

Early New Zealand Books Project
The University of Auckland Library



One of England's Little Wars

Octavius Hadfield

First published by Williams and Norgate in 1860

Digitised and made available online by the University of Auckland Libraries and Learning Services.

Epub © 2013 [Early New Zealand Books Collection](#)

ISBN 978-1-927288-36-8

Contents

1. [\[Text\]](#)
2. [Publication details](#)
3. [Conditions of use](#)

[TITLE PAGES]

ONE OF ENGLAND'S LITTLE WARS.

Page 1

A LETTER
TO THE RIGHT HON.
THE DUKE OF NEWCASTLE,
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES.

BY OCTAVIUS HADFIELD,
ARCHDEACON OF KAPITE, NEW ZEALAND.

WILLIAMS & NORGATE,
14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON,
AND
20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.
1860.

Page 2

Hocken Library Facsimile No. 4

This copy of the original edition is published by the Hocken Library, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand, 1967

Printed Itek-offset in New Zealand by John McIndoe Ltd, Dunedin.

ONE OF ENGLAND'S LITTLE WARS.

Page 3

WHEN a flagrant act of injustice has been committed by the Governor of a British colony in the name of Her Majesty the Queen, it is not easy to determine on what course to pursue. If, indeed, an Englishman were the sufferer, either the Courts of law or the public press would afford a sufficient guarantee that the injustice would be remedied. But when an aboriginal chief is affected by such an act of injustice, neither of these avail him: he may be two hundred miles distant from any Judge of the Supreme Court; and he fails to enlist the sympathy of the public press. Feeling deeply convinced that such an act of injustice has been committed by Colonel Browne, the Governor of this colony, in his recent forcible expulsion of William King from land inherited by him from a long line of ancestors, I venture to address your Grace, as Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, and to call your attention to the facts of the case. If the assertion I have just made is true, I need scarcely offer any apology for my advocacy of the cause of justice. But there are special reasons why I should not now remain silent. I have affixed my name to a statement on this subject, drawn up by

the Bishop of Wellington, and addressed to your Grace. I have known William King for more than twenty years. I have had favourable opportunities for becoming acquainted with all the facts connected with the pretended purchase of his land. I have during eighteen years paid much attention to the subject of native titles to land; and fourteen years ago I wrote a paper on this subject, which I gave to Sir George Grey, and for which I received his thanks. Besides, having frequently told William King and other chiefs, in accordance with the most solemn and positive statements published in official documents, that the British Government never would unjustly seize their lands, I am now ashamed to meet these chiefs, however unconsciously I may have misled them.

Page 4

I have asserted that Colonel Browne has committed an act of injustice in the name of Her Majesty the Queen. It is to be regretted that, in his official documents addressed to the native population, he should have unnecessarily used Her Majesty's name. In my neighbourhood the more intelligent natives have hitherto been able to discriminate between an act of the Governor's and one of the Sovereign's, and have consequently forwarded, through the Governor, a Petition to Her Majesty, praying for his recall. This Petition has, I am informed, through some alleged informality, been detained; thus furnishing another instance of the difficulty experienced by the natives in obtaining

any remedy for an act of injustice. But when Colonel Browne states that he has the authority of Her Majesty's Government for the forcible expulsion of William King from his land, I am obliged to demur, because it is quite impossible that the real merits of the case can have been fairly submitted to the consideration of Her Majesty's Government, the most recent authoritative statements on the subject being notoriously at variance with facts, and proving the absolute present ignorance of the local Government.

