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Epigraphs

Du muß herrschen und gewinnen,
Oder dienen und verlieren;
Leiden oder triumphieren,
Amboß oder Hammer sein.

Goethe, Der Groß-Cophta (1791), Act 2.

(You must be masterful and win,
Or serve and lose;
Grieve or triumph,
Be the anvil or the hammer.)

Ambition is the growth of every clime.

William Blake, King Edward the Third

Ambition, in a private man a vice,
Is in a prince a virtue.

Philip Massinger, The Bashful Lover

Authority is never without hate.

Euripides, Ion

Welch Schauspiel! Aber ach, ein Schauspiel nur!
(What a show! But alas, only a show!)

Goethe, Faust, part 1, Nacht

They change the sky and not their soul who run across the sea.

Jamie O’Neill, At Swim, Two Boys
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Preface

Ma’afu, born in Tonga about 1825, was a son of Aleamotu’a, Tu’i Kānokupolu and a cousin of Tupou I, king of Tonga. When aged in his early twenties, he came to live in Fiji and within 15 years established a power base to rival that of any indigenous chief. In 1865, a Wesleyan missionary visiting the island of Vanuabalavu paid a call on Ma’afu at his home in Lomaloma. The visitor was impressed:

This man, so knowing, so powerful and resolute, seems to be now throwing all his influence into the scale of good, as he before threw it into that of evil. He must be either a really changed man or a most finished hypocrite…¹

The missionary articulated a dilemma which had engaged the minds of many of his colleagues, and others who thought to put pen to paper, for more than 30 years. Was Ma’afu the force for good he often claimed to be, and indeed often seemed, or did he assume the cloak of justice only to further his boundless ambition and taste for discord and intrigue? Was he a beacon of hope for his people in Lau, or a cunning and ruthless autocrat bent only on the preservation of his power? Few who enjoyed the acquaintance of Ma’afu during the years before he was appointed as Tui Lau in 1869, and who recorded their thoughts for posterity, were able to reconcile these conflicting impressions.

In Fiji, Ma’afu pursued a career essentially uncompromised by moral ambiguities. Attracted to the islands by his ties of kinship with Lau and by the prospect of a freedom denied him in Tonga, Ma’afu established a unique position of power which rivalled that of any indigenous chief. The creation for him in 1869 of the title of Tui Lau was at once an innovation in the polity of Fiji and an acknowledgement of the power which he had established in the islands. Despite his importance in nineteenth century Fiji, Ma’afu’s life has rarely received the attention from scholars which it merits. This neglect has left unresolved several questions concerning his career in his adopted home.

Most published works have given only passing attention to the reasons why Ma’afu left his home in 1847 to spend the rest of his days in Fiji. For a long time a view was expressed, based more on hearsay than a consideration of the available evidence, that Tupou I removed his young cousin from Tonga as a means of eliminating a dangerous rival for power. While modern scholarship has largely discredited this notion, there is need for a detailed consideration of the evidence to determine both the circumstances and the motive for his departure

¹ [Unnamed] Wesleyan missionary to Stephen Rabone, 4 Jul 1865, WMN(A), No. 38, Jan 1867, 601.
Ma‘afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

from Tonga. Similarly, his acquisition of sovereignty in the future chiefdom of Lau has never been acknowledged for what it was: a process legitimate in both established Fijian custom and English law. That sovereignty made possible his creation as Tui Lau and provided the basis for his future accession to power as Viceroy in the so-called Cakobau Government and, eventually, as Roko Tui Lau in the British Crown Colony of Fiji.

Ma‘afu was sometimes seen, during his lifetime and since, as an agent of his king, Tupou I, in the latter’s ambitions to influence and even, as often claimed, to conquer all or part of Fiji. While this question has been addressed by modern scholars, it will not suffer from a reassessment in the wider context of Ma‘afu’s career from his childhood in Tonga until his declining years in Lau. There is also the question of the nature and extent of his ambitions, a dilemma which engaged the attention of many of his contemporaries and which has been the subject of comment from scholars and other commentators ever since. The enigma that Ma‘afu posed his missionary visitor in 1865 was never to be satisfactorily resolved in his lifetime. Because Ma‘afu rarely gave voice to his ambitions, they remain elusive. A reassessment now of the life of Fiji’s first Tui Lau can at least begin to determine whether he was indeed a force for good, or whether his perceived hypocrisy derived from a lust for power in which the lotu was just another force to be harnessed along the road to the mastery of Fiji.

This book had its beginnings in the doctoral thesis I wrote in the Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies at The Australian National University, Canberra. When I began research, it was my intention to cover the whole of Ma‘afu’s life. That proved to be an elusive objective, since the University’s suggested upper limit of 100,000 words for a doctoral thesis meant that I could not cover that life in the detail I considered appropriate. The thesis therefore concluded with Ma‘afu’s 1869 installation as Tui Lau. The present work carries the story to its conclusion, covering in particular Ma‘afu’s short and tumultuous career as Viceroy in the planter and settler oligarchy known as the Kingdom of Fiji and later, after Cession, as Roko Tui Lau, a post that enabled him to continue as ruler of Lau, albeit as a salaried official of the British colonial administration. In theory, as Roko Tui Lau, he was answerable to the Governor in Levuka. In practice, he continued his sometimes benevolent if always despotic sway over the islands of eastern Fiji.

The trail in search of Ma‘afu has been a long and meandering one, with part of the way guided by the very few historians who have researched and published in nineteenth century Fijian history. I have also been led into many unexpected byways. Archival research has been conducted in Australia, New Zealand, Fiji, Tonga, the United Kingdom, Vanuatu and the United States. Numerous field trips, some financially supported by the Research School of Pacific and Asian
Studies and some privately funded, were made in eastern and southern Fiji as well as in Tonga. I record elsewhere my indebtedness and gratitude to numerous people and institutions.

The trail in fact began during a walk around Levuka on an overcast August morning in 1985. Reminders there of the nineteenth century European presence awakened an interest in the events of those years and particularly in the response of the Fijian people to the aliens in their midst. That interest lead to reading, beginning with R.A. Derrick’s *History of Fiji*. In this and other secondary works, one name stood out among all the Fijians, Tongans and Europeans: Ma’afu. He was ubiquitous, a man whose presence and importance could never be gainsaid as the chiefs and people of Fiji played out the dramas which would, eventually, lead to a precarious unity of the *matanitu* under foreign rule. Yet so little had been written about Ma’afu. Who was he, and whence did he come? What drove him rarely to leave centre stage in a country not his own? This work is a search for answers to many questions concerning the enigmatic Tongan chief who, for more than 30 years in Fiji, engaged the attention of all who crossed his path. He was a figure who could not be ignored, a man whose mark on the history of the islands of Fiji is greater than that of any of his contemporaries.

This work is concerned with Ma’afu’s life from his birth in Tonga about 1825 until his death on Vanuabalavu on 6 February 1881. Any chronicle of the affairs of Fiji and more especially of the Tongan community in Lau, during Ma’afu’s early years in those islands, must be subject to judgments still essentially alien and often unsympathetic. Some of the most important sources, the writings of the resident missionaries, are full of the minutiae of daily life, of the comings and goings of the Fijians and Tongans among whom they lived and of what the writers believed were the important issues of the day. They are also strongly influenced by the bourgeois, Christian and conservative values, the ideology of their nation, religion and class, in which the missionaries themselves had been nurtured. To quote Frank Welsh, a historian of South Africa, “the link between salvation, virtue, monogamy and trousers was universally acknowledged”. More often than not, chiefs and other persons of note are assessed according to their personal appearance and habits, their response to the Christian message and, in the case of chiefs, to the perceived nature of their authority. Wars and political manoeuvres are considered above all in the light of how they advance or hinder the *lotu*. Yet, for these middle years of the nineteenth century, among the remote islands of Lau and eastern Cakaudrove, the missionary sources are almost all we have. Visiting naval commanders, such as John Erskine of HMS *Havannah* or Charles Wilkes of the United States Exploring Expedition, can provide us, in the published accounts of their voyages, with impressions usually informative and often incisive. Such impressions, nevertheless, are suspended in

---

time and place. Our knowledge of the cast of characters and of the ebb and flow of events must emanate largely from the pens of the missionaries. Of the minds of their Fijian and Tongan hosts we can know very little, except when their words are reported in some missionary journal or letter. Often, such reporting is doubly filtered: people were inclined to circumspection in their discourse with missionaries, while the missionaries in turn were wont to exercise discretion in recording the words of others. Our pleasure in the richness and magnitude of missionary sources must ever be tempered by frustration at our inability to gain an indigenous perspective of both people and events.

Biography always risks becoming, in the words of Irish historian S.J. Connolly,

an essentially fictive process: the organisation of selected traces of the past into a coherent narrative or analysis involves the creation of meanings and relationships that are not inherent in the materials themselves.³

To entertain the notion that it is possible to construct a true account of a person’s life, whether that person be living or dead, is to entertain an illusion. “Evidence” of that life, whatever its nature and however profuse it might be, is always subject to a multiplicity of interpretations. Whatever rhetoric a biographer might adopt, he can never forget that his mission, conscious or otherwise, is to inform, to influence, to persuade and to please his readers. Any biography must be, in many if not most cases, a construction, rather than a reconstruction, of the subject’s life. Aware, as I have tried to be, that I approach this study of the life of Ma’afu with my share of preconceptions, I can but acknowledge that my words cannot be free of bias and error. No biographer can claim otherwise. To describe Ma’afu’s life is to construct a narrative that cannot, in at least some aspects, accurately reflect the life itself.

I have presented elsewhere a more detailed discussion of the particular difficulties involved in writing a biography of Ma’afu.⁴ He spent his formative years in Tonga, then a non-literate society undergoing unprecedented and sometimes violent change. He was to attain power as a great chief in Fiji, a society where, like Tonga, the past was enshrined in rich oral traditions, although the various alien visitors, colonial administrators as well as missionaries and naval captains, would increasingly chronicle many aspects of his turbulent career. Finally, during the last 12 years of Ma’afu’s life, firstly as Tui Lau and then as a salaried official of the British colonial administration, he came under often intense scrutiny from many documented sources, including newspapers, which greatly enhance our knowledge of his public and private lives and even, if only rarely, the inner workings of his mind. Ma’afu’s life encompassed a period when

---

the ancient Pacific, already known to Europeans, passed into a new phase of existence, a time when the islands’ fortunes, especially including those of Tonga and Fiji, were determined by the interests and ambitions of Great Britain and other powers that concerned themselves with the world’s largest expanse of ocean. Since almost all the documented sources on which I have drawn for this work were compiled from a European perspective, it is inevitable that the biases and opinions of the time have influenced some of the conclusions I have drawn.

My purpose has nevertheless been to relate Ma’afu’s story. It is not well known, especially in his homeland, while in Fiji it has become overlaid with the myth that always enshrouds the powerful. By the time of the Cession of Fiji to Britain, Ma’afu had become the most powerful chief in the islands. He was also, with reason, the most feared and distrusted, at least among the indigenous chiefs. Today, the Fijian people’s knowledge of the first Tui Lau and his times is hampered, not only by the enshrouding myth, but also and especially by the inadequate attention given to the history and prehistory of their islands in the Fijian school curricula. To understand and to be proud of their past, Fijians must first come to know that past. If this book can open even a small window into their history, I will be content.

John Spurway

Exeter, Devon, England, December 2014
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A Note on Spelling

Except for quotations from primary sources, I have generally used modern standard Fijian and Tongan spelling for personal names and place names. There are two notable exceptions: in the case of Ma’afu’s wife, Elenoa Gataialupe, I have adopted the Fijian spelling throughout the book, rather than the Tongan ‘Elenoa Ngataialupe. In the case of their only surviving son, Siale’ataongo, I have used the Tongan spelling, rather than the Fijian Sialeataogo. In both cases my choice conforms to the variants most often encountered in published works.

It should be borne in mind that there is no glottal stop in standard Fijian, so that the chiefly title is written Tui, as in Tui Lau. Its Tongan equivalent does feature a glottal stop: Tu’i, as in Tu’i Kānokupolu.

The Fijian alphabet, devised by missionary David Cargill, features several letters whose pronunciation differs from both Tongan and English:

B is “mb”, e.g. Bau (pronounced mbau)

C is a hard “th”, e.g. Cakobau (pronounced thakombau)

D is “nd”, e.g. Nadi (pronounced nandi)

G is “ng” as in “sing”, e.g. Golea (pronounced ngolea)

J is “ch”, e.g. Jone (pronounced CHO-nay)

Q is “ng” followed by a hard “g”, e.g. Qamea (pronounced nggamea)
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1. Ma`afu`otu`itonga

To stand at the north-western point of Tonga’s main island, Tongatapu, where the country’s first missionaries landed in 1797, is to be conscious of the island’s most salient characteristic: its flatness. A long, low line of green, highlighted between the deep blue of the lagoon and the softer blue of the sky, stretches eastwards in a semi-circle, fading into the horizon beyond which lies Nuku`alofa, Tonga’s capital. On Tongatapu, a generation after the missionaries’ arrival, Moala, spouse of Aleamotu’a, the island’s principal chief, gave birth to their first child. While the baby’s name, Ma`afu`otu`itonga, was that of his great-grandfather, the sixth Tu`i Kānokupolu, he was usually known simply as Ma’afu. Since his death, he has been referred to in Tonga as Ma`afu Fisi, or Ma`afu of Fiji, a designation that helps distinguish him from other bearers of the name in Tonga and acknowledges the role he played, later in life, on the Fijian political stage.

Aleamotu’a’s father, grandfather, and other relatives had ruled as Tu`i Kānokupolu at various times between the mid eighteenth century and 1820. The title, in temporary abeyance at the time of Ma`afu’s birth, was one of the three offices of state in Tonga. The others were the Tu`i Tonga, still existing in the 1820s although with much reduced power, and the Tu`i Ha`atakalaaua, defunct since 1799. The highest-ranking of these titles, that of the Tu`i Tonga, which evolved in the twelfth century, was endowed with sanctity in the eyes of the Tongan people. Very few people were allowed to associate with Tu`i Tonga, whose person was tapu. Despite the enshrined sanctity of this great office, it was never immune from the winds of political fortune.¹ It is worth remembering, in the light of Ma`afu’s future career in Fiji, that the islands subject to the Tu`i Tonga’s influence at various times during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries included not only modern Tonga, but also Samoa, Tokelau, Uvea, Futuna and part of Lau, the eastern archipelago of Fiji.

Tu`i Tonga functioned both as a temporal ruler and as a sacred intermediary with the gods. As the population of Tonga, and particularly Tongatapu, increased, the demands placed on him became increasingly onerous. A solution adopted during the fifteenth century was the creation of the new title of Tu`i Ha`atakalaaua, whose purpose was to absorb the office of hau, hitherto the exclusive domain of the Tu`i Tonga. The hau was both secular and political; its incumbent came
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to exercise functions independent of the Tu`i Tonga, whose duties were both religious and ceremonial. In practice, the country’s most powerful chief was usually considered as hau. He had to belong to a royal lineage and should have demonstrated both leadership qualities and military prowess. His position was never secure; there are examples in Tongan history of a hau being challenged and sometimes deposed by members of his own caste.\(^2\) While political power was an accepted prerogative of Tonga’s most successful chief, challenges to that power from other chiefs could always occur.

The duality of kingship following the creation of the Tu`i Ha`atakalaua reflected an increasingly complex society. The division of executive duties was to be repeated in the seventeenth century, when the sixth Tu`i Ha`atakalaua, Mo`unga-o-tonga, apparently followed his ancestor’s example in creating another lineage, intended to absorb some of his functions. Accounts of the origin of this new lineage, eventually known as that of the Tu`i Kānokupolu, could well owe more to myth than to history. A son of Mo`unga-o-tonga, Ngata, whose mother was Samoan, was supposedly sent to govern the poor district of Hihifo in western Tongatapu. The title of Tu`i Kānokupolu was probably not used until the time of Ngata’s grandson, Mataeletu`apiko. Its meaning has been given as “`flesh or heart of Upolu’ in honour of Tohu`ia, mother of Ngata, and the many supporters she brought with her from the Samoan island of Upolu’.”\(^3\) The title reflects a consolidation, over at least three generations, of a power that came to extend well beyond Hihifo. The role of the Tu`i Kānokupolu can be considered as that of a secular king.

The new lineage gradually eclipsed both its predecessors. Evidence for this fundamental change in the Tongan polity is found in the genealogies of the Tu`i Tonga, whose office holders had been wont to seek their wives from the daughters of whoever was hau, in practice usually the Tu`i Ha`atakalaua. The genealogies reveal that the daughters of the Tu`i Kānokupolu came to be seen as the most suitable.\(^4\) Since, in Tonga, the personal rank of a male ruler is inherited from his mother, this change of allegiance indicated the growing prestige of the Tu`i Kānokupolu. From the eighteenth century, the Tu`i Kānokupolu was often, but not always, considered as hau, thanks to the power and prestige accrued to his office. In 1799, the office of Tu`i Ha`atakalaua became extinct following the death of its last incumbent, while the office of Tu`i Tonga remained sanctified by religion and removed from actual power. The name borne by Tupoulahi’s immediate predecessor, Ma`afu`otu`itonga, can be translated as “fire or weapon of the Tu`i Tonga”,\(^5\) an indication of the perceived role of the holder of that
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\(^4\) Gifford, 35.

\(^5\) ibid., 99–100; Tupou Posese, personal communication, Nuku’alofa, May 1995.
office. By the 1820s, the decade of Ma`afu’s birth, more than a generation of instability, punctuated by intermittent civil war, meant that the Tu`i Tonga and Tu`i Kānokupolu titles no longer possessed the means to confer authority, as they had traditionally done. Force had become necessary to establish and maintain power. Following the death in 1820 of the previous Tu`i Kānokupolu, Aleamotu’a’s nephew Tupouto’a, no-one was appointed in his place. The absence of a Tu`i Kānokupolu is an indication not only of the instability of the times but also of the Realpolitik of Tonga, where military power, always essential for the hau, had become a concomitant of political authority.

The nature of concepts such as rank, authority and power should be considered in the light of the aberrant nature of Tongan politics in the 1820s and especially with regard to Aleamotu’a, whose appointment as Tu`i Kānokupolu in 1827 occurred as a consequence of unprecedented political circumstances. A modern scholar has proposed some useful working definitions:

By `rank’ I mean a quality commanding respect and deference, and inherited from one’s parents; it cannot be altered either by one’s own achievements, or by one’s failures. By `power’ I mean legitimate, institutionalised power. ‘Power’ [involves the] capacity to direct and order the activities of other people.6

Aleamotu’a, also known by his family name of Tupou, possessed rank, not only because of his close relationship to his predecessors as Tu`i Kānokupolu, but especially through his mother Kaufusi, a member of the Fale Fisi, or House of Fiji.7 The Fale Fisi, although considered foreign, enjoyed high status because its Fijian male progenitor had married a sister of the Tu`i Tonga, the highest-ranking female in Tonga.8 Authority derived from such august rank has been described as “the socially recognised right to rule”9. The essential difference between Aleamotu’a and most of his predecessors lay in his actual power, or capacity to rule, which was largely confined to the district around Nuku’alofa. Moreover, he was sympathetic to Christianity at a time when many other Tongatapu chiefs bitterly opposed it. Aleamotu’a had yet to accommodate the demonstrated military power of his great-nephew Tāufa`āhau, who after 1826 was the effective master of Ha`apai and Vava`u, the other principal island groups of Tonga. Tāufa`āhau, the most powerful chief in the islands, was considered as hau, and could assume the role of kingmaker. Any “socially recognised right to rule” possessed by Aleamotu’a counted for less than his nephew’s acquired power. Henceforth Aleamotu’a’s authority, limited as it was, would increasingly

6 Bott, “Power and Rank...”, 10.
7 Aleamotu’a is also sometimes referred to as Tupou-in-Faletu’ipapai, a reference to the cemetery where he was buried. Gifford, 91.
9 Bott, “Power and Rank...”, 9.
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depend on the support of Tāufa’āhau. While the prestige of the title of Tu’i Kānokupolu remained undiminished, its revival would depend on political circumstances.

There were three traditional divisions of society in Tonga: the first was the ‘eiki, consisting of the chiefs and their immediate relatives. This level included holders of the three offices of state as well as heads of the various ha’a, or clans. The second level, again very restricted, consisted of the matapule, who were ceremonial attendants of the great chiefs. The great bulk of the people formed the tu’a, or commoners.10 Another authority would exclude the Tu’i Tonga from the ranks of the ‘eiki and place him on an exalted level of his own, since by the sacred nature of his office he was differentiated from the ranks of the other great chiefs.11 Membership of all classes, except occasionally some of the matapule, was ascribed: birth was the sole qualification. Ma’afu’s later career, in both Tonga and Fiji, cannot be properly understood unless his origins near the apex of this highly stratified society are understood.

During the decade of Ma’afu’s birth Tonga, after some 30 years of upheaval, experienced the intrusion of European weapons, trade goods and religion. The decades of instability had meant that, on Tongatapu at least, rank and power remained apart. Ever since the days when the Tu’i Tonga was invariably hau, actual power had to be maintained by force and remained subject to challenge. The titles of Tu’i Tonga and Tu’i Kānokupolu were both revived in 1826, following the victory of Tāufa’āhau over the forces of Laufilitonga, the designated Tu’i Tonga, at the latter’s stronghold, the fortress of Velata in Ha’apai. Reintroduction of the titles reflected a desire by the Tongatapu chiefs to keep Tāufa’āhau at bay, rather than a wish to restore the traditional Tongan polity. His victory dealt a fundamental blow to the prestige of Tonga’s greatest office of state, which had been growing weaker since the eighteenth century. Tāufa’āhau was already master of Ha’apai and Vava’u; now his ageing great-uncle was seen as a buffer to his assuming control of Tongatapu as well, despite the older man’s dangerous flirtation with the new alien religion. Aleamotu’a was, according to his Wesleyan missionary friend John Thomas, a chief without a people.12

Tāufa’āhau, a son of Tupouto’a, complemented his great-uncle in that while Aleamotu’a possessed high rank, the younger chief had accumulated both political and military power. Many visitors to Tonga during the last years of Aleamotu’a’s rule were dismissive of both the man and his authority. The American commodore Charles Wilkes, who called on the aged chief at his home

11 Kaeppler, 174.
12 Thomas, quoted in Campbell, Classical Tongan Kingship, 28.
in Nuku`alofa in 1840, described Aleamotu’ a as “much bent with age … (and) fit for anything but to rule; domestic and affectionate to his family, caring little about the affairs of government, provided he can have his children and grandchildren around to play with”.\textsuperscript{13} Aleamotu’ a informed Wilkes that “he much desired peace and quietness and was willing to do anything to bring it about … everyone seemed to give him the credit of being an imbecile sleepy fellow, and paid him little or no respect”.\textsuperscript{14} Aleamotu’ a’s apparent ineptitude was of little consequence since Tāufa‘āhau, in whose hands effective power lay, was anything but imbecile and sleepy. Wilkes’ views reflect Aleamotu’ a in his twilight years, a benign figure devoid of authority, no longer interested in an office he had not sought and to which he was elevated for political reasons. They tell us nothing of his involvement in the greatest catalyst for change in Tongan history: the advent of Christianity.

During his career in Fiji, Ma`afu was wont to proclaim himself as the champion of Christianity. Cynics then and later decried his hypocrisy, with his various interventions in support of persecuted Christians seen as nothing more than attempts to expand his power. Yet Ma`afu was his father’s son: Aleamotu’ a, during his early years as Tu’i Kānokupolu, was steadfast in his support of Christianity. When the London Missionary Society’s John Williams and Charles Barff visited Tongatapu in 1830, they encountered a Fijian chief named Takai, originally from the island of Lakeba in Lau. Takai had spent time in Tahiti in 1825, where he attended the LMS church and school in the district of Papara. He requested the mission to send teachers to Lakeba, whose paramount chief, Tui Nayau, Takai described as “a friendly, peaceable man” who would afford the teachers a favourable reception.\textsuperscript{15} Two members of the Papara congregation, Hape and Tafeta, were chosen to travel to Fiji and in 1826 they accompanied Takai on board the \textit{Snapper}, Captain Samuel Pinder Henry, en route for Lakeba. When they called at Tongatapu, Aleamotu’ a, being informed by Takai that the Tahitians had “found the true God and the word of Life, and … were going … to the Feejees to teach his countrymen the way to Heaven … answered … It must not be so, If the word he spoke was really a good word it must not go to the tail first but begin with the head (The Tongatabooans take the lead among the Islands in their vicinity and are called the head and all others the tail)”.\textsuperscript{16} So the Tahitians stayed, by invitation, not to say order, of Aleamotu’ a, who was anxious for his people to hear the Word.

\textsuperscript{14} ibid., 28.
A school opened by the Tahitians on Tongatapu was reported in 1827 as well attended and “countenanced by the chief Tupou”.\textsuperscript{17} Three months after his arrival in Tonga in June 1826, John Thomas recorded his puzzlement at the gift of five bunches of bananas from “the chief of Nuguloffa … His name is Toobo”.\textsuperscript{18} The influence of “Toobo”, or Aleamotu`a, can be discerned throughout these early years of Christianity in Tonga. Tongatapu was then in a state of near anarchy, with each chief “like a little king in his own village and among his own people. This is the consequence of thirty years of unrest”.\textsuperscript{19} The absence of central authority was the principal reason why no Tu`i Kānokupolu had been appointed following the death of Tupouto`a in 1820. Despite these uncertainties, Aleamotu`a appears to have stood out among his fellow chiefs. Thomas wrote of him: “this man [h]as given up the Tonga gods he [h]as destroy’d [sic] the spirit house and built a school and chapel to the Lord … [where] as many as choose to go, assemble to worship … These people have something to endure from other parts of Tonga, but the chief continues steadfast, and says he will die rather than give over praying”.\textsuperscript{20} Aleamotu`a revealed considerable courage in remaining a committed Christian through the years of civil disturbance, when the evangelisation of Tonga depended largely on the political fortunes of the champions of the lotu, as the new faith was called. He even sent a secret message to Finau, ruling chief of Vava`u, urging his conversion.\textsuperscript{21} The young Ma`afu, residing in his father’s compound at Nuku`alofa and attending the mission school, must have learned an early lesson that the fortunes of Christianity were often linked to the political process.

Because of his ardour for religion, Aleamotu`a faced many difficulties. After he allowed the Tahitians to proceed to Lakeba in November 1827, he faced an ultimatum from most of his peers: he must renounce the lotu or prepare for war. Fearing for his personal safety following threats from some fellow chiefs, Aleamotu`a made active plans to flee. On the night of 28 November, he ordered “the two large Feejee canoes” to be launched, so that he, his family and some loyal followers could find refuge in Fiji or Samoa, where they could worship unmolested.\textsuperscript{22} According to Tāufa`āhau’s son Tevita `Unga, Aleamotu`a “took with him his son Ma`afu, [who] was still very young at the time”.\textsuperscript{23} The following afternoon, after prolonged discussion “with three enemy chiefs”,

\begin{itemize}
\item[17] Davies, 291.
\item[18] Thomas, Journal, 28 Sep 1826.
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\item[20] ibid.
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Aleamotu`a relented. He informed missionary Nathaniel Turner “that, for the present, he had yielded to his enemies, and that from this time the Lotu ... was to be stopped”.

In return for his apparent capitulation, the other chiefs agreed to invest Aleamotu`a as Tu`i Kānokupolu, a rank to which his birth, if not his inclination, entitled him. “This was a crafty move”, declared Turner, “inasmuch as the obligations of royalty implied the support of the gods of Tonga ... Tupou stepped into the snare”. Aleamotu`a did not however abandon his principles. “I never heard”, Turner wrote, “what has been stated by others, that [Aleamotu`a] promised to give up the lotu”.

Aleamotu`a agreed to invest Aleamotu`a as Tu`i Kānokupolu, a rank to which his birth, if not his inclination, entitled him. “This was a crafty move”, declared Turner, “inasmuch as the obligations of royalty implied the support of the gods of Tonga ... Tupou stepped into the snare”. Aleamotu`a did not however abandon his principles. “I never heard”, Turner wrote, “what has been stated by others, that [Aleamotu`a] promised to give up the lotu”.

A new age existed in Tonga in the 1820s, with the advent of the lotu. No-one, including Aleamotu`a, could recognise its significance in the manner his son was to do in another time and place.

Aleamotu`a remained quietly determined never to abandon Christianity. On 1 December 1827, Thomas noted that the chief “agreed to give up the Lotoo and be made Tooinacabola ... people are to meet at this place to make him. This is a serious event”. Concerning his appointment, Aleamotu`a “seemed to condemn it in his heart, while he yields to it in his actions”. He was invested with great ceremony on 7 December, in the presence of the two missionaries stationed at Nuku`alofa, Nathaniel Turner and William Cross, and about 300 other people. Tu`a were forbidden to witness so sacred a ceremony. As part of the ritual, while he sat against the traditional koka tree drinking his third cup of kava, Aleamotu`a “was formally named Tali-ai-Tupou after the family god, which was a great worldly honour, as well as divine, and he thus became the Tu`i Kānokupolu”.

This was an attempt by the chiefs to set Aleamotu`a firmly, and permanently, against the alien religion and all its implications. Aleamotu`a, “severely tried in his profession of Christianity”, evinced anxiety and some bewilderment. How much of these events were later related by Aleamotu`a to his favourite son, or were learned by the latter from others, cannot be known. It seems likely, in the light of Ma`afu’s career, that the lessons of his father’s great dilemma were not forgotten.

The Wesleyan missionary John Hunt, writing in Fiji some 20 years later, was more cynical than his colleagues in assessing Aleamotu`a’s motives. He described the
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chief as “not sincere in either his adherence to Christianity or his renunciation of it”. Such an assertion, made with the confidence born of hindsight, is suspect. Thomas, Turner and Cross, all contemporaries of Aleamotu’a, recorded their awareness of the chief’s impossible position, as well as their belief in his ingenuousness. Thomas recognised the political implications of Aleamotu’a’s apparent apostasy, while Turner wrote that he and his colleagues were afraid that the investiture of the chief as Tu’i Kānokupolu “obliges the Individual thus created to maintain most of the ancient superstitions of the Land, and this it is certain was the principal thing which the chiefs who oppose our religion had in mind in creating Tubou to this office”.

Although the missionaries praised Aleamotu’a for his devotion to Christianity, the wider political agenda cannot be ignored. Tāufa’āhau, the most powerful chief in Tonga following his victory at Velata, was now rumoured to be planning an invasion of Tongatapu. Aside from its political implications, the elevation of his great-uncle to the dignity of Tu’i Kānokupolu possessed the potential to check any ambitions Tāufa’āhau might have had involving armed intervention on Tongatapu. Tāufa’āhau did not possess the support there that he enjoyed on Ha’apai and Vava’u, and would have had to tread warily. The significance of the investiture ceremonies extended well beyond the religious convictions of one chief.

Despite being backed into the proverbial corner on the question of the lotu, Aleamotu’a waited only six weeks before announcing that services could resume in the Nuku’alofa chapel, closed since the investiture. Then, after announcing in March 1828 that he intended resuming public worship, he felt confident enough to do so almost three months later. Evidence of the other chiefs’ reaction to the Tu’i Kānokupolu’s unexpected move came from Hihifo, whose chief Ata, an unwavering opponent of the lotu, was “very angry that Tubo [h] as again come forward in the good cause”. Nine days later, Aleamotu’a met in class and “engaged in prayer … like one that had been accustomed to pray for years”. This public identification with the lotu proved to be a political crossing of the Rubicon for Aleamotu’a, with one of its many consequences being that Ma’afu’s childhood would be very different from what it might have been, had not the already disturbed Tongan polity been thrown into further disarray by the intrusion of the new faith. The missionaries, determined that the Word should be widely disseminated among young Tongans, made arrangements for
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the production of the first schoolbook. They also decided that schools should be established at each station, with handwritten lessons being used until the new book was available. The first Wesleyan school in Nuku’alofa, later probably attended by Ma’afu, was opened in March 1828 “with an intention to teach both children and adults to read in their own language”. The foundations of education in Tonga were thus established before the small son of the Tu’i Kānokupolu was old enough to attend classes. Amid this apparent hive of spiritual and pedagogical industry, Tongatapu’s first public baptism, that of Ata’s nephew Lolohea, occurred in January 1828. The fortunes of Christianity, while appearing brighter, remained tied to those of Aleamotu’a.

At the close of the 1820s, it was Ma’afu’s spiritual development, rather than his secular education, which occupied the missionaries’ attention, if only by implication. In February 1829, William Cross administered baptism to five women, among them Moala, Ma’afu’s mother and the common law wife, in missionary eyes, of Aleamotu’a. Moala “chose the name of Mary, because it was the Christian name of our Lord’s mother, whom she appears to be ardently desirous of imitating”. Turner had no doubt “but she is a truly sincere and good woman”. Moala, a teacher at the Nuku’alofa mission school, could read the hymns used at the services and knew several of them by heart. She placed great emphasis on the spiritual development of her children: “She frequently conducts their family worship herself, giving out the hymn, leading the tune and engaging in prayer. They generally commence their morning devotion as soon as it is daylight”. Mary Moala, as she is known in Tonga today, appeared sincere in her conversion. On 10 January 1830, Aleamotu’a himself was baptised, along with four of his children, and he and Moala were united in Christian marriage. Ma’afu’s baptism provided him with a cloak of spiritual respectability, a garment he was never loath to assume, many years later, in Fiji.

The various ceremonies at Nuku’alofa were conducted by Turner in the presence of his colleagues Cross and Thomas and of a congregation exceeding 1,000. Aleamotu’a

was neatly dressed in native cloth and looked well. He stood up in front of the pulpit with his wife and children at his left hand. He first called the attention of the people assembled and then openly and firmly renounced the gods of Tonga, declaring them all to be vanity and lies.

39 The book, written by Nathaniel Turner, was entitled First Lessons in the Language of Tongataboo, one of the Friendly Islands; to which are added a Prayer and several Hymns.
42 Cross to GS, WMMS, 9 Apr 1829, WMM, third series, Vol. 8, 546.
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He assured us and his people that he had cast away the things he knew to be sinful ... [and] that he had made an offering of himself, his wife and children that day unto the Lord...\(^{45}\)

Aleamotu`a urged his people to follow his example and to forsake the “ignorant priests ... who pretend to be inspired with the spirits of the gods”.\(^{46}\) He was then baptised Josiah, the name of the Hebrew king who destroyed idols throughout Israel and ordered his people to return to the true God.\(^{47}\) His choice of Christian name, doubtless inspired by the missionaries, revealed how anxious they were to use temporal authority to help spread the Word and to reinforce its message. Following Aleamotu`a’s death in 1845 Thomas, weary and disillusioned after almost 20 years in Tonga, wrote of the former king: “It had been well, if Josiah ... had possessed that zeal for God and for the spread of true religion, that distinguished him after whom he was named ... although he was not what we should have rejoiced to have seen him, yet he had something good in him towards the Lord our God”.\(^{48}\) Perhaps little discredit should fall on Aleamotu`a for failing to achieve the harsh spiritual standards expected by the uncompromising Thomas. Nevertheless, the implications of the choice of name were not to be lost on Ma`afu.

After his baptism, Aleamotu`a presented four of his children for the same rite. Among the three boys and one girl, who were baptised Hezekiah, Henry, David and Selina, only Henry can be identified with certainty: he was of course Ma`afu. John Thomas, writing in 1846, stated that only one of the four was then still alive.\(^{49}\) If that were true, the survivor had to be Ma`afu. The two children Aleamotu`a had with an earlier wife, Moe`ia, were named Ta`i and Hingano and appear not to have been included in the 1830 ceremony.\(^{50}\) Other sons born to Ma`afu’s parents included Fisi`ihoi, who was baptised as William and who died in 1850 aged about 20;\(^{51}\) Samuel, baptised in June 1830 and buried one month later;\(^{52}\) Siaosi Niuleitulu, who reached adulthood and fathered at least four children; Lausi`i, who was born in 1837 and lived only four months; and Josiah,
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baptised on 2 July 1843 “aged about one month”. There were also daughters Vika Kaufusi, or Victoria, who reached adulthood and had two children, and Luisa Tupou, who appears to have died aged about 14. It has been suggested that Ma’afu was named Henry after his father’s friend Samuel Pinder Henry of Tahiti, but there is no contemporary evidence that this was so. Captain Henry was certainly on friendly terms with Aleamotu’a, since in 1828, when the captain called at Tongatapu on his way to Sydney, he presented Aleamotu’a with “a musket or two, a large quantity of fine beads, and some other articles valuable here”. Ma’afu was often referred to during his adult life, in both Tonga and Fiji, as Enele or Henry Ma’afu.

The prospects of Christianity on Tongatapu were linked to the political fortunes of Aleamotu’a which, following the chief’s baptism and marriage, continued to appear promising. When the first post of a new chapel was erected in Nuku’alofa, Turner was enthusiastic: “The site of the chapel is excellent, about 80 feet above the level of the sea … the highest spot of ground on Tonga[tapu]. And what renders the site of our chapel more interesting is, it is in the centre and on the summit of their great fortification at Nuku’alofa”. The placement of the chapel on the hill known as Sia-ko-Veiongo, the site of an earlier fortification, was not without irony. One of the effects of the wars on Tongatapu during that decade was the proliferation of fortresses, where ‘rebel’ chiefs, those who rejected the lotu and its inherent threat to Tonga’s highly structured social order, took refuge with their followers. Many of the chiefs who embraced Christianity sought to enhance their social position or political power. Others preferred their traditional society, a preference that meant that one pillar of that tradition, loyalty to the Tu’i Kanokupolu, was now difficult to maintain. Aleamotu’a, invested as Tu’i Kānokupolu in a time-honoured ceremony, sought to govern within the bounds of the traditional Tongan hierarchy. Yet he was a Christian, and wished to promote the faith among his fellow chiefs. In so doing, he was bound to cast severe strains on the polity of his divided island.

The new chapel, which opened in September 1830 with a congregation of about 1,000, including Aleamotu’a and his family, was certainly a boost for Christianity on Tongatapu. Nevertheless, much still depended on Aleamotu’a’s ability to help spread the new faith, whose self-proclaimed champion he was, while maintaining his secular power. His own life was not devoid of tragedy; two months before the chapel opening Turner recorded the interment of Aleamotu’a’s month-old son, Samuel:
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The father and mother, with some hundreds, attended ... Many were affected to tears while I addressed them on the subject of death, and the happiness of that world towards which little Samuel had just taken flight. The father in particular listened with great attention and interest...  

The loss of this month-old child, the small brother whom Ma`afu must barely have remembered, reveals their father Aleamotu’a as a man who remained committed to the Christian faith and derived benefit from it. In later years, as he grew into old age and as his son left childhood behind, some of his missionary friends came to see the old man's vulnerability as weakness and even moral turpitude. Whatever flaws of character Aleamotu’a possessed, his influence on Ma’afu, who spent most of his first 20 years in his father’s household, must have been great.

Williams and Barff, touring Tongatapu in 1830, recorded that they made frequent calls on Aleamotu’a “and were much pleased with his general deportment. ... Tupou kindly entertained all our native teachers and their families at his house more than a week ... The Queen appeared at the house of God on the Lord’s day in her new bonnet”. We can readily imagine, from this account and others, little Ma`afu growing to maturity in a household permeated by the spiritual succour provided by visiting missionaries and native teachers, while the finer details of Christian living were manifested in such genteel touches as bonnets for the ladies to wear to chapel. Both Ma`afu’s parents appear to have practised Christianity with a fervour characteristic of the newly converted.

It is useful to compare missionary accounts with those from other outsiders not concerned to promote the interests of evangelical Christianity. The barque Elizabeth, Captain Henry Ransome, arrived at Tongatapu in October 1831. One week later, Ransome described Aleamotu’a as “much beloved and respected by his subjects [and] very particular in the observance of his religious duties”. Before he left Tonga, the captain attended service in the Nuku’alofa chapel, where Aleamotu’a “appeared to pay great attention to the sermon ... He is very friendly with the missionaries and endeavours to render their situation as comfortable as he can, his Subjects also follow his example”. Yet it was to be a missionary who was the first to see moral weakness in Aleamotu’a. In 1832, John Thomas observed that Aleamotu’a lacked spiritual fortitude. “Since his baptism”, wrote Thomas, [Aleamotu’a]

---
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has held fast to his profession. He has some good qualities, but is so mild in his government, that one is reminded of the state of the Israelites, where there was no king, ‘and every man did what he thought was right in his own eyes’. It is thought that if Tubou had used his influence amongst his chiefs and people, hundreds, who at this time worship dumb idols, would have been worshippers of the true God.  

Thomas does not suggest how Aleamotu’a might better have influenced his fellow chiefs. Missionary David Cargill, who arrived in Tongatapu in January 1834, described Aleamotu’a as “a tall, stoutly-built man; but his countenance is not expressive of either intellect or benignity”. Despite this poor estimate of Aleamotu’a’s abilities, Cargill was later to praise the chief’s spiritual strength. Aleamotu’a “embraced the religion of the Bible from a conviction of its truth, not influenced by political motives, or the expectation of political aggrandisement”, Cargill wrote in 1842. The rebel chiefs of Tongatapu, on the other hand, rebelled because Aleamotu’a renounced heathenism:

They did not upbraid him with an attempt to encroach on their privileges, or endanger their liberties or their lives, but uniformly asserted their love to the religion of their ancestors, and a determination never to abandon it; these were the motives by which they were stimulated.

Cargill’s estimation of the “rebel” chiefs’ motives leaves us with the picture of a “king” whose feet were planted firmly on the moral high ground, at least by missionary standards. Such an interpretation implied a rigid separation of political and religious motives on the chiefs’ part, a view somewhat at variance with reality. In the 1830s, political divisions among the Tongatapu chiefs had come to assume a religious aspect; Aleamotu’a was a Christian, while his opponents remained heathen. Cargill’s opinion nonetheless leaves open the question of how Aleamotu’a reacted to the pressures of the 1830s, when Ma’afu was rapidly growing to maturity.

Thomas’ restrained comments on Aleamotu’a’s unwillingness to assert his influence as he should are interspersed with more direct criticisms, the most serious of which concerned the sin of spiritual pride. At a service in March 1832, Thomas “corrected some errors into which our people are in danger of falling, such as calling Tubou the rock of religion at Tonga”. Later the same year, Thomas “told the people not to call their chief … a Minister of Christ … they seem to wish to make him like a Pope … I do not wish to offend him, but
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cannot agree for him to meddle in [church] matters”. It is unfortunate that our documented sources for Aleamotu’a’s life during the first half of the 1830s are largely confined to missionary writings, chief among them those of Thomas, whose views on religious matters were narrow at best and ignorant at worst. But Aleamotu’a’s was not the only influence on the young Ma’afu, and perhaps not even the most important; Moala must be credited with her part in the formation of the character of her son.

Unlike her husband, Moala, according to the missionaries, could do no wrong during these early years of Christianity in Tonga. In 1830, Cross forwarded to his Society in London two specimens of the handwriting of the more than 60 Tongatapu women. One example was “by Mary, the wife of our chief Tubou”. It read: “Lord Jehovah, give me a wise mind. I will give thanks to the Lord Jesus Christ, all the days of my life in this world”. Missionary William Woon echoed his colleague’s sentiments in 1831:

I have been busily employed in the printing office, preparing the little book, … I … intend to print 3000 copies … While engaged at the press, the Queen, an excellent well-informed woman, paid me a visit. I gave her a copy of the work … with which she was much pleased and delighted.

The book consisted of passages of Scripture translated into Tongan. Three years later, Moala stood equally high in the missionaries’ esteem: “The chief’s wife is a valuable acquisition to [the female] school [at Nuku’alofa] and is a very diligent and steady support of the infant church of Christ”. By that year, Ma’afu must have begun his education at one of the mission schools. It appears he received both encouragement and practical help from his apparently scholarly and pious mother, to whom it seems fair to look as the source of his undoubted intelligence.

The progress of education on Tongatapu from the earliest Wesleyan schools established in the 1820s is well documented although, since no attendance records have survived, we cannot be certain that young Ma’afu attended any of the schools. Yet it is impossible to imagine that he did not; his mother was both literate and an avid promoter of education in Tonga, while Aleamotu’a saw himself as a patron of the church and all its works. Ma’afu’s signature, in a somewhat immature hand, has survived on many documents in Fiji. So far as the missionaries in Tonga during the 1830s were concerned, formal education was the chief means by which Christian doctrine could be inculcated and indeed
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there is circumstantial evidence that Ma’afu learned more than how to write his name. Captain Ransome was a guest in Aleamotu’a’s compound one day during his 1831 visit:

we passed by the grounds belonging to the King who we found seated on a grass plot with several of his chiefs around him … When Tubou saw us, he motioned for us to sit down with him, when we had an agreeable repast of bananas and cava – the king’s house is spacious and neatly built, his family, all daughters I saw engaged in reading and writing, having been instructed by the missionaries, they had several books which they [sic] had procured for them...71

Ransome’s reference to Aleamotu’a’s family as “all daughters” could be explained by Ma’afu’s absence from the compound when the captain visited, or perhaps the boy was thought too young to begin formal schooling. Encouraged by the missionaries, Aleamotu’a and Moala, having ensured the education of their daughters, were not likely to neglect that of their sons.

The perception which the adult Ma’afu possessed of the role of missionaries, and of the church generally, as well as the use he was to make of them for essentially political ends, probably owed something to the education he received in Tonga. In mission schools, before Ma’afu was old enough to attend, the Biblical and Wesleyan model was used “as a basis for teaching on kingship and law”,72 while the Wesleyans’ aim was “to teach both adults and children to read in their own language”.73 They sought to establish their schools and churches firmly at village level, as a means of promoting stability and ensuring that the church became the focus of social activity. The schools were an inherent part of this process, a force of indoctrination that would teach the Tongan people how to live a proper Christian life within, as far as possible, the existing framework of Tongan society. With church control of education absolute, religion and literacy would remain indissolubly linked in Tonga during the years of Ma’afu’s childhood and youth.

Aleamotu’a was the “king” cast by the missionaries, and to some extent himself, in the role of defender of righteousness on Tongatapu. As a mission school pupil, and as his father’s son, Ma’afu was able to appreciate the benefits that could come the way of the ruler who saw himself, and was seen by others, as the champion of the cause of the Lord. Nevertheless, the foothold secured by Turner and his colleagues remained precarious during the years when Ma’afu would have attended a mission school. Despite the strength of the schools in and near Nuku’alofa, strong opposition to Christianity persisted elsewhere on
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Tongatapu. From 1833 until 1841 the Tongan mission schools, which catered for adults as well as children, were under the overall charge of Jane Tucker, wife of Wesleyan missionary Charles Tucker. The proficiency of the schools, and of Mrs Tucker, was praised by Commodore Wilkes during his 1840 visit. The main mission school in Nuku‘alofoa, which Ma‘afu had probably attended, “equals, if it does not exceed in order and regularity any in our own country”. Various curricula, all printed in the vernacular in Tonga during the 1830s, placed emphasis on Christian virtues such as fellowship with all people, avoidance of hatred, and the importance of love and forgiveness, as part of the Christian ethic. Biblical stories illustrating these precepts were also prominent; included among them were the parables of the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son. These were some of the influences acting on the mind of young Ma‘afu at a time when, in Tonga, such principles were more often honoured in the breach than in the observance.

The schools afforded the Wesleyans an opportunity to promote an equally important aspect of their programme: their theories of kingship. In 1834 two small school books were published which “taught that kingship was divinely ordained, that it involved important duties and responsibilities, and that the king and his people were bound together in a covenant with Jehovah, the basis of this agreement being the Ten Commandments”. The books contained extracts from the First Book of Samuel, whose theme “is that faithfulness to God brings success, while disobedience brings disaster”. The Lord’s message to the priest Eli was unequivocal: “I will honour those who honour me, and I will treat with contempt those who despise me”. The missionaries sought to inspire the ruler and people of Tongatapu with the story of the evolution in ancient Israel of a monarchy inspired by the Lord and firmly under his sovereignty. Although none is on record as saying so, the missionaries in the 1830s might well have considered “King Josiah’s” intelligent young son as one on whom the Biblical concept of kingship should be particularly impressed. Influenced as they were by the custom of primogeniture, which was observed in most European monarchies if not in Tonga, they might have considered Ma‘afu as a possible future Tu‘i Kānokupolu and as “king” of Tongatapu, if not eventually of the whole of Tonga. Yet Tāufa‘ahau had attracted much favourable missionary comment as early as 1828, when he called “to pay his respects” to Aleamotu‘a, newly invested as Tu‘i Kānokupolu. On his visit, Tāufa‘ahau impressed Nathaniel Turner with his
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intelligence and curiosity concerning Christianity, and asked Turner to send a missionary to Ha`apai.80 According to John Williams, Tāufa`ahau “resolved at once to abandon the gods of his forefathers, and place himself under Christian instruction”.81 Conversion was necessary for political reasons since, even in 1828, it was apparent that any chief wishing to gain control over all Tonga would have to come to terms with the new faith. Coming to terms, in the long run, could only mean becoming a Christian.

Although Tāufa`ahau’s military power was not yet extended to Tongatapu, the chief was in the early 1830s regarded as hau by all of Tonga, except for the dissident chiefs on Tongatapu itself. Evidence of Tāufa`ahau’s perception of his role came in 1831, when missionary Peter Turner noted that the chief “was called King George as he had chosen the name of the late King of England George”.82 Having begun to meet in class in 1830, Tāufa`ahau was baptised as “Joaji” in August 1831, in the presence of about 2,000 people. His three children, also baptised, were given the names of Sālote, Tafita and Josaia. Thomas, understandably, was enthusiastic:

What was said of Saul of old may justly be said of our king; `a choice young man (1 Samuel 9:2) and a goodly, there was not among the children of Israel a goodlier person than he, from his shoulders and upwards he was higher than any of the people”83

Another Biblical king had emerged, or so Thomas would have us believe. Almost 20 years later, Tāufa`ahau’s son Tevita `Unga, the “Tafita” of 1831, who was blind in one eye, informed another Wesleyan missionary, Richard Lyth, that this affliction was the cause of his father’s embracing Christianity.84 There was also an oral tradition that Tāufa`ahau “confessed, many years afterwards, to a close friend and relative that the excellence of European arms and tools first attracted him to Christianity”.85 Whatever his reasons, King George, as Europeans would usually know him, was to remain steadfast in the faith, even though the quest that led him to accept Christianity was as much political as spiritual.

