year to incarcerate someone but only \$3,000 to

send them to a stopping violence program.”¹⁶⁷ The duty to prevent violence from occurring mandates that the state actively support men’s self-referrals to stopping violence programs—particularly, as the number of self-referrals has only increased since the government’s public awareness campaigns.¹⁶⁸

Programs for women

In a similar vein, women who want to attend protected-persons programs cannot always do so free of charge if a protection order was granted more than 3 years ago, or if they do not apply for a protection order. Some protected-persons program providers require a court referral (and therefore court funding) for women to come to their programs. Others offer a sliding scale.¹⁶⁹ Women’s ability to attend protected-persons programs should not depend on their seeking a protection order (or their ability to pay). Sometimes women may not want to bring their case before a judge, yet they still may want to “do something” to deal with a violent situation. The obligation to seek a protection order may prevent women from attending these programs in practice.

B. ACCESS TO LEGAL AID

One of the most important features of a comprehensive strategy to eliminate domestic violence is a proper response from courts. Consequently, it is crucial that victims of domestic violence have prompt access to the courts. Many interviewees observed that applying and obtaining a protection order is not as easy as it should be. In the words of Brian Gardner, the National Manager of NNSVS, the process to get a protection order is “the opposite of free, easy and safe.”¹⁷⁰ Different reasons account for this opinion.

First, many applicants who do not meet the threshold for legal aid but still earn a low salary, have to pay for a lawyer to prepare their protection order application. This can be very costly. Even police officers acknowledge the problem with lack of access to legal aid. “If women don’t qualify for legal aid, the average cost is about NZD 1,000 [in Invercargill].

160 Interview with Robert Loo, Family Court Coordinator & Chairman, Family Violence Focus Group, Invercargill (May 14, 2008).

161 The Network’s agencies are ‘not for profit’ community agencies that receive funding “from a wide range of government agencies, charitable trusts, and donations.” *Id.*

162 Interview with Alison Stephens, Ministry of Justice, Wellington (May 21, 2008).

163 Interview with Brian Gardner, National Manager, National Network of Stopping Violence Services, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

164 Interview with Service Provider.

165 Interview with the Manager of a Stopping Violence Program.

166 *Id.*

167 Interview with Stopping Violence Program.

168 Since the “It’s Not OK” campaign there has been double the number of non-mandated male participants in the men’s programs. Interview with Andrew Treacher, Men’s Program Coordinator, NNSVS, Wellington (May 19, 2008).



The lack of legal services available to women who face domestic violence situations can be even graver when it comes to immigrant women. In Christchurch, there was an incident where a Filipina woman was unable to get legal status because she did not get the final protection order. The director of the only ethnic women's refuge in the city explained that the client did not have legal representation and "the judge's comments indicated that the judge thought the woman just wanted the final protection order for immigration purposes, even though she had documented abuse...."

Women can get help from the community law office or self-represent. [However] if the judge does not like the content of the affidavit, he will discharge the application and the woman can't apply for another [protection order]. It is a problem when women don't have a lawyer..."¹⁷¹ Police Family Violence Coordinators share this opinion: "it is appalling you have to pay to be safe. If you need legal protection, it could be NZD 800-1,500 for legal costs. If the respondent contests the protection order, the applicant owes even more."¹⁷² Specialized family lawyers summarize this dramatically: "it is financially unsustainable to assist women in getting protection orders, because there is not enough funding."¹⁷³ Lynn Ginty, a worker at Nelson Rape Crisis since 2002 who previously

worked with Women's Refuge, thinks women should not have to pay for lawyers when applying for a protection order.¹⁷⁴ Neville Robertson, a prominent domestic violence researcher in New Zealand, thinks likewise: "[t]here are too many hurdles to getting a protection order: the cost, junior level lawyers doing all the applications...it needs to be free and easy."¹⁷⁵ Ginty further observed, "if the government were serious about stopping domestic violence, it would subsidize protection orders."¹⁷⁶

Second, attorneys who have very little experience are the ones who generally provide legal aid. A senior attorney explained that young lawyers do legal aid to gain experience.¹⁷⁷ Because domestic violence incidents are particularly complex, there should be

169 Interview with Holly Carrington, Services Manager, Preventing Violence in the Home, Auckland (May 12, 2008).

170 Interview with Brian Gardner, National Manager, National Network of Stopping Violence Services, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

171 Interview with Sergeant Margaret Windle, Police Family Violence Coordinator, Invercargill (May 14, 2008).

172 Interview with Pegeen O'Rourke, Police Family Violence Coordinator, Christchurch (May 13, 2008).

173 Interview with Alexander Ashmore, barrister, Mahon & Associates, Auckland (May 14, 2008).

174 Interview with Lynn Ginty, Nelson Rape Crisis, Nelson (May 16, 2008).

175 Interview with Neville Robertson, Senior Lecturer, University of Waikato Law School, Hamilton (May 15, 2008).

176 Interview with Lynn Ginty, Nelson Rape Crisis, Nelson (May 16, 2008).

177 Interview with Shelley Gray, attorney, Invercargill, May 15, 2008. Gray remarked remuneration for legal aid is "dreadful...an attorney with 6 years of experience may charge anything from NZD 250 to NZD 400 per hour." The rates for legal aid are NZD 140 per hour.

efforts to attract senior lawyers to take protection orders' applications and domestic violence cases more generally. Domestic violence cases require particular skills, which need time to develop. Alexander Ashmore, a barrister in Auckland, made a worrying statement: "young lawyers are scared of hearings."¹⁷⁸

Third, in some places, the lack of incentives for lawyers to take these cases can result in a total absence of lawyers. Lynn Ginty, from Nelson Rape Crisis, pointed out that over the 2007 Christmas break, "no lawyers were available to help women through Women's Refuge, so women would call Rape Crisis. Rape Crisis would refer women to the Law Institute, who would then refer them to lawyers in Christchurch."¹⁷⁹ One Māori service provider said that "legal aid lawyers are a dying breed."¹⁸⁰ She observed that in Palmerston North, for instance, they have no legal aid whatsoever.¹⁸¹

The lack of legal services available to women who face domestic violence situations can be even graver when it comes to immigrant women. In Christchurch, there was an incident where a Filipina woman was unable to get legal status because she did not get the final protection order. The director of the only ethnic women's refuge in the city explained that the client did not have legal representation and "the judge's comments indicated that the judge thought the woman just wanted the final protection order for immigration purposes, even though she had documented abuse...the woman also missed the appeals process, because she had no lawyer."¹⁸² Several service providers observed that "self-represented women have less validity in the eyes of the judges."¹⁸³ A judge at a Family Violence Court confirmed this perception: "even if [self-represented women] are educated and intelligent they don't always get it right as if they had a lawyer."¹⁸⁴

C. LACK OF MANDATORY AND ADEQUATE TRAINING

In order to appropriately address domestic violence

incidents and their consequences, public officials and frontline service providers need to be adequately trained. In New Zealand, the lack of mandatory training for some officials in key positions may seriously undermine the country's obligation to combat and eliminate domestic violence. As we discuss below, several people identified as a major problem the absence of coherent and robust training policies. New Zealand has successfully brought the issue into the spotlight—programs have been put in place, reports and working papers are constantly released, and there is highly organized civil society which pushes the matter. Yet New Zealand could do more. In the words of one government official, "training is patchy...and not good."¹⁸⁵

Police

Police are often the first to intervene when a domestic violence incident occurs. Consequently, their response can determine to a large extent how the case will unfold. Police not only show up at the scene of an incident—they also prosecute cases. Police prosecutors appear in many of the less serious criminal charges in the District Court, and in preliminary hearings of some serious charges. Hence, police need to know exactly what kind of evidence they should collect; *how* they should gather that information; who they need to talk to, *when*, etc.

There is agreement that police do not receive adequate training on domestic violence. Judge Peter Boshier stated: "There is not enough training for the police and court staff on family violence."¹⁸⁶ Similarly, staff from the National Collective of Independent Women's Refuges commented that "police only get 6 hours of training on domestic violence in 6 weeks of training."¹⁸⁷ Holly Carrington, from Preventing Violence in the Home, observed that "training on domestic violence does not give [police] the needed understanding of why domestic violence happens."¹⁸⁸ As explained below, one of the most cited problems is the police's failure to enforce protection orders—or,

178 Interview with Alexander Ashmore, barrister, Mahon & Associates, Auckland (May 14, 2008).

179 Interview with Lynn Ginty, Nelson Rape Crisis, Nelson (May 16, 2008).

180 Interview with Māori provider.

181 See *id.*

182 Interview with Leila Chacko, Director, Shakti Ethnic Women's Support Group, Christchurch (May 12, 2008).

183 Interview with Lynn Ginty, Nelson Rape Crisis, Nelson (May 16, 2008). Similarly, Chacko, from Shakti, added that the judge in the Filipina woman's case possibly had a lack of sensitivity towards the woman's claims.

184 Interview with Judge David Mather, Waitakere Family Violence Court, Auckland (May 14, 2008).

185 Interview with the Ministry of Women's Affairs, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

186 Interview with Peter Boshier, Principal Family Court Judge, Wellington (May 20, 2008).

187 Interview with Heather Henare, Chief Executive, Women's Refuge, Wellington (May 21, 2008).

188 Interview with Holly Carrington, Services Manager, Preventing Violence in the Home, Auckland (May 12, 2008).

189 Interview with Peter Boshier, Principal Family Court Judge, Wellington (May 20, 2008).

more generally, the laws and regulations on violence against women. As Judge Peter Boshier stated it: “it is fair to say that some police prosecutors are not well trained and sensitive to the issues. Some old school prosecutors just want to get it through, and are quick to amend a charge down to common assault.”¹⁸⁹ Staff from Preventing Violence in the Home made the same remark: “Auckland prosecutors just want expediency in cases, and have good intentions, but don’t always have adequate training or look out for safety of women.”¹⁹⁰ The lack of training is problematic since it can cause a significant imbalance between the victim, who is represented by an overworked policeman who is not a qualified lawyer, and the respondent, who often has a fully qualified and trained defense attorney.

Police receive a small amount of training on domestic violence. As noted above, according to NGO workers, police only get 6 hours of training on domestic violence.¹⁹¹ In Invercargill, the Police Family Violence Coordinator told us that police have 4 hours of formal training on domestic violence issues.¹⁹² In Christchurch, police officers receive “at least 5 1/2 hours of training dealing with protection orders, investigations [and] prosecutions.”¹⁹³ As a result of this poor training, some women expressed concern with the government’s initiative to increase the power of police to issue on the spot protection orders—one of the proposals that came out of the DVA 1995 review process, which was announced in June 2008.¹⁹⁴ It became clear that the absence of a uniform, nationally coordinated policy on police training affects the government’s effort to prevent and eliminate domestic violence notwithstanding their legal obligation to do so.

Judges

Judges play a crucial role in protecting women who are victims of violence. Judges hear applications for protection orders, oversee men’s attendance to stopping violence programs, and decide on convic-

tions against perpetrators. Also, judges’ work can have an impact on the *prevention* of violence—if men see that protection orders are granted, or perpetrators get serious sentences for using violence or for breaches of protection orders, they may be deterred from engaging in this behavior. Notwithstanding the critical role of judges, the law does not contemplate mandatory training for judges on domestic violence issues.

Domestic violence service providers think judges’ knowledge about domestic violence is too narrow. NGO workers remarked that judges have “no real understanding of the dynamics of fear. [They have] no information on what happens after; [they] don’t understand retaliation acts. [The] ones who were lawyers in Family Court know a bit more but struggle with psychological abuse and signs of it.”¹⁹⁵ Solicitors echoed this idea: “a lot of judges in the past were trained about the issue; new up and comers are not being trained. Nowadays they assume that they will pick it up through experience.”¹⁹⁶

The Ministry of Justice deems that it would affect the judiciary’s independence should judges be subject to mandatory training, even in the face of international law standards that call for the training of judges. “International committees always recommend judge training, but they only look at judges’ failure in the process, when it’s actually a larger issue... Judges have control over their own training programs.”¹⁹⁷ The officials’ remarks are consistent with the opinion of the Principal Family Court, Peter Boshier: “The Institute of Judicial Studies recommends some training for judges, but not too much because the judges would rebel.”¹⁹⁸

Women’s Refuge has delivered training to judges, although not as part of a consistent national policy. Women’s Refuge staff affirmed that judges should receive much more training: “[w]e have had two opportunities to deliver trainings and both were half an hour!”¹⁹⁹ Judge David Mather, at the Waitakere Family Violence Court, acknowledged: “we, judges, need training.”²⁰⁰

190 Interview with Holly Carrington, Services Manager, Preventing Violence in the Home, Auckland (May 12, 2008).

191 Interview with Heather Henare, Women’s Refuge, Wellington (May 21, 2008).

192 Interview with Sergeant Margaret Windle, Police Family Violence Coordinator, Invercargill (May 14, 2008).

193 Interview with Pegeen O’Rourke, Police Family Violence Coordinator, Christchurch (May 13, 2008).

194 *Id.* In June 2008, the government announced that it would send a bill to Parliament to strengthen domestic violence laws. One of the proposals was to grant the power to police to issue on the spot short-term protection orders. “Govt proposes strengthening domestic violence laws,” *Stuff.co.nz* (June 10, 2008) available at <http://www.stuff.co.nz/4579347a11.html>.

