

To whom it may concern at the RBNZ Digital Cash public consultation,



Even with decades of research behind me of New Zealand's present entirely foreign investment bank underwritten as compounding interest-bearing loans money supply system, which I contend has already been bad enough for New Zealand society, as the foreign privately owned investment banks at the heart of it, have taken advantage of the price of land, sale of existing houses and interest mortgage payments being excluded from the Consumer Price Index measure of inflation, to overextended computer entry credit into the non-productive residential property sector well out of balance with the nations physical productive capacity to ever earn enough to sustainably service the debt, I approached the RBNZ public consultation of CBDC and RBNZ Digital Cash with an open mind.

I have read many of the RBNZ documents and watched the 29 May 2024 RBNZ consultation meeting with the Finance and Expenditure Select Committee of Parliament featuring RBNZ lead on the issue Ian Woolford, along with many other appearances he and others have made.

Getting straight to what my decades of research lead me to believe is the crux of the matter I will zoom in on the protecting of our nation's Monetary Sovereignty claimed benefit.

I would argue that presently via the NZ Debt Management, within the NZ Treasury, RBNZ funding structures, in that order, our monetary sovereignty remains abdicated to the same foreign privately owned investment banks it did from our colonial past, as we still use their Credit Debt as the origination mechanism of our entire money supply, with sovereign cash (Coins and notes) only coming into play when private bank customers want physical representation of private bank digital currency for which they pay seignorage (Difference between cost of manufacture and face value of the time) for.

So surely we are only talking about preserving the structural ability to one day take up our right of monetary sovereignty, such as we have maintaining an alternative electronic payment settlement outside of the private banks in play as we do, should the political decision ever be made to do so.

Given how I already have grave concerns about the present foreign bank underwritten money supply systems of our nation I look at this issue trying to assess whether it is someone finally looking to have the back of our society with this or is it going to be another mechanism for the senior most private owners of foreign banks to further extort our nation.

To best quickly sum up if I would support a CBDC or RBNZ Digital Cash (Which is an oxymoron as no digital currency electronically transferred can ever technically be called cash, only coins and notes ever can be) I will list the standards either would have to be up to before I would support them:

The RBNZ must also offer direct loans of New Zealand Digital Cash for productive economic purposes or natural disaster crisis recovery, at business cost covering fees only rather than compounding interest, run as a non-profit nation-building or rebuilding, public trust, without foreign borrowing.

The RBNZ must provide the wallet service.

Sovereign coins and notes must always remain readily available and to be deposited at a Post Office Kiwibank Branch alongside any other currency at no cost to any business, with the manufacturing of them to be returned to New Zealand.

All gold royalties from non state owned gold mines are to be markedly increased and paid in physical gold, building a national gold reserve.

Only then will we be a true monetary sovereign nation rather than only a semi-autonomous foreign privately owned investment bank debt colony we remain by political choice at present.

After having watched the consultation meeting between the RBNZ representatives and the Parliament Finance and Expenditure Select Committee I honestly could not work out if New Zealand society or the foreign privately owned investment banks our money supply remains contracted out to would benefit the most, and to be frankly honest I don't think anyone at the meeting did either.

This worries me very much.

Yours sincerely
Iain Parker