Editors' Note

This special issue of the *New Zealand Population Review* engages with the notion of migration-led diversity, the ways in which it matters and comes to matter in 21st century Aotearoa New Zealand. Globally, the year 2019 has seen the continued reinvigoration of right-wing populism, which reverberated locally in the callous White supremacist shooting of members of the Muslim community in Christchurch on 15 March 2019. In the immediate aftermath of the massacre, 'New Zealanders' rushed to express their disbelief and anger at this murderous manifestation of racial hatred, describing it as an aberration that did not square with New Zealand values of tolerance and openness to diversity. However, in the debates that followed, the divergent perspectives and experiences of communities of colour soon surfaced. Alongside routine experiences of racism, from everyday micro-aggressions to systemic discrimination, these also included, for instance, the experience that Muslim communities had been scrutinised as potential terrorist threats while White males had escaped the same racial profiling (Al-Assad, 2019; Rahman, 2019). Drawing attention to the longstanding history and persistence of racism in this country routinely causes White discomfort and defensiveness (Kaho, 2019), which highlights a desire for harmony and cohesion that comes at the expense of acknowledging how racism as well as the persistence of settler-colonial structures shape people's life worlds differentially.

The discursive repertoires enabled by the racial settler colonial order of Aotearoa New Zealand and our position within this system frame our thinking about migration, diversity and difference: what diversity should look like, where and how it can be expressed, what its place and role in the 'host society' is, and how it should be 'managed'. One contemporary strand of this framing is the tendency to make a business case for diversity. As accelerated international mobility has led to greater population diversity in many countries, including Aotearoa New Zealand, the notion of a 'diversity dividend' has been gaining traction. By now deeply entrenched in policy, business and also academic discourses, this rhetoric forms the basis for efforts to 'realise', 'capture', 'maximise' or even 'reap' the dividends, benefits

or advantages of diversity. This suggests a strategic approach to both framing and managing diversity, which, at first glance, appears to entail a commitment to diversity; that is, to the representation and inclusion of 'diverse' people and to equality. While this pro-diversity approach looks ostensibly positive, it is important to deconstruct its motivations, practices and implications. We argue that this paradigm is problematic in a number of ways. To summarise these only briefly. Firstly, the benefits of diversity are almost exclusively framed in economic terms and reduced to economic indicators such as GDP and GDP per capita. For businesses, globalising cities, and host societies more broadly, diversity has become a tool to boost productivity, profits and prosperity (for example, Page, 2007; Wood & Landry 2008). However, the causal relations between diversity and economic growth are unclear. Secondly, such dividend framing structures migration policies, privileging those migrants who are deemed to be particularly 'valuable' (Collins, 2020) and therefore reproducing stratification and inequalities. This also creates expectations of migrants to contribute to society in ways that are not applied to residents without migrant background (Simon-Kumar, 2015). It is telling, for instance, that narratives of the contributions migrants and former refugees make are frequently drawn on to counter opposition to immigration. Furthermore, the economic imperative neglects both the complexities of population diversity and its effects in manifold social arenas. In this context, it is important to explore how institutional and state approaches to managing migration and diversity shape the narrative of a diversity dividend. Last but not least, diversity discourses arguably divert attention from analyses of racism and the reproduction of racialised advantage and disadvantage and, in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand, the focus on ethno-cultural diversity also obfuscates Indigeneity and the state's settler colonial structure as dimensions that are integral to understanding the racialisation of different groups.

The motivation for this special issue arose from our own entanglement with such discourses in an academic setting as part of the CaDDANZ research team. Short for *Capturing the Diversity Dividend of Aotearoa/New Zealand*, the CaDDANZ research programme encompasses a variety of quantitative and qualitative research projects that collectively set out to "identify how New Zealand can better prepare for, and respond to […], demographic changes in order for the country to maximise the benefits

associated with an increasingly diverse population" (CaDDANZ, n.d.). Cognisant of the programme's complicity in furthering discourses that serve to reproduce discourses and practices that effectively stratify populations, in this special issue, we propose that the very idea of a diversity dividend needs to be critically evaluated.