195 Interview with Holly Carrington, Services Manager, Preventing Violence in the Home, Auckland (May 12, 2008).

196 Interview with Anthony Mahon, solicitor, Mahon & Associates, Auckland (May 14, 2008).

197 Interview with Justine Cornwall, Ministry of Justice, Wellington (May 21, 2008).

198 Interview with Peter Boshier, Principal Family Court Judge, Wellington (May 20, 2008).

199 Interview with Sheryl Hann, Women’s Refuge, Wellington (May 21, 2008).

200 Interview with Judge David Mather, Waitakere Family Violence Court, Auckland (May 14, 2008).

Lawyers

Although women may self-represent to obtain protection orders, it is not an easy process and women benefit significantly from legal representation. “Preventing Violence in the Home suggests that women get lawyers,” says PVH’s Services Manager, Holly Carrington.²⁰¹ “Even though they’re only filling out an affidavit of the witness, it’s hard to get protection orders, increasingly so, and lawyers know which criteria they have to meet in the witness statement.”²⁰² Or, as Judge Peter Boshier told us: “Because women have less access to legal aid, they have trouble meeting the evidentiary requirements and cannot get a protection order for that reason.”²⁰³

Lawyers get to know about these criteria only through practice, however, for there is no contemplated training in law schools’ curricula. As a result, some think all law schools should require future lawyers be trained on the issues surrounding domestic violence and protection orders.²⁰⁴ The lack of training is not only a problem with future lawyers, but also with practicing lawyers. “There’s no training at all for lawyers. Optional training costs about \$300. On the Domestic Violence Standing Committee, which is conservative, lawyers take a gender-neutral approach. There has been talk about developing guidelines for lawyers because there’s no guidance or training for lawyers. There’s no way to mandate [training].”²⁰⁵ In the words of experienced family lawyers, “training for lawyers needs to be refreshed.”²⁰⁶

Benefits officers

Benefits officers from Work and Income New Zealand (WINZ)—the government agency that provides financial assistance and employment services throughout the country—receive a fairly large number of domestic violence disclosures, from victims as well as from perpetrators. Only in 2006-2007, there were about 4,000 family disclosures to WINZ staff.²⁰⁷

Within WINZ, there are 26 Family Violence Response Coordinators who support, mentor and provide advice to Work and Income officers on family violence matters, safety issues and services across the country.²⁰⁸ Family Violence Coordinators operate on a co-delivery model with local NGO and family violence agencies to deliver family violence awareness training to the WINZ staff. Clients are given resource kits, which include information on Women’s Refuge, local services, crisis plans, and the impact of family violence on children.²⁰⁹

There is also a Family Violence Intervention Programme (FVIP) training which is provided to front-line Work and Income and Benefit Control staff. The training consists of a one-day session, co-delivered by Work and Income and NGO trainers with presentations from other NGO service providers.²¹⁰ It covers issues such as prevalence of family violence, its definition, causes, social context, dynamics, indicators, effects, and practice sessions (such as routine screening). There is also refresher training for staff that has been employed longer provided by the Family Violence Response Coordinators. “But the problem with refresher training,” a Family Violence Response Coordinator acknowledged, “is having time to release the case managers so that they can attend the refresher training.”²¹¹

Staff members acknowledge that the training is meant as an introduction, and is not intended to replace skilled intervention from family violence specialists.²¹² Moreover, Katie O’Donnell, the Family Violence Response Co-Coordinator in Wellington, said that despite the fact that every person should be routinely screened, “some staff are not ready to ask those questions [on family violence].”²¹³ Given the prevalence of domestic violence in New Zealand, frontline staff should conduct mandatory screening of all clients. Also, there should be incentives for staff to enroll in refresher training.

201 Interview with Holly Carrington, Services Manager, Preventing Violence in the Home (May 12, 2008).

202 See *id.*

203 Interview with Judge Peter Boshier, Principal Family Court Judge, Wellington (May 20, 2008).

204 Interview with Māori providers.

205 Interview with Sheryl Hann, Women’s Refuge, Wellington (May 21, 2008).

206 Interview with Emma Parsons, Attorney, Mahon & Associates, Auckland (May 14, 2008).

207 Interview with Olwen Taylor, Work and Income Family Violence Intervention Program, Ministry of Social Development, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

208 *Id.*

209 *Id.*

210 Personal communication (email) with Virginia de Joux, Senior Policy Analyst, Child Family and Community Policy, Ministry of Social Development (December 4, 2008).

211 Interview with Katie O’Donnell, Work and Income Family Violence Response Co-coordinator, Ministry of Social Development, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

212 *Id.*

213 *Id.*

D. FAILURE TO REQUIRE DATA COLLECTION

In February 2007, the CEDAW Committee reviewed New Zealand's periodic report on compliance with the provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. The Committee noted the "need to improve availability of reliable and in-depth data on domestic violence."²¹⁴ In August 2007, after New Zealand appeared before the Committee, the Committee observed "that insufficient statistical data disaggregated by sex in all areas covered by the Convention [made] it more difficult to assess accurately the situation and progress of different groups of women with regard to all areas covered by the Convention," including violence against women.²¹⁵

The current laws and regulations fail to adequately address this important topic. New Zealand acknowledged before the CEDAW Committee that data collection, particularly on the number of convictions for domestic violence incidents, "is not...comprehensive."²¹⁶ In its response to the Committee, the government stated that the "[t]he Taskforce for Action on Violence within Families [had] identified as a priority the need to ensure comprehensive family violence data"²¹⁷ without detailing the specific measures to be adopted. It comes as no surprise then that the Committee eventually called upon New Zealand

to consider using measures such as benchmarks, targets, recruitment and support programmes, incentives and quotas with regard to various articles of the Convention and to strengthen its system of data collection in all areas covered by the Convention, in order to enhance its knowledge base about the actual situation of different groups of women and to track trends over time. It also calls upon the State party to monitor, through measurable indicators, the impact of measures taken and progress achieved towards the realization of

de facto equality for women. It encourages the State party to use these data and indicators in the formulation of laws, policies and programmes for the effective implementation of the Convention.²¹⁸

The absence of available data encompasses several areas: enforcement of protection orders, the effectiveness of stopping violence programs, the number of convictions for domestic violence incidents, and so forth.

In some instances, available data is problematic and may be difficult to use for comparative purposes. Like in other places, available data in New Zealand does not necessarily comprise all women who may be victims of domestic violence. Radha Balakrishnan, principal policy and research analyst at the Families Commission, observed that since questionnaires on family violence "are framed differently [it is] harder to compare data from subsequent years," adding that police "haven't collected data well enough to recognize it is an issue."²¹⁹

Similarly, there is no mandated data collection to assess the effectiveness of men's stopping violence programs. Brian Gardner, the National Manager of the Stopping Violence Services Network, remarked that "it's often difficult to make sense of the data."²²⁰ Gardner, more generally, said that "the number of deaths related to domestic violence has been rising [yet] it's difficult to get information."²²¹ Parekotuku Moore, the National Director of Māori Development, echoed Gardner's remarks: "we are not funded well enough to have a really robust system of data to know who is coming through our programs."²²² As we explain in the following section, the lack of attention given to these programs is particularly problematic.

Scholars argue that New Zealand should be able to produce, collect and disseminate data without too much effort: "New Zealand is a little country—it shouldn't be hard to evaluate and to have statistics,"

214 CEDAW Committee, *List of issues and questions with regard to the consideration of periodic reports: New Zealand*, Feb. 27, 2007, CEDAW/C/NZL/Q/6, para. 10.

215 CEDAW Committee, *Concluding comments of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women: New Zealand*, Aug 10, 2007, CEDAW/C/NZL/CO/6, para 20.

216 CEDAW Committee, *Responses to the list of issues and questions with regard to the consideration of the sixth periodic report: New Zealand*, Apr 27, 2007, CEDAW/C/NZL/Q/6/Add.1, at 11.

217 *Id.*

218 CEDAW Committee, *Concluding comments of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women: New Zealand*, Aug 10, 2007, CEDAW/C/NZL/CO/6, para 21.

219 Interview with Radha Balakrishnan, principal policy and research analyst at the Families Commission, Wellington (May 21, 2008).

220 Interview with Brian Gardner, National Manager, National Network of Stopping Violence Services, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

221 *Id.*

222 Interview with Parekotuku Moore, National Director of Māori Development, National Network of Stopping Violence, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

The Leitner Center delegation had the opportunity to question government officials about New Zealand's failure to collect data in light of the international bodies' recommendations, such as the CEDAW Committee's reports. One government official acknowledged that this is a problem that was not limited to domestic violence: "New Zealand does not have enough data on anything."

observed Ruth Herbert, a private consultant who wrote a thesis on domestic violence in New Zealand.²²³ According to Herbert, "the government has not been willing to pay NGOs to collect data."²²⁴ Judge David Mather made a similar point when asked whether the government had any interest on compiling statistics. His response left no room for doubt: "No."²²⁵ Moreover, Judge Mather commented that the Ministry of Justice's statistics "are not so fresh," referring us to the research conducted by scholars at Massey University. Leigh Coombes, a lecturer in psychology at Massey University and one of the researchers who conducted the study on the Waitakere Court, confirmed the government's lack of interest in serious data collection. She observed that "judges at Waitakere wanted the Court evaluated, but the Ministry of Justice was not on board, so the judges asked Massey University."²²⁶

Scholars believe that the government could do better fighting domestic violence if strategies were based on research and evidence:

unless initiatives and strategies are based on evidence, or can be critiqued by researchers and strategists to add some 'pseudo' analysis, then the prioritisation and decision making around which initiatives and strategies to

adopt for implementation ends up being based on an arbitrary decision making process rather than good science. And the arbitrary decision making process can fall victim to power and control dynamics as people jostle to get their issues on the list.²²⁷

The New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse's Chief Researcher confirmed Herbert's remarks. He acknowledged that the Clearinghouse's goal is "to break down the silos,"²²⁸ adding that there is a lack of evaluation of best practices, culturally appropriate approaches to domestic violence, information on elder abuse, and that research on evaluation accounts for less than 10% of the research.²²⁹ However, it is unclear whether the government's ultimate goal for creating the Clearinghouse was to share info with the NGO community or to provide information to policy-makers.²³⁰

The Leitner Center delegation had the opportunity to question government officials about New Zealand's failure to collect data in light of the international bodies' recommendations, such as the CEDAW Committee's reports. One government official acknowledged that this is a problem that was not limited to domestic violence: "New Zealand does not

223 Interview with Ruth Herbert, researcher, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

224 *Id.*

225 Interview with Judge David Mather, Waitakere Family Violence Court, Auckland (May 14, 2008).

226 Interview with Leigh Coombes, lecturer, School of Psychology, Massey University, Auckland (May 14, 2008). See Mandy Morgan, Leigh Coombes and Sarah McGray, *An Evaluation of the Waitakere Family Violence Court Protocols* (May 2007), available at http://psychology.massey.ac.nz/pdf/Family-Court-Protocols_Apr2007.pdf.

227 Personal (email) communication with Ruth Herbert, October 2, 2008. In her thesis, Herbert writes about the Family Violence Taskforce: "it is generally the case that the higher the level of official sitting at the governance table (in this instance CEO level) the lower the level of community involvement. Whilst there are non-government agencies represented on the Taskforce, indications are that the voice of the community is often not being heard. The potential for an imbalance of power when community agencies are in a forum with their funders has been noted. Interviewees reported

have enough data on anything.”²³¹ When asked about the lack of data on stopping violence programs’ effectiveness, this official concluded: “It’s actually very hard to do effectiveness research.”²³²

In this context, the importance of the CEDAW Committee’s final recommendation to New Zealand is clear. The CEDAW Committee called upon New Zealand “to ensure that adequate data is collected on all forms of violence against women and [urges] the State party to conduct research on the prevalence, causes and consequences of violence against all groups of women to serve as the basis for comprehensive and targeted intervention.”²³³

Conclusions and Recommendations

ACCESS TO PROGRAMS

Conclusion:

Under the DVA 1995 and its implementing regulations, the government provides funding to specialized agencies that provide stopping violence services. Funding goes only to court-mandated programs, however. There is little or no funding for men who voluntarily seek help through these programs, notwithstanding that these men may be more likely to change violent behavior.

Recommendation:

To better comply with its duty to prevent violence from occurring, New Zealand should actively support men’s self-referrals to stopping violence programs—particularly as the number of self-referrals has increased in response to the government’s public awareness campaign.

Conclusion:

On many occasions, men who begin stopping violence programs drop out without completing the program. When courts mandate men to attend such programs, and men fail to attend, there are legal avenues available. However, men who self-refer do

not have a legal obligation to remain in the program.

Recommendation:

The government should consider implementing incentives for men to complete the whole program so as to ensure that all efforts to prevent violence from occurring are made.

Conclusion:

Women who want to attend protected-persons programs may have to pay to attend such programs if they have not applied for a protection order or if they were granted a protection order more than 3 years ago. As a result, a woman’s ability to attend a protected-persons program may depend upon her seeking a protection order or her ability to pay.

Recommendation:

In order to better comply with its duty to prevent incidents of domestic violence and address the structural causes of such violence, New Zealand should actively support the participation of women in protected-persons programs, by establishing incentives and facilitating women’s access to these programs.

LEGAL AID

Conclusion:

Under international law, New Zealand has an obligation to provide safe and prompt access to justice for victims and survivors of domestic violence, including free legal aid where necessary. The process of obtaining a protection order is complex and, in reality, requires the assistance of an attorney. For women who cannot afford a private attorney but who also do not qualify for legal aid, it may be financially unsustainable to obtain an order of protection.

Recommendation:

To better comply with its international legal obligations, the government should consider providing legal aid for all women applying for protection orders.

different sectors not respecting each other’s perspective and that can lead to power and control issues. See Ruth Herbert, *Learning Our Way Forward. Implementation of New Zealand’s Family Violence Strategies*, Dissertation for Master of Public Policy, March 2008, at 64 (on file with authors).

228 Interview with Nick Fahey, former New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse project manager (May 12, 2008).

229 *Id.*

230 *Id.*

231 Interview with Ministry of Women’s Affairs, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

232 *Id.*

233 CEDAW Committee, *Concluding comments of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women: New Zealand*, Aug 10, 2007, CEDAW/C/NZL/CO/6, para 25.

Conclusion:

In many cases, the lawyers who provide legal aid are junior lawyers who take such cases to gain experience. As a result, the attorneys who handle these cases may lack the experience necessary to handle the complex issues that arise in domestic violence cases. Further, in some areas, the lack of incentives for lawyers to take legal aid cases has resulted in a complete absence of legal aid lawyers.

