IN THE WAITANGI TRIBUNAL

WAI 1750
WAI 1920

IN THE MATTER of The Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975

AND of claims in the North-Eastern Bay of Plenty Historical Inquiry (Wai 1750)

AND a claim made by Rachel Maunganui Wolfgramm, Tania Haerekiterā Wolfgramm, Wikuki Kingi, Jason Paul Mika and Te Rēinga Kingi-Chase on behalf of all whānau whānui, marae, hapū, iwi and Māori of Aotearoa (Wai 1920)

PRESENTATION SUMMARY OF JOINT BRIEF OF EVIDENCE OF RACHEL MAUNGANUI WOLFGRAMM, TANIA HAEREKITERĀ WOLFGRAMM AND JASON PAUL MIKA

Dated 28 August 2026

RECEIVED
Waitangi Tribunal
28 Aug 26
Ministry of Justice
WELLINGTON

WACKROW PANOHO
& ASSOCIATES

Level 5, 50 Kitchener Street
Po Box 461
AUCKLAND
Raewyn Clark / Bobbi Walker
Ph. (09) 379 5026
E mail: raewyn@wpalawyers.co.nz / bobbi@wpalawyers.co.nz

Introduction

Rachel Wolfgramm

Ko Te Whakatōhea, Te Aupouri me Ngāi Takoto ōku iwi. Hineīāhua Rangihaerepō me Horiana Balneavis Rangihaerepō ōku tīpuna nō Ngāi Tamahaua, Ngāti Patumoana me Ūpokorehe. Maunganui Kapa ōku tipuna no Te Aupouri. Ko Horiana Kapa Haggar ōku whaea, ko Tevita Tapueluelu Wolfgramm tōku papa nō Vava'u, Pule'anga Fakatu'i 'o Tonga. E 56 ngā mema o tō tātou whānau.

Ko James Seranke Rolfe tōku hoa rangatira. Tokorua ā māua tamariki, a ko Isaac Jason, ko Ash David. E noho ana ahau kei Kohaturoa, Mahurangi, Te Raki o Tamaki Makaurau.

Tania Wolfgramm

Ko Te Whakatōhea, Te Aupouri, Ngāi Takoto ōku iwi. Ko Te Rangihaerepō te tupuna Rangatira o Te Whakatōhea. Ko Tevita Tapueluelu Wolfgramm raua ko Horiana Kapa Hagger ōku mātua. Ko Wikuki Kingi tōku hoa Rangatira. Ko Johanna, Darcy, Vincent āku tamariki. Ko Aliyaha, Hayley, Mason āku mokopuna. Ko au Tania Haerekiterā Wolfgramm.

Jason Mika

Ko Ngāi Tūhoe, ko Ngāti Awa, ko Te Whakatōhea, ko Ngāti Kahungunu ōku iwi. Ko Te Manapakupaku Mika tōku koroua i noho mai rā i Tapuiwāhine, ki te whārua o Rūātoki. Ka moe a Te Mana Mika i a Ripeka Poihipi nō Te Whakatōhea. Nā rāua ka puta ko Taima, ko Mere, ko Tui, ko Ripeka, ko Hare, ko Ani, ko Paddy, ko Wyness, rātau ko Tāpene. Ka moe a Ani i a Paddy Cassin nō Ngāti Awa. Nā Ani rāua ko Paddy ka puta ko Hiria rāua ko Hone. I whāngaia a Hiria e Parati Merito rāua ko Mamaeroa Meihana i Poroporo. I whāngaia a Hone e te koroua a Hawera Tuna nō Rāroa i Te Waimana.