The missionaries’ lavish praise for Tāufa`ahau reflected their belief that the pendulum of political power would, in the fullness of time, swing his way. That power was already his, at one level; all that remained was for him to exercise it over all of Tonga. Implicit in many of the missionaries’ eulogies is their belief that “King George” was the natural successor to Aleamotu`a, not only as ruler of
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Tongatapu, but as king of a united and Christian Tonga. While any accession to power by Tāufa’āhau remained in the future, Aleamotu’a continued to impress missionary visitors, even those with so discerning an eye as John Williams. In Tongatapu again late in 1832, Williams described Aleamotu’a as “decidedly firm in his profession” and his wife Moala as “sincerely pious”. Moala in fact was “always employed at home in attending to the wants of her little family … or in attending religious meetings schools and visiting the sick”. Aleamotu’a knew that many of the chiefs were angry with him for having embraced Christianity, but submitted “willingly to his losses of property, food and respect”. These comments from Williams form a pleasant contrast with Thomas’s niggardly complaints about Aleamotu’a’s supposed spiritual laxity. Aleamotu’a, human failings notwithstanding, remained Tu’i Kānokupolu, confident in the bond with his great-nephew. Yet, even though his position was in this one respect secure, the uncertain and indeed ominous political scene on Tongatapu during these years meant that no-one could vouchsafe even a guess concerning the future inheritance, either personal or political, of the young Ma’afu.

The civil strife that recommenced in January 1834 was another episode of the instability that bedevilled Tongatapu for over 30 years. On this occasion, however, Tāufa’āhau emerged as a significant player. Until the previous year, his formal chieftainship had been confined to Ha’apai, but after his investiture as Tu’i Vava’u in 1833, he became effectively master of central and northern Tonga. Tāufa’āhau thus brought impeccable credentials with him when he arrived at Tongatapu in February 1834 with 50 double canoes filled with warriors. Although he has been accused of intervening in order to further his own ambitions, an assertion impossible to refute, his intervention, as hau, was legitimate. Inevitably, the missionaries on Tongatapu saw his arrival as evidence of his support for Aleamotu’a against the anti-Christian forces. Before he landed, some of his followers disembarked and presented Aleamotu’a “with large quantities of food … as a token of humility and respect. While Josiah continues as the head of his children, [Tāufa’āhau], though next in rank to himself, must sit amongst the common people”. Like the children, Tāufa’āhau remained content to play a subordinate role, avoiding armed clashes amid persistent rumours of war. His part in the avoidance of conflict was considered crucial: when the United States Exploring Expedition visited Tonga in 1840, Commodore Wilkes recorded that only the intervention of Tāufa’āhau had saved the Tu’i Kānokupolu from being driven from his kingdom.
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While the mission school curriculum continued to emphasise Christian virtues,\(^92\) the tense religious and political circumstances then prevailing on Tongatapu posed a special challenge. The missionaries responded by highlighting Old Testament condemnations of idol worshippers, lawbreakers and heathens in general. These teachings were contained in five small booklets, two of which featured translations from 1 Samuel dealing with King Saul’s battles against opponents of his secular rule and of the spiritual rule of Jehovah. The subject matter of these books reveals the missionaries’ awareness of the political implications of acceptance of the *lotu*. The chosen parts of 1 Samuel dealt with the armed resistance faced by King Saul, resistance that had arisen through fear that the enemies of Jehovah would triumph. Saul had been chosen as Israel’s king in order to save his people from their enemies. All five booklets enlarged on the theme that Jehovah will give strength to a righteous ruler who makes war on idolaters.\(^93\) The missionaries’ choice was apposite: the Christians of Tongatapu were cast in the role of the Lord’s chosen people, who must be ruthless in their defence of the true religion. Their ultimate victory could not be doubted.

As a pupil in the Nuku’alofa mission school, and especially as the son of Aleamotu’a, the missionaries’ chosen defender of righteousness, Ma’afu was in a unique position to appreciate the benefits likely to accrue to a ruler who was endorsed as the champion of the *lotu*. But he was still very young and was spending his school years in an atmosphere of continued upheaval and threats of war. We have no way of knowing for how long he attended school, or how well he learned to read in his own language. In later years, when he had achieved a position of power in Fiji, before and after its cession to Great Britain, he was known to put pen to paper only to sign his name. Nevertheless, the society in which he grew up must be considered vital in the formation of the future Tui Lau. Both inside the mission classroom and within the confines of his father’s compound at Nuku’alofa, Ma’afu had the opportunity to learn a vital lesson: that a ruler who fought in the defence of the faith need never shed the cloak of justice. He might also have learned that religion can also play an essentially political role, serving as a veneer for the acquisition and consolidation of political power. Most importantly of all, as he watched the drama unfolding on Tongatapu’s political stage, Ma’afu probably realised that he could never become Tu’i Kānokupolu himself, even by force, so long as Tāufa’āhau was alive.

---
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\(^93\) For example, Psalm 2 “God’s Chosen King” and Psalm 18 “David’s Song of Victory”, quoted in Cummins, School and Society..., 167.
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Although we cannot definitely place Ma`afu in a classroom at any time during his childhood, we do have a description of the scene inside the Nuku`alofa mission school, with which the boy was certainly acquainted. Jane Tucker’s "recollections of … missionary life in the Friendly Islands" are on record:

The students were all seated on the ground in the schoolroom; and … each was furnished with a slate and pencil. They wrote from copy-slips, which [Mrs Tucker] had prepared for them. After practising writing for some time, those who were most advanced were formed into a class. A sentence was read to them, and they were required to write it on their slate. This was generally well done, as the Tonguese have little difficulty in spelling their own language correctly. In hope of benefiting [sic] the local preachers, she made it one of their school exercises to write sermons…

We are entitled to picture the child Ma`afu seated on the classroom floor, slate in hand, absorbing both the alphabet and the faith of his missionary fathers. It is likely, given his keen intelligence and his august rank, that the lessons being enacted beyond the classroom walls absorbed the greater part of his attention.

More than a year later, the difficulties faced by the Tu`i Kānokupolu were no easier of resolution. Christianity in Tongatapu was “almost totally confined to Nuku`alofa [and] a spirit of opposition to Christianity seems to have grown up in the minds of some of the chiefs who were previously indifferent”. When in September 1835 a stockade was built around the chapel on Sia-ko-Veiongo, Aleamotu’a at last appeared determined to stand up to his disaffected fellow chiefs. “They have made a regular shuttlecock of [Aleamotu’a]”, wrote missionary James Watkin, “and he has endured their bad manners with great patience but is tired at length, and determined to resist their evil intentions”. Desultory murmurings, sometimes of sufficient strength to be called plots, had surrounded Aleamotu’a ever since his investiture as Tu`i Kānokupolu in 1827. Tāufa`āhau’s arrival in February 1834 with his warriors had merely replaced the lid on a simmering cauldron.

The year 1834 had been marked by an unprecedented religious revival, “a most beloved manifestation of the spirit”, in Ha`apai and Vava’u. Tongatapu nevertheless remained aloof from this visitation of the holy spirit to the point where, owing to “the belligerent aspect of affairs”, the usual Wesleyan
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school report could not be submitted.\textsuperscript{98} The following year, prejudice against Christianity reached new heights; opposition had “never been more violent than at the commencement of the present year”\textsuperscript{.99} Many people, fearful of war and famine, left Tongatapu. During one of several visits to the island, Tāufaʻāhau “loaded several large canoes with yams, and sent them to the principal heathen Chiefs, as an expression of his sympathy and friendship, or as a proof of his desire to alleviate their sufferings and relieve their distresses”.\textsuperscript{100} As if famine were not enough, fresh rumours arose that some chiefs were again plotting to depose Aleamotu’a, “which would be small loss to him, for his authority is much reduced”.\textsuperscript{101} Maʻafu was little more than 12 and facing dangers more serious than those of his infancy.

Shortly afterwards, Maʻafu accompanied his mother and four brothers and sisters to Vavaʻu, a visit which Thomas, then stationed in the northern archipelago, ascribed solely to Moala’s Christian duty. “It says something of their love that they should have engaged in a voyage of upwards of 140 miles in order to visit us”.\textsuperscript{102} It also says something of the dangers they faced at home, since Moala and her party were refugees from famine and growing unrest. With Thomas choosing to present her visit as something akin to a social call, he could hardly embellish his words with any hint of the gathering storm. Some three months earlier, one of the Tonga missionaries did vouchsafe some doleful news in the annual “Tonga School Report”: “I cannot boast of a great increase [of scholars] … the state of the island from the prospect of war and its distressed condition in consequence of famine may perhaps be urged as the reasons why … great numbers have removed in consequence and many who have not removed have been prevented from attending [school]”.\textsuperscript{103} Missionary Stephen Rabone recorded the Tongatapu chiefs’ desire to depose Aleamotu’a and “replace him with someone more favourable to their views and practices”.\textsuperscript{104} In mid December, Tāufaʻāhau called at Vavaʻu on his way from Haʻapai to Tongatapu. Aleamotu’a had sent for him as protection against the rebel chiefs’ expressed wish for a new king, and he had come to Vavaʻu “to consult with the great chiefs of this place”.\textsuperscript{105} On Tongatapu, the Christian supporters of Aleamotu’a
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had been reluctant to advise their friends in Ha`apai and Vava`u that war was likely, “lest there should be the semblance of their having occasioned the war by … having acquainted their auxiliaries with its probability”.106

The events of 1837 need not be considered in any detail here. The arrival of Tāufa`āhau with a fleet of canoes was inevitably seen as a hostile act by the heathen chiefs, who had long been anxious to provoke him to war.107 The causes of the conflict, which began one week after his arrival, can best be ascribed to the polarisation of Tongan society. After hostilities commenced, the schools in Nuku`alofa quickly became overcrowded with refugees driven from their villages by the anti-lotu chiefs.108 Two rebel forts were besieged, with that at Hule causing the greatest loss of life and occasioning considerable missionary distress, despite the Christian party’s victory. According to Pita Vi, a Tongan teacher, the siege of Hule fortress occurred only after both Aleamotu`a and Tāufa`āhau had exercised the utmost Christian forbearance. “The Tu`i Kānokupolu sent word to the chiefs of Hule … and told them that he loved them, but what were their wishes? Would they accept Christianity or would they not? … they replied that they wanted to fight … Then Josiah sent … to Tāufa`āhau that he was to please himself”.109 The chiefs’ quarrel was not so much with Aleamotu`a as with Tāufa`āhau, on whose power Aleamotu`a depended. Tāufa`āhau’s position as hau was under challenge.

The Christian forces’ capture of the fortification at Hule on 25 January resulted in the “murder of 300 men women and children from among the rebel ranks”, while only six Christians fell.110 When fighting ceased in early February, the rebels were confined to three of their other large forts. Despite their setbacks, the heathen had remained “so infatuated … that they would not lay down their arms”, spurning peace offers from both Aleamotu`a and Tāufa`āhau.111 In view of the nature of the propaganda that had for several years been dispensed in classroom and pulpit, it is worth considering missionary attitudes, in both Tonga and Great Britain, to the war itself and to the massacre at Hule in particular. Tāufa`āhau had been followed to Tongatapu by Thomas’ urgent admonition not to attack first: on 8 January the missionary, still in Vava`u, had preached from 2 Chronicles 20, where the king of Judah is urged not to fight but to leave the battle to the Lord. A copy of the sermon was sent to Tāufa`āhau immediately afterwards.112 Thomas was well aware of the political nature of the struggle on
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Tongatapu and of the fact that some non-Christian chiefs lent their support to Aleamotu`a. It was the military supremacy of Tāufa`āhau that was under threat. Watkin, who remained in Aleamotu`a’s fortress at Nuku`alofa, reported that the Hule massacre and other occasions when lives were lost were evidence of “Satan’s kingdom being destroyed with great spirit”.113 Two days before the Hule massacre, Thomas preached on Joshua 10, which considers the successful Israelite invasion of Canaan:114 “Joshua conquered the whole land … He spared no-one; everyone was put to death”.115 The war on Tongatapu was nothing less than the struggle of Christianity for supremacy over the forces of darkness.

Since the fortunes of the new religion, politically charged as they were, were destined to be so significant during Ma`afu’s career in Fiji, it is useful to consider some reactions to the great loss of life on Tongatapu during the years of his childhood. John Beecham, one of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society’s General Secretaries, did not share Thomas’ unquestioning support for what he saw as the forces of the Lord, support that Hule did nothing to diminish. In February, Thomas preached on Judges 5:31: “So let all thine enemies perish, O Lord”. He did not forget to add in his journal: “The people were very attentive”.116 Beecham severely condemned Tāufa`āhau’s actions in storming the fortress at Hule and slaughtering men, women and children. “That his brother was severely wounded in the earlier assault was not sufficient to authorise a Christian king and a preacher of the Gospel to adopt such a course”.117 Here was humanity placed above evangelisation; Beecham, unlike Thomas, was removed from the political arena. By way of contrast, Charles Tucker in Tonga saw mitigating circumstances in a rebel plan to murder Tāufa`āhau and all his army. The king was to be lured inside the fortress on the understanding that the heathen chiefs there wished to embrace the lotu. Tāufa`āhau informed Tucker that “while marching toward the fortress … he had no intention whatever of harming the women and children, ’but in a moment it came into his mind to put all to the sword’. He said he believed it was the just judgment of God upon all the people of that place, because of the horrid plan they had formed of murdering him and all the Christians”.118

With hindsight born of our knowledge of Tāufa`āhau’s long years as king of Tonga, and of the chequered future progress of Christianity in Fiji, we are entitled to treat the chief’s explanation, as reported by Tucker, with scepticism. For Tāufa`āhau, the Christian-heathen contest possessed a complex political hue. Civil strife in Tonga had occurred throughout his lifetime; his position

113 Watkin, Journal, 14 Feb 1837.
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117 John Beecham to Chairman of the Friendly Islands’ District, 28 March 1838, WMMS OC, 1834–1838.
as hau, involving his inevitable succession as Tu`i Kānokupolu, the traditional opposition to his own family, and the duplicity of sometime allies who had again taken up arms against him, all served to propel Tāufa`āhau along the road to Hule. Nevertheless, “the teachings of the missionaries gave [Tāufa`āhau] a religious-Christian rationale and sanction for prosecuting the war”. The incongruity of this Christian king leading his men in prayer before investing Hule and massacring its inhabitants must be seen in the context of the political and religious pressures of the time. Ma`afu, not present at Hule or even then on Tongatapu, would be confronted with similar complexities later in the century in Fiji. There, he was to pursue a career essentially uncompromised by moral ambiguities, a career characterised in far greater measure than his cousin’s by opportunism, unbridled ambition, cunning, outright deception and sometimes violence. This divergence of approach and indeed of philosophy is a reflection of differences of character between the two men rather than the consequence of any inordinate contrast between the political circumstances each of them faced.

With peace seemingly assured, Moala and her children sailed to Ha`apai in April, en route to Tongatapu. Except for the times such as this when Ma`afu and his family were evacuated from Tongatapu, we know almost nothing of his daily life during his childhood. Although we have good reason to suppose him dutifully attending school when Tongatapu was at peace, we do not know how often he went, or how far he absorbed the mission teachers’ message. We should nonetheless pay some attention to the evolving curriculum to which Ma`afu was exposed, even if only intermittently. The missionaries did not serve a diet of continual death and destruction, unleavened by the gentler message of the Christian gospel. Some of them, at least, were sensitive to the more fundamental teachings of Christianity. Rabone, for example, perhaps in reaction to the slaughter at Hule, decided to concentrate on the themes of mercy and love in his sermons. This message had been heard in Tongan schools at least two years earlier: in February 1835, a translation of part of the Gospel of Matthew was published for use in schools. The small book, which included the Sermon on the Mount and the Beatitudes, “taught the blessings of mercy and peacemaking, and outlined man’s responsibility to his neighbour”. The parable of the Prodigal Son was also included. Here was a marked contrast with the emphasis on militarism and destruction found in the Old Testament texts. Yet, however determined many of the missionaries might have been to present teachings that highlighted Christian brotherhood, mercy and forgiveness, their school curricula and their sermons inevitably came under the influence of the
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increasing hostility and division within the Tongan social fabric. Faced with the reality of a bitter conflict, the missionaries resorted to a doctrine of “holy war” in both classroom and pulpit. If war there must be, then let the forces of the Lord triumph over those of the heathen. Somewhere among the civil strife and the conflicting messages from the bearers of the lotu there moved a small boy, whose reactions to it all must be forever a matter of speculation.

For the moment, in mid 1837, peace prevailed on Tongatapu. The missionaries continued to extol the virtues of Tāufaʻāhau “whose very name almost strikes terror into the heathen”. Eulogy was tempered with a pragmatic note of caution: “The Christians have not thought it prudent to remove out of the Fortresses lest their enemies should take advantage of it, and murder many of them”. Only Tāufaʻāhau and his military strength stood between the survival of both Christianity and Aleamotuʻa on the one hand, and anarchy and civil war on the other. At the end of 1837 there arrived on Tongatapu a fleet of 23 canoes, carrying about 2,000 men and led by Tāufaʻāhau. “The heathen are afraid”, declared Rabone. One positive result of this further intervention was the conversion of Tāufaʻāhau’s grandfather, Maʻafu of Vaini, one of Tongatapu’s most defiant rebels. His renunciation of the old gods is typical of much of Aleamotuʻa’s rule as Tuʻi Kānokupolu: the lotu was used as an effective means of diffusing political opposition and avoiding war. Conversion of the recalcitrant chiefs helped to consolidate Aleamotuʻa’s precarious position while at the same time preparing a secure power base for his eventual successor, Tāufaʻāhau.

Although we do not know whether Maʻafu, aged about 13, was among the 1,067 scholars recorded on Tongatapu in October 1837, it is likely that his education still owed much to events beyond the classroom walls. While learning the rules of those most fundamental of all political games, the acquisition and preservation of power, Maʻafu lived in his father’s household, which lay inside the fortification at Nukuʻalofa. The house and adjoining mission school lay on top of “a gentle acclivity”, that is, Sia-ko-Veiongo. Nearby, on the path up the hill, lay a drum, “a large hollow log, not unlike a pig trough, made of hard, sonorous wood; it is struck with a mallet [and] gives a sound not unlike a distant gong, and it is said may be heard from seven to ten miles”. From the summit of Veiongo, part of the view over coastline, lagoon and reef, familiar to Maʻafu as a child, can still be seen. Its position in the time of Aleamotuʻa as a natural centre of any communication may easily be appreciated.
We are no closer, during these final years of Ma`afu's childhood, to determining to what extent he was influenced by the mission teaching to which he had for so long been exposed. We do know that, in more stable times, the prospects for Christian education had markedly improved. An important innovation was that children were now taught separately from adults.\textsuperscript{129} “All the schools are conducted on strictly religious principles”, the Society was assured. “They are invariably concluded with singing and prayer, and are attended by all ranks, from the King and Queen, to the meanest of their subjects, and by persons of all ages, from infancy to hoary hairs”.\textsuperscript{130} If we wish to sustain this image, we might picture Ma`afu seated among his peers, now separate from the “hoary hairs”, joining in the singing and prayer with relish. When such a report of universal piety, dutifully presented for consumption at home, is considered in the light of political reality in Tonga, we might also record the words of Dante:

\begin{quote}
Imagination, thou dost so abstract us
That we are not aware, not even when
A thousand trumpets sound about our ears.
\end{quote}

The picture of Ma`afu in the mission schools of the late 1830s should rather be sought among other missionary reports, where a more pragmatic, not to say rational, assessment of their educational policy and practice is presented. Many of the Wesleyans were recording increasing discontent with the state of education in Tonga, especially with regard to the schools’ lack of appeal for young people. In a surprising admission, the books available, which were mostly Methodist catechisms and extracts from Scripture, were stated to be too few in number and, more significantly, too narrow in content. The schools themselves were seen as more like Sunday schools than day schools, providing additional avenues for worship rather than a secular education.\textsuperscript{131} Some missionaries were prepared to advance reasons for this educational dead end that the mission schools had apparently reached. One, which no-one who has read any contemporary missionary journal would doubt, was that because the missionaries were constantly busy with a multitude of tasks, they had insufficient time to devote to pedagogical matters. We might also question whether their training and indeed inclinations enabled them to prepare a curriculum not based entirely on Scripture. Another reason for the impasse in the schools was that the so-called native teachers, Tongans who had received a modicum of instruction in religion and literacy, were inefficient schoolmasters.

\textsuperscript{129} The official report of the state of the Missions and Schools in Tonga, as presented at the District Meeting in October 1837, WMMS Annual Report, 1838, 40.
\textsuperscript{130} ibid.
\textsuperscript{131} See, for example, Ha`apai School Reports for 1836 and 1837, and Tonga School Reports for 1839 to 1841, WMMS District Meeting Minutes, Fiji and Friendly Islands, 1827–1855.
because they lacked proper training.\textsuperscript{132} If Ma`afu’s school attendance survived his several evacuations from Tongatapu and the disruptions of the island’s civil strife, the quality of the education he did receive must be called into question.

Amid anxiety about the future course of mission education, and about the fortunes of the lotu as the pendulum of political power swung to and fro, there sometimes emerges from the missionary writings a picture of Aleamotu’a and his family simply as a family, facing the vicissitudes of life. Late in 1837, Charles Tucker recorded in his journal a picture of their intense grief:

\begin{quote}
I buried one of the king’s children, he was 8 months old, a remarkably fine child, taken off after but 4 or 5 days sickness. Most of the people of Nuku’alofa attended the funeral. May the Lord strengthen and console the minds of the afflicted parents … Mary wept much, Josiah was not present – he is passionately fond of their children.\textsuperscript{133}
\end{quote}

This boy, whose name was Lausi’i, was the second of the sons of Aleamotu’a and Moala known to have died in infancy. Their elder surviving son is likely to have been doubly precious to them and, in view of the several mentions by missionaries of Aleamotu’a’s fondness for his children, also likely to have been indulged. The picture of Ma`afu at the end of the 1830s is of a wilful boy in his early teens, living under the benign authority, if authority it can be called, of an indolent father and a pious mother, and sometimes attending a mission school whose quality of instruction was dubious and whose future was clouded. The position of the lotu on Tongatapu was by no means assured; the heathen chiefs continued to pose a real if quiescent menace, while peace and indeed the survival of Ma`afu’s father depended on the good will and active support of Tāufa`āhau, as it always had. The turbulence surrounding the end of Ma`afu’s childhood in Tonga may be seen as a harbinger of his future career among the islands of Fiji.

\begin{flushright}
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2. “Ma`afu...had sailed for Feejee...”

A prelude to the events of the 1840s, the decade when Ma`afu left his homeland, occurred at a ceremony near Neiafu, Vava`u in March 1839. The local chiefs, their matapule and many of the district’s adult males assembled for the promulgation of a new code of laws prepared by Tāufa`āhau. The laws, already in operation in Vava`u for more than a year, were read to the gathering by Tāufa`āhau, who enlarged upon any requiring explanation.¹ Heavily influenced by the missionaries, they were to be introduced in Ha`apai as well. By implication, Tongatapu waited only for political stability and the conversion of the remaining heathen chiefs before it too was to enjoy the benefits of the code.

Typical of the code’s provisions was its fourth paragraph:

my people should live in great peace ... having no wish for war ... therefore I wish you to allow to your people some time for the purpose of working for themselves; they will work for you ... in working your Canoe; in planting your yams, and bananas, and in whatever you may require their services; but ... it is no longer lawful, for you to ... take by force any article from them, but let their things be at their own disposal.²

The code delineates an ordered Christian society, where king, chiefs and people live in mutual obligation, with commoners’ rights enshrined in law for the first time. Tongatapu in the early 1840s, the years of Ma`afu’s adolescence and young adulthood, was vastly removed from such an ideal condition.

The renewal of hostilities in 1840 echoed the events of three years earlier. Fortresses were prepared owing to “misunderstandings” between Christians and heathens, while keeping the Christians on the right path was difficult “inasmuch as quarrels are principally of a family character”.³ In January, with Aleamotu`a once again preparing to send to Tāufa`āhau for assistance, “confusion and uproar” prevailed everywhere on Tongatapu. Defensive stockades were under construction and houses were being carried into the fortress: “altogether one scene of confusion”.⁴ The immediate cause of Aleamotu`a’s appeal to his nephew came on 14 January, when he and his family were visiting Fo`ui, a small, fortified Christian settlement in Hihifo. When four Christians from Fo`ui were murdered while working in their gardens outside the fort, Charles Tucker described the atrocity as “the greatest insult the heathen could offer [Aleamotu`a]”, since it

¹ John Thomas, Journal, March 1839.
⁴ ibid., 20 Jan 1840.
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occurred while the chief and his family were inside. Evidence that Aleamotu`a had lost effective control over the Christian chiefs, hitherto his only Tongan supporters, came on 23 January when, during a meeting between himself, Tucker and Stephen Rabone, word came that a Christian man from Fo`ui had left the fort there and killed two of the heathens. This action was a direct defiance of Aleamotu`a, who had ordered the Fo`ui people to remain inside their fortress until the arrival of Tāufa`āhau.6

Once again, the fortunes of Christianity were placed in the hands of Tāufa`āhau, whose power as hau was under threat from the “confusion and uproar” on Tongatapu. He arrived from Vava`u, accompanied by 30 men, on 25 January and was quickly followed by his “great war vessel” and other large canoes bringing more than 200 warriors.7 Tāufa`āhau learned on arrival at Fo`ui that the heathens in their fortress were plotting to kill him. After investing the fortress for almost a fortnight, he entered it and captured more than 500 people, apparently without loss of life. All were pardoned. Realising that his continued presence in Tongatapu was essential, Tāufa`āhau decided to make his residence there and brought “about nine hundred men, with their families, from Ha`apai and Vava`u to reside with him”.8 Tucker believed that only Tāufa`āhau’s actions had prevented an immediate heathen attack on Nuku`alofa.9

Tāufa`āhau was now responsible, not only for keeping the Christian cause alive on Tongatapu, but also for the personal safety of Aleamotu`a and his family. It is likely that Ma`afu, then aged about 15, accompanied his parents to Fo`ui in January 1840, since “King Josiah and his family were on a visit there”. Aleamotu`a’s brother Lasike, known to missionaries as Abraham, took a large party of men to Fo`ui to remove the family to the safety of the fortress at Nuku`alofa.10 We have no means of assessing the degree of political astuteness that Ma`afu, in personal danger as he was, then possessed. He must have realised that his father’s position owed everything to rank and nothing to power, and that the hau, whose support was vital to the ageing Aleamotu`a, would inevitably replace him. This uneasy relationship between rank and power had existed since Aleamotu`a’s investiture as Tu`i Kānokupolu, after which he and Tāufa`āhau were often referred to in documented sources as “the two kings”. When the United States Exploring Expedition reached Tongatapu in April 1840, Commodore Charles Wilkes received the “two kings” on board the expedition’s flagship. “Their majesties were both naked, except the tapa wound

5 Charles Tucker to GS, WMMS 15 Apr 1840, WMN, New Series, No. 25, Jan 1841, 420–421.
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round their waists … They left the ship highly delighted with their presents and visit”.

Social niceties aside, both “kings” continued to face the heathen menace and Wilkes was quickly asked by Tucker to “use his influence to bring about peace”. With fighting again occurring at Hihifo, Wilkes came on shore for a second meeting with the “kings”, this time to consider how peace might be re-established. The meeting, which took place inside Aleamotu’a’s “small hut” within the fort at Nuku’alofa, had much to say about the future course of political power in Tonga.

While Aleamotu’a and other Tongatapu Christian chiefs conferred inside the hut, Wilkes, in company with Tucker and Rabone, waited outside for Tāufa’ahau to arrive. Wilkes afterwards praised that chief’s demeanour and physical appearance, observing that Tāufa’ahau possessed the presence of one used to command. The chief nevertheless seated himself outside the hut because, as Tucker explained, Tāufa’ahau was not yet considered a native chief of Tongatapu. Tradition demanded he be seated among the common people. Because Wilkes knew Tāufa’ahau to be the “ruling chief de facto” in Tongatapu, he requested his admission to the hut. After being duly requested by his uncle to enter, Tāufa’ahau sat himself “at a respectful distance from the king, to whom he showed great and marked respect”.

Here, as at the investiture of Aleamotu’a as Tu’i Kānokupolu more than 12 years before, Tāufa’ahau knew his rightful place. Now, even though absolute power was already his, he was still content to wait.

The meeting resolved to convene a gathering of heathen and Christian chiefs, under Wilkes’ chairmanship, on the island of Pangai in the Nuku’aloa lagoon, for the purpose of negotiating peace. In the event, only one supposedly heathen chief presented himself, only to decamp with his followers after two days. The American expedition then left for Fiji, Wilkes having been unsuccessful in his role as mediator. Ma’afu remained inside his father’s compound surrounding Sia-ko-Veiongo, where he witnessed much more than the scenes of “confusion and uproar” so painful to the missionaries. On his visit to the compound, Wilkes had noted “large numbers of warriors, all grotesquely dressed and ready [to] … fight, with clubs, spears and muskets”. More pertinent to Tonga’s future was the “town” which Tāufa’ahau was building “just without the fortification of King Josiah”. The presence of the most powerful chief in Tonga was more than an outward and visible commitment to the cause of Aleamotu’a and Christianity. Wilkes correctly read the political writing on the wall when he
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observed: “the permanency and arrangement with which the town is laid out make Tāufa’āhau’s intention quite evident”.17 Construction of the “town” was a preparation for the day when Tāufa’āhau would assume in law the authority that, for most practical purposes, he already possessed.

Because of the assistance received from Tāufa’āhau, Aleamotu’a gave his nephew “land, and half the village of Nuku‘alofa”, including a broad sea frontage. “There are therefore now two large fences at this place”, Thomas duly recorded, “the one called the old, and the other the new fort, the old is in the occupancy of Josiah and his people, the other King George and his [chiefs] and their wives and families live in. This arrangement is said to be highly offensive to some of the heathen chiefs”.18 Despite such manifestations of power, Tāufa’āhau “did not consider [the] Nuku‘alofa people as belonging to him but rather to Josiah”.19 Tāufa’āhau’s professions of humility continued to reflect a traditional power structure in which the hau deferred to a ranking chief.

The situation on Tongatapu quickly deteriorated after the brief interlude provided by the visit of the American expedition. On 5 May, “war” broke out afresh on Tongatapu, while next day came news of a plot to kill Setaleki Mumui, a nephew of Aleamotu’a who was considered by some as a possible successor.20 During the following month Peter Turner, a Wesleyan missionary working in Ha’apai, recorded the arrival of five canoes from Tongatapu, en route to Vava’u, whence they would bring as many men as possible to aid Tāufa’āhau’s cause. “The heathens are determined on war and on their own distruction [sic]”, Turner declared. In Fiji, three canoes were being built; “when they shall be finished many Tonguese may be expected to return home”. On Tongatapu, Europeans were anxiously awaiting the arrival of the Wesleyan mission ship Triton so that they could be evacuated. “The schools and society are torn to pieces”, Turner lamented.21 The situation there appeared more dangerous than at any time during Ma`afu’s brief life. He was, of course, still too young to play any part, political or military, in the affairs of his troubled island.

During these critical weeks, Ma`afu probably remained inside the fortress at Nuku‘alofa. Fearful of heathen incursions, his father “with other old chiefs … slept outside [the mission’s] gates” on the night of 17–18 June, although Tāufa’āhau, investing the heathen fortress at Vaini, returned before any harm could befall his uncle. Two days later both chiefs, supported by Rabone and Tucker, sought help from Commander Walter Croker, captain of the visiting

17 ibid.
18 Thomas, Tongatapu or the Friendly Islands, 1237–1238.
19 Rabone, Journal, 1 May 1840.
20 Thomas, Journal, 5–6 May 1840.
British sloop of war *Favourite*. On 24 June, Croker and about 100 of his men, in an act of supreme folly, accompanied Tāufaʻāhau and his forces to the heathen stronghold at Pea where, in the ensuing affray, Croker was killed. One result of this affair, according to Peter Turner, was that “the prowess of England is considerably lessened … and the natives only think more of their own skill”. Despite this blow to English, and by implication missionary, prestige, Croker’s death was followed by an uneasy calm. When John Thomas, stationed at Vavaʻu, arrived at Tongatapu on 21 July, he found the island at peace. The day before he returned to Vavaʻu in August, he received Aleamotuʻa at the mission in Nukuʻalofa. “To all appearances peace is settled”, the missionary recorded. “There has not been any war since the day I landed here, and I think the Lord has disposed both heathens and Christians to be at peace”.

A curious aside to these events occurred in June 1840, when missionary Joseph Waterhouse, visiting Vavaʻu, recorded that “King Josiah, feeling himself unable to contend with the wicked Heathen who have so long been threatening him, has resigned his throne in favour of his relative George, King of Vavou [sic]”. Waterhouse misunderstood the relationship between uncle and nephew or, in political terms, between rank and power. His colleague Rabone referred to the essentially family character of the disputes between Christian and heathen and condemned the warlike disposition of people who had been Christians for only a few years. Thomas deplored violence as a means of propagating the faith; according to him, “where persecution begins, Christianity ends”. While most commentators saw the events at Foʻui, the destruction of the heathen spirit houses by Tāufaʻāhau’s forces and the deliberate burning of the Foʻui chapel by a Christian man as immediate causes of the fighting, the events of the first half of 1840 must be considered in a broader context. For Maʻafu, who rated no mention in any account of the wars, the broader context defined his political future and was eventually to send him permanently beyond the shores of Tonga.

Maʻafu remained confined within his father’s compound at Sia-ko-Veiongo, whose surrounding fence and a deep trench symbolised the intense religious divide between Aleamotuʻa and his heathen relatives. While Tuʻi Kānokupolu fortified his home because he feared for the safety of himself and his family, the heathen
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chiefs saw the defences as a declaration of war.\textsuperscript{30} The conflict’s chief protagonist, Tāufa’āhau, aware that the contest would decide the fate of Christianity on Tongatapu, was determined to avoid the bloodshed of the last serious clashes three years earlier. Before the attack on Fo‘ui, Tāufa’āhau explained to his warriors that during the 1837 war they had not “fought as Christians should fight” and urged them not to shoot or strike “but in case of life and death”.\textsuperscript{31} For Wilkes, the war was “in great measure a religious contest, growing out of the zeal the missionaries have to propagate the gospel and convert the heathen”.\textsuperscript{32} We might wonder if this summation is entirely justified, in view of Tāufa’āhau’s warning to his forces and Thomas’ later denunciation of “persecution” in the name of Christianity. Wilkes, however, recognised the link between Christianity and the political pressures of the day. “With this [religious contest] is combined the desire of … Tāufa’āhau, who is already master of Ha`apai and Vavao [sic], to possess himself of all the islands of the group”.\textsuperscript{33} Considering his short stay in Tonga, Wilkes’ analysis is remarkably pertinent. For him, “the missionaries and [Tāufa’āhau] were mutually serving each other’s cause”.\textsuperscript{34} The inhabitants of Tongatapu, whom other Tongans had always respected, were now threatened with subjugation by those same people. Wilkes observed that “such feelings are enough to make them war against any innovation in their social polity and laws”.\textsuperscript{35}

Incisive though these comments are concerning the situation on Tongatapu, they fail to reflect the complex causes of the wars of the 1830s, wars occasioned by the power struggle already in progress for half a century. The same power struggle resulted in Aleamotu’a’s elevation to the rank of Tu’i Kānokupolu and would ultimately exclude the young Ma’afu from a share in the evolving polity of his native land. Our knowledge of his life during this time of turbulence is inevitably limited by the paucity of documented references to him in the decade following his baptism in January 1830, beyond mentions of the cosy domesticity of his family life.\textsuperscript{36} Ma’afu, though, was soon to leave behind the comforts of his parental home. John Thomas, who arrived at Tongatapu from Vava’u in July, was summoned to meet Aleamotu’a, Lasike and Tāufa’āhau at Sia-ko- Veiongo. “After much time spent in consultation, it was agreed to send early on Monday morning a person to the heathen chiefs, proposing peace. In this I rejoice”.\textsuperscript{37} The subject of the men’s deliberation was presumably the forthcoming negotiations with the heathen. Neither on this day nor the next
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did Thomas make any mention of an event of major significance in Aleamotu`a’s family that would occur the following week. Thomas’ journal for Wednesday 29 July contains this somewhat laconic entry:

At 10 o’clock a very large concourse of people assembled at the Sia where after singing and prayer I married Henery Ma’afu King Josiah’s eldest son to Elinoa Gatailupe, the sister to Queen Charlotte, after which I preached on Matthew 6:33 “But seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all things shall be added unto you”. 38

Contemporaries must have seen Ma`afu’s marriage as a very suitable alliance, as much for its implied political strategy as for the respective ranks of the parties concerned. There is unfortunately no record of the discussions that brought it about. The ceremony took place in the presence of “a very large assembly of friends from various parts of the Kingdom”, although Aleamotu`a was not among them. Because it was “war time”, the feast “was only on a small scale, being … about twelve roasted hogs, with other things prepared for the occasion”. 39

Ma’afu and Elenoa Gataialupe were distantly related by blood: both were descended from Mataeleha`amea, fourth holder of the Tu`i Kānokupolu title, who first made the title one of significance outside Tongatapu. Of greater importance in 1840 was the fact that Elenoa was the half-sister of Lupepau`u, known to Europeans as Queen Charlotte, the Christian wife of Tāufa`āhau. Ma`afu, probably no more than 16, gained as a brother-in-law the man in whose hands supreme power in Tonga effectively lay. Both men acquired status from their wives, since Elenoa and Lupepau`u were great-granddaughters, through the female line, of the Tu`i Tonga Fefine Siumafua`uta. 40 The union of Ma`afu and Elenoa was political in nature. Although related by blood to Tāufa`āhau, Ma`afu acquired further status through his close alliance, through marriage, with the hau. That status was enhanced by his wife’s descent from a Tu`i Tonga Fefine, the highest-ranking woman in Tonga. It is highly significant that both Ma`afu and Tāufa`āhau, men who already enjoyed relatively high status through birth, were considered to have gained rank through their respective marriages. Although contemporary evidence is lacking, it is likely that Aleamotu`a and Tāufa`āhau arranged the marriage as a means of strengthening their own alliance amid the political turbulence of the times.

38 ibid., 29 July 1840.
39 Thomas, Tongatapu or the Friendly Islands, 1260.
40 Siumafua`uta’s daughter, Lapulo`u, grandmother of Elenoa and Lupepau`u, was a wife of Finau Ulukālala II, the hau of his day. He is well known in Tongan history partly because of his prominent place in William Mariner’s account of his four-year stay in the islands. See John Martin, ed., Tonga Islands: William Mariner’s Account, fifth edition, Nuku’alofa 1991. See also Elizabeth Bott, Tongan Society at the Time of Captain Cook’s visits. Discussions with Her Majesty Queen Sālote Tupou, Wellington 1982, 151.
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In view of Ma`afu's marriage and of the dislocation of society after the fighting in 1840, we may suppose that his formal education was over. In May, Sarah Thomas, wife of the missionary, recorded the arrival in Nuku`alofa of two canoes from Fiji. "The king's son Henele Ma`afu is [in] one of the last canoes", Mrs Thomas noted. Apparently one of the canoes had been sent to fetch Ma`afu home, following a probably lengthy stay in Fiji.41 We have no indication of the purpose of the visit, except that the presence in Fiji of a young Tongan of high rank was not unusual. Ma`afu had probably spent some of his time at Lakeba with his kinsman Tui Nayau, paramount chief of that island and nominal ruler of southern Lau. There is a tradition from Lakeba and from neighbouring Nayau that, if true, does much to explain Ma`afu's eagerness to visit those islands. While in Lau, Ma`afu apparently spent some time in the village of Liku, on Nayau, where he became enamoured of a girl named Kisiana, the daughter of a chief, Tui Naro. Ma`afu and Kisiana had a son named Kateni, whose descendants are supposedly still to be found in Lau.42 This undocumented tradition cannot be placed in any particular year. Yet, only six months after Ma`afu was brought home from Fiji, he made a sudden and unexpected departure for those shores again. On 5 November 1841, Thomas recorded in Nuku`alofa:

Yesterday about 3 o'clock it was known ... that Ma`afu, the King's son and two others he calls his sons, had sailed for Feejee, without informing their parents and friends of it. ... I fear the war has so dissipated [the young men's] minds ... A canoe is now to be got ready to follow the runaways, to take them some property which will be useful to them at Feejes – thus many more will be leaving us, at least for some time, and others fear that as there is war at Feejes, some will not return again.43

The departure of the pursuit canoe on 9 November was accompanied by "great crying" by those left behind.44 While the missionary ascribed Ma`afu's eagerness to depart to the exigencies of wars in both Tonga and Fiji, we are entitled to speculate about other reasons for Ma`afu to leave his family and friends. Perhaps little blame can be assigned to the impulsive adolescent for seeking refuge from political and social turbulence, as well as a meddlesome missionary. By 18 November Ma`afu, his companions in adventure and their pursuers had all reached Lakeba, where missionary Thomas Williams was in no doubt of the visitors' purpose. When Williams returned to Lakeba on 17 November, following a visit to Oneata, he encountered all the Tongan canoes. "The parties are fugitives", Williams wrote of the canoes' occupants, "sons of
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the Tonga King, two chiefs with their canoes sent in pursuit of them”. We do not know when Ma`afu returned from this his second precipitate expedition to Fiji within a year, although he is unlikely to have been long delayed. We next encounter him in July 1842, working with friends on the seafront in Nuku`alofa, building a large canoe.

Ma`afu’s apparently quiet existence following his return from Fiji might be seen as the calm before yet another storm. The months of September and October 1842 represent the first period of his life when we have a variety of documented references, some of them detailed, to his activities. The events of those months are best prefaced by the words of missionary George Turner, in the service of the London Missionary Society, who spent several fruitless months on Tanna, in the New Hebrides, before being forced to flee the island in January 1843. Writing more than 40 years later, Turner made reference to the sorry history of the sandalwood trade on the neighbouring island of Erromango. “About fifty years after the visit of Captain Cook [to the New Hebrides], it became known that sandal wood was plentiful on Eromango [sic]”, Turner recorded. He mentioned the high prices paid for sandalwood in India and China, incentive enough for vessels to visit the New Hebrides in search of the exotic commodity. “Some captains tried to get it by fair dealing with the natives”, Turner wrote, “but others landed with armed force, plundered their plantations and shot as many as they could who opposed them”. The earliest expedition of any size had sailed under the command of Samuel Pinder Henry, son of LMS missionary William Henry and friend of Aleamotu`a. Henry’s ship, the Sophia, called at Tongatapu in 1829 and recruited 95 Tongans, apparently after Henry had “begged” Aleamotu`a “to give him men to go to the islands to cut sandalwood”. On Erromango, while maintaining mostly peaceful relations with the local people, Henry’s party cut great quantities of sandalwood. After selling his cargo at Honolulu, Henry emerged from the expedition at a loss. Despite further similar contacts, the New Hebrides in the early 1840s were still reputed to be islands of disease, danger and malevolence.

George Turner’s indignation concerning the activities of the sandalwood traders was first committed to paper in June 1843 when, five months after his return from

47 The New Hebrides were renamed Vanuatu when the islands achieved independence in 1980.
48 George Turner, Eromanga, [written 13 Nov 1885], LMS, South Seas Personal, Box 1, Folders 7–9.
49 Statement of Tingea [a former matapule to Ma`afu and resident on Vanuabalavu, Fiji], 8 Mar 1881. “Notes [by C.R. Swayne] … on early Fijian history and Ma`afu”, in G.K. Roth, Papers.
51 I am indebted to Shineberg for this account of the early sandalwood voyages to the New Hebrides.
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Tanna to Samoa, he wrote to John Thomas in Tonga.\(^{32}\) Turner was disturbed by reports of a second expedition that, like its predecessor, had called at Tongatapu for the purpose of recruitment. He found a sympathetic ear in Thomas, who described the expedition as “a very grievous affair to us”.\(^{53}\) Thomas had become aware of the proposed voyage in late July 1842, when he returned to Tongatapu from a missionary meeting at Vava`u. He found lying at anchor, not only HBM sloop *Favourite*, commanded by Captain Sullivan, but also the schooner *Sophia*, Captain Samuel Henry, an English vessel called the *Sultan*, Captain Scott and the O.C. *Raymond*, Captain Dennison, “said to be an American”. Sullivan, aware that the other three vessels were about to sail to the New Hebrides in order to obtain sandalwood, expressed his suspicions “concerning them and their designs” to Thomas.\(^{54}\) The missionary needed no persuasion to set himself against the proposed venture.

Thomas’ misgivings began the day he returned to Tongatapu. Although the *Favourite* had left two days earlier, the three sandalwood ships remained in port, their captains even attending service in the Wesleyan chapel at Nuku`alofa on Sunday 24 July, when Thomas preached in English. For the missionary, a crisis was fast approaching: the next day, he recorded that Aleamotu`a had “ordered his men to go with Captain Henry, to cut sandal wood, though about eighty died when he took some fourteen years ago … Our King does many things he ought not as a Christian to do”. On this occasion, Ma`afu was one of about 60 young Tongans recruited by Henry. Later in the week, Thomas asked Aleamotu`a what the expedition’s precise objectives were. “The King” requested his friend to write to Henry “to ask him how long they expected the men to work for him, and how they were to get back again home”. Thomas was indignant that the “King” should permit 55 young men to be absent during planting time, “and one his own eldest Son – without knowing when they were to come back, or how”.\(^{55}\) As for the “eldest Son”, there is evidence that his father made some attempt to keep him at home. “Ma`afu was then a youth”, declared his former matapule Tingea in Fiji almost 40 years later. “[Aleamotu`a] did not want him to go but he went”.\(^{56}\)

Ma`afu almost certainly took a more active role in the recruitment than Tingea’s terse statement suggests. When Captain John Erskine, commanding HMS *Havannah*, visited Tonga in 1851, he interviewed a young chief named Methuselah Tae on the subject of the 1842 expedition. Tae, who was warned by his superior Setaleki Mumui, a high-ranking chief, magistrate and cousin

\(^{32}\) Turner’s letter to Thomas has apparently not survived. Thomas referred to it in his reply, written at his station on Tongatapu in 1845: Thomas to George Turner, 17 Feb 1845, LMS SSL, Box 18.
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\(^{54}\) Thomas to GS, WMMS, 8 Jun 1843, WMMS Tonga IL.


\(^{56}\) Statement of Tingea.
of Ma’afu, to speak the truth, “told his tale in the presence of the chiefs, the missionaries, and an assemblage of his countrymen, several of whom had been his companions [on the expedition]”. According to Tae, Ma’afu was building a large canoe when Captain Henry arrived on Tongatapu. He readily engaged with Henry to recruit 60 men who were subsequently distributed evenly between the three vessels.\(^{57}\) Although, in later years, Ma’afu made no reference to such an active role, there is no reason to disbelieve Tae’s account, given as it was before an audience likely to have been aware of any deviation from the truth. Indeed, Ma’afu’s recruitment of woodcutters for Henry was still spoken of in the Pacific more than 30 years later. In 1874, New Zealand trader Handley Sterndale, in an official report to the then colony’s Prime Minister, Julius Vogel, wrote of Ma’afu’s having begun “active life in 1842, by hiring himself and small companies of his people to unprincipled trading captains”\(^{58}\).

At the time, Thomas probably knew little or nothing of Ma’afu’s recruitment role, since the expedition’s ships had been at Nuku’alofa for an unknown period before the missionary’s return. Although Aleamotu’a must have been aware of his son’s activities, he made no mention of them when questioned by Thomas about the expedition. Before Thomas responded to Aleamotu’a’s request that he write to the captain, Henry himself arrived and promised both “king” and missionary that the men would not be required for more than five months. Thomas later laid particular emphasis on the strength of Henry’s reassurance: “if he could not obtain the sandalwood, he would not on any account take a stick of it – he promised me that he would purchase the wood – or not have it at all”\(^{59}\). Writing to his colleague almost three years after the events, Thomas clearly wished to stress Samuel Henry’s duplicity. Whatever faith he placed at the time in Henry’s assurances, he expressed to the captain his concern that he had neither been consulted nor given an opportunity to address the men. Thomas could not conceal his displeasure that events were quickly moving beyond his control.

Henry smoothed the missionary’s ruffled feathers by immediately asking him to address the men prior to their embarkation. Thomas did so, with Aleamotu’a present, “for what purpose I know not … He most certainly wishes to be a kind of god to the people, and acts with no regard either to the good of their bodies or their souls … he could not have done a more untimely or unseemly thing, as far as the good of his country or of his family is concerned”. Thomas assured the men that he had had nothing to do with their departure. Then the ships set sail, accompanied by much crying and firing of muskets from the shore and

\(^{57}\) Erskine, 143–144.
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by return volleys from the vessels’ guns. At 4 p.m., Thomas preached in the Nuku`alofa chapel on 2 Samuel 22:4: “I will call on the Lord, who is worthy to be praised: so shall I be saved from mine enemies”. For Thomas, the enemies of his flock were not to be found among the savage islands of the New Hebrides.  

Thomas Williams on Lakeba recorded some unusual excitement on 1 August 1842. While visiting the island’s north coast, he heard of the arrival of four vessels off Tubou, Lakeba’s chiefly village in the south. Setting off quickly to walk the seven miles to Tubou, Williams at length recognised the mission ship Triton on one of its occasional visits. “I … was at a loss what to make of the rest”, he observed. “I found on enquiry that they were on their way to the New Hebrides in search of sandalwood, and had called here in hopes of increasing the numbers of Tonguese natives they had on board to serve as woodcutters”. Williams recorded no disembarkation from the ships, nor did he mention any augmentation in the woodcutters’ numbers. Captain Henry, apparently considering the 60 or so men recruited at Tongatapu insufficient for his purpose, hoped to obtain others from among the large Tongan community on Lakeba. That he was unsuccessful seems to be confirmed by Williams’ failure to mention any local recruitment and by later comments by Dr Berthold Seemann, the botanist who accompanied Colonel William Smythe on his visit to Fiji in 1860, when the question of the island’s cession to Great Britain was under consideration. Seemann, who met Ma`afu in Fiji, stated that no recruits were procured at Lakeba. Perhaps more reliable is the evidence of George McLean, mate on board the Sophia, who later wrote that “sixty natives” had been recruited at Tongatapu. When the fleet reached Erromango in September, after a brief stop at Tanna, “our natives seventy in number went on shore to cut sandle wood [sic]”, recorded McLean. It is likely that the ten additional cutters were Tahitians, who are known to have been part of the expedition from its inception. While it is possible that the call at Lakeba was made at Ma`afu’s suggestion, Samuel Henry would have needed no prompting. He had visited the island in 1829, when he met Malani, then Tui Nayau, and conveyed the news that the Christian teachers whom Tui Nayau had been expecting were detained in Tonga. Tui Nayau entreated Henry to find another teacher, which the captain eventually did, bringing a Tahitian named Tahara`a to Lakeba the following year. It is likely that Henry also knew Malani’s brother and successor, Taliai Tupou, who was Lakeba’s ruling chief when Henry returned in 1842.
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In 1850, while visiting Bau, Fiji, Ma`afu was questioned about the 1842 expedition by Lieutenant Walter Pollard, commander of HMS *Bramble*, which accompanied the *Havannah* for much of its Pacific cruise. He informed Pollard that precisely 67 Tongans had been recruited at Tongatapu. If the assertion that he was instrumental in the cutters’ recruitment is true, Ma`afu must have been aware how many were engaged. Methuselah Tae also stated that no one was taken on board at Lakeba. The expedition duly left the island on 3 August, soon parting company with the *Triton*. Hoping to find his fortune in the New Hebrides, Henry was to earn only ignominy and permanent alienation from the missionary cause.