Page 5

An official document put forth by the Governor, entitled "Statement relative to the purchase by the British Government of Teira's land at Waitara, Taranaki," contains, I presume, all that can be advanced in justification of his own proceedings. It is fortunate that the merits of the question lie within very narrow limits. The right of natives to their lands is not now a subject of dispute. The Governor says, "The Queen has said that all the natives shall be free to sell their lands to her, or to keep them, as they may think best." The question at issue is simply this – Is a native chief to be forcibly ejected from his land, because an individual member of his tribe tells a subordinate land agent that it is his, and not the chiefs, and that agent believes him? The Governor says – Yes; the chiefs say – No. We have resigned our sovereignty to Her Majesty the Queen; and in return for that, Her Majesty has guaranteed to us the protection of

the law. We claim to have disputed titles to land, which it is desired to purchase, decided in some competent court on evidence given upon oath, for we have never consented, and we will never submit, to have the titles to the land on which we live, and on which we cultivate the food for our subsistence, decided by a mere subordinate land agent, interested in acquiring land, and resting his decision on the bare assertion of a man of no note or rank in the tribe. This is really the question at issue between the Governor and William King. Were Teira's title as good as I am quite certain it is bad, and had William King no valid title whatever, still the real question raised by this act of the Governor's is what I have now stated it to be. Are chiefs to be debarred from all right to defend their titles in a competent court of law? Is the ipse dixit of an interested subordinate land agent to deprive a chief of his land, and justify the Governor in having recourse to arms? If so, of what conceivable use or meaning is the guarantee in reference to their land contained in the Treaty of Waitangi?

Page 6

Before I endeavour to refute the Governor's statements as to the respective titles of the claimants, it will be necessary to seek the origin of the dispute. Before his

death, William King's father obtained a promise from his son that he would not sell Waitara. This took place in the presence of the leading men of the tribe. This alone would shew what native law or custom on the subject has been, otherwise the

promise would not have satisfied the old chief. But I mention this to account for the apparent obstinacy of William King in reference to the small district of Waitara, which he and his tribe have possessed for ages, and which has rendered a remarkably mild and inoffensive chief generally unpopular. Not long since a girl, who was affianced to Teira's brother, preferred William King's son and married him. It is well known here that Teira immediately meditated revenge for this slight put upon his brother. He was well aware of William King's promise to his father. He knew the district land commissioner wished to obtain land. He made an offer of the land, hoping to do, what he has succeeded in, – make use of the Governor to avenge the insult he had received. It even appears that Teira was not satisfied in receiving the payment for the land he sold, which is all that a vendor usually expects, but actually obtained a promise from Colonel Browne that he would push the matter to extremities. The document above referred to, says, (page 4, c. 14): "The Governor has given his word to Teira, and he will not go back from it. The land has been bought and must be surveyed. The Queen's soldiers will protect the surveyors." This admission in an official document widely circulated among the natives has been very severely animadverted on by the chiefs as derogatory to the Governor, who they consider has allowed himself to be made a tool of by a low-bred man in gratifying his feelings of revenge against his chief. It

appears that no sooner was the land occupied by the troops, than Teira, under the Governor's protection, gave vent to his feelings of vengeance: it is stated – "Two of the Pas have been destroyed; but they were fired by Teira's party, and not by the troops." In March last year, the Governor visited Taranaki, and held a meeting of the natives of the district, at which he explained his views on several subjects. He there stated, "that he never would consent to buy land without an undisputed title." On that occasion Teira offered to sell his land. William King then protested against the sale, on the ground that Waitara was his. I quote the Government document above referred to, (page 2): "He said – 'Listen, Governor, notwithstanding Teira's offer, I will not permit the sale of Waitara to the Pakeha. Waitara is in my hands, I will not give it up, I will not, I will not, I will not.' He and his followers abruptly withdrew." He wrote to me in July last, saying that in spite of the Governor's public assertion that he would not purchase "without an undisputed title," and that he and those who acted with him claimed the land, and denied Teira's title, the district land commissioner was forcing on the negotiation with Teira, and informed him that he was authorized by the Governor to do so. He seemed wholly perplexed at the contrariety that existed between the Governor's public declaration and the authorized acts of his subordinate. The conclusion he came to was that the Governor was seeking some

ground of quarrel with him, as Teira's pretension to the ownership of the land was really so preposterous, that some other cause must be sought for. I have since seen a letter from the principal land commissioner to a chief of this place, written with a view of allaying suspicions, and justifying the purchase of the disputed land and the subsequent recourse to arms. But the commissioner having evidently some misgivings as to the probable efficacy of his arguments among natives well acquainted with the real merits of the case, adds, naively enough, that another reason for the war was – "the murders that had taken place in the district;" although William King, whatever may be insinuated to the contrary, took no part in these, and it is well known, that Ihaia the perpetrator of one of the foulest and most brutal murders ever committed in New Zealand, is now among the Governor's allies. The commissioner's admission, as contained in this letter, has filled intelligent natives with amazement, and destroyed all confidence in the veracity of official documents.