Ka moe a Hiria i a Paul Pettit, he Pākehā no Taumarere ki te Taitokerau. Nā Hiria rāua ko Paul ka puta ko au. I whānau mai ahau i Whakatāne i te 18 Pēpuere 1971, ēngari, nā tōku kuia, nā Ani Mika rāua ko tōku koroua a Pateriki Adams nō Ngāti Kahu ki Whangaroa ahau i whāngai. I whakatipu ai ahau me āku tuahine a Tania me Tina i Rotorua i te nuinga o te wā e tamaiti ana ahau tae noa ki te mutunga o te kura tuarua. Ko Valencia nee Finau tōku hoa wāhine. Tokotoru ā māua tamariki, a ko Hiria Alison, ko Jason John-Paul, ko Emily Wyness. Tokowhā āku tamariki pakeke atu i te tokotoru nei, arā, ko Jade Kerry, ko Patrick Paora, ko Ripeka Katarina, rātau ko Taiarahia Akolo. Kai Tāmaki Makaurau ahau e noho ana, e mahi ana mō Waipapa Taumata Rau. He kairangahau pakihi tāku mahi.

1. We, Rachel Wolfgramm, Tania Wolfgramm and Jason Mika, along with Wikuki Kingi and Te Rēinga Kingi-Chase, are named claimants for the Wai 1920 claim. We acknowledge the original claimants, Dr Manuka Henare, Te Uranga O Te Ra Wikuki Kingi Tohunga JP QSM and Puroko Fraser Tawhai of TE HA Leadership group, who first filed the Wai 1920 claim in 2008.

2. Drawing on our respective academic backgrounds and expertise in Māori economic development, we provide this evidence to assist the Tribunal in understanding the culminative and intergenerational economic consequences of Crown actions and omissions in the Inquiry district.

3. A central proposition of our evidence is that the Crown raupatu did not simply deprive Whakatōhea of their lands, it dismantled an existing and thriving Māori economy and

fundamentally changed the economic trajectory of the iwi. The resulting consequences continue today through diminished wealth, reduced economic participation, constrained opportunities, and the inability of generations to accumulate and transfer wealth. We consider that an assessment of prejudice of this type, must be informed by an accurate quantification of the economic loss. We have therefore proposed a framework through which the Tribunal can assess the scale of economic loss suffered by Whakatōhea and identify Treaty-consistent remedies capable of addressing that prejudice.

4. Throughout our brief of evidence, we refer to a range of academic sources, including our own work, that support the concepts and propositions advanced. A bibliography of these materials has been provided for the Tribunal's consideration.

Whakatōhea economy pre-raupatu

5. The evidential record in this inquiry demonstrates that prior to raupatu Whakatōhea possessed a functioning and productive economy founded upon collective ownership of land, access to natural resources, agricultural production, coastal trade and commercial enterprise.

6. Historical evidence demonstrates that Whakatōhea actively participated in regional markets, invested in productive assets and generated economic surplus through trade. In the decades before raupatu, Whakatōhea operated a substantial trading fleet, generated significant recorded export income through regional and inter-colonial trade, and consistently reinvested that income in productive infrastructure such as roads, bridges, mills and farm machinery.

7. In our opinion, Whakatōhea should be understood as an Indigenous economic entity. Constituent hapū and whānau collectively participate in economic activity for the benefit of their people. The confiscation of Whakatōhea lands therefore did more than remove individual assets. It dismantled the economic base upon which future prosperity depended.

8. We say in our evidence that the transfer of Whakatōhea land and resources to the Crown, and subsequently to settlers, simultaneously weakened the Whakatōhea economy while strengthening the settler economy. This represented a structural transfer of wealth and productive capacity from one economy to another. That structural transfer is not merely an inference from the fact of confiscation; it is demonstrated in the historical record before this Inquiry.

9. Concurrently, the trajectory of wealth accumulation and reinvestment was extinguished by raupatu and then by the subsequent confinement of Whakatōhea to a small fraction of an acre of productive land per person on marginal reserve land. In our opinion, it is that lost trajectory of growth and reinvestment – and not merely the value of the land physically taken – that must be measured when assessing the economic prejudice Whakatōhea has suffered.

