



Overseas Aid or Domestic Expenditure? The New Zealand Government and the Problem of Justifying Trade-Offs Between Domestic Scarcity and Obligations to the Pacific

Zexin Lu

King's College, Auckland 1062, New Zealand
cola2017.lu@gmail.com

Abstract. The modern foreign aid debate is predominantly consequentialist, centring on the outcomes of aid and whether it promotes development or creates dependency. While questions of justification are not absent, they are often treated as secondary to those of effectiveness and outcomes. This paper examines how New Zealand should justify aid to Pacific Island Countries under conditions of domestic fiscal scarcity. It treats the aid debate as a problem of public and moral justification, evaluating four frameworks - liberalism, communitarianism, cosmopolitanism, and economic analysis - against four normative criteria. This study concludes that the strongest justifications for New Zealand are those grounded in communitarian and economic principles, recognising that no single framework, or possibly combination of frameworks, will fully resolve the tension between domestic obligation and external duty. This study reframes Pacific aid as a question of both political efficiency and the legitimate reasons for maintaining or changing aid policy under scarcity.

Keywords: Official Development Assistance, Justification, Fiscal Scarcity, Trade-off, Obligation.

1 Introduction

The balance between foreign aid and domestic needs is a much-contested issue in developmental economics. In New Zealand (NZ), this question is tied to the country's identity as a Pacific nation, and aid is closely linked to stability and partnership. During periods of fiscal constraint, overseas assistance is often seen as discretionary [1]. The main challenge is deciding what New Zealand should fund and how it can justify compromises between domestic expenditure and its obligations to Pacific Island Countries (PICs).

Throughout this research, the term "aid" includes Official Development Assistance (ODA), which the OECD defines as government aid that promotes the economic development and welfare of developing countries, i.e., NZ government resources

transferred externally for development and humanitarian purposes [2]. “Aid” is used in a broader sense to include aid-funded support, such as labour mobility schemes. In this paper, ODA is treated as distinct from defence expenditure and private charity. Where relevant, ODA includes grants, concessional finance, and technical assistance, but excludes spending for military, intelligence, or commercial purposes. These boundaries must be noted, as the justificatory logic shifts depending on how the aid is framed. The paper uses the term “obligation” to mean a duty or responsibility that can constrain government choice. For clarity, four types of obligations are distinguished. Moral obligations concern what is right independently of state policy. Political obligations are what the New Zealand state owes as an institution to those affected by its actions. Legal obligations are duties arising from formal commitments under domestic or international law. Relational or special obligations refer to duties grounded in relationships, such as New Zealand’s historical links with PICs.

This study furthermore refers to fiscal scarcity, justification, and trade-offs. Fiscal scarcity is the limited availability of financial resources, such as tax revenue and borrowing capacity, to a government for funding its expenditures. Justification refers to the publicly defensible reasons offered to make a policy choice legitimate and can be moral or political. A trade-off is the selection between competing claims under constraint and can be short-term or long-term. The purpose of this paper is to evaluate how New Zealand can legitimately justify its aid choices for the Pacific amid scarcity. It considers how New Zealand should justify maintaining or changing ODA to PICs amid domestic fiscal scarcity, as well as the public reasons given in the national political sphere. By employing normative criteria and political-moral frameworks, the paper tests what counts as a legitimate justification for aid choices under scarcity.

From Murray Rothbard’s libertarian perspective, the provision of foreign aid is irrational. He justifies the reduction of foreign aid by arguing that it is coercive to domestic taxpayers. Furthermore, aid distorts market signals and prevents true free trade, instead acting as a tool to secure foreign markets for domestic firms [3]. Under scarcity, aid remains unjustified. Rothbard instead advocates for a policy of non-intervention and voluntary exchange, allowing foreign nations to develop without overdependence on donor countries.

From a communitarian perspective, the focus of moral obligation is the bound political community, and common history creates special duties to one’s compatriots. Under this system, the state’s priority is the welfare of its own citizens. However, this lens can be extended to justify aid to the Pacific by viewing the region as a set of special relationships [4]. In the context of fiscal scarcity, a communitarian approach defends a statist priority while also validating a tiered hierarchy of assistance. This hierarchy prioritises obligations to neighbouring countries over distant ones, i.e., Pacific aid over aid to other countries.