Recommendation:

The government should implement incentives to attract senior lawyers to provide legal aid for victims and survivors of domestic violence in order to ensure adequate legal representation for the victims and survivors of domestic violence. Additionally, in order to comply with its obligation to provide safe and prompt access to justice for victims and survivors of domestic violence, including free legal aid where necessary, New Zealand must ensure access to legal aid attorneys for survivors of domestic violence where such attorneys are needed.

TRAINING**Conclusion:**

Police play an essential role in addressing domestic violence. They are the first to respond when a domestic violence incident occurs and they also prosecute many of the less-serious offenses in court. Yet there is no uniform, nationally-coordinated policy on police training related to issues of domestic violence. This affects the government's effort to prevent and eliminate violence against women.

Recommendation:

In order to comply with its obligation to prevent domestic violence and to impartially and seriously investigate acts of domestic violence, New Zealand should implement a uniform program of training for all police on responding to situations of domestic violence.

Conclusion:

Both judges and lawyers play an essential role in

protecting women who are victims of domestic violence. Judges decide applications for protection orders, oversee men's attendance to stopping violence programs, and decide on convictions against perpetrators, among other things. Lawyers assist women when applying for protection orders and need to know which criteria must be included in the affidavit. Under the current regulations, however, there is no mandatory training on domestic violence for judges or lawyers.

Recommendation:

Given the significant role they each play in addressing violence against women, the government should establish mechanisms for mandatory training on domestic violence for both judges and lawyers.

Conclusion:

Benefits officers from Work and Income New Zealand (WINZ), the government agency that provides financial assistance and employment services throughout the country, receive a large number of domestic violence disclosures annually.

Recommendation:

Given the prevalence of domestic violence in New Zealand, frontline WINZ staff should receive refresher training on domestic violence issues and should conduct mandatory screening of all clients.

DATA COLLECTION**Conclusion:**

Domestic observers and international bodies, such as the CEDAW Committee, have observed that there is insufficient data collected on domestic violence in New Zealand. The lack of complete and reliable data affects the implementation and evaluation of effective domestic violence policies because such policies are not based on comprehensive research. For instance, there is no data available to assess the effectiveness of men's stopping violence programs.

Recommendation:

The government should produce, collect and

disseminate data on domestic violence (including, for example, research on the prevalence, causes and consequences of violence against all groups of women, enforcement of protection orders, effectiveness of stopping violence programs, the number of convictions for domestic violence incidents, evaluation of best practices and culturally appropriate approaches to domestic violence) in full coordination with all relevant governmental and non-governmental agencies.

3. Problems with implementation

A. STOPPING VIOLENCE PROGRAMS

The government fails to adequately monitor the effectiveness of stopping violence programs. Stopping violence programs are a critical component of any comprehensive strategy to eliminate violence against women. They help men (and women) to deal with domestic violence and its implications, and despite being triggered by domestic violence incidents, stopping violence services are intended to help prevent more violence. Therefore, the government should evaluate these programs to see how they are working *in practice*, and determine what is needed to improve them.

It is assumed that because men complete a stopping violence program they are ready to live free of violence. As one stopping violence program acknowledged, men “graduate” from these programs because they complete the number of required sessions but there is no actual assessment as to whether, and how, the program has helped the person deal with violence.²³⁴ For Brian Gardner, the National Manager of the Stopping Violence Services Network, “the government should be asking the men and women who use the services and are impacted by them [about the programs’ effectiveness], but they’re not.”²³⁵ Andrew Treacher, a Men’s Program Coordinator in Wellington, agreed: even though he requires men to complete a behavior checklist at the beginning and the end of the program, he complains about the lack of funding “to measure success or conduct research and [thus] design new programs.”²³⁶

Public servants confirm these remarks. A domestic violence advisor explained that they evaluate the effectiveness of programs “basically by respondent’s attendance of a program.”²³⁷ Similarly, the Family Violence Court Coordinator in Invercargill added, “a lot of work needs to be done evaluating the effect of those programs.”²³⁸ Even the Principal Family Court Judge, Peter Boshier, raised concerns about the lack of evaluation:

There is inadequate research on the efficacy of programs for violators of domestic violence laws. Victim programs are more successful than perpetrator programs. The perpetrator programs are a start, but studies need to be done to see their effect on individuals. If perpetrators don’t go to the meetings, they are not held accountable, and the Ministry of Justice is not good at prosecuting breaches. Men do not attend programs at a rate of about 30%, but the prosecutors put such breaches at the bottom of their priority list. Men who do not attend court-mandated programs need to be prosecuted so people know the courts mean business.²³⁹

During the Leitner Center’s visit to the country, it became clear that stopping violence programs play a crucial role in the strategy to prevent and eliminate violence against women. Yet it was also clear that there is much to be done to improve these programs’ effectiveness. Hence, the government should allocate sufficient resources to evaluate these stopping violence programs and also to allow for follow-up with the participants.

B. PROBLEMS WITH PROTECTION ORDERS

At the core of the DVA 1995 lie protection orders. Protection orders aim to ensure the safety of victims of violence by preventing violence from occurring in the future. Therefore, when protection orders are not granted or served on respondents in a prompt manner, there is a failure to protect victims of domestic violence as intended. Similarly, when respondents who fail to observe protection orders are not sanctioned, not only are women put in danger; the whole

234 Interview with Stopping Violence Program.

235 Interview with Brian Gardner, National Manager, National Network of Stopping Violence Services, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

236 Interview with Andrew Teacher, Men’s Program Coordinator, National Network of Stopping Violence, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

237 Interview with Domestic Violence Worker.

238 Interview with Robert Loo, Family Court Coordinator & Chairman, Family Violence Focus Group, Invercargill (May 14, 2008).

239 Interview with Judge Peter Boshier, Principal Family Court Judge, Wellington (May 20, 2008).

system that has been put in place to prevent and eliminate domestic violence is undermined. We observed different problems with protection orders, including failure to serve protection orders, lack of enforcement of protection orders, and little knowledge on how to obtain protection orders.

Failure to serve protection orders

Failure to serve protection orders stands out as one of the most common problems recounted to the Leitner Center delegation. One person we met with commented that “there are police stations that actually refuse to serve protection orders. There are serious attitudinal issues that must be changed on a government level and through police training. There is a common misperception that it is easy to get a protection order with no evidence and deprive men of their children.”²⁴⁰ Likewise, police should always serve protection orders as rapidly as possible. As told by Judge Peter Boshier, “one woman was granted a protection order on a Friday, there were problems serving the protection order, and she was fatally stabbed on Monday.”²⁴¹ As observed by a men’s programs worker, “late service can re-spark violence.”²⁴² In many instances, the man has already cooled down, the incident of violence has past, and so the late service takes them back to the emotional state linked to the violence event, thus increasing the risk to the woman. Quick service helps concentrate the situation into a shorter period of time and allows parties to move forward quicker.²⁴³

Failure to serve is particularly acute in rural and isolated zones. One interviewee remarked that “serving protection orders in the North can be tough because perpetrators can hide out for months.”²⁴⁴

Lack of Enforcement of Protection Orders

Once a protection order is granted, women should feel safer. In theory, protection orders should keep a perpetrator away from the applicant. And,

should there be a breach, police are supposed to respond promptly. In many cases, survivors of domestic violence told us that police had responded quickly and decisively. As a result, women did feel safer. There are occasions, however, when the opposite is true. If protection orders are not correctly enforced, they may in fact endanger the person who initially sought help from the legal system by increasing the hostility without providing additional protection. Some domestic violence workers remarked that “women are scared to use protection orders, because enforcement is not good, thus putting them in more danger.”²⁴⁵ In December 2006, for instance, Reipae, a 19-year old woman, was stabbed by her ex-partner after police bailed the perpetrator to her address at 4 a.m.²⁴⁶ He had been held by the police for fighting in the street. The police bailed him to Reipae’s address, notwithstanding the fact that she had a protection order against him which included a provision that said he was not allowed on her property.²⁴⁷ Reipae phoned the police during her ex-partner’s fatal attack on her with a knife. She was dead before they arrived, only three hours after her ex-partner had been released from custody. “The perpetrator killed her, had a drink of water, and went and hanged himself.”²⁴⁸ A domestic violence worker commented: “bailing to the address of a victim is very common.”²⁴⁹

Breaches of protection orders amount to a large number of the stories collected in the 2007 study *Living at the Cutting Edge*, commissioned by the Ministry of Justice.²⁵⁰ The Leitner Center delegation encountered several women whose stories mirror the ones contained in the aforementioned report. One paradigmatic case in the report is Marama’s: after several episodes of both psychological and physical abuse, she had a protection order against her partner, Patrick. Despite the protection order, on many occasions Marama’s partner would break in at her house leaving calling cards, putting mucus on the window screen of her car, or flattening the bike’s tires

240 Interview with Domestic Violence Advisor.

241 Interview with Judge Peter Boshier, Principal Family Court Judge, Wellington (May 20, 2008).

242 Interview with Stopping Violence Program.

243 *Id.*

244 Interview with Domestic Violence Advisor.

245 Interview with Holly Carrington, Services Manager, Preventing Violence in the Home, Auckland (May 12, 2008).

246 A member of Reipae Joanne Dobson’s family narrated her tragic death to us. Reipae’s story is also one of the 212 cases of women and children who, as August 2007, had died in domestic violence homicides since the enactment of the Domestic Violence Act 1995 to whose memory a report on protection orders is dedicated. See Neville Robertson, Ruth Busch, Radha D’Souza, Fiona Lam Sheung, Reynu Anand, Roma Balzer, Ariana Simpson and Dulcie Pina, *Living at the Cutting Edge. Women’s Experiences of Protection Orders*, Vol. 1 & 2, August 2007, available at <http://research.waikato.ac.nz/CuttingEdge/> at i ff.

247 Interview with family member of Reipae Joanne Dobson.

248 Interview with family member of Reipai Joanne Dobson.

If protection orders are not correctly enforced, they may in fact endanger the person who initially sought help from the legal system by increasing the hostility without providing additional protection. Some domestic violence workers remarked that “women are scared to use protection orders, because enforcement is not good, thus putting them in more danger.”

to let her know that he still had access to her and her daughters. On one occasion, Marama called the police but, as she explains, they “didn’t seem bothered.”²⁵¹ “On another occasion, Patrick actually called out to Marama. She called the police, and they told her that it could be anyone.”²⁵² After another incident, she called the police and they “suggested that Marama should hide out in her garden and take photos of Patrick [damaging her property]. When she raised the issue of her safety, they told her to “fit out a security light.”²⁵³ The report is filled with stories of breaches of protection orders. Similarly, a public health scholar argues that the government agencies’ failure to enforce protection orders ultimately led the government to adopt a whole new policy on enforcement: *Te Rito Action 3* “to establish and implement processes for ensuring that the legal sanctions under the Domestic Violence Act 1995 are effectively monitored and enforced.”²⁵⁴ Yet, this policy “appears never to have been actioned.”²⁵⁵

Lack of enforcement of protection orders touches on police and judge training. As Chief Judge Peter Boshier remarked: “enforcement of protection orders

is a grey area. Many cops are young, 20-22 years old, and show up to a scene where the people involved are all older than them, and there may be alcohol involved and a lot of moving people. The cops may not know who to believe, and in the exercise of their discretion, may not be conservative enough.”²⁵⁶

Judges also play a role in making sure protection orders are enforced. Shelley Gray, an attorney in Invercargill with vast experience on family law and protection order applications, observed that judges are generally not strict with individuals who breach protection orders. “People who breach protection orders are not given high sentences,” she remarked.²⁵⁷ This can cause a man to resent a woman, potentially leading to more violence. In addition, as explained in the previous section, whenever a respondent fails to attend a stopping violence program a judge may summon him before the court.²⁵⁸ This is a discretionary power that judges have and it should be utilized. Otherwise, women may be at even higher risk than when the violence began. The United Nations’ treaty bodies have also been critical of judges in this area. In 2007, the CEDAW Committee declared its

249 Interview with Domestic Violence Worker.

250 Neville Robertson, Ruth Busch, Radha D’Souza, Fiona Lam Sheung, Reynu Anand, Roma Balzer, Ariana Simpson and Dulcie Paina, *Living at the Cutting Edge. Women’s Experiences of Protection Orders*, Vol. 1 & 2, August 2007, available at <http://research.waikato.ac.nz/CuttingEdge/>.

251 *Id.*, Vol. 1, at 47.

252 *Id.*

253 *Id.*

254 See Ruth Herbert, *Learning Our Way Forward. Implementation of New Zealand’s Family Violence Strategies*, Dissertation for Master of Public Policy, Victoria University, Wellington, March 2008 (on file with authors).

255 *Id.*, at 41.

256 Interview with Judge Peter Boshier, Principal Family Court Judge, Wellington (May 20, 2008).

257 Interview with Shelley Gray, attorney, Invercargill (May 15, 2008).

258 DVA 1995, § 42.

concern “about the continued prevalence of violence against women, particularly Māori, Pacific and minority women, and the low rates of prosecution and convictions for crimes of violence against women.”²⁵⁹

One reason for poor enforcement of protection orders is that Criminal Courts deal with breaches of those orders, rather than Family Violence Courts, which have granted the protection orders. A domestic violence worker explained that the breach itself may appear quite minor, especially for a criminal court judge who is used to seeing different types of criminal cases.

If the woman goes ahead and prosecutes that breach, and the judge ends up spending most of his or her day dealing with what would appear to be a far less serious matter than other things, judges might think, “This is not a big deal. It’s not serious.” You’re often dealing with criminal court judges that don’t have an understanding of family violence. The victim will go through the whole process only to have the judge tell the perpetrator that he has to go through a domestic violence program, which in fact was already mandated by the protection order in the first place. Why, then, as a victim, would you drag yourself through the whole process?²⁶⁰

Stopping violence programs’ workers can also help to enforce protection orders. It is critical that service providers, who develop relationships with men who attend these programs, be attentive to any type of non-observance. If they act promptly, grave incidents may in fact be prevented from occurring. But even if service providers act quickly, it is paramount that the courts respond. If judges fail to use their power to check whether or not a respondent is in fact attending the program, incidents may happen. A stopping violence program’s worker narrated an incident “in 2006, [where] two women were murdered...I had done the paperwork on these men for not showing up [to stopping violence programs] and nothing was done.”²⁶¹ His critique is directed to the court system.