Intergenerational wealth and taken economy

10. We have advanced in our evidence concepts of intergenerational wealth and the taken economy to demonstrate a link between historic dispossession and the socio-economic position Whakatōhea are today. The stark contrast between intergenerational wealth and intergenerational poverty in New Zealand highlights the growing economic inequality that has

social implications for ‘unequal societies’. While a small segment of the population of the North-East Bay of Plenty continues to accumulate significant wealth, many families, particularly Māori, face entrenched ‘multigenerational poverty’.

11. Much has been written regarding intergenerational poverty and intergenerational trauma experienced by Māori. We consider that equal attention should be given to the concept of intergenerational wealth. We refer to Dr Tania Wolfgramm’s report for the Waitangi Tribunal’s Mana Wahine Kaupapa Inquiry to demonstrate this.

12. The report records, for example, that BERL’s analysis for te ōhanga wāhine Māori the assets of the Māori women’s economy at $18.1 billion in 2022, with contributions of $5.9 billion to production GDP, $10.6 billion to income GDP and $19.7 billion to expenditure GDP nationally, together with a further $6.6 billion in unpaid ‘mahi aroha’ – caregiving, household and community work – performed annually. This same report documents the corollary: that a disproportionate number of Māori, and wāhine Māori and their whānau in particular, continue to live in areas of high socio-economic deprivation as measured by the New Zealand Deprivation Index, and that disparities in outcomes such as home ownership between Māori and non-Māori women persisted, and in some respects widened, between 1990 and 2020.

13. In our opinion, that contemporary pattern of concentrated wealth alongside concentrated and persistent deprivation is the observable, present-day expression of the same ‘taken economy’ we describe in relation to Whakatōhea. Intergenerational wealth involves more than the transfer of financial assets. Transmission of land, productive resources, knowledge, commercial capability, relationships, governance experience and opportunities from one generation to the next are also features of this transference.

14. Through forced confiscation and coerced alienation, the Crown took parcels of land and resources from our people. With it, the Crown took the foundation upon which our economic independence was built, along with the authority to organise and manage these resources in the Whakatōhea way. Where our people have been deprived of our productive base, the effects have been carried forward through whānau lines. The loss has deprived our whānau, hapū, and iwi the opportunity to generate wealth, maintain sustainable livelihoods, and pass down assets through generations of whānau.

15. Each generation inherits fewer assets, fewer choices and fewer opportunities for education and enterprise, while accumulating a heavier burden of social and economic stress. That loss becomes pervasive and embedded in housing, employment, income, health, education and migration patterns.

16. Economic deprivation affects our ability to remain on our whenua, maintain our marae, support our kaumātua, and raise our tamariki in our own communities. Where our economic base has been removed, whānau leave the rohe for access to work, education and housing. The loss is not only a financial matter, but a cultural violence that rends our communities a part.

17. While creating individual opportunities, the local Māori economy is weakened by an urbanising population and an exodus of leadership, labour and purchasing power. We also see

a direct connection between intergenerational trauma, wellbeing and wealth. Moreover, agencies such as the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE), carry out functions that Māori communities, iwi, hapū, and whānau in the North-Eastern Bay of Plenty were historically denied: access to opportunities and the mobilising of capital to build industry capabilities through enterprise. This ministry's existence reinforces our point that economies do not develop by accident; they are shaped by policy.

18. Agencies such as the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE), carry out functions that Māori communities, iwi, hapū, and whānau in the North-Eastern Bay of Plenty were historically denied: access to opportunities and the mobilising of capital to build industry capabilities through enterprise. This ministry's existence reinforces our point that economies do not develop by accident; they are shaped by policy.

Economic modelling and quantifying the Māori economy

19. In our view, proper assessment of the Whakatōhea economy cannot simply measure present-day income, employment, business ownership or asset value. It must also assess what the Whakatōhea economy could have become had our hapū and iwi continued developing our resources on our own terms. That modelling needs to quantify the loss of wealth and opportunity caused by the alienation of our land, the restriction of our access to natural resources, and the disruption of our systems of production, trade and collective decision-making.