With the exception of Thomas’ brief reference to the “eldest Son” of the “king”, none of the contemporary sources makes any mention of Ma`afu prior to the fleet’s arrival in the New Hebrides. The story of the events of September and October, when the fleet visited three New Hebridean islands, can be very simply told. Arriving first at Port Resolution in Tanna, Henry was effectively discouraged by two “Reverend gentlemen [who] came on board and informed us that we could not get any sandlewood [sic] on Tana without much difficulty”.

The “reverend gentlemen” were George Turner and his missionary colleague Henry Nisbet, who fled Tanna only three months later, owing to the local people’s hostility. Not usually open to dissuasion by missionaries, Captain Henry must have anticipated easier pickings elsewhere.

On Erromango, the next island they visited, the ships anchored in Dillon’s Bay, where LMS missionary John Williams had been murdered three years earlier. This time the locals appeared friendly, coming off in canoes with bows and arrows which they traded for fishhooks. The woodcutters landed and for three days worked harmoniously with the Erromangans, who helped them cut and carry sandalwood. On the fourth day a “disturbance” arose following the theft of three axes by natives. The Tongans shot one of the thieves, Erskine wrote, while according to McLean, who might have witnessed the events, men, women and children were killed “at 4 o’clock p.m. All that side of the island was a continual blaze of fire, [the Tongans] burnt … villages, sugar cane in fact all of their cultivations were destroyed, [and] their coconut trees were cut down with axes”. The murder and destruction continued for a fortnight and McLean, writing some 14 months later, was specific in assigning guilt:

I blame the masters of the vessels for encouraging the Tongatapu people to act as they did in giving them ammunition to kill the natives; I being mate of Captain Henry’s vessel, the Tahitian natives belonging to our
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vessel gave me an exact account of every transaction ashore some days they killed five natives more or less every day four natives swam off and begged of us not to kill them and made signs they would assist us in cutting and carrying wood.\textsuperscript{69}

In contrast with this detailed account, Ma`afu stated to Lieutenant Pollard only that the cutters "had several rows with the natives, and that one of the Tonga men was wounded and afterwards died". According to Ma`afu, "the reason for leaving Eromango was, that they were getting short of provisions, and were afraid to take any from the natives".\textsuperscript{70} While Ma`afu naturally attached no blame to himself for the incidents, it is interesting that he also sought to absolve the ships’ masters from responsibility.\textsuperscript{71}

The expedition sailed northwards to Efate, then generally known to Europeans as Sandwich Island or Lavelave, where it arrived on 19 October. “We anchored in a beautiful bay”, George McLean wrote,

And on sailing round this island we discovered beautiful harbours and bays and thousands of natives dancing on the sandy beach pointing their arrows and spears as we sailed along. It is without doubt the finest island that I have seen in the South Seas … but two days after we arrived … it bore a different aspect, their villages were all burnt, gardens and fences destroyed [and there were] killed upwards of a hundred natives in a short time”.\textsuperscript{72}

McLean was disturbed by the contrast between the peace and beauty of Efate and the horrors perpetrated there by the visiting Tongans. On this occasion, consideration of the details of the atrocities reveals Ma`afu as an active participant.

The most reliable account of the Tongans’ stay on Efate appears to be that of Methuselah Tae. He told Erskine that the Tongan cutters were given arms before landing to commence work, while the white men remained on board the vessels. Before long, for reasons not stated by Tae, a battle ensued, in which 26 unarmed natives were killed, with no injury to the Tongans. Not satisfied with their bloody victory, the intruders pursued the surviving Erromangans to a fort, which was stormed and taken, involving further loss of life. Those still alive escaped to a small island off the northern coast of Efate, where they took refuge in a cave. Their fate can be told in Erskine’s account of Tae’s words:

\textsuperscript{69} McLean to Murray.
\textsuperscript{70} Erskine, 145, n. 1.
\textsuperscript{71} As a consequence of this and other raids by ships’ crews in search of sandalwood, the Erromangans developed strategies designed to sabotage sandalwood expeditions before the crews even reached shore. See “Second Voyage of the ‘John Williams’ from England”, Samoan Reporter, September 1848, 3–4, FO 58/65.
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they hid themselves in a cave, whither they were pursued by Ma`afu and his party. After firing into the cave, ... the besiegers, pulling down some neighbouring houses, piled the materials into a heap at its mouth, and, setting fire to it, suffocated them all. In spite of this occurrence, and the remonstrances of Ma`afu, who was tired of this warfare, Tae declared that Henry ... kept them cutting wood for three days longer before he would accede to their wish to return to Tonga, which they ultimately did, bringing with them four Erromangans.\footnote{Erskine, 144–145. See also “The New Hebrides, New Caledonia and the Loyalty Islands”, enc. 4 in J.E. Erskine to Admiralty, 10 Oct 1849, Adm.1/5606, PRO Reel 3303. The island where the cave was located was either Moso or Lelepa, islands which lie off the north coast of Efate. There is an unsubstantiated and unsourced account of Ma`afu's involvement in similar suffocation and murder, years later, on Vanuabalavu. See “Sundowner” [H. Tichborne], Rambles in Polynesia, London 1897, 45–46.}

Tae's account, detailed though it is concerning the sequence of events, says nothing of their cause. Fortunately, during the visit of HMS \textit{Havannah} to Efate in September 1851, Erskine was able to interview two local men who vividly remembered the affray. The account of those men, named by Erskine as Talipoa-uia and Tongalulu,\footnote{These men were almost certainly Tongolumanu, a chief from Leosa village on Lelepa, and Taripoa Wia, probably from Moso. Dr Chris Ballard, pers. comm.} agreed in essentials with that of Tae. The men recalled that the ships' captains had obtained permission for the Tongans to cut and remove sandalwood, in exchange for “a regular payment”. Peace was shattered by the “arrogance” of the visitors, who forcibly removed coconuts, then under \textit{tabu}, and sang songs meant to insult their hosts. Talipoa-uia and Tangaloa affirmed that the ensuing conflict resulted in the deaths of 40 people from one side of what is now known as Havannah Harbour and 20 on the other.\footnote{The northern shore of the harbour is formed by the southern coast of Moso island.} The men also spoke of the suffocation of their fellows and agreed that eight bodies in all were found, six in one cave and two in another.\footnote{Erskine, 326–327.} Ma`afu would vouchsafe to Pollard only that when the Tongans were returning to their camp one evening after cutting wood, they were “annoyed” by the natives, whom they subsequently drove into a cave, where all but two were suffocated. He professed himself ignorant of the number killed. In an assertion lent credence by the other participants stating that the Europeans remained on board ship, Ma`afu informed Pollard “that the masters of the vessels had nothing whatever to say to it and ... were much displeased when they heard of it”\footnote{ibid., 145, n. 1.}.

Ma`afu's son Siale`ataongo, asked by a visitor to Tonga in the 1860s what he knew of the sandalwood expedition, provided a detailed if hearsay account. After reaching Efate, the ships
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anchored in Havannah Harbour and at Sama [sic] the principal village there, they turned themselves loose – they were all well armed with firearms, and robbed and plundered at will – they fought the Efatese, of whom ‘Moafu’ and his Tongans killed 26. Then the Efatese built a fort – but this was stormed, taken and the defenders butchered. Those who escaped retreated to Deception island at the entrance to the bay and hid in a cave there. The Tongans followed them, fired into the cave, then pushing down some houses piled them up at the entrance to the cave set it on fire and suffocated the lot – the vessels got their loads of sandalwood and then left...78

Siale`ataongo’s story refers to Sema village on the Efate mainland and suggests that the cave where the massacre occurred was located on Moso, once known as Deception Island. The villagers of Sema were closely related to the communities of western Moso.79 Significantly, Siale`ataongo reveals that the details of the 1842 expedition were still recalled in Tonga more than 20 years later.

We should finally consider the only other eyewitness account of the events on Efate, before attempting to determine what Ma‘afu’s role actually was and how much responsibility he should bear for what occurred. George McLean made reference to further depredations that the other narratives omit. The dramatic nature of events is best conveyed in McLean’s own words:

They killed the chief and his daughter on the beach and stript them of their ornaments, drove the natives aback into the interior and on top of the mountains, we held possession of the islands two months. I could hear the natives every night moaning over the dead bodies of their relations, our natives destroyed ship loads of yams that were strung up under their beautiful trees and killed hundreds of pigs took them on board and salted them down, the poor natives could see us plundering their property dare not come near us, they were afraid of firearms we took some of them prisoners two boys are at Tongatapu belonging to Sandwich Island.80

McLean’s account tends to confirm that of the two Efatese men. Later, missionary indignation over these events was both fervent and prolonged. In the aftermath of the expedition, Thomas on Tongatapu led the charge. Because of his personal acquaintance with most of the principals of the affair, he was best able to uncover the essentials of the truth. Also, he had ample time to speak to many of the Tongans who participated, some of whom he must have known since their childhood. Four days after two of the sandalwood vessels returned in October,

78 Alfred William Martin, untitled reminiscences, 206–208, PMB 1342.
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Thomas interviewed their masters, as well as the two “doctors” on board. All parties readily acknowledged the “war”, but their attribution of blame to the Tongan cutters served only to inflame Thomas’ suspicions. He quickly learned the details of the events on Efate and noted that, according to several Tongan participants, the ships’ captains and “doctors” all knew of and approved the slaughter in the caves. While the Tongans would have been under orders from Ma’aifu, each side, Tongan and European, clearly sought to endow the other with as great a share of the blame as possible. For Thomas, since the cutters were supposed to have acted on their masters’ orders, it was the masters who bore ultimate responsibility.

According to Thomas, trouble arose on Efate on one occasion because a young Tongan named Atete had been badly wounded with an axe. The missionary considered such an incident a paltry reason for all that followed. There is no question that his anger and compassion were genuine: “Oh how has my heart ached for the poor natives of Aromanga and Lavelave. Oh the awful wickedness of our natives”. But anger had turned to fury and compassion to righteous indignation when, the following month, he wrote a long letter to Captain Henry. The rage in Thomas’ heart was evident from the letter’s opening words, from Leviticus 19:17: “Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart: thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him”. This emotional response to the sins committed on the sandalwood expedition led to a measured denunciation of Henry’s role, beginning with his deception of Aleamotu’a “under the garb of friendship”. Thomas informed Henry that those of his followers who were members of society had been expelled from it “for obeying your wicked orders”. Thomas acknowledged that while some of the evil acts in the New Hebrides might have been committed without Henry’s knowledge, “the war was begun and continued purely on your account … I am compelled to lay the whole responsibility upon you”.

In view of what Thomas would later write on the same subject, it is worth noting that he made mention to Henry of men, women and children “who had hid themselves in a large cave [and] were suffocated by the Tonga chief Methuselah [and his party]”. Thomas could not restrain his grief and anger: “Oh cursed love of gold that has led to such deeds of darkness and cruelty upon the poor and unoffending inhabitants of the New Hebrides”. He concluded his diatribe against Henry with a reference to the destruction of the New Hebrideans’ dwellings and plantations and above all to the ruin of their “prospects” by the depredations of the Tongan cutters whose actions he considered to be the ultimate responsibility of the expedition’s leader. Nor did he lose sight of the setback the events posed
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for the spiritual prospects of the people, whose experience at the hands of professing Christians were likely to alienate them from the faith, and from its messengers, for a very long time.\(^8\) Despite the censure Thomas heaped on the expedition’s leader, he did not forget the leadership role played by Methuselah Tae, who was later to accord that same role to Ma`afu.

In his 1845 letter to George Turner, Thomas acknowledged his sympathy for Aleamotu’a in 1842, partly because he saw the Tu’i Kānokupolu as the dupe of Henry. Thomas enclosed for his correspondent’s benefit another copy of his 1842 letter to the captain. He referred in this copy to the suffocation in the cave being occasioned “by the Tonga chief M-----, whereas in the copy sent to his Society two years earlier, Thomas named Methuselah Tae as the person directly responsible for this particular atrocity. Although Thomas shrinks from writing Ma`afu’s name in full, there can be little doubt that, during the two years since he wrote to Henry, he had come to see Ma`afu as the “Tonga chief” at whose door blame for the massacre in the cave could be laid.

George McLean, whose account of the expedition is the most detailed, concluded by stating that after the cutters had returned home, they refrained from speaking to their friends about events in the New Hebrides until the ships had sailed away again. “I am also well aware that they have not told Mr Thomas one half of their crimes and horrible transactions on those Islands where so much blood were [sic] spilt for a few tons of sandalwood”.\(^8\) Thomas did not need to know the full story in order to express his horror and to apportion blame. Although he censured Aleamotu’a, at least in his correspondence, for his failure to resist Henry’s overtures, the missionary was unequivocal in blaming the captain. His colleague in the London Missionary Society, Aaron Buzacott of Rarotonga, shared Thomas’ opinion. Writing in 1844, Buzacott referred to the Star massacre of 1842, when Samuel Henry’s 20-year-old eldest son was among the crew of that ship massacred at the Isle of Pines near New Caledonia. “Surely there is a God that judgeth in the earth”, Buzacott declared.\(^8\) While Buzacott’s views are likely to owe much to Thomas’ reports of the expedition, he agrees with Thomas that Captain Henry bore ultimate liability for the New Hebridean atrocities. It was Henry, along with his fellow captains, who armed the cutters and allowed them to operate on shore without supervision. In blaming Henry, the missionaries are correct only to the extent that a captain is always responsible for the actions of his crew. In this case, Ma`afu acted independently, as Polynesian chiefs usually did. His cutters would have followed his orders with no thought of what the captains’ views might be. Methuselah Tae’s account suggests that when Ma`afu

\(^8\) Thomas to Samuel Pinder Henry, 17 Nov 1842, enclosed with Thomas to GS, WMMS, 8 Jun 1843.
\(^8\) McLean to Murray.
\(^8\) Aaron Buzacott to Arthur Tidman, 3 Jun 1844, LMS SSL.
wished to bring the murder and destruction to an end, Henry ordered the cutting to continue for several more days. Greed for profit seems to have been the principal motive of the expedition's leader.

In this context of ultimate responsibility, we must finally consider the role of Ma`afu and how much of the blame he shared. Although, in later years, he was sometimes accorded responsibility for the slaughter in the caves, the extent of his culpability cannot be determined from the available evidence. Certainly Methuselah Tae, speaking before a critical audience, placed responsibility for the caves episode firmly on Ma`afu's shoulders, even though he considered that Ma`afu was afterwards “tired of this warfare” and had vainly urged Henry to depart. But it was Tae himself who apparently bore Thomas’ condemnation for this incident, and Thomas was in a favourable position to know. The testimony of Methuselah Tae, and Ma`afu’s later reticence when asked about the violence on Efate, suggests that he played a willing role in the slaughter in the caves, even if he cannot be shown to have been its instigator. In the light of his future career in Fiji, where he was sometimes known to use murderous violence for his own ends, and in consideration of the leadership role which this charismatic chief of exalted rank, though still young, could have easily assumed among his fellows, it is unlikely that he lacked initiative in the pursuit and destruction of the Efatese. Neither should we overlook the fact that for some 15 years Thomas and his colleagues had been instilling in their Tongan congregations contempt for heathenism in all its manifestations. It could be argued that Thomas himself was partly responsible for the attitudes towards non-Christian people that the young Tongan cutters carried with them to Efate. While Samuel Henry can be shown to be morally callous and needlessly cruel, Ma`afu was, at least in part, his willing henchman.

After Ma`afu returned from the sandalwood expedition in late October, he was not long in arousing missionary indignation once again. In January 1843, he committed “a very painful and immoral act” which came to light at one of the mission’s regular “watchnights”. Ma`afu’s wife, “who is the Queen Charlotte’s sister, having had to endure much neglect and indifference for a long time, has left him”. Several days later, the “foolish young man” was not disposed to accept advice on how to atone for his immorality, which was probably adultery.

87 Julian Thomas, in his Cannibals and Convicts, London 1886, stated that Ma`afu lit the fire at the cave’s entrance (p. 67). Writing more than 40 years after the events, Thomas is likely to have been influenced by Erskine’s published account.
89 Thomas, Journal, 4 Jan 1843.
Thomas attributed part of the blame to Aleamotu’a “for sending [Ma’afu] on that expedition to the New Hebrides”. The same day, the missionary had a long interview with Elenoa:

I heard her statement respecting the way she has been treated by her husband for a long time … Had … her husband … waited upon her and wished her to remain, … she would have remained, but she said this was her second week of being separated from him, and no-one had been to ask her to remain, however she did not expect it of them, and she was tired of being cast off and taken no notice of by her husband.\(^90\)

During the next few days, Thomas could not persuade Aleamotu’a to attempt to influence Ma’afu. “The old man is but little concerned I fear about anything which will tend either to his own or anyone else’s real good”. The most he could be prevailed upon to do, according to Moala, was “to appeal to Ma’afu to build our canoe house, as a payment for his sin”.\(^91\) We do not know whether Ma’afu accomplished even this token act of atonement. In his late teens, he remained as he had long been: his own master.

During the two years following the New Hebrides expedition, only Ma’afu’s moral degradation was vouchsafed to posterity: we learn nothing of his growing political consciousness. Yet, as the son of Aleamotu’a, he must have been aware of the increasing encroachment of the outside world on Tonga and of the uncertainty, tending sometimes to fear, which arose in the islands when their vulnerability to the growing European presence in the Pacific was felt. The most significant manifestation of that uneasiness came in the form of a letter sent by Aleamotu’a to Queen Victoria, asking that Tonga be placed under British protection. Written by Tāufa’āhau at Aleamotu’a’s dictation, the letter was translated, with copies being made by missionary George Miller. One copy was despatched, through Walter Lawry, to the British government, while Thomas forwarded another to his Society in London.\(^92\) The letter emphasised that Tonga had hitherto been independent and free of interference from any

\(^90\) ibid., 10 Jan 1843.
\(^91\) ibid., 10 and 16 Jan 1843.
\(^92\) Josiah Tubou to Queen Victoria, 19 Feb 1844. A copy of the letter in the original Tongan appears in John and Sarah Thomas, Correspondence 1835–1843. For the English translation, see WMMS Tonga Correspondence 1835–1843; The Report of the Wesleyan-Methodist Missionary Society for the Year ending April 1845, 42; and John Thomas to Captain Tucker of HBM ship Dublin at Tahiti, 20 Apr 1846, FO58/26. Thomas sent the translation to Captain Tucker with the request that Tucker forward it to Queen Victoria “by the first opportunity”. Another translation was given to Rev. Walter Lawry, who passed it on to the Governor of New Zealand, Sir Robert Fitzroy. Fitzroy in turn forwarded it to the CO, whence it was sent to the FO. There, “it was conveniently forgotten, although a pencil note on it indicates it was ‘seen by Lord Aberdeen’” [Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs] [Fitzroy to Stanley’, with enclosures, 16 Nov 1845, CO209/33 and Stephen to Addington, 21 July 1845, FO88/44, both quoted in Angus Ross, New Zealand Aspirations in the Pacific in the Nineteenth Century, Oxford 1964, 28). Thomas enclosed a further copy with his letter to the GS, WMMS, 2 May 1844 (WMMS Tonga Correspondence). See also The Report of the Wesleyan-Methodist Missionary Society for the Year Ending April 1846, 44.
other power. Nor, said Aleamotu’a, would any such power be likely to interfere “with a people so few in number, so poor and so feeble”. But now, having noted recent activities by the French in the Marquesas, and bearing in mind their augmented presence in Tahiti, Aleamotu’a feared they had similar designs on Tonga. He stressed his subjects’ continued feelings of good will towards England and reminded Queen Victoria that it was from England that Tonga had received “Sacred Scriptures, that we might know the true God”. The hand of the Wesleyan missionaries can readily be seen in this letter, even apart from its references to the benefits of Christianity. More fearful of Roman Catholic evangelisation in Tonga than of French political ambitions, and jealous of their positions of influence with Tonga’s “kings”, they saw British protection as the only effective means of assuring that the dominant position which they and the Wesleyan doctrine had achieved in Tonga would not come under threat.

The “good will” referred to by Aleamotu’a was apparently reciprocated. Eight months after his appeal to Queen Victoria, he received a letter from a British naval officer, Andrew Hamond, “Commander and Senior Officer at the Society Islands”. The letter, written on board HM Steam Vessel *Salamanca* at Tahiti, praised Aleamotu’a for reports “from the masters of English vessels trading with the Friendly Islands that the Natives from all the groups under his wise benign rule, are invariably well disposed to all foreigners, whom commerce or misfortune may … bring them into contact with”. Such flattery was not without purpose: Aleamotu’a was urged to assert whatever influence he could on the chiefs of Fiji to prevent the murders and other atrocities that continued to take place there. Hamond, who overestimated the extent of Aleamotu’a’s influence in Fiji, was prompted to write by his belief that those who basked in the light of British “good will” were endowed with certain responsibilities to ensure they remained worthy of it.93

Neither Aleamotu’a nor Tāufa‘āhau was aware in February 1844 that the French had assumed control of both Tahiti and the Marquesas.94 Nevertheless, French activities in both places reinforced in the minds of Tonga’s rulers a sense of their islands’ vulnerability. The insecurity of both Aleamotu’a and the missionaries was heightened by the presence of two French priests on Tongatapu. During the period when Tāufa‘āhau and Aleamotu’a were discussing with Thomas the proposed letter to Queen Victoria, Aleamotu’a was informed that the priests intended visiting Tāufa‘āhau. Acting with uncharacteristic alacrity, and for reasons not entirely clear, Aleamotu’a sent a message ahead of the priests, urging Tāufa‘āhau to prepare kava for them. When the Frenchmen finally spoke to Tāufa‘āhau, they urged him to embrace Roman Catholicism, describing “Mr Wesley” as “a poor man”, and declared that all the remaining heathens in Tonga

---
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would soon be papists. In the event, France was never to manifest an interest in acquiring Tonga, while the sought-after British protection would not eventuate for more than 50 years.

There is no telling whether these weighty matters occupied the attention of Ma’afu. Thanks to various visitors to Tonga in the middle of 1844, we have glimpses into the life of Aleamotu’a and his family, including Ma’afu. George Miller recorded in November 1843 that he had procured “the loan of a horse from the King’s son for … six weeks on the promise of payment”. This successful negotiation with a missionary strongly suggests that the son in question was Ma’afu, who was to get the better of many of Miller’s colleagues in Fiji in the future. More problematic is Miller’s reference several months later to Moala’s crisis of conscience, when she sent in her class paper because she had supplied her son, “who had gone to the Heathen”, with the means of becoming tattooed, and was sending him things from time to time. Miller appreciated Moala’s delicacy, even if he, reflecting perhaps his own share of that quality, declined to name the erring son. He also knew whose good opinion it was desirable to retain: when he received a visit from Aleamotu’a two months later, he presented the aged “king” with a four-gallon iron pot, a very large knife, a gauge and four yards of broad calico. As Ma’afu was to learn in Fiji, the rewards of Christianity were not always confined to the spiritual.

Two months later, Ma’afu made himself useful to the captain of a visiting British ship. HMS *North Star*, a Royal Navy hydrographic vessel commanded by Sir Everard Home, arrived at Tongatapu from Tahiti on 29 July. The ship’s log records: “Hove to and received a Pilot (a Native named Henry son of the King Josiah of Tongatabou)”. The *North Star* remained for over a week; on 6 August, after Aleamotu’a had visited the ship during the morning, the “Pilot (Prince Henry) came on board at 1:30. [We] weighed and made sail …. [At] 3:30 Lowered a boat and discharged pilot”. In this terse report we find the last documented reference to Ma’afu before the event which was more significant, in political terms at least, than any other in his life hitherto: the death of his father Aleamotu’a in November 1845.

Aleamotu’a’s final illness became evident in August 1845, after his return to Nuku’alofa from a visit to the nearby island of ‘Eua. Suffering on his return from the early effects of dysentery, Aleamotu’a experienced a decline in health during the next three months. Finally, on Sunday 16 November, he was missing from his usual place in chapel. Thomas visited him in the evening and found

95 George Miller, Tongan Diary, 19 Feb 1844.
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99 HMS *North Star*, Ship’s Logs, Series 1, 9 Sep 1841 – 10 Oct 1850.
him “in much pain”, but “composed in his mind”. Aleamotu’a died two days later, at about 10 p.m. on Tuesday 18 November, in the presence of Moala and all their children, including Ma’afu, his sister Baba, his brother Lasike and John and Sarah Thomas.\(^{100}\) The only significant absentee was Tāufa‘āhau, who was in Vava’u. Aleamotu’a was buried in a vault near Sia-ko-Veiongo, “according to his own expressed wish”.\(^{101}\) The death of his father bequeathed to Ma’afu a future in which nothing could be certain. The indulgences of the past were at an end, while no-one, least of all Ma’afu himself, could determine what if any place he would have in the new structure of power.

In assessing Aleamotu’a’s rule, we need only recall a very few of the comments made during his lifetime and that only to remind us of the indulgence which suffused Ma’afu’s childhood and youth. Stephen Rabone, never Aleamotu’a’s closest friend among the missionaries, opined several years before the chief’s death that the people of Tongatapu “have no fear [of him] nor do they respect him”.\(^{102}\) Commodore Wilkes’ references to Aleamotu’a’s desire for “peace and quietness” have already been noted.\(^{103}\) Among more formal missionary criticisms were the charges that Aleamotu’a took no notice of crime on Tongatapu, encouraged rather than checked surviving heathenish customs, and was nothing less that “an enemy to civilisation”.\(^{104}\) Rabone, the most scathing of all, declared simply that nothing could be said of Aleamotu’a that was worth saying. “He lived an easy and comparatively a useless life”, the missionary claimed.\(^{105}\) Unjust as this last comment is, the fact remained that the uncertainties and dangers that marked much of Aleamotu’a’s time as Tu’i Kānokupolu were only partly overcome when his successor sought to complete the unification of Tonga as a Christian kingdom.

When news reached Tāufa‘āhau in Vava’u of Aleamotu’a’s serious illness, he proceeded at once to Tongatapu.\(^{106}\) There, “he was received with great respect by the chiefs and people of Nuku’alofa and after performing some little marks of respect he was appointed to succeed Josiah Tubou as Tu’i Kānokupolu”.\(^{107}\) Even though some heathen chiefs had not consented to the appointment, neither did they object, and the requisite ceremonies proceeded without hindrance. Succession of the hau in circumstances such as these was usual in

\(^{100}\) The account of Aleamotu’a’s final illness and death is based on that in John Thomas to GS, WMMS, 16 Mar 1846, WMN, New Series, No. 94, Oct 1846, 153–156. See also Thomas, Journal, 1–18 Nov 1845; Miller, Nov 1845; WMMS Annual Report, 1847, 75.

\(^{101}\) Aleamotu’a’s grave, restored in the 1990s, is located in the Mala’e ‘Aloa, the chiefly cemetery in Kolomotu’a, Nuku’alofa.

\(^{102}\) Rabone, Journal, 21 Jan 1840.

\(^{103}\) Wilkes, 28.
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\(^{105}\) Rabone, Journal, 10 Dec 1845.

\(^{106}\) ibid., 5 Nov – 13 Dec 1845; Turner, Journal, 26 Dec 1845.

\(^{107}\) Turner, Journal, 26 Dec 1845.
Tongan tradition. Only with the explicit consent of Tāufaʻāhau could another relative of Aleamotuʻa, such as his nephew Setaleki Mumui or his brother Lasike, have been appointed to succeed him. In the circumstances of 1845, such an appointment would have been most unlikely. More than 30 years later, it was stated in Tonga that Setaleki had waived his right to succeed in favour of Tāufaʻāhau, a assertion unsupported by contemporary evidence.108

A brief consideration of the circumstances of Tāufaʻāhau’s accession to power and of the lack of any real opposition to him should be made, especially in the light of the prospects of Maʻafu, son of the previous Tuʻi Kānokupolu but still only about 20. On his deathbed, the Tuʻi Kānokupolu had named “King George” as his successor. “I do not think there is any other person so suitable”, Thomas believed. “My prayer to God is, that he [Tāufaʻāhau] would undertake for us and give to God a righteous Governor”.109 Thomas need not have worried: Tāufaʻāhau was hau, and his succession was certain. At a time when several leading Tongatapu chiefs were yet to embrace Christianity, Tāufaʻāhau enjoyed missionary support as an unequivocal champion of the faith. While approval from the traditional Tongan polity was less explicit, it was to Tāufaʻāhau and no other that most of the chiefs had looked to succeed as Tuʻi Kānokupolu. Five years before, when Aleamotuʻa had been dangerously ill with dysentery and thought unlikely to survive, urgent messages had been sent to Tāufaʻāhau at his home in Haʻapai, urging him to hasten to Tongatapu. The Wesleyan missionary at Haʻapai, Peter Turner, realised that none but Tāufaʻāhau could succeed: “he is the only next heir”.110 Turner and his colleagues, notably Tucker and Rabone, recognised that when Aleamotuʻa had sent urgently to Tāufaʻāhau for help following the outbreak of civil war in January 1840, he was exercising “a right according to the usages of these islands to require his services”.111 Although Tāufaʻāhau’s warriors were correctly auxiliaries to those of Aleamotuʻa, it was Tāufaʻāhau who was appointed commander of the united forces. Such appointment was “by the wish of the Chiefs”, and not only because Josiah’s age disqualified him from such an office. The chiefs in question were influenced by Tāufaʻāhau’s mana as hau; their choice could have fallen on no one else.112

Although Tāufaʻāhau’s family connections were largely irrelevant to his right to succeed as Tuʻi Kānokupolu, they should not be overlooked, even though they alone could not have ensured his elevation. He was neither brother nor son of Aleamotuʻa, but Aleamotuʻa had succeeded as Tuʻi Kānokupolu under
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extraordinary and unprecedented circumstances. Tāufa`āhau was the son of Tupouto`a, Aleamotu`a’s predecessor as Tu`i Kānokupolu, and grandson of Tuku`aho, Aleamotu`a’s older half-brother, who had also held the high office. What counted for him in 1845 was the fact that he had enjoyed supreme military power in Tonga throughout Aleamotu`a’s ineffectual rule. Following his accession, he was able to combine his power with full titular authority. His perceived role as a champion of Christianity, a champion with both military muscle and traditional authority, created a potential for stability that had not existed in Tonga for more than 50 years.¹¹³

Tāufa`āhau’s investiture ceremony, which the “heathen” chiefs present did nothing to oppose, took place at the village of Pangai in Hihifo. In his description of the ceremony, Thomas laid emphasis on the changed nature of the Tu`i Kānokupolu’s august position. Not only was Tāufa`āhau “the legitimate heir to the government”, he was also “the first Tui-Kanokubolu Preacher and Class Leader that ever existed”.¹¹⁴ In some circumstances, Tāufa`āhau’s role as the champion of Christianity would have alienated the heathen chiefs, in particular those of the Ha’a Havea. But the head of the Ha’a Havea was Ma`afu of Vaini, successor to Tāufa`āhau’s grandfather, who had died in 1842. It was this “new” Ma`afu, as Thomas called him, along with the other most important chiefs of his ha’a, Lavaka of Pea and Vaea of Houma, who elected Tāufa`āhau as Tu`i Kānokupolu.¹¹⁵ Tāufa`āhau’s claims could not be gainsaid; he was hau, and no other chief could dispute his succession unless able to mount a challenge.

Nowhere among reports of the death of Aleamotu`a and succession of Tāufa`āhau is there any mention of Ma`afu.¹¹⁶ We are not even certain whether he witnessed the investiture ceremony, although there are indications that he did not. Only one person was then named as a possible rival to Tāufa`āhau: Mumui, often called by his Christian name of Shadrach, or Setaleki, the son of Aleamotu`a’s half-brother Tupoumālohi, the fourteenth Tu`i Kānokupolu. Tāufa`āhau is supposed to have expressed a wish that preference be given to Mumui.¹¹⁷ Bearing in mind the missionaries’ unqualified support for Tāufa`āhau, such a request is not likely to have been taken seriously. As hau, Tāufa`āhau could have chosen the new Tu`i Kānokupolu, if he genuinely did not wish to accept office himself. Mumui outranked him, as did Lasike, who was apparently not considered by anyone. Mumui however had in the past been mentioned as a possible future Tu`i Kānokupolu.

¹¹³ For a discussion of the nexus between rank and power in Tonga, see Elizabeth Bott, “Power and Rank in the Kingdom of Tonga”, JPS, Vol. 90, No. 1, March 1981, 7–81.
¹¹⁴ Thomas to GS, WMMS, 17 Mar 1846, WMMS Tonga Correspondence and WMN, New Series, No. 94, Oct 1846, 156–157.
¹¹⁵ Thomas, Journal, 10 and 25 May 1842.
¹¹⁶ See, for example, Thomas, Journal, 2 Dec 1845.
¹¹⁷ Thomas West, Ten Years in South-Central Polynesia, London 1865, 58.
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Mumui was “the missionaries’ principal school teacher” in 1840, with sole charge of the large mission school at Nuku’alofa. Jane Tucker had informed Commodore Wilkes that Mumui was deemed a son of Josiah and would be considered, along with Tāufa`āhau, as a possible successor. Proficient in English, Mumui was later described as “tall and handsome, but delicate-looking”, with “a mild and unambitious disposition”. Despite his high rank through his mother and his identification through the missionary cause, Mumui was not in 1845 a candidate for the office of Tu’i Kānokupolu, whatever some earlier expectations among resident Europeans might have been. Tāufa`āhau had long been paramount chief of Tonga and was seen by the Wesleyan missionaries as a crusader for their cause, a man who would fuse the new religion firmly with the traditional structure of rank and power in Tonga.

There is no contemporary evidence that Ma`afu might have succeeded his father. He was too young and inexperienced and did not enjoy the missionaries’ confidence. He lacked any serious credentials, among them high rank, for the task, and was not even considered. Forty years after Aleamotu’a’s death, the British Consul to Tonga, James Blyth, recorded an oral tradition that the dying Tu’i Kānokupolu said to his son Ma`afu, “Do not be persuaded by the people to be my successor: I wish Tubou to succeed me. Wait for him”. We also have some interesting, if very flimsy, evidence that Ma`afu might have been asked to intrigue against Tāufa`āhau. On 5 December, Thomas, who never bore any love for Ma`afu, recorded: “Ma`afu the King’s son has rather disgraced himself. His conduct was nearly the only thing I have heard of which gave pain”.

From letters received since we learn that the Tuitonga has been trying to get the son of the late Tubou to aid in beating off George by some secret operations. The late Tubou’s son would not unite in so base a deed and thus the vile purposes of God’s enemies have been brought to light and will no doubt be frustrated. There may be some exaggeration in this account but the above is as I have been informed.
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To what letters was Turner referring? And what if anything had “Tubou’s son” been asked to do? Aleamotu’a was survived by at least three sons, so it is not certain that Turner was referring to Ma`afu. The only way any of them could have effectively challenged the hau would have been in alliance with the Tu`i Tonga and any forces at the latter’s disposal. While it is just conceivable that Ma`afu was keeping his options open concerning a future challenge, he had to accept that Tāufa`āhau, unlike Aleamotu’a and many of his other predecessors as Tu`i Kānokupolu, united that office with the substance of power. Ma`afu himself was left firmly in the political wilderness.
3. “A fast ignorant vain young man”

On 3 May 1846 Matthew Wilson, a Wesleyan missionary stationed at Ha`apai, baptised the month-old son of “Henali and Elenoa Ma`afu”.¹ Since only the baby’s Christian name, Josiah, is recorded in the baptisms register, we do not know which of the three children of Ma`afu and Elenoa he was.² The baby, named after Ma`afu’s late father, was only three years younger than his uncle, another Josaia, who had been baptised at Nuku`alofa on 2 July 1843 by John Thomas. This child, referred to in the register as “son of Josaia and Mele”, was the youngest of Ma`afu’s siblings.³ The mention of his mother Moala under her Christian name gives no hint of how she would be castigated by the missionary during the years to come. The conduct and moral character of both Moala and her eldest son were condemned to the extent where the young Ma`afu was more than willing to avail himself of an opportunity to leave Tonga for an indefinite period.

Moala, who had earned Thomas’ unstinted praise as wife, mother and class leader following her conversion, was now a widow. The missionary was not long in changing his tune: in January 1846, describing some “heathenish” ceremonies associated with the funeral of Aleamotu`a, he accused Moala of behaving more like a heathen than a Christian.⁴ Within a few days, Moala was suspended “for the present” from her position as class leader.⁵ Then, the following September, we learn that Moala, still under suspension, had “gone from bad to worse” by “yielding to the wicked conduct of a young single man” and permitting “two married men to defile and dishonour themselves with her – one of whom is son-in-law to the present king and the other to the old king’s brother”.⁶ Only a week later, Moala was supposed to have been “going after a young man named Nanua, who professed a regard for [her], but her Son opposes it”.⁷ The sorry tale culminated in February 1847, when Thomas married “poor fallen Mary” to the single man who had been enjoying her favours.⁸ While Moala’s conduct was highly offensive to Thomas’ concept of Christian morality, it was not, in terms of more traditional Tongan mores, likely to ruffle many feathers. The missionary’s unyielding intolerance was soon to be exercised in equal measure towards Moala’s eldest son.

¹ Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga, Register of Baptisms, Tongatapu Circuit 1840–1972.
² The children were Siale`ataongo, Makakaufaki and Hoboatefua-a-tonga. Tongan genealogies, translated for E.W. Gifford. Only Siale`ataongo reached adulthood.
³ Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga ... Tongatapu Circuit 1840–1972.
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⁸ ibid., 24 Feb 1847. Curiously, there is no record of Moala’s marriage in the Wesleyan marriage register.
On 1 June 1847, Thomas borrowed a horse from a neighbour and rode to the villages of Masilamea and Nukunuku to preach. He experienced problems on his return:

[I] found the horse rather eager to get back ... he stumbled over some roots which run across the road – and came down upon his knees ... On reaching the bay which was dry and hard – the tide being low – he set off on the gallop ... passing very near a bush which may have taken my hat off, I leaned a little on the left side to avoid it and while leaning rather more upon the left stirrup than usual ... the leather broke – and I was unable to regain my balance – and fell to the ground – and the horse galloped away towards home without me ... I set off home on foot – I saw the horse for more than a mile – still galloping and making for home. ... Ma`afu it seems took the horse home – saying that it had been found alone galloping. But I ... learned, that one of Ma`afu's men ... had caught the horse and instead of riding back with him to me, he most selfishly rode home himself with him. – I saw Ma`afu in the Malai near the burying ground as soon as I arrived – and although he knew I had borrowed the horse and might have hurt myself, he did not so much as open his mouth to me, but suffered me to pass him, walking with a stick I had picked up on the way. As little concerned are some here, for an old Missionary, as though he was a dog – or some intruder amongst them – such is the gratitude of some, who have for the last sixteen years been the object of our solicitation and toil.

But it does not matter. The Lord careth for me, and he has preserved both man and beast.9

We may imagine this “old Missionary” trudging homewards past the burial ground, his hat intact but his dignity rent asunder, while the watching Ma`afu, his face a mask of stolid indifference, nursed a secret retribution in his heart.

This incident, less than a month before Ma`afu’s final departure from Tonga, culminated several months of carping criticism of him by Thomas. Shortly before Christmas 1846, Ma`afu had been drinking kava one Sunday afternoon with a group of friends, instead of attending service. Thomas was indignant: “I do not know where the wickedness of these young men with their companions will end! Oh that they were wise – that they would consider their latter end”.10 Then, on New Year’s Day, “a new evil” which began “in this Christian village: Foot races men running etc”. Having been advised by the king not to attend foot races elsewhere, Ma`afu had apparently organised his own at home. “He is

9 ibid., 1 Jun 1847.
10 ibid., 21 Dec 1846.
a fast ignorant vain young man”, Thomas deplored, “yet God can save him”.

Thomas became even more explicit in expressing his intolerance only days later, when describing his pain on learning that even some class leaders had attended the foot races. “This they profess to have done, not knowing there was any harm in it. I thought it very strange indeed that they should have had such views – but it shows me … that our people are in a very feeble state”.

Such an attitude was nothing new for Thomas. Fifteen years earlier, again at Nuku’alofa, he had expressed his “astonishment that our people have been allowed to be present at sports … they looked upon their country men, club fighting, wrestling, and punching each other with their fists … this I consider very bad conduct”. His views were unchanged in 1847. For Ma’afu, apparently still living in Nuku’alofa, cheek by jowl with Thomas we might almost say, it seemed that whenever he looked over his shoulder, the admonitory puritanical finger of John Thomas was wagging firmly in his face. This, in a society increasingly disciplined since its unification under the rule of Tāufa’āhau, meant that Ma’afu was restrained by an ever-tightening rein. Gone was the indulgence of his father’s time; if he wanted to gratify what some have called his reckless ambition and others his love of discord and intrigue, he would have to seek more suitable horizons beyond the shores of Tonga.

Many suggested reasons for Ma’afu’s departure from Tonga have appeared in published works. He was supposedly exiled to Fiji by Tāufa’āhau, who saw his cousin as a potential rival for the kingship, one around whom dissenting chiefs, with their followers, might rally. He was alleged to have incurred the king’s displeasure through breach of trust and open rebellion, and it was even stated that if he had remained in Tonga he would have been put to death “as there was not room in Tonga for two such important persons as himself and the King”. Tāufa’āhau’s supposed removal order was sometimes allied with a mission to govern or otherwise control the unruly Tongans, many of them exiles, who lived in Fiji and who were represented as a potential threat to the king’s authority.
was even claimed that Ma`afu came from Tonga in charge of a hoard of brigands, for the sole purpose of imposing the Wesleyan doctrine on the Fijians by force of arms.¹⁸ Such a view, nothing more than the petulant response of an irresponsible Roman Catholic bishop to the triumph of Protestantism in Fiji, requires no serious consideration. The other contentions are worthy of attention, however, if only because of their recurrence in print over more than a century.

Tāufaʻāhau had spent a fortnight with the Tongan community in Fiji when in October 1842 his fleet of canoes was blown off course and fetched up on the shores of Lakeba. During his stay, Tāufaʻāhau consulted the unofficial leaders of the Lauan Tongans, Sefanaia Lualala and his cousins, the brothers Lasike and Tupou Toutai. Lualala was also a first cousin, through his Fijian mother Vuturogo, of the Tui Nayau, Taliai Tupou. The Tongans on Lakeba had long caused disruption on the island, taking “unwarrantable liberties with the Fijians’ property and even with their persons”.¹⁹ Tāufaʻāhau, who had conveyed several Christian teachers to Samoa, was urged by missionary James Calvert to devote his pastoral energies to Fiji, whose needs Calvert considered much greater than Samoa’s. Calvert urged the king to persuade Lasike, whose influence in both Lakeba and Bau was considerable, to involve himself in the Lord’s work. At the missionary’s urging, Tāufaʻāhau and Lasike engaged in a lengthy and outwardly cordial kava session. Several weeks later Lasike, acting at Tupou’s suggestion, called a vono, or council, in a fruitless attempt to bring the Tongans under proper control.²⁰ That task was one Maʻafu was later to accomplish.

Five years later, Tāufaʻāhau was well aware of the continuing volatile nature of the Tongan community on Lakeba and elsewhere in Fiji and of the potential threat that community posed for the fragile peace established in Tonga. The accommodation he achieved with Lasike and Tupou Toutai is especially significant in that their father, Tupou Niua of Vavaʻu, had been murdered by Tupoutoʻa, Tāufaʻāhau’s own father. While the potential for continued hostility was great, both sides were aware of the value of peace. Tāufaʻāhau, if he were to achieve his ambition of uniting Tonga under his own rule, could not afford to antagonise the Lauan Tongans, and more especially their leaders, who had good reasons for distrusting him, or even for showing open hostility. Lasike and his brother were renowned fighters, whose alliance with the ruling family of Lakeba was of great value to Tui Nayau in keeping the matanitu of Bau and Cakaudrove at a distance. Their presence on Lakeba, and that of their followers,

¹⁹ Thomas Williams, The Journal of Thomas Williams, missionary in Fiji 1840–1853, ed. by G.C. Henderson, Sydney 1931, 68 (24 Feb 1842) and 80 (28 Apr 1842); Thomas Williams to his father, 2 Apr 1842, Thomas Williams, Letters to his father 1839–1843.
²⁰ Williams, Journal of Thomas Williams…, 108–109 (22 Oct 1842) and 113–114 (5 Dec 1842). See also Thomas to GS, WMMS, 6 Jan 1843, WMMS IITF; and James Calvert, Journal, 22 Oct 1847 and 15 Nov 1847.
meant that Bau, to whose rulers the Tongans were usually loyal, would have no reason to go to war against the Lakeban state. But Tāufaʻāhau’s star, in 1842, was clearly on the ascendant in Tonga, while Lasike and Tupou Toutai were in turn aware of their own need for his good will. So the accommodation was reached, and it proved to be lasting. Following Tāufaʻāhau’s accession as Tuʻi Kānokupolu and ruler of a united Tonga in 1845, he appeared not to consider that the Tongans in Fiji posed an active threat to his rule.

Lakeba has been depicted as a “rallying place for disaffected chiefs, restless warriors and adventurers from Tonga,” a description that could convey the impression that the displaced Tongans gathered on Lakeba were all refugees from Tupou’s regime in Tonga. Despite active hostility to Tāufaʻāhau among some chiefs of Vavaʻu, there is no evidence that, in 1847, any of the “disaffection” on Lakeba manifested itself in open hostility to Tupou. There is similarly no suggestion that Maʻafu, in the year he arrived in Fiji, sought to enlist the support of his fellow countrymen in order to foment dissension or rebellion at home. Suggestions that Maʻafu then yearned for power in Tonga ignore the realities of the country’s power structure. Aleamotua’s naming of Tāufaʻāhau as his successor was a formality: Tāufaʻāhau was hau and had possessed absolute power for some 18 years. Moreover, he enjoyed the unequivocal support of Tonga’s Wesleyan missionaries, most of the Christian chiefs and even some of their heathen counterparts. Although the new king faced intermittent challenges to his power until 1852, his position was never under serious threat. Maʻafu would have been rash indeed to challenge him, even had he wished to do so. He appears to have rebuffed an overture from the Tuʻi Tonga, the one person who might have been able to pose a serious threat to the king. While some might have seen Maʻafu, who was a generation younger than Tupou, as a future Tuʻi Kānokupolu, the constraints upon him following his father’s death were severe. Questions of Realpolitik aside, the legal restraints on chiefs in Tonga following Tāufaʻāhau’s accession as Tuʻi Kānokupolu were considerable. The first Tongan Code of Laws, adopted on Tongatapu under Tāufaʻāhau’s rule, placed distinct limitations on the power of the chiefs. Among the Code’s provisions was the requirement to remain loyal to the government which, at this early stage of Tonga’s constitutional development, effectively meant the king. The notion that, during the years immediately following his father’s death, Maʻafu harboured ambitions in Tonga and sought assistance from among the Tongans living in Fiji cannot be sustained. If he sought to escape the restraints of Tāufaʻāhau’s régime, he could only sail away.

---

21 Derrick, History..., 127. See also Basil Thomson, The Diversions of a Prime Minister, Edinburgh and London 1894, 361.
22 After his accession as Tuʻi Kānokupolu, Tāufaʻāhau came to be known as Tupou I. In this work, he is referred to as Tupou in any context after 1845.
Finally, other reasons for Ma`afu’s coming to Fiji may be considered in passing. The Wesleyan missionaries there are said to have applied to Tāufāhau for help in controlling the Tongans in Lau, and in response the king sent over his young cousin. Ma`afu, meanwhile, fretting for adventure, supposedly asked the king if he could proceed to Lakeba “on a canoe-building voyage” which would last for several years and allow him to indulge in a little adventure on the side. In view of Ma`afu’s strained relations, to say the least, with Thomas and the other missionaries in Tonga, it is hardly likely that the king would have asked him, of all people, to help the Wesleyans in Fiji. A canoe-building expedition was in accordance with the tradition of young Tongans of high rank voyaging to Fiji, with their followers, for sojourns of varying lengths. There is evidence, which will be considered later, that the building and repair of canoes indeed played a part in Ma`afu’s participation in the voyage, although the notion that he sought permission for some adventure on the side may safely be eschewed. Leaving canoes aside, all other hypotheses concerning his motives have two things in common: they are based on no contemporary evidence and they beg the question as to why Ma`afu really did come to Fiji.

The islands of Lau, dotted across the sea between Fiji and Tonga and forming part of Fiji, present a face different from that of Fiji’s larger landmasses. When walking southwards along the road through Lomaloma village, on the island of Vanuabalavu in northern Lau, the visitor unwittingly crosses into the village of Sawana. Unwittingly, because there is no sign, fence or any other physical evidence of the boundary, as there once was. Yet Sawana is another place, a village whose history is written in the faces of its people. They are mostly of Tongan descent, with many still speaking Tongan, although few now regard it as their mother tongue. Their ancestors in most cases came to Vanuabalavu during the time when Ma`afu lived there as Tui Lau. Similarly, on Lakeba, the chiefly island of Lau, the faces of the people are different, but in another way. They are of a hue lighter than those of most other Fijians; here, in contrast to Vanuabalavu, Fijian and Tongan have become one. Miscegenation has resulted in a people of different appearance, whose language, a dialect of Fijian, contains many Tongan words in everyday use. The Tongan influence on Lakeba, Vanuabalavu and most other islands of Lau has been profound and is of long standing. Ma`afu’s advent in these islands in 1847 must be seen as part of a mosaic whose first pieces were fitted into place centuries before.

First contacts between the two groups began in prehistoric times, during the first settlement of western Polynesia. Following European penetration of the

Pacific, Tonga was, until the nineteenth century, better known to Europeans than was Fiji, with European visitors to Tonga sometimes informed that Fiji was a mountainous land inhabited by cannibals.\textsuperscript{26} On his second visit to Tonga in 1777, James Cook recorded that the many parrot feathers he saw there “all come from Fidgee, as also some of their finest striped and chequered [bark] cloth and a few other articles”.\textsuperscript{27} Red parrots “abounded in Taveuni, where they were caught by nets, and purchased by the Tongans, who traded with them in exchange for the fine mats of the Samoans”\textsuperscript{28} There also came, “along with the many male spouses … other goods associated with males including bowls and neck rests made of wood, and slit gongs”.\textsuperscript{29} Trading opportunities had been a principal motivation for Tongans to visit Fiji for centuries before large numbers of them, responding to unrest at home, began making the voyage during the closing years of the eighteenth century. According to an oral tradition on Lakeba, many Tongans came to settle there during the early nineteenth century, under the auspices of Laufitu, the Tongan wife of the then Tui Nayau, Ratu Rasolo, father of Taliai Tupou.\textsuperscript{30} Among the many other links between the two groups, the most significant, for Ma`afu at least, were dynastic in nature.