In defiance of all remonstrance on the part of William King and other owners of the land, the purchase was made by the district commissioner, Mr. Parris. I again cite the Governor's document (page 3), "Soon after the receipt of Mr. Parris's letter of the 4th December, the Governor in Council gave directions for the survey of the land. Accordingly, on the 20th February the survey was attempted by a small unarmed party, but was put a

stop to by a crowd of King's people." The survey was actually interrupted by women, it being William King's object not to break the peace, but to act legally, that is, to remove trespassers, but to do so without violence. He wished merely to assert his ownership to the land. It is seen above that the survey was first attempted on the 20th February. Will it, then, be believed that a Proclamation of Martial Law, dated Auckland, January 25, had already been placed in the hands of a subordinate officer, commanding at Taranaki, to be used at his discretion, though no overt act whatever had at that time been committed? It is difficult to imagine what justification will be given for such an unusual course. Shortly afterwards the land was occupied by the troops, and the natives retreated to the woods. They returned and erected a small stockade on the disputed land. Here the first collision took place; after which they evacuated the stockade, and returned again to the woods. The Governor, however, has been attacked by natives of other tribes who sympathized with William King; but who acted without any orders from him.

I now proceed to consider the grounds publicly set forth by the Governor in defence of his extraordinary act at Taranaki, in forcibly ejecting William King and his tribe from a block of land situated on the south side of the river Waitara, consisting of about six hundred acres, on the bare assertion of a district land commissioner, that it belonged to an-

other person, who had sold it to the Government. It is stated that the land belonged to Teira and a few other persons, who were the real owners, and who have sold it to the Government; – that Teira's title to the land was "carefully investigated and found to be good – that William King and those who acted with him had no title to it; – that "William King never pretended to deny Teira's right of property, but insisted on his own right to put a veto on all sales at Waitara." I deny the truth of all the statements. I am prepared to prove their falsity here, where evidence can be obtained; but I must, under the present circumstances, in the absence of documents, endeavour to do so by the use of such arguments as can be appreciated at a distance. I must, however, make a few preliminary remarks. The ownership of the land ought to have presented but few difficulties to the land commissioner. It was not wild land, or land which the tribe who occupied it had conquered from other tribes. On the contrary, it was land which had been owned by the tribe for many generations, and had been subdivided into small allotments among upwards of fifty occupants, with boundaries accurately defined by stone posts, which had existed for ages. I should perhaps say that all the claimants belong to one tribe – Ngatiawa. Some years before the establishment of the British Government in New Zealand, a large portion of the tribe migrated to the southward, to Cook's Strait, for the purpose of

being near whalers, and obtaining English goods.

William King was one of this party. Subsequently Waikato attacked that portion of the tribe which remained at Waitara, and defeated them. But they never held possession of the land; and consequently never acquired any title to it. William King, it will be observed, was never conquered or driven from his land. Before New Zealand became a British colony, he informed me of his intention to reoccupy it. The statement, therefore (page 4), that "Ngatiawa had been dispossessed by Waikato," as being at variance with fact, is highly offensive to the natives; and it certainly is not very easy to ascertain the purpose for which it has been advanced, as the present dispute is not between Ngatiawa and Waikato, but between members of the former tribe only. To the shrewd native mind, however, it has also suggested another question. It had hitherto been assumed that the British Government was bound to respect such rights in reference to land as existed when the treaty of Waitangi was made. The inference drawn from the allusion to the former quarrel with Waikato, which occurred many years before the treaty was made, is, that no reliance can be placed on any treaty or any promise, that no security can be obtained.