For this purpose, this special issue of the *New Zealand Population Review* brings together contributions by scholars who have extensively researched demographic change, the fluidity of cultural identities, the role of Māori in shaping approaches to immigration, and how population diversity manifests and matters in workplaces, institutions and neighbourhoods.

In the commentary that opens this special issue, **Francis Collins** delves deeper into the diversity dividend problematic. He critically illuminates the origins and dimensions of the diversity dividend as a pervasive contemporary political project. He specifically draws attention to the ways in which this ideology has been strategically deployed to "extract value" from ethnic diversity and how it manifests in the state-led stratification of migrants in New Zealand immigration policy. Collins concludes his critique of "the fraught logics" of the diversity dividend paradigm with a call for a transformative agenda that acknowledges the intersections of diversity and inequalities as well as the settler colonial structures embedded in Aotearoa New Zealand.

One step removed from problematising the diversity dividend per se, the first two papers make the case for a more complex understanding of diversity. **Michael Cameron** and **Jacques Poot** use census data to reveal how ethnic diversity has changed rapidly over time, and how it is expected to change in the future. While previous research has tended to obscure both regional variation and heterogeneity within broad ethnic categories, their use of the cohort change method allows them to project disaggregated ethnic populations, and to compare diversity across regions. Following on, **Lars Brabyn, Natalie Jackson, Glen Stitchbury** and **Tristan McHardie** argue that it is necessary to gain a more nuanced understanding of socio-demographic diversity and population change that takes account of the complex interplay of multiple structural factors including natural growth, ageing and migration as well as its distinct spatial patterns. Of specific interest to end users of such data, such as local and central government and public services, the New Zealand Atlas of Population Change (NZAPC) is discussed as an

alternative tool to other available online maps. Featuring maps accompanied by researcher-informed narratives rather than simply data, this atlas allows end users of population and diversity data to derive greater benefit and a deeper understanding of diversity patterns.

Responding to population diversity has become core business for many organisations. This includes inward-facing diversity strategies (such as HR policies), which aim to manage representation within the workforce, and also outward facing strategies. While some organisations explicitly provide services to new migrants, for others, engagement with new migrants and ethnic communities is part of a wider remit. **Geoff Stone** and **Robin Peace** report on a programme of developmental evaluations that were undertaken with English Language Partners New Zealand and New Zealand Police in order to establish the capacity and capability of these institutions to respond to diversity. In its methodological focus, the article draws two main conclusions. For one, it emphasises the value of developmental evaluations for gaining an understanding of how organisations conceptualise diversity and the variety of factors that shape their responsiveness. Secondly, in reflecting on the work undertaken, the authors highlight the value of developmental evaluations for the organisations insofar as "a critical evaluative friend" can enable them to develop stronger responses to diversity.

One particular discourse that has run in parallel to that of maximising the benefits of diversity is that of mitigating the ostensible challenges of living with difference. Internationally and in Aotearoa New Zealand, the notion of social cohesion has been a central frame for discussions of how to 'manage' diversity. Primarily revolving around the ideas of shared values and integration, cohesion has mostly been conceptualised as situated at the level of the state. **Robin Peace** and **Paul Spoonley** revisit the New Zealand policy debates about the utility of social cohesion as a policy framework. Charting reasons for its limited uptake in the policy space as well as limitations of the concept, they offer a novel way of conceptualising cohesion, not as a property of diverse individuals but situated in the interpersonal relations that are enacted daily in quotidian contexts. They argue for a broader, more inclusive understanding of difference and for a shift from an abstract idea of cohesion to cohesive ties, as something that can be observed and potentially measured in everyday encounters between people. For these cohesive ties to form, there must be

scope for interactions to occur. **Dave Maré's** contribution to this special issue focuses on Auckland, New Zealand's most diverse city, where well-documented ethnic segregation limits residents' opportunities to interact across ethnic groups. He measures diversity by both ethnicity and birthplace and looks at where people both live and work. This novel approach reveals that commuting to work raises people's exposure to diversity, particularly for those living in areas of low diversity.