A cosmopolitan perspective holds the individual as the fundamental unit of moral concern, rendering national borders arbitrary. Under this system of global justice, foreign assistance is a compulsory duty triggered by urgent human need and the prevention of foreseeable harm [5]. While fiscal scarcity may constrain the state’s capacity to act, it does not provide a moral justification for statist priority.

An economic outlook gives mixed evidence on the effectiveness of ODA. ODA is evaluated by its ability to promote growth or mitigate systemic poverty. Economists often highlight the principle of diminishing marginal returns, suggesting that while initial investments in infrastructure or health care can yield high growth, subsequent inflows may be restricted by absorptive capacity or fuel domestic inflation. Under fiscal scarcity, opportunity costs between aid and domestic expenditure mean that aid is justified where the marginal benefit to the recipient outweighs the domestic trade-offs.

This study proceeds in five parts. It sets out the New Zealand-Pacific aid context, then evaluates the main justifications for Pacific ODA through the frameworks above. It compares the strengths and limits of these approaches through defined criteria. Finally, the paper synthesises these findings to outline what a reasonably defensible New Zealand justification could look like across domestic and Pacific audiences, while recognising that any such justification will remain contestable.

Overall, this paper argues that New Zealand can justify maintaining or changing ODA to Pacific Island Countries even under domestic fiscal scarcity, but only if the justification is framed as (i) a special obligation grounded in regional relationship and historical responsibility, and (ii) a long-term public-interest policy that reduces future costs and instability.

2 Literature Review

The question of foreign aid and its trade-offs have been widely studied in development economics and political philosophy. Existing research offers a wide range of conclusions. Huntington notes that wealthier countries have a moral duty to share their resources with those who lack them. He justifies aid as a long-term investment that advances the interests of the donor country, since more developed countries are more reliable trading partners than less developed ones. Aid is defended as a strategic tool for short-term political benefits such as base rights [6]. It is further justified to gain the goodwill of the recipient country and to minimise the risk of potential retaliation that a failure to aid them might trigger. However, Huntington admits that there is unlikely to be a solid justification for prioritising foreign development over domestic needs. A. Michaelowa and K. Michaelowa justify ODA on the grounds of poverty eradication. While the study does not discuss the trade-off between foreign aid and domestic needs, the authors argue that politicians justify overseas climate aid as a politically safer alternative to confronting domestic policy failures [7].

More recent research by Heidland, Michael, Schularick, and Rainer Thiele justifies foreign aid as advancing the mutual interests of both countries. The authors argue that donor countries receive (i) economic returns, e.g. boosting exports and creating foreign direct investment (FDI) opportunities, (ii) geopolitical returns, e.g. gaining a favourable voting alignment in the UN, and (iii) security guarantees, i.e. protecting the donor from international threats [8]. The authors justify the trade-off in the domestic economy by weighing domestic welfare against foreign welfare on a utility function. It argues that the returns generated by aid effectively reduce the net cost of meeting domestic needs

- the “cost-offsetting” effect makes foreign aid justifiable even under periods of fiscal scarcity.

3 New Zealand-Pacific Aid Context

New Zealand has historically been a regional hegemon in the Pacific. In the last half-century, NZ has increasingly identified itself as part of the Pacific *whānau*, with its growing Pacific population and constitutional obligations to Tokelau, the Cook Islands, and Niue [9]. PICs are geographically remote and highly exposed to natural disasters and the effects of climate change. Given their small populations and limited domestic revenue, they are among the most aid-dependent countries in the world. New Zealand introduced the “Pacific Reset” policy in 2018. It was designed to strengthen the New Zealand-Pacific partnership and enhance New Zealand’s influence in the region by increasing aid and investment to Pacific Island nations [10]. Pacific aid is planned to take up 60% of New Zealand’s ODA spending between 2024 and 2027 [11]. This created much debate over the trade-offs between overseas aid and domestic economic needs. Winston Peters, Minister of Foreign Affairs, had noted that New Zealand taxpayers disapprove of multi-million-dollar aid grants overseas [12]. Many NGOs, such as World Vision NZ and Oxfam Aotearoa, have labelled government decisions to cut back on aid as a betrayal of Pacific neighbours, especially regarding funding for the climate crisis [13]. What is being contested is less scarcity than the reasons offered for putting the needs of some ahead of others. If the government reduces aid, it must explain why it prioritises domestic expenditure. If it maintains or increases aid, it must explain why overseas obligations warrant spending that could otherwise improve domestic economic conditions. This paper evaluates the justifications of foreign aid under domestic scarcity. To assess this, this study defines a set of normative criteria that strong justifications should satisfy and sets out four candidate moral logics. The justifications given are mapped to these frameworks, and the criteria are used to determine their strength and the order in which they should be considered.