But with regard to Teira's right to sell, which is so positively asserted, and on the supposed validity of which a war has been commenced at Taranaki, can I expect to be believed in England when I

assert, as I do unequivocally, that Teira's father, Tamati Raru, through whom alone the son could lay claim to any land as inherited by him from his ancestors, is still living, and opposed its alienation? Teira's father is indeed the owner of a small portion of the block; but it would be irrelevant to the purpose of my present argument to discuss his right to sell, inasmuch as he refused to do so, and co-operated with William King in opposing his own son up to the very commencement of hostilities. I feel that nothing I could add to this fact would tend to strengthen the assertion I make, that the claim set up on behalf of Teira to alienate the whole block of land is altogether untenable.

Page 13

But perhaps the most extraordinary statement made is, that William King "never denied Teira's right of property." The document goes further and says, (page 4, c. 11): "It is not disputed by any one." I have already cited the Governor's own admission that William King positively told him that "Waitara was in his hands," and that he would not part with it. I am unable to conceive in what manner the old chief could more distinctly deny his opponent's title. It is true Mr. Parris, the district commissioner says, that in answer to his question – "Does the land belong to Teira and his party?" He replied – "Yes; the land is theirs, but I will not let them sell it." I am credibly informed that the chief did not intend to convey the meaning here attributed to him; that what he said was, that Teira

and his party were part owners of the land, but that did not justify them in selling the whole. I can easily conceive how such a mistake would arise, as it is quite in accordance with the idiom of the Maori language to begin an objection by "Yes," i.e. you are right to a certain extent, but, &c. And that was exactly the chiefs meaning: Teira has a right to a small part; but he wishes to avail himself of that to establish a claim to the whole block of land now under discussion, and that I will not allow him to do. Here the irregularity of the whole proceeding appears; for had such a question been put in a court of law, and the alleged answer been returned, William King's counsel would have taken care that no inference prejudicial to his interests should be drawn from it. But to return to the chief's plain assertion to the Governor that Waitara was his, and that he and the other principal owners declined to sell it; and the claim implied in this. How does the Governor deal with it? How does he escape from the difficulty implied in his own admission that he will not purchase land the title of which is disputed? He merely pretends that William King "insists on his own right of putting a veto on all sales at Waitara." And it has been reiterated in New Zealand that he belongs to a land-league whose object is to prevent the sale of land. But these statements, wholly at variance with facts, can only be the result of entire ignorance both of the validity of the respective titles, and of that chiefs ground of opposition.

Page 14

The document says (page 2), "At the meeting of 12 March, 1859, no substantial exception was made to the right of Teira and his party to the land, William King insisting merely on his own possession." When it is allowed that no "substantial exception" was made to Teira's right, and that William King insisted merely on his own "possession," I conceive that considerable weight and importance ought to be attached to these admissions put forth in a document purporting to justify hostilities that had actually taken place, and that they really refute the reckless assertions made by the Governor that the chief neither had a right, though actually in possession, or made exception to Teira's claim. The document proceeds: – "As to the possession, the facts of the case are, that when King returned to Taranaki from Waikanae in 1848, being in fear of an invasion of the Waikatos from the north, he asked permission of Tamati Raru, Teira's father, to build a pa upon the piece of land on the south bank of Waitara, now sold to the British Government. Permission was granted, and King's pa was erected on the south bank, his cultivations being on the north bank. King's followers have, however, encroached with their cultivations upon the south side of the river; and these encroachments have been, for a long time, a source of continual dissension." It is true that King did ask Raru's permission to build a pa on a piece of land belonging to him. But what, let me ask, is the impression the passage just