Neighbourhood diversity is also the theme of **Jessica Terruhn's** contribution. Using the Auckland suburb of Northcote as a case study, she critically examines the role diversity plays in policy and planning documents that guide an ongoing large-scale housing development and revitalisation project in Northcote. She demonstrates that diversity dividend rhetoric is central to developer-led visions for the new neighbourhood and that ethno-cultural and income diversity are selectively employed to justify state-led gentrification under the guise of housing mix. She concludes that the diversity rhetoric benefits those already privileged while risking the direct or indirect displacement of existing low-income residents.

The function served by diversity discourse in media representations of immigrants is then analysed by **Sandy Lee** and **Trudie Cain**. Their analysis of immigration-focused newspaper articles over a one-year period in the lead up to the 2017 general election shows that migrants were regularly framed negatively, as morally inferior. In addition, even pro-immigration articles tended to focus on the economic benefits that could be accrued by migrants' presence in New Zealand and participation in the labour force. The authors argue that this diversity dividend framing denies the human needs and desires of migrants, and therefore contributes to the dehumanisation of migrants.

Taking the critique of diversity as diversion from racism and inequities and its overly narrow focus on ethnicity further, **Arama Rata** and **Faisal Al-Asaad** emphasise that the ideology of diversity conflates differences between peoples of colour in the settler colonial context of Aotearoa New Zealand. More specifically, its framing around inclusion and recognition of cultural difference obfuscates the particular political location of Indigeneity and cannot usefully address Indigenous sovereignty. Instead, it subsumes Indigeneity under the umbrella of ethnic difference and in doing so, the authors argue, inhibits relationships between Māori and tauiwi (settlers) of colour to the point of antagonising racialised minorities. The core

concern of the article is how to allow relationships that are based on solidarity and united in opposition to White supremacy and settler colonialism to flourish. Drawing on interviews with Māori community leaders, the authors propose the Indigenous concept of whakawhanaungatanga as a framework for building relationships between Māori and tauiwi of colour. Subverting the dominant settler state approach to diversity, strategies of whakawhanaungatanga revolve around a conditional solidarity that is based on recognition of intersecting histories and experiences of "settler colonial racialisation and oppression" as well as potential alignment of anti-racism and sovereignty movements.

Jessica Terruhn
Arama Rata
(Guest Editors)
December 2019

References

Al-Assad, F. (2019, 17 March) Today, we mourn. Tomorrow, we organise. *Overland*.
        https://overland.org.au/2019/03/today-we-mourn-tomorrow-we-organise/

CaDDANZ (n.d.). *About us*.
        http://www.caddanz.org.nz/massey/learning/departments/centres-research/caddanz/caddanz_home.cfm

Collins, F. L. (2020) Legislated inequality: Provisional migration and the stratification of migrant lives. In R. Simon-Kumar, F. L. Collins, & W. Friesen (Eds), *Intersections of Inequality, Migration and Diversification: the politics of mobility in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 65–86), Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Pivot.

Kaho, S. (2019, December 8) Getting past white defensiveness. *E-Tanagata.* https://e-tangata.co.nz/comment-and-analysis/getting-past-white-defensiveness/

Page, S.E. (2007) *The difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rahman, A. (2019, 17 March) We warned you. We begged. We pleaded. And now we demand accountability. *The Spinoff.* https://thespinoff.co.nz/society/17-03-2019/we-warned-you-we-begged-we-pleaded-and-now-we-demand-accountability/

Simon-Kumar, R. (2015). Neoliberalism and the new race politics of migration policy: Changing profiles of the desirable migrant in New Zealand. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *41*(7), 1172–1191.

Wood, P., & Landry, C. (2008). *The intercultural city: planning for diversity advantage*. London, United Kingdom: Earthscan.