20. We therefore propose that a robust counterfactual model proceeds in four stages. We. First, it establishes the pre-raupatu baseline: the size and scale of Te Whakatōhea land and resource base, population, trade and productive assets immediately before Crown intervention, drawn from the historical record before this Inquiry.

21. Second, the modelling should project a counterfactual growth trajectory for the baseline forward to the present day, applying reasonable and evidenced growth assumptions – for example, comparable rates of asset and income growth achieved by iwi with an intact or restored economic base following Treaty settlement, and national and regional GDP growth over the same period – while adjusting for the compounding effect of intergenerational reinvestment described above.

22. Third, the modelling should establish the actual position of Whakatōhea today, including present land holdings, asset base, income, employment and business ownership.

23. Fourth, the modelling calculates loss as the difference between counterfactual and actual positions, expressed both in monetary and non-monetary scale of loss.

24. This is not a novel methodology. BERL employed a similar approach to quantify the scale of te ōhanga Māori, the Māori economy and te ōhanga wāhine Māori, which measures the Māori women's economy both by asset and by income, and additionally valued the contribution of unpaid or 'mahi aroha' economic activity. The same combination of asset base valuation, GDP contribution analysis, and valuation of non-market economic activity may be applied at hapū or iwi level to model what an intact Whakatōhea economy would look like today.

25. We also emphasise that the absence of hapū and iwi-disaggregated economic data is not a neutral gap. As is separately documented in the context of Crown engagement with wāhine Māori and Māori research more generally, the Crown's persistent failure to measure, map and quantify its engagement with, and impact upon, Māori economic activity is itself a continuing feature of the prejudice we describe. This data gap makes demonstrating the scale of what has been lost difficult. In our view, this difficulty should not be allowed to relieve the Crown of its obligation to provide itself and Māori with accurate information on the impact Crown breaches of the Treaty have had on the Whakatōhea economy.

26. Before the full force of Crown intervention was brought to bear, Whakatōhea were not passive participants in the economy. We were active owners, producers, international traders and national competitors. Our economic base included land, forests, waterways, harbours, fisheries, cultivations, and the authority to organise and manage those resources collectively. In our view, any counterfactual model needs to recognise that Māori were capable of competing in, adapting to, and shaping the settler economy.

27. If Whakatōhea and other Māori of the North-Eastern Bay of Plenty had not been excluded from critical economic opportunities, the value of our economy today would likely include not only the value of the assets we retained, but also the accumulated value of businesses, infrastructure, and the intergenerational capital that would have flowed from an intact productive base. For that reason, we do not consider the question to be simply what the North-Eastern Bay of Plenty economy is worth now. The more important question – simply put – is what value was negated because of Crown treaty breaches.

28. A comparative analysis should examine the contemporary regional economy and then ask what proportion of that activity would reasonably have been Māori-led or Māori-owned if the Crown had not used law, policy and force to remove Māori from the economic landscape. In that sense, the loss we speak of is not confined to land as a physical 'asset'. The loss necessarily includes: lost scale; lost bargaining power; lost access to capital; lost governance authority; lost commercial confidence; lost population retention, and lost capacity to transmit wealth between generations.

29. We do not offer precise figures in our evidence, as that is properly a matter for expert economic evidence, but we consider the Tribunal should require any such modelling to address each of these components explicitly, rather than treating the loss as confined to the value of the land alone.

Sustainable Māori economy through tikanga

30. Where Crown policy historically undermined our economic capacity, we consider that a Treaty-consistent response must now include active support for Māori-led regional economic development in the North-Eastern Bay of Plenty. Modern Māori economic development must deliberately intervene and invest in building up the capacity of our regional economies through a process guided by Māori aspirations to be self-determining, consistent with the principle of tino rangatiratanga (Awatere et al., 2017; Mika et al., 2016a). Moreover, we argue that to be effective, Māori economic development must be guided by conceptualisations of economy and enterprise that originate from a te ao Māori world view and mātauranga Māori

that integrates where appropriate and beneficial elements of non-Māori knowledge at the iwi, hapū and whānau scales (Mika et al., 2016b; Mika & Niu, 2025; Spiller et al., 2025).