Page 15

cited is intended to convey? Assuredly a very false one. The only possible construction to be put on these words is, that William King and his "followers" – as his tribe seems to be designated – having no land of their own on the south side of the river, took advantage of a concession made to them for their personal security to encroach on property to which they had no right. But I have before asserted that they were the owners of by far the largest portion of this land, which they had inherited from their ancestors, and which is subdivided and accurately marked with stone posts. What then is the one particle of truth on which this false statement is built? It is simply this, that King consulted his friend Raru as to whether the pa, in which for their mutual security, they all belonging to one tribe, were about to reside, should stand a few chains nearer to the water side than it would have stood had it been erected on his own land on the same side of the river. I can only characterize this statement as disgraceful to an official document, whether the error arose from ignorance or wilful misrepresentation. It is further added that "a large section of W. King's tribe residing at Queen Charlotte's Sound, including Roopama Te One and his followers, affirm the right of Teira's party." The Governor must feel his case very weak to have recourse to such an argument as this. Why does he go to the Middle Island to seek for owners of the land, when there are a hundred of these ac-

Page 16

tually in possession? Why does he overlook those members of the tribe residing at Wellington and Waikanae, who all support King's claim? Why moreover does he seek for an accurate and unbiassed opinion from a personal enemy of King's, who expelled his brother from Waitohi? It would be difficult to suggest any other answer to these questions than that he has begun to doubt the validity of Teira's title. But when the fact itself on which the assertion is made, that these persons "affirm the right of Teira's party" is examined, it appears that the commissioner derived his information from Roopama, who used their names not only without their consent, but actually in the face of their positive assertion that King and his party were the real owners. It would be wearisome to comment in detail on all the mere assertions made about Teira and others being "the undisputed owners" of the land. These are made with a view of justifying a war evidently begun in utter ignorance of the real merits of the question. But there is one expression which seems artfully to imply the Governor's moderation, which may require a few words in explanation. It is said (page 5), "If William King had really possessed any authority over Teira, and had been able to prevent his offering his land to the Government, the Governor would not have interfered, and the land would not have been bought. Even after the offer of the land, if William King had succeeded in preventing Teira from applying

Page 17

for and receiving the payment, no attempt would have been made to take possession." These words are absolutely devoid of any meaning, except on the supposition, that they may convey to persons at a distance an impression of the Governor's moderation, or unless in the case of William King, it was intended to add insult to injury. How could a loyal chief "prevent" a man "offering" his land to the Government? or "prevent his applying for and receiving payment?" Such language is simply nonsense. For surely the Governor did not intend, that King ought to have done what Katatore did a few years ago, turn out with an armed party and shoot his opponent. It is impossible to say what is meant.

Page 18

It is further said (p. 4.), that "Teira's title has been carefully investigated and found to be good." I deny that any investigation whatever deserving of that designation, has ever taken place. The whole transaction has been left in the hands of Mr. Parris, the local land commissioner, whose business is to purchase land, and who by the very nature of his office, is disqualified in the estimation of the natives, impartially to investigate claims to land. The chief commissioner did not investigate the claim. He told me after the war had commenced, that he had only made a preliminary inquiry early in 1859. What is demanded by the natives is, an impartial court in which their respective claims can be stated; and before which they may bring evidence to be

received on oath. Nothing short of an inquiry conducted on such principles as these, can be considered an "investigation" of their titles to land. But the absurdity of the procedure, not only in this particular case, but in all the so-called investigations of natives' titles to land, appears in the fact, that up to the present time no principles have been laid down, as to what constitutes a title to land; and each commissioner, is left to the unfettered use of his own discretion to decide on this delicate subject. The consequence is that these commissioners, many of whom are not qualified by previous education and habits of thought, to deal independently with a question of so much difficulty, very frequently, as might be expected, act on very different principles, and arrive at various conclusions. Such being the anomalous position in which this most important subject has been hitherto left, it is useless for the Governor to say, "that if any man could prove his claim," such claim would be respected. How prove a claim, when as yet no principle is acknowledged, by which its validity can be tested, and no recognized tribunal exists before which it can be brought? Probably a district commissioner holding less narrow views than those held by Mr. Parris, would have acknowledged William King's claim, and the colony would have been spared an unjust and unnecessary war.