In the traditional polity of Tonga, the highest-ranking title was that of the Tu`i Tonga. Once his secular functions had been absorbed by the hau, at first the Tu`i Ha`atakalaua and, later, the Tu`i Kānokupolu, the Tu`i Tonga became “the quintessence and symbolic embodiment of the nation”.\textsuperscript{31} Despite his august rank, his sisters were ranked even higher, which meant that a method had to be devised for arranging marriages for them so that they and their children did not threaten the privileged position of the Tu`i Tonga. Tongan tradition holds that in the early seventeenth century, Sinaitakala, the older sister of Fatafehi, Tu`i Tonga at the time, was accorded the special title of Tu`i Tonga Fefine. Her spouse was a Fijian, known in Tonga as Tapu`osi, a chief from the village of Waciwaci on Lakeba. It has been estimated that this union occurred “about Tasman’s time”,\textsuperscript{32} that is during the first half of the seventeenth century. At about the same time, Fatafehi took as his spouse Kaloafutonga, sister of Ngata, founder of the Tu`i

\textsuperscript{26} J.C. Beaglehole, ed., \textit{The Journals of Captain James Cook on his Voyages of Discovery}, Vol. 3: \textit{The Voyage of the “Resolution” and “Discovery” 1776–1780}, Cambridge 1967, 163.
\textsuperscript{28} Thomas Williams and James Calvert, \textit{Fiji and the Fijians}, ed. by George Stringer Rowe, London 1870, 82–83.
\textsuperscript{29} Adrienne Kaeppler, “Exchange Patterns in Goods and Spouses: Fiji, Tonga and Samoa”, \textit{Mankind}, Vol. 11, No. 3, 248. See also Williams and Calvert, 67–68.
\textsuperscript{30} A.C. Reid, “Notes on some Fijian hereditary titles”, \textit{TPFS}, Vol. 10, 1969, 47. Taliai Tupou was the son of Tuidravu, another wife of Rasolo.
\textsuperscript{31} Elizabeth Bott, \textit{Tongan Society at the Time of Captain Cook’s Visits: Discussions with Her Majesty Queen Sālote Tupou}, Wellington 1982, 32.
\textsuperscript{32} E.W. Gifford, \textit{Tongan Society}, Honolulu 1929, 34.
Kānokupolu line. More significantly, Kaloafūtonga was a daughter of the Tu‘i Ha‘atakalaua. The descendants of both these unions altered the nature of the Tongan hierarchy and forged stronger ties between Tonga and Fiji.

The son of Sinaitakala and Tapu‘osi, Fonomanu, was the first in Tonga to carry the title of Tu‘i Lakepa, a name derived from his father’s island of birth. He was the founder of the Fale Fisi, or house of Fiji, whose members were considered as a separate category of chiefs, an innovation in the Tongan polity. Fonomanu’s cousin Fonokimoana was called the Tamaha, or “sacred child”. As the daughter of the Tu‘i Tonga Fefine, she enjoyed the highest rank of any person in Tonga, a position fraught with dynastic implications. Thenceforward, it became the practice of the Tu‘i Tonga Fefine, always the oldest full sister of the Tu‘i Tonga, to seek their spouses from among the senior ranks of the Fale Fisi. In each generation, children of such unions, because of their quasi-foreign Fijian origins, were considered to be outside the system, even though they outranked the Tu‘i Tonga. They can be regarded as holding too high a rank for any office, or to be in a special sacred category. As one scholar has rightly observed, “this neutralisation of the descendants of the Tu‘i Tonga Fefine was clearly a political device”, 33 designed to ensure the survival of the Tu‘i Tonga’s paramount position.

---

Chart 1: Links between Lakeba and the offices of Tu‘i Tonga Fefine and Tu‘i Kānokupolu.

Source: Author’s depiction

A further dynastic affiliation came into being when the third Tu‘i Kānokupolu, Mataeleutu‘apiko, gave his daughter Toafilimoe‘unga to a Lakeban chief named Paleisasa, son of the Tui Nayau, Delaivugalei. Popua‘ulī‘uli, daughter

of Toafilimoe`unga and Paleisasa, was a wife of Ma`afu`otu`itonga, sixth Tu`i Kānokupolu, who succeeded about 1730. Their son Mumui was father of Aleamotu`a and grandfather of Ma`afu.34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delaivugalei (Tui Nayau)</th>
<th>Mataeletuatu`apiko (TK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paleisasa = Toafilimoe`unga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma<code>afu</code>otu<code>itonga = Popua</code>uli`uli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumui = Kaufusi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleamotu`a = Moala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma`afu = Elenoa Gataialupe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2: Ma`afu’s descent from the Tui Nayau family of Lakeba.

Source: Author’s depiction

In the wake of Tapu`osi’s emigration to Tonga, other Lakebans followed the chief’s example. Prominent among them was one Pupu Tui Soso, chief of Nukunuku village in Lakeba. Arriving in Tonga with Paleisasa, Pupu later adopted and brought up one of Paleisasa’s sons, who was later known as Tu`i Vakano. Pupu and his entourage settled on land from where the mother of his adopted son originally came; the titleholder of this estate is still called Tu`i Vakano. There has been a long tradition that the Tu`i Vakano has the “responsibility to provide a guard, dressed and armed in Fijian fashion, at installations of the Tu`i Kānokupolu.”35 Ever since Tāufa`āhau was invested in this office in 1845, the reigning monarch has formally held the title of Tu`i Kānokupolu. When, in 1918, Queen Sālote was installed in the traditional office,

She was preceded by a man who ran ahead, brandishing a spear, crouching and looking around. During the kava ceremony, he was free of all restrictions. He smoked, lounged and walked close before and behind the Queen’s person and when the pig’s liver was placed before

34 Bott, 145, 152. Popua`uli`uli was also known as Kavakipopua.
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

her he impaled it on his spear ... This man ... a herald ... comes from one of the traditional foreign clans. It is said that a man named Soakai, also Fijian, had similar rights in the Tu`i Tonga’s kava circle.36

Such profane behaviour from anyone else in the presence of the Tu`i Kānokupolu would have ensured the perpetrator’s immediate death in pre-Christian Tonga. It was tolerated at the ceremony because the “herald” was considered as a foreigner, a person who was not bound to respect the hallowed ritual and the lofty status of all the other participants. Evidence that in today’s Tonga the foreign character of the Fale Fisi and other noble houses of Fijian origin has become somewhat diluted came in 1967 at the installation of King Tāufāhau Tupou IV as Tu`i Kānokupolu, when the then Tui Soso from Nukunuku was invited down to perform the same ceremonial function. Tonga’s links with Lakeba are not forgotten.37

The islands of Lau, while part of Fiji, form a transitional zone between that country’s heartland and the neighbouring archipelagos of Tonga. The absorption over several centuries of thousands of Tongans, with their cultural and linguistic baggage, was enhanced by the islands’ geography. From north to south they cover a distance of over 450 kilometres, with the distance between each island usually less than 50 kilometres. Most islands rise to heights of more than 100 metres. Navigation between them has always been facilitated by this intervisibility, while for navigators sailing from a distance, the Lauan islands present a large target. One authority has proposed that a meaning of the word lau in a local dialect is “hitting the target”.38 Such a connotation, if correct, could well owe its derivation to canoe voyaging.

The map of Lau shows the archipelago’s three sub groups: in the north, the Exploring Isles, of which Vanuaabalavu, the future home of Ma`afu, is the chief; in the west the Yasayasa Moala, comprising Moala itself, Totoya, Matuku and Vanua Vatu; while in the centre and south lie the islands of southern Lau, or Lau-i-Cake, centred on Lakeba and stretching to Ono-i-Lau in the far south. It is in Lau-i-Cake, many of whose islands are closer to Tonga than they are to Viti Levu, that the strongest sailing tradition has existed in recorded times. These islands were early and for long exposed to visitors, marauders and settlers from Tonga. One of their chief attractions was a heavy hardwood known in Fijian as vesi, which does not occur naturally in Tonga. Always the preferred wood for canoe construction in southern Lau, vesi is characterised by strength, natural durability, low shrinkage and good seasoning qualities. Because of its heaviness, vesi requires almost a year to dry out after cutting before its buoyancy is sufficient.

37 Reid, 7, n. 26.
for the construction of canoe hulls. This requirement was one reason why Tongans who came to Lau to construct large ocean-going canoes often needed to stay for several years. Most of the canoe builders went initially to Vulaga, in southern Lau, where a lineage of Tongan carpenters known as Tiafau had settled. They remained specialists in their craft, relying on their host community for food, a habit their fellow countrymen were to emulate elsewhere in Fiji. While *vesi* grew well on Vulaga, it was even more abundant on Kabara, a little to the west. A strong canoe-building tradition existed on these and other islands of Lau well before the eighteenth century, when Tongans began voyaging to Fiji in much greater numbers, bringing a new technology with them. Their carpenters were able to utilise the adze and the chisel to exploit *vesi* on a much larger scale. The *camakau* or sailing canoe of Lau was developed in Tonga into the *hamatafua*, or voyaging canoe, directly as a consequence of increased contact with Lau. The design of the *hamatafua* was probably developed by Tongan carpenters working in Lau, where the availability of *vesi* and other timbers, as well as their own skill in working with timber, led to this adaptation of Fijian design superior to anything known in Tonga.

Missionary Thomas Williams, a student of Fijian ethnology, noted the “clumsy and hardly manageable” nature of the *tongiaki*, the Tongan double canoe. When he lived in Fiji, this craft had been superseded by the larger double-hulled *kalia*, itself based on the Fijian *drua*. He compared the *tongiaki* to its Fijian counterpart in the same way as a “coal barge” might be compared to a “clipper yacht”. “Not the slightest change has been made in the model thus adopted”, Williams stated, “now … used for more than a century by the best seamen in these regions; but the Tonguese have the praise of executing the several parts with superior care and finish”. By the nineteenth century, when they were under construction in Lau, the *kalia* had become the Tongans’ principal means of voyaging to Fiji. The platform between the *kalia*’s two hulls featured a small “house” in its centre, for storage of cargo and shelter for some passengers during inclement weather. Such vessels, the largest of which could carry up to 150 people, carried uncounted numbers of Tongans between their islands and Fiji.

---

39 See Gillett for a detailed discussion of canoe construction methods using *vesi* and other timbers.
41 Williams, *Journal of Thomas Williams…*, 90 (28 June 1842).
43 Clunie, 33–39.
45 Williams and Calvert, 64; David Cargill to GS, WMMS, 18 Jun 1839, quoted in David Cargill, *The Diaries and Correspondence of David Cargill 1823–1843*, ed. by Albert J. Schultz, Canberra 1977, 61.
46 For detailed descriptions of *kalia* see Thomas West, *Ten Years in South-Central Polynesia*, London 1865, 48–50 and Haddon and Hornell, 272 et seq.
Craft such as the *kalia* were of great economic importance to Lau. In the 1840s it was written of them: “[They] may be almost considered the staple commodity of the islands. The Friendly Islanders are in the habit of coming down with their families for the purpose of buying or building them”.

The shipwrecked sailor John Twyning, writing of the same period, said: “The King of Lakeba derives considerable advantage from the islands’ timber, in permitting the inhabitants of the Friendly and other islands to build their canoes in his dominions. He provides the persons building them with provisions during the time they are constructing, and receives in return, muskets, hatchets, whales’ teeth, kava roots and such other articles as are either useful or desirable to him”. Because the craftsmen, other workers and their families required support from their host communities, an economic organisation involving other islands, besides those on which the Tongans lived, was needed. The profits to be made from canoe construction, exemplified by the trading arrangements described, were tempered by the need, not only to feed and house the “visitors”, but also to keep them under at least a modicum of control. As the demands of warfare increased, first in Tonga from the late 1830s and in Fiji owing to the struggles between the rival *matanitu* of Bau, Rewa and Cakaudrove until 1855, so too did the construction of *drua* increase. The political implications of these developments were great, as were the concomitant economic changes. In mid nineteenth century Fiji, the Tongans formed an integral part of the islands’ evolving polity and of their increasingly complex economy.

Tongan colonisation of eastern Fiji began in earnest during the final decades of the eighteenth century, when the complex balance of power in Tonga was beginning to disintegrate. Fiji was considered as more than a refuge from civil war and political turbulence at home. Its chief attraction was its maritime technology, with the consequence that many of the temporary settlements there became permanent, including especially those on Lakeba, whose ruling house was of part-Tongan descent. The former site of the island’s chiefly village, Tubou, was first occupied by a Tongan camp, while the name Tubou is itself of Tongan origin. The people of Tubou moved to the village’s present site, on the southern shore of the island, only in the late 1860s, during the reign of Taliai Tupou as Tui Nayau. Almost a kilometre up the Nakula stream, which divides Tubou from Levuka village, lies the site of the former village of Nakorovusa, abandoned for present-day Tubou.

At the time of Ma’afu’s arrival, the Lakeban state included all the islands of central and southern Lau. Vanuabalavu and smaller nearby islands owed allegiance to

---


49 Hocart, 10. Only a few house mounds remain visible at the site of the former village.
Cakaudrove, the _matanitu_ that also included Taveuni and the eastern third of Vanua Levu. Through most of Lau the Tongans had, to varying degrees, become assimilated into their host communities. This process, continuing at the time of European contact, often involved marriage into Fijian families, giving many of the Tongans and their descendants access to land. The Tongans’ involvement in canoe building and in trade ensured their incorporation into the economic base of Lau well before Ma’afu ventured into their midst.

During the two decades before Ma’afu came to live in Fiji, some Tongan chiefs on Lakeba had participated in raids on Vanuabalavu and elsewhere in Cakaudrove, while Tanoa, the _Vunivalu_ of Bau, who was forced into exile in 1833, was reinstated four years later with Tongan help. Prominent among the Tongans who aided Tanoa were Lasike and Tupou Toutai. They had reached Fiji in 1833 when, with a large number of followers, they sailed from Vava’u to Somosomo in Taveuni in order to build several canoes to be used in aid of Tanoa’s efforts to regain control of Bau. Tanoa is supposed to have given his Tongan supporters permission to settle anywhere in Fiji. He had neither the right nor the power to grant such permission, which in any case Lasike, Tupou Toutai and his followers scarcely required. Lasike, who remained a faithful ally of Bau, went to Lakeba to oversee the building of a very large canoe for use by Bau against Somosomo. He and his brother typify the depth of Tongan involvement in Fijian political affairs for more than a decade before Ma’afu’s arrival in the islands.

Apparently always faithful to the accord he had achieved with Tāufa‘āhau over the kava bowl, Lasike accompanied over 1,000 Tongans who arrived in Lakeba in June 1845, when another large canoe was under construction. This one was intended for Tāufa‘āhau, who succeeded as Tu‘i Kānokupolu only six months later. The canoe, built at Kabara, finally reached Lakeba in December 1845, an indication that the strategic alliance between Tāufa‘āhau and the Tongan power base in Lau, fostered in 1842, was working well. What remained unclear were the future relations between Bau, Lakeba and Tonga, the last now unified under Tāufa‘āhau. Between all three of these entities alliance, implied threats and ill-concealed hostility had existed for several decades in an ever-changing kaleidoscope.

Because of their rank and leadership roles among the Tongans in Fiji, Lasike and his brother are better documented than other Tongans then living there. They might nevertheless be said to represent the many Tongan chiefs who sought

50 The _Vunivalu_, whose title means “root of war”, should be distinguished from Roko Tui Bau, the sacred or paramount chief of Bau. The _Vunivalu_ was effectively the secular ruler of Bau.
51 John Eagleston, Logbook of HMS _Emerald_, 18 Sep 1834. See also Wilkes, 55.
54 Lyth, Journal, 4 Jun 1845; Lyth, Day Book, 8 Dec 1845.
either refuge or adventure in Fiji, chiefs who, with their followers, were to play a crucial role, especially on Lakeba, in the spread of Christianity. William Cross and David Cargill, the first European missionaries to work in Fiji, were heavily dependent on the Tongan community on Lakeba, from whose ranks their first Lakeban converts came and whose members built Lakeba’s first Christian church. Among the earliest Fijian converts was Vuetasau, son of the former Tui Nayau, Malani and nephew of the incumbent ruler, Taliai Tupou. Vuetasau, part Tongan by descent, adopted the Christian name of William on his baptism in 1846. He oversaw the building of a chapel at Tubou and the establishment of the first school in Lakeba, begun in his house in 1850. For a man who, before his conversion, boasted 16 wives, his commitment to the lotu was certain to earn missionary approval as an example to his fellow Fijians. Despite their early reliance on the Tongans, however, the missionaries soon despaired of the community. In 1842, Calvert observed that while the Lakeba Tongans were “lounging about in Fiji, some … of their families are in Tonga in want, or dependent upon others”.

Fiji in the 1840s consisted of seven matanitu, or confederations, possessing varying degrees of independence and all inherently unstable because of the changing demands of alliance and war, as well as uncertain succession. Not counted among the seven was Lau, centred on Lakeba, whose prominence among the small, scattered islands Williams ascribed to its Tongan connection. Whatever the truth of that assertion, Tui Nayau’s dominions in 1847 extended from the island of Cicia to Ono-i-Lau. In view of its allegiance to Bau, Lau is not usually considered as an “independent” matanitu in the manner of Bau itself or of Cakaudrove, to which parts of Lau also owed some measure of allegiance. The complex and shifting relationship between Lau and those two matanitu was further disrupted through the involvement of the Lakeba-based Tongans, firstly in the restoration of Tanoa to power in Bau and later by their raids on Vanuabalavu and some nearby islands then under the suzerainty of Cakaudrove. Nevertheless, the power of Bau remained real enough in Lakeba, at least in the 1840s. Williams recorded in 1843 that “a [Lakeban] tribute fleet left for Bau, taking one immense canoe, fifteen rolls of bark cloth, whales’ teeth and (for
Lakeba’s changing relations with both Bau and Cakaudrove are a reminder that the balance of power between Fiji’s *matanitu* had always been fluid. Traditional loyalties seldom counted for much if they conflicted with the need for survival. The Tongans, whose presence in Fiji in the middle of the nineteenth century was to determine the outcome of the struggle for supremacy between Bau and Rewa, had become a force in Fiji comparable to the most powerful *matanitu*. When in April 1840, a force of Tongans landed at Bau, they were offered tribute in the form of slaughtered and live pigs, vegetables and yams. Such tribute, fully in accordance with the Fijian tradition of acknowledging the realities of power, illustrated the degree of Tongan involvement in the islands. What no one could predict in 1840, with the unity of Tonga and the supremacy of Tāufa‘āhau still to be achieved, were the implications of this undeniable Tongan power. The reception given to the Tongans at Bau was typical of the respect shown to loyal allies, and none was more loyal than Lasike and Tupou Toutai. Their unexpected meeting with Tāufa‘āhau and Lualala on Lakeba in 1842 was of fundamental importance in determining the future direction of Tongan authority in Fiji. In making Bau almost their second home, the Tongans had clearly allied themselves to power. Were they intent only on serving their allies’ interests or were the implications of the alliance more far-reaching?

The tribute offered by Bau was more than a reward for Tongan military assistance. It was also a tacit acknowledgement of Tongan power and of the implicit challenge that power posed to Bau’s precarious ascendancy in Fiji. The family of Tui Nayau continued to acknowledge allegiance to Bau, even though the relationship between them could not have existed independently of the Tongans. When Tagici suffered ill treatment and humiliation at the hands of her Bauan hosts, she returned to Lakeba, where her arrival prompted Cakobau, Tanoa’s son and ultimate successor, to complain to the visiting Tāufa‘āhau “that his Lakeba vassals had not kept their engagement concerning Tagici”. He promised that “if they send her back [from Lakeba] with the tribute, then he would give his free consent to her returning home”. Forced briefly to return to Bau, Tagici was soon restored to Lakeba, after intervention by Tāufa‘āhau. The Lakebans had sought to resolve the impasse by delaying their customary tribute to a waning Bau. It is significant that the matter was resolved only with Tongan help.
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In preserving his power in Lau, Tui Nayau could not afford to ignore Cakaudrove, especially as Bau’s supremacy was no longer assured. In 1839, Tui Nayau sent Lasike to Somosomo, the chiefly town of Cakaudrove, to ascertain what intentions Yavala, Tui Cakau held towards Lakeba. Tui Nayau appeared to feel threatened by Cakaudrove, to which Lakeba had long paid tribute. Two years later, it was thought necessary on Lakeba to prepare earthworks as a defence against an expected attack from Cakaudrove, an attack that never eventuated. Then, in 1846, two alarms occurred during the same month. Tui Nayau again ordered Tubou fortified when, on 8 January, a canoe arrived at Lakeba from Bau with the news that Bau intended to make war on the island. On 31 January, another canoe arrived, this time from Vanuaabalavu. Its occupants informed Tui Nayau that Tuikilakila, a son of Tui Cakau, was on the point of “visiting” Lakeba “in search of property” which, according to oral tradition in Lakeba, was a war canoe. Tui Nayau sent an emissary to Vanuaabalavu to soro, “so that the chief may not come … the land is poor at present”.

Whatever threats, real and imaginary, Lakeba felt from Bau and Cakaudrove, the omnipresent Tongans acquired additional menace after 1845, when the nominal unity of their homeland was achieved. With the king more powerful than ever, the pressure on Tui Nayau and other Lauan chiefs to accept the lotu became greater. Among the Fijian matanitu, Bau still posed the greatest threat towards the Lakeban state. Allied to Bau and to the threat it represented were the Tongans, who remained allies so long as the power and prestige of Bau’s rulers offered sufficient incentive. In Lau, the reality of Tongan power meant that Lakeba, for so long faced with the dilemma of how to placate one potential enemy without offending another, no longer had to make a choice. The Tongans were at once Lakeba’s salvation and its nemesis.

Allied to the growing Tongan presence in Lau was Christianity, which had gained its first precarious toehold in Fiji through the missionary Isireli Takai, who had originally gone to Tahiti “for instruction respecting Christianity” at the request of Malani, then Tui Nayau. Despite the interest Malani vouchsafed for the lotu, he told one of the ships’ captains who brought Takai and his Tahitian friends to Fiji in 1832 that he felt unable to convert. The autonomy of the Lakeban state was too precarious for Malani to contemplate upsetting the delicate balance by adopting an alien faith. The removal of Takai to Oneata, an island subject to Lakeba, possibly resulted from Malani’s essentially political need to distance
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him from the bearers of the lotu. After Malani’s death in 1833, his younger brother Taliai Tupou, who succeeded as Tui Nayau, was occupied in ensuring that his authority was not undermined by Fiji’s endemic instability. The Tongans on Lakeba, some of them at least nominal Christians, kept the flickering flame of the lotu alive in Fiji until the English Wesleyans became established. This new dimension to the Tongan presence was to play a significant part in the steps Ma’afu would take in extending his future power in Lau.

The new Tui Nayau had never been a favourite with missionaries, being described by Thomas Jaggar as “a great persecutor … [who] murdered an aunt and strangled his own mother”. Like his predecessor, Taliai Tupou articulated essentially political reasons for his unwillingness to convert. Professing to David Cargill his belief in Jehovah as the only true God and intimating that he would lotu at some future time, Taliai Tupou nevertheless expressed a strong “fear lest the inhabitants of those islands which are not subject to him should make war upon him, or lest some of those Chiefs who submit to his authority should be displeased at his renunciation of the religion of Feejee, and dethrone him”. Although there was a growing Christian congregation on Lakeba, most of them were Tongan. Tui Nayau’s prevarication, arising from his awareness of the political implications of conversion, came to the fore when the United States Exploring Expedition was visiting Lakeba: he informed Lieutenant-Commander Ringgold that he would convert after Tanoa’s death. Six years later, Tui Nayau’s daughter and her husband Lualala, chief of Waciwaci village, publicly urged him, unsuccessfully, to embrace Christianity. Able as he was to articulate his dilemma, Taliai Tupou was as far as ever from resolving it.

Among the Tongans living on Lakeba were several who were to become unwitting, not to say unwilling, allies of Tongan political power: the teachers and the so-called Native Assistant Missionaries. Six of the more prominent among them, including Joeli Bulu, Jone Havea and Tāufa‘āhau’s brother-in-law Suliaisi Naulivou, had reached Lakeba from Vava‘u in June 1838. The presence of these men, chosen in Tonga by missionary Dr Richard Lyth, doubtless helped to inspire the erection of a new chapel at Bucainabua, near Tubou, built by Tongans with some Fijian assistance and opened in October 1838. It was men such as these teachers and assistant missionaries who earned the praise
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of Walter Lawry, General Superintendent of the Wesleyan Missions, when he visited Lakeba in 1847, the year of Ma’afu’s arrival. He saw the Tongan religious leaders, with their quasi-European ways, as harbingers of Christian civilisation in a savage land.78 But Lawry was only a visitor; resident missionaries such as Calvert and Cross were well aware of the distinction to be drawn between resident Tongan teachers and their fellow countrymen who descended on Lakeba and other islands of Lau for periods of varying length, usually doing little or no work and requiring support from their host communities. Calvert articulated the menace posed by the Tongan community on Lakeba:

Many of the Tonguese, if they are what they call themselves – Christians — are idle, covetous, impudent roaming Christians. Not many months ago 15 large canoes, with perhaps 1000 Tonguese on board, left Feejee for Tonga. Some of them had been in Feejee two years, or more … During their stay, they were principally dependent upon the Feejeeans for food, none of which they purchased – but have been given, begged, and in some cases stolen. They came to Feejee in search of canoes, sails, earthenware, sandalwood etc. and I suppose they did not take less than 400 wooden bowls with them to Tonga.

From the immense property which they secured in Feejee – and for the awful quantity of food they ate – they brought very little property. Their living idle and very poor in these lands for a long time had a bad effect on Feejee. … The injury they receive and do by these visits would be greatly lessened if they had comfortable homes, and some profitable employment in their own land…79

The dilemma posed by the Tongan presence in Lau remained a preoccupation of the missionaries. Lyth, who reached Fiji from Tonga in 1839, recorded in 1846 his pain at Tui Nayau’s “vacillating character” and “lack of moral resolution”.80 Several months later, the missionary’s zeal remained unrequited: “the King … some months ago appeared to be on the point of turning, but has relapsed … into a settled state of heathenism”.81 Even as the missionary recorded his frustrations, the Tongans were helping Tui Nayau along the road to a final decision. “Most of the Tonguese settlers here have been away since December, having gone to assist Thakobau and Tuikilakila against Natewa”.82 Lyth, like many other missionaries, could not appreciate that Christianity prospered or not according to the imperatives of Fijian culture and the exigencies of political
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reality. Cargill at least recognised the political implications of any decision by Tui Nayau to “turn”. The ruler did not exist in a moral vacuum, as Lyth apparently believed. Rather, he participated in a dialectic that would, in the fullness of time, convince him to _lotu_, for the preservation of his power rather than for the salvation of his soul.

The accommodation reached between Tāufaʻāhau and the Tongan leaders on Lakeba in 1842 was seriously called into question when Lasike, who had assumed his family title of Finau, died in December 1844. Calvert described the Tongans then as being in “an awful state”, a reference to their spiritual condition, but he was also well aware of the possible consequences of Lasike’s passing. When news of the death reached Tāufaʻāhau in Tonga, he wrote to Cakobau concerning relations between their two countries. His letter, brought to Fiji by his brother Lausi’i, passed through Calvert’s hands in December 1845. Since Lausi’i had broken the seal, the missionary was able to read the king’s words. So concerned was Calvert about the letter’s implications, he alerted his colleague and friend, missionary John Hunt, who was stationed at Viwa.

Calvert believed that Tāufaʻāhau had long wished to challenge Bau and had refrained from doing so only because of Lasike’s support for Tanoa and Cakobau. He held this belief despite Lasike’s advice to him during 1844 that a challenge of sorts had actually been made. Hunt was also informed that Lasike, or Finau as Calvert referred to him, “often spoke much against George to Cakobau. Now that Finau is dead, George considers his way open to Bau”.

Calvert recalled Tāufaʻāhau’s words, directed to both Tanoa and Cakobau:

> I write to you two, to thank you for your kindness to Tonguese who have frequently voyaged about Feejee. You have screened them in your kingdom. To whom, in the event of danger, should they look but to you two, while they are in your kingdom? Do not say, why do you send to other parts of Feejee, and not to us in … Lau … That is caused by the way of us Tonguese. Some are evil seeds. Your minds are dark, and know not these things. Cakobau, believe not their lies. They deceive you – lest we should sail to you, and you obtain property thereby. He is a deceiver – but that deceiver has escaped to the grave. Write to me, and let me know your mind. Love the missionaries. Forgive any wrong words in my letter – Believe me it is true.

As Calvert observed to his friend, the references to lies and deceit were directed against Finau. The missionary was apprehensive lest Finau’s surviving brother, Tupou Toutai, should attempt to influence Cakobau against Tāufaʻāhau. In
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that event, “a dreadful eruption” would likely ensue between Tāufaʻāhau and the Tongans on Lakeba. Only the good sense of both Tupou Toutai and Lausiʻi prevented fighting between their respective followers, Calvert believed.

From Tāufaʻāhaus letter, as recalled by Calvert, and from the missionary’s comments, it is not possible to determine what Tāufaʻāhau’s intentions were towards both Bau and the Lakeban state in the mid 1840s. It is clear that the king was vitally concerned to maintain his influence with the ruling chiefs of Bau and with the Tongans on Lakeba. He had written to Finau before receiving news of his death and now appeared most anxious to reassure Cakobau that he, Tāufaʻāhau, was the true voice of Tonga. The “lies” and “deceit” spread by Finau should, Tāufaʻāhau believed, be buried with him. It is surely significant that his letter was written during the final months of Aleamotuʻa’s life, a time when Tāufaʻāhau must have known that his succession as Tuʻi Kānokupolu and the union of all Tonga under his own rule could not be far distant. By coincidence, he was invested as Tuʻi Kānokupolu only a few days before Calvert’s letter to Hunt was written. Given Tāufaʻāhau’s need to consolidate his rule and to deal with the remaining chiefs who still opposed him at home, it is unlikely that he contemplated hostilities against any part of Fiji during the first years of his kingship. Nevertheless, his determination to enlarge his influence in both Bau and Lakeba could be seen as evidence of an intention to be more closely involved with Fiji in the future. For the present, however, any anxiety which Cakobau felt concerning Tāufaʻāhau’s intentions towards Bau would have been relieved by the friendly and respectful tone which the king adopted in his letter. But Cakobau needed to retain the support of Tupou Toutai, no friend of Tāufaʻāhau, and his followers, which he would likely lose if he embraced the Tongan king too warmly. His position was nothing if not delicate.

Further complications for Cakobau arose from Ratu Mara, who was indefatigable in his observance of the practice whereby chiefs obtained wives from districts where Bau possessed, or desired, supremacy. According to William Pritchard, the first British Consul in Fiji, “the object of Bau was to possess as many vasu to different districts as possible. A vasu has the right to appropriate anything belonging to the brothers of his mother, and can also claim the services of his uncle’s tribes in war”. Thomas Williams made mention of the vasu taukei, “a term applied to any vasu whose mother is a lady of the land in which he is born … a vasu taukei can claim anything belonging to a native of his mother’s land, excepting the wives, home and land of a chief. Vasus cannot be considered apart from the civil polity of Fiji … supplying the high pressure power of Fijian despotism”. Bau’s use of the vasu system to extend its influence was legitimate in terms of the polity of Fiji. Ratu Mara was a son of Vuibureta, a half-brother of
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Tanoa, and thus a classificatory brother to Cakobau. Mara’s mother, Adi Veisaca, daughter of a former Tui Nayau, ensured for him vasu rights on Lakeba. The connection ran deeper still, since Vuibureta’s mother Ufia was also from Lakeba. Mara’s vasu rights covered not only Lakeba, but also the Lauan islands subject to it. Mara was, in effect, vasu to Lau, a position he was never loath to exploit.

Mara, always a stormy petrel and feared throughout Lau, was sometimes seen as a barometer of Bauan intentions and placated or resisted accordingly. To his chagrin, he was never accorded the respect shown to both Tanoa and Cakobau, probably because was always ruthless in his attempts to augment his personal power. Having long been thwarted by the Tongan community on Lakeba and in particular by their loyalty to Cakobau, he arrived on the island in late 1845 after several years of voyaging between Fiji and Tonga. His visits were always associated with Bau’s demands for tribute, demands which Tui Nayau, in response to Mara’s vasu rights and to the Bauan power which those rights both represented and enhanced, could never deny. The best Lakeba could do was to keep up the supply of canoes, tabua, masi and sinnet and to fortify Tubou when attack threatened, as it did again at the end of 1845.88

Reference has already been made to the lack of evidence for the earlier view that Tupou sent Ma`afu to Fiji in order to remove a potential rival for the kingship.89 The king nevertheless knew about and approved of Ma`afu’s voyage to Fiji since, in the established traditions of young Tongans of noble birth spending long periods in Fiji, Tongan chiefs of senior rank could order younger relatives or subordinates to make the voyage. Through his descent from Paleisasa, Ma`afu was related by blood to Tui Nayau, a kinship acknowledged whenever he visited Lakeba or any of its subject islands. The practice had long existed whereby young Tongan chiefs descended from Paleisasa spent time living with Tui Nayau’s family, acting as “courtiers and envoys”.90 This practice, so another oral tradition in Lakeba would have it, accounted for Ma`afu’s advent in 1847. Aleamotu’a had also visited Lakeba, very likely in keeping with his family links with the island, while his brother Lasike is known to have been on Lakeba in January 1839.91 When the two Tahitians Hape and Tafeta were detained at Nuku’alofa in 1826, Aleamotu’a declared that he had been to Lakeba and was a “friend” of Tui Nayau. It was in the capacity of a friend that “he took possession of the present intended for the Fijian chief”.92 The “present” was Christianity. LMS missionary John Williams referred to the “leadership role” accorded to
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Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

Tongatapu by the people of Lakeba and also to their acknowledgement of Aleamotu’a “as a kind of superior over them”. In paying yet another visit to Lakeba, Ma`afu was following a well-established family tradition, whereby young chiefs of the families of the Tu`i Kānokupolu in Tonga and the Tui Nayau in Lakeba “lived with the head of the other as a courtier, and supervised the ceremonial making of the chief’s yaqona, and acted as his envoy to convey commands to subject chiefs”. It appears that a clearly defined role awaited Ma`afu in Lau.

Ma`afu’s departure from Tonga in June 1847 was connected with the presence in the islands of Ratu Mara, who had been forced to flee Fiji about 18 months earlier. The reasons for his flight were outlined by his grandson, Gustav Mara Hennings, in 1910. Having indiscreetly admired a “fair princess”, already married, at Bau, Mara was duly banished. Pursued by a death sentence, he headed first for Lakeba, where he made use of his vasu rights to requisition a double canoe. He then set off for Tonga, accompanied by four young Lakeban chiefs and two from the island of Moce. When in Tonga, he supposedly became the friend and ally of Tupou, even helping him to escape a murder plot by the still heathen inhabitants of Houma.

Hennings’ account eulogises his grandfather and stresses his crucial role in preserving both the peace of Tonga and the person of the king. While still in Tonga in early 1847, Mara appeared to enjoy the tacit approval of John Thomas, who had long been one with Tupou in promoting the unity of Tonga as a Christian kingdom. In March, at a service at Sia on Tongatapu, five adults, including a Samoan chief, were baptised. “Feejeeans were present with their chief Marra”, Thomas recorded. By mid 1847, Mara was expected to return home in order to make his peace with Bau. In April, Calvert on Lakeba informed his “brethren”, Thomas Williams at Somosomo and Hunt at Viwa, concerning Mara’s return: “Mara is in Tonga. He is to be brought by George Tupou’s sons, etc, who are to be joined by the Lakeba people to sorovakina him to Bau”. The intention was that Mara should humble himself at Bau, acknowledge his past errors and beg forgiveness. Before his departure from Tonga, Mara visited the island of Tungua, in Ha`apai, the residence of the Tamaha, the eldest daughter of the Tu`i Tonga Fefine. Because of an ancient association, or tuvua, between Tungua and Moala, where Mara possessed vasu rights, the Tamaha presented Mara with “a great war canoe” in order to revive the relationship between the two islands. His return to Fiji was imminent.
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According to Hennings, Tupou, wishing further to honour his departing guest, “ordered some of the highest chiefs in the land … to accompany Mara to Fiji”. Those chiefs included the king’s son Tevita `Unga, his brother Lausi`i, a chief called Moses Taufa and Ma`afu. Hennings’ account further states that although Ma`afu “may have visited Fiji before”, the circumstances of his coming in 1847, which led to the growth of his power and to his rivalry with Cakobau, were not well known. According to an oral tradition in Tonga, Ma`afu’s canoe, part of the folau escorting Mara, bore the Tongan name Hiki mo e falike, meaning, “to go away, taking with you everything you own, including the floor mats”. The canoe was later to be presented to Tui Cakau, a move fraught with implications for Ma`afu’s future power base in Vanuaabalavu. In the immediate context of Ma`afu’s departure from Tonga, the name implied a clean break with the past. Ma`afu was heading for a new life.

In the light of the evidence, inconclusive though it is, that Ma`afu intended leaving Tonga for good, it is tempting to succumb to the romantic aura induced by the traditional name of Ma`afu’s canoe. Some caution is advised, however, since one of Ma`afu’s companions on the voyage suggested many years later that Ma`afu did plan to return. His matapule Tingea, when interviewed at Lomaloma by magistrate Charles Swayne shortly after Ma`afu’s death, stated that Ma`afu had come to Fiji to build some canoes and then to bring the folau back to Tonga. “Ma`afu agreed with Tai his mother [that she] should remain at home until his return and then sail for Samoa”, Tingea declared. When the canoes had been refastened and the folau was about to sail for Tonga, Ma`afu was invited to visit Matuku where a solenu was made for him. Tingea’s statements conflict with Ma`afu’s own account, to be considered later, that following his arrival in Lakeba, he remained there until he presented his canoe to Tui Cakau and accompanied that chief to Vanuaabalavu.

Cautionary though Tingea’s account is, there is strong contemporary evidence that a canoe named Hiki mo e falike existed and was coveted by Tui Cakau. Thomas Williams, stationed at Somosomo in 1846, later recorded that one of the Tui Laucala’s daughters, a wife of Tui Cakau, had given birth to a daughter who was named Falike. Tui Cakau was much pleased with the child and made a great fuss of her. “At the time of her birth, the King [Tui Cakau] was fully set on securing the famous Tonga canoe, the Hiki mo e falike. As it appeared to be the supreme object of his desire, so that by wishing the little girl to be called
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after the canoe he showed unusual regard for her”. Ma`afu himself stated in 1864 that the canoe Tuikilakila “begged” from him was named the Falike. Finally, in a Court of Arbitration hearing one year later, Ma`afu again referred to the canoe he gave Tuikilakila as the Falike. While the canoe in question was not named expressly for Ma`afu’s voyage to Fiji, he certainly presented it to Tuikilakila in about 1849. Tingea’s account casts doubt only on what Ma`afu’s intentions were when he left Tonga. It is likely that Ma`afu had no definite plans and was content to take whatever opportunities offered themselves in Lau, as he did when he accompanied Tuikilakila to Vanuabalavu on board the Hiki mo e falike. His subsequent career indicates that, if by chance he did leave his floor mats at home in 1847, he had good cause to send for them within a short time of his arrival in Fiji.

The exact time of Ma`afu’s arrival in Fiji has never been satisfactorily established, with estimates between 1840 and 1853 appearing in various published works. Available evidence can determine the date to within three weeks. Reference has already been made to Ma`afu’s presence at Nuku’alofa on 1 June 1847, the day John Thomas was thrown from his horse. On 28 June, preparations for the departure appear to have been well in hand. Thomas recorded that “two of the king’s brothers and nearly all his sons, with many others, are going to Feejes”. Mara was to be accompanied by what modern diplomacy would call a high-level delegation, in order to provide him with moral support in his delicate mission to Bau. The delegation would also remind Bau of the reality of Tongan power, which Fiji’s most prestigious matanitu could never afford to ignore. The mission was the first evidence since late 1845, when Tupou wrote his apparently friendly letter to Cakobau, of the king’s close interest in Fijian affairs. Although the report of the Wesleyan missionaries’ district meeting, which concluded at Nuku’alofa on 14 July, made no mention of the departure, the voyagers had probably already reached Fiji.

By 20 July, some three weeks after Thomas noted the imminent departure of the folau, the party had been in Fiji for several days, if not for a week or more. Richard Lyth, then stationed at Somosomo, recorded: “Tidings have arrived of Ratu Mara’s arrival in Feejee from Tonga, accompanied by King George’s two sons – in order to offer a soro to Cakobau for Ratu Mara’s restoration of favour
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On its way to Lakeba, the folau called at Moala, not unexpectedly in view of Mara’s connections there. Calvert, then in charge of the Wesleyan mission at Lakeba, recorded:

here Mara is with six canoes given to him in Tonga and his own tabilai [a type of canoe prow]. Ma`afu, Ugu and Vugukoto – Laujii – all here – to accompany Mara to Bau – and to build canoes here. In a month or two, they talk of going. On these Tonga and Feejeean affairs I might write several sheets – but refrain … The Tonguese who accompany Mara have not received a very hearty welcome here – no house built for them – until Mara arrived from Moala, and then had to build it.108

Ma`afu, restrained by the demands of both church and state in Tonga, would have been ready enough to leave. But Fiji possessed attractions apart from the absence of centralised authority and an omnipresent and ever-hostile missionary. Calvert was right in ascribing to the Tongan party a second reason for visiting Lakeba: the desire to build or repair canoes. In his statement made after Ma`afu’s death, Tingea said that when Ma`afu came to Fiji, he brought with him several canoes to be refastened by Lauan experts.109 According to Tingea, payment for such specialised services included military service for various Lauan chiefs. In 1852, “Henili Maafu, Chief from Nuku`alofa” appeared at the head of a “List of Tonguese Building or Repairing Canoes in Feejee” drawn up by Richard Lyth. The list indicated that he had been at work in 1847.110 The construction and repair of canoes, vital in Lau’s evolving economy, was in part responsible for the employment of Tongan mercenaries, themselves crucial to the political fortunes of Fiji’s matanitu throughout much of the nineteenth century.

Ma`afu himself, never one to enlarge on his past, referred almost 30 years later to the importance of canoe building and repair in his coming to Fiji. In September 1875, when he was Roko Tui Lau in the new British administration, Ma`afu dined at Government House in Levuka. A fellow guest was Baron Anatole von Hügel, a visiting naturalist and anthropologist from England. Von Hügel showed Ma`afu a civitabua, “a breastplate composed of plates split from the sperm whale teeth”, which the baron had obtained during an expedition in the mountains of Viti Levu the previous June.111 Because of their rarity, he suspected, correctly, that civitabua were “not of Fijian origin”.112 The earliest civitabua known to Europeans were collected in Tonga by Captain Cook’s officers in the 1770s. They

108 Calvert to Thomas Williams, 23 Jul 1847, Personal Papers.
109 Statement of Tingea…
110 Lyth, Circuit Returns 1850–1853, 80a.
111 Clunie, 162.
were thought to have served as armour in response to the need for protection against Fijian weapons.\textsuperscript{113} Ma`afu manifested great interest in the \textit{civitabua} shown him, telling the visitor that such items were heirlooms even in his youth, serving as badges of honour for Tongan chiefs. The baron wrote that they were “used in the same way as Tabua are … used … in Fiji. Ma`afu’s first visit to Fiji was caused by a similar ornament and he eventually bought a large canoe with it. Mine may possibly be the same but he does not feel sure about it”\textsuperscript{114}. The two men’s host at the dinner, Governor Sir Arthur Gordon, made a similar reference, brief but intriguing, to the \textit{civitabua}: “a tabua first brought Ma`afu when a lad to Fiji”.\textsuperscript{115} The “first visit” of which Ma`afu spoke was possibly the lengthy period he spent in Fiji in 1841, but the reference to the large canoe suggests that some kind of exchange was made, possibly with Tui Cakau. Whatever the story behind the \textit{civitabua} really was, it is certain that the need to repair canoes was one among several reasons why Ma`afu came to Fiji in 1847.\textsuperscript{116}

Whatever thoughts Tupou might have had concerning Tongan influence in Fiji, he was also mindful of his country’s relations with European powers, especially Great Britain. In March 1848, the Governor of New Zealand, Sir George Grey, wrote to the Colonial Office on the subject of Fiji and Tonga:

\begin{quote}
A consideration of the several statements at various times made to me regarding the present state of the islands in the Pacific, has led me to conclude that a very general desire prevails upon the part of the Inhabitants of the Friendly Islands, and of the Feejee Islands, both European and native, to be brought under Great Britain, in the same manner that the New Zealand Islands have been”\textsuperscript{117}.
\end{quote}

Grey had requested Captain Maxwell of HMS \textit{Dido} to visit Tonga in order to ascertain the wishes of its inhabitants. After reading the captain’s report, Grey was able to inform the Colonial Office that Maxwell was of the opinion that the … King of these [Tonga] Islands and many of the principal chiefs desire British protection, and that the establishment of such a protectorate would be popular and acceptable to all the Christian part of the population.\textsuperscript{118}

Grey possessed no authority to negotiate with the Tongans on the subject of British protection. He did, however, urge Lord Grey, Secretary of State for the
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Colonies, to reply to the letter written four years earlier by Aleamotu'a seeking protection from Great Britain. The Governor outlined the reasons why he believed a sympathetic response to this request would favour British interests in the longer term and enclosed for the information of Lord Grey a copy of a letter he received from Tupou. Written on 28 August 1847, barely two months after the king’s sons, his brother and Maʻafu had set sail for Fiji, it is of great significance in any consideration of the king’s attitude towards Fiji at that time:

I, George, write this in love to you the Governor of New Zealand, the Reverend Mr Lawry having made known to me your kind regard for me. Therefore I am wishful to make known to you, that we wrote to Queen Victoria of England, to beg her to pity us, a weak people, who are exposed to danger, and we have been expecting to receive a letter in answer to ours, but now it is a long time since we wrote, and no letter has been received, neither has any of Queen Victoria’s ships of war called upon us; hence we are not certain whether or not our letter was received.

But now I beg to forward to you a copy of that letter, that you may see it, and do with it what you think may be right – for our minds continue as they were – we wish to be friends with England. It is true that we as a people are few in number and very feeble, not worthy of the notice of a great people such as England, but we do not wish to fall into the hands of any other nation.

It is this which has led me to write again at this time...

The king’s enclosure of a copy of Aleamotu’a’s letter of 1844 implies a full endorsement of his predecessor’s wish that Great Britain assume some responsibility for Tonga. In these circumstances, it is unlikely that Tupou would have wished to involve himself in any military adventures, or undue political activity, in Fiji. His own position on Tongatapu, as Captain Maxwell had reported to Sir George Grey, was not entirely secure, owing to continued opposition from some heathen chiefs and their followers. He might have envisaged a British protectorate over both Tonga and Fiji, in which the political evolution of both groups could continue, while British protection would preclude interference from any other power, especially France. In this regard he would certainly have been influenced by the English missionaries, particularly Thomas and Lawry, who were anxious to see a peaceful Tonga united under the rule of ‘King George’ and the doctrines of Charles Wesley. In his published account of his Tongan visit in July 1847, Lawry referred to the king’s offer to Sir George Grey:

Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

The King renews the proposal … [previously] made, that he and his people become not merely the allies, but the subjects, of the British crown. This is done because they fear the French, whose base conduct towards the people of Tahiti is fully known here. I am glad the king has taken this step.\(^{120}\)

When Tupou sent members of his family, including Ma`afu, to pay a call on Cakobau, his intentions are unlikely to have been anything but benign.

In the event, the British declined to assume the protection of both Tonga and Fiji, owing to the expense involved.\(^{121}\) Sir George Grey was however urged to maintain the friendliest possible relations with Tonga’s king. Late in 1847, he assured Tupou of his and Queen Victoria's friendship and invited the king to visit New Zealand.\(^{122}\) When the Dido was in Tonga in January 1848, Captain Maxwell gave Tupou a present sent by Grey.\(^{123}\) Yet, despite these manifestations of friendship, the king remained apprehensive, expressing his concern to Governor Grey that while some French vessels had visited Tonga, the Dido was the only English vessel seen there for a long time.\(^{124}\) Once Tupou realised that the shield of British protection would not be put into place, he might well have felt justified in exercising a freer hand in Fiji, especially after the last significant opposition to his rule in Tonga was overcome in 1852. By then Ma`afu had been living in Fiji for five years and had become a power there in his own right.

Whatever Ma`afu’s intentions were in 1847, it is clear that his visit was made with the approval of his king. Finding himself among his own kin in Lau, Ma`afu was following a path that members of his family and countless other Tongans had travelled before him. He was part of a Tongan delegation on a friendly and informal visit to Bau, whose purpose cannot be shown to be anything more than a timely reminder of Tongan interest in Bau and in Fijian affairs generally. It is impossible to say what more profound ideas Tupou then possessed, if indeed his visit did represent any longer-term plans on his behalf. Speculation on the point would only be misleading. What is certain is that Ma`afu, having, metaphorically at least, brought all his floor mats with him, was to establish a power base in Lau that would shake the fast-evolving polity of Fiji to its foundations.

\(^{120}\) Lawry, 24. See also Fremantle to Osborne, 12 Dec 1855, Adm.1/562; Erskine to Admiralty, 10 Oct 1849, Adm.1/5606 and Enc. 2 [Erskine’s account of his visit to Tonga]. The recommendations of Lawry and Sir George Grey would bear some fruit in 1852, when a hydrographic expedition under the command of Henry Mangles Denham was appointed to undertake a nautical survey of Fiji. John Beecham to Richard Lyth, 14 May 1852, MOM 104.
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\(^{123}\) Thomas, Journal, 7 Jan 1848.
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4. “...the reformation is exploded”

In the mid-nineteenth century, the Lakeban state belonged to the second rank of the matanitu of Fiji. Although its paramount chief, Tui Nayau, was not subject to the direct authority of any other Fijian chief, he commanded neither the population resources nor the reserves of manpower that were at the disposal of Bau, Cakaudrove and Rewa, the major powers of Fiji. Lau, long in an unsettled state because of the resident Tongans, underwent further disruption during the 1840s following the introduction of Christianity. While the lotu was making slow if unsteady progress among the Lauan population, both Fijian and Tongan, Tui Nayau himself, for essentially political reasons, still declined to lotu. As missionary Richard Lyth was to note several years later, Tui Nayau felt himself “to be but a small king, and [looked] this way and that for help”. The several forces for change existing in Lau in 1847 occasioned a sense of uncertainty, not to say unease, in the islands. The same forces were to create opportunities for Ma`afu in a milieu with which he had long been familiar.

The “king”, Taliai Tupou, Ma`afu’s kinsman and host, had earlier claimed the interest of visiting ships’ captains. Charles Wilkes, commander of the United States Exploring Expedition that visited Fiji in 1840, was not impressed by Tui Nayau. “He is a corpulent nasty looking fellow”, Wilkes noted, “and has the unmitigated habits of a savage … He exercises despotic power over all the surrounding islands … [and] has the character of being a cruel tyrant”. Wilkes’ second in command, Lieutenant-Commander Ringgold, described their chiefly host as possessing “a dull-looking countenance” and “mean and niggardly in his disposition”. Taliai Tupou clearly failed the test of bourgeois respectability. His visitors could not understand that the cruelty and despotism which they discerned in his rule were characteristic of Fijian political power. The ascendancy of Tui Nayau depended on his ability to meet the other matanitu, if not on equal terms, at least in a context where the autonomy of the Lakeban state would not be placed in jeopardy.