4 Normative Criteria

This section sets out the normative criteria used to evaluate justifications for ODA to PICs in the context of New Zealand’s fiscal scarcity. Justifications given are ordered by their ability to satisfy four tests: (i) consistency, (ii) public reason, (iii) priority ordering and (iv) relationship legitimacy. The consistency criterion states that a justification should (a) apply the same principle(s) across matching cases, (b) the principle(s) support the policy, and (c) the principle(s) can be maintained across different claims the justification makes. A justification fails this test if it relies on incompatible reasons or applies its stated rule(s) selectively. The test requires that the same reason(s) can be offered to both New Zealand citizens and PICs to justify maintaining or changing the Pacific ODA. Developed from the work of John Rawls, the public reason criterion requires that foreign aid be justified by reasons that citizens could reasonably accept, i.e., through shared political values, regardless of private

beliefs [14]. A justification fails this test when it is based on specific beliefs or stems from ideological biases. The priority criterion requires that a justification specify how obligations are ordered when resources are scarce. A defensible justification must state which duties take precedence under scarcity. A justification fails this test if it fails to rank claims clearly. The relationship legitimacy criterion requires that the justifications for Pacific ODA be consistent with the partnership terms that New Zealand has promised to uphold. A defensible reason must treat Pacific states as partners with legitimate interests, i.e. ends in themselves [15]. A justification fails if it treats the NZ-Pacific relationship as purely instrumental or does not align with partnership obligations. These criteria set the standard of a defensible justification of Pacific ODA under domestic scarcity. This study continues by defining four frameworks and testing how each would construct such a justification.

5 Theoretical Frameworks

This section defines the frameworks used in evaluating justifications. It examines how each framework would construct its justification for Pacific ODA in the context of domestic scarcity. Each subsection ends by evaluating the justification's strength based on the number of previously defined criteria it meets.

5.1 Libertarianism

Libertarianism generally opposes government spending on foreign aid, viewing it as coercive redistribution that taxes citizens to fund foreign governments. It argues that aid creates dependency and hinders economic development [3]. However, it supports private charity and the promotion of free trade as means to assist foreign nations. The reduction of Pacific ODA is justified as necessary to advance the economic self-sufficiency of PICs. A transition from government-funded ODA to private investment is justified to assist the Pacific without exacerbating fiscal scarcity. These justifications meet the criteria of public reason and priority ordering. These justifications are relatively consistent across cases and in line with recent policies to cut Pacific ODA. However, it can be argued that a libertarian outlook treats Pacific nations as instruments in the larger scheme of free trade, undermining the NZ-Pacific relationship and thus failing to meet the criteria for relationship legitimacy.

5.2 Communitarianism

Communitarianism maintains that states have special obligations to those with whom they share a bounded community. It gives priority to citizens and to communities with which the state has special ties, such as PICs, over non-citizens. Foreign aid is unjustified under scarcity unless the recipient and donor countries share linkages, e.g., historical relationships, that define them as a community, e.g., the "Pacific whānau" [16]. Communitarianism structures the justification for Pacific ODA as follows. Domestic needs take priority in times of scarcity, as the NZ government's first obligation is to NZ citizens. However, New Zealand may still owe special duties to certain PIC(s) due to political obligations and historical promises. Communitarianism justifies ODA where it specifies these special ties. Communitarian justification is

consistent insofar as it distinguishes layers of obligations and applies them across similar cases. The Pacific has always been prioritised in New Zealand's ODA policies in the same way that domestic needs are prioritised under scarcity, namely by giving special obligations precedence over others. The arguments appeal to public reasons, as a state's duty for the good of its people is among the commonly acknowledged political values. Its order of priority is clear, and it meets the relationship legitimacy criteria by acknowledging the Pacific partnership as genuinely binding.

