

generated either way by the tragic events of the Wairau Affray apparently led Elliott to demand vigorous prosecution of the wars which broke out in Taranaki on 17 March 1860.<sup>22</sup> Elliott severely castigated the military inefficiency of British Generals Gold and Cameron and the government's vacillating and expensive conduct of the war, and together with the *Wanganui Chronicle*, the *Thames Advertiser*, the *Auckland Evening Star*, the *Wellington Evening Post* and the *Grey River Argus*, (from all of which Elliott quoted bylines) appeared to have exerted considerable influence on the final outcome of events. But Elliott was no less concerned about accurate representation of the historical facts of the war.

The words 'native war', will now almost cause a man to drop his paper in disgust. But we have not done with them yet; they must stand, and they will stand again and again; they will stand as long as men try for party purposes, to foist off ungenerous guesses and base insinuations for pure knowledge and undefiled truth. How many more times are we to be called upon to state the true cause of the native war? How is it that men of intelligence, will persist in uttering mis-statements, when the truth lies within their reach? It is a lamentable fact, that to some natures a belief, or a pretended belief in the political dishonesty of people in high places, is more pleasant than a belief in their political honour and straightforwardness. Here we have Mr Saunders, again stating as a fact, that which he merely supposes to be a fact. He says (and his party says with him) that the native war arose from a squabble about the right ownership of a few acres of land. As often as this mis-statement finds its way into print, will we contradict it. We are writing history—it is the duty of everybody to see that nothing is perverted, 'extenuated, or set down in malice'. The native war arose in a very simple fashion. One landed proprietor, being a loyal subject of Queen Victoria, wanted to sell land, which was undoubtedly his own private property; a band of men, evil disposed to wards the Government, leagued together to prevent him from selling—and even went so far as to threaten the lives of the purchasers. The man who wanted to sell, naturally claimed the protection of the law under which he had lived, and that protection was afforded him—that it took the form of steel and gunpowder, was not the fault of the administrators of the law, but the fault of the blind fanaticism of the opponents of the law, and more than that, it was the fault, the heinous fault, of those who 'urged them on'. Once again, do we assert, that the war was not undertaken to 'try a question of ownership'; the question of ownership was *settled* long before hostilities were even talked of. The opposers of the sale agreed to the justice of the settlement; they acknowledged that the would-be vendor was the rightful owner, but they added that, rightful owner though he was, he should *not sell*. If this coercion of a peaceable subject by a set of turbulent league-men, and this threatening to take the lives of her Majesty's officers, would not militate against the Queen, her Crown, and dignity, and against the law of her realm, we should like to know what would. Farther on we find Mr Saunders slaving Mr C. W. Richmond, and then like a 'boa', endeavouring to swallow him whole. Mr Saunders commences by calling Mr C. W. Richmond a man of varied talents, and a most amiable man, and immediately afterwards he accuses Mr Richmond of acts of which no such man as Mr Saunders describes, could be guilty. Fancy Mr C. W. Richmond, or Mr anybody else, fascinating an old soldier like Colonel Gore Browne, into such a state of noodleism that he would march off his army and commit acts highly injurious to the colony at large, and of course, by inference, highly beneficial to Mr Richmond, and his settlement in particular. This is a very