31. We observe that where regional Māori economic institutions have been formed, whether regional Māori tourism organisations, Māori business networks, or Māori economic agencies, they have done so without rightful access to public funding, relying instead of voluntarism ('mahi aroha'), taking up service contracts which impinge upon tino rangatiratanga, and adapting business development modalities that do not come from or serve our whānau, hapu, iwi, and Māori entrepreneurs.

32. A sustainable Māori economy in the North-Eastern Bay of Plenty is an economy grounded in te ao Māori, which broadly encompasses five key elements: mātauranga Māori, tikanga Māori, reo Māori, kaupapa Māori, and wawata Māori. When based on a Māori world view, the Māori economy at all levels is an inherently environmental economy,

33. A Māori environmental economy is one in which the human economy is embedded in the nonhuman realm of the environment, which has both spiritual and physical dimensions because the world exists as a consequence of cosmological beings from which humans descend and upon whom humans depend for their existence. In te ao Māori, nature is viewed as a "unified spiritual-socioecology" in which economic relations are guided by an ethic of kaitiakitanga, or guardianship over material and nonmaterial resources, and success is reflected in relational balance between human and nonhuman elements.

34. If our Whakatōhea economy had been allowed to flourish according to tikanga, it would have created value in ways that protected people, place and planet. It would have treated whenua, wai, ngahere, moana and other taonga not as commodities but as living relationships carrying responsibilities and benefits.

35. Modelling this kind of economy, therefore, requires a broader understanding of value. Economic value includes income, employment, productivity, business ownership, investment and assets. But intrinsic value includes the health of te taiao, the ability of hapū to exercise kaitiakitanga, the transmission of mātauranga, and the wellbeing of present and future generations, which is reflected in Māori business and economic philosophy, exemplified in manahau (Mika et al., 2022a), economy of mana (Dell et al., 2018; Hēnare, 2018), and Māori economies of wellbeing (Spiller et al., 2025).

36. A tikanga-based economy would hold those forms of value together rather than trade one off against the other. It would ask whether economic activity strengthens the mauri of the rohe, whether benefits are shared across whānau and hapū, and whether decision-making remains accountable to those who carry whakapapa and responsibilities to the place.

37. Economies depend on access to capital for enterprise formation, innovation, resource mobilisation, as mediums of exchange and measures of wealth. While Māori readily adapted to the colonial monetary system to facilitate trade with the settler economy and to finance international trade, including the formation of Māori-owned banking institutions, access to finance has been a constraint for Māori as a consequence of Crown Treaty breaches and the impact of colonisation. While some analysts attribute problems of Māori access to capital to

market failure, others show that colonisation was financed through the individualisation and alienation of Māori land through subsequent indebtedness, and unfair and illegal land purchases. Ongoing exclusion of Māori from access to and use of their natural resources for economic development negated our ability to accumulate savings and capital. Multiple attempts have since been made to develop institutions, policies and programmes to improve Māori access to capital, necessary to build Māori enterprise capability; advance Māori economic growth; apply Māori values to investment; and to collectivise tribal capital with international financial providers. None of these efforts have so far materialised into a Māori financial intermediary capable of serving Māori aspirations for self-determined economic development among whānau, hapū, iwi, and Māori enterprise of various scales and stages of the business lifecycle.

38. On this basis, the economic loss suffered by Māori in the North-Eastern Bay of Plenty is also the loss of a development pathway, which has deprived whānau, hapū and iwi of this rohe with pathways toward mauri ora, human flourishing (Durie, 2016). The issue is not only that we have been prevented from accumulating assets; it is also that hapū-specific systems of care for te taiao were displaced by Crown and settler systems that often-separated economic use from cultural responsibility.

Remedies sought

39. We consider that any Treaty-consistent remedy must be commensurate with the scale, duration and compounding character of the economic harm we have described. It is not enough for redress to address the original taking of land in isolation; it must also address the trajectory of loss that has continued, and compounded, in the generations since.