5.3 Cosmopolitanism

A cosmopolitan perspective holds that all persons have equal moral worth and that duties to persons are universal. Peter Singer argues that people have a duty of assistance, i.e. if they can prevent harm without sacrificing something comparably important, they ought to do so [17]. In terms of ODA, domestic scarcity does not eliminate duties to individuals abroad. If more economically developed countries (MEDCs) can provide aid to less economically developed countries (LEDCs) that reduce poverty at a moderate cost, they should do so. Pacific ODA is justified as follows. The citizens of PICs have interests that are equal to those of NZ citizens. If ODA prevents serious harm, then it is a morally urgent good, and New Zealand ought to fund it unless doing so would require sacrificing something comparably important. Given fiscal constraints, Pacific ODA is justified if it prevents greater harm than would result from its absence. This justification passes the consistency test, as it is based on a single principle: that persons have equal moral worth regardless of nationality. It appeals to public reasons by employing shared values, such as the prevention of avoidable suffering. Its order is clear, ranking impact and need-based aid above non-basic domestic expenditures. However, its link to the relationship legitimacy criterion is disputable. Compared with the communitarian justification, cosmopolitanism does not privilege relationship-based duties. Therefore, it may undervalue the Pacific-NZ partnership and the legitimacy of special commitments. Cosmopolitan may justify maintaining or increasing ODA overall rather than Pacific-first aid.

5.4 An Economic Outlook

This section sets out the economic features of the trade-off between Pacific ODA and domestic expenditure. It explains opportunity cost, time-horizon asymmetry, and the use of aid as an investment. As fiscal resources are scarce, using them in one area requires reducing their use elsewhere. Opportunity cost is the value of the best alternative use of the funds given. Government spending on Pacific ODA implies forgone domestic expenditure. In this way, any claim to increase Pacific ODA incurs a cost, spending on domestic needs, that must be justified as an opportunity cost - the second-best alternative - to the ODA itself. Time-horizon asymmetry means that the ODA-domestic spending trade-offs are difficult to estimate. While the costs of Pacific ODA are borne in the short run through the national budget, its benefits often materialise only in the long run and remain uncertain. Domestic costs are immediate and take a visible form in the economy as cost-of-living pressures. Thus, although Pacific aid can have long-term net benefits, it is difficult to weigh them against short-term costs. This explains certain inconsistencies between the government's justifications for Pacific aid and their reduction in real ODA.

Furthermore, aid can be used as an investment. Pacific ODA is given for long-run returns, such as regional stability, increasing factor mobility, and trade cooperation. Economic analysis bases justifications on market theory. In relation to the four criteria, these justifications are logically consistent and largely appeal to public reasons. However, the order of obligations under scarcity remains unclear due to the subjective nature of opportunity cost and the unpredictability of the time-lag. The relationship legitimacy criterion is rarely met, as the model posits rational, self-interested actors. ODA recipient countries may be treated as instruments for long-run returns by donor countries.

6 Mapping New Zealand Policy and Justification to Frameworks

This section maps the justifications offered in the current NZ political environment to the frameworks outlined above. This paper then identifies the strongest argument(s) as those that (i) meet the most criteria and (ii) are most consistently seen in NZ policy.

Casey Costello, the NZ Customs Minister, has argued that traditional aid to the Pacific should end and be replaced by long-term private investment to increase the Pacific economy's self-sufficiency [18]. This reason for reducing Pacific ODA aligns with libertarian principles and thus fails to meet all four criteria.

A communitarian perspective aligns with MFAT's statement that New Zealand's place is in the Pacific [19]. It justifies the Pacific as an extended community of shared cultural and historical links [11]. In line with the Pacific reset, MFAT identifies PICs as New Zealand's closest partners geographically and politically, as justification for Pacific ODA under scarcity [20]. Furthermore, the New Zealand International Development Cooperation (IDC) aims to use aid to create shared prosperity and stability in the Pacific [21]. These justifications for foreign aid meet all four criteria: they are stated consistently across various NZ policies, appeal to public reasons, and meet the standards of relationship legitimacy. Moreover, its priority is clear in the sense that New Zealand and PICs progress together, with aid to partner countries justified under scarcity.

The MFAT explains ODA as assistance to those most in need [20]. Aid is used to improve measures that (i) help countries be more prepared for disasters and (ii) reduce disaster risks. Pacific ODA is justified, in a cosmopolitan manner, as aid to those most vulnerable to natural hazards. New Zealand's geographical proximity to PICs means it can intervene quickly, either before a disaster occurs or early in its aftermath. This specific justification meets the criteria of consistency and public reason. It fits the relationship legitimacy criterion; however, as a cosmopolitan outlook, it does not prioritise the Pacific because of a special partnership but rather because of its vulnerability to natural disasters. Nevertheless, its priority under scarcity remains unclear, as no ordering rule is specified for allocating domestic expenditure and disaster relief aid.