Captain John Erskine, commander of HMS Havannah, which visited Lakeba in August 1849, was gracious enough to concede some favourable points of character to Tui Nayau. While recalling Wilkes’ uncompromising views, Erskine noted that John Malvern, one of the resident Wesleyan missionaries, “gave [Taliai Tupou], although a heathen, a very good reputation for humanity and general conduct”. Erskine incidentally revealed something of Tui Nayau’s political acumen when he remarked to him “that I hoped to hear of his becoming

1 Richard Lyth, Day Book No. 7, 6 Mar 1851.
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a Christian before he died, at which he smiled, but made no reply”. The chief’s acceptance of the lotu was only two months away but, whatever his state of mind in August, he was not revealing it to his visitor.

Chart 3: Family of Tui Nayau.

Source: Author’s depiction.

After Ma’a’fu’s death in 1881, it became an article of faith among the Tongan residents of both Vanuabalavu and Lakeba that, soon after his arrival in Fiji, Ma’a’fu assumed the role of “right-hand man” to Tui Nayau. An oral tradition refers to Ma’a’fu as the liga kaukauwa, or strong arm of Tui Nayau who, because

---

he was “too old … gave authority to Maʻafu to lead the vanua”.

One tradition stated that when Maʻafu reached Fiji, “Taliai was advanced in years and greatly afflicted with elephantiasis, and it was not long before Maʻafu became practically his regent”. These claims arose from the legends that grew up around Maʻafu’s memory in Lau. Nevertheless Maʻafu was able, not only to exercise a free hand in his own activities, but also to assume an increasingly active if informal role in the administration of Tui Nayau’s domains. Unfortunately, for the period of almost two years between Maʻafu’s arrival in Lakeba and his departure in May 1849 for a residence of 18 months in Cakaudrove, there exists no documented reference to him. We cannot know whether he assumed any kind of leadership role on Lakeba during this time.

Taliai Tupou’s designated heir was his nephew Vuetasau. Although he was to be lost at sea in 1856, before he could succeed as Tui Nayau, Vuetasau became a close associate of Maʻafu during the early 1850s, when the Tongan’s presence came to be felt in Lau. For several years following his conversion in 1846, Vuetasau found favour with the missionaries, for whom he offered great hope for the future. His present influence among the Lakeban people was limited by the refusal of his uncle to lotu, the instability caused by the resident Tongans and the labyrinthine politics of a Fiji that knew neither unity nor peace. By the time of Maʻafu’s arrival, political power in the islands’ most powerful matanitu, Bau, had shifted from the aged Tanoa to his son Cakobau. For upwards of 30 years, until after the Cession of Fiji to Great Britain, Cakobau never left the eye of the political storm in Fiji. Already being seen by some as the future ruler of a united Fiji, Cakobau was a man whose ambitions, such as they were, were always to be overtaken by events. Lyth, stationed at Viwa in 1847, recorded that Cakobau “is now regularly called both by his own people and the whites Tuiviti, i.e. King of Feejee”. While giving tacit support to the Wesleyan mission, Cakobau remained steadfast in his refusal to lotu, although susceptible to missionary influence in some matters of policy. In September 1847, Walter Lawry, always concerned to promote both Wesleyan and British interests in Fiji, noted of Cakobau:

Upon the whole, he is rather favourable to our mission here, but does not lotu … War is his delight, and feasting on bodies of the slain. He is sitting by my side as I write, and is urging me to persuade Governor Grey [of New Zealand] to visit him in a war steamer, in order that they may be allied friends. He reposes confidence in England, but not in

---
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France; for the barefaced outrage of protecting Tahiti is known to him, and heartily denounced. He and his chiefs say that they shall one day lotu, and that the gospel will one day triumph in Fiti.10

Lawry’s words reveal the strong influence he and his colleagues sought to bring on Cakobau concerning Fiji’s dealings with the European powers in the Pacific. The account also reveals Cakobau’s capacity for telling his missionary friends what he knew they wanted to hear. As far as internal politics were concerned, Cakobau was less willing to heed his new friends. Aware that his political fortunes would suffer if he were to lotu, he continued to make war. “The king says, that the lotu is near, but that he has a few more towns to burn before he and his warriors lotu”, noted Lawry’s colleague Joseph Waterhouse, a later resident of Bau.11 Cakobau believed that only when his ascendancy was secure could he afford the luxury of conversion.

On Lakeba, the missionaries continued to evince great interest in the spiritual welfare of the resident Tongans, whose souls were always thought to be in jeopardy. They displayed less awareness of the political implications of the Tongan presence in Lau. In February 1846, following the departure of a folau under the leadership of Lausī'i, Tāufā'āhau’s brother, few Tongans remained on Lakeba.12 Lyth described them as “running headlong to destruction”,13 a despairing note echoed by Walter Lawry on his visit in September of the following year. “A colony of godless Tongans is a drag upon our wheels at this place”, he lamented.14 In October 1847 the death occurred of Julius Naulivou, a Native Assistant Missionary, brother-in-law of Tupou and an adopted son of Malani, the previous Tui Nayau.15 Whether or not prompted by Naulivou’s death, Tupou appeared with a large folau at Bau in November, on his way home from a visit to Samoa.16 He was unwittingly exposing himself to an assassination plot, “concocted in Fiji, by a few discontented Tonguese chiefs then residing there, whose wicked project was … abetted by others in Vavaʻu”. After his return to Tonga, the king responded to this threat by replacing the governor and several judges in Vavaʻu.17 No report of the alleged plot seems to have reached James Calvert and John Malvern, the two Wesleyan missionaries stationed on Lakeba. During the ensuing year, they continued to complain of the audacious
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conduct and dissolute character of the Tongans, which they partly ascribed to the Tongans’ passionate fondness for voyaging. Of greater significance was the death in May of Tupou Toutai, following that of his brother four years earlier. His passing meant that there was no longer any Tongan resident in Lau who was sufficiently prominent to act as a filter between Cakobau and Tupou. Lausi’i continued to visit Bau during these years when the king’s anxiety to secure some form of protection for Tonga meant that he was unlikely to have designs on the islands of Lau.

Following the deaths of his two cousins, Lualala was the most senior in rank and influence among the Tongans on Lakeba. A son of Finau ‘Ulukalala-i-Ma’ofanga of Vava’u and his Fijian wife Vuturogo, a daughter of Niumataiwalu, a former Tui Nayau, Lualala was also a great-uncle of ‘Elenoa Gataialupe. Through his mother, he was vasu to Taliai Tupou and had spent much of his early life in Lau. His half-brother, Finau ‘Ulukalala Tuapasi, was ruler of Vava’u in 1831, the year Tāufa’āhau, then Tu’i Ha’apai, converted to Christianity. Following a failed rebellion against Tuapasi, Lualala was exiled to Fiji. In May 1837, David Cargill noted the arrival in Lakeba of “Lua – the chief who persecutes the Christians and who was the occasion of the late war in Tonga ... He has great authority in this part of Fiji”. Later, he achieved rehabilitation: in 1842, although still not baptised, Lualala earned praise for his efforts to convince the people of two Lakeban villages to abandon heathenism. Lualala, Calvert noted, “is very influential and active. He was formerly a terror to all”. More than a decade later, the ageing Lualala and the new chum Ma’afu would be appointed joint governors of the Tongans in Lau.

From about 1857 until his death in 1881, Ma’afu made his home on Vanuabalavu, then part of Cakaudrove, a matanitu that also included Taveuni, its smaller neighbours Laucala, Qamea and Rabe, much of eastern Vanua Levu and numerous other islands such as Cicia, Mago, Tuvuca and Naitauba. Today, the last four islands, as well as Vanuabalavu and the small islands within its reef, lie within Lau. Ma’afu is known to have set foot on Vanuabalavu in 1849, in company with Tuikilakila, who had succeeded his father Yavala as Tui Cakau in 1845. The island had undergone intermittent civil war during the 1840s, when the introduction of Christianity exacerbated existing social divisions among the approximately 3,000 inhabitants, who were divided between two vanua, or
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districts, Yaro (now called Mualevu) in the north and Lomaloma in the south. Both vanua were subject to Tuikilakila “who had threatened to kill and eat any of his subjects who should lotu”. When Tuikilakila visited Lomaloma, he denied having made any such threat and received a peaceful tribute from the Vanuabalavu Christians. There was no trouble until the village of Daku-i-Yaro decided to rebel and offer its allegiance to Lomaloma. War between the two districts quickly followed, with Christians from both sides taking refuge on the island of Munia in the Vanuabalavu lagoon. Although an uneasy reconciliation was achieved in October 1844, the subsequent return of teachers to Lomaloma and the despatch of Tongan missionaries to Yaro served only to augment the instability of the troubled island.

With renewed hostilities between Yaro and Lomaloma resulting in the deaths of five teachers, most Christians remaining at Lomaloma also removed to Munia to escape the conflict. When news of the deaths reached Lakeba, some Tongan leaders there, including Lualala, sought to raise a folau to visit Vanuabalavu and move all remaining Christians to Munia if danger still threatened. The missionaries urged Lualala to limit the operation to a small number of people on five canoes and not to venture beyond Munia. Should the matter not be settled amicably, they were advised to await the return of Tupou Toutai from Bau. The advice was not heeded, with 12 canoes sailing on 29 December under Lualala’s leadership and visiting Nayau, Mago and Cicia, as well as both districts of Vanuabalavu. Everywhere, people were exhorted not to engage in revenge killings. Just two days after the fleet’s departure, a delegation of Christians reached Lakeba from Lomaloma, having been sent by the chiefs there in an effort to forestall a visit from the Lakeban Tongans. The Lomaloma chiefs had agreed to lotu, “believing that to be the only act that would prevent their being punished”. When Lualala’s expedition returned, he reported that many people had lotued on the islands the Tongans visited, including the chiefs of Mago and Nayau. He also presented Tui Nayau with a large tabua, an “offering of peace” from the Lomaloma people “on account of the murder of the teachers”. The whole voyage had apparently been “tolerably peaceful”.
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While there is no evidence that Ma`afu participated in Lualala’s expedition, it is difficult to see him remaining at Lakeba. Of the acknowledged Tongan leaders known to have been living there in 1847, the only one who did not join Lualala was Tupou Toutai, absent from the island at the time. If Ma`afu did accompany his fellows, he witnessed at close quarters the discord the new faith could engender in a society already divided, a situation familiar to him since his childhood on Tongatapu. He was also exposed to the *Realpolitik* of eastern Fiji, where even the implicit threat of Tongan intervention was enough to cause the Lomaloma chiefs to *lotu*. The deaths of Tupou Toutai and Naulivou meant that the older Tongan leadership in Lakeba was passing away. With Lualala himself advancing in years, his restless countrymen would, before long, look to a new leader. Ma`afu, a charismatic chief of high rank, needed no leave from the other Tongans to fill the shoes of the departed leaders. He would take full advantage of opportunities that were, even during his early years in Lakeba, being revealed to him.

**Chart 4: Family of Tui Cakau.**

Source: Author’s original.
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Over 30 years later, at hearings in Lomaloma of the Lands Claims Commission established to inquire into Fijian land tenure, Ma’afu was to relate a detailed version of the events which led to his assumption of sovereign rights in Vanuaabalavu and, ultimately, to the creation for him of the title of Tui Lau. After he reached Lakeba in 1847, documented sources are silent about him for several years. While Lyth had earlier recorded his gratitude “to the great Author of all events” for Tuikilakila’s moderation towards the Vanuaabalavu Christians, Thomas Williams placed little trust in that chief. He believed that Tuikilakila’s refusal to lotu would inevitably lead his people to ruin. “His recent liberality to the Tonguese is in part attributable to a secretly encouraged hope of obtaining help from George”. Williams knew that Tuikilakila’s power depended on his military strength, which could only suffer if he and his people accepted the new faith. “He thinks if his people become Christian they will not be so ready to fight”, a view much in accord with Cakobau’s. His frame of mind appeared unchanged when he visited Lakeba about May 1849 when, to his surprise and apparent pleasure, he either made or renewed his acquaintance with Ma’afu. The two chiefs departed together to visit Vanuaabalavu. In granting Ma’afu levying rights to the island and several others in Cakaudrove during the voyage, Tuikilakila laid the foundation for Ma’afu’s sovereignty over Vanuaabalavu, a matter of some controversy in the future. Ma’afu’s customary rights to the island were not to be finally established until February 1865 when British Consul Henry Jones, after a judicial enquiry, found him to be its lawful owner. In 1849 and 1850, Ma’afu spent about 18 months living under the protection of Tuikilakila, during a time when that chief was engaged in active persecution of Christians in those areas of Cakaudrove where the new faith had become established.

Thomas Williams, always sceptical about the prospects of Christianity in Cakaudrove, believed that he understood Tuikilakila well. “Nothing can be more complete than his assurance that he can prevent his people becoming Christians, and yet retain missionaries or, what with him passes for the same thing, knives and axes … Tuikilakila will not give the Missionaries permission to preach, because ’his people shall not lotu until he does, and [he] intimates that he never shall’”. Lyth, confining himself to a discussion of Tuikilakila’s spiritual poverty, recorded that chief’s determination “to hold fast to his proved hatred of God … he should be left to discover his sin and folly by the loss of his present advantages. The lotu is about the only prop he has left – but he despises it and trusts in broken reeds”. Ma’afu, a baptised but non-practising Christian, was apparently content to join Tui Cakau in an anti-Christian rampage while the two
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were voyaging in Cakaudrove waters. James Watsford, a Wesleyan missionary at Lakeba, noted the departure of the two chiefs in Ma`afu’s canoe and lamented that all the Vanuabalavu chiefs who had accepted the lotu during Lualala’s visit in 1847 had now renounced it. Ma`afu and Tuikilakila had “sadly insulted our cause at Lomaloma”, Watsford noted. Further, on being prevented from setting up house in the Christian chapel at Somosomo, the Tongans, apparently including Ma`afu, turned the local Christians out of their bure instead. They seemed “to have sold themselves to work iniquity”, Watsford declared. Ma`afu was to remain in alliance with Tui Cakau, and living in Cakaudrove among conditions of disarray, for some 18 months.

During Ma`afu’s obscure stay in Cakaudrove, events occurred in both Fiji and Tonga that would greatly influence his future. The first official presence of the wider world in Fiji had come in February 1846 when John Brown Williams assumed the duties of U.S. Commercial Agent. He established a home on Nukulau island in Laucala Bay, east of the present-day city of Suva. The accidental destruction by fire of his house and its contents, including business and consular records, on 4 July 1849 was to have consequences extending over more than two decades. Williams valued his loss at US$3,006–12½, advising the U.S. State Department that local chiefs should be punished and compensation obtained. This claim, progressively enlarged, became a thorn in the side of Cakobau and was to be exploited by Ma`afu in his attempts to gain ascendancy over his Fijian rival. In the meantime, Captain Erskine, visiting Ha`apai during the final few days before his ship’s departure for Fiji, met Tupou at Lifuka and gave him a letter from the British Secretary of State for the Colonies, declining the king’s request that Britain assume protection of, or sovereignty over, the islands of Tonga. If Ma`afu ever heard of the British rebuff, he is not likely to have been greatly concerned. The refusal of Great Britain to become involved in Tonga or Fiji meant that it was to be nine years before an official British presence was established there, with the appointment in September 1858 of William Pritchard as the first British Consul. Those nine years saw the rise of Tongan influence in eastern Fiji to a position where the fortunes of Cakobau, and the independence of several Fijian matanitu, effectively lay in Ma`afu’s hands.

During the months following Ma`afu’s departure from Lakeba, Ratu Mara remained a threat. Tui Nayau’s dilemma was that, should Mara land in force, he could not be directly opposed without the risk of armed confrontation with Bau. In early October Tui Nayau asked the missionaries to write to Tupou on his behalf, “to request help from Tonga against the meditated attack from

36 James Watsford to Thomas Williams, 19 Jun 1849, Letters to Thomas Williams. See also Walter Lawry, A second missionary visit to the Friendly and Feejee Islands, London 1851, 200–201.
37 John B. Williams to U.S. State Department, 25 July 1847, USC 1.
38 Captain John Erskine to FO, 10 Oct 1849, Enclosure 2: “The Friendly Islands”, FO 58/69. See also Ch. 3.
Bau and for the establishment of this land to Tui Nayau and his Tonguese ally, but not so as to exclude the continuance of friendly intercourse with Bau and Somosomo”. Such a balancing act, even if feasible, would need little to upset it; that little and more came only a fortnight later. On 19 October, when Tui Nayau heard that Mara was definitely on his way to Lakeba, he suddenly accepted the lotu. Worshipping publicly in Lakeba’s Wesleyan chapel, he was followed in his profession by many leading chiefs and other people, including “the head Priest” and ambassadors to Bau. One day later, Tui Nayau assembled his people at a meeting “to put the affairs of the land in order”. Both resident missionaries, Lyth and Malvern, were invited by the “king” to speak. For the two Englishmen, their triumph excluded urgent political considerations. Lyth continued to believe that Tui Nayau’s conversion was the consequence of much serious thought and missionary prayers, while Malvern, more politically astute than his colleague, was sure that the news of Mara’s imminent arrival, reaching Tui Nayau the day before his conversion, had been the catalyst for change. One day after the meeting, on Saturday 20 October, Mara and his force of 300 men appeared off the beach at Tubou.

The Tongan leaders on Lakeba, Lausi’i and Tu`ipelehake, were quick to ally with Tui Nayau following his conversion. Not so Mara, who had long been resentful of Tongan power at Lakeba, which he saw as infringing his legitimate vasu rights. His resentment turned to fury when Vuetasau refused to hand over one of his daughters, now a Christian, to become one of Mara’s wives, as he had once promised to do. The desire to add to his harem had been an important reason for his frequent urging of Cakobau to make war on Lakeba. Mara apparently convinced Cakobau “that Christianity alone had made Lakeba indigent and rebellious; and then he asked permission to be empowered to lay waste to the windward islands of Eastern Fiji. [Cakobau] gave his consent to the scheme, but refused to furnish the means”. If any further incentive to descend on Lakeba were needed, Mara had been involved in a major dispute with Lualala, an old adversary, at Vanualabalavu in 1847. He had ordered the people of Mualevu to close their town against the Tongans and later attempted to enlist Tevita ‘Unga in a plot to kill some of the Tongan chiefs. Mara’s grievances were many when he arrived in force off Lakeba.
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Mara’s designs were thwarted in singular fashion. He arrived aboard his *drua*, the *Uluilakeba*, still ignorant of Tui Nayau’s conversion, while `Unga, who had feigned acquiescence in Mara’s plot, managed to reach Lakeba ahead of the hostile fleet. Before Mara could land, a delegation of leading Tongans paddled out to brief him on recent events. Mara declared he was ready for either peace or war. With a mass of Fijians and Tongans occupying the beach, ready to oppose any attempted landing, only Mara and his henchman Koroitoa were allowed ashore. Met by Lausi’i, they were conveyed to the Bauan settlement of Levuka, close to Tubou, while armed warriors continued to patrol the beach. `Unga ordered Mara’s warriors back to their canoes, where they remained all night, tired and hungry. Before leaving for Moala four days later “ashamed and chagrined”, Mara made peace with Tui Nayau and received a gift of 300 yams from Lyth and Malvern to feed his hungry warriors.

Missionary delight with the events on Lakeba was predictable, with David Hazlewood stressing their spiritual aspect: “Mara had gone to do great things, taking 300 warriors to fight, but was overcome without a blow, except that of an invisible hand”.

Lyth preferred to comment on the political implications of Mara’s rout: “Lakeba is loyal to Tui Nayau and Tui Nayau and Lakeba are loyal to Bau”. As if to underline his friend’s point, Tui Nayau made plans to send a *soro* to Cakobau, assuring him of his continued allegiance. The Tongans on Lakeba meanwhile “commenced building a fence around their town” for fear that Mara might return. Despite these fears, the defeat of Mara, ostensibly an agent of Bau but in reality the renegade he had always been, neatly defined Lakeba’s place in the Fijian polity. Gone was the unquestioned supremacy of Bau among the islands of Lau; Tui Nayau, who had lotued to make sure of Tongan support, had now received it in abundance. He had become at least a nominal Christian, while his Tongan guests, now more firmly his allies, remained on Lakeba. For them, alliance with the Lakeban state meant that their subservience to Bau was greatly diminished. The security of Lakeba now rested on a Tongan foundation.

Changes in the political landscape did not mean that the threat from Bau was removed. Likewise Cakaudrove, where Tui Cakau’s depredations against Christians continued, could not be overlooked. With work on the precautionary defensive fortification at Tubou continuing, Tui Nayau was in no doubt concerning the delicate political circumstances of his realm. His letter to Tupou,
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conceived when the arrival of Mara was imminent and written after the fractious chief had been forced into retreat, says much about the prospects of the Lakeban state at the time:

I am Tui Nayau … now the Lord is with my soul and I am converted … I want to inform you that there is trouble here in Fiji. The Lord has saved us from the hands of the murderers … the heathens desire to … enslave us … Lakeba is an independent place and does not link with Cakaudrove or Bau. I, Tupou Malohi and Ulukalala-i-Feletoa told Tui Cakau to let Lakeba link to Bau because that is our chiefly … island. Now our Christianity is of no use because they want me dead, so that the Tongans will suffer. Now Tupou please love me and my blood relatives and the Church of the Lord to protect us from the Antichrist.

If you love us, send some people by canoe to … help us, if not our land will be destroyed. I heard that Tui Viti wants all Tongans to return to Tonga so that the land will be vacant for them to use. My wish is for more Tongans to come to Lakeba, and I think the Tongans have worked better on this land. Now we are saved because we are in the light…

My wish is for the land to be shared equally to you and me to ensure the end of sadness … Mara was in the canoe on the sea for the whole night … the Lord help him to change his mind not to start the war.

The people of Bau were in another canoe ready for battle to help Mara but instead Mara returned and told them the good news of Christianity. I told the Tongans not to return to Tonga to await the battle that never happened because of our Christian faith.

If you want more Tongans to come to Lakeba, yes you can send them as soon as possible…

Ever since his conversion in 1833, Tupou had been a champion of the *lotu*, determined that a reunified Tonga should be a Christian kingdom. Tui Nayau now took pains to present himself as a persecuted Christian ruler struggling to ensure the survival of his state in the face of heathen onslaught. The picture he paints of Lakeba’s fortunes, finely drawn as it is in an effort to arouse Tupou’s sympathy and support, also demonstrates the extent to which Christianity had become an integral part of the political process in central and eastern Fiji. The fortunes of the Lakeban state had come to depend on whether Tui Nayau and other leading chiefs had accepted the *lotu* or not. Taliai Tupou’s letter had wider implications still: whatever reservations he might have felt about asking

50 The letter in the original Tongan is found in Richard Lyth, Day Book, 5 Nov 1849. I am indebted to Mr Viliame Veikune of Sawana, Vanuabalavu, Fiji for an English translation.
for Tongan help were swept aside by his desire to maintain his independence from Bau and Cakaudrove. Lakeba and southern Lau were laid firmly at the feet of Tonga.

As with any letter written by a missionary, there remains the question of how far Tui Nayau’s words reflect his own mind and how far he was influenced by the man who held the quill. When the two men sat down to compose their message to Tupou, Richard Lyth’s pen possessed a greater potency than did Tui Nayau’s club. Yet Lyth, after having for so long expressed grief, anger and frustration about the Tongans living in Fiji, cannot have possessed an unmitigated desire to invite more of them to come down. In any case, whatever the play of ideas and will between him and Tui Nayau, it was the letter itself which counted in the end. Only two months earlier, Tupou had finally learned that British protection for his country would not be forthcoming. Now, when he received an open invitation to intervene in Lau, his response, whatever it might be, need not be affected by any consideration of possible British reaction. In terms of his relations with Fiji, Tupou was, to a greater extent than ever before, his own master. The essential question, in late 1849, was whether he also wished to become master of Lau.

During the weeks following the letter’s despatch, the situation apparently remained calm on Lakeba. Mara had removed to Moala, while Tui Nayau was preparing a *soro* to be sent to Bau, a plan he had formulated before Mara’s invasion. Lyth expressed his satisfaction at the kindness Tui Nayau had shown to Mara and the respect shown to Bau. The missionary was sanguine: “The king and the land generally are kindly disposed toward Mara, and he has only to become of a better mind to find all that he need wish at his command”. Bau, meanwhile, despite Tui Nayau’s continuing discomfiture, was apparently unperturbed. Cakobau recognised the political basis for Tui Nayau’s conversion and evinced amusement rather than disquiet at the rejection of Mara. When the latter sent a *tabua* to Cakobau requesting help, the Vunivalu did not trouble to call a meeting of his chiefs. Instead he requested Calvert to convey a goodwill message to Lakeba, “expressing his approval of the many conversions there”.

Lyth, hoping for “a new era” in the mode of living of the Tongans resident in Fiji, outlined his views to Thomas Williams:

Not long ago, I wrote to … King George making a representation of the state of affairs and requesting him to take the subject into his

52 Cakobau’s title meant “root of war”. He should not be confused with the Roko Tui Bau, a kind of sacred king who was bound to uphold religion and associated customary practices and who never personally engaged in war.
consideration. I understand that Lakeba has met with a favourable reception and that ... Joeli Mafileo is coming ... to investigate the subject. I suggested the propriety of appointing a Governor, to govern the Tongan people, and several other measures which if carried out, would establish their coming to Feejee for canoes, on a principle, that would be right and equitable – and end the abomination of Feejee being made a refuge for all that is base and abominable from the Sister Group.\(^{54}\)

Four years later, Tupou was to acquiesce in the suggested appointment of a governor of the Tongans in Fiji, when Lualala and Ma`afu were jointly confirmed in that position. In the meantime, events in Lakeba lent credence to the missionary's optimism. In December, the message of congratulations from Cakobau reached Tui Nayau, along with the Vunivalu's expressed desire for continued peace between Bau and Lakeba. The reassuring words were accompanied by the gift of three American axes and ten roots of *yaqona*. “This [is] an event the more gratifying as it was unexpected”, Lyth declared.\(^{55}\) In the face of yet another flowering of the *lotu*, and of the reality of Tongan power in Lau, Cakobau could only make the best of the situation. He was probably unperturbed by Tui Nayau’s conversion: when missionaries James Calvert and William Moore, visiting Bau three months later, asked Cakobau if he was ready to accept the *lotu* himself, “he listened attentively, but said he is engaged in war and cannot lotu yet, but will soon”.\(^{56}\) Cakobau was probably more concerned with the political implications of the events in Lakeba, where the uneasy peace prevailing at the end of 1849 was effectively a power vacuum in the making. Tui Nayau’s rule, freed as it was of an immediate threat from Bau, still depended on outside support. The chief had looked to Tonga for that support and could not yet know the extent to which his request would bear fruit.

Missionary optimism concerning Lakeban affairs was not sustained. Lyth quickly resumed his familiar theme: on 24 January, he lamented, “The Tonguese are very bad and under no restraint. What will become of them?”\(^{57}\) Less than three weeks later, after praiseing the progress of the Fijian Christians on Lakeba, he derided the Tongans again: “the members of Society from Tonga act as a dead weight and the mode of living amongst them has a direct tendency to corrupt their minds”.\(^{58}\) None of this was new. Following the conversion of Tui Nayau and his success both in thwarting Mara and accommodating Bau, the Tongans in his dominions remained a volatile and wayward element, without restraint, direction or effective leadership.
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Ma’afu might have provided such leadership had he been living on the island. In May, with HMS Havannah in Australian waters, Erskine despatched Lieutenant Walter Pollard, in command of HM Schooner Bramble, to Fiji. After visiting Rewa, the Bramble, sailing to Ovalau, encountered five Somosomo canoes in the Moturiki passage, “waiting for permission to proceed to Bau, whither they are bound with tribute”. A number of Somosomo chiefs on board were described as “very great personages”. On 29 June, the Bramble anchored off Bau so that Pollard could call on Cakobau, after which the captain witnessed the ceremonial arrival of the Somosomo chiefs. They had to approach Bau “in a most reverential manner” and were not allowed to scull their canoes, leaving that function to be performed by Tongans carried on board for the purpose. Following their landing, they were required to remain in isolation in the strangers’ house for three days, before their tribute could be formally presented to Tanoa. There were about 600 Somosomo people, “and in a canoe belonging to a Tongan chief named Mafu, which had lately been built for him at Somo-Somo, a hundred or a hundred and twenty Tongans”.59 Ma’afu had clearly established a position for himself at Somosomo, having had a drua built for him and being included with his mentor and other Cakaudrove chiefs in their tributary visit to Bau. Pollard’s conversation with Ma’afu at Bau, concerning the 1842 sandalwood expedition to the New Hebrides, is the first significant mention of him since his arrival in Fiji three years earlier.60 Ma’afu’s position in Cakaudrove owed much to his rank in Tonga and to the rights bestowed on him by Tui Cakau. By this time, after more than a year with his powerful friend, his thoughts might well have turned to the voyage “home” to Lakeba.

Despite the representations from Tui Nayau, Tupou seemed bent on withdrawal from Fiji. Walter Lawry, on the second of his pastoral visits to the Fiji and Tonga missions, noted at Hihifo on Tongatapu in June 1850 that “there was a great stir about so many [Tongans] going away to Feejee, where they generally act as the English in Paris – cast off restraint and live as they list”.61 A familiar lament, but when Lawry’s party left Tonga for Fiji in July, it included, at the king’s request, Joeli Mafileo, the Tongan local preacher who lived at Lakeba. Mafileo, who had served more than once as an intermediary between Tupou and his subjects in Fiji, carried with him tabua and other presents from the king to various Fijian chiefs. He also conveyed Tupou’s message “that all the Tonga people are to come away from Feejee, where they have been misbehaving, or the King will cast them off”. Those who chose to remain would, “in future, be subject only to the chiefs of Feejee”.62 Lawry endorsed this policy as a means of removing from Fiji those whose presence hindered the progress of Christianity. Curiously, a few days after
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his arrival in Lakeba, he was to express a more favourable view: “The Tonga people residing here used to be, in many instances, mere scape-grace people; but the case is very different now. They are generally an orderly and respectable class, fearing God and walking uprightly”. Lawry, it must be said, lacked the intimate knowledge of the Lakeba Tongans possessed by his colleagues who had worked on the island for years. Nevertheless, whatever their spiritual state, those same Tongans were faced with a choice of returning home or dispensing with their king’s protection. The crew of the *Bramble*, visiting Lakeba in July following their short stay at Bau, found the Tongans were much in evidence. “The Tonga people have a fortified town to themselves and it seems altogether like Tongataboo than Feejee. The latter seems to have instilled the customs and ways of the strangers who really seem to people the island considering I saw only four Feejee men”. This was part of the community which the king instructed to come home or be cast off. Two questions arise from Tupou’s ultimatum: whether his authority among such an entrenched community was as great as he apparently believed and whether it was not in any case too late to dilute the community of “strangers” who had become part of the social and political landscape in their adopted home.

Tupou’s apparent desire to sever relations with Lau was never to be reconciled with the needs of the Tongans there, who were not persuaded to return home in sufficient numbers. A meeting of Tongan local preachers on Lakeba in October 1850 devoted itself to matters pastoral and political: two of their number were appointed to oversee the pastoral needs of the inland and seaside settlements, while the meeting also discussed the necessity “of there being a chief appointed from Tonga to govern the Tongan residents and visitors”, a move “unanimously regarded as highly desirable”. Joeli Mafileo, the perennial go-between, was asked to convey this message to the king. Lyth had called for the appointment of a governor, but here was the same request emanating from within the Tongan community itself. Despite the king’s edict in July, it seemed that the Lakeba Tongans were, in the literal sense at least, beyond recall.

By October, the hostilities of the previous nine years on Vanuabalavu were over. Nevertheless, the fortunes and prospects of the Christians on the island had not improved: in September, a Fijian teacher from Ono-i-Lau was murdered on Vanuabalavu. His Tongan companion, who survived, asked the murderers, “‘Why do you take one only? Will you not take my life also?’ ‘No,’ they replied, ‘you are from Tonga, but he is of Feejee, and what right had he to profess Christianity?’”

---
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of the *lotu* in Cakaudrove. The new faith, like the Tongans who professed it, was perceived to be alien. The murderers’ attitude might be taken as representing that of Tuikilikila who, like Cakobau, was well aware of the potential threat that the *lotu* posed to his authority. Unlike Cakobau, he would not tolerate a missionary presence in his dominions and continued actively to persecute those of his subjects who converted. Lyth noted tersely in early October: “Tui Lomaloma has lotued – the war is ended”. 68

Although Ma`afu was still living in Cakaudrove, probably in close contact with Tui Cakau, we know nothing of his attitude toward the state of affairs on Vanuabalavu. The restoration of peace must have been connected with the arrival at Lakeba in November of the canoe *Tafale*, from Somosomo by way of Lomaloma. Its passengers brought word that “Tupeleahake, Banuvi, Maafu, with their respective canoes are at Vanuabalavu on their way from Somosomo to this place”. 69 Earlier in the month, a *folau* brought over 100 people from Tonga, including some described by Joeli Mafileo as “insubordinate and mischievous [and] of all people the most unfit to come into the presence of heathens”. Mafileo thought their arrival “the more injudicious as [the king] has sent a letter to Tui Viti desiring him to lotu”. 70 It must have been evident even then that Tupou’s policy of withdrawal would not, or more probably could not, be put into practice. The king nevertheless appeared to be taking steps to discipline those Tongans returned from Lau who were considered to have transgressed during their time away. Tevita `Unga informed Lyth that his father would not acknowledge his own sister Lavinia on her return from Fiji “until she made some atonement for her crimes in Fiji. After working a month as a punishment she was admitted into his presence, and a house assigned for her accommodation”. 71 Other returning Tongans were judged and punished “without regard to rank”. 72 These actions, while commendable in missionary eyes, were probably of little consequence to the Tongan community in Lau. The Tongans had long since assumed a permanent place in Lauan society; any reforms to their way of life would have to be effected in Lau itself.

On the morning of 3 December 1850, Enele Ma`afu climbed out of the *Tabilai*, the canoe built for him at Somosomo, and stepped ashore at Lakeba. 73 His arrival, in company with his fellow chiefs and an entourage of local preachers and others, ended a self-imposed exile in Cakaudrove lasting some 18 months. Lakeba had changed during his absence: Christianity had, if not triumphed, certainly
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gained the upper hand, while the newly-converted Tui Nayau, in his letter to Tupou the previous year, had fallen little short of offering Lakeba to Tonga on a plate. But the king had declined to intervene in the manner requested, leaving the Lakeban state in a kind of political limbo. Despite the reprieve gained when Mara’s incursion was rebuffed, Lakeba remained insecure. Much would depend on the direction taken by the island’s Tongan community, now firmly entrenched and able to ignore requests from Tupou to return home. Such were the conditions that greeted the returning exile.

Ma’afu’s arrival with the other Tongan chiefs marks a subtle but significant change in his life. Henceforth, his movements would, in large part, be recorded by the missionaries, a distinction the young chief had not enjoyed during his earlier stay on Lakeba between 1847 and 1849. In a community lacking effective leadership, the returning chief, still only about 24, quickly made his presence felt. On 23 December, a “Papist youth” menaced Lyth with a club in the Wesleyan chapel, striking him a severe blow on the hand. Four days later Ma’afu, who heard of the attack while he was visiting Oneata, “came over to see how things were going on”.74 This incipient leadership role, if such it was, occurred when events elsewhere in Fiji were bringing into focus the social and political dilemmas of the time and the role which the Tongans living in Fiji could play in the attempted resolution of those dilemmas.

Almost a year after his return to Lakeba, Ma’afu was to witness a new challenge to the progress of Christianity in Fiji. In November 1850, there was an outbreak of violence in the Christian village of Dama, near the former Wesleyan mission at Tiliva in Bua.75 Lyth saw the violence as a “war against Christianity … encouraged by Bau”.76 Less than a month later, the Christian chief of Dama was murdered while on his way to peace negotiations at the nearby village of Nawaca.77 According to William Moore, Cakobau “had given the Nawaca people permission to kill all the Christian natives [at Dama], only to spare those who would become heathen again … Many will die rather than give up their religion”.78 When Calvert, at his mission on Viwa, learned that Cakobau had intrigued to “destroy” Christianity throughout south-west Vanua Levu, he took a large tabua to Bau as an offering to Cakobau. Tui Viti, as the missionaries now usually referred to him, was “entreated” to stop the fighting.79 Even though Cakobau had stipulated that no harm be done either to missionaries or to Tongans, he was reminded that visiting ships of war were liable to seek revenge
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for destruction of Christian property. While at Bau, Calvert heard that a large heathen force had assembled near Dama, ready to complete the destruction of that town and also take Nawaca and Tiliva. Taking advantage of the presence at Bau of Tu`i Ha`apai, brother of Tupou, Calvert asked the chief to take his accompanying force of 300 warriors to Bua in support the Christian cause. Tu`i Ha`apai agreed, only to find that Cakobau would not permit the three large Tongan canoes to depart. After several days’ delay, the Vunivalu permitted one canoe to proceed, with Calvert on board. While a full-scale war in the Dama district was avoided, several Tongans were killed or wounded in an engagement with a force from Nawaca.  

The hostilities in Bua were in similar vein to those on Vanuabalavu, where Ma`afu had not hesitated to intervene. Here, though, he had to tread more warily, owing to Cakobau’s involvement. While Cakobau instigated and encouraged the violence against the Christians, he continued to refuse to heed the entreaties both of Calvert and the Tongan chiefs resident at Bau. “It was only, when worn out by importunity, and perhaps alarmed for the consequences should any injury befall the Mission, that he at length unwillingly permitted a canoe to go, to render some protection to [the] Missions”. Although desultory clashes between Christian and heathen continued in the area for more than two years, heathen activity had received a check. The significance of these clashes lies in what they reveal of Cakobau’s attitude to Christianity at the time and in the use made by Calvert of Tu`i Ha`apai’s large force of Tongans in seeking to defend the Christian cause. Despite Ma`afu’s absence, the precedent for Tongan involvement in Bua had been established.

While Ma`afu, a nominal Christian, was bent on exploiting the lotu to his advantage, Cakobau remained “greatly annoyed” with the new faith. With the missionaries having refused to encourage the people to assist Cakobau in his various wars, the Vunivalu felt that his authority was diminished among those of his subjects who had converted. Joseph Waterhouse indeed believed that the lotu people had become “a party in the nation over which the prince exercised but slight authority”. Moreover, members of this party were not merely apostates from the faith of their fathers, but were “secretly disaffected towards his government”. For this reason, “the extirpation of the Christians” was planned: “Dama was but a beginning”. When besought by Calvert to end the fighting in Vanua Levu and to protect the Christians there, Cakobau rebuked the missionary:
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I shall not protect them; and I rejoice that you have now a fight of your own. When I ask you lotu people to help me in the war, you say, “No; it is not lawful for Christians to fight!” … Now, you have a fight of your own, and I am glad of it! Besides, I hate your Christianity’.  

The rebuke was largely justified, since the events of Dama had brought home to the missionaries the folly of turning the other cheek and of expecting help from a chief who had long been urged to abandon fighting. Cakobau’s rage neatly exposed the limitations of Calvert’s idealism. It also expressed the Vunivalu’s frustration with a doctrine which he knew, even then, was likely eventually to triumph. Asked by Calvert whether he intended to stop the progress of Christianity, Cakobau replied, “No, I cannot do that. I know … that we shall all become Christian. But, in the meantime, I delight in you Christians being compelled to engage in war as well as we”. We are entitled to ask whether, in view of Dama and of Waterhouse’s allegation that nothing less than the “extirpation” of the Christians of Fiji was planned, Cakobau was as resigned to the inevitable as the missionary suggests. Whether or not the Vunivalu accepted the inevitable triumph of Christianity, his attitude stands in stark contrast to that of Ma`afu. The Tongan, equally aware of the political implications of the lotu, was determined to adopt its cause as a means of smoothing his path to power.

It was painfully evident to Cakobau that Ma`afu and the Tongans would no more go away than would Christianity. Despite their comings and goings being avidly noted by the missionaries at Lakeba, and despite the periodic appeals by Tupou for his subjects to return home, they were also in Fiji to stay. While their numbers constantly fluctuated, their conduct continued to attract missionary comment, sometimes favourable, usually the reverse. At home in Tonga, Tupou had not yet suppressed the last resistance to his rule. It might well have suited him that so many of his subjects remained in Fiji, despite his appeals to them to return and his disciplinary actions against those subjects known to have misbehaved themselves in Lau. Cakobau was as much aware of these complexities as he was of the implications of the large Tongan force present at Bau at the time of Dama, a force over which he was, for once, able to exercise a modicum of control.

The missionaries, like Cakobau, had to reach an accommodation with the Tongans, in their case so that the prospects of the lotu would not be diminished. Nine months after Dama, Lyth berated “the present bad system, of wholesale flocking to Fiji of this volatile people” and despaired of “the evils that have so frequently been complained of by the Missionaries”. Tu’i Ha`apai, acting on Tupou’s instructions, had commenced the work of “clearing out” as many
Tongans from Fiji as possible. Eleven large *drua* left Lakeba in early May, conveying several hundred men home to Tonga. “Lakeba has not been so clear of Tonga people since the arrival of Missionaries in the group in 1835, and probably for years before that”.87 Despite the missionary’s apparent optimism, the numbers of Tongans in Lakeba would recover. With Dama having demonstrated that Tongans were always likely to be involved in any conflict in eastern Fiji, Cakobau had to maintain his authority amongst a people who respected it only when it suited them. While he could dilute the threat posed by Christianity by adopting the faith himself, as he would do in 1854, it would never be possible to accommodate the Tongans so easily.

Tongan unrest on Lakeba continued after Ma`afu’s return from Cakaudrove. In January, some Tongan youths, in an act of “cruel and wicked oppression”, took possession of a canoe that had failed to make the correct approach to the beach at Tubou and seized a quantity of yams and pigs on board. The spoil was shared with some unnamed Tongan “chiefs” and a Tongan preacher. This “despicable” act, instigated by Semesi Fifita, a brother of Lausi`i, occurred when the Tongans were at prayer. The next day, Lyth bemoaned the “trying people [who] will not dig and to steal, oppress and plunder they are not ashamed”. Two weeks later, whether or not as an act of atonement, Ma`afu, Tu`ipelehake, Lausi`i and Banuvi “with their people were occupied in setting four new posts in the Bethel chapel”.88 The Tongans continued to act as they pleased and to heed the missionaries when they pleased. Ma`afu, for the first time in Lakeba, is counted among his fellow chiefs. We can surmise that Lyth allowed himself a wry smile when, on 7 February, he recorded advice received from Calvert on Viwa that “‘It is probable that Tui Viti is about (or thinks he is about) trying to persecute Christianity … (he) is very anxious to get all the Tongans at Lakeba out of the way’”.89

The Tongans’ victory at Dama, effectively a diplomatic triumph over Cakobau, would likely have pleased Ma`afu. Tui Nayau, however, was “anything but comfortable on hearing of the real and threatened doings of persecution”.90 On 7 March, he and Vuetasau asked Lyth to write on their behalf to Tupou. Tevita `Unga, still on Lakeba, had visited Lyth the previous evening, “being desirous of hearing respecting passing events, as well as stating his own views”.91 This was the time when Tui Nayau was looking “this way and that for help”.92 He was evidently not the only Fijian “king” so placed: Cakobau was supposedly “trembling” when of one of Tu`i Ha`apai’s canoes returned from Bau with news

---
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of the visit to Fijian waters of an American warship sent to investigate various grievances. Lyth could not hide his pleasure at the Vunivalu’s discomfiture: “so the tables are turned – instead of holding a rod over the Christians of Feejee, God is holding a rod over him”. While tables might have been turned, the presence, brief as it was, of American military power served only to add another ingredient to the bubbling cauldron.

In April 1851, it appeared that Ma`afu might be persuaded to ponder his spiritual condition. Cakobau had advanced his own cause, at least in the missionaries’ eyes, by a series of concessions. He agreed to receive a missionary at Bau, to allow public worship there on the Sabbath and to declare “freedom of conscience in matters of religion”. While it is certain that the Vunivalu’s actions were not prompted by a desire to attain the means of grace, Lyth was encouraged to turn his attention to Ma`afu. “I embraced an opportunity of speaking seriously to Ma`afu about his soul yesterday”, the missionary was not slow to record. Since no response to his exhortations was noted, Ma`afu’s concerns appear to have remained essentially temporal. He had recently returned from a visit to Moala, where all was reported quiet following the murder there two months earlier, on Mara’s orders, of the occupants of a Tongan canoe. Mara continued “to cherish a bad spirit towards Lakeba and will be glad if he can gain the co-operation of Tui Viti to fight the place”. Since the failure of his military action against Lakeba, Mara had continued to nibble at the edges of the Tongan community there whenever opportunity arose. His apparent hopes for some kind of alliance with Cakobau against the Tongans came to nothing, since the Vunivalu besought Calvert to “warn Mara fully about his actions”. On his return from Moala, Ma`afu reassured Lyth that the people there had no wish to fight Lakeba and had only acted as they did because of their fear of Mara, who had since left the island for Bau. Several months earlier, Ma`afu had returned from Oneata to investigate the attack on Lyth. Now, in the worst threat of violence against the Lakeba Tongans for several years, Ma`afu had either been sent, or gone of his own accord, to take matters in hand. The voyage to Moala was an indication that his growing authority on Lakeba was accepted, not only by his fellow Tongans, but also by the ruling chiefs and the Wesleyan missionaries.

Ma`afu would not lack opportunities to exercise that authority. In March Lyth, who believed that the threats to Christianity in Lau and elsewhere in Fiji had not diminished, received a letter from Mataiase Vave, a Tongan local preacher
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working at Lomaloma. Vave reported that raiders from Somosomo had recently visited the island of Mago, near Vanuabalavu, where they had burnt the chapel and plundered a Christian teacher’s house. Another raid was carried out at Susui, while at Munia the people were preparing to expel the Lomaloma Christians living among them, in order to avoid a similar fate. The Christians at Mago had been harassed in similar fashion at least twice before. Following these latest raids, the Mago Christians removed to Lomaloma, while some lotu people in Mualevu ventured as far as Oneata in search of sanctuary. Lyth saw further evidence of a conspiracy:

it appears the work of persecution is going on, there is an opinion afloat that an understanding exists between Tui Viti, Tuilaila and Mara, to prosecute this new undertaking. Tui Viti taking Ra, Tuiliiaila Vanuabalavu, and Mara Moala and Lakeba.

While Lyth’s sources of information are unknown, such a conspiracy seems unlikely, since the three supposed conspirators were themselves at odds, with little in common beyond their intense dislike of the changes wrought by Christianity. Cakobau’s disquiet concerning the Tongans might have diminished in May, when the 11 druа carrying hundreds of Tongans left Lakeba for home. Among the departing notables were Tevita `Unga, Semesi Fifita, Tu`i Ha’apai and Lausi’i, leaving Lualala and Ma`afu as the only Tongan community leaders on the island. It would be their task to direct any Tongan involvement in the troubles in Cakaudrove.

Unlike similar occasions in the past, no Tongan canoes sailed from Lakeba to Vanuabalavu to investigate the depredations on Mago and Susui. There was a proposal to undertake a voyage but, two days after Vave’s letter arrived, the Tongan chiefs agreed to postpone a visit “and to send off one canoe at first to see how things are going on at Mago and Vanuabalavu and to act … as the case seemed to call for afterwards”. News of the various removals rendered any further action unnecessary, even before the mass departure of early May. In any case, Tuikilakila would soon assure Calvert that the purpose of the raids had been to remind the Christians in his domains of their customary duties and that “he would not interfere further”. Ma’afu visited Oneata, possibly
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in connection with the arrival there of the Mualevu Christians, and after his return on 30 May he sought and received permission to meet in class. Lyth was impressed, writing of Ma’afu: “he has been the subject of serious impressions for some months: the Lord convert him fully”. The apparent change continued: less than a fortnight later, Ma’afu and Elenoa dined with the Lyths, with the missionary remarking of his guest: “he is now a steady man and in a hopeful way”. Whatever Ma’afu’s true spiritual state, his temporal affairs were never neglected. Three days after his social success, he sailed to Kabara to proceed with the construction of a new canoe.

Having been reassured by Calvert that things were peaceful in Cakaudrove, Lyth in turn advised his Society that “all is quiet in the Windward Isles … It is reported … that Tuikilakila’s sons are fighting amongst themselves”. Yet the picture he paints was deceptive: Lau might well have been peaceful, but like most parts of Fiji, it was affected by the long-running conflict, already a decade old, between Bau and Rewa. While fighting, intermittent but persistent, was concentrated on the Rewa delta, forces from Tailevu, Lomaiviti, Bua, Macuata and Cakaudrove were sometimes involved. The intricate causes and progress of the war do not concern us here; suffice to say that Bau had enjoyed the upper hand until the death in September 1851 of Rewa’s paramount chief Cokanauto, Roko Tui Dreketi, vasu to Bau. When his brother Qaraniqio, who succeeded him, ejected Bauan forces from Rewa, the war entered a new phase. While these events did not affect the Lauan Tongans for several more years, they should be borne in mind in view of the extensive and decisive involvement of Tongan forces in the final stage of the war in 1855.

Ma’afu and his fellow Tongans on Lakeba remained undisturbed by the renewal of hostilities in Rewa. Lualala was finally baptised in June, several years after accepting the lotu, while Tui Nayau, although now professing Christianity, still refused both to marry his principal wife and to relinquish the others.

Walter Lawry, visiting Lakeba in July 1850, had described Tui Nayau’s religion as “only a word, and not a power, so far”.

During most of 1851, Ma’afu appears not to have engaged in political activities, since the sole mention of him over several months occurred in October when Lyth sent him “to investigate the disgraceful
conduct of Mary Jane, wife of old chief Sefanaia [Lualala] of Waciwaci”\(^ {114} \) This is the first known occasion when Ma’afu was employed in Lau on pastoral duties, a sure sign of the missionaries’ continuing favour. While he continued to enjoy Lyth’s approval, the missionary expressed increasing unease about the prospect of Tongans returning to Lakeba in numbers. News from emissaries of Tupou in November that more small canoes were needed prompted a lament from the missionary that “Lakeba is likely to be crowded with Tongans”\(^ {115} \). A few days later, he consulted Vuetasau about “the expected flocking of Tonguese to this land” and how to “guard their people from the oppression of foreigners”\(^ {116} \). It was to Ma’afu that Lyth turned on 15 December: “I embraced an opportunity of setting before Ma’afu his responsibility to put evil away from his people, or to separate them from him”\(^ {117} \). Here was an unequivocal acknowledgement of Ma’afu as the leader of the Lakeba Tongans, who are described as “his people”. Lyth was more confident about Ma’afu’s leadership qualities than he was about those of Vuetasau in the Fijian community. He had for several months been expressing reservations about Vuetasau, whose conduct sometimes fell short of the missionary’s exacting standards\(^ {118} \). Vuetasau, although not a Tongan, was seen as a partner with Ma’afu in the leadership of all the inhabitants of Lakeba. He had acted wisely in early December when, on a visit to Cicia, he met Mara, who begged to be conveyed back to Lakeba, where he longed to exercise his vasu rights. Vuetasau prevaricated, telling Mara that Tui Nayau’s permission should be sought first, a wise move in view of Mara’s earlier depredations in “the land where he was made rich”\(^ {119} \).