I think it has now been shown that a gross act of injustice has been committed by Colonel Browne;

that he has acted illegally in employing troops to eject a native chief from land which he occupied, the validity of his title having never been disproved; and no breach of the peace having been committed. Perhaps, My Lord Duke, I ought to stop here, having only ventured to address your Grace for the purpose of calling attention to a flagrant act of injustice. I have hitherto felt my ground secure: I have been dealing with facts within my knowledge: I can in so clear a case distinguish between justice and injustice. But in the remarks I am about to make I lay myself open to the charge of presumption. Still I feel bound to express my opinion that the Governor's attack on William King was, not only impolitic, but under the present circumstances of the colony, an act of folly closely bordering on insanity. That he acted without the least foresight, or the remotest suspicion that he was about to rouse the whole native population to an expression of indignation, and many to take up arms, appears very evident. He no sooner began hostilities, than he found the means at his disposal wholly inadequate to the task he had undertaken. He then sent to the neighbouring colonies for more troops; gave orders for calling out the militia; returned to provide for the defence of Auckland; postponed the meeting of the General Assembly; and issued circulars to various native chiefs, as well as men of lower rank throughout the colony, inviting them to assemble at Auckland, and consult with him

about the state of the country. Am I wrong in assuming, that all these acts plainly indicate his entire ignorance of the nature of the step he was taking, when he began hostilities this autumn at Taranaki? But this ignorance admits of no excuse, because there are men in the colony, who did from the first actually predict some of the worst consequences of his rashness, and who still foresee much that will necessarily follow.

But I must explain more fully what I mean by the impolicy of the present hostilities. A conspiracy has for some years existed, whose object has been to create an organization for opposing Her Majesty's Government, whenever any of its acts should appear to the authors of the conspiracy, prejudicial to what they considered their inalienable rights. Three years ago it had so far advanced that the chief movers ventured on electing a king. This movement has proceeded unchecked to the present time. The nature of this conspiracy has been quite clear from the very first to those, who combine political knowledge and sagacity, with an accurate acquaintance with the native character and modes of thought. Had Sir George Grey been in the colony it could scarcely have originated at all; and would certainly have been immediately put down, if any attempt had been made to promote it. But Colonel Browne neither had the requisite qualifications to enable him to discover its true import, nor cared to obtain from others the information that might have tended to

supply their want. His eyes are now opened. At least they ought to be. But it will be curious to ascertain what excuse he will make to Her Majesty's Government, for his culpable dereliction of duty in permitting the conspiracy to reach its present dimensions.

This apparent digression is relevant to the object I have in view. With such a conspiracy in existence, as that to which I have now very briefly alluded, ordinary prudence would have dictated, that no step should be taken, that was likely to fan the flame and hasten the conflagration, unless indeed there were means at hand to extinguish it. But what has Colonel Browne done? Why, he has gone out of his way to commit an act of injustice against a great chief who had always been loyal to Her Majesty's Government, and who had strenuously and effectively resisted the movement in favour of the Maori-king. The result of this is two-fold: loyal chiefs are disheartened, and turn their eyes towards the Maori-king; the conspirators have gained more strength and adherents within the last three months than during the three previous years. It is possible that at a distance from the colony my bare assertion of William King's consistent loyalty may be called in question. I have already said that I have known him for twenty years. When the first collision took place in the year 1843, between the English and the natives, under the command of Te Rauparaha and Te Rangihaeata at Wairau, the

latter were elated with their success, and proposed to plunder and destroy the town of Wellington. Great efforts were for some days made to organize a force for the purpose. The strength of the local government was ascertained. The time required to obtain troops from the neighbouring colonies was nicely calculated. But the attempt was baffled. In a work published last year in London, and written by Mr. Swainson the late Attorney-General of the Colony, the safety of Wellington at that time is attributed to my influence and exertions. I received the thanks of the Governor of the Colony. I was then residing about forty miles from Wellington, at Waikaure, a native Pa, of which William King was the chief. He had about a thousand well armed men who obeyed his orders. I attribute to that chiefs loyalty alone the failure of Te Rauparaha and Te Rangihaeata's schemes.