40. Each element of redress set out in our evidence responds to a specific dimension of the prejudice we detailed. We consider that redress should include recommendations that the Crown:

    a. Establish and fund, by way of ongoing appropriation, a regional Māori economic development agency for the North-Eastern Bay of Plenty inquiry district, to support the economic recovery of Whakatōhea and other Māori of the inquiry district; and

    b. Support the establishment of Māori-owned and Māori-controlled financial institutions within the Inquiry district, including a Māori bank, to provide Māori with equitable access to capital and credit;

41. These first two measures respond directly to the loss of scale, governance authority and access to capital identified earlier in this evidence. Without a dedicated Māori-governed development agency and Māori-controlled financial institutions, Whakatōhea and other Māori communities remain structurally excluded from the very mechanisms of accumulation that the Crown's breaches originally denied them. A regional economic development agency for the North-Eastern Bay of Plenty inquiry district would perform, on a Whakatōhea and district-specific basis, the kind of function that agencies such as the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment already perform for other parts of the economy such as

mobilising capital and building industry capability. These two critical components of economic development were historically denied to Te Whakatōhea.

c. Reform Crown and local government procurement policy and practice to ensure equitable access for Whakatōhea businesses and Māori-owned enterprises to government contracts and procurement opportunities;

42. Procurement reform responds to the loss of bargaining power and commercial confidence we describe above. A Māori economy that was prevented, by Crown law, policy and force, from competing on equal terms cannot be expected to compete on equal terms today without deliberate structural support of this kind.

d. Ensure that the basic needs of Māori communities are met, including ending Māori homelessness, and by ensuring equitable Māori access to health and education services and outcomes, recognising the ongoing economic consequences of historic and continuing Crown failure in these areas;

43. Ensuring that the basic needs of Māori communities are met is not, in our view, separate from economic redress; it is integral to it. As we have described, the erosion of the productive base has been carried forward through housing, health, education and migration outcomes, and each generation has inherited fewer assets, fewer choices and a heavier burden of social and economic cost as a result. Redress that does not address these compounding effects will not restore the economic position that was lost.

e. Provide full and comprehensive monetary compensation to Māori for the loss of economic development opportunity caused by the Crown's breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi and its principles, including the value of the Māori economy foregone as a result of those breaches.

44. A calculation of redress requires detailed evidential support spanning the full and comprehensive monetary compensation for the Māori economy foregone. We do not consider that this figure can properly be estimated without comprehensive, independent economic modelling. We therefore recommend that the Tribunal direct, or the parties commission, expert economic modelling applying the four-step methodology we have proposed. We consider consider that our evidence, together with the historical record before the Inquiry, provides a sound evidentiary foundation on which such modelling can be built.

45. We wish to emphasise, however, that monetary compensation alone cannot constitute a complete remedy. Consistent with the evidence we give above regarding a sustainable Māori economy grounded in tikanga, redress should also include investment in Māori land, Māori enterprise, rangatahi capability, environmental restoration, and iwi and hapū governance, so that the economy rebuilt is not only well-capitalised but consistent with the values that would have shaped its development had it not been interrupted by Crown's breaches.

Conclusion

46. The economic position of Māori in the North-Eastern Bay of Plenty cannot be solely understood by looking only at present-day indicators. It must be understood as the result of

a longer history in which our land, resources, authority and economic opportunities were taken or constrained, and through which our ability to build intergenerational wealth was seriously undermined. We say that the loss was not only financial. It was also the loss of a Māori-led development pathway grounded in tikanga.

47. Naturally, any meaningful and future focused remedy should support Māori to rebuild an economy that is sizeable, resilient and competitive, recognises Māori as economic leaders rather than as marginal participants, while also being sustainable according to tikanga.

DATED this 28th day of August 2026

_____

Rachel Maunganui Wolfgramm / Tania Haerekiterā Wolfgramm / Jason Paul Mika