During the year following Ma’afu’s return from Cakaudrove, neither he nor the Lakeban state was able to exert any significant influence in Vanuabalavu or its nearby islands. That situation was to change during 1852. Late in January, Mataiase Vave arrived in Lakeba with news that Raivalita, a son of Tuikilakila, had visited Lomaloma and disrupted a Christian service, forcing the local chief, Sefanaia Ravunisa, a Christian, to expel the Tongan teachers from the village. Raivalita had acted “to keep his father’s territories from the encroachments of Bau and Lakeba chiefs”\(^ {120} \). Four days after Vave’s arrival, Ma’afu, Vuetasau and other prominent Fijians and Tongans from Lakeba left for Lomaloma with instructions from Tui Nayau “to pursue a moderate course of conduct towards Somosomo and only to remove such of the Christians as lotu truly”.\(^ {121} \) The expedition, under Vuetasau’s command, spent only one night at Lomaloma, returning to Lakeba
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with Vave and other teachers and leaders. It seems that on this brief visit, under the direction of Vuertasau, Ma’afu did not collect any tribute or otherwise exercise the levying rights granted him three years earlier by Tuikilakila.

On Lakeba, Tui Nayau expressed his dismay at the expected arrival of a large party of Tongans for more canoe building by declaring “that his Tongan friends love his vesi more than him”. Ma’afu meanwhile appeared to have undergone a spiritual reformation: in describing “an astonishing and pleasing change wrought in Ma’afu”, Lyth recorded the words of a man who had accompanied him on the recent voyage to Lomaloma. Ma’afu “was continually reproving his people when they did wrong – and was reading his bible all day long”. Once back in Lakeba, Ma’afu addressed a large assembly of Tongans at Lualala’s house, reminding them that since Tui Nayau and his people were now Christian, it behoved the Tongans “to serve God and put away their sins”. Ma’afu requested Lualala to move from his home in Waciwaci to the seaside near Tubou, so that they might co-operate in keeping the Tongans in order. Ma’afu, Lyth declared, “has become steady, attentive to the means of grace, diligent in using the word, and for some time now a candidate for church membership”. The missionary offered no explanation for such a transformation, beyond that of God “bringing it about in his own way without any special effort on our part”.

Ma’afu’s reforms, both personal and communal, proved of short duration. Only ten days later, he evinced “an outbreak of temper”, almost clubbing a young Tongan for frequenting his house during his absence in Cakaudrove and drinking yaqona with Elenoa and other Tongan women. Elenoa herself confessed to her husband that she had “committed sin” with Semesi Banuvi. “O these abominable Tonguese”, wailed Lyth. In a later addendum Lyth noted laconically: “Since this outbreak Ma’afu has quite turned back to the world – Sefanaia has returned to Wathiwiathi and the reformation is exploded”.

Whether or not Ma’afu was aware, Mara was still scheming to regain his vasu rights on Lakeba. Having earlier stated that Lakeba “would be all right” if Vuertasau and another chief named Koroi Rajini were killed, Mara was now expected to attempt to enlist the two chiefs to his cause. Mara believed that they “had all in their power in the Lakeba dominions. No doubt but he remembers their former plans together – whether against Lua or Tui Nayau”. When this scheme came to nothing, Mara in February allied himself with the principal Rewan chiefs arrayed against Cakobau, while at the same time continuing his raids among islands owing allegiance to Lakeba. Before he “fled” to Rewa, Mara
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“had been speaking evil of Lakeba and the lotu to the Vunivalu and others, saying that Lakeba was bad because of it”.127 Tui Nayau, as delicately placed as ever, declared that Lakeba was not his or Mara’s but the Vunivalu’s land. He reassured Cakobau that if Mara landed they would take care of him “and not kill him – for if he was killed Lakeba would be afraid”.128 Ma’afu, firmly placed now in his leadership role on Lakeba, would have to confront Mara sooner rather than later.

Another person likely to confound the Ma’afu’s ambitions and Tui Nayau’s peace of mind was Tuikilakila, Tui Cakau. The events of January on Vanuabalavu were another episode in Tui Cakau’s long campaign against the incursions of Christianity there. In March, two of his sons, Raivalita and Mara, had been forced to leave Vanuabalavu after, among other depredations, destroying the chapels at Lomaloma and on Munia. Lyth believed that these “outrageous proceedings” had “almost cured the people themselves of their opposition to Christianity”.129 Within a week, however, the missionary’s grim satisfaction changed to alarm when he heard that “a large army” from Cakaudrove had reached Lomaloma on its way to fight against both Cicia and Lakeba itself. Ma’afu was recalled from a visit to Kabara, while defensive fences were hastily built around Tubou and Levuka. Several canoes carrying “the most influential chiefs” sailed to Cicia to assist in its defence. The day before their arrival, the two Cakaudrove canoes arrived off Cicia but were not allowed to land. Their chief Vakaloto, another son of Tui Cakau, on asking the reason why their landing was opposed, was told it was because of the persecution of the lotu people in Cakaudrove. The next morning there was an exchange of fire as the Cakaudrove party made sail to depart, resulting in one of their number being wounded. But depart they did, before the canoes from Lakeba arrived, with news later that their chief Ravunisa had “begun again to keep the Sabbath”, while other Christians continued steadfast. The threat to Lakeba, if there had been one, came to nothing.130

These events, a setback for Tui Cakau, nevertheless did little to allay the fears of those at Lakeba, including Ma’afu, concerning Cakaudrove’s ultimate intentions. While visiting Bau in June, Lyth heard that Tui Cakau – “his cannibal majesty” – was also there, and sought him out for a meeting. When Lyth called accompanied by his colleagues Thomas Williams and James Watsford, Tui Cakau literally danced with delight at seeing them, or so it appeared to the missionaries. Following their entreaties, he agreed to allow the expelled Tongan teachers to return to Vanuabalavu. He further declared that he harboured no animosity towards Lakeba “but on the other hand appeared to be peacefully disposed”.
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Although Lyth was reassured, events would reveal the extent to which he and his fellow missionaries had been deceived. On returning to Lakeba, he was dismayed to discover that Mara, his intentions unknown, had arrived on the island the day before. Tui Nayau, on hearing about Lyth’s interview with Tuikilakila, entertained “strong suspicions that Tuikilakila’s intentions toward Lakeba are not so pacific as he had stated them to be”. Lyth believed there was less to be feared from Tui Cakau than from his sons, since it was they, and not he, who had turned the Christians out of Lomaloma and later threatened Cicia. “The heathens have been rebuked not on account of political but religious principal [sic]”, he declared. But the two were inextricably linked; for the Cakaudrove chiefs, the most important consideration was the threat to their hegemony posed by the lotu.

Missionary exasperation persisted following the breakdown of Ma’afu’s reforms. In August an American trader named William Ives, who had been living on Lakeba for several months, absconded with two girls employed as servants by John Malvern. Ives sailed away with them in a whaleboat that three Europeans, in company with Ma’afu, had brought over from Oneata a few days earlier. Lyth deplored the “impudence” of the Tongans with Ma’afu at their head. Ma’afu admitted knowledge of the plot, but denied being privy to the girls’ abduction. “[It] was evident that he knew more than he admitted”, Lyth declared. Mara had apparently “entrapped” Ma’afu into participation, “though [Ma’afu] I fear is bad enough for it”. Two days after Ives’ departure, Mara and Ma’afu themselves left, bound for Cicia and Moala.

A mystery surrounds Ma’afu’s intentions during these weeks. In August Joseph Rees, a resident of Viti Levu and former printer for the missionaries, arrived on Lakeba with news that a war against the island would begin “after the next yam season. Rees said that Tuikilakila did not seem desirous of war – but had been urged to it by Ma’afu”. Then, two days later, Mara returned from Cicia with news that Ma’afu had joined Ives and was proceeding with the American to Ovalau. This curious sequence of events was only partly explained by the news that the three Europeans were escapees from prison in Samoa who had had a boat constructed for them at Futuna and sailed in it to Oneata, whose chief detained them. They were freed only when Ma’afu visited Oneata, requisitioned the boat and sailed in it, with the men, to Lakeba.
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It is impossible, on the available evidence, to deduce Ma’afu’s motives during this period of intense activity. While Rees’ secondhand account of Ma’afu’s apparently bellicose attitude serves only to deepen our perplexity, it is clear that Lyth’s distrust of Ma’afu was increasing. Having now observed Ma’afu at close quarters for more than two years, the missionary was not prompted solely by Ma’afu’s failure to assume the mantle of a responsible Christian leader of the Tongan community on Lakeba. During Ma’afu’s absence, all the villages on Lakeba repaired existing ditches and dug new ones, in expectation of an invasion from Somosomo. Ma’afu returned to Lakeba in September after five weeks away, during which time he had visited Ovalau, Bau and even Ra, on Viti Levu’s northern coast. He brought with him news of the continued success of Rewa in the war against Bau.

It was now more than five years since Ma’afu had come from Tonga to begin what was to be a permanent residence in Fiji. During that time, there is little evidence of close contact between him and the islands of his birth, a situation which resulted in part from the efforts of Tupou to consolidate his rule and to achieve in fact the unity which had existed in name since his succession as Tu’i Kānokupolu in 1845. When Ma’afu was reputedly intriguing with Mara and urging Tuikilakila to fight, Tupou achieved his final victory over the last “heathen” rebels at Pea on Tongatapu, emerging as “undisputed Sovereign of the Friendly Isles”. The king’s victory was enhanced by a timely visit from HMS Calliope, a British warship whose commander, Sir Everard Home, successfully urged Tupou to accept the peaceful surrender of the Pea chiefs. Home had visited Tonga eight years before when, as commander of HMS North Star, he engaged the services of Ma’afu as pilot. Now, sailing to Fiji in September after the cessation of hostilities on Tongatapu, Home headed for Moala, where he heard Ma’afu had gone. Disappointed at missing him there, Home wrote him a long letter, outlining the recent events at Pea, rejoicing in the king’s final victory and addressing Ma’afu as “an old friend”. Home expressed the wish to foster the spread of Christianity in Fiji, following its success in Tonga, and to do what he could to protect the Fijian people from unscrupulous Europeans.

Lyth, perhaps after discussion with Home, wrote “it was expected that the King … would at once prepare to visit Feejee … to carry out a reform of his people resident in Feejee – to remove the refractory – and set a suitable person over the rest”. The missionary probably heard from Home that such was the intention of Tupou, who had long been aware of the nature of the Tongan community in Lau. Now that peace and unity were established at home, he enjoyed an
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unprecedented opportunity to put his second house in order. The implications of a final peace in Tonga cannot have been lost on Ma’afu although, as so often, his views on the subject were not recorded.

The period when the final unification of Tonga under Tupou was achieved also marks the end of the first phase of Ma’afu’s career in Fiji. Through the fog occasioned by the paucity of sources and the accretion of legend, it is possible to discern the foundations of his future power. In these early years, when Ma’afu’s ambition had not yet asserted itself, he was yet unable to challenge for supreme power in Fiji. There is no evidence that he then held any longer term plans in that direction. What can be said is that he both recognised opportunities when they occurred and did his best to make them occur. His acquaintance with Vanuabalavu, likely begun at the time of Lualala’s expedition there in 1847, bore fruit less than two years later with the grant of levying rights by Tui Cakau. Ma’afu’s subsequent “exile” in Cakaudrove remains the least-known period of his life in Fiji. While his rank alone would have ensured his place among the Somosomo chiefs bearing tribute to Bau in 1850, we know almost nothing of his life at Somosomo, the nature and extent of his alliance with Tui Cakau, or his attitude towards the persecution of Christians in Cakaudrove, carried on intermittently during his stay. Once he returned “home” to Lakeba, the record of his words and actions found in missionary sources is evidence of his growing prominence among the Tongan community there. He was acknowledged by Tui Nayau, the missionaries and, most importantly, by the Tongans themselves, as a leader. His recognition in this role by Lyth is especially significant in the light of that missionary’s growing distrust of him. Ma’afu’s frequent voyaging to southern Lau, the Yasayasa Moala, Bau, Cakaudrove and parts of Viti Levu indicates a widening network of contact and influence over all of eastern Fiji. The valu ni lotu, or war of Christianity, to be considered in the next chapter, was to be the first occasion when the power and influence, still limited as they were, which Ma’afu had acquired would come to be enhanced through war.
5. “We are Kai Tonga”

The islands of Moala, Totoya and Matuku, collectively known as the Yasayasa Moala, lie between 100 and 130 kilometres south-east of Viti Levu and approximately the same distance south-west of Lakeba. While, during the nineteenth century, the three islands owed some allegiance to Bau, there existed also several family connections with Lakeba. The most prominent of the few practising Christians there was Donumailulu, or Donu who, after lotuing while living on Lakeba, brought the faith to Moala when he returned there in 1852.1 Because of his conversion, Donu was soon forced to leave the island’s principal village, Navucunimasi, now known as Naroi. He took refuge in the village of Vunuku where, with the aid of a Tongan teacher, he introduced Christianity.2 Donu’s home island and its two nearest neighbours were to be the scene of Ma’afu’s first military adventures, ostensibly undertaken in the cause of the lotu.

Richard Lyth, still working on Lakeba, paid a pastoral visit to the Yasayasa Moala in October 1852. Despite the precarious state of Christianity on Moala itself, Lyth departed in optimistic mood, largely because of his confidence in Donu, “a very steady consistent man”.3 He observed that two young Moalan chiefs “who really ruled the land, remained determined haters of the truth”.4 On Matuku, which he also visited, all villages had accepted the lotu except the principal one, Dawaleka, to which Tui Nayau was vasu.5 The missionary’s qualified optimism was shattered in November when news reached Lakeba of an attack on Vunuku by the two chiefs opposed to the lotu. After the entire village, including the chapel, was burnt down, Donu sent to his Lakeba friends for help.6 The timing and intensity of the island’s response to the appeal were largely determined by the events of the preceding few months.

In September HMS Calliope, Captain Sir Everard Home, reached Levuka after calling at Moala. “The Feejees were never in a worse state than at the present time”, Home recorded, a situation he ascribed largely to the continuing hostilities between Bau and Rewa.7 He thought the end might be near now that Qaraniqio was gaining support at the expense of Cakobau. Qaraniqio, professedly anxious for the war to end, announced he would lotu when it did. Home hastened to assure the Vunivalu that if he too were to become a Christian, “all Feejee will follow your example”. Cakobau was susceptible to such advice, having been
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5 ibid. See also Journal, 1–7 Oct 1852.
6 ibid., 26 Nov 1852; Lyth to GS, WMMS, 10 Jan 1854.
7 Sir J. Everard Home to Augustus Stafford, Secretary of the Adm, 20 Dec 1852, Adm.1/5617, PRO reel 3303.
“deeply impressed with the effects of Christianity” on Lakeba when he visited the island earlier in the year.\(^8\) For the present, though, “all [remained] dull and fearful” at Bau.\(^9\)

Home also called on James Calvert at Viwa, where he reported an atmosphere of “joy” in marked contrast to the gloom prevailing at Bau. It is likely that the views expressed in his letters to Cakobau and Qaraniqio reflected those of Calvert, who believed that peace and unity would follow a conversion at Bau. Calvert asked Home to intervene in a worsening dispute in Bua, where the commander arrived with the missionary on 19 October. The mission station at Bua Bay, supervised by Thomas Williams and William Moore, was being hard pressed by neighbouring heathen villages, while there had earlier been rumours of an impending attack by Ritova, Tui Macuata and \(\text{vasu}\) to Cakobau. Only three days after his arrival, Home presided over a meeting of the heathen and \(\text{lotu}\) chiefs of Bua, at which peace was agreed.\(^10\) Ma’afu, on Lakeba, was reportedly ready to sail to Somosomo, at the behest of the missionaries and Lualala, with gifts for Tuikilakila.\(^11\)

For the moment, though, Ma’afu remained immersed in matters of local concern, building a house for the new Wesleyan schoolmaster, William Collis. A chapel was likewise under construction in Tubou, partly in expectation of a visit from King Tupou. The need for it had arisen from Ma’afu’s gift to the missionaries of the old chapel for use as a school, “a proposal that has given general satisfaction”. When, on the same day, trader William Ives returned to Lakeba with one of the girls he had earlier abducted, Ma’afu again denied knowledge of the affair, naming a local preacher as implicated.\(^12\) When word came from Moala of the murder of a local preacher named Maciu, Ma’afu’s presence on Lakeba meant that he could respond quickly, although in November he visited Ono, whence he returned in Joseph Rees’s company.\(^13\) Tui Nayau initially sent a \(\text{tabua}\) to the Moalan chief “who was at the root of the persecution”, but the gift and its accompanying conciliatory message were slow in arriving. The urgent request for help from Donu resulted in the despatch on 7 December of a Lakeban complement that included Ma’afu as well as Waqimalani and Sokutukivei, both senior chiefs of the Vuanirewa, who sailed in the \(\text{Tabilai}\). Their spokesman was the Mata ki Bau, the Lakeban envoy to Bau, who carried a second large \(\text{tabua}\) for presentation to the Moalan chiefs. The choice of the Mata ki Bau for the delicate mission was prompted by the allegiance, limited as

\(^8\) Report of the Work of God in the Vewa Circuit to June 1852, Methodist Mission: Correspondence and Papers relating to Ba Military Campaigns 1873, PMB 1093.
\(^9\) Home to Tui Viti, 13 Oct 1852, WMMS LFF. See also Home to Qaraniqio, 18 Oct 1852, quoted in Thomas Williams, The Journal of Thomas Williams..., ed. by G.C. Henderson, 2 vols, Sydney 1931, 577.
\(^10\) Williams, 576–578 (19–22 Oct 1852); James Calvert to GS, WMMS, 16 Feb 1853, WMMS LFF.
\(^11\) JM, 27 Nov 1852.
\(^12\) Lyth, Journal, 21 Oct, 5 Nov and 24 Nov 1852.
\(^13\) JM, 25 and 27 Nov 1852.
it was, of the Yasayasa Moala to Bau. Lyth asserted that these chiefs were under orders from Tui Nayau and Vuetasau to attempt a peaceful resolution of the conflict.\textsuperscript{14}

When the Moalan chiefs refused to receive Tui Nayau’s envoys, the latter returned to Lakeba, leaving the rival villages, heathen Navucunimasi and \textit{lotu} Vunuku, building war fences. On 13 December, a \textit{lotu} party left Vunuku to lay siege to Navucunimasi. The return of the Mata ki Bau to Lakeba the same day left Tui Nayau and Vuetasau little choice but to follow their failed diplomacy with military assistance. Vuetasau sailed with Loganoimoce and others, but when he reached Moala five days later, all was over. While Vuetasau was still at sea, Ma`afu and his followers, including a Vava`u chief known in Fiji as Wainiqolo, had quickly joined the \textit{lotu} party investing Navucunimasi. When, three days later, the combined force entered the village, the teachers and principal chiefs assembled in the temple for a \textit{cuva}, or bowing of the knee, a symbolic submission, even if under duress, to the \textit{lotu}. During proceedings, one of the “heathen” chiefs had the temerity to laugh, causing Ma`afu to charge at him with the end of his musket. During the ensuing mêlée, the \textit{lotu} forces, both Tongan and Moalan, ransacked the village houses while the two principal chiefs, Baba and Koroitoa, were taken prisoner, bound with sinnet and placed on board the \textit{lotu} canoes, eventually to be conveyed to Lakeba. One of the Tongan preachers attempted to deny the destruction wrought by the \textit{lotu} forces in his choice of a text for the sermon preached on 15 December among the foundations of the demolished temple: “But we were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children”.\textsuperscript{15}

Vuetasau was confronted with the victory of the \textit{lotu} forces when he arrived at Moala on 19 December. Ma`afu had stolen his thunder; Tui Nayau and Vuetasau’s attempted diplomacy had been overturned by the Tongans, whose armed intervention on the side of the \textit{lotu} quickly defeated the heathens of Navucunimasi. Tui Nayau and his nephew had sought to intervene in Moala because they regarded the troubles there as “a contest between the heathen and the Christians that involves Moala … Totoya and Matuku”. To Lyth’s chagrin, the decision was made without consultation with the missionaries.\textsuperscript{16} The formal submission of Moala to the \textit{lotu}, occurring after Vuetasau’s arrival, was followed a week later by the conversion of the leading non-Christian community on Totoya. On Matuku, only Tui Yaroi remained steadfast in opposition after the

\textsuperscript{14} ibid., 6–7 Dec 1852.
\textsuperscript{15} This account is based on Lyth, Day Book, 11–17 Dec 1852. See also Lyth, Journal, 13–15 Dec 1852; Lyth to GS, WMMS, 10 Jan 1854, WMMS LFF; JM, 13 Dec 1852.
\textsuperscript{16} Lyth, Journal, 13 December 1852.
conversion of his entire village in January 1853. Ma`afu, seeking perhaps to demonstrate his commitment to the *lotu*, sent Lyth a huge *tainoa*, six feet in diameter, pillaged from the temple at Navucunimasi.\(^{17}\)

One immediate consequence for Moala was the installation as Tui Moala of Baba, who was to rule the island as a kind of governor for Ma`afu. This was a significant change, since before the Tongan intervention, Moalans regularly sent first fruits tribute to Bau.\(^{18}\) Much later, at the Lands Claims Commission hearings in 1880, Ma`afu would claim, with documentary evidence, that Cakobau had urged the Moala chiefs to rebel against their new master and place themselves under Bau. “Stay as you are”, Ma`afu supposedly told the chiefs. “If anything comes of [Cakobau’s request], it will be a fight between me and Bau”.\(^{19}\)

Following their departure from Matuku, where Tui Yaroi had agreed to *lotu* in the future, the Lakebans returned home “in triumph” on 8 January 1853.\(^{20}\) The changes they had wrought in the three islands, ostensibly in support of the *lotu*, were essentially political in nature. While Ma`afu gained most from them, no conclusions can be drawn concerning the nature or extent of his ambitions in 1852. There are significant clues, however, in the evidence he gave before the Lands Claims Commission hearings and in the oral traditions from these years recounted in the *Tukutuku Raraba*. Both accounts present the events of late 1852 from a perspective markedly different to that of Lyth. Ma`afu’s sworn evidence at the Commission was:

I remember hearing of a church at Moala being burnt. The chief of Moala wrote … to me and to the missionary to send a boat over to protect them … the Lakeba people were afraid. I said, “Very well, I will go down and see about it”. There was my vessel and a Lakeba vessel, and we set sail for Totoya. I anchored at Totoya and found there a Kabara vessel. I asked them to come with us. We went on and reached Moala. We anchored at one of the “lotu” towns, and a chief of one of the heathen towns came and asked, “Who are you?” We said, “We are Kai Tonga.” He said “You are like the peeling a ripe banana and eating it, after which there is nothing left.” The crew of the canoe heard this and followed the chief to capture him. I waved to them to desist. Then the vessel went away and we slept there. Next day was Saturday, and I ordered all hands to land and put up a fighting fence … we sent out a scout who reported that the enemy was approaching. When the men heard this they stopped work

\(^{17}\) ibid., 30 Dec 1852.
\(^{19}\) Evidence of Ma`afu, LCC R972 Matuku.
\(^{20}\) Lyth to GS, WMMS, 10 Jan 1854.
and commenced the fight. We beat them, and they never came on again.
The next day they soro’d. From that time Moala was under Tonga, and Matuku and Totoya also.21

Ma’afu’s claim that, following his brief campaign, the Moala group was “under Tonga” is echoed in the Tukutuku Raraba of Sawana, which records that following the capture of Baba and Koroitoa at Navucunimasi, Ma’afu had declared: “Moala will be under lewa vakatoga” [Tongan law or jurisdiction].22 Writing more than a year after the events, Lyth was prepared to shed the best light possible on Ma’afu’s actions: “Ma’afu ... had the principal command, and acted, if not in all respects with moderation and prudence, yet at least with decision”.23 Again, this time in a significantly wider context, Ma’afu’s leadership role was acknowledged. Father Joseph-François Roulleaux, a Marist missionary in Fiji, could not but view the onward march of Wesleyanism in those islands with irony. Recalling the events at Pea and Houma on Tongatapu earlier in the year, he wrote of Ma’afu’s actions in the Yasayasa Moala: “Il paraît que Ma’afu s’est comporté en digne parent du roi Georges” [It appears that Ma’afu conducted himself in a manner worthy of a relation of King George].24

In evidence before the Lands Claims Commission in 1880, Ma’afu found it expedient to present the actions of himself and his followers as protecting the lotu and placing the islands under the protection of a rule of law based on Christian principles. The reality was simpler: whether Donu’s appeal had been made to the Vuanirewa chiefs, as Lyth suggests, or directly to him, as Ma’afu claimed, he was quick to use the opportunity to play the most fundamental of political games: the augmentation of power. So long as the new status quo persisted, Ma’afu remained the effective master of the Yasayasa Moala.

The absence of Bau from any involvement in the events on Moala owed something to the rapidity with which they occurred. More important was the distraction occasioned both by the reversals of fortune in the seemingly endless hostilities with Rewa and by the long-expected death of Tanoa on 8 December 1852. Home joined the chorus of missionaries in urging Cakobau not to allow the customary strangling of widows following Tanoa’s death. However, for Cakobau to yield to such persuasion would have meant acknowledging the threat to his power posed by Christianity.25 For Ma’afu, the fortunes of Cakobau were to become increasingly important since, after the Tongan’s success in the

21 Evidence of Ma’afu, 20 Nov 1880, LCC 960 Munia. See also “The German Land Claims” in Fiji, Notes on the Statements and Evidence contained in two volumes recording the proceedings of the Anglo-German Mixed Commission of 1884–1885.
22 TR, Tikina ko Lomaloma, Koro ko Sawana, Yavusa ko Toga, Native Lands Commission, Suva.
23 Lyth to GS, WMMS, 10 Jan 1854.
24 JM, 26 Dec 1852.
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Moala group, further expansion of his influence and power would bring him into confrontation with Bau. On Lakeba meanwhile, after Ma`afu’s triumphant return, Lyth was well aware of how the rapid reversal of the lotu’s fortunes had occurred. When told that all but two Matuku villages had lotued and that the last heathen village on Totoya was ready to follow suit, he was certain that “the fear of the conquerors of Navucunimasi had lead to this general turning”. The military prowess of Ma`afu and his followers had asserted control of the islands in the name of Christianity. In the process, the Tongan chief had discovered that the cloak of the lotu fitted his powerful shoulders too well to be discarded.

A month after Ma`afu’s return, he and Vuetasau were planning “to go with a large folau to Vanuabalavu to carry out another crusade … to intimidate them into submission either to lotu or … to abstain from persecution if they show fight[,] of course they will fight them”. The voyage would repeat the tried and tested modus operandi of the two chiefs, who were then in southern Lau seeking recruits. Tui Nayau, harbouring doubts, asked Lyth whether such a method of propagating the lotu were right. The missionary replied that it was not. Speaking in the presence of his advisers, Tui Nayau referred to the plan as “so different from the course pursued by the missionaries from England and Tonga – certainly a new thing sprung up in Lakeba”. Lyth lamented that Vuetasau and Ma`afu “are their own counsellors; they neither told their minds to the King nor yet to us”. The two chiefs meant to pursue their plan in defiance of all opposition.

Tui Nayau’s moral dilemma arose from a visit two months earlier from a son of chief Sefanaia Ravunisa, who asked if he would accept a soro from the Lomaloma chiefs and send some more teachers. He agreed to both requests. Lyth, aware of “the still unsettled troubles of Vanuabalavu” and of the continuing threat to Lakeba from Somosomo, nevertheless rebuked the Tongan missionary Joeli Bulu for his “disposition to administer some Lakeba physic” to Vanuabalavu, in other words to use force to encourage conversion. The plans of Ma`afu and Vuetasau exacerbated Lyth’s frustrations with the Tongans, whose continued residence on Lakeba he described as “a second Egyptian bondage”. By 25 February 1853, most of the folau was ready to sail, headed by Ma`afu’s canoe Tainawi. Other prominent Tongans such as Semesi Fifita, and even Tui Nayau himself, were expected to join. Ma`afu, perhaps feeling that he should not openly defy the missionary, proposed a compromise: “The King should [first] send a canoe … to
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Tuikilakila and that he Ma`afu should undertake the commission – if that should fail then what should be done would be a further consideration – that ... was the only reasonable course – for good to go before and bad to follow – not vice versa – as he understood the King to have said”. 34 Ma`afu suggested that he and Lyth have separate interviews with Tui Nayau to persuade him to acquiesce. He claimed that his only purpose in voyaging to Cakaudrove was to seek Tuikilakila’s agreement to restore the Christian teachers. Lyth was not convinced:

I put it to [Ma`afu] whether it was not both his mind and William’s to go and punish the Vanuabalavu people because of the offence they had given them – this he could not but admit had something to do with it tho’ he denied that revenge was the only motive.35

Two nights before the planned departure, Tui Nayau advised Ma`afu that the folau was not to sail to Somosomo. Ma`afu agreed, only to announce in the morning plans to sail immediately to Vanuabalavu instead, claiming that he, other chiefs and the two missionaries had agreed on the change. Lyth, his patience exhausted, could not refrain from sending a message to Ma`afu, asking his forgiveness for “having believed he was an honest man”.36 But Ma`afu would not be dissuaded. On the morning of departure, he declared flatly to Lyth that he was sailing to Somosomo to see Tuikilakila, while Vuetasau would proceed “to make the lotu warm at Vanuabalavu”.37

The folau of eight large canoes set sail on the morning of 2 March, only to be driven back by contrary winds when they had cleared the island. One of the canoes lost its mast and sail overboard, while another struck some rocks. The scheme was confounded further when many of the voyagers contracted influenza soon after their return.38 Lyth saw divine intervention: “He blew upon the unrighteous project and they returned confounded and chagrined. Ma`afu is ready to sail when the wind and weather will serve – to Somosomo, on the King’s and their own business”.39 Although Ma`afu and Vuetasau realised that the time was not yet ripe to increase their influence in Vanuabalavu, Lyth was right to think that the “unrighteous project” was delayed rather than abandoned.

While both Tongans and missionaries were preoccupied with plans for the delayed voyage, news continued to arrive from the Yasayasa Moala concerning the fortunes of the newly converted villages there. On Matuku, Tui Yaroi, the only chief still holding out, was “awaiting the folau from Lakeba that is
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37 ibid., 28 Feb 1853. See also Lyth, Journal, 1 Mar 1853.
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to lotu him”.40 Ratu Mara, who had left Lakeba late in January, had called at Moala, picked up Donu and sailed with him to Matuku. He mourned “his loss” of Moala, “his great trust”, and was thought likely to foment trouble in Matuku.41 Meanwhile Ma’afu, his Vanuabalavu plans delayed, turned his attention elsewhere. On 2 April, accompanied by an envoy of Tui Nayau, he left in the Tainawi for a formal visit to Bau. His purpose was to wait on Cakobau in order to convey fresh assurances of loyalty from Tui Nayau, following the death of Tanoa four months earlier. For unexplained reasons, Vuetasau tried, unsuccessfully, to prevent the departure of this folau.42 Ma’afu’s prestige in the eyes of Cakobau could only have been enhanced by this visit, since the Vunivalu had previously encountered him only in roles subordinate to those of older Tongan chiefs such as Lualala and Tu’ipelehake. On Lakeba, Ma’afu’s absence was quickly felt. Ives was still trying to recover one of the girls he had earlier abducted from John Malvern’s care, a move supported by Tui Nayau alone among the chiefs. “All are looking forward to Ma’afu’s return as the event that will settle the question”, Lyth recorded.43 With his power in Lakeba now beyond dispute, Ma’afu appeared the obvious choice for the mission to Bau. Hitherto, he had played a role largely determined by himself and had made the most of his opportunities. Now, he was engaged by the paramount chief of Lau in the exercise of a customary diplomatic function. Vuetasau’s opposition to Ma’afu’s voyage might have been occasioned by his realisation that his Tongan friend was, for the first time, acting entirely on Fijian business. While Tui Nayau’s use of his Tongan kinsman as an envoy was in accordance with Lakeban tradition, it is possible that Vuetasau resented the enhanced status implied in such a mission.

While it is uncertain how long Ma’afu remained in Bau, by mid July he was again in Matuku, where hostilities had recommenced. After news reached Lakeba “of the murder of two lotu men sent by Donu to the town of Yaroi”, Vuetasau and Waqaimalani set off at once on the now familiar mission to assist the Christians. On Matuku, their first engagement against a small village near Yaroi was unsuccessful and resulted in the deaths of several Fijians and Tongans from the Lakeban party. In August, following news of the death of Kolilevu, Tui Yaroi’s Christian son, and about 20 others, Ma’afu apparently underwent some “searchings of heart”, seeing the hand of God in the series of reversals. When he and Mataiase Vave, the Tongan teacher living at Tubou, informed Vuetasau of their dilemma, the latter confessed that he had left Lakeba without Tui Nayau’s consent, so determined was he to respond to the appeal from Donu and Kolilevu for assistance against Tui Yaroi. “This disclosure surprised Ma’afu, who
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professed to have been simply actuated by a desire to succour the persecuted lotu people as he viewed the case, having been kept in perfect ignorance of the real root of the war”. 44 Since Vave was about to return to Lakeba, Ma`afu asked him to inform Tui Nayau of the real state of affairs. A native teacher, probably Vave, who accompanied Vuetasau on his hurried voyage to Matuku, later largely confirmed Ma`afu’s professed ignorance. According to the teacher, Vuetasau and the other chiefs of Lakeba “feared the Tonguese very much so they determined to go to Matuku” following news that “the Christians were being clubbed” there. Lyth, who gave permission for the teachers to accompany Vuetasau, said that he did not know the cause of the violence on Matuku. “The root of the matter was hidden from him. Ratu William [Vuetasau] alone knew. Everyone thought that it was on account of the persecution to which [the] Christians had been subjected, even Henry Maafu thought the same”. 45

Whatever Ma`afu professed to believe, he and Donu had voyaged to Matuku with a large complement of Tongans, Totoyans and Moalans and approached the island’s shores with shouts of war. Ma`afu’s profession of ignorance was a lie; he had been determined on war from the start and waited only for an opportunity, which came in the summons from Donu and Kolilevu. While, as at Totoya, he had not been party to the original plot, he needed no persuading to join the belligerents’ cause. After these facts were confirmed by further reports from Matuku, Lyth met several of the teachers to consider punitive action. On 29 August, Donu and Vuetasau were “expelled the Society … Donu for having originated the war and William for not preventing it when he could”. 46

Lualala, fearful lest something happen to “his son Ma`afu”, said he would sail to Matuku and restore peace. If Tui Yaroi did not agree, Lualala would take the town, leaving Tui Yaroi and his followers to “soro by lotuing”. Both Tui Nayau and Lyth condemned this “Tongan method of making Christians”. 47 Finally, news came on 27 September that the war on Matuku was over and that Tui Yaroi had finally lotued. He did so only after his sons and their families left his village and were detained by Vuetasau in the lotu fortress. “Tui Yaroi and his sons [were] reserved to be brought to Lakeba as virtual slaves”. The day after this news reached Lakeba, the weekly church meeting in Tubou expelled all church members, including local preachers and teachers, who had voluntarily participated “in the Matuku business”. 48 Lyth was later to inform his colleague Robert Young, visiting Fiji, that after the Matuku war, “a lesson was taught that will not soon be forgotten … that church membership and aggressive war are

44 This account is based on Lyth, The War in Matuku, in his Journal, 24 Aug – 2 Dec 1853, 117–122.
46 Lyth, The War in Matuku.
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incompatible”. Seeking to ensure that Maʻafu had learned the lesson, Lyth gave him “a little advice” early in December, expressing disapproval of the course of events in Moala and Matuku and beseeching him to eschew such conduct in future. “He received the advice as well as could be expected, and after the first shock, said he knew the affair at Matuku to be wrong”. A few days before this reproof, Maʻafu had evinced, if not regret, certainly awareness that his actions in Matuku were indeed ill-advised. Tevita ʻUnga had come to Lakeba with some of the spoils from Matuku, intending that they be returned to their rightful owners. Maʻafu, “doubtless feeling it to be a silent reproof against his own people’s conduct, had signified his displeasure that the things had been brought, and gave orders that they should be burnt”.

His fortunes at a temporary ebb during the weeks following Matuku, Maʻafu appears to have lived quietly at Lakeba, possibly aware of the need to toe the missionary line. When Lyth told him of plans “to have a separate cause” in the Tongan settlement of Uea and to appoint a newly-arrived local preacher there, Maʻafu approved, saying he would investigate the best means of having a chapel constructed in the village. One day in late October Lyth, his new colleague John Polglase, Mataiase Vave and others waited on Maʻafu at his house, very likely in order to assert subtle pressure, this time in numbers. Whatever degree of rehabilitation Maʻafu had achieved, his prospects were shortly to be enhanced by a distinguished visitor to Lakeba. Tupou, anxious to visit a European settlement, had accepted an invitation to sail in the mission ship John Wesley for a voyage to Bau and Sydney. He arrived unheralded at Lakeba on 6 November and, during his stay of less than a week, conferred a singular honour on Maʻafu and Lualala, appointing them as joint governors of the Tongans in Fiji. Missionaries had more than once urged the King to appoint a governor as a way of establishing some formal means of control over the Lauan Tongans, who had been the subject of continual gnashing of missionary teeth since Cross and Cargill reached Lakeba in 1835. Similar appeals had come from Tongan local preachers on the island. Lyth, though, must have experienced mixed feelings at seeing authority placed in the hands of Maʻafu. While the young chief was well qualified by means of his rank and established leadership role among the Tongan community on Lakeba, his recent exploits in Moala and Matuku had demonstrated yet again, at least to Lyth, that he required a large measure of control himself.
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It would be more than a month before there was any reaction to the King’s move. Still intent on Ma’afu’s rehabilitation, Lyth referred to “a hopeful sign” on 13 December when Ma’afu called to discuss a proposed vono, or general meeting of the village, which was duly held six days later.\(^5\) Ma’afu, Vuetasau and large numbers of people from Tubou and Uea attended. The purpose of the vono was to inform the people of the decisions made at a series of meetings between Tupou, Ma’afu, Vuetasau and other chiefs during the King’s visit in November. The principal decision was of course that to appoint Ma’afu and Lualala as governors. Lyth, setting aside any reservations he might have felt, described the appointments as “the commencement of an era long desired, prayed and laboured for”.\(^6\) Although he had known of the decision for at least six days,\(^7\) neither he nor his colleagues Robert Young and Nathaniel Turner, who were accompanying the King, seem to have been aware of it during their visit, as none mentioned it in their various documented accounts.\(^8\) Despite the alliance between King and missionaries, there were clearly some matters considered chiefly business, about which the missionaries could be informed in proper season. The King would have entertained no doubt that when the missionaries were apprised of the appointments, they would wholeheartedly approve.

Lualala was at least a generation older than Ma’afu, a difference which meant that control of the Lauan Tongans was effectively placed in the hands of the younger man. Since Ma’afu’s appointment was partly a response by Tupou to missionary pleas of long standing, consideration should be given to how far Ma’afu was the “agent” or representative of the King. Tupou had overcome the last resistance to his rule in Tonga less than 18 months earlier, which allowed him to devote more attention to the Tongan diaspora in Fiji. It is impossible to draw definitive conclusions about the full implications of the appointment, since we cannot know what was said in the discussions between Ma’afu, Tupou, Lualala and others. The appointment endowed Ma’afu with an official status, acknowledged by Tui Nayau and the missionaries, to complement the position of leadership which his own efforts, in peace and war, had established. There is no evidence, and indeed it is most unlikely, that the appointment formed part of any longer term plan for Tongan intervention in eastern Fiji.\(^9\)

It has been erroneously stated that Ma’afu was expelled from church membership in 1853 for his part in the events on Matuku.\(^6\) Such a move would have lost
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the missionaries far more than it gained them: even before his appointment as governor, Ma`afu was the acknowledged leader of the Lauan Tongans, all nominally Christian, and his expulsion could well have affected the precarious loyalty of his fellows to the church. Although Lyth was censorious of Ma`afu for his actions in Matuku, he considered the Tongan less culpable than Vuetasau and Donu, who were expelled. The notion that Ma`afu was similarly treated arose from a misinterpretation of Lyth’s letter to his Society of 3 March 1854, which refers to the expulsion of “two chiefs [who] had lent themselves and their people to aid a bad cause”.61 Significantly, Robert Young made no mention of an expulsion of Ma`afu in his lengthy account of his visit to Fiji, which does refer to the expulsion of Vuetasau “for persisting in making war upon the people of Matuku that they might be compelled to lotu”.62 It is impossible to think that, had Ma`afu been expelled, the two missionaries and Robert Young, all writing about Lakeban affairs during the final months of 1853, would have omitted any mention of it. The supposed expulsion quickly became one of the many myths obscuring Ma`afu’s life.

Lyth described the war in Matuku as “a political dispute, commenced on political grounds. The Christian name had been profanely assumed by some, for no other purpose than to further their own ambitious projects, and to ensure the co-operation of the Lakeba chiefs”.63 Ma`afu, who had sailed to Matuku with hostile intent, was, although he did not commence hostilities, one of those who sought to fulfil “their own ambitious projects”. On 3 October he, Vuetasau and other chiefs were interrogated on several matters by Lakeba’s assembled teachers. Vuetasau attempted to justify Matuku by saying that they had only followed the practice of the Tongan lotu. Tupou had behaved in similar fashion against heathen chiefs in Tonga, Vuetasau reminded the gathering, “and Lakeba and Tonga were one. Why did we not go and put Tubou out of Society?” Lyth referred to the authority of the Bible over any supposed precedent set by the King of Tonga.

Ma`afu sat and listened while missionary and chief reiterated their apparently irreconcilable views. For Vuetasau, Matuku was “the war of the lotu”, while Lyth asserted that “religion had nothing at all to do with it”. After the vono concluded, Ma`afu hastened to Bucainabua to assure Lyth privately that he had resisted Vuetasau’s invitations to join his force and “did not go until William went for him himself”. He expressed his disgust over Vuetasau’s “raking up all the errors of Tonga for his own defence”. Lyth knew better, of course, but Ma`afu’s avoidance of expulsion might have owed something to his eloquence in
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denying guilt and transferring blame. All his active life, Ma`afu knew when to take the plunge and when to draw back from the edge, denying intent. Vueta Sua, ever obdurate, had voiced his exasperation at the vono by demanding of Lyth: “Wherein are you caused pain – are you plundered of your property?”64 Ma`afu, who knew better than most the cause of the missionary’s pain, sought only to soothe and comfort.

After leaving Lakeba, Tupou and his party proceeded to Bau to confer with Cakobau. Formally installed as Vunivalu in July, Cakobau had suffered a series of reverses during the year and was, at the time of Tupou’s visit, “on the verge of ruin or revolution”.65 The worst setback had come in August with an unsuccessful attack by Bauan forces on the Rewan village of Kaba. Mara had now assumed leadership of the Rewan forces arrayed against Bau, whose fortunes had reached their nadir. For years, missionaries had urged Cakobau to admit a resident missionary to Bau; now, in late 1853, Cakobau’s position allowed him no refusal when Calvert again raised the matter. Joseph Waterhouse landed at Bau in October and after exerting considerable pressure on a reluctant Cakobau, he was allowed to remain.66

By way of contrast, Cakobau welcomed Tupou’s unexpected arrival. During their initial discussion, the Vunivalu “feelingly referred to his present reduced position”. Reassured by the King’s sympathy, Cakobau presented him with a large drua, the Ra Marama, which Tupou arranged to collect during his return voyage from Sydney. The gift was accompanied by Cakobau’s expressed wish “that kingly help might be afforded”. Tupou did not fail his host: in a reference to Kaba, he declared: “The rebel fortress seems to me anything but impregnable”. As Waterhouse later wrote, “it was evident that each King understood the other”.67 Dr Berthold Seemann, the botanist who made a lengthy visit to Fiji in 1860, documented a firm tradition that “the arrangement relative to the subjugation of Kaba” was made on board the John Wesley during Tupou’s stay in Fiji in late 1853.68

The meetings between Cakobau and Tupou, unlike those held by the King at Lakeba, are well known to posterity, thanks to the record left by witnesses Waterhouse and Young. Since the understanding reached between the two men was to bear fruit in 1855 in a massive Tongan intervention in Fiji in support of Cakobau, it is important to remember that at the time of the King’s 1853 visit, there was no formal alliance, either political or military, between Bau and Tonga.
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Cakobau was reassured by the promise of future help from the King, who hoped to see the Vunivalu accept the *lotu*, although whether he pressed that point during his visit is unclear. Certainly Cakobau would have well understood the political advantages of conversion. Ma’afu, meanwhile, already in good standing at Bau and with his success in the Moala group under his belt, must have been more confident of his rehabilitation in the eyes of the Lakeba missionaries.

Intent perhaps on making further amends, Ma’afu left Lakeba in December on board the *Tainawi* to visit Oneata and Kabara, returning on 4 January 1854.\(^{69}\) During the ensuing weeks, he basked in missionary approval by attending service regularly, seeking again to meet in class and establishing a school in Uea. He declared to his fellow Tongans, “‘until now we have been heathens, not Christians … now we will begin to be Christians’”. People painting their faces were, by Ma’afu’s orders, to be put to work. Lyth was pleased when some Tongan youths stole one of Ma’afu’s canoes in order to sail to Somosomo or Bau “to escape the restraints of a Christian land – a most hopeful omen this for Uea”. In February, Ma’afu approached Lyth “respecting some misconduct of his own”. The missionary, “humbled and encouraged”, described the reform in Uea as “most impressive”. Ma’afu instructed the people to attend the school unless they were sick and reminded them to maintain a modest form of dress. He even diverted men from the construction of his house so they could help build the new chapel in Uea.\(^{70}\) Lyth described as “truly astonishing” the reforms effected by Ma’afu, who had introduced “order and propriety in the place of confusion and irregularities of all kinds in the town where he and most of the Tonguese reside”.\(^{71}\) It remained only to see for how long Ma’afu would remain steadfast.

Diversion from the straight and narrow was not long in coming. A deputation from Lomaloma had reached Lakeba in December 1853, seeking the return of their native teachers in order to meet the increasing demands of public worship.\(^{72}\) Five teachers accordingly left in January 1854 for Lomaloma, where their arrival caused “great rejoicing” and convinced the remaining unconverted chiefs and people to *lotu*. Yaro remained largely heathen, although the chief permitted a teacher to reside in his village and to conduct worship.\(^{73}\) The following month, Tuikilakila was murdered at Somosomo by one of his sons, who in turn died by the hand of another son.\(^{74}\) While his death meant that the prospects for the *lotu* in Vanuabalavu were likely to improve, the general instability prevailing in Cakaudrove increased the possibility of outside intervention, notably from Ma’afu.

---

\(^{69}\) Lyth, *Journal*, 22 Dec 1853 and 4 Jan 1854.
\(^{70}\) ibid., Jan – Feb 1854, passim.
\(^{71}\) Lyth to Mary Lyth, 27 Feb 1854, Letters home from Richard Burdassal Lyth and Mary Ann Lyth 1829–1856. See also Lyth to GS, WMMS, 3 March 1854.
\(^{73}\) Lyth to GS, WMMS, 3 Mar 1854; Lyth to Mary Lyth, 27 Feb 1854.
\(^{74}\) Lyth, *Journal*, 23 Feb 1854; Lyth to GS, WMMS, 3 Mar 1854; Brewster Papers B5, Notes on pre-European history of Fiji, 1796–1867 (E.J. Turpin), Roth Papers, AJCP M2792. It was generally believed that Cakobau
The death of Tuikilakila did nothing to alleviate the reduced fortunes of Bau and its ruler. After Cakobau’s setback when his forces failed to regain control of Kaba in August 1853, a fresh and well-prepared campaign the following March was also unsuccessful, owing to “the presence and active assistance [to the rebels] of some of the whites and half-castes who wished to protect Kaba in order to pressure Ovalau”. In April, Cakobau received a letter from Tupou, written about a month after his return to Tonga from Sydney. The letter, which went first to Lakeba, was delivered to Bau by a messenger sent by Ma’afu. In it, the King advised Cakobau that he would visit him again “when we have finished planting”. The letter continued:

It is good you should be humble; it will be well for you and your land. I wish, Thackobau, that you would lotu. When I visit you, we will talk about it … But it will be well for you, Thackobau, to think wisely in these days.

The suggestion to lotu appeared to be a significant departure for the King, since no such advice had apparently been offered when Tupou called at Bau on route to Sydney. But there had been another letter, written soon after the King’s visit, in which Tupou had requested Cakobau to become a Christian. Waterhouse was to note that “the chief acknowledged receipt of this communication without referring to George’s request”, although he did give permission for the erection of a chapel at Bau. The letter of February 1854 was something more than a friendly suggestion to lotu. It intimated, Calvert said, “that evil might come to Bau”. However serious Cakobau considered the threat to him, he knew that only his conversion would win the King of Tonga wholly to his side.

Despite the veil of missionary fervour which inevitably enshrouds the documented reasons for Cakobau’s conversion, the final decision was certainly his. After another failed attempt to subdue Kaba, Cakobau remarked to his priest:

You promised that we should take Kaba, but Jehovah had love for the Kaba, and your love was of no avail. Don’t you suppose that this religion will end – that it will be as a dream, which is done away with when one wakes in the morning. I have decided, and we shall all become Christians.
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Waterhouse, to whom Cakobau had first announced his decision on 27 April, believed that the Vunivalu had been alarmed at Tuikilakila's death, which seemed to illustrate dire biblical warnings that the wrath of the Lord will be visited upon people and places that reject the Word. Waterhouse, to whom Cakobau had first announced his decision on 27 April, believed that the Vunivalu had been alarmed at Tuikilakila's death, which seemed to illustrate dire biblical warnings that the wrath of the Lord will be visited upon people and places that reject the Word.82 Tupou's letter had arrived "at this crucial time", following as it did Cakobau’s ominous reversal at Kaba.83 His public profession of Christianity on Sunday 30 April, in the presence of more than 300 of his chiefs, family members and other residents of Bau, was accompanied by sermons from both Calvert and Waterhouse. The missionaries saw it as the beginning of a new era in Fijian history, as indeed it was. They also recognised the political nature of Cakobau’s decision: Christianity was a force the Vunivalu could no longer resist. His enemies were preparing to hammer at his door, while his one powerful friend had not only offered support if Cakobau would lotu, but had reminded him of the probable consequences if he did not. In the end, Cakobau made the decision for no better reason than to preserve his power.84 Even then, the lotu could not ensure his survival. Waterhouse, recognising the political motives for the conversion, believed that Cakobau's death “was sought, not because he was a Christian, but because of his former ambition, pride, cruelty and ingratitude to tried friends”. The Vunivalu scorned Waterhouse's suggested program of political reform and faced the rejection of his own peace proposals from Qaraniqio.85 Since much of his unpopularity now extended, by implication, to the faith he adopted, it seemed that the only benefit likely to ensue in the short term would be intervention by Tupou.