Under the National Party (2008–2017), aid was justified as a means of creating conditions for economic growth and free trade [9]. This logic is also reflected in later

policy. For example, the IDC funds programs such as Strengthening Pacific Labour Mobility (SPLM), which increases the labour mobility of Pacific workers by supporting their participation in New Zealand labour schemes. It also supports the Recognised Seasonal Employer (RSE) scheme, which provides training for Pacific workers in New Zealand and improves their occupational mobility [22]. MFAT's five-year commitment from 2020 to 2025 to spend 20% of its total ODA on Aid for Trade in the Pacific shows that aid is being treated as an investment in future economic growth [23]. Similarly, the Pacific Agreement on Closer Economic Relations (PACER) Plus aims to increase exports from Pacific Island countries and encourage free trade and FDI [24]. This is intended to create a more stable trading environment while also improving market access for New Zealand suppliers and investors. These justifications meet the four criteria, but they are weak in setting a clear priority order, as the future effects of prioritising Pacific ODA under domestic scarcity remain uncertain.

This study argues that the strongest justifications are those grounded in communitarian and economic principles. Communitarian justifications meet the most criteria, and the economic ones are most consistently referred to in NZ policy. Furthermore, this research finds that a combination of cosmopolitan, communitarian, libertarian, and economic logic best explains the New Zealand government's stance on Pacific ODA. Aid ought to be given to reduce harm in crises and to recognise the NZ-Pacific partnership, but amid scarcity, opportunity costs must be accounted for, and a shift from government-funded ODA to private investment should be incentivised to increase PICs' economic self-sufficiency and promote free trade.

7 Discussion

This section covers the implications of this analysis, examines philosophies for inferring NZ's political morality, and assesses the paper's limitations. The contemporary consensus widely interprets NZ's political morality as broadly egalitarian, shaped by the Treaty of Waitangi, emphasising the inclusion of diverse cultures, and valuing itself as a "good neighbour" [25]. This analysis implies that New Zealand practices an aid aligned with the political morality of both cosmopolitan and communitarian perspectives. The MFAT offers humanitarian justifications for its aid policy, i.e., to those most vulnerable, and invokes NZ's relationship with PICs in its justifications. While the country's aid scheme generally aligns with liberal internationalist rhetoric, focusing on sustainable development and poverty alleviation in the Pacific, it is heavily influenced by national interests and diplomatic goals. The ODA program, administered by MFAT, is subject to changing government priorities and thus frequently shifts its emphasis.

This paper is subject to several methodological and scope-related limitations. This paper uses the method of sorting justifications into frameworks. However, that classification is subjective - a reader could dispute whether a policy is really communitarian or economic, so some conclusions depend on interpretation. Furthermore, the evaluative criteria that the paper chooses are contestable. The standards of consistency, public reasons, priority ordering and relationship legitimacy

are plausible, but other standards could be used. Another paper might include effectiveness or democratic accountability, which would change the result. The scope is broad and in some senses abstract. The paper treats “the Pacific” at a general level. PICs differ in their vulnerability and political relationship with NZ; thus, the argument may be too broad to apply accurately to every case. Lastly, aid decisions are often multi-causal, and official documents are both strategic and explanatory. The paper mainly analyses the public reasons the government gives for aid policy and neglects some implied or inferred motivations or justifications for aid. Consequently, the paper is stronger at evaluating the legitimacy of publicly stated justifications than at covering all potential justifications for ODA.

8 Conclusion

This paper concludes that the most plausible justification for changing or maintaining NZ’s ODA to PICs must recognise New Zealand’s special relationship with the Pacific, be grounded in humanitarian principles, and acknowledge ODA’s trade-offs with domestic stability. However, the opportunity cost of maintaining or changing foreign aid cannot be decisively justified nor resolved by any single framework or combination of frameworks. A comparison of New Zealand and Australia suggests that both countries use aid as part of a broader effort to preserve strategic influence in the Pacific and to respond to China’s growing presence in the region. Australia’s ‘Pacific Step-up’ and New Zealand’s ‘Pacific Reset’ policies reflected this objective through expanded development cooperation and diplomatic engagement. However, Australia’s Pacific policy is defended on the grounds of strategic competition and security concerns, while New Zealand’s approach is more closely tied to migration links and a strong sense of the Pacific as an extended regional community. This paper contributes to existing discussions by evaluating the aid debate as a deontological problem of public justification. It applies normative criteria to the NZ–Pacific case and offers a framework for assessing aid justifications under conditions of scarcity. Its framework combines economic analysis with political philosophy and provides a basis for evaluating such justifications.