Lack of education about protection orders’ availability and application process

Despite the increasing public awareness of domestic violence in New Zealand, many people feel that the application process to obtain a protection order is still very complicated and largely unknown to the public. A domestic violence advisor, for instance, said that “with the knowledge that I have it is still difficult [to prepare an application for a protection order].”²⁶² This advisor further remarked that there is “a huge gap in people’s awareness [of availability of protection orders].”²⁶³ It is important that victims of violence have easy access to protection orders since protection orders trigger a number of services and legal protections, most prominently, stopping violence services.

As Robert Loo, Family Court Coordinator in Invercargill and Chairman of the Family Violence Focus Group, pointed out: “the biggest issue is accessing services if you don’t have a protection order; the government only funds for those who have protection orders and that is a small part of the women who could use services but they have no way to access them.”²⁶⁴ This makes access and availability of protection orders significantly important for New Zealand’s domestic violence strategy.

Providing information to the community on the application process for protection orders is also critical due to the absence of legal aid services in many instances—whether it is due to geographic isolation, lack of lawyers willing to take legal aid cases, or to the fact that women may simply not qualify for legal aid.²⁶⁵

Further, education on the availability of protection orders should be directed also to government workers. As one service provider pointed out, “workers often have a small amount of experience with protection orders... The government should fund community trainings and provide funding for training social workers. Every government worker within CYFS, all NGOs, the Trust’s health board, all of these should be trained. We get whānau who know a little about protection orders but don’t know how to

259 Concluding comments of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women: New Zealand, Aug 10, 2007, CEDAW/C/NZL/CO/6, para 24 (emphasis added).

260 Interview with Domestic Violence Worker.

261 Interview with Stopping Violence Program Manager.

262 Interview with Domestic Violence Advisor.

263 *Id.*

264 Interview with Robert Loo, Family Court Coordinator & Chairman, Family Violence Focus Group, Invercargill (May 14, 2008).

265 See, *supra*, Part II.2.B.

266 Interview with Service Provider.



Group meeting with Maori service providers at He Waka Tapu, in Christchurch, South Island. In many of our interviews in New Zealand, people emphasized the importance of Māori programs to address domestic violence for Māori communities because Māori will be more likely to access such programs and because the substantive aspects of such programs are more effective in reaching Māori audiences.

access the process because they are prevented by prohibitive costs [of hiring a lawyer].”²⁶⁶

C. MEETING THE STANDARDS OF THE DVA 1995

Emotional abuse

Section 3 of the DVA 1995 includes psychological abuse within the definition of domestic violence.²⁶⁷ However, in practice, it is difficult to obtain legal protection whenever violence is psychological, as opposed to physical. Family lawyers see that judges are eager to grant protection orders for physical abuse, but they are reluctant when it comes to psychological violence. Shelley Gray, a senior family lawyer in Invercargill noted: “[t]he problem is judges tend to grant protection orders mostly when there’s physical violence; if there’s no physical violence, they may just not issue a protection order.”²⁶⁸ She added that “‘zero tolerance’ is just words.” Similarly, Anthony Mahon, a solicitor in Auckland, commented: “emotional claims are much harder... to describe.”²⁶⁹

A service provider in Wellington observed that “people don’t understand that domestic violence includes emotional and psychological violence. It is rare to have a POL-400 [police form] for incidents of emotional and psychological violence. Even CYF has said, ‘it’s only verbal,’ even if [the violence] is recurring and there are children involved.”²⁷⁰ The service provider commented that the public education campaign—“It’s not OK”—did not raise awareness enough about emotional and psychological violence.²⁷¹ A survivor of domestic violence who currently serves as a volunteer, commented: “Initially, after the DVA was enacted, it was not [hard] to obtain protection orders for emotional abuse[, due to the push for strong implementation of the Act. However, it has now become harder; lawyers tend to put off survivors who come to them with emotional abusive cases, because their chances of getting protection orders are slim.”²⁷²

Judge Boshier held a different perspective. According to him, “most lawyers don’t volunteer this information [for example, copies of text messages

267 Section § 3(2) DVA 1995: “In this section, violence means—(c) Psychological abuse, including, but not limited to, (i) Intimidation: (ii) Harassment: (iii) Damage to property: (iv) Threats of physical abuse, sexual abuse, or psychological abuse: (v) In relation to a child, abuse of the kind set out in subsection (3) of this section.”

268 Interview with Shelley Gray, Attorney, Invercargill (May 15, 2008).

269 Interview with Anthony Mahon, Solicitor, Mahon & Associates, Auckland (May 14, 2008).

270 Interview with service provider.

271 *Id.*

272 Interview with a survivor of domestic violence.

and emails as evidence of such abuse), and so there is an issue of evidence.”²⁷³ He believes most family court judges share the view that emotional abuse constitutes family violence.²⁷⁴

At times, police also fail to deal with situations where abuse is not physical. The Services Manager of Preventing Violence in the Home, an organization which provides training to police, remarked that “police should take into account the risk to the victim and the victim’s perception of risk. But the police are not adequately trained to assess risk. There are technical breaches of the protection orders that they don’t arrest for unless it’s a physical assault.”²⁷⁵ Another survivor of domestic violence who volunteers at a service provider, said they get worried when they have a client who has been through emotional abuse, because “we just know it won’t get through.”²⁷⁶

Immigrant women and disabled women

New Zealand’s law and regulations on domestic violence are directed to all individuals. However, two disadvantaged groups are often left in the margins of the DVA 1995 and its implementing regulations—immigrants and women with disabilities.

Immigrant women often come from cultures where there is no reporting and no law on domestic violence, where violence is “part of life for the woman.”²⁷⁷ For many migrant women, residency status is used by abusive partners as a tool of power and control. According to Shila Nair of Shakti Asian Women’s Centre: “Often in these cases, women find they can’t go home because they are no longer a part of her family in her home country, and there is a stigma of those who leave marriages. Therefore, women find it hard to find a place to stay.”²⁷⁸ Holly Carrington, from Preventing Violence in the Home, further noted: “when [migrant women] do leave the man and seek help, they report feeling alienated by the environment of the court, eventually making them return to the household.”²⁷⁹

Shakti workers commented that women find that “judges have hardly any cultural understanding; and even though they want to implement New

Zealand law, they need to understand cultural backgrounds.”²⁸⁰ Shila Nair highlighted, though, one major case in 2007 where Judge David Mather, from the Waitakere Family Violence Court, recognized dowry as psychological abuse. “It was a major milestone for this kind of cultural understanding.”²⁸¹

There is disagreement on whether police with the same cultural background should be called to the scene of a domestic violence incident. In Christchurch, for instance, workers at Shakti have a good relationship with a Chinese woman police officer, “who is able to serve as translator for Chinese women who report domestic violence.”²⁸² In Auckland, however, Shakti workers think differently:

there are instances where police will send a policeman with the same ethnic background as the victim thinking they are being culturally appropriate, and it is actually bad for the victim because the police from the same culture will think the abuse is okay and not recognize the act as domestic violence.²⁸³

Generally, migrant women tend to report domestic violence less than Māori and Pakeha women. As a consequence, the government’s notable public campaigns efforts should be especially sensitive to migrant women. However, this is not the case. According to Shila Nair, “It’s not OK!’ is not working for immigrants—the general sentiment is that it is propaganda that is not meant for us, it is for Whites and Māori.”²⁸⁴ Indeed, when the Leitner Center delegation met with staff from the Campaign for Action on family Violence, we raised the question about the absence of immigrant faces on the TV ads. Staff members were aware about “increasing the stigma attached to already stigmatized groups.”²⁸⁵ Yet they noted that there were no immigrant faces on the ads due to time constraints: “We only have 40 seconds to send the message out.”²⁸⁶ Since migrant women are particularly invisible to domestic violence strategies—due to language and cultural barriers—using part of those 40 seconds to portray ethnic migrant communities should be a priority.

273 Interview with Judge Peter Boshier, Principal Family Court Judge, Wellington (May 20, 2008).

274 See *id.*

275 Interview with Holly Carrington, Services Manager, Preventing Violence in the Home, Auckland (May 12, 2008).

276 Interview with a survivor of domestic violence.

277 Interview with Shila Nair, National Coordinator, Shakti Asian Women’s Centre, Auckland (May 16, 2008).

278 *Id.*

279 Interview with Holly Carrington, Services Manager, Preventing Violence in the Home, Auckland (May 12, 2008).

280 Interview with Shila Nair, National Coordinator, Shakti Asian Women’s Centre, Auckland (May 16, 2008).

281 *Id.*

282 Interview with Leila Chacko, Director, Shakti Ethnic Women’s Support Group, Christchurch (May 12, 2008).

Women with disabilities also face greater challenges when they are victims of domestic violence. According to Lorri Mackness, Disability Project Coordinator of the National Network of Stopping Violence Services, disabled women are 2 to 22 times more likely (depending on the study) to be abused.²⁸⁷

During the DVA 1995 review process that the Ministry of Justice conducted at the beginning of 2008, the Disability Coalition Against Violence filed a submission in which it stated that “just as Pakeha cannot know or tell Māori what they need, non-disabled cannot know or tell disabled what they need.”²⁸⁸ The Coalition raised as problematic the “lack of access to refuges and safe places for many people with disabilities” and “the lack of trained pool of domestic violence carers on call to support disabled victims, who cannot get into refuge and cannot be left on their own when the police remove the abuser.”²⁸⁹ Like migrant women, women with disabilities often refrain from reporting abuse and violence. Laurie McNess commented: “There was one instance where one of my clients came forward with sexual abuse claims, and a week later six of her friends did as well. Over the next two months, 70 more people had stories of sexual abuse by workers in the facility, but they had to walk away because there wasn’t enough staff to deal with it—it would create chaos in the management.”²⁹⁰

Conclusions and Recommendations

STOPPING VIOLENCE PROGRAMS

Conclusion:

Stopping violence programs play a crucial role in New Zealand’s strategy to prevent and eliminate domestic violence yet the government currently does not have a uniform approach to evaluate the efficacy of such programs.

Recommendation:

To better comply with its international obligation

to act with due diligence to prevent acts of domestic violence, the government should allocate resources to evaluate stopping violence programs with a view to improve the efficacy of these programs.

PROTECTION ORDERS

Conclusion:

Protection orders lie at the core of the current legislation on domestic violence (the DVA 1995 and its Regulations). Therefore, it is crucial that protection orders be served promptly. In some instances, police refuse to serve protection orders; on other occasions, they fail to do so, thus putting women in more risk.

Recommendation:

In order to comply with its obligations to act with due diligence to prevent acts of violence, the government should ensure that police promptly serve protection orders in all cases and by all possible means.

Conclusion:

Once a protection order is granted it remains in place unless a judge dismisses it. Police officers and judges should therefore consider breaches of protection orders serious in all cases. In some instances, however, members of the police or judiciary have deemed breaches of protection orders to be minor or of little importance.

Recommendation:

The government should make efforts to make sure that protection orders are fully enforced and that all breaches are addressed promptly and decisively.

Conclusion:

Criminal courts oversee breaches of protection orders. On occasions, this causes a lack of coordination with Family Violence Courts, which grant protection orders. Further, Criminal Court judges, who are used to dealing with serious crimes, may underestimate incidents that constitute breaches of protection orders.

283 Interview with Shila Nair, National Coordinator, Shakti Asian Women’s Centre, Auckland (May 16, 2008).

284 *Id.*

285 Interview with Family and Community Services, Ministry of Social Development, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

286 *Id.*

287 Interview with Laurie McNess, Disability Project Coordinator, National Network of Stopping Violence Services, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

288 See NNSVS Disability Coalition Against Violence, *Submission to the Ministry of Justice on the Review of the Domestic Violence Act 1995 And Related Legislation*, February 2008, at 5 (on file with authors).

289 *Id.* at 6.

290 Interview with Laurie McNess, Disability Project Coordinator, National Network of Stopping Violence Services, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

The government should carry out adequate training on emotional abuse for police, judges, lawyers and government workers to ensure that emotional abuse is treated as seriously as physical abuse when it comes to granting and enforcing orders of protection.

Recommendation:

The government should consider giving jurisdiction to Family Violence Courts to address breaches of protection orders.

Conclusion:

Victims of domestic violence must have easy access to protection orders. In many cases, victims do not know enough about available services and the process to obtain protection orders.

Recommendation:

Because protection orders trigger a number of services for both victims and perpetrators, the government should make efforts to make information on protection orders easily available, particularly in isolated and rural zones.

EMOTIONAL ABUSE

Conclusion:

Under Section 3 of the DVA 1995, emotional abuse is treated as seriously as physical abuse. In practice, however, there is little enforcement of these provisions. Because emotional abuse is hard to prove, judges may be less eager to grant protection orders on grounds of emotional abuse alone. Police may also be unwilling to arrest for breach of a protection order that does not involve physical assault. As a result, many incidents of actual violence are not properly addressed, thus undermining the government's effort to eliminate violence against women.

Recommendation:

The government should carry out adequate training on emotional abuse for police, judges, lawyers and government workers to ensure that

emotional abuse is treated as seriously as physical abuse when it comes to granting and enforcing orders of protection.

IMMIGRANT WOMEN

Conclusion:

Under the current legislation and regulations, migrant persons are subject to the law's protection. In practice, however, migrant women report domestic violence less and remain invisible to many of the protections due to cultural and language barriers.

Recommendation:

In order to better protect migrant women from acts of domestic violence and to investigate and punish such acts against migrant women, the government should conduct training for judges and police on how to deal with domestic violence within immigrant communities.

DISABLED WOMEN

Conclusion:

Women with disabilities face particular challenges when they are victims of domestic violence. They are more likely to face abuse and less likely to report abuse or violence due to lack of access to refuges and safe places because of their disabilities and an inability to care for themselves when left alone if the police remove the abuser.

Recommendation:

The government should consider making refuges more accessible for women with disabilities and providing trained persons to support disabled victims in their home where necessary.