Although, at the time of Cakobau’s conversion, Ma`afu had been governor of the Tongans for almost six months, he nowhere figures in any contemporary account of the events at Bau, Rewa and Cakaudrove. His greater prestige and status were still confined to Lau and the Yasayasa Moala. A few days before the ceremony at Bau, Ma`afu was rejoicing in his newly completed house, “an ornament to the town of Uea”, and discussing with Lyth and Vuetasau plans to restore liberty to Tui Yaroi and other Matuku captives and to convey them home.86 His mind was quickly diverted from these concerns when news arrived from Mataiase Vave of a massacre of 17 Christians in Lomaloma on Easter Sunday. The ringleader of the murderers was reported to be Tuilakeba, “chief of the turtle fishers”. Vave’s messenger, Mafoa, brought two appeals for help to Lakeba. One was from the nominal chief of Lomaloma, who appealed directly to Tui Nayau, while the surviving Christian teachers there sent their request to the two missionaries on Lakeba. Lyth and Polglase “desired … Ma`afu to help us in our troubles by
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going to the relief of our teachers and friends at Susui”. He sailed on 29 April in the *Tainawi*, accompanied, in another canoe, by Joeli Bulu and Jonah Tonga as missionary representatives.87

There is conflicting evidence concerning the involvement of Ma`afu in the mission to Lomaloma. He later stated that after reaching Lakeba, Mafoa went first to Tui Nayau, who refused assistance. Then, following Mafoa’s subsequent appeal to him, Ma`afu set off for Susui with two large canoes.88 The traditional account on Vanuabalavu indicates that Vave’s messenger brought Ma`afu a letter reporting the murder of one Ratu Tomasi, who had been eating turtle meat without sharing it with a chief named Tui Keba.89 Ma`afu’s claim to have acted only after Tui Nayau refused to intervene conflicts with contemporary accounts. According to Lyth, after Ma`afu readily agreed to go to the help of the endangered teachers and people, Tui Nayau “desired [him] at the same time to offer his [the King’s] assistance to the Lomaloma chief who, … himself driven from his own rightful soil by a rebellious party of his own subjects, had appealed to [Tui Nayau] for protection and advice”.90 Ma`afu gave evidence on the matter at a Court of Arbitration convened by the British Consul in 1865 to determine the legal ownership of Vanuabalavu. Much of what he said was disingenuous, an attempt to deprecate the influence of Tui Nayau while at the same time enlarging on his own. But all that lay in the future in 1854, a time when praise from Lyth was unstinting. “Ma`afu did his work excellently well”, the missionary declared, “and returned home in peace”.91

According to another missionary, “the whole affair was more than sanctioned at Somosomo”.92 If that was so, it does not belie the fact that the power of the Somosomo chiefs to become actively involved in Vanuabalavu was now limited. Raivalita, who had succeeded as Tui Cakau only two months earlier, was far from secure in his position. In any case, Ma`afu would have needed no persuasion to intervene, especially in view of the levying rights granted him five years earlier, rights which he had had little chance to enforce. Ma`afu later stated that he picked up some Christians who had taken refuge on Susui and returned them to Lomaloma, where he helped them construct a defensive fence around their village. While he and some of his party were bathing, they were fired upon by “the heathen”. Two days later, reinforced by 200 Tongans from Lakeba, Ma`afu sailed to Mualevu. There, after two days of fighting, the Yaro chiefs surrendered and offered *tabua* and baskets of earth to Ma`afu,
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“expressly stating that they gave themselves and their district, and during the same week the chiefs of the Lomaloma district did the same for the second time they having presented earth to Ma’afu on his first arrival”. Later in the same month, Ma’afu further stated, he sent two men named Samate and Lavaki to Somosomo to inform Raivalita that he (Ma’afu) had come to Lomaloma at the request of its chiefs and had since conquered the Yaro people. Both parties had given themselves and their land to him.”

At the 1865 Court of Arbitration, Samate and Lavaki corroborated Ma’afu’s evidence. Samate expressed his belief that Vanuabalavu belonged to Ma’afu, while Lavaki said that when Ma’afu’s message was conveyed to Raivalita, the Tui Cakau had said, “‘Very good, if I ever want to go there, I will ask Ma’afu’”.

Despite this apparent unanimity, it is useful to consider the oral history recorded in the Tukutuku Raraba. The Lomaloma chiefs presented several tabua to Ma’afu at Susui, telling him that if he helped them to overcome the Mualevu people, “they would like him to accept Lomaloma and its people in his charge”. The Tukutuku Raraba goes on to record a battle between Wainiqolo and a Mualevu force on a beach between Lomaloma and Mualevu. Defeated survivors from the Mualevans retreated to a fort in Boitaci village, from which Wainiqolo’s men soon expelled them. Another oral tradition makes mention of Ma’afu’s “anger” when Puleiwai, a “respected” Tongan living in Mualevu, was ambushed and murdered by Wainiqolo and two other men whom Ma’afu had sent to Mavana to fetch him. Ratu Qoroniyasi, Tui Mavana at the time, was supposedly related to Ma’afu.

The outcome of the battle on the beach and other skirmishes was that Ma’afu and his forces burnt Mualevu village before returning to Lomaloma. Ma’afu gave the island of Cikobia to Wainiqolo as a reward and after returning to Lomaloma to pay a final call on Mataiase Vave, quickly set sail for Lakeba.

While this traditional account naturally makes no mention of dates, there is evidence that the events they describe concluded within days. Ma’afu had returned to Lakeba before 13 May, since on that day he sailed again for Vanuabalavu, on Tui Nayau’s orders, “to convey a party of the Thithia and Nayau people to relieve the Tonguese who were keeping watch at Susui”. Ma’afu’s intention had been to proceed from Vanuabalavu to Moala for pigs and yams, in order to prepare for the expected arrival at Lakeba of Tupou and a large folau. This plan was abandoned when he received Tui Nayau’s orders. On 23 May, while he was helping the Lomaloma Christians to erect a protective fence, one of his men was shot dead by heathen forces. Hostilities recommenced immediately but were over within four days, “when, to the astonishment of all parties, the whole
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island surrendered to Ma`afu, and some of the principal conspirators were given up to him”. Once all his opposing forces were subdued, Ma`afu allowed the remaining conspirators to escape. The consequence was that, with the exception of a few young men, the whole of Vanuabalavu, including the chiefs of Yaro and Lomaloma, had accepted the lotu and “agreed to merge their ancient differences and live in peace”. Ma`afu and his force returned to Lakeba on 3 June, with Tuilakeba, the principal perpetrator of the April massacre, one of several prisoners.96 No wonder the Tongan was thought to have acted “excellently well”.

By 1854, the levying rights granted Ma`afu by Tuikilakila and the gift of the soil by the Vanuabalavu chiefs, bases for Ma`afu’s claim to the sovereignty of Vanuabalavu, were firmly in place. With the island remaining nominally subject to Cakaudrove, its people were expected to provide massive tribute to Tui Cakau and his entourage whenever they visited.97 Nevertheless, effective control of Vanuabalavu from 1854 lay with Ma`afu and his Tongans. While some details of the brief campaign cannot be reconciled among the different accounts, the essential fact is that Ma`afu’s intervention gave him effective sovereignty of the island, a situation Raivalita accepted because he had no choice. Subsequent judicial enquiry, firstly at the Court of Arbitration in 1865 and secondly at the Lands Claims Commission hearings in 1880, confirmed Ma`afu in possession. When he asserted that his sovereign rights were bestowed entirely in accordance with Fijian custom, it did not matter that this claim rested on a foundation less than entirely secure. Ma`afu ruled Vanuabalavu by right of conquest; the presentation of soro by the Vanuabalavu chiefs and acknowledgement of his position by Tui Cakau were only icing on the cake. Ma`afu’s acquisition of Vanuabalavu was yet another step, the most important one to date, whereby the Tongan “prince”, as Europeans often referred to him, achieved his transformation into a chief of Fiji.

Only nine days after his return “home” to Lakeba, Ma`afu set sail yet again, this time for the Yasayasa Moala.98 While his immediate purpose is unknown, the events of the previous two years meant that those islands, like Vanuabalavu, would henceforth count among his principal concerns. Lakeba was then described as “the centre of political, religious and educational influence” in eastern Fiji, a situation Lyth said had come about “through Tongan energy and enterprise”. He also acknowledged that while the new locus of power was nominally Lakeba, “the real one is Tongan and Tongan power, wherever known, is feared”.99 One consequence of this change occurred following the death in
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custody on Lakeba of Tui Yaroi. Another Matuku chief was appointed, not as Tui Yaroi, but as Tui Matuku, a new title bestowed from Lakeba, rather than by customary process on Matuku itself. The Moalan Baba, freed from captivity, became Tui Moala, while the chief of Totoya lost the nominal authority over Matuku and Moala that he had traditionally possessed.\textsuperscript{100} The several new appointees recognised that their authority derived, not simply from Lakeba, but from Ma’afu and the Tongan power base on that island.

These changes, while decisive, were not as clear-cut as they might appear in retrospect. When the British Commission of Enquiry, sent to investigate Cakobau’s 1858 offer of cession, visited Lakeba in 1860, Tui Nayau informed the Commissioner, Colonel William Smythe, that the Moala group constituted an independent state, while Vanuabalavu owed its allegiance to Cakaudrove.\textsuperscript{101} Although traditional tribute obligations were still observed, the reality was that following the end of the valu ni lotu in June 1854, effective control of the Yasayasa Moala and Vanuabalavu lay in Ma’afu’s hands. It was his conquests and their aftermath which brought these islands under the eventual suzerainty of Lau, an achievement which raises the question of whether Ma’afu was acting in the interests of the government of Tonga, effectively King Tupou. Although it can be argued that he was bent on securing supreme power in Lau and possibly elsewhere in Fiji, there is no evidence that, in 1854, he was acting at the behest of Tupou. Lyth, in his pertinent analysis of the political changes consequent upon the valu ni lotu, makes no mention of any involvement by the Tongan King.\textsuperscript{102} The new and enlarged Lauan state, now well in the process of its evolution, was the work of Ma’afu, the Tongan forces at his command and the Wesleyan missionaries. Even Tui Nayau, who condoned and sometimes directed Ma’afu in his military adventures, could be ascribed a hand in its creation. For him, the withdrawal of Cakaudrove from Vanuabalavu, as well as the ending of Bauan infiltration of the Yasayasa Moala, helped to sustain the precarious independence of Lau more than any of the other political changes he had witnessed. For Ma’afu, by way of contrast, the new conquests gave him a degree of power and authority unprecedented in the long history of Tongan involvement in eastern Fiji.

Oral tradition held that after the defeat of Mualevu, Ma’afu assumed direct personal control of Vanuabalavu, having “a house built for himself at Lomaloma” and appointing “magistrates and other officials”. The tradition further held that Ma’afu did not return to Lakeba until the time of the Kaba rebellion and the arrival of Tupou in Fiji in March 1855.\textsuperscript{103} These last details are certainly wrong.
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Aside from the lack of contemporary evidence for any Tongan settlement on Vanuabalavu in 1854, we know that Maʻafu returned to Lakeba on 3 June and sailed south for the Yasayasa Moala nine days later. The six months or more until February 1855 are a blank in Maʻafu's life, owing partly to the departure from Fiji in October of Lyth, whose journals and other writings are the most important sources for Maʻafu's movements during the early 1850s. The most that can be said about Maʻafu during these months is that he had not yet moved his residence to Vanuabalavu.

Towards the close of 1854 there was unease in both Fiji and Tonga about the activities of the French in Tahiti and the possibility that they sought to extend their influence to western Polynesia. Following visits to Fiji, Tonga and Samoa during the following year, Captain Stephen Fremantle, an officer of the Royal Navy's Australian Squadron, noted that Tupou had concluded a treaty with France. Believing that both Tongans and Europeans were wary of France’s ulterior motives, Fremantle was apprehensive that the French priests there would assert a degree of political and social control in Tonga such as the Wesleyan missionaries had done so effectively since the islands’ reunification in 1845. Tupou’s own concerns were reflected in the treaty, concluded with Governor Josephe du Bouzet of Tahiti in January 1855. The most important of its eight articles was the first, which provided for perpetual peace between Tonga and France. Implementation of the treaty meant that Tupou was free of a potential threat which had long disturbed his peace of mind. He could now turn his attention to other aspects of his kingdom’s foreign policy.

The King’s letter to Cakobau, received in April 1854, had made it clear that Fiji was in danger and that Tongan help would be dependent on Cakobau’s acceptance of the lotu. Early in 1855, preparing for his promised second visit, Tupou proposed to bring a folau of more than 30 large canoes. Thomas West, a Wesleyan missionary working in Tonga, was urged by Calvert “to persuade [the King] … to reduce the number of his fleet to eight or ten canoes, lest any harm might be created, in the then distracted state of Fijian parties”. Tupou would not consent, since he felt that a small folau would, in the same “distracted state” of Fiji, be seen as a sign of weakness and “would be the signal for our destruction”. For the King, prudence lay in a display of majesty and
power. He also impressed upon West the need to exercise further control over the Tongans in Fiji, whose “bold and enterprising and overbearing conduct … [had] often led to serious disputes”. West agreed, acknowledging the debt owed to the Tongans, whose presence fostered the spread of Christianity and the safety of both missionaries and teachers.\textsuperscript{110} The King had told West that he had no wish to take part in any of the Fijians’ quarrels and in his subsequent letter to Cakobau, he had informed the Vunivalu that he would soon pay a visit “to bring away my canoe”.\textsuperscript{111} Several months later, West saw the need to correct some false impressions concerning Tupou’s motives:

Other … important reasons beside that of friendship toward Thakobau have led to the visit of King George to Feejee and these ought to be known so that it may not be set down, as many will have it, to his ambition and love of power or an unnecessary interference in Fijian affairs.

West referred to the King’s long-held wish to visit Fiji again, a visit prevented by the islands’ unsettled state and by the instability occasioned by the Tongans resident there. Many of them were said to have rendered Lakeba “the rendezvous of worthless characters and of chiefs and their dependents who were disaffected at different times to the reigning chiefs of Tonga”. Significantly, West made specific mention of Ma’afu in this context:

Of late the power of the Tonguese party has been greatly increased under the leadership of Maafu who was at one time one of the King’s chief opponents, and they have given great annoyance and trouble to the King of Lakeba and the Feejeeans generally. They have proceeded so far as to make plausible pretences to fight and take possession of several islands belonging to the Lakeba dominions. Nor do they owe any allegiance to Tuiniyau … although resident on the island.\textsuperscript{112}

There is no reason to doubt West on the motives for the King’s visit. It is worthy of note, in the wider context of the growth of Tongan power in Fiji, that a Wesleyan missionary should refer to the “plausible pretences” of Ma’afu and his forces in taking possession of the Yasayasa Moala and Vanuabalavu. West did not acknowledge Ma’afu as a champion of the lotu, choosing instead to present the chief’s Fijian conquests as successful efforts to establish a personal power base. West, although working in Tonga, was better able to see through Ma’afu than Lyth on Lakeba had been. His opinion was the first documented expression of a view no modern historian would dispute. West makes the further intriguing reference to Ma’afu having been “one of the King’s chief opponents”, a hint that before his departure from Tonga, Ma’afu might indeed have intrigued against

\textsuperscript{110} ibid., 393.
\textsuperscript{111} Tupou I to Cakobau, 28 Feb 1854.
\textsuperscript{112} West to GS, WMMS, 1 Nov 1855, WMMS LFF.
Tupou. Too much could be made of the missionary’s aside, however, since there is no contemporary evidence that Ma’afu was ranged against his kinsman. The most significant aspect of West’s letter to his Society, written while Tupou was still in Fiji, is its revelation that Ma’afu’s conquests during the valu ni lotu were entirely his own, and not part of any plan by Tupou to involve himself in the affairs of Fiji.

Meanwhile, Bau’s immediate prospects continued to deteriorate. When several towns on nearby Viti Levu changed allegiance from Bau to Rewa in October 1854, Qaraniqio eagerly anticipated both the destruction of Bau and the ingestion of its ruler. Despite Calvert’s exhortations, Qaraniqio indignantly rejected the lotu, and when he died of dysentery in January 1855, the missionary saw the hand of God. Since the chief had been unable to name a successor, other Rewan chiefs lost the will to continue the struggle against Bau, with all its incipient hardships, once a conciliatory message arrived from Cakobau. Following a formal presentation at Bau from the Rewan chiefs, peace was concluded on 9 February.113 There nevertheless remained in Rewa several disaffected chiefs who could not be reconciled with Cakobau’s conversion and who saw their fight against him as a defence of the old ways against the new. Their strength, already significant, was enhanced by the commitment to their side of Mara, who had his own reasons for continuing to defy Cakobau.114 It is likely also that the expected intervention by Tupou helped unite the Rewan chiefs, both lotu and heathen, to join forces in order to mount an effective defence against the invader. Once the disparate forces ranged against Cakobau were gathered at Kaba, Mara boasted that the Tongans could never hope to take the village, a boast which caused Calvert to resign himself to the inevitability of armed conflict. The missionary later learned that Mara’s defiance had only firmed Tupou’s resolve to intervene.115

Ma’afu, still living on Lakeba, made a hurried departure on 10 February, supposedly heading for Tonga by way of Kabara.116 If his purpose was to consult Tupou, he might have been unaware that the King had left Tongatapu on 15 January en route for Vava’u, there to supervise the preparation of his folau.117 Towards the end of February, after the King’s return to Tongatapu, the immense fleet finally sailed. It reached Lakeba on 9 March, where John Polglase’s wife Mary counted 36 canoes “and upwards of 3,000 people”.118 The fleet had touched
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at Kabara and Moce en route.\textsuperscript{119} It was later reported that the King’s purpose in coming to Fiji was to “bring Tonguese property” to Cakobau in return for the \textit{Ra Marama} and to congratulate the Vunivalu on his renunciation of heathenism.\textsuperscript{120} While these reasons were true enough, Tupou’s principal mission in Fiji was political, since he was resolved to sustain Cakobau against his heathen enemies and to redefine the role which the long-established Tongan population was to play in Fiji.

At Lakeba, Tupou’s folau was augmented by “a considerable force well supplied with firearms”, a force probably commanded by Ma’afu. It seems likely that he and his followers were part of the fleet when it reached Moturiki, an island east of Viti Levu, on 21 March. The stay at Moturiki was made in accordance with Fijian custom, so that preparations for the King’s formal reception at Bau could be made. Acting on a request from the Governor of Tahiti, Tupou sent a small canoe, with 20 persons on board, across to nearby Ovalau to deliver letters to the French priests there. He also sent a \textit{tabua} and a bundle of kava to Tui Levuka, who had recently lotued. As the canoe neared Totogo, the village north of Levuka where the priests lived, its occupants were fired on by four men acting on orders from the chief of the Lovoni people in the interior of Ovalau. Some local Fijians were apprehensive that the presence of a Tongan teacher, Paula Vea, might serve as “an excuse for [the Tongans’] visiting the island”.\textsuperscript{121} When the firing began, Tui Levuka, accompanied by resident missionary James Binner, arrived in haste in order to call to the Tongans to pull away from the shore. In the ensuing confusion, the leader of the Tongans, Tawaki, was mortally wounded. Standing out to sea to avoid an approaching canoe containing Mara, the Tongans made their way back to Moturiki.\textsuperscript{122}

Mara, whose position was greatly affected by Tupou’s alliance with Cakobau, had every reason to cause the Tongans to be lured into a trap. He could appeal to the Vunivalu’s Fijian and European enemies on Ovalau by posing as an enemy of the Tongans\textsuperscript{123} and in fact tried to persuade the retreating Tongans to land at Levuka. Tupou learned several days later, after his arrival at Bau, that Mara “had presented whales’ teeth to many of the chiefs of the Windward Islands in Ovalau, for the purpose of inducing them to join in a war against the Tonguese at Lakeba. He had also [requested] the people of Ovalau [to] fire upon, and
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destroy ... any ... Tonguese canoe of King George’s fleet that might happen to touch at the island”. Calvert, visiting Bau at the time, gave the same account of the events near Levuka. The murder of Tawaki meant that Tupou could no longer present his visit as a ceremonial state occasion and a show of solidarity with a fellow Christian monarch. If the murder were not avenged, the safety of all resident Tongans in Fiji, as well as the thousands of visitors, would be placed at risk. If Cakobau wished to request military assistance from his visitor, the King was very willing to listen.

Despite the request made to Tupou to wait at Moturiki, the death of Tawaki caused the angry King to order the fleet to Bau at once, so that Tawaki might be buried. Tupou and his advisers were now “unanimously resolved to help [Cakobau] in the subjugation of his rebellious people”. When he arrived, Tupou “ordered the chiefs of Tonga[tapu], Haabai and Vava’u, to meet separately, and consider what course they were disposed to follow in reference to Tawaki’s death”. Their resolution was to demand both an explanation and reparation from Mara. When Cakobau was advised of the Tongans’ position, he announced to Tupou “your fleet came with peaceful intentions, but now it is right that we should fight together”. Tupou meanwhile yielded to Calvert’s request to send a message to Mara, urging him to sue for peace and saying that if the Tongans laid siege to Kaba, where Mara was now ensconced, they would certainly be successful. Mara’s response was open defiance; he claimed that the Tongans could never take Kaba and boasted of the warriors from several other Rewan towns who were at his command. A clash was inevitable and, as Calvert wrote, “its results for good or evil will be immense”.

Although Cakobau had long been urged to abandon the war against Rewa, as much for its deleterious effect on Christian evangelisation as for its inherent evils, the time for peace was long past. Tupou attended an immense prayer meeting on 2 April, later promising to prevent loss of life as far as possible. On the same day, the Tongan fleet proceeded from Bau to Kiuva, a village on
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the east coast of Rewa, drawing fire from Kaba as it sailed past. The Kabans “waited with impatience” to engage the Tongans, having been reassured by their oracles that the “Christians” would be destroyed. After waiting at Kiuva for four days to allow the disparate groups of Fijians allied with Cakobau to join them, the combined fleets finally arrived off Kaba peninsula early on the morning of 7 April. The confidence of Mara and his allies behind the fortifications appeared undiminished:

The heathen and other wicked men were greatly rejoiced that they had embroiled [Tupou] in Fijian war thus, as they supposed, having an opportunity of trying the strength, worth and truth of the ‘lotu’ and even some nominal Christians in Bau said if the Tonguese were not successful they would become heathen again. The priests became inspired, the gods prophesied destruction of the Tonguese fleet, the enemies cut wood to dress the bodies of the slain and the town was filled with the most courageous men in Fiji.

When the Tongans landed, they were immediately fired upon. Tupou’s plan was to cut wood for the construction of a fence, so that those within the Kaba fortress could be starved out. However, after some Tongans were shot and clubbed and their bodies dragged into the village to be cooked and eaten, the Vava’u forces immediately stormed the fortification, captured it easily and set it on fire. On the other side, where Tupou’s Fijian allies were advancing on a separate front, the Kabans stationed at a defensive fence abandoned their posts and ran into the village. Meeting no resistance, the Fijians joined with their Tongan allies in quickly breaching Kaba’s defences and entering the village, where the bodies of the slain had been laid out before various temples. Mara, with more than 100 followers, managed to escape, running over sharp shells along the reef and swimming to the town of Vatoa, opposite the Kaba peninsula. On arrival, he uttered a cry of despair to a Wesleyan teacher that has resonated through the history of Fiji:

Aye, Acqila, your spirit is still in you, because you have not seen them.
The man is a fool who fights with Tongans … They are gods, not men.

Mara quickly escaped to Ovalau with a few followers. Inside Kaba, while the Tongans exercised mercy to their captives, their Fijian allies showed little restraint in slaughtering adults and children. Altogether, about 180 Kabans were killed, with over 200 made prisoner. Among the Tongans, deaths amounted to
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only 14, with about 30 wounded, of whom six later died. When the prisoners were delivered to Cakobau, their lives were spared and most were allowed to return to their homes.¹³⁷

On the very day of the battle of Kaba, Calvert found time to record his opinion that “this is a day much to be remembered in Feejee”.¹³⁸ In political terms, Kaba marked the beginning of the period when effective power in Fiji passed from Fijian hands into those of outsiders, first the Tongans and, within a single generation and by Fijian consent, the British. This change would bring a new stability, since the Tongans’ authority could not be challenged in the way that Bau’s had been in the eastern parts of the islands. In the aftermath of Kaba, the most pressing question was the nature of the Tongans’ new role. Since Tupou and his forces would eventually return home, that question centred on the many resident Tongans and, in particular, on their emerging leader, Ma`afu. To the authority and prestige which Ma`afu had acquired through his appointment as governor and his victories in the valu ni lotu would now be added power devolved from the military success of his king.

There exists no contemporary reference to Ma`afu’s participation in the battle of Kaba. A twentieth century writer claimed that at a critical moment in the battle, Ma`afu threw a fresh division into the attack, enabling Kaba’s defences to be breached and the town taken.¹³⁹ There is support for this assertion in two traditional accounts. The Tukutuku Raraba of Sawana yavusa records simply that Ma`afu accompanied Tupou’s forces to Kaba,¹⁴⁰ while another tradition places Ma`afu at the head of a contingent of his own called the Kailoma.¹⁴¹ While it seems that Ma`afu’s role in the battle was significant, the details hardly matter. As a consequence of the engagement and of his close involvement with Tupou throughout the King’s long visit to Fiji, he was well placed to become the most powerful chief in those islands.

The events during the weeks following Kaba demonstrated how the power formerly enjoyed by Bau and Rewa had suddenly shifted to Tupou. According to a Bauan oral tradition still extant in 1970, the bodies of the Tongans who fell at Kaba were brought to Bau and buried in the ceremonial mound known as Navatanitawake.¹⁴² If the tradition is accurate, there could have been no more eloquent witness to the status and authority of the Tongans than the interment of their dead on the chiefly island of Fiji. In the immediate context of April
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1855, Tupou received a letter from David Whippy, the respected American Vice Consul at Ovalau, who had been living in Fiji for more than 30 years. Whippy, writing only a week after Kaba on behalf of himself and other Europeans resident at Levuka, expressed regret that any quarrel should have arisen between them and the King. He asked Tupou to “keep this war from Ovalau”, reminding the King of the “outrages out of number” endured by the foreign residents of Fiji.¹⁴³ A fortnight later, further letters arrived from the whites of Ovalau, requesting the King to keep any future war away from their island.¹⁴⁴ Anxious to protect their lives and property as they were, the Europeans knew where the new locus of power in Fiji effectively lay.

Tupou stated that he had only gone to Kaba because Mara was there. For the future safety of Tongans living in Fiji, the King felt he had to act against Mara, whom he saw as the cause of their being fired upon at Ovalau and of the bad feeling prevailing against the Tongans. For the same reason, he intended, as did Cakobau, to show mercy to the vanquished Kabans and their numerous allies.¹⁴⁵ This avowal of reluctance to be involved in war and of determination to temper his power with both justice and mercy, ambitions worthy of a Christian King, must have been music to missionary ears. It remained to be seen whether, in the light of events over the next 14 years, Tupou had been less than forthcoming in outlining the motives which had led him to the ramparts of Kaba.

Mara had still to be dealt with and his friends subdued. There remained in Rewa several villages whose chiefs professed continued loyalty to Mara, among them Nakelo, whose chief came to Bau begging for peace. He was so amazed to find that his captured son had been spared that he lotued at once. It was quickly apparent that not only the village of Kumi, on the coast of Verata, whence Mara had escaped to Ovalau, refused submission to Bau. Tupou agreed to Cakobau’s request to subdue Kumi, so that it might not threaten Bau in the future. On 13 April, 143 canoes left Bau and stood off Kumi, where the Vunivalu sent a message requesting the inhabitants to vacate the village so that it could be burnt. Flee the inhabitants did, Kumi was duly burnt by the Tongans, and all resistance was at an end. Cakobau, who owed his survival to Tupou, in gratitude presented the King with an 86-ton schooner called the Cakobau.¹⁴⁶ It now remained for the King to visit Rewa and other parts of Fiji, in part to familiarise himself with the islands whose fate now lay effectively in his hands.

Tupou and his entire party left Bau for Rewa on 11 May, the King sailing in the Ra Marama, accompanied by Cakobau in his own canoe. At Buretu, one of the
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rebel villages, the local chiefs presented Cakobau with several *tabua*, while at Nakelo, where the royal party spent the night, immense quantities of food were offered to both the Vunivalu and Tupou in the presence of crowds of people who had come to witness the unprecedented spectacle of 40 canoes, long streamers attached to their mastheads, proceeding up the river. At several villages, baskets of earth, *tabua* and other tokens of submission were laid before the Vunivalu in accordance with customary practice. Always these ceremonies were watched by Tupou, a reminder to all that Cakobau, under whose suzerainty Rewa now lay, operated under a Tongan aegis. At one village, a meeting was called of all the rebel chiefs, who were enjoined by Tupou to keep the peace in future, under pain of “chastisement by the combined powers of Bau and Rewa”.

This move, an attempt to secure the future security of Bau, could not have been made without the ultimate protection of Tongan military power, a protection of which Tupou’s hearers would have been well aware. Calvert, who accompanied the King on his tour of Rewa, did not neglect to describe the King’s prowess in the management of the *Ra Marama*: “He is a thorough master in all he does, both by superior wisdom and superior physical power”, the missionary enthused.

The question which many must have asked at the time was whether Tupou wished to extend the same degree of mastery to Fiji itself. For all his military success at Kaba, and his continued support of Cakobau, Tupou never forgot the principal reason for his presence in Fiji: espousal of the *lotu*. The missionaries took satisfaction in the mass conversions, in both Bau and Rewa, which followed in the wake of Tupou’s triumph and the consolidation of Cakobau’s position. On 15 May, the King left Bau for a visit to Kadavu, with the intention of pressing the Christian message on the chiefs there. During his absence, moves occurred to promote peace on Ovalau, where opposition to Cakobau was still significant. In May a local trader, American Thomas Dunn, arrived at Levuka on board his ship *Dragon*. Meeting Mara on board, Dunn urged the renegade to go to Bau and make his peace with Cakobau. Mara replied that he would like to do so but feared earning the displeasure of the Europeans resident in Levuka who he claimed protected him. Dunn immediately went ashore and brought Tui Levuka, David Whippy and another European resident on board. The result of a meeting between them and Mara was a plan for them all to proceed to Bau within a few days to make peace offerings. Dunn requested Waterhouse to urge the return of Tupou and the Vunivalu as soon as practicable, so that a formal peace might be concluded. Because of the *Dragon’s* sailing schedule, the meeting at Bau took place on 18 June, four days before Cakobau’s
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return.\textsuperscript{150} Nothing conclusive resulted, leaving Ovalau as the one former “rebel” area not avowing allegiance to the Vunivalu. With many of the Europeans there still fearful of Cakobau and some chiefs toying with the idea of seeking French protection, one missionary foresaw anarchy if the disaffection on Ovalau could not be overcome before Tupou returned home.\textsuperscript{151} With Mara’s fangs not yet drawn, the ascendancy of Cakobau was far from assured.

Meanwhile, the Tongan folau, encountering contrary winds on its way to Kadavu, was forced to put in at the island of Beqa, where there was insufficient food to support the horde of unexpected visitors. A Beqan chief, Tui Sawau, seized the opportunity to complain to Cakobau about some villages in isolated parts of the island, which had prepared no food for the visitors and whose inhabitants “were only subject to the skies”. When a party of Tongans approached the villages, stones were rolled down at them. Cakobau quickly passed the request to Tupou, whose messengers soon persuaded the inhabitants of all the recalcitrant villages but one to place themselves under the authority of Tui Sawau. Ma‘afu and ‘Unga were sent to “fetch the chief and people” of Naceva, the one village holding out. The outcome was that, once all eight of the villages which had defied Tui Sawau were cleared, they were burnt. The people “were advised to live together … and not quarrel among themselves”\textsuperscript{152} and about 1,000 of them lotued. Once again, only Tongan intervention had been able to subdue forces opposed to a Fijian chief. The added significance of the Tongans’ visit to Beqa is that it resulted in the only documented reference to Ma‘afu during Tupou’s long stay in Fiji. We see him in a clearly subordinate role, acting at the behest of his king. There is a marked contrast here with the victorious Ma‘afu of the valu ni lotu, when he acquired the Yasayasa Moala and Vanuabalavu in a manner sanctioned by custom. If he were to be confirmed as master of Lau, it could only be with the acquiescence of Tupou.

At this mid point of Tupou’s long visit to Fiji, it is useful to make brief reference to a constitutional question which would in time help to define Ma‘afu’s relationship with the evolving kingdom of Tonga. Although Tupou’s ascendancy and the unity of his kingdom had been assured since 1852, Tonga lacked a written constitution and was governed in accordance with law codes heavily influenced by Wesleyan missionaries. The King’s power, within the traditional Tongan hierarchy, was supreme and in no way subject to the will of the people. Such an arrangement conformed to Tongan custom, but if Tupou were to succeed in maintaining his country’s independence and in securing international recognition, he would inevitably face pressure from outside to
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establish a regime more compatible with western, particularly British, notions of responsible government. While in Sydney in 1853–4, he had met Charles St Julian, an English-born law reporter who acted as Consul for the kingdom of Hawai’i. In subsequent years, Tupou and St Julian corresponded on the need for constitutional changes in Tonga, with St Julian offering advice, often gratuitous but usually detailed and well-informed, on specific changes he thought desirable. While the details of these lengthy exchanges need not be considered here, it is of passing interest to note one letter written by St Julian in June 1855, when Tupou was still actively promoting the *lotu* in Fijian waters. St Julian urged the King, who was anxious to secure international recognition of Tongan independence, to ensure that the rule of succession be “thoroughly determined, [so] that the heir … of the throne can be properly trained and prepared, under the guidance of the reigning sovereign”.¹⁵³ This question was not to be properly addressed until the promulgation of the first Tongan constitution 20 years later. In 1855, when the principle of primogeniture was by no means established in Tonga, any consideration of Tupou’s possible successor could not have excluded Ma’afu. The son of Tupou’s predecessor as Tu’i Kānokupolu and already an acknowledged leader among the Tongan diaspora in Fiji, Ma’afu must have loomed as a possible future King. He had been living in Fiji for eight years and for two years had been exercising some of the customary functions of a Fijian chief. Both his relationship with his King and his part, if any, in the evolving polity of his homeland would soon require definition.

We cannot know whether these questions exercised the minds of Ma’afu and Tupou as they sailed southern Fiji waters in the middle of 1855. The *folau* proceeded from Beqa to Kadavu and Vatulele, where again mass conversions occurred, before returning to Bau. Calvert, anxious for the King to continue his good work, “urged Tupou to do all he could for Feejee, which he appeared disposed to do”.¹⁵⁴ Doing “all he could” meant continued practical support for Cakobau and active promotion of the *lotu*. By early June, Tupou was again at Bau, accompanied by “his little son”, intending to take home a small canoe given him by Cakobau during a previous visit.¹⁵⁵ As always, religious could not be separated from political considerations, now almost inevitably involving outsiders. When a Royal Navy hydrographic survey ship, HMS *Herald*, arrived in Levuka in July to begin a nautical survey of Fiji, its commander, Captain Henry Mangles Denham, was immediately sucked into the vortex of Fijian politics. Tui Levuka and other Ovalau chiefs asked him to accept the cession of the island to Great Britain, a request with which Denham was initially sympathetic, even
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though he lacked any authority to represent the British government. He took pains to outline to the chiefs the conditions implied in an act of cession and agreed to hoist the British flag at Levuka a few days later.\textsuperscript{156} The proposal had the support of prominent European residents of Lau and was accompanied by the despatch to Denham of several baskets of earth.\textsuperscript{157} Cakobau and Tupou came together on board the \textit{Herald} to lend support to the local chiefs’ wishes. Denham demurred, saying that the question should also be considered by chiefs in other parts of Fiji, while a greater authority than he should decide whether to entertain the offer.\textsuperscript{158} The captain was then unaware that Tui Levuka had given Monseigneur Bataillon, a French bishop visiting from Tahiti, a signed paper requesting French protection and asking that a French warship be despatched from Tahiti.\textsuperscript{159} Since there were six towns on Ovalau which, although subject to Bau, were in open rebellion, much would depend on Cakobau’s attitude towards any notion of cession.

In the event Cakobau expressed approval of the idea, provided his differences with Ovalau’s chiefs were settled and the six recalcitrant towns were reconciled with Bau.\textsuperscript{160} His enthusiasm was such that he announced to Denham his desire to “lead” Ovalau’s annexation, as an example to the rest of Fiji.\textsuperscript{161} Both he and Tupou, who was still visiting Bau, were invited by Denham to be present at the flag-raising ceremony, but declined. The proposal had no hope of success, in view of the unwillingness of the British government of the day to acquire any Pacific possessions and of the peculiar concept of “cession” held by Cakobau. For the Vunivalu, cession could only involve the occasional visit of a British warship to look after his interests. He would not contemplate British control over the land or people of Fiji.\textsuperscript{162}

The attitude of Tupou towards the question of cession is unclear. Having objected to any form of British protectorate over his own country, he might now have been disposed to change his mind, owing to the various overtures being made to him by the governor of Tahiti and to the friendship treaty signed the previous January.\textsuperscript{163} His immediate concern though, as he prepared to visit Ovalau in Cakobau’s company, was to settle his differences with those who had shot Tawaki four months earlier.\textsuperscript{164} On 25 July, when the two chiefs arrived at
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Ovalau with a fleet of 11 canoes, a conference of all contending parties took place on board the *Herald*. It involved, as well as Tupou and Cakobau, Tui Levuka, Ratu Mara, David Whippy, a number of chiefs from both Ovalau and Bau and of course Captain Denham. When Denham became aware of Tui Levuka’s duplicity in making overtures to Monseigneur Bataillon as well as himself, he announced he would have to refer the cession request to his commanding officer, Captain Fremantle, whose vessel, HMS *Juno*, was expected in Fijian waters later in the year.\(^{165}\) Although he strongly favoured cession of the whole of Fiji to Great Britain, Denham could not entertain any offer made in such improper circumstances. In any case, to do so would have exceeded his instructions and earned his government’s displeasure. Commenting on the abandoned plans for the ceremony at Levuka, Denham declared “the flag hoisted must be clean”.\(^{166}\)

At the meeting, Cakobau managed to convince his suspicious fellow chiefs of his good intentions towards Ovalau. Agreement was reached that when the Vunivalu returned from his forthcoming visit to Cakaudrove, in company with Tupou, a formal *soro* from the rebel Ovalau towns would be presented to him.\(^{167}\) With all effective opposition now at an end in central Fiji, Cakobau could turn his attention to a *matanitu* which had caused him much difficulty in the past. The company of Tupou would set the final seal to the Vunivalu’s supremacy and, the missionaries hoped, assist the progress of the *lotu* in Cakaudrove. Although the King regretted that so many lives had been lost at Kaba, he was still determined, if only now as an interested observer, to secure both peace and Christianity for Fiji.

Tupou, Cakobau and the fleet received a warm welcome in Taveuni, where Raivalita had emerged victorious from several months of warfare following his father’s murder in February 1854. He was formally installed as Tui Cakau in the presence of Tupou, a move implying the Tongan King’s approval and support.\(^{168}\) In response to a request from Raivalita, Tupou sailed to the island of Rabe, subject to Cakaudrove, where 20 Tongans, whose canoe had drifted to the island on a voyage from Lakeba to Tonga, had been killed and eaten. Rabe people had also killed two Somosomo chiefs, one of them a half-brother of Raivalita.\(^{169}\) When Tupou, on a mission “to make enquiries”, arrived at the island on board the *Cakobau*, he and his party were well received. It afterwards transpired that a man from Tuniloa island who came on board the *Cakobau* had planned to murder Tupou but lost heart. When the man returned to shore, six Tongans
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\(^{165}\) Calvert, Journal, 19 Jul 1855.
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\(^{169}\) Seeemann, 245.
who had earlier gone ashore from the King’s vessel were themselves murdered. The King immediately made sail back to Somosomo. Raivalita, who regarded these new atrocities at Rabe as the last straw, presented the island to Tupou as a personal fief and, supported by other Somosomo and Bauan chiefs, asked the King to return to Rabe and destroy its people. This Tupou bade fair to do. After landing on the island, his forces killed 280 people, while a further 60 drowned while attempting to escape. With the destruction complete, Rabe would thereafter be regarded by the King as his own property, separate from Ma’afu’s acquisitions in eastern Fiji. According to a future Prime Minister of Tonga, chiefs from Rabe had placed soil from Rabe at the King’s feet in a formal token of the transfer of sovereignty. In the immediate context of Tupou’s visit to Fiji, Rabe’s rebellion against Tui Cakau was at an end. The island joined Vanuabalavu and the Yasayasa Moala as lands under one form or another of Tongan control.

While Tupou, Cakobau and, presumably, Ma’afu, were visiting Cakaudrove, events occurred elsewhere in Fiji which, although not involving Tonga, were to undermine the sense of security that Cakobau enjoyed. In September the USS *John Adams*, Commander Edward Boutwell, having called at Rewa, arrived at Levuka to investigate further the claims arising from the destruction by fire of Consul Williams’ house six years earlier. When Boutwell presented the Bauan chiefs with a formal demand for US$30,000 “for depredations and losses to American citizens in Fiji”, the chiefs refused to sign a document admitting the justice of the claim. Boutwell knew that when the fire occurred, the island of Nukulau was not subject to Cakobau’s control. He was also aware that the Vunivalu did not enjoy authority commensurate with the title of Tui Viti, by which he had been known to Europeans for more than a decade. As unscrupulous as Consul Williams, Boutwell persisted in the claim “because [Cakobau] was the greatest robber, and had invited King George of the Tongan Islands, to join him in subduing Fiji”. After Boutwell finally raised the indemnity to US$43,686, Fremantle accused the American of “supercilious hauteur” and “extortion”. Noting that the alarm raised in the minds of many Fijians by Boutwell’s “peremptory proceedings” caused them to look to Great Britain for protection, Fremantle duly received from Tui Levuka a renewal of the offer to cede Ovalau. Believing that Tui Levuka and the other chiefs “were afraid of King George, of the French, of the Americans, and in fact of each other”, Fremantle informed Tui Levuka that discussions with the British government would be necessary before
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any decision could be made.\textsuperscript{175} As far as fear of the French was concerned, a French armed transport, the \textit{Perroquet}, had been anchored at Levuka only four days before the \textit{John Adams} arrived. On a voyage from Tahiti to New Caledonia, the ship had called “to see if the French clergy are in want of official aid”\textsuperscript{176}

Cakobau, returned from Taveuni and summoned aboard the \textit{John Adams}, signed an acknowledgement of the American debt “through fear” and was given two years to pay.\textsuperscript{177} For the Vunivalu, the situation was rich in an irony he would not have appreciated. His authority, limited as it was, had been underwritten by the military successes of Tupou and his forces, while his Fijian enemies had been reduced to impotence. Now, he was faced with demands as incomprehensible as they were unjust from a foreign power whose force could not be gainsaid. Only some form of British protection would offer him any chance of repudiating the American “debt”. Within four years, his security was to be further undermined by Ma`afu, whose power base in Lau would, following the departure of Tupou, enable him to challenge the Vunivalu for supremacy in Fiji.

The threat from Ma`afu was not immediately apparent when Boutwell was confronting Cakobau. Tupou and the bulk of his \textit{folau} left Wairiki on 18 September, reportedly “for home”.\textsuperscript{178} Within a month of this departure, Ma`afu formally handed over to his King all the lands he had acquired in Fiji. While there is no contemporary account of the occasion, it seems to have taken place on Vanuabalavu. In an 1864 statement to the then British Consul, Ma`afu recalled the circumstances:

In the latter end of 1855 (say November) King George, on his return from Bau and Taveuni, called at Vanua Balavu, the people in anticipation of his visit having built him a large house. On this occasion Ma`afu formally handed over to him the islands he had acquired, when King George said to Ma`afu, take care of them for the Tongan Government…\textsuperscript{179}

Three months after Ma`afu made this formal statement, he made further reference to his gift to Tupou:

Be it known unto all men that Vanua Balavu and all other lands situated in Fiji and which were formally given to me, that in the year … (1855) I gave the said lands to George Tubou and the Government of Tonga,

\begin{itemize}
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\item \textsuperscript{177} Enclosure in John Bates Thurston to Captain C.W. Hope, n.d., in Charles Webley Hope, Letter-Journals.
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\item \textsuperscript{179} Statement of Ma`afu, November 1864.
\end{itemize}
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

and the only connection I have now with the same am [sic] that I am governor of the people and Lands belong[ing] to the Government of Tonga and situate in Fiji.\(^{180}\)

The “lands” in question included the Yasayasa Moala, acquired by right of conquest, as well as Vanuabalavu and the islands within its reef, which had been ceded to Ma`afu in accordance with Fijian custom. It is important not to place too great an emphasis on Ma`afu’s claim that these islands “belong[ed] to the Government of Tonga”. In the 1860s, neither Tonga nor Fiji constituted a nation state in the modern sense of the term. The “Government of Tonga” then effectively meant Tupou himself. In handing over his lands to the King, Ma`afu was performing his duty as a Tongan chief. On 4 January 1856, only one week after his return to Tonga, Tupou addressed a fono of Tongatapu chiefs on the subject of Ma`afu. The King

spoke in the highest terms of Henry in Feejees, lamented much and said, how he was grieved at his loss – That he had no-one here, to whom he could look or upon whom he could depend. That if Henry was here he [Tupou] may then sit down and enjoy himself, or walk about at his pleasure.\(^{181}\)

Tupou’s confidence in Ma`afu meant that he would have been content to leave the Tongan lands in Lau, nominally his own, in the capable hands of his younger kinsman.

By 1864 and 1865, when Ma`afu’s formal statements were made, he had been exercising authority in the two island groups for a decade. That authority had never been called into question in the islands themselves. It is significant that Ma`afu chose to describe his sovereignty in terms of a gift from his king, rather than basing his rule on the usages of Fijian custom, as he was entitled to do. Ma`afu possibly believed that both the British Consul and the government he represented would readily understand and accept a sovereignty deriving from a Christian monarch whom they admired and whose government they recognised. There is no reason to suppose that the agreement of late 1855 implied any desire on Tupou’s behalf to exercise greater authority over Ma`afu’s Fijian lands in the future. Ma`afu’s authority in those lands was acknowledged to accord with both Fijian and Tongan custom. In that acknowledgement lay the seeds of his future appointment as Tui Lau.

The departure of Tupou and his folau for home must have occurred soon after the King’s agreement with Ma`afu. The fleet reached Lakeba on 15 October, where its 35 large canoes carrying 2,000 men impressed a visiting Irish professor as “a

\[^{180}\text{CRD, BCFP, Register No. 379, 4 Feb 1865.}\]
\[^{181}\text{John Thomas, Journal, 28 Dec 1855 and 4 Jan 1856.}\]
very pretty sight” as they sailed into the Tubou roadstead. During a stay of several weeks, awaiting a fair wind for Tonga, Tupou encountered Thomas West and his wife when they arrived from Ha’apai. West noted, perhaps naively, that the Tongans evinced “a genuine satisfaction that the Gospel would now have a free course through Fiji, such as it had never had before”. Tupou and his queen, who had accompanied him throughout his Fijian visit, joined over 1,000 of their fellow Tongans in attending a farewell service given in their honour. When the Wests were about to set sail, Tupou presented the missionary with his war club, saying that he could “afford to part with it now that the work in Fiji was done, in which it might have been of service to himself”. On a more practical level, the Tongans’ Lakeban hosts felt the strain of feeding such a vast number of people. The visit was prolonged, since the King had time to visit Ono, in southern Lau, whence he returned to Lakeba on 10 November. It seems likely that either on that voyage, or when he finally left for home, Tupou conveyed Ma’afu as far as Kabara. The latter is recorded as arriving back at Lakeba on 24 December, having been taken on board at Kabara by a visiting ship on its way to Lakeba. Tupou finally reached Tonga on Christmas Day, arriving at Ha’apai in time to appear “first at public worship”. “No warrior”, the resident missionaries remarked, “ever returned from battlefield less affected by the evils of war than King George”.

The implications of the tumultuous events of 1855 appear to have been lost on John Polglase, the Wesleyan missionary stationed at Lakeba. In his circuit report for the year, he recorded the astonishing observation that “no important political change has taken place in … the Feejee group during the year”. The truth was exactly the opposite; as Polglase should have been aware, the predominance of Christianity was now assured in Fiji, with the exception of central and western Viti Levu. While Thomas West ascribed the triumph of his faith to “the religious example of the Tonguese”, a more likely cause was the demonstrable inefficacy of the old gods, coupled with the conversion of Cakobau. Everywhere, even before the departure of the Tongans, resident missionaries were besieged by requests for teachers which could not be met in the short term. The eventual triumph of the faith was assured; even with the various outside pressures being felt by Fiji, the lotu was bound to triumph. Just as the military victories of the Tongans, on behalf of themselves and Cakobau, defeated the old gods, they also, as part of the same process, greatly hastened

182 Dr William Harvey to Mary Christy Harvey, 15 Dec 1855, in Dr William Harvey, Letters on Tonga and Fiji.
183 West, Ten Years…, 408.
184 William Harvey to Mary Christy Harvey, 12 Dec 1855.
185 Polglase, 12 Nov 1855.
186 ibid., 24 Dec 1855.
189 West, Ten Years…, 403.
190 ibid., 411; The Empire, 10 Dec 1855; Calvert to Hoole, 20 Oct 1855.
the destruction of the traditional Fijian polity. Adherence to the Christian God was in itself a check on chiefly power. The fragmented political structure of Fiji, with its ever-shifting alliances, meant that it was very difficult for one chief to exert himself over the whole group, as Cakobau hoped to do and as had occurred in Tonga, whose society was structured very differently to that of Fiji. The internecine struggle between Bau and Rewa had seemed likely to end with Rewan dominance in central Fiji, until Tongan intervention turned the tables and left Bau in the ascendency. Thenceforth, Tongan power was long to be a permanent feature of the polity of Fiji; no Fijian chief, however powerful, could be master of the group but by Tongan leave. The process whereby Fijians were to lose control of their own affairs had begun. The new and decisive ingredient in the Fijian political mix, Tongan power, was quickly centred on Ma`afu, who continued the process begun long before Kaba and not concluded until 1869, when he became a chief of Fiji in his own right.

Captain Fremantle, reporting at length to the British Admiralty at the conclusion of the visit of HMS Juno to Fiji and Tonga, questioned Tupou's motives and urged the British government to consider seriously the annexation of both groups. Fremantle wrote of the “doubtful aspects” of Tupou's expedition, of the “distress” caused by the need to provide food for the Tongan multitude and of the “swaggering domineering tone” of the visitors. More importantly, he accused Tupou of having, at the end of his “cruize”, taken possession of Lau, whose inhabitants, the most Christianised of all Fijians, supposedly preferred to be subject to Tongan rule. Fremantle concluded with some gratuitous advice to Tupou not “to wish to extend his dominions” following proceedings “as a friendly neighbour [which] have been very questionable”. No evidence was offered for Tupou's expansionist plans, which were supposed to include Samoa as well as Fiji.191 In any case, Tongan military involvement beyond the shores of Tonga had traditionally been undertaken to support allies or clients, not to extend Tongan rule. Conquest was not an issue, except in cases of rebellion, as had occurred on Tongatapu during the earlier years of Tupou's rule.