Again in the year 1846 when Te Rangihaeata was in arms against the Government in the neighbourhood of Wellington, William King, though a near relation of that chief, evinced his loyalty to the Crown, not only by a steady resistance to all the solicitations of that chief, but by actually taking up arms against him. He captured with two exceptions the only prisoners taken during the war, and in fact hastened its conclusion. What are the loyal natives to think of a Governor who, without the least provocation, singles out this chief, distinguished

through a long course of years for his loyalty to Her Majesty's Government and friendliness to the English, for a hostile attack? I say friendliness to the English, because all the old settlers who have known him from the time when he saved the lives of a shipwrecked crew in the vicinity of Rangitikei, before New Zealand became a British colony, will bear out my assertion in this respect. I have pointedly alluded to the fact of William King's previous loyalty, because many attempts have lately been made to connect him with the Maori-king movement, and to defend what I deem the Governor's unjust and illegal hostilities, on the ground that it was needful to offer some check to that.

Nothing but the deepest conviction of the present critical state of this colony, and Colonel Browne's utter incapacity to rescue it from disaster and ruin, has induced me to address your Grace. It is still possible that the presence of some superior man might restore the confidence that is lost. A little delay may occasion a war of races. No doubt Great Britain has men and money wherewith to carry on against the native race a war of extermination. But is this to be the issue of the endeavours to establish Christianity and civilization among one of the most intelligent and tractable of races. Are we in the middle of the nineteenth century to confess to the whole civilized world that our Christianity and our civilization have given us no advantage

over these people but that of a more scientific use of material force? Is the pride of Englishmen to exclude from their breasts all sympathy for a race but recently emerging from barbarism, because it has qualities too nearly resembling their own – because it repudiates degradation, and refuses to be submissively trampled under foot? Is the sound of war once heard to deafen their ears to the cry of justice

But however certain, humanly speaking, the result of a war must be, when waged by Great Britain against this native people, let not its magnitude be underrated. There are probably not less than twenty thousand men capable of bearing arms. With arms and ammunition they have recently been abundantly supplied through the Governor's very injudicious relaxation of Sir George Grey's stringent regulations on the subject. They occupy a country inaccessible to troops. If this appears a strong assertion, let me refer your Grace to Sir George Grey's despatches on this subject. Twenty years would not end a war of races, which must be a war of extermination. In the war that occurred, 1845-1847, it appeared that more of Her Majesty's troops lost their lives than there were aborigines killed. And from a carefully made calculation I once saw of the expense incurred, it was clear that each one of these must have cost several thousand pounds. In a war of races the loss of life and the

expenditure would be greater still. Is Great Britain prepared to purchase at such a price as this her own everlasting disgrace?

Page 26

I remain,
My Lord Duke,
Your Grace's most obedient Servant,
OCTAVIUS HADFIELD.
Otaki, May 29, 1860.

Conditions of Use

By their use of these ebooks, texts and images, users agree to follow these conditions of use:

- These ebooks, texts and images may not be used for any commercial purpose without permission from the University of Auckland Library.
- These ebooks, texts and images may not be re-published in print or electronic form without permission from the University of Auckland Library. However, educators are welcome to print out items and hand them to their students.
- Users are not permitted to download our ebooks, texts, and images in order to mount them on their own servers for public use or for use by a set of subscribers. Individuals and institutions can, of course, make a link to the copies at ENZB, subject to our conditions of use. It is not in our interest or that of our users to have uncontrolled subsets of our holdings available elsewhere on the Internet. We make corrections, add tags, add images, etc. on a continual basis, and we want the most current text to be the only one generally available to all Internet users.
- These texts can potentially be used as the basis for additional TEI tagging or for some other etext or ebook project, but we ask that you let us know before you start, so that we can coordinate work on that text and make sure that we are not working on it simultaneously. We would like a copy of the improved text for our collections.

[Request for permission form](#)