III: Domestic Violence in Māori Communities

The rates of family violence in Māori communities in New Zealand are even higher than the rates for the general population discussed above. According to the Ministry of Social Development's 2008 Social Report, Māori women are three times more at risk of being assaulted or threatened by a partner than the average (18 percent compared with 6 percent for all respondents).²⁹¹ The problems discussed above with respect to the current domestic violence legislation and regulations and their

implementation also pertain to the Māori communities and impede progress on eliminating family violence in these communities. Indeed, some of the cases discussed above to illustrate these identified problems involve Māori communities.²⁹² In addition to these general problems, there are issues specific to the Māori communities that lead to increased rates of violence and that require culturally appropriate responses and Māori-specific programs to address domestic violence.

This part first briefly considers the composition of the population of New Zealand and identifies disparities between different segments of the population. It then considers some of the reasons offered to explain these disparities. This section provides some context for the discussion regarding domestic violence in Māori communities that follows. Without such context, "[t]here is a risk of reductionism, which reduces family violence to an intimate relationship removed from any social context."²⁹³ This section then highlights some of the difficulties facing Māori communities in addressing domestic violence.

1. Socioeconomic indicators and disparities in New Zealand

Although estimates vary somewhat, approximately four and one quarter million people live in New Zealand.²⁹⁴ People of European descent or Pakeha comprise the largest ethnic group, at nearly three million people (approximately 78%).²⁹⁵ The second largest ethnic group is the Māori, who make up about 15% of the population, or approximately .57 million people.²⁹⁶ Asians comprise about 9% of the population, and Pacific peoples are about 7% of the population.²⁹⁷ New Zealanders have a fairly high life expectancy and, to the extent that life expectancy is a proxy for overall health, they are a fairly healthy people. But health is not evenly distributed. Overall life expectancy at birth for the three year period ending in 2006 was 81.9 years for females and 77.9 years for males.²⁹⁸ Life expectancy for Māori women, however, was 73.2 years and for Māori men 69.0 years.²⁹⁹

There are similar disparities in earnings, unem-

291 Ministry of Soc. Dev., The Social Report 2008, 105 (2008) available at <http://www.socialreport.msd.govt.nz/documents/sr08-safety.pdf> [hereinafter Social Report 2008]

292 See, e.g., *supra* notes 246-48 and accompanying text.

293 See Interview with Di Grennell, Executive Director of Amokura Family Violence Prevention Strategy ("Amokura") (May 12, 2008).

294 See, e.g., Ministry of Soc. Dev., The Social Report 2007 11 (2007) available at <http://www.socialreport.msd.govt.nz/2007/index.html> [hereinafter Social Report 2007] (indicating that the resident population was estimated to be 4.17 million at the end of December 2006); Statistics N.Z., New Zealand in Profile: 2008 (2008) available at <http://www.stats.govt.nz/NR/rdonlyres/D94E8A52-F75F-4EC7-BB5D-D9871D9AE198/0/5789NZIn-ProfileWEB.pdf> [hereinafter N.Z. in Profile] (indicating a population of 4.23 million as of 2007); U.S. Dep't of State: New Zealand: Country Reports on Human Rights Practices - 2007 (2008), <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2007/100532.htm> (last visited May 5, 2008) (giving a figure of 4.24 million).

295 See Social Report 2007, at 15 (Using data from the 2006 Census, 2,997,071 or 77.6% of people who stated an ethnicity, with people able to specify up to three ethnic groups).

296 See Social report 2007 (Using data from the 2006 Census, 565,329 people, or 14.6% of people who stated an ethnicity, with people able to specify up to three ethnic groups). Government statistics count Māoris in two ways, through ethnicity and descent. Māori ethnicity refers to cultural affiliation, while Māori descent is about ancestry. Thus, while in 2006, 565,329 people identified with the Māori ethnic group (cultural affiliation), 643,977 were of Māori descent (ancestry). See Statistics N.Z., 2006 Census: QuickStats About Māori (Revised) (2007) available at <http://www.stats.govt.nz/NR/rdonlyres/095030F8-BD62-4745-836D-0EF185619C37/0/2006censusquickstatsaboutmaorirevised.pdf> [hereinafter Māori QuickStats]. Unless otherwise indicated, figures stated or referred to in this paper that are derived from official sources that utilize the ethnicity measure.

297 See Social Report 2007, at 15 (in the 2006 Census, of those who stated at least one ethnicity 354,549 (9.2%) and 265,974 (6.9%) people, identified as Asian and/or Pacific, respectively). These figures include all of the people who stated an ethnic group, whether as their only ethnic group or as one of several ethnic groups. Where a person reported more than one ethnic group, they have been counted in each applicable group. Totals therefore add up to more than 100 percent.

298 See *id.* at 24. Both male and female life expectancy at birth have been steadily increasing since the mid-1980s. See *id.*

299 See *id.* at 24 (data based on three-year averages from 2000-2002).

ployment and education. Median hourly earnings in June 2006 were NZ\$ 17.00 per hour.³⁰⁰ Disaggregated by ethnicity, Europeans were the only group with a median income higher than the total median (NZ\$ 17.74 per hour, compared to Māori (NZ\$ 15.15 per hour), Pacific peoples (NZ\$ 14.50 per hour), and Others (NZ\$ 15.56 per hour)).³⁰¹ Unemployment, relatively low in New Zealand, has “declined steadily since 1998.”³⁰² However, the rates for Māori (7.9%), Pacific people (6.4%), and Others (including many recent migrants) (6.2%) were much higher in 2006 than the overall rate (3.8%) and European rate (2.7%).³⁰³ With respect to educational attainment, in the year ended December 2006, 77% of the population aged 25-64 had attained an educational qualification at upper secondary or above, and almost 20% of people had a bachelor’s degree or higher.³⁰⁴ The rates of people with at least upper secondary level qualifications is lower for Māori (60.7%) and Pacific peoples (53.5%) than Europeans (80.1%), however.³⁰⁵ Similarly, the rates of people with tertiary qualifications were 18.9% for Europeans, 6.5% for the Māori, and 7.1% for Pacific peoples.³⁰⁶

Compared to some countries New Zealand has a relatively low homicide rate.³⁰⁷ All of its citizens are not equally safe from crime, nor equally involved in the penal system, however. In 2004, the number of people who “died as a result of assault or intentional injury” was 1.2 per 100,000 people, with males more likely to die from assault or intentional injury than females (1.7 and .7 per 100,000, respectively).³⁰⁸ Disaggregated into a binary Māori/Non-Māori variable, the Māori rate (2.9 per 100,000) is more than double the overall rate, and more than triple the non-Māori rate (.8 per 100,000).³⁰⁹ The rate for Māori males (4.7 per 100,000) is nearly triple the overall rate for

males, while the rate for females (1.2 per 100,000) is almost double the overall rate.³¹⁰ Māori and Pacific peoples are also more likely to be the victims of a crime than Asians or Europeans. According to the New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey 2006, “39 percent of New Zealand adults aged 15 years and over experienced some form of criminal victimization in 2005.”³¹¹ For Māori and Pacific peoples, however: “47 percent of [Māori and Pacific] adults had experienced some form of criminal victimization in 2005.”³¹²

Perhaps most relevant for the current report, “[f]or Māori women, the risk of being assaulted or threatened by a partner is three times the average (18 percent compared with 6 percent for all respondents).”³¹³ As noted by one Māori leader, “family violence is the most significant issue confronting our people.”³¹⁴ “I told the Minister of Social Development that family violence was the most significant issue facing the community and if we did not find a way to stop it, it would destroy our communities.”³¹⁵ On the opposite side of the criminal justice system, Māori and Pacific peoples have much higher incarceration rates (440 and 220 per 100,000, respectively) than the overall population (130 per 100,000), the collective Non-Māori rate (80 per 100,000), or the rate for the European ethnic group (70 per 100,000).³¹⁶

2. Explanations for the disparities

Although disparities for segments of the New Zealand population on a variety of indicators are fairly well established, the causes for those disparities are far less settled, and proffered solutions to the problems they present vary greatly. Suggested causes for disparities between Māori and others range from a historical legacy of colonialism and discrimination to

300 See Social Report 2007 at 48. Male employees (NZ\$ 18.13 per hour) were compensated better than women (NZ\$ 15.88 per hour). See *id.*

301 See *id.* at 49.

302 See *id.* at 44-45 (3.8% in 2006, with 3.5% for males, 4.1% for females, compared to 6.1% (total, male, and female) in 1996 and about 7% in 1998).

303 See *id.* at 45.

304 See *id.* at 40.

305 See *id.* at 41 (Others includes, e.g., Asians).

306 See *id.* Māori and Pacific students are less likely to leave secondary school with a qualification at National Certificate of Educational Achievement at Level 2 or above, less likely to participate in early childhood education, less likely to be enrolled in degree-level courses at the tertiary level, and less likely to attain a tertiary qualification. See *id.* at 34-41.

307 See Kevin Watkins, United Nations Dev. Program, Human Development Report 2007/2008 (2007) available at http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr_20072008_en_complete.pdf [hereinafter HDR 2007/2008].

308 Social Report 2007 at 100-01.

309 See *id.* at 101.

310 See *id.*

311 *Id.* at 102.

312 *Id.* at 103.

313 *Id.* at 103.

314 See Interview with Māori leader.

315 See *id.*

a range of analyses from a “culture of poverty,” “culture of violence,” to a “warrior gene.”³¹⁷ According to some Māori service providers we interviewed, Māori communities exist in a context of disempowerment, which engenders family violence. “[Colonial history] doesn’t become an excuse [but it] creates a context in which certain choices become more viable.”³¹⁸ One interviewee noted that warrior myth is the pop explanation for domestic violence in Māori communities. In the absence of other more positive, externally-generated images of Māori, it has become internalized by Māori.³¹⁹ “Not a lot of attempts [have been made] to separate out a history of warfare [from] violence between intimate partners.”³²⁰ Contrary to this image, early ethnographers criticized Māori for “not disciplining children and [for] their women being too uppity...and having a voice.”³²¹ An academic we met with also pointed to colonization as one of the factors leading to domestic violence in Māori communities:

I think a lot of it is rooted in post-colonization issues... There was colonization and between 1840-1899 Māori lost a lot of land and commercial opportunities, so there was a socioeconomic collapse and poverty. Then diseases and various wars, and the population collapsed numerically. Then we went through a period of assimilation. Then with post-World War II urbanization, another push of assimilation. Also the deliberate introduction of alcohol... So there started to be set up multiple generations of dysfunction. The term “multi-generational stress disorder” is used to describe countries where there has been colonization and indigenous peoples are now a minority in their homeland.³²²

Socio-economic factors have also been pointed to as a cause of domestic violence in Māori communities. For his part, then Minister of Justice Mark Burton (2003) acknowledged that the “root causes of Māori over-representation in the criminal justice system appear to be centred on socio-economic factors rather than ethnicity. Being Māori does not make a person an offender.... Pacific peoples’ over-representation in the criminal justice system... seems to be centred on similar socio-economic risk factors.”³²³ A Māori provider similarly noted that: “The single most persistent factor shared among domestic violence cases is socioeconomic. If you control for socioeconomic indicators then our (Māori) disproportionality disappears.”³²⁴

According to Robert Cooper, CEO of Ngati Hine Health Trust, violence in New Zealand is “horizontal, structural, and political.”³²⁵ Government legislation is causing “unbearable pressure on ordinary family relationships [when] they’re tough enough. There is insufficient income to meet fundamental needs, children’s nutrition is inadequate.”³²⁶ Many Māori youth take up drugs, gangs, and violence because they offer a logical “escape from brutal realities” of their lives. Māori have “enough natural intelligence to forecast their future. Their prospects as older people aren’t good.”³²⁷ Of course, there are “some people with individual capacity who will shine in anything that they do and have the opportunity to follow careers [but] there are others for whom that is a forlorn hope.”³²⁸ There are many more in the latter camp who are “overwhelmed, poorly educated, under-employed, underpaid, and culturally alienated. Within our families there are those among us who are not benefiting from New Zealand’s economic and social development.”³²⁹

316 See Hon. Mark Burton, Cabinet Policy Committee Paper 11 Māori and Pacific Peoples, 3 available at http://www.justice.govt.nz/effective_interventions/cabinet_papers/maori-pacific.pdf (2003 data). By 2006 the non-Māori imprisonment rate had risen to 98 per 100,000, the Māori rate to 568 per 100,000. See *id.* at 3 n.1.

317 See, e.g., Julie Cassady, *The Legacy of Colonialism*, 51 Am. J. Comp. L. 409, 409-10, 448-56 (2003) (arguing that bad conditions for indigenous peoples are largely the result of the historical legacy of colonialism and discrimination); James O. Gump, *Review [untitled]*, 100 Am. Hist. Rev. 1217, 1218 (1995) (asserting, in a review of *Once Were Warriors*, the existence of a “culture of poverty [that] has spawned a culture of violence,” without bothering to define either term or provide nontautological evidence of their existence); Warrior Gene Theory Sparks Debate and Highlights Domestic Violence in New Zealand, <http://www.news-medical.net/?id=19383> (last visited May 5, 2008) (describing one researcher’s claim that Māori disproportionately carry a “warrior gene,” making them more prone to violence and other bad behavior).

318 See Interview with Māori Service Providers.

319 See *id.*

320 See *id.*

321 See *id.*

322 See Interview with Academic.

323 Hon. Mark Burton, Cabinet Policy Committee Paper 11 Māori and Pacific Peoples, at 1 available at http://www.justice.govt.nz/effective_interventions/cabinet_papers/maori-pacific.pdf (2003).

324 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

325 See Interview Robert Cooper, CEO of Ngati Hine Health Trust, Whangarei (May 2008).

326 See *id.*

327 See *id.*

328 See *id.*

329 See *id.*

On a recent trip to New Zealand, the former Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous people “received plenty of evidence concerning the historical and institutional discrimination suffered by the Māori people.”³³⁰ According to the former Special Rapporteur, “[h]istorically, much legislation [has] had a negative impact on Māori rights.”³³¹ The historical discrimination seems largely to have been related to land rights and culture.

With respect to land, the former Special Rapporteur notes that “approximately... 94 per cent of Māori ancestral land base has been appropriated by a variety of historical processes, including... fraudulent purchase, confiscation or alienations of land under the various Native Land Acts, and the individualization and fragmentation of title resulting from the Native Land Court.”³³² One specific example of this is that in the 1860s the Crown used military action to confiscate over 2 million acres from the people of Taranaki (over 96% of their original lands) while persecuting those who resisted, and then sold or leased the land to non-Māori into the twentieth century.³³³ In contemporary times, Treaty settlements intended to redress this historical discrimination have “involve[d] quantities of reparation that represent merely a fraction of the value of the land and resources lost by Māori during the colonial period,”³³⁴ arguably compounding prior discrimination and constituting a continuing form of discrimination against the Māori. It is perceived as such by some Māori legal authorities, particularly because “claimants [are forced] to waive their entitlement to the protection of the courts when they negotiate settlements... until the claimants have waived their rights, the negotiations will not be finalized,” and the result is therefore perceived as “a largely imposed settlement package, which claimants cannot bring before an independent or judicial body for rigorous qualitative

testing.”³³⁵ And of course, the biggest recent land rights issue has been the Foreshore and Seabed controversy.³³⁶

With respect to cultural discrimination, the former Special Rapporteur points out that, historically, cultural and educational policy was based on a model of Māori assimilation,³³⁷ which undermined Māori cultural identity and governance structures.³³⁸ Use of the Māori language in schools was actively discouraged,³³⁹ for example. These policies did not recognize the “inherent rights” of the Māori, nor their “traditional governance bodies.”³⁴⁰ According to one Māori provider we met with, “institutionalized racism is still present, though it’s not like it was 20 years ago. Now Māori are driven to be ‘Māori for Māori.’ Twenty years ago, an organization like [this one] wouldn’t have existed because separatist strategies were scorned. Views are more accepting now to let Māori choose for themselves. Before, there was also no trust of Māori with funds for programs and there were doubts about Māori’s skills to administer programs... sense that you can be too brown.”³⁴¹

A final area highlighted by the former Special Rapporteur has to do with depiction of Māori in the media, where stereotypical and negative images seem to dominate.³⁴² A 2004 study showed that Māori are portrayed as possessing benefits denied to others, and as being corrupt or financially incompetent managers.³⁴³ The former Special Rapporteur considered the study’s findings to be of “special concern,” and that they “highlight a systematic negative description of Māori in media coverage” warranting attention via the New Zealand Human Rights Act.³⁴⁴ We heard similar critiques from people we met with in New Zealand. As stated by one Māori provider: “If you ask any New Zealander to name three children who have been killed they’ll name three Māori. But Māori children are not the only ones [who have been the victims of family violence murders].”³⁴⁵ An

330 Rodolfo Stavenhagen, United Nations Commission on Human Rights, Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Indigenous People: Addendum, Mission to New Zealand para. 14, at 54 (2006) available at <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=E/CN.4/2006/78/Add.3>. (Hereinafter Report of Special Rapporteur, Mission to New Zealand).

331 *Id.* para. 8, at 5.

332 *Id.* para. 23, at 8.

333 *See id.* para. 8, at 8.

334 *Id.* para. 32, at 10.

335 *See id.* para. 34, at 10.

336 *See id.* para. 43, at 12-para. 55, at 15.

337 *See id.* para. 59, at 15.

338 *See id.* para. 77, at 19.

339 *See id.* para. 60, at 16.

340 *Id.* para. 78, at 19.

341 *See* Interview with Māori Service Provider.

342 *See* Report of Special Rapporteur, Mission to New Zealand, para. 66, at 17.

343 *See id.*

344 *See id.*

academic similarly noted that if you take six cases, three are well known Māori cases, and three are non-Māori cases no one has ever heard of, where the facts are substantially the same.³⁴⁶ “Discrimination in how Māori are depicted feeds the stereotype that all Māori men are violent and abuse their wife and children, which is extremely unhealthy.”³⁴⁷ A Māori leader also noted that the media spotlights problems in non-Pakeha communities. “The selection of news items pertaining to Māori and immigrant communities is illustrative of a racist attitude... What [the media] does to people is tell them they can’t work their way out of the situation they’re in. The media tells them they’re poor, dumb, and don’t contribute to the economy and there is nothing of the accomplishments of Māori and Pacific communities....”³⁴⁸

3. Funding Issues

A number of individuals expressed concerns related to government funding of Māori service providers. In particular, individuals noted difficulties due to insufficient funding of programs, government funding unnecessary new strategies or programs rather than sustaining existing programs and government policy against funding needed capital expenditures. Although we focus on Māori service providers here because our research in this area was gathered primarily from Māori providers, we recognize that many of the difficulties with respect to funding would apply to non-Māori providers as well.

The government has a policy to “never give out the whole funding amount” required for a program.³⁴⁹ This causes great difficulties for service providers who must provide 100% of needed services without receiving funding to cover the costs of such services and with little time or ability to fundraise to make up the difference. According to a member of Parliament,

the government often outsources its work without providing total funding.³⁵⁰ The “social services have become little fingers of the state,” but they are deliberately underfunded.³⁵¹ NGOs have to be accountable, but because they are underfunded, they have to pay staff less. The member of Parliament gave, as an example, a group of 200 Māori social service providers that must comply with state regulations, but pays 20% less than market for salaries because of insufficient funding.³⁵² Moreover, a Māori service provider pointed out that “the government funds itself to screen and make referrals but refers people to NGOs /service providers that are under-funded.”³⁵³

One Māori service provider explained that they are funded to provide domestic violence services by Child, Youth and Family (CYF), a service of the Ministry of Social Development.³⁵⁴ The funding they receive, however, only covers the cost of such services for the first two quarters of the year. This provider also noted that they service a broad geographical area.³⁵⁵ It takes “time and money to reach isolated communities and people in need of [their] services.” Yet they receive no funding for education, outreach or for gas for transportation.³⁵⁶ Moreover, “the government agencies will continue to refer clients even though they know we’re not funded to provide that service.”³⁵⁷ Another Māori provider similarly noted that they are only funded for a certain number of families in a year but that they “work with that [number of families] in a week.”³⁵⁸

One service provider we met with in the South Island receives half of its funding from the government, and raises the rest of its funding from “trusts, lotteries, wherever we can.”³⁵⁹ This provider is “only covered for the first initial contact of a number of clients per year.”³⁶⁰ As a result, they spend “quite a lot” of time chasing money.³⁶¹ Another provider in the South Island noted that the funding they receive “is stringent” and that they “have to do a lot of actively

345 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

346 Interview with Academic.

347 See *id.*

348 See Interview with Māori Leader.

349 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

350 See Interview with a member of Parliament.

351 See *id.*

352 See *id.*

353 Interview with Māori Service Provider.

354 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

355 See *id.*

356 See *id.*

357 See *id.*

358 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

359 See Interview with Domestic Violence Service Providers.

360 See *id.*

361 See *id.*

seeking funds.”³⁶² This provider “fulfill[s] our contract number of people that we’re supposed to see in the first four months of the year.” This organization may be “fully funded” by the government as a result of a new policy, Pathway to Partnership, discussed below. The additional funding they may receive will not cover the cost of having someone do all the paper-work that will be required, however.³⁶³ It will cover “existing contracts, probably. Not salaries or wages. It will cover outreach, residential services, the phone line, but not the people to answer the phone or the phone bill. Only enough for day-to-day operations, not training.”³⁶⁴ The organization expressed concern about people hearing that they are to be fully funded now, which could make it harder for them to raise money they need to cover operating costs.³⁶⁵

Another problem identified with respect to funding was a pattern where the government will fund an initiative in the beginning but will not provide funding to sustain the program. A Māori leader noted that good projects are often put in place but then funding is withdrawn or cutback.³⁶⁶ For example, Mauri Ora was a project that was working but funding almost cut until they convinced the Ministry of Māori Affairs to adopt the project.³⁶⁷ The project was saved but it is still under-resourced. According to the Māori leader, “[t]hey don’t resource it to the level it needs to be” which is “appalling because they do go through an exceptional process” in terms of getting certified.³⁶⁸ “Even if they basically jump through all the government’s hoops they still don’t get the required funding to do their jobs.”³⁶⁹ A domestic violence expert we interviewed similarly noted that it is “a trait of that part of government,” the Ministry of Social Development, “they have a little bit of money so they support something at the start and hope others will take up the funding later.”³⁷⁰ According to a domestic violence counselor, “What I’ve seen is that the Māori services come and go and that there are many cases where Māori groups that are successful have funding that is not renewed. Or mainstream

organizations copy the model and then the Māori service funding is pulled.”³⁷¹

A number of people also expressed frustration with the government practice of funding new studies and initiatives to address domestic violence rather than adequately funding existing organizations that are working on this issue. One person described the government approach as: “Bang! Here’s a new campaign. Community: Define. Deliver. Here’s \$40,000. But there is no follow up.”³⁷² Knowledge is lost with each new round of task forces, reports, and guidelines.³⁷³ As noted by Ruth Herbert: “There have been strategies for Māori over and over but there has not been a big impact. Some of the policies were good but when they are not implemented they are lost and new policies are thought up. Why? There is a lack of resources, will and continuity. We keep rearranging the deck chairs on the ship.”³⁷⁴ Others noted the challenges for the Family Violence Taskforce in developing a shared analysis of violence in a big group with varying levels of knowledge and experience in working with domestic violence. They also commented on the difficulty of retaining suitably experienced policy, research and operational support.³⁷⁵ Ruth Herbert also pointed out that “[i]n New Zealand we forget to look at other countries and how they have done things so we are always inventing new processes... New Zealand won’t look at other models. New Zealand wants to reinvent the wheel and try something new.”³⁷⁶

One service provider suggested that “the government must also actually give money to existing networks and agencies rather than keep spending money on new strategies.... The government’s approaches are too short term. We need money to sustain the capacity that has been built. Many positions are under-resourced. After money is spent on training, etc, there is very little left over for individual clients.”³⁷⁷ This provider also noted “[b]y the time the money has dripped down, it ends up providing! \$20 per client.”³⁷⁸ Another service provider similarly

362 See *id.*

363 See *id.*

364 See *id.*

365 See *id.*

366 See Interview with Māori Leader.

367 See *id.*

368 See *id.*

369 See *id.*

370 See Interview with Domestic Violence Expert.

371 See Interview with Domestic Violence Counselor.

372 See Interview with Māori Service Providers.

373 See *id.*

374 See Interview with Ruth Herbert, Domestic Violence Researcher, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

375 See Interview with Māori Service Providers.

Another problem identified with respect to funding was a pattern where the government will fund an initiative in the beginning but will not provide funding to sustain the program. A Māori leader noted that good projects are often put in place but then funding is withdrawn or cutback.

noted of new strategies and task forces “they have these meetings. They get paid \$200 a day or something ridiculous. They make these beautiful policies, it comes back into our community, by the time it gets here there’s nothing.”³⁷⁹

A final problem noted with respect to funding is that “most contracts don’t allow for capital expenditures.”³⁸⁰ Because of funding restrictions, service providers may not use government funds for buildings, telephone lines, or other capital expenditures.³⁸¹ In one instance, an organization’s request for government funding to install a phone system was rejected. Yet the same organization was later “criticized for not being responsive [by phone],” which was the very problem they were attempting to alleviate with additional phone lines.³⁸²

The New Zealand government has announced a new funding plan, Pathway to Partnership, which may help address some of the problems identified above. According to the Ministry of Social Development, “Pathway to Partnership is a multi-year strategy aimed at strengthening community-based family, child and youth focused services.”³⁸³ Pursuant to this plan, the Government is increasing its investment in these services by \$446 million over the next four years.³⁸⁴ The funding will be for existing services that currently have a contract with a relevant government agency. “The money is being progressively

introduced from 1 July 2008, with an extra \$52 million available in 2008/09. This is made up of the \$37.5 million announced in February 2008 as well as \$15 million already allocated as part of Pathway to Partnership in the 2007 Budget. The funding increases to \$192.8 million in 2011/12.”³⁸⁵ At the time of the Leitner Center’s visit to New Zealand in May 2008, we were informed by the Ministry of Social Development that the plan was “being developed as we speak” so we were not able to determine how the new program would address the problems identified above.³⁸⁶

4. Approval and Contracting for Service Providers

Under the DVA 1995 and its implementing regulations, service providers must be approved in order to receive government funding. The approval process for service providers is set forth in the Domestic Violence (Programmes) Regulations 1996 (as amended 2002). The system for approving domestic violence programs is both complicated and lengthy. There are two parts to the approval process: provider approval and program approval. Under the Regulations, applicants are required to submit detailed written submissions to panels that review the applications.³⁸⁷ For organizations applying to be

376 See Interview with Ruth Herbert, Domestic Violence Researcher, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

377 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

378 See *id.*

379 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

380 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

381 See *id.*

382 See *id.*

383 See Ministry of Social Development, Pathway to Partnership - Background Information, available at <http://www.msd.govt.nz/about-msd-and-our-work/work-programmes/initiatives/pathway-to-partnership/key-information/key-information-background.html>

384 See *id.*

385 See *id.*

386 See Interview Ministry of Social Development, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

387 See, e.g., Domestic Violence (Programmes) Regulations 1996 (as amended 2002), Section 13 (Applications for approval as programme providers).

an approved service provider, such applications must include:

- the date the organisation was established (regulation 20);
- the objectives and functions of the organisation (regulation 20);
- whether the organisation has, in the past, provided programmes similar to those for which the applicant seeks approval;
- the authorised persons (the facilitators): full names and addresses; and a summary of their knowledge, skills and expertise (regulation 20).
- a system for ensuring that facilitators only have authorisation to provide programmes for the duration of the agency's approval;
- a process to ensure that only facilitators who continue to meet regulation 15 deliver programmes;
- a code of ethics or practice;
- an effective complaints procedure;
- a relevant level of continuing education and an appropriate level of peer supervision or peer review for facilitators;
- systems to ensure assessment and ongoing review of the needs of attendees;
- provision for communication between the facilitator and any other programme provider who is providing a programme to any other person who is protected by, or subject to, the same protection order;
- safety provisions for every person attending the programme;
- regular monitoring, evaluation of effectiveness and presentation of programmes; and
- procedures to manage confidentiality, consent and safety issues (section 43).³⁸⁸

There are additional application requirements then for program approval.³⁸⁹ If an application is approved, "the domestic violence advisor will arrange for the regional contract manager to negotiate a contract for

the service. A contract is required before the Ministry of Justice can make referrals to the programme. Approval of a programme does not guarantee a contract with the Ministry of Justice although all approved providers will be considered for a contract."³⁹⁰

As a result of these government certification requirements, "there has been a movement from an activist/grassroots approach to a professionalization of the response to domestic violence."³⁹¹ Although this may seem to be a positive development, "the bar for professionalism keeps rising, making it hard for providers to attain approval."³⁹² According to one provider, this has the "effect of specifically limiting Māori providers because in some areas no one can qualify.... [P]roviders that have already been doing the work for years and have hands on experience and skills but lack formal training are often unable to get government approval or funding."³⁹³ Significantly, "these are the people who best understand the community and its cultural dynamics."³⁹⁴ This raises the question of "what do we mean by being qualified?"³⁹⁵ If you create a set a criteria and the reality is that there is no one in an area who can meet it, the result is that no one can provide the needed service and no money is authorized to fund what might be working.³⁹⁶ Māori focused and community delivered training such as training provided by Project Mauri Ora and Amokura are intended to address these training needs for rural Māori communities.

Panels are not required to meet with the organizations applying for approval. Rather, the determination is made by the panel based on paper submissions from the organization seeking certification. In practice, the paper process is a barrier for many Māori service providers.³⁹⁷ It means that organizations that know how to fill out a government application with the correct language can get approved, "even if they have no idea what they are doing."³⁹⁸ At the same time, "for Māori service providers they don't have the capacity to fill out the application with the correct bells and whistles."³⁹⁹ To illustrate this

388 Provider Guidelines: For providers wishing to be approved to provide domestic violence programmes, (December 2005), at 11. These guidelines were prepared by the first regional domestic violence approval panels, the regional domestic violence advisors and the former Department for Courts National Office in consultation with Te Puni Kokiri, the Ministry of Women's Affairs, the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, the National Offices of Relationship Services, the National Collective of Independent Women's Refuges and the National Network of Stopping Violence Services. The Guidelines have been updated to reflect the Domestic Violence (Programmes) Regulation amendments made in 2002. See *id.* at 3.

389 See *id.* at 12.

390 See *id.* at 10.

391 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

392 See *id.*

393 See *id.*

394 See *id.*

395 See *id.*

396 See *id.*

problem, one service provider shared that:

Well, currently there's a group...it's kaupapa-Māori-driven. It's a Māori program, Māori models. They haven't gone for approval because they can't jump through that hoop of approval...because they don't have somebody with the skill and expertise to stick them through the entire process of making application, of how it looks like in a folder... As you know, they're saying "But we want you to do this, this, and that" but who knows how to fill out that paper work? You know you've got this really good meaning marae-based organization but nobody know how to do that. So it's just silly-what they need to do is start sending their people who write that stuff out to the communities, have them say, "This is how you do it" give them a template, fill it out. Make it easier.⁴⁰⁰

This situation led another Māori service provider to note that oftentimes the "qualification needed to provide a government-contracted service isn't worth the paper it's written on" and that "the best people working on domestic violence do it from their heart not for the almighty dollar."⁴⁰¹ Another person suggested that organizations applying for funding should be assessed based on experience rather than focusing exclusively on paperwork. The panel should "look at the structure of governance and who is responsible for running and an organization's operations and function. In particular, look at the governing board and ask what life skills do they bring to the table? Obviously, they need to have some form of official qualifications, but it's also important that they belong to the area and have experience."⁴⁰²

In some instances, organizations also have difficulty in accessing the forms and applications to apply for funding.

The push everywhere is to de-paper. Some contracts are only available through an electronic tendering system. The effect on rural/

small organizations who lack access to technology is profound. For example, there are some places that only have dial-up connections to the internet. The end result is that people are being assessed on their ability to navigate the forms rather than provide the needed service. And while they might fail at registering, they could have succeeded at the other.⁴⁰³

Even after certification, the paperwork and administrative requirements can be onerous. As noted by one provider, "It's a huge uphill battle to keep up with it."⁴⁰⁴ According to a Māori service provider, "the interesting thing about the government funding, what they've actually done, they're giving out these little piecemeal amounts with these huge accountability reports, it's crazy, the huge amounts of hoops that we have to jump through to retain and maintain that funding is huge, and for a small amount of money."⁴⁰⁵ They went on to explain that the government wanted them to have "supervision, supervision reports, and you can't find a supervisor.... You can't get them...that's a real problem. See, and there are lots of more isolated communities than ours that have struggled, really really struggled."⁴⁰⁶ Interestingly, this Service Provider acknowledged that "there's nothing wrong with having one... We'd love having a supervisor" but "we can't, we live in [a rural location]. It's a bit hard to access things like that... [T]here are just not enough trained people around.... Especially trained around domestic violence, not enough."⁴⁰⁷

Some organizations have actually given up program approval and government funding as a result of the administrative requirements. One Māori provider relinquished program approval for individual counseling programs, deciding not to go "through all that paper work again to just do individuals because it's a small amount of money...too many hoops- too many technical and legal hoops to jump through, honestly the paper work is phenomenal."⁴⁰⁸ As a result, they now refer people in their area who seek that type of program to the closest urban area.⁴⁰⁹

397 See *id.*

398 See *id.*

399 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

400 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

401 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

402 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

403 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

404 See *id.*

405 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

406 See *id.*

407 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

408 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

409 See *id.*

5. Services in Rural areas

Rural Māori communities have particular difficulties in accessing services. “This region (the north) has the unfortunate distinction of being the ‘top-of-the-bottom.’ In other words, they rank near the top in all social indicators you don’t want to rank highly in. The communities are under-served and under-resourced.”⁴¹⁰ In addition, “[a]s the price of petrol has gone up recently, the difficulty of reaching rural populations has become more severe; it is also compounded by the geography and lack of infrastructure in the North (dirt roads, rural communities).”⁴¹¹ As noted above, in some areas there are limited providers because no one in the area can qualify for certification or comply with the administrative requirements to sustain funding.⁴¹²

According to some, this problem of access to services is exacerbated by the “no-go zones” policy of the government.⁴¹³ “No-go zones” are places where unemployment benefits are not offered. “If you move in [to a no-go zone] you are not eligible for government benefits because you’ve moved away from jobs.”⁴¹⁴ This policy is “completely encouraging urbanization.”⁴¹⁵ It also depletes the rural area of older people who can contribute to the community but need to receive benefits.⁴¹⁶ “If you’re not available to work because you live in an area without industry, ‘no benefit to you, sorry.’ But you might be being a positive influence. This policy disadvantages a lot of not quite retirees who have a lot to contribute on the marae.”⁴¹⁷ Moreover, “strong communities are pivotal in prevention. For long term change we need positive people.”⁴¹⁸

Of particular significance for domestic violence, there are also problems with the 111 (emergency services) phone service for individuals in rural areas. “The call center is based in Auckland. Dispatchers might not know locations or pronunciations of rural, less known places. The dirt road distance might be 2

hours assuming the police are at the station to take the call.”⁴¹⁹ As a result, women may not receive assistance they require in a timely manner.

6. Relations between the Police and Māori Communities

Issues regarding police enforcement of protection orders and failure to serve protection orders have been documented above.⁴²⁰ In addition to these general problems, which apply to both Māori and non-Māori communities, there is tension between the police and Māori communities in parts of New Zealand which may lead Māori not to call the police in situations of domestic violence. As noted by several interviewees, “Māori are suspicious of the police—specifically in relation to domestic violence issues. They ask themselves: Will they come? Will they come in a timely manner? Will they inflict physical harm?”⁴²¹ “People’s reluctance to involve the police in domestic violence disputes reflects how people feel about police in other parts of their lives.”⁴²² To illustrate this point, one person commented that Māori are glad that the police do not carry guns.⁴²³ Another interviewee explained

“Right now, a lot of effort is going into the recruitment of Māori police officers. The police department is trying to rebuild rapport with the Māori community after last year’s terrorism raids.... People see a disconnect between the police saying it is wrong to threaten violence in the home but then they knocked down doors and subjected men and elders to humiliation. How is it wrong to threaten violence in the home but how is it not wrong when a child sees his father kneeling in the dust in his underwear?”⁴²⁴

The Leitner Center did meet with one service provider that informed us that their community has

410 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

411 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

412 See *id.*; Interview with Māori Service Provider.

413 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

414 See *id.*

415 See *id.*

416 See *id.*

417 See *id.*

418 See *id.*

419 See Interview with Māori Service Providers.

420 See *supra* Part II.3.B.

421 See Interview with Māori Service Providers.

422 See Interview with Māori Service Providers.

423 See *id.*

424 See *id.*

no difficulty with police response to domestic violence.⁴²⁵ They attributed the solid police performance in these cases to the personalities of the police in that area and the relationships that had developed between the police and the domestic violence service providers there.⁴²⁶ Unfortunately, they acknowledged that “the police response is totally dependent on our relationships that we all have with them... The bigger areas don’t have that.”⁴²⁷

7. Māori programs addressing domestic violence

As noted above, New Zealand is obligated to take measures to prevent and eliminate domestic violence.⁴²⁸ In many of our interviews in New Zealand, people emphasized the importance of Māori programs to address domestic violence for Māori communities because Māori will be more likely to access such programs and because the substantive aspects of such programs are more effective in reaching Māori audiences.

In terms of accessing programs, Māori service providers indicated that Māori were more likely to attend programs run by Māori because they feel safe culturally and do not encounter institutionalized racism in such programs. “Māori clients work better with Māori service providers. In order to promote change within Māori communities, the change must come from Māori. Before the Māori safe house, Māori women just were not accessing services at all.”⁴²⁹ According to one Māori provider, their organization has determined “that in order to promote change and education you need Māori to be involved. A huge amount of Māori were not accessing services because there were no Māori faces. Māori felt [the general domestic violence services were not] for them.”⁴³⁰ One provider explained that they embrace the notion of cultural as well as physical safety. They take into account “cultural safety at

every point during contact with our client.”⁴³¹ According to another Māori provider, “It’s really about creating and ensuring a culturally safe space. If they didn’t have a culturally safe space, they might not be willing to leave a situation of domestic violence.”⁴³² Mariameno Kapa-Kingi, General Manager, Whānau Whanui, Ngati Hine Health Trust, similarly noted, “we are more comfortable with each other because of our culture...Māori are more amenable to receiving corrections from other Māori.”⁴³³

Providing cultural safety through cultural practices such as separating items pertaining to food and those pertaining to the body, removing shoes before entering a house and use of karakia (prayers) allows the women to engage.⁴³⁴ Di Grennell gave another example regarding Māori organizations using culturally significant language when discussing zero tolerance to violence policies. She noted that “zero tolerance frameworks need to be culturally appropriate. Amokura uses ‘Transforming Whānau Violence.’ This framework focuses on key cultural imperatives to effect personal and cultural change.”⁴³⁵

Having Māori service providers also frees victims from battling with institutional racism.⁴³⁶ Stacey Pepene, Coordinator of Te Puna o te Aroha, Māori Women’s Refuge in Whangarei recognizes institutionalized racism as a form of violence and wants to make sure a woman is “not having to defend her position as a victim of domestic violence as well as a Māori.”⁴³⁷ For example, “Māori workers are more likely to understand poverty and act in a respectful way that doesn’t cause shame.”⁴³⁸ This avoids judgment using Pakeha views.⁴³⁹ To illustrate this problem, Ms. Pepene explained that:

traditionally Māori families sleep together [in one large room as in a communal Marae setting] but now the system uses that as an indicator of unsafe conditions (and as grounds for removing the children from the house, for example). The government emphasis on over-

425 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

426 See *id.*

427 See *id.*

428 See *supra* Part I.

429 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

430 See *id.*

431 See *id.*

432 See Interview with Māori Service Providers.

433 See Interview with Mariameno Kapa-Kingi, General Manager, Whānau Whanui, Ngati Hine Health Trust, Whangarei (May 2008).

434 See Māori Service Providers.

435 See Interview with Di Grennell, Amokura, Whangarei (May 12, 2008).

436 Interview with Māori Service Providers.

437 See Interview with Stacey Pepene, Coordinator of Te Puna o te Aroha, Māori Women’s Refuge in Whangarei (May 2008).

438 See *id.*

439 See *id.*

crowding and the health and safety issues associated with overcrowding is good in terms of health management but that tells every Māori that if you're sleeping more than 1 person to a room then you're putting your family at risk of disease. The effect of this is that it drives Māori families underground. From a public health standpoint this is dangerous. It also results in an underreporting of actual need to avoid the judgment."⁴⁴⁰

The Leitner Center met with one woman who went through a Māori program to address her issues regarding domestic violence. In discussing the efficacy of the program, she recounted that "instead of leaving Māoriness outside, and being embarrassed about it, it embraced Māoriness in all parts. It is a holistic approach to healing that teaches the person to embrace her identity."⁴⁴¹

The substantive approach of Māori domestic violence programs differs from other programs as well in that Māori programs focus on the impact of colonization on Māori and many problems that Māori now face, in part as a result of colonization, including domestic violence. Non-Māori programs, in contrast, tend to focus on domestic violence as a problem of intimate partner relations. One Māori leader stated that "[m]ost people are blown away by how violence came into the family because of colonization and how drugs and alcohol also came into the society because of colonization. Almost any negative behavior you can think of has infiltrated our families."⁴⁴² Another noted "that's the nature of colonization. You internalize the negatives about who you are and [are told] someone else saved you."⁴⁴³ The Māori leader went on to explain that "violence towards family is not an historical trait in the Māori culture. The early settlers were very clear that they found the Māori too indulgent with their children and didn't discipline them accordingly."⁴⁴⁴ As a result, the process of decolonization is such an important part of the process of dealing with

domestic violence. Colonization gives a context to Māori families who suffer from violence what is happening to them. For families, it's as if a light comes on for them after having been in a place of darkness when they learn about how colonization has affected them on an individual level.⁴⁴⁵

Not surprisingly, some Māori leaders believe that many of the programs addressing domestic violence on an individual level have not worked for Māori. We were told that "the government continues to send people to DV programs that are individual-focused. This has worked for some but it hasn't worked for Māori, Pasifika... anyone who isn't Anglo-saxon. If we want to be successful in the way in which we govern then we ought to be supporting successful programs."⁴⁴⁶ A domestic violence counselor at a Māori provider similarly discussed "a problem of false consciousness with Māori that can be connected to domestic violence, in that both circumstances have a patriarchal view of the relationship (man-woman, Māori-crown). Māori cannot be themselves, because they are forced into the colonizer's framework. Healing from domestic violence requires healing on two levels in order to recover from the victimization."⁴⁴⁷ According to Di Grennell, to address domestic violence, you need to challenge the idea that violence within whānau is acceptable or culturally valid and remove opportunities for violence to take place, which can be liberating for historically oppressed communities.⁴⁴⁸ A successful approach to domestic violence includes empowering people to demonstrate their capacities. She emphasizes that quality and effective services are also a necessary part of prevention.⁴⁴⁹

Māori organizations also discussed the importance of a communal or extended family approach to address domestic violence. Amokura advocates for a "whānau ora" or "whānau (wider family) wellbeing" framework, which sees the solution to family violence incorporating the involvement of the

440 See *id.*

441 Interview with Domestic Violence Survivor.

442 See Interview with Māori Leaders.

443 See *id.*

444 See *id.*

445 See *id.*

446 See *id.*

447 Interview with Domestic Violence Counselor.

448 See Interview with Di Grennell and Ani Pitman, Amokura, Whangarei (May 12, 2008).

449 See *id.*

450 See Interview with Di Grennell and Ani Pitman, Amokura, Whangarei (May 12, 2008). The Māori term for extended family is Whānau but "Whānau,"

The substantive approach of Māori domestic violence programs differs from other programs as well in that Māori programs focus on the impact of colonization on Māori and many problems that Māori now face, in part as a result of colonization, including domestic violence.

extended family and the extended family as possessing interests related to family violence, such as shared responsibility for protection of a woman or child or interests in redress.⁴⁵⁰ For other Māori providers, the first step for women is to identify their whānau network and marae. “If you’re Māori you have a whānau” yet “some of our women are so disconnected that it’s about getting her...outside of the nuclear family because as a Māori, that’s only the beginning. It’s only the smaller core to a much larger picture.”⁴⁵¹ These providers work to have the women re-access those connections believing that “if we can get her reconnecting with her whānau, it’s going to be much safer for her and the children. It’s about empowering her to use those connections and encouraging her to not work in isolation because one of the founding tactics of domestic violence is isolation. The perpetrator will try to isolate her to the point where she feels she’s burnt her bridges...”⁴⁵² A Māori leader also emphasized the importance of family: “Kinship ties have been eroded through urbanization as Māori have been shifted away from the tribal setting and lost their connection to who they are. They lose their connection with their extended family and become isolated. That contributes to drug and alcohol use, family violence, etc. When you’re part of a collective it’s a lot more difficult to get involved in that type of behavior.”⁴⁵³

To be clear, Māori Programs do not allow perpe-

trators of domestic violence to avoid responsibility for their violent acts. Colonization is used as a starting point to help Māori understand and deconstruct the dynamics of violence within the context of colonizing practices. “It is a means of contextualizing the violence of our country’s development”⁴⁵⁴ and helping Māori understand how they got to this place but not to avoid all personal responsibility. For example, at one men’s program we met with, men’s groups are run with Māori culture and history as a guideline. Men are greeted with powhiri. The groups discuss the Treaty of Waitangi and on the board is written “Male by birth, man by choice.”⁴⁵⁵ Men are told to think about this challenge and work to understand a family relationship. Sessions include equality, parenting and child care. Often, men don’t acknowledge committing violence in the present, but blame it on the past—they externalize the blame, and often blame colonization. In such instances, they are told, “white men came and colonized, but they didn’t pick up your hand and make you smash your missus.”⁴⁵⁶

8. The New Zealand government’s obligation to consult with Māori

As noted above, pursuant to the Treaty of Waitangi, the Crown is obligated to consult Māori before adopting any measure that could affect them.⁴⁵⁷ While in New Zealand, the Leitner Center met with

as it appears in government legal and policy documents, does not always reflect the reality of its meaning within the Māori cultural context. In many government documents, it is used synonymously with nuclear family. As a result, when it is incorporated into legal documents and enforced, it doesn’t allow for the inclusion of extended family members.

451 Interview with Māori Service Provider.

452 See *id.* In the North, we similarly heard that “It’s really sad to see the high levels of domestic violence... Every woman that comes to see me because of domestic violence knows another family member or friend experiencing domestic violence. So we don’t see so many of these women. The government needs to learn to bring the wider Whānau in. The Whānau can build you up or strip you down.” Interview with Women’s Advocate.

453 See Interview with Māori Leader.

454 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

455 Interview with Domestic Violence Counselor.

456 See *id.*

457 See *supra* Part I.3.B.

a number of Māori organizations and individuals who expressed frustration with the manner in which the government conducted such “consultation” with respect to domestic violence programs. For example, one Māori leader expressed the view that:

The Domestic Violence Task Force should work to hear a Māori voice in order to respect the partnership idea of the Treaty of Waitangi. The Treaty of Waitangi relationship is with the Māori tribes, but the tribes are not invited to the task force meeting. Rather, the crown sets up the task force and then invites a few token Māori to attend...this is not a partnership. If the crown has defined the relationship, there is no space for Māori tikanga. To make the partnership into a reality, there needs to be a change in the fundamental beliefs of the government. But the government does not want to hear what Māori really have to say because it is frightened about what it will have to change.⁴⁵⁸

Another practitioner similarly noted that the “Māori world view is ignored and isn’t taken to account until later. The legislation is drafted, then passed, then implemented and it is at that stage (implementation) when we get to have some influence but by then it’s too late.”⁴⁵⁹ What should happen, according to a presentation at a Ministry of Social Development meeting, is that the “consultation process should mean that the government approaches Māori with a few options and engages with the Māori in making the right choice...Māori want to have greater influence on the creation of the options the government is considering when creating new programs.”⁴⁶⁰ To address this gap, several providers advised that “the most important thing would be for the [Domestic Violence] legislation to mention the Treaty of Waitangi.”⁴⁶¹ All the regulations would then flow from that. This would acknowledge that this policy has specific relevance to Māori.”⁴⁶² A Māori leader similarly noted that amending the DVA 1995 to reference the Treaty of Waitangi would “force the government to work with the people of the land. This [Labour]

government has been trying to move away from putting the Treaty into Legislation.”⁴⁶³ Another Māori provider similarly noted that reference to the Treaty would have implications for how regulations, policies and practices are formulated and funded.⁴⁶⁴

Conclusions and Recommendations

FUNDING

Conclusion:

The New Zealand government currently relies on NGOs to provide many of the services necessary to comply with its obligations under international law including, for example, providing shelters for victims of domestic violence, education and outreach regarding domestic violence, stopping violence programs, telephone hotlines and training programs. The New Zealand government does not provide sufficient funding to cover the costs of such services, however.

Recommendation:

When implementing the new Pathway to Partnership plan, the government should recognize the actual demand for domestic violence services that it relies on NGOs to provide (and that the government is required to provide under international law), such as providing shelters for victims of domestic violence, education and outreach regarding domestic violence, stopping violence programs, telephone hotlines and training programs, and should allocate adequate funding to cover the actual costs of such services.

Conclusion:

The New Zealand government appears to have a short-term approach to funding domestic violence service providers and programs whereby it will fund an initiative at the outset but will not provide sufficient funding to sustain programs, even those that are successful.

458 Interview with Māori Leader.

459 Interview with Māori Service Providers.

460 Presentation by Work with Diverse Communities, Ministry of Social Development, Wellington (May 19, 2008).

461 Interview with Māori Service Providers. Although, the Leitner Center delegation also encountered individuals who believed that “the Treaty of Waitangi doesn’t have anything to do with violence,” and “is more or less about land and seafood.” Interview with Family Violence Workers.

462 Interview with Māori Service Providers.

463 See Interview with Māori leaders.

464 See Interview with Māori Service Provider.

Recommendation:

In order to more effectively address issues related to domestic violence and to comply with its international obligations, the New Zealand government should consider providing funding to sustain successful domestic violence service providers and programs rather than prioritizing new initiatives and studies.

Conclusion:

Typically, contracts between the New Zealand government and service providers working on domestic violence issues do not allow government funding to be used for buildings, telephone lines or other capital expenditures. Yet such expenses are often necessary for an organization to effectively provide the relevant services.

Recommendation:

The New Zealand government should provide funding for capital expenditures where such items are necessary for NGOs to provide the domestic violence services the government outsources to them.

APPROVAL AND CONTRACTING FOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SERVICE PROVIDERS**Conclusion:**

Under the DVA 1995 and its implementing regulations, domestic violence service providers must be approved by the government and receive a government contract in order to receive government funding. The system for approving domestic violence providers and programs is both complicated and lengthy. The approval process requires applicants to submit detailed written submissions to panels that review the applications. The government process for approval has the effect of limiting approval and contracts (and, as a result, limiting funding) for Māori service providers who often lack the technical expertise to navigate the application process. As a result, in some areas, there are no organizations funded to provide needed domestic violence services.

Recommendation:

The government should consider simplifying the application process to obtain approval for domestic violence service providers and programs, providing

template forms and making panel members or government officials available to assist Māori service providers and organizations with the application process.

Conclusion:

In some instances, government contracts for domestic violence services are only available through an electronic tendering system. Organizations that lack access to technology and the internet are not able to access the applications for such contracts.

Recommendation:

The government should ensure that applications for government contracts are made available to Māori service providers and organizations that lack access to the on-line forms for government contracts for domestic violence services.

Conclusion:

The administrative requirements in terms of paperwork and supervision after an organization receives approval can also be onerous, and in some cases impossible, for Māori service providers to satisfy, especially for service providers in rural and more remote locations.

Recommendation:

The government should consider revising the administrative requirements in terms of paperwork and supervision for organizations that have provider and program approval in order to reflect what is possible for Māori and rural service providers and thereby to encourage the provision of services in areas of need while maintaining standards for government-funded services.

SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS**Conclusion:**

Rural Māori communities have particular difficulties in accessing services. In some areas there are limited providers because no one in the area can qualify for approval or comply with the administrative requirements to sustain funding. The difficulty of reaching rural populations is compounded by the geography and lack of infrastructure in the North. Of

particular significance for domestic violence victims, there are problems with the 111 (emergency services) phone service for individuals in rural areas. Dispatchers at the call centers are sometimes unfamiliar with locations or pronunciations of rural, less known places. As a result, police are not always able to respond to calls for help in a timely manner.

Recommendation:

The government should consider providing regional or more local call centers for 111 phone services so that emergency services can respond to individuals in rural areas on a timely and effective basis.

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE POLICE AND MĀORI COMMUNITIES

Conclusion:

There is general distrust between Māori communities and the police in parts of New Zealand, particularly after the terrorist raids in 2007, which may lead Māori not to call the police in situations of domestic violence.

Recommendation:

The police department should try to repair relations and develop strong relationships with the Māori community so that Māori will contact the police in situations of domestic violence. The effort in some parts of New Zealand to recruit Māori police officers is clearly a positive step. There are existing models of close cooperation between domestic violence service providers and the police in some communities in New Zealand that could be replicated elsewhere in the country.

MĀORI PROGRAMS ADDRESSING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Conclusion:

The New Zealand government should be commended for funding Māori service providers to pro-

vide Kaupapa Māori programs on domestic violence and Māori shelters. Māori are more likely to access such programs and the substantive approach of such programs appears to be more effective in reaching Māori individuals.

Recommendation:

New Zealand should continue to support Māori service providers to provide Kaupapa Māori programs on domestic violence and Māori shelters and should allocate adequate funding to cover the actual costs of such services under the new Pathway to Partnership plan.

THE NEW ZEALAND GOVERNMENT'S OBLIGATION TO CONSULT WITH MĀORI

Conclusion:

Under the Treaty of Waitangi and international law, the New Zealand government has an obligation to consult with Māori before adopting strategies, initiatives or programs that will impact Māori, including domestic violence strategies, initiatives or programs.

Recommendation:

In order to comply with its obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi and international law, the government should consult with Māori regarding new strategies, initiatives or programs to address domestic violence in Māori communities at an early stage when Māori can help shape the new programs (rather than asking Māori to approve strategies, initiatives or programs that have already been formulated by the government). The government should also consider amending the DVA 1995 to reference the Treaty of Waitangi. We recognize this is a controversial proposal but, in so referencing the Treaty, the government would signal to Māori that it is serious about its commitment to consult Māori about domestic violence strategies, initiatives or programs which impact them and to its Treaty obligations more broadly.

Conclusion

Notwithstanding New Zealand's commitments under international and domestic law to secure equality for women and to prevent, investigate and punish acts of domestic violence, violence against women continues to be an acute social problem

in New Zealand. While it is clear that New Zealand has made deliberate efforts to combat domestic violence, this report identifies a number of weaknesses with New Zealand's domestic law and policies to address domestic violence and offers suggestions for

how such problems might be addressed. It is our hope that this report contributes to the work of the many non-governmental organizations, government officials, service providers, lawyers and academics working on these challenging issues in New Zealand.



**Leitner Center
for International Law and Justice**

Fordham Law School

33 West 60th Street
Second Floor
New York, NY 10023
212.636.6862

www.leitnercenter.org