References

1. The Treasury New Zealand: Fiscal Strategy Report 2025: Fiscal context. (2025). <https://budget.govt.nz/budget/2025/fiscal-strategy-report/fiscal-context.htm>
2. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD): Official Development Assistance. (2024). <https://www.oecd.org/en/topics/policy-issues/official-development-assistance-oda.html>
3. Rothbard, M.N.: *For a New Liberty: The Libertarian Manifesto*. (1973).
4. Walzer, M.: *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality*. Basic Books (1983).
5. Singer, P.: Famine, Affluence, and Morality. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 1(3), 229–243 (1972).
6. Huntington, S.P.: Foreign Aid for What and for Whom. *Foreign Policy* (1), 161–189 (1970).

7. Michaelowa, A., Michaelowa, K.: Climate or development: Is ODA diverted from its original purpose? HWWI Research Paper No. 4-2, Hamburg Institute of International Economics (2005).
8. Heidland, T., Michael, M., Schularick, M., Thiele, R.: Identifying mutual interests: How donor countries benefit from foreign aid. Kiel Working Paper No. 2291, Kiel Institute for the World Economy (2025).
9. Siaoisi, A.S.N.: The pua (frangipani), taniwha and dragon: New Zealand and China's foreign aid in the Pacific and local stakeholder perceptions – The case of Samoa. Doctoral dissertation, University of Canterbury (2022).
10. Cloutman, A.: What is the Impact of Foreign Aid in the Pacific? Master's thesis, University of Canterbury (2025).
11. New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade: Where our funding goes. (2024). <https://www.mfat.govt.nz/en/aid-and-development/our-approach-to-aid/where-our-funding-goes>
12. Peters, W.: A peaceful, prosperous, democratic Pacific. (2025). <https://www.beehive.govt.nz/speech/%E2%80%98peaceful-prosperous-democratic-pacific%E2%80%99>
13. Sachdeva, S.: Govt's climate aid reduction 'betrayal' of Pacific, NGOs say. *Newsroom* (2025). <https://newsroom.co.nz/2025/05/23/govts-climate-aid-reduction-betrayal-of-pacific-ngos-say>
14. Quong, J.: Public Reason. In: *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2022 Edition) (2022).
15. Kant, I.: *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Cambridge University Press (2012). (Original work published 1785).
16. Haua, I., Enari, D.: 'Whānau: an interconnected world': Re-examining Māori and Pasifika connections. *ResearchGate* (2023).
17. Singer, P.: *The Life You Can Save: Acting Now to End World Poverty*. Random House (2009).
18. Vailala, A.: NZ Customs Minister says aid to the Pacific should eventually end and become investment. *PMN* (2026). <https://pmn.co.nz/read/political/nz-customs-minister-says-aid-to-pacific-should-end-and-become-investment>
19. Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade: Apia – Our Story. (2024). <https://www.mfat.govt.nz/en/about-us/mfat75/75-our-story/apia>
20. Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade: Humanitarian Action. (2024). <https://www.mfat.govt.nz/en/aid-and-development/humanitarian-action>
21. Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade: Our approach to aid. (2024). <https://www.mfat.govt.nz/en/aid-and-development/our-approach-to-aid>
22. Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade: Labour Mobility. (2024). <https://www.mfat.govt.nz/en/aid-and-development/labour-mobility>
23. Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade: Australia and Pacific. (2024). <https://www.mfat.govt.nz/en/countries-and-regions/australia-and-pacific>
24. Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade: PACER Plus Overview. (2024). <https://www.mfat.govt.nz/en/trade/free-trade-agreements/free-trade-agreements-in-force/pacer-plus/overview>
25. Levine, S.: Political values: New Zealand's values and the wider world. *Te Ara – the Encyclopedia of New Zealand* (2012).

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