Fremantle was not the only commentator then and since to ascribe imperialist ambition to the King of Tonga. Yet there has never emerged any evidence that Tupou, in 1855, had any concerns beyond bringing peace to Fiji and aiding the spread of the lotu. West, who knew Tupou well, was aware of such views even before the Tongan fleet returned home:

> No doubt the proceedings of King George and the Tonguese generally will be closely scrutinised and strongly animadverted upon by interested parties who will not scruple to give currency to statements and remarks derogatory to the king's character.192
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West also made the point that after his successful campaign in Rabe, Tupou “once and firmly refused” the offer from Tui Cakau of the island of Taveuni.\footnote{West to GS, WMMS, 1 Nov 1855. It is impossible to believe that such an offer, if it occurred, was made in earnest.} Tupou’s restraint, under severe provocation, in dealing with the rebels on Ovalau, and his and Cakobau’s conspicuous acts of mercy towards defeated Rewan chiefs, were not consistent with any desire for conquest. In sailing home with his magnificent prizes, the canoe \textit{Ra Marama} and the schooner \textit{Cakobau}, Tupou would have been content with a job well done. It would be several more years before there emerged even the suggestion that he was casting longing eyes over the Lauan archipelago.

Although several writers have referred to Tupou’s “instructions” to Ma`afu at the end of the Tongans’ long stay in Fiji,\footnote{See, for example, R.A. Derrick, \textit{A History of Fiji}, Suva 1950, 117; Basil Thomson, \textit{The Diversions of a Prime Minister}, Edinburgh and London 1894, 364; Reid, 90.} there is no evidence for any arrangement between the two men beyond that detailed by Ma`afu in his statements considered above. Ma`afu’s successes in the Yasayasa Moala and in Vanuabalavu had occurred without any assistance from Tupou. His personal ambition was unquestionably great, as was his ability to seize any opportunity that presented itself. The power which he and the other Tongans resident in Fiji enjoyed at the end of 1855 owed more to his own achievements that it did to the endorsement he received from Tupou. Ma`afu would emerge within three years as a bitter and menacing rival to Cakobau. While, according to himself, he held his Fijian lands as a gift from his king, they and the power they represented were the fruits of his own military prowess and his diplomatic skill.
Fiji experienced relative tranquillity for more than a year following the tumult of 1855. Evidence for Maʻafu's activities during the months after Tupou’s departure is fragmentary, offering only occasional glimpses into the life of the man in whose hands Tongan power in Fiji now lay. He had been entrusted with the care of the Tongan lands in Fiji, with the measure of the King’s confidence in his kinsman apparent in the address he made to the assembled chiefs of Tongatapu one week after his return.¹ The King’s accolade suggests that he saw Maʻafu as a possible successor, both as Tuʻi Kānokupolu and as King. Maʻafu, the son of Tupou’s predecessor, was a generation younger than Tupou and, as governor of the Tongans in Fiji, enjoyed a power and prestige he could scarcely have foreseen when he quit Tonga nine years earlier.

The King’s only surviving legitimate son, Vuna, died in January 1862 and for more than 13 years thereafter there was no designated heir. The Constitution of 1875 would provide for the succession of Tupou’s eldest son, Tevita ‘Unga and his descendants, with the stipulation that should the King’s line fail, the succession would pass to Maʻafu, who was then Roko Tui Lau in the British administration of Fiji. The King’s mind at that time was revealed in an address to the Tongan Parliament. He said that he had planned for Vuna to succeed, but the latter’s death had left the succession question unresolved:

> For that reason, I said in my mind Maʻafu should succeed me. By our … Tongan ideas it is his turn but I see that if I follow the rule of changing backward and forward in the Royal Succession, yourselves also will have to do so. I am however of a mind that from father to children shall be the rule of succession, both for me and for yourselves … Maʻafu you are aware holds office in Fiji under the English government and moreover I think … that Maʻafu will not act against my wish and he will not be so wanting in love for Tonga as to act in a way that will create a disturbance in the country which would end in its loss.²

The King would have been aware that just as he had been Aleamotu’a’s chosen successor, Aleamotu’a had, according to an oral tradition, urged Maʻafu to wait for Tupou, in other words that he had wanted his son to succeed eventually.³ Now, Maʻafu’s official position in Fiji was seen as an effective bar to his
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succession in Tonga. However, circumstances had been very different 18 years earlier. Although Vuna was still alive in 1856, the possibility that the position of Tuʻi Kānokupolu might return to the senior branch of the family, in the person of Maʻafu, is likely to have been present in the King’s mind when he addressed the fono of Tongatapu chiefs.

Maʻafu appears to have remained at Lakeba until the second half of 1857. In February 1856, the captains of two ships just arrived in Levuka from Sydney desired his presence, sending a boat to Lakeba to fetch him. Although it is unknown why the captains were seeking him, John Thomas in Tonga provides us with a clue about one month later. Orders from Sydney had arrived for “the … Europeans living at Ovalau”, who were required “to disperse themselves and leave the islands to be governed by the King of Feejies – and not for them to set themselves up in … forming a party against him”. Ratu Mara seems to have been a prime mover in forming the “party”: in August, he was still on Ovalau, reportedly “getting up a plot against Cakobau”. Whether or not Maʻafu was also on Ovalau, he was certainly back in Lakeba by 26 May, when Mary Polglase noted that he had “settled” the “disgraceful affair” of a woman named Neomai. Maʻafu’s role among the Tongans on Lakeba would soon earn him uncharacteristic praise from John Polglase who, like many of his colleagues before and later, lamented the conduct of the visitors to the island:

the godly, the peaceful, the loyal subject, is often oppressed … by those who … are guided by no rule but their own vicious inclinations. Whatever may be the case in Tonga itself, the above is eminently true with regard to many of the Tonguese who [come] to Feejee. A whale’s tooth, a root of yang-gona, or some such paltry thing presented to Tui Nayau, entitles a Tonguese chief to cut a canoe in any of the subject islands; and the Feejeeans have to feed him and his people, [and] assist in felling trees and in dragging them to the place appointed. The Tonguese in return not infrequently steal everything they can from them, and descend to all that is mean and vile if they can only accomplish their ends. The chief being so intent on getting his canoe, he thinks little of the conduct of those whom he has brought with him … it is to be regretted that King George does not look into the conduct of those of his subjects who take up a temporary residence here.

Although little had changed in the more than two decades since Wesleyan missionaries first encountered Tongans resident on Lakeba, there now appeared a chief willing to urge at least a modicum of restraint:
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Complaints are constantly being taken to Ma’afu … respecting [the Tongans’] mode of proceeding in the different islands they visit, and it is but just to say that he does exert himself to prevent the [misbehaviour]. There is reason to believe that his mind is being awakened to the responsibility of his position, from the fact that he manifests a desire to do good in various ways, and we [believe] too that there is a gracious work going on in his heart, still the evil does exist, and punishment is not inflicted on evildoers to the extent that it ought.\(^8\)

Polglase appeared willing to ascribe a virtuous motive to Ma’afu’s efforts to control his fellow countrymen. The missionary couple were not alone in their desire to sustain Ma’afu’s quest for grace: just three days after Mrs Polglase praised Ma’afu’s pastoral zeal, John Thomas, once the chief’s nemesis, wrote a note from Nuku’alofa “to accompany a copy of the Scriptures to Fejees – for … Maafu called the son of the king”.\(^9\) Ma’afu’s favour in the eyes of Tupou appeared undiminished. However, the most significant event of the year for him was the loss at sea of Vuetasau, his former companion-in-arms and nephew and heir of Tui Nayau. The two had once been confederates; now that Vuetasau was gone, the reliance of Tui Nayau on Ma’afu could only have increased.

Although the authority vested in Ma’afu by Tupou and acknowledged by the Lauan chiefs appears to have remained unchallenged during this period, Tongan power in Fiji did not exist in a vacuum. In Tonga itself, Tupou remained intent on gaining for his kingdom the British protection he had sought in vain during the late 1840s. In May he wrote to Queen Victoria seeking a treaty with Great Britain, assuring her that Tongans were now cultivating their lands and sought to “exchange [their] products for the improvements … comforts and embellishments of Civilized Life”. The British were offered trading privileges and protection for their subjects in Tonga in return for a treaty guaranteeing the islands’ independence. The Colonial Office remained sceptical: “King George says one word for the independence of his people and two for himself. It is a question which I would leave to the Foreign Office”.\(^10\) While the King’s letter was not forwarded from Sydney for more than two years, he gained the support of Captain Stephen Fremantle, who visited Tonga in command of HMS \textit{Juno} later in 1856. Fremantle noted the existence there of disaffected “malcontents … abetted by the French missionaries”, as well as the frequent visits of French men of war sailing between New Caledonia and Tahiti.\(^11\) Although Tupou, who had once referred to French offers of friendship as “a deadly shade”, favoured British protection over that of any other foreign power, he remained determined
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not to be “subject to any other people or kingdom in this world”. The most the British were prepared to do was to consider a consular appointment in Fiji. It was thought that the presence of a consul might be conducive to mitigating the “state of anarchy” there and to easing Tupou’s anxiety. In both groups, “there was said to be an opening for British trade”.

None of these considerations was then of any great moment in Fiji. The “state of anarchy”, which was nothing new, did not diminish either Ma’afu’s position of strength among the resident Tongans or the threat posed by that strength to the indigenous chiefs. He made a visit home to Tonga in December:

News was brought that a canoe had arrived at Hihifo from Feejees. It is reported that some warrior chief from Feejee – who caused the late war there with King George has come to Maafu of Feejee to humble himself and ask pardon.

It is probable that during Ma’afu’s visit, consultations took place between him, Tupou and other chiefs, but to what purpose is unknown. Ma’afu returned to Lakeba in March 1857, following a “long sail” which likely included his stay in Tonga. He quickly readjusted to life in Lau: after a conversation with John Polglase, during which “he evinced a very teachable spirit”, Ma’afu turned his attention to the missionary’s spiritual comforts. Tui Nayau, just returned from a visit to Ono, was given a feast including upwards of 80 turtles. When the Polglases did not receive the share they expected, Ma’afu remedied the situation by sending them, as his personal gift, two large turtles and some taro. Whether this thoughtfulness foretold a more harmonious relationship with the missionaries remained to be seen.

Social niceties were usually a diversion for Ma’afu. Soon after his return, he received a letter from Vakawaletabua, Tui Bua, a Christian and the son of a Tongan mother, “requesting help against the Heathen”, a reference to forces belonging to Ritova, Tui Macuata. Ma’afu referred the request to Cakobau who, according to Lakeban sources, replied that preparations for war should be made.

On Polglase’s urging, Ma’afu despatched a canoe to Bau, supposedly to seek clarification before involving himself in any hostilities. He told the missionary he would proceed to Somosomo instead, explaining that he was
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intent on helping free an English ship that had run aground on a reef. It is likely that he made straight for Bua, if only for a short time. South of Bua lies the vanua of Solevu, which then owed its primary allegiance to Bau and whose people were traditional enemies of the neighbouring Buan village of Nadi. When the heathen chief of Solevu, bent on the destruction of neighbouring Christian villages, surrounded one of them with the intention of starving out the inhabitants, a Tongan local preacher borrowed a canoe from William Wilson, the resident Wesleyan missionary, and sailed to Bau, in order to request urgent help from Cakobau. The Vunivalu responded quickly, arriving with a “small fleet” and 300 men, along with “some Tonguese”. After almost all the inhabitants of Solevu had fled into the bush or been taken prisoner, Cakobau’s forces burned the town, not neglecting to protect the resident Catholic priest and his property. In a move revealing much of his state of mind, Cakobau had asked the Tongans who came to him from Bua not to send to Lakeba to seek assistance from Ma’afu.

This local conflict quickly assumed a sectarian aspect. Cakobau’s intervention turned the tables against the heathen forces, to the discomfiture of local French priests, who threatened to send to New Caledonia for a French warship. Priests, in Fiji and elsewhere in the Pacific, would sometimes threaten the intervention of a French man-of-war “as a kind of moral suasion”. According to Wesleyan missionary John Binner, the Vanua Levu “heathens” were calling themselves lotu popi or lotu katali ka, demonstrating, not a commitment to Roman Catholic dogma, but rather a determination to confront the lotu weseli which bade fair to change their world forever. To the inherent instability of this matanitu was added a veneer of sectarian confrontation that was scarcely understood and which carried with it the faint but sinister threat of imperialist force ready to be summoned when required. That such a force existed only in the minds of those who raised its spectre scarcely mattered in the exigencies of the moment. The complexities, real and imagined, of south-western Vanua Levu provided ideal opportunities for intervention by Ma’afu.

Tui Bua was no stranger to Tongan intervention. In August 1855, no less a personage than Tungi Halatuitui’a, a Tongan chief of august rank, had visited Bua, where he successfully persuaded Tui Bua to embrace Christianity. On this occasion, as he later revealed, Tui Bua acted against Cakobau’s expressed
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17 John Polglase, 2 and 21 Apr 1857.
18 William Wilson to GS, WMMS, 10 May 1857, WMMS LFF; John Binner to John Eggleston, 20 Apr 1857, MOM 165.
19 Wilson to GS, WMMS, 10 May 1857.
20 Statement of Tui Bua, LCC 586.
21 Royce, 14 May 1857.
23 Binner to Eggleston, 20 Apr 1857.
24 Bua Circuit Report 1855, MOM 5. Tungi would have been Tu’i Ha’atakalaua, had that title still been conferred.
wish in making a direct appeal to Ma`afu. Another Buan ally, Tui Wainunu, “a Papist and a perfect devil”, joined forces with Ritova as well as Tui Levuka and Ratu Mara, the ubiquitous stormy petrel of mid nineteenth century Fiji. William Wilson described Tui Wainunu as “the chief employed by the town of Solevu to do its pleasure in making war”, while Wilson’s colleague James Royce believed, with justification, that each of these chiefs was “an outlaw and a nuisance”. Yet another dimension to this conflict emerged in July when the Europeans on Ovalau expressed their “alarm” over a rumour that Tupou was returning to Fiji, supposedly bent on the destruction of Levuka. Ma`afu had not yet intervened, since he was still on Lakeba in mid July.

Ma`afu’s involvement became increasingly likely as the situation in Bua deteriorated. In August came the news that the forces of Mara and Tui Levuka had murdered the Christian chief of Nadi village, as well as a local preacher. Other Buan chiefs allied with Mara were sending “property” to villages on Viwa and in Rewa, villages allied with Bau, many of which “accepted the property, thereby pledging themselves to co-operate in the designs of their abettors to accomplish the downfall of Bau”. For once, rumour among the Europeans on Ovalau was factual: Cakobau, now “in apprehension of danger … despatched two messengers to King George of Tonga … to solicit his counsel and aid”. Intervention by Ma`afu came following Tui Bua’s appeal to him. Forces belonging to both chiefs “attacked Macuata as far as Udu and Cikobia” before returning to ravage Solevu, a campaign lasting three months. During the “war”, Ma`afu “sent for [Tui Wainunu] to go on board [Ma`afu’s boat] so that peace might ensue and then … took him prisoner”. Ma`afu acted at the request of Tui Bua, who sought to save Tui Wainunu’s life after the destruction of the forces of Solevu and Wainunu. The so-called Tongan war ended when Buli Solevu soro’d to Tui Bua and Ma`afu with tabua and baskets of earth. Twenty-eight years later, the “war” was to be remembered in Bua with

a grand feast to commemorate Tui Bua’s great victory at Solevu over twenty years ago, when Ma`afu swept Macuata, taking Ritova and Tui
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25 Statement of Tui Bua. See also Evidence of George Wakawale Tabua, Tui Bua, 30 Aug 1878, LCC R929 Lovoni.
26 Royce, 14 May 1857. For a detailed account of Tui Wainunu’s participation in the war, see Evidence of [his son] Tabu Lovoni, 21 Aug 1878, LCC R929 Lovoni.
27 William Wilson to GS, WMMS, 10 May 1857.
28 Royce, 17 and 22 Jul 1857.
29 John Polglase, 21 Jul 1857.
30 Royce, 17 Aug 1857.
31 John Malvern to Eggleston, 1 Jan 1858, WMN(A), No. 6, Oct 1858, 90.
33 Evidence of Tabu Lovoni, LCC R929 Lovoni.
34 Evidence of Tui Bua, LCC R929 Lovoni.
35 For a detailed account of the fighting, see Evidence of Tui Bua, LCC R929. See also Tui Bua’s evidence to the 1883 Land Claims Commission, quoted in H.B. Richenda Parham, “A brief account of a well-known chief: Ra Masima, Tui Bua”, TPFSSI, Vol. 2, 100–102.
Wainunu prisoners. He did not advance beyond the southern coastline and thus victory was achieved, thus Tui Bua saved his bacon, wherefore he now proposes to sacrifice the bacon of the whole province. The levy [for the feast] is one pig and one hundred yams for every man, and one mat for every woman.36

For Tui Bua, the welfare of his matanitu involved more than the defeat of a small, though rebellious, vanua. Nevertheless, despite the alliance between them, born of expediency, Tui Bua appeared apprehensive of Ma`afu’s wider ambitions.

While Ma`afu and his wary ally were gaining victory at Solevu, the former’s ascendancy in Lau came under some scrutiny in Australia. Charles St Julian, the Sydney law reporter who had corresponded with Tupou,37 published a monograph concerning the Tongan presence in Lau in the aftermath of Kaba. Tupou and his subjects living in Lau were described as “allies of Cakobau in the punishment of his rebellious subjects and foes”, a description as apposite in 1857 as it would have been two years earlier.38 Moreover, “by way of giving a character of permanence and solidity to this new dominion [Lau]”, Tupou had appointed Ma`afu as chief judge there.39 There was supposedly a twofold purpose to the appointment: to provide “an aspect of union and concentrated rule to [Tupou’s] Fijian sovereignties” and also to remove “to an honourable position at a distance a chieftain who might, one day, have proved troublesome at home”.40 St Julian’s suggestion that Tupou wished to keep Ma`afu “at a distance” for fear of his being “troublesome” is flatly contradicted by the King’s publicly expressed wish during the previous year that Ma`afu were at home in Tonga.41 St Julian goes on to refer to Tupou’s “right of conquest” in Lau and avers that only the lack of an “efficient system of government” in Tonga itself prevented the King extending his dominion over Fiji and Samoa.42 The use of such legal terms as “sovereignties” and “right of conquest” owed more to St Julian’s vivid imagination than to the realities of Lau in the mid 1850s. If he is correct in his reference to Ma`afu’s appointment as “chief judge”, the move was further evidence of the King’s confidence in his kinsman, whose power in Lau he had earlier recognised with the appointment

36 FT, 21 Oct 1885.
37 See Ch. 5.
40 ibid.
41 See above, n. 1, Ch. 5 n. 181.
42 St Julian, 13. See also St Julian’s unsigned letter to the editor of the SMH, which accuses Tupou I of “clearly [having] an eye to the acquisition of sovereignty over Samoa, as well as over the Feejees”, SMH, 9 Jan 1858, 5. The letter prompted an immediate protest to the editor from John Eggleston, who described part of its contents as “a slander upon [the King’s] character”. This in turn resulted in a lengthy letter from St Julian to Eggleston, seeking to justify his views. (Eggleston to the Editor of SMH, 11 Jan 1858; St Julian to Eggleston, 13 Jan 1858, ML As 60).
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as governor.\textsuperscript{43} To write in terms of “sovereignty” is to ascribe to Tonga a status as a sovereign state it did not possess. The concept was still alien to the nineteenth century Pacific, when sovereignty effectively lay in the hands of the man who wielded the greatest power. In Lau, in 1857, that man was Ma’afu.

It is unfortunate that the period of more than a year following the early hostilities on Vanua Levu is one of the most obscure of Ma’afu’s adult life. It was later stated that during this period he “divided his time between Lomaloma and Lakeba”,\textsuperscript{44} and it seems safe to say that, if he was not living permanently at Lomaloma, he was spending considerable time there. The future United States Vice Consul, Isaac Brower, stated in evidence before the Lands Claims Commission in 1880 that he “saw” Ma’afu at Lomaloma in 1857. The Tongan was then “exercising the authority of a chief, having vessels built for him, which he said were for Tonga”. This was at a time when Vanuabalavu was supposedly suffering from “the oppression and unjust conduct of many Tonguese who resort thither”. On Lakeba, the “darkness and worldliness” of many resident Tongans was reflected in the fall from grace of five of six local preachers who had come down from Tonga during the previous four years in order to cut canoes.\textsuperscript{45} More importantly, Ma’afu had, according to Brower, been to Levuka to consult Consul Williams. “He had spoken to Williams about the American indemnity, provided the US would recognise him as king of Fiji. I have had this from Williams’ own lips”.\textsuperscript{46} If Brower’s claim is accurate, it reveals the full extent of Ma’afu’s ambition at a time comparatively early in his career. Nevertheless, the evidence should be treated with caution. Brower was speaking in 1880, twenty years after Williams’ death. By that time, the extent to which Ma’afu had changed the history of Fiji was apparent. It would have been all too easy, then, to ascribe to him an aspiration which he almost certainly possessed 23 years earlier, but which he would have been unlikely to articulate in so forthright a manner. It is significant that, in his lengthy and detailed despatches to the U.S. State Department at the time, Williams made no mention of any such request from Ma’afu. More pertinent are the Consul’s reports wherein he writes of the “Tonguese exotick” who control Lau and

\begin{quote}
make such laws as best suit them. [They] have been a blessing to that part of Fiji, but for them there would have been no business done … they … have made the Fijian work making [coconut] oil … Beche de Mar, and Arrow root, causing a considerable commerce from that part.
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{43} St Julian might have been referring to Tupou’s appointment of Ma’afu as joint Governor of the Tongans in Fiji, made in 1853.
\textsuperscript{45} Lakemba Circuit Report 1858, WMMS Minutes of Mission District Meetings, MOM 6.
\textsuperscript{46} Evidence of Isaac Mills Brower, 6 July 1880, LCC 930.
\end{footnotes}
Notwithstanding the Tonguese are not a very industrious race of men themselves, but for them the Fijians at Lau … would have been comatose to this day.\textsuperscript{47}

While Williams is here concerned with the commercial impact of the Tongans, he is unlikely to have overlooked such naked political ambition, had it been confided to him.

During the week when the above despatch was written, Cakobau sent a request to Lakeba for assistance, following a fresh outbreak of hostilities in Vanua Levu, where 27 Christians were killed near Nadi. Cakobau was also faced with the rebellion of one of his own Bauan chiefs, his half-brother Dranibaka, who had joined the heathen forces on Vanua Levu.\textsuperscript{48} Mara, “at his old game again”, not content with fomenting trouble in Bua, sailed to Kadavu, where he “turned some of the towns” and encouraged the building of war fences against any attack by Cakobau’s forces.\textsuperscript{49} Faced with the disaffection of his brothers and other chiefs, Cakobau “several times had to seek [the] Tongans’ aid”.\textsuperscript{50} In the midst of this renewal of war, 14 Lomaloma chiefs addressed a letter to the British Consul. They expressed their extreme disquiet with the news “that Cakobau had given all the Fiji Islands to England … Cakobau don’t rule all the Windward Islands of this group; is not chief to Windward – one ruler to our land Ma’afu … We … have given the … land to Ma’afu to rule over”.\textsuperscript{51} Although Ma’afu was not among the 14 chiefs to sign the letter, his hand might readily be seen in its conception. The immediate significance of the protest is that it constitutes the first documented reference to the question which would not be settled for 16 years: whether Great Britain could be persuaded to assume some form of control over all or part of the group and so ease the growing burdens on the shoulders of Cakobau.

This concern over cession anticipated the arrival in Fiji in September of William Pritchard, the first resident British Consul. Pritchard wasted no time in reinforcing Cakobau’s belief in the benefits of cession, while advising the Governor of New South Wales, Sir William Denison, that the desire for British annexation in Fiji was increasing.\textsuperscript{52} Pritchard deprecated the Tongans’ “veneration” for their chiefs, “inculcated in their infancy, cherished in their youth [and] matured in their manhood”. For this reason, he believed, Tongan Christian teachers working in Fiji advocated the “cause of King George” as much as they did “the Cause of God and religion”. While they were, “on the

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{47} John B. Williams to U.S. State Dept, 12 Feb 1858, USC Laucala 3.
\textsuperscript{48} Royce, 17 Feb 1858.
\textsuperscript{49} ibid., 21 Feb, 19 and 30 Apr, 8 May 1858.
\textsuperscript{50} Vewa Circuit Report, June 1858, WMMS Minutes of Mission District Meetings, MOM 5.
\textsuperscript{51} Protest to British Consul by Lomaloma chiefs, 19 May 1858, enc. with John B. Williams to U.S. State Dept, 30 Sep 1858, USC Laucala 3.
\textsuperscript{52} William Pritchard to Foreign Office, 15 Sep 1858, FO 58/88; Pritchard to Sir William Denison, 24 Sep 1858, CO 201/504; Denison to Pritchard 12 Oct 1858, CO 201/504.
\end{footnotes}
whole, efficient teachers, many of them are [also] agents of their King, or, in Fiji particularly, of his representative Ma’afu”. 53 Pritchard’s consular colleague Williams stated that the king “is experiencing rule” over Lau in the persons of “a powerful chief … Ma’afu, with considerable many of his people”. Williams’ primary interest, as always, lay in the so-called American debt. Since Tupou supposedly ruled part of Fiji, he should be held liable for part of the debt, Williams believed. He informed his State Department that according to the “treaty” made on board the USS John Adams in October 1855, any government taking possession of any part of Fiji must share responsibility for the debt. 54 The vexed questions of cession and the American demands for payment, along with the unresolved and deadly quarrels in Vanua Levu, meant that the pressures building on Cakobau were more difficult of resolution even than those of the closing months of the Rewan conflict. Ma’afu, not for the first time, kept a low profile, his power acknowledged by the Americans and his influence on events confined to the protest articulated by the Lomaloma chiefs. He was well aware that any form of British control over Fiji, however benign, would inevitably damage his own prospects.

Lack of direct evidence during these months means that little can be said concerning Ma’afu’s activities and future plans at a time when Fiji moved rapidly into the spotlight of two foreign powers. Pritchard drafted an offer of cession in October 1858 in response to a plea for help from Cakobau, following a renewal of the American claims. An American warship, USS Vandalia, under Commander Arthur Sinclair, had arrived in Fiji to investigate the “debt”. When Sinclair fixed the sum owing at $45,000 and gave Cakobau one year to pay, the Vunivalu realised that desperate and unprecedented measures were needed. 55 The result, a formal offer of cession signed by Cakobau on 12 October, was a document equally remarkable for its candour and for its falsehoods. The candour lay in the ready acknowledgement of Cakobau’s American “debt”, of his inability to pay within the specified period, and of the evils then likely to ensue. The document’s falsehoods included Cakobau’s claim to enjoy “full and exclusive sovereignty” over all the islands of Fiji and to be recognised in that position by the governments of Great Britain, France and the United States. Pritchard believed that the pretence of sovereignty and recognition were essential if the offer were to have any chance of acceptance. Cakobau,

53 William Pritchard, Polynesian Reminiscences, London 1866, 294–295. See also n. 139, below.
55 James Calvert to Eggleston, 18 Oct 1858, WMMS LFF. See also Bau Circuit Report for the year ending June 1859, WMMS Minutes of District Meetings 1858–1860, MOM 6.
understanding little and fearing much, had no choice but to comply. In return, the British government was to pay $45,000 to the United States in full settlement of the “debt”, while Cakobau was to convey to the British 200,000 acres “in fee simple”, a requirement which, given the true nature of his “sovereignty”, it would be impossible to fulfil.  

Although Cakobau had recently signed a “Convention” with France, the nature of Fiji’s polity meant that he was always destined to be on the back foot when dealing with any foreign power seeking to meddle in the islands. The divisions entailed by the importance of the mataqali and their determination to preserve ancestral lands meant that Fiji could not hope to progress beyond a collection of matanitu whose relationships were bedevilled by the ever-changing fortunes of marriage alliances, vasu rights and military prowess. The structure of Fijian society militated against the kind of unity Tupou had achieved in Tonga. Cakobau held greater prestige than any other Fijian chief, but was far from enjoying any kind of paramountcy. Such power as he did possess was seriously weakened by the American claim that, as he knew for certain by 1858, would not go away. After his conversion to Christianity, with disputes still rife even within his own family, he could only be swept along by the lotu, rather than use it to his advantage. In his request to the Tongans in Bua not to seek assistance from Ma’afu, Cakobau had demonstrated his distrust of the chief. We may suppose that fear of Tongan ambition now weighed as heavily in the Vunivalu’s mind as did his despair over the unjust claims of his American tormentors.

The situation in Fiji in 1858, with Cakobau ready to place his precarious ascendancy in British hands, meant that foreign involvement in, and domination of, Fijian affairs could only increase. That likelihood did not mean, however, that the British government would be inclined to accept the offer of cession. Denison, seeking to influence Whitehall on the matter, expressed his belief that any danger posed by the French to British interests in the Pacific to be “trifling”. The British government concurred; the Colonial Office, while aware of growing pressure from British missionaries and residents in the Pacific for some form of protection, felt that French activities in the area were “wholly unimportant to Great Britain in a political point of view”. Pritchard, who
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56 For the text of the offer of cession, see G.C. Henderson, ed., *The Evolution of Government in Fiji*, Sydney 1935, 1–4. See also *SMH*, 3 Dec 1858, 4; John B. Williams to Sir William Denison, 7 Dec 1858, FO58/91.
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possessed no authority to negotiate with Fiji’s chiefs on the matter of cession, accepted Whitehall’s reluctance to annex the islands as a challenge. It was later said of the Consul that he

was an enthusiastic advocate of annexation. He believed that the looms of Lancashire were to be kept going with Fijian cotton, and that the dearth of rags in [Britain’s] paper mills was to be made good by large importations of the bark of Fijian trees. Like all pioneers of a new idea, he did not meet with the success he merited, and in one quarter … he was … denounced as a Russian agent.\(^{60}\)

Whether or not he was motivated by altruism in 1858, as this tribute might suggest, he later claimed not to have realised the very limited scope of Cakobau’s authority, saying that when the Deed of Cession was signed, “my impression was … that Cakobau was the actual as well as the recognised King of Fiji”.\(^{61}\)

All these considerations lend, in retrospect, a surreal quality to a ceremony at which a bewildered Fijian chief signed away a sovereignty he did not possess to the representative of a foreign government that had no desire to accept it.

Ma’afu’s influence was paramount among those chiefs who signed. Initially, both Cakobau and Tui Cakau refused to make their marks on the document, despite threats from Pritchard to unseat them and appoint others in their place if they refused. When Pritchard went on to threaten the deposition of Tui Nayau as well, Ma’afu became “afraid”. He said to witness Joeli Bulu, “tell Tui Bau and Tui Cakau to give up their lands; if we were asked to give, and might please ourselves, it would have been well, but this is compulsion”. Bulu, himself “afraid”, quit the meeting, leaving Ma’afu to urge the reluctant chiefs to sign.\(^{62}\)

In the event, all the chiefs present did so except Tui Nayau. Pritchard renewed his threat:

‘I will appoint another, and you, Tui Nayau, shall be put down.’ Tui Nayau said, ’It is well. A Chief from Tonga is made Chief of Lakeba; a Chief from Lakeba goes to Tonga and is made Chief there’. The Consul said that Ma’afu should be appointed in his place; and Tui Nayau said, that would be well. Tui Nayau was then silent, refusing to give up his land.\(^{63}\)

Tui Nayau, who had earlier observed that one end of his land joined to Tonga while the other pointed towards Fiji,\(^{64}\) was likely emboldened to resist the Consul’s threats because he felt himself to be under the protection, and to some

\(^{61}\) Pritchard to Col. William Smythe, 14 Jan 1861, enc. in Pritchard to Russell, 6 Jan 1863, FO 58/98.
\(^{62}\) Evidence of Joeli Bulu, Report of the Commission Appointed to Inquire into the Conduct of Her Majesty’s Consul at Fiji, with Minutes of Evidence, Sydney 1862, 51, FO58/108.
\(^{63}\) Evidence of Ratu Ilaisa Nuicikacika, Report of the Commission...
\(^{64}\) ibid.
extent the authority, of Ma’afu. The latter’s influence also counted with his ally, Tui Bua, who stated that he would “follow” Ma’afu, who had aided him in his troubles after Cakobau had four times refused to do so. Tui Bua signed on the following day, following Ma’afu’s specific request.\(^6^5\)

Ma’afu urged the principal Fijian chiefs to sign the deed of cession because he felt it was the most sensible course of action to take. The insistent Pritchard carried with him the threat, however vague, of some kind of retribution if the chiefs did not comply. Any retribution would involve the British even further in Fijian affairs, thus thwarting whatever plans Ma’afu had further to enhance his power in the islands. On the other hand, if the chiefs did sign, Pritchard would sail away to attempt to convince his government. During the Consul’s inevitably long absence, Ma’afu could exploit the situation on the ground to his advantage and so place himself in a position of greater strength when Pritchard returned.

Ma’afu, Pritchard and the leading chiefs were not the only players on the field. Mara, supported by some dissident Europeans, supposedly including Brower, remained ready to foment trouble whenever opportunity arose.\(^6^6\) John Polglase described Mara as “at present one of the most active in the service of the devil”.\(^6^7\) For the moment though, Ma’afu dominated play. Following Pritchard’s departure for London in November, the ink barely dry on the deed of cession, Ma’afu appears to have begun an attempt “to make peace between Bau and his enemies”, although Mary Polglase entertained doubts about his intentions.\(^6^8\) If the report were true, his efforts were not directed towards Bua. In mid December, five young Christian men were murdered near the Wesleyan mission at Tiliva in Cakaudrove, apparently on the orders of Ritova. Three days later, although not in response to the murders, five Tongan canoes arrived at Tiliva from Lakeba, bringing a new *drua* for Tui Bua. William Wilson noted that “the Tonguese have been very busy presenting and receiving property, and preparing for a voyage to Bau”. It is unlikely that the proposed voyage formed part of any plans for peace by Ma’afu, since only a week later, the “whole neighbourhood” of Tiliva was “in an uproar”, preparing for the expected arrival of Cakobau, escorted by a large Tongan fleet. The Vunivalu’s purpose was “to make enquiry of the heathen chiefs why they will not cease for war, being often warned and entreated”. Wilson warned that “if they do not apologise it is probable there will be a battle”.\(^6^9\)

\(^{65}\) Evidence of Tui Bua, *Report of the Commission*...

\(^{66}\) John Binner to GS, WMMS, 29 Oct 1858, WMMS LFF.

\(^{67}\) Lakemba Circuit Report 1858, WMMS Minutes of District Meetings 1858–1860, MOM 6.

\(^{68}\) John Polglase, 21 Dec 1858.

\(^{69}\) William Wilson, Journal, 17, 20 and 27 Dec 1858, quoted in Wilson to John Eggleston, Feb 1859, WMN(A), No. 11, Jan 1860, 169.
Despite appearances in Bua, Ma`afu did engage in peacemaking efforts at Bau during the following month. In January he arrived there with a force variously reported to be between 500 and 1,000 men, “to assist in subduing the rebellion of the Bau dominions”. The “rebellion” involved a family dispute between six chiefs who were relatives of Cakobau. Ma`afu, whose men had arrived armed with muskets, joined Cakobau in examining and passing sentence on the “rebel” chiefs who were brought before them. On 14 January, “[Ratu] Mara and Naulivou … were examined in the presence of Ma`afu, the Vunivalu and many Tongan and Fijian chiefs. They had no excuse to offer for their conduct”. Other chiefs were similarly examined, since

Ma`afu and the Vunivalu [were] determined to settle all at once. The Vunivalu is clear: the rebels are without excuse. A general meeting of the Chiefs and people from all places near Bau is to take place. All will be made to declare for or against the Vunivalu and then if there must be fighting they will fight.  

Binner was confident that the strident efforts of Cakobau to deal with his recalcitrant relatives and other “rebel” chiefs would succeed, although there remained danger from “some bad whites who are leaving no stone unturned to accomplish the destruction of the Bau chief”. Here, for once, we have unequivocal evidence that Ma`afu was using his influence in the interests, not merely of peace in general, but also of Cakobau and central Fiji. Was he preparing the ground for the expected British administration, or was he taking advantage of an opportunity to draw the fangs of Mara, while simultaneously weakening the position of other rebel chiefs and of dissident Europeans? It was not only Cakobau who stood in the way of Ma`afu’s ambitions.

The apparently successful negotiations during January appear not to have settled matters in the immediate vicinity of Bau. In March a “rebel” chief, accompanied by one of Ma`afu’s men, called on Consul Williams at Levuka and requested him to mediate between his forces and Cakobau. Williams cautiously agreed, “if Ma`afu would be responsible for everything that might occur”. Three days later, Ma`afu arrived off Totogo in his schooner but did not land, owing to the simultaneous arrival of a large drua crowded with about 200 men. When large numbers of local people flocked to the beach to defend themselves
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73 Binner to Eggleston, 24 Jan 1859.
against the intruders, Ma`afu sent a message to Williams saying that he was afraid to come on shore. Despite Williams’ reassurances, Ma`afu remained on board his schooner. Believing that the presence of so many armed men was more appropriate for warfare than for peace negotiations, Williams decided against proceeding to Bau as a mediator. Decrying Fijian “treachery” in the presence of such an armed force, Williams was also critical of the “retinue of attendants” accompanying Ma`afu. He thought that had they not come, peace negotiations would have ensued. Ma`afu and his “attendants” sailed to neighbouring Moturiki, apparently regretting the persistence of family quarrels among the chiefs and a lost opportunity for peace.  

Insofar as Fiji possessed a seat of power in 1859, Ma`afu was present at its core, acting in concert with the Vunivalu in dealing with the most troublesome “rebel” chiefs. His apparent roles as peacemaker and as an associate of Cakobau in the latter’s attempts to set at least part of his house in order, did not deceive many of the more influential European residents of the group, to say nothing of the indigenous chiefs, whose thoughts were never committed to paper. In April, an illuminating exchange took place between Consul Williams and Robert Swanston, acting British Consul in Pritchard’s absence. Swanston informed Williams that following what he could “glean” from Ma`afu, the latter’s actions in Bau had resulted from “[a desire] on the part of Ma`afu to aggrandise himself. The latter individual will go on until he is ordered out of the group by one of us. What business has he, acting the firebrand in this way?” An interesting appraisal, coming as it did from a man who would act as Ma`afu’s secretary eight years later. In reply, Williams was remarkably prescient in placing the Tongan upstart in context:

sovereignty gives the right to the soil – proprietary and territorial. The usual … custom in Fiji … is that … the principal chief chose[n] … had absolute power to convey or transfer any land in his territory, whether belonging to himself, or any of his subjects … A change of rulers is effected by war – and a powerful chief of great influence, for instance the Tongan chief of the Windward Isles.

Williams used his intimate knowledge of Fiji to place Ma`afu’s actions in a context few other Europeans would have recognised at the time. History would bear out the Consul’s judgment.
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War, meanwhile, continued in Vanua Levu in the form of further Buan raids against Macuata. Cakobau, apprehensive that Ma`afu might become involved, wrote to him from Bua in May:

I don’t understand Ratu Mara going to [Macuata], I have not sent him, I don’t like his work – Don’t pay attention to what he may say to you. Don’t pay attention also to the advices the foreigners give you at this time. One of my messengers is gone, speak together, you will know from him what is my will.

Ma`afu informed Williams and Swanston in September that the above letter, written for Cakobau by missionary John Smith Fordham, was delivered to him by the Vunivalu in person. Although both missionary and chief appeared united in their determination to distance Ma`afu from the renewed hostilities, another missionary, James Royce, reported Bua to be quiet “through the interference of Ma`afu”.

In Macuata, as in many Fijian matanitu, divisions existed within the ruling family. In early 1859, the faction controlled by Ritova was in the ascendancy, although Ritova’s main rival, his kinsman Bete, could not be discounted, since the two had long been contending for supremacy. With the situation further complicated by Ritova’s rivalry with Tui Bua, firm ally of Ma`afu, the politics of Bua and Macuata remained inextricably linked. Swanston, who was to state that even in 1859 he “wished to see Ma`afu head chief in the Fijis”, believed that the origin of the war in Macuata was Ma`afu’s “ambition … to advance the interests of the Tongans in Fiji”. This was certainly an oversimplification, in view of the endemic disputes both within Macuata and between Ritova and Tui Bua, the last having begun more than a decade earlier. Although speaking in 1862, Swanston indicates that the nature and extent of Ma`afu’s motives had been understood three years earlier.

With the renewal of hostilities, Tui Bua quickly applied for help to Raivalita, Tui Cakau and to Cakobau, in both cases without success. He then wrote both to Ma`afu and to Wainiqolo, Ma`afu’s principal lieutenant and Tui Bua’s kinsman through his Tongan mother. Four separate messages were sent to Ma`afu, who repaired to Lakeba and set out from there in a fleet of druа, himself sailing in the Ra Marama. The fleet proceeded to Wairiki, where yet another message awaited him. Ma`afu sent Wainiqolo to Bua with instructions to make enquiry into the state of affairs there before rejoining him at Bau. In the meantime,  
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81 Evidence of Robert Swanston, Report of the Commission…
Ma`afu continued to Levuka, where he was joined by the Lakeba *vasu*, evidence that his campaign had been carefully planned. From there, the force proceeded to the Dreketi River in Macuata, where hostilities were quickly joined. While, according to Pritchard’s later account, Ma`afu had also promised his support to Ritova, there is some near-contemporary, if anonymous, evidence that he had also made friendly overtures to Bete. The subsequent fighting was notable for the savagery of Wainiqolo and his second in command Semisi Fifita. When Wainiqolo, who was accompanied by about 80 warriors, requested reinforcements, Ma`afu sent two *drua*. Two years later, the same anonymous hand described Tongan depredations in Macuata:

> The Tonguese did not content themselves with merely taking a place; they plundered and set fire to the dwellings, cut down the fruit trees, filled up the wells, violated the women, and put down as many of the fighting men as their ferocity prompted them. When Ma`afu and his hordes had been at a place, it was as if a cloud of locusts had descended. Not only had every vestige of provisions, pigs, fowls, yams and taros, disappeared, but the plantations themselves had been destroyed, forcing the poor natives to seek such wild roots as would enable them to eke out their miserable existence. Yet, after all their provisions, tools, native cloth, canoes and whatever movables they were possessed of had been carried off or destroyed, they were compelled to make cocoa-nut oil, sailsmasts and other articles for their conquerors.

Persistent rumours of missionary support for the violence led John Eggleston, secretary of the Australasian Wesleyan Missionary Society in Sydney, to protest to Ma`afu against a number of outrages and urging him to reveal himself as the true inspiration of his lieutenants’ work. That Ma`afu, for so long a proclaimed patron of the *lotu*, should attract missionary ire says much about the unrelenting ferocity that the Tongan forces wreaked on the unconverted Macuatans. Not for the first time, Ma`afu’s absence from the action permitted him some degree of dissociation from events that, in these cases, owed as much to the settlement of old scores as it did to the planned augmentation of Tongan power. Again not for the first time, he would benefit in the aftermath.

---
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After protracted fighting, Ritova had surrendered by October to the combined forces of Cakobau, Tui Cakau, Tui Nayau, Tui Macuata, Tui Dreketi and Ma`afu. He was conveyed as a prisoner to Taveuni and placed under Tui Cakau's authority. Tui Bua retained his office, while Macuata was divided into two, with Bete being made chief of the western district, while the eastern district was placed under the authority of his half-brother Bonaveidogo. Both brothers were to pay tribute to Ma`afu, as was his long-standing ally, Tui Bua. Finally, the vanua of Solevu, hitherto a foothold of Bauan influence between the matanitu of Bua and Cakaudrove, came under the suzerainty of Tui Bua. Once final submissions to them had taken place, the bulk of the Tongan forces was expected to return to Tonga. As if to stamp his authority on all the lands of northern Fiji, Ma`afu appointed Tui Cakau as “King of all Vanua Levu and the Windward Islands including Lakeba, Lomaloma etc. Bete is made Tui Macuata but all recognised Tui Cakau as master”. Joseph Waterhouse believed that Ma`afu's action was “partially the result of our [i.e. the missionaries’] coming here”, a view that probably arose from Ma`afu’s claimed identification with the mission cause. Since Raivalita was lotu, his appointment as “king” while his “heathen” fellow chief cooled his heels at Somosomo might be seen as an attempt by Ma`afu to legitimise his augmented power in the missionaries’ eyes. A Christian chief of such a large part of Fiji could not but please them and, by implication, the British government, under whose authority Ma`afu and Tui Cakau had both agreed to place themselves.

All of Vanua Levu and Taveuni was now subject either to Ma`afu’s direct authority, as in Bua and Macuata, or to his strong influence, as in Cakaudrove. The loss to Bau of Solevu symbolised the diminution of Cakobau’s power and prestige throughout the region, a change rendered more significant by the fact that there had never been open hostility between him and Ma`afu. The two were ostensible allies, both professedly Christian, and Ma`afu had voyaged to Bau for consultations before and during the Macuata troubles. Nevertheless, the Vunivalu could scarcely have witnessed a plainer demonstration of Ma`afu’s ultimate aims. Pritchard would later claim that Ma`afu’s objectives during this period were to attach himself to the Wesleyan influence, to “purchase” the goodwill of the resident Europeans and to “quieten” the suspicions of Cakobau. To these ends, he proclaimed his intention to remove all obstacles to the missionaries’ teaching, purchased arms and ammunition from the whites,
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6. “I shall be chief at Bau…”

paying with coconut oil, and visited Cakobau, supposedly seeking his approval for aid to Tui Bua and Bete.\(^\text{90}\) While Pritchard’s intimate involvement in Fijian politics over several years merits a serious assessment of his views, his account by no means tells the whole story.

The interpretation Ma`afu sought the world to place on his actions is revealed in his exchanges with Swanston. The Acting Consul had received complaints from Williams concerning Tongan actions in Macuata, while Père Jean-Baptiste Bréheret, head of the Catholic mission, believed that Ma`afu was carrying on a religious war. Swanston was so concerned about the potential political implications of these complaints that he travelled to Solevu, then under siege from Ma`afu. He alerted Ma`afu to the seriousness of the charges against him and urged him to come to Levuka to meet Williams and Bréheret. Ma`afu denied any interference with the Catholic mission, although he acknowledged receiving letters of complaint from Williams.\(^\text{91}\) He repudiated Williams’ complaints, declaring that he was “fighting for the chief of Bau and for the mission”. Ma`afu showed Swanston the letter from Cakobau, which he said was really from a missionary. On examining the letter, Swanston told Ma`afu that it was in fact from Cakobau. When Ma`afu objected that Cakobau had given him the letter personally, stating it was from a missionary, Swanston pointed out to Ma`afu that the letter bore Cakobau’s signature. Ma`afu professed his astonishment, declaring that since the letter was in the missionary’s handwriting, he had assumed the signature to be the missionary’s.\(^\text{92}\) It says something of Cakobau’s fear of Ma`afu that he should assert the authority of a missionary, rather than his own, in seeking to keep Ma`afu out of the Macuata wars.

Ma`afu was prevailed upon to accompany Swanston back to Levuka, where he succeeded in mollifying Williams and Bréheret. The former was in any case chiefly concerned with the deleterious affect the Macuata war had on American trading activities in Vanua Levu, while Bréheret sought to prevent any further encroachment on the few Catholic converts in the area.\(^\text{93}\) Once again Ma`afu was able to head off his critics. His achievements in Fiji up to this time, properly described as “breathtaking”,\(^\text{94}\) meant that the road to Bau now lay open before him. Of Ma`afu’s ambition there can be no doubt, while any suggestion that Tupou encouraged him cannot be sustained, although there might well have been tacit support from the King. At the time, Joseph Waterhouse wrote that

---

\(^{90}\) Pritchard, *Polynesian Reminiscences*, 226.

\(^{91}\) One such letter is John B. Williams to Ma`afu, 1 Aug 1859, USC Laucala 3. The Consul complained of threats made by Ma`afu’s men against an American citizen named George Trask “to destroy him and [his] schooner ‘Paul Jones’”. Williams also referred to an “act of piracy” whereby some Tongan men had commandeered a whaleboat belonging to Trask and another American named Christopher Carr.

\(^{92}\) The letter in dispute was almost certainly that dated 21 May 1859 and signed by Cakobau (see above, n. 76). It was penned by John Smith Fordham.


\(^{94}\) A.C. Reid, *Tovata I and II*, Suva 1990, 32.
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“Ma`afu was either implementing Tupou’s wishes or this was the first version of his own ideas on the future, featuring a united eastern and northern Fiji”. 95 The dilemma is scarcely easier of resolution today than it was then.

Cakobau meanwhile was able to rid himself of one thorn in his flesh. On 6 August, while hostilities were continuing in Vanua Levu, Ratu Mara and his associate KoroiLATikau were hanged at Bau. Mara, who acknowledged the justice of his fate, 96 had long been a dangerous rival to Cakobau and indeed a continuing threat to whomever held the reins of power in Fiji. His unbending opposition to the *lotu* had also earned him the enmity of the missionaries. 97 For Ma`afu, the end of Mara, in whose company he had voyaged to Fiji twelve years earlier, was welcome. Missionary James Royce saw Mara’s death as part of an attempt by Ma`afu to “drive … the rebels to one corner, where he intends to take them and bring the fighting to an issue”. 98 Mara’s daughter, Adi Mere Hennings, was later to provide anecdotal evidence of Ma`afu’s role in her father’s downfall. She spoke of the days when she and her German trader husband William Hennings were neighbours of Ma`afu at Lomaloma. Speaking inside her house, she said:

that big mirror over there was noticed by Ma`afu when he called in to see my husband one day, years after my father’s death, and he said to me with a sigh, ‘It was Mara who gave me my first big mirror (glass of shadows).’ So I answered him, ‘Yes, and it was you who caused his shadow to depart’. Whereupon he gave a guilty start and left the house, never to return again. 99

Ma`afu’s chagrin, feigned or otherwise, supposedly arose from his devious actions in pushing Mara in the direction of the gallows. According to Mara’s grandson Gustav Mara Hennings, son of Adi Mere, Ma`afu had offered his services as an intermediary between Mara and Cakobau, but purposefully declined to act in that capacity once Mara had arrived at Bau. After Mara, tired of waiting, had quitted Bau in anger, Ma`afu claimed to Cakobau that he (Ma`afu) had been let down and suggested that the Vunivalu pursue Mara and return him to Bau. 100

The duplicity supposedly achieved its purpose, since Mara had always posed a threat to Bau and his permanent removal could only help smooth Ma`afu’s path to power. However, these accounts from Mara’s daughter and grandson must seriously be called into question. Contemporary evidence from Joseph Waterhouse at Somosomo suggests that Mara and his extensive entourage reached Bau only after