

***“He who oppresses the poor to increase his riches, and he who gives to the rich, will surely come to poverty.”***

The following verbose tome represents my crude distillation of decades of thought and study and months if not years of notes and personal experience within the Anglo-Indigenous and migrant New World.

It places focus on what I believe to be the key issues of immigration – those of loyalty, practicality, and simple common sense – and addresses what I believe to be the necessary changes, checks, and balances.

I have done my best to see the issue fairly. It is not fair, reasonable, or grounded in any kind of fact to scapegoat all social problems on migrants. As policy it is irresponsible and as personal thought not sensible. The contrasting position on migration however is typically a no holds barred importation of human beings, yet this position lacks common sense as well and is ignorant of the realities of human life.

That said, in my observation New Zealand’s immigration system is broken and good for no one, except for a certain sliver of society. While big business must be represented and addressed fairly, this favor is not ultimately productive to wider society. Favoring big business in its labour needs allows big business, which can afford it, to neglect the wider training and inputs required to make society improve.

I believe my position to be cohesive and sensible if somewhat incomplete, due to the challenge of whittling it all down. For instance, it is my opinion that the key skill required in a migrant is perfect English. Not Queen’s English, but the ability to read and write and comprehend English. Without the ability to read and write a person is utterly hobbled, regardless of origin. But the English language in the present era is very easy and common to learn, and such commonality removes the ability for it to be exploited or monetized.

I believe there must be more focus on individual migrant responsibility, but at the same time, more responsibility shown by the New Zealand government, and a shift away from using migrants as political pawns in self-interested games. Both sides must hold each other in tension. There must be skin in the game for everybody involved, yet the focus must shift away from dollars and cents and into the practical considerations of housing and infrastructure.

Scapegoating migrants is simplistic and not moored in reality. What needs to be understood is the reading between the lines; the underlying realities and disenfranchisement of both parties, and the human needs that must be accommodated in a fair and just society.

Thank you for the invitation to contribute.

Respectfully,

Andrew Turner, September 23, 2021

The result of current immigration rules in New Zealand is one that both oppresses the poor and causes poverty by catering to the rich. It misuses and wastes migrants and their lives and labour, and gives little back to New Zealanders as a whole except headaches. New Zealand's policy of giving 'gifts' to the wealthy and to wealthy migrants does not help the economy or the nation but actually hinders it, and lower skilled or labour based policies harm both migrants and locals, in excess favour of employers.

Long term lack of opportunity combined with a discouraging socioeconomic climate within which to raise a family, live life, and pursue honest work will mean a country that consistently loses its best and brightest overseas and within which organized crime, thriving in social dysfunction, will continue to grow – why play by the rules when the rules are determinedly against you? What is the point of going to legitimate work when that work will gain you nothing?

Yet abusing the human dignity and finite lifespan of migrants is foolish and counterproductive, and removing bureaucrats from having any responsibility or accountability with their decision making lacks sense, especially when it's plain for all to see that most decision making on migration is ultimately at the discretion of the minister or politicians involved, and that the bureaucrats in question do not know their right hand from their left when it comes to policy. The policies themselves were written by a different generation of politicians and more than likely the bureaucrats and experts originally associated with the program, as well as the reasons and situations underlying the original program, no longer apply.

However, ignoring or disparaging the contributions of business and big business to society is not reality. It must be recognized and appreciated that certain aspects of living are virtually impossible to do on a small, private scale, and that large wealth will accrue, generally, to people involved in those enterprises that are done on a large scale. However, favouring those people or industries at the continual expense of others, over the long term, is a solvent to a civilized nation, as it prevents the very dynamics that created that wealth from happening again, entrenching social disadvantage and encouraging an eventual class system. Whether a class system is welcomed is another thing entirely. Though there are always the rich and always the poor, favouring ('giving gifts' to) the rich has the eventual effect of making the poor very poor, and the rich very rich, to the point where democratic ideal ceases to function and a nation becomes a failed state.

Below I will highlight what I believe to be the primary problems in New Zealand immigration, and the primary solutions, beginning with unsustainable immigration numbers, and not taking into account the effect of an amount of tourists equalling roughly 280,000 permanent residents per year using New Zealand's fixed infrastructures.

'Unsustainable' is a critical concept to define. As it is typically known, 'unsustainable' means excessive quantities of people creating unpleasant real or perceived cultural shifts, high costs, and infrastructure pressure, and this reality is more important than actual numbers as actual numbers are usually skewed – ie though 11 migrants to 1000 locals is insignificant, concentrating those migrants so that there's 500 migrants to 1000\*<sup>1</sup> locals is not, especially when migrants have no reason to become true citizens.

---

1 The business owners who profit from these migrants and those property owners who benefit from price inflation create a spillover effect that is by and large negative. The rich get richer, the poor get poorer.

Immigration regulation plus finite energy equals simplicity therefore cities inflate migrant-based pressure because they are simple to live in. The influx can drive down wages and creates a lack of evolution and maturity in the local job arena.

An equal reality is that in many situations labour is not effected. The current system, however, favours business too highly without adequate recourse, at least historically. Low skilled labor taking jobs from locals is not an issue and is not an issue any more than the butcher running out of beef liver is ever an issue, as in the same way most people don't eat liver when there's something else available, most people don't work certain jobs, if given a choice<sup>2</sup>. Static or stagnant low skilled labor where a business refuses to hire locally due to work visa conditions being over favorable to employers, so that migrants must stay on instead of moving on, is an issue because it creates a barrier or breaks a rung on the 'ladder'. A factory with mostly migrants is not an issue, so long as locals have enough suitable jobs to move on and up, and so long as both migrants and locals have access to some form of education or other betterment that rewards applied effort so that both groups move on and up should they will. Much of the time migrant groups gravitate into certain jobs but this causes no issue so long as locals are free to move through. When this movement is interrupted, stagnation occurs. That is what occurs when a visa is indiscriminately tied to an employer.

Regulation, usually designed to control a problem but most of the time only creating a new one, nearly always concentrates power in the hand of a select few and in a select few areas because regulations take time and time means money, and most people are short on both. Consequently, there is a large monetary concentration in Auckland, Wellington, and Queenstown, which then creates or exacerbates economic realities and turns them into problems, such as when high real estate prices in these cities create a spillover effect where wealthy city people price out a local rural population, but the local population can't compete. While applauded in certain circles, high real estate prices rob Peter to pay Paul, as when one generation effectively robs another, they will be billed for it, practically speaking, just later on in life via inflation, death taxes, or otherwise.

In an ideal world wealth would get turned into more wealth but in reality, large bureaucracy and state-underwritten businesses like banking create a permanent and impenetrable ceiling when combined with council planning and voting patterns. Migration concentrated in those regions then makes worse a real issue and in particular the issue of housing – as housing shortages are almost solely caused by local councils and building regulations, not lack of land. It is a very simple thing to purchase a few houses, tear them down, and build a large apartment building on top, but it is rarely done. Consequently, both parties in this debate are correct: migration is a problem (with housing), and migration is a solution (with employers). On either hand the average voter suffers as he or she is forced into poor labor conditions and high costs of living, and if given a choice between working poverty and state funded poverty, many people will choose state funding, if only to retain an amount of independence.

That is solely the result of regulation. The immigration regulations are a solution to a hotel's or an orchard's need for workers; the regulations are a problem when it means more or less subsidized hotels crowd out apartment buildings and new orchards become nonviable due to entrenched competition and land costs.

---

2 Most people do not want to work split shifts in a dairy farm, picking fruit, wiping bums, or slaughtering animals.

One of these submissions, for instance, suggested the equivalent of a quota based slave auction as a solution for migration, but the reality of all quotas is that businesses would form whose sole purpose was the ownership, leasing, and transfer of labour quota, the result being one of utter labour and business stagnation and increased consumer prices due to monopoly, alongside the treating of humans as that much cattle. Within a week a New Zealand manned LLC would form which would then solicit investments from qualified investors, chief of which would be businesses who benefit from bulk imported labor. It would quickly become more profitable to own quota than orchards. This labor would have no rights and be tied to the job. The effect would be one of making those business owners exceedingly wealthy and one of removing proper competition from the business arena, especially if there was vested interest in both ends of the deal. The end result would be a labor market ruled by these barons where local workers and business owners of all types are placed in ever more unwinnable competition to indentured foreign slaves, consumer prices rise due to artificial constraints, regular wages are pinned down, businesses don't die natural deaths or live natural lives, and New Zealand suffers as a whole.

Contrast that to unregulated work visas: a foreigner, even in unskilled labor, has no real legislated advantage in being hired over a local because just like the local, he or she has the freedom to simply move on. Because of this, employers are forced to address conditions that result in loyal workers, and the business evolves (or goes belly up) based on sound doctrine. If the issue is one of local 'work ethic', which I am always suspicious of, as the essence of capitalism is to cream the value over and above another person's labor, then that work ethic must be addressed and accommodated as a reality into a business model, and if the business model is not sustainable, find another business. It's easy to get people to work when holding a gun to their head. Whole countries run that way. But it's not free, sustainable, or civilized. Regulation, therefore, should be focused on systems that prevent exploitation, and migrant policy should instead shift to population policy<sup>3</sup> and individual migrant responsibility, leaving immigration policy itself as governing parameter only, and in the hands of the employer-employee relationship. This parameter ought to be very basic, held to rigidly, and held to with account by all parties.

Particular care must also be paid to buy-in immigration. Calling this type of migrant an 'investor' or 'entrepreneur' almost entirely ignores the truth. Of course there are people who emigrate and form businesses, but most, especially not the truly wealthy, do not. New Zealand is too small and too well regulated for a wealthier -- typically older -- person to benefit from investing, particularly if the investments can not include land.

However, 'investor' type immigration does carry with it an intrinsic appeal. It scratches a conceited itch in most people to rub shoulders with the successful. Conceit is not intelligent policy, and in a country like New Zealand I am convinced that investor-class immigration is incredibly destructive\*<sup>4</sup>. There is

---

3 It does not make sense to ignore the infrastructure and social pressures created by the equivalent of 280,000 full time residents arriving as tourists yearly. It is not as though tourists are cash machines that exist without effect on the world around them. Nor does it make sense to then complain about 40,000 migrants. Full time residents create a balanced cash flow. Tourists are there to play, and when their playing interacts with services like housing, which effect locals, the balance is disrupted.

4 Minister Nash's comments towards specifically working to bring in wealthy tourists ignores the fact that doing so would turn New Zealand into a nation of servants. Combining this focus with immigration allowing the importation of low paid labour (because many locals will have no desire to be housekeepers) will compound a problem. If working to recreate Edwardian England social castes, it's a great idea.

no need for a migrant to emigrate in order to invest and to allow what is essentially purchased citizenship makes a mockery of a just nation.

Buy in immigration destroys countries and particularly countries like New Zealand with its relative youth and inherent limits, and the true wealthy will not invest their money into the risk attendant to all business but rather into blue-chip stocks, bonds, equities, and real estate, none of which benefit the average New Zealander, all of which enrich a very specific class of New Zealander. The average New Zealander carries all of the burden of inflation and otherwise and virtually none of the benefit of foreign wealth within their shores unless that wealth is transferred into cash flow, something that will not likely occur in New Zealand because New Zealand has a wide deep moat around it, even moreso if that investor's wealth is a singular outpost of cash stashing combined with houses, lands, and equities in several other nations and a passport that accesses all of them. Vancouver, Sydney, London, Auckland – is it reasonable to expect that person to put their money in liquid wealth, in New Zealand? When British Columbia alone has more or less the same population but sits adjacent the USA and the rest of Canada?

If New Zealand wants to invest in wealth it ought to invest in thinkers, specialists, writers, and scientists of all types from around the globe, not monetary wealth, and it ought to vigorously poach them if need be. The approach ought to be handpicked by the government or nominated by the population via blind applications and then government initiated and not, I might add, solely a virtue-signalling cause du jour faddish thing but rather a general seeking of excellence in the classic liberal tradition. Progress demands the sustaining of free thought around the world. New Zealand is in a unique position to be the Switzerland of the new world, and sustainable wealth is always the result of simple principles applied diligently. It is why Mennonites thrive in the middle of Central America's banana republics.

In recap, and as a solution, the best immigration\*<sup>5</sup> stems from a very low amount of regulation combined with rigorously and diligently applied justice. Simple laws, rigorously applied. Simple bars, rigorously upheld.

I have watched migrants my entire life. I am an 'aware' (not 'woke) product of migrants and indigenous. I can trace the emigration of my forefathers simply and easily, and I married a migrant. Within four generations, all major races of the earth are represented in my children. I have watched what succeeds in policy and what doesn't. You leave people alone, and they'll do what they need to do and are best at.

Highly regulated immigration is abused on both hands. Migrants get residence or citizenship through some sort of program invented in 1995 then leave. Prospective migrants, orchestra conductors through air pilots, are not kept in the country because nobody listens to music or flies airplanes. Swiss carpenters have to hit a reset on their migration papers each time a new government is elected. This is solely because bureaucrats are not practically capable of administering the lives of human beings in any

---

5 The best immigration system is positive natural reproduction. When a people refuses the rigor of raising children, immigration is a necessity or the system will collapse. Counting the economic gains of a dual income with no children ignores the fact that the children grow to produce and consume themselves and short sighted. Monetary wealth is determined by population because population determines market size. Therefore, a wealthy New Zealand is a populated New Zealand.

great quantity or quality yet they do so without any real supervision or accountability. In New Zealand, the newspapers make fodder of immigration complaints – everybody from doctors to fruit pickers has a complaint. That is because the immigration system is broken. A migrant in New Zealand lives for all intents and purposes as a second class citizen but with all the responsibilities of a local plus a suitcase full of extra responsibilities<sup>6</sup> while being governed by a clock that's only right twice a day.

What end and what purpose do these regulations serve, exactly?

Immigration deregulation must be attendant to a handful of qualifications: perfect English, an entry exam citing rights and responsibilities so that the migrant is on firm footing, employment, and perfect legal character. In exchange, policy consistency and judicial fairness in return for the freedom to make necessary choices. Adult children who have grown up in New Zealand should be granted residency but not citizenship. Tearing up families upon completion of high school is stupid and counterproductive to the nation.

The immigration process must be employer/employee led not bureaucrat led. Resumes are terrible at determining actual skill and are as often as not a measurement of what a person can't do as much as what they can, and that practical application must be proven at work, not under the lidless gaze of a migration official – especially not when ultimately, the Minister responsible makes the rules by fiat through Special Direction. Furthermore, New Zealand's present focus is on organizational types of workers; what is equally or even more needed in a country like NZ are resourceful people, especially outside the large cities. Notice that a resourceful person is not necessarily an entrepreneur. Organizational people thrive in rigid and reliable business environment like banking or government or teaching or healthcare, not so much in a town that needs sheep shearers for three weeks, then fruit pickers for a month, then someone to help mend a fence for two and a half weeks. The importance of this type of work should be evident whenever one tries to stay fed, warm, and out of manure. That is the reality of life in the wider regions of New Zealand (and in much of the New World). A government due to its pigeonholed nature assumes that all people are like them and they have succeeded due to their rigid world but in reality their success is due mostly to their paycheck being very secure. Many people do not thrive in that setting, nor is it practical to encourage that kind of system particularly as it inevitably becomes a burden to wider society.

This is not, respectfully, my picking on the civil service, government, or politicians. My point is that all wealth inevitably is the result of intelligent and applied digging in literal dirt and the civil service is paid from the proceeds of that digging. Therefore, intelligent policy must revolve around shovels as well as pocket protectors and not just the fantasy life of people who are buy and large completely removed from the effects of any decision made on immigration.

If organizational people are gears, then resourceful people are the grease between those gears. The allegory, while it may not be appealing, is appropriate, and both must work together. If both are complaining about policy then the government had best listen or the whole apparatus risks grinding to a

---

6 The outcome being that the higher bar actually elevates a migrant above the local population if that migrant is finally able to settle down. On first glance this would seem like a good thing, but combining that with a second passport and greater wealth simply creates social troubles. If a New Zealander was threatened with exile if he or she did not make \$27 an hour and work for the same person exclusively it's fairly certain there'd be an increase in productivity among New Zealanders. Which party would be willing to campaign on that?

halt. If I might take the allegory one step further, a key aspect of mechanical engineering lies in proper tolerances. Too tight, and a speck of grit jams the machine, or something overheats and the whole thing catches fire. Too loose and everything rattles to bits.

The practical implications of the allegory are easy to see.

And, human beings being who we are, this moves me on to the checks and balances necessary to avoid chaos. Some of them may appear extreme but I am convinced they are not.

Most honest ill sentiment (apart from bog-standard racism) towards migrants I am convinced is the result of locals knowing that those migrants, due to the possession of multiple passports and usually languages, have an unimaginable advantage over New Zealand born locals and also instant recourse should the going get tough. When the going gets tough in New Zealand, a New Zealander has to deal with it. A migrant can and often does simply just leave. It is an inarguable and unearned advantage to have a passport to multiple nations and an advantage not likely to ever be replicated by New Zealanders. By removing the ability to hold multiple passports except in some cases like Australia or native-born Pacific Islanders<sup>7</sup>, much if not most immigration will be eliminated, especially among those who are not serious. If the rule is applied to rich and poor alike, it is certain that many prospective migrants would not be able to stomach the idea of immigration. This concept underlies what I believe to be key to useful policy. A migrant with a second passport to Tonga carries no advantage over a local. A migrant with a passport to Canada at 40 million or Brazil at 500 million or China at 1.1 billion, does.

In my observation, the best results in immigration are achieved with the least amount of rules and the maximum amount of responsibility. In my experience this is usually via children who grow up where one parent is local and the other a migrant, but the children are also migrants and citizens due to birth. I think it is fair to state that an adult migrant is never 100% local. Maybe 99%, but not 100%, no matter their country of origin. A young person is and therefore ultimate migrant policy should sensibly focus on young people. The result would be one of complete and seamless integration free of government interference. Contrast that with the present state of a migrant child who grows to adulthood in New Zealand then gets expelled from the country upon completion of high school. It's like building, pruning, and maintaining a vineyard then tearing it up a week before its first harvest.

I would suggest that all things considered, this is not wise policy.

More rules placed by the government means more government responsibility and more room therefore for government oversight and error, and ought to be avoided.

There should be no dual citizenship except Australia and the Pacific; to become a citizen one must turn in their previous citizenship formally. All minor children become citizens under the same rule; a minor under their parents may be a defacto resident but citizenship depends on forsaking any former visa and citizenship within a certain time frame after the age of majority. The penalty for not doing so should be expulsion. A young person must be ensured that stability on visa terms is within their control. If they expect to simply stay in the country indefinitely without committing, then expulsion is fair.

---

<sup>7</sup> As opposed to people gaining citizenship in the Pacific then moving to New Zealand

Residency for all parties should be attached to a New Zealand passport/endorsement by a number. This passport must be presented upon overseas travel if the person wants to reenter New Zealand. If a certain amount of overseas travel is exceeded, residency will be returned to a work visa. Residency will have a time limit before citizenship is called for, and the penalty for fraud or overstay or not becoming a citizen should be expulsion<sup>8</sup>. A migrant must be guaranteed that stability is within her control. In return, New Zealand must be reassured that she is serious about New Zealand.

Absolutely no criminal activity on behalf of adult migrant in residence or visa, or else expulsion, particularly in violent (including extremist), narcotic, or exploitative crime. Some allowance made for the 'follies of youth' so long as the follies aren't violent or exploitative; if a kid gets into a fight he ought not to be deported four years later. On the other hand if he develops a habit of stealing cars and beating people with chains, he ought to get deported. Expulsion must be guaranteed, but not their family; that is the same as throwing the whole family in prison. Adult children should be treated like locals. After citizenship, foreign-born citizens would be treated like locals within the justice system.

By streamlining the visa/resident/citizen stream, the justice and immigration system would be able to function far more smoothly with far less overhead and far greater reach. There is no constructive purpose in differentiating between different industries for instance as a need is a need regardless of whether it's talent, health care, or vine pruning. A need is a need, and unless a certain industry is creating an actual problem that needs actual addressing all more rules do is create more work and waste more time. Does it really matter where a pillow thrower is born if the pillows are getting thrown? And if the pillows aren't getting thrown, perhaps the boss ought to pay a bit more or find something more suited to his winning personality, because now there's no reason for his migrant employee to not just move to Invercargill and flip pillows there.

In conclusion, buy in migration is unjust and socially irresponsible. Regulation on migration beyond bare population policy is not good for the local population at large. The importation of money ought to be separate from the importation of people. Migration ought to be driven by necessity, and migration policy ought to be the management and oversight chiefly of a population whose purpose is integration in place of a natural negative birthrate. More and hard responsibilities ought to be demanded of migrants, yet those same migrants should not live under the threat of arbitrary and senseless eviction.

More responsibility on behalf of migrants will prevent wishful or usurious larking expeditions to New Zealand. It will sift out those who migrate to take advantage from those who are there to live and commit. People will know where they stand and they will stand committed or they will leave. Immigration would likely fall and working conditions will be forced to improve, because there would be no reason to hire a foreigner over a local, if the foreigner has the same ability to move on as a local does. A certain amount of tolerance will allow the free mesh of new and old contained within the walls of the island, and ultimately, a clear line will be drawn between who is the spectator and who is the player in Team 5 Million.

---

8 Something like this: Open work visa 3 years/NZ Migrant Travel Visa > Present 85% of 3 years > Residency Application last quarter year 3 > Residency 2 years, no recourse, one time only > Citizenship or leave country with family.

Further thoughts:

-- Trade missions and trade ties ought to be formed between New Zealand and countries of a similar size who can be bargained with and who do not belong to any common market. This may influence migration. Canada, Chile, Ukraine, etc. China, India, and the USA are too large to bargain with.

-- Migration policy must take into account the amount of tourists in a normal year.

-- Policies that create an atmosphere not conducive to the raising of families seem to have two results: an increase in systemic poverty due to unplanned pregnancy, and an increase in immigration, which becomes a double edged sword if both aspects begin to upset the status quo. Therefore the cost of living is critical in maintaining society.

-- Migration policy must differentiate between urban and rural. Rural policy should seek to balance the depth of local old money against the vigor of young people embarking on life. Therefore, post secondary education should be spread out into the regions in order to attract new blood to old money. This would include migrants. Agriculture is excellent for establishing old money, and education is great for attracting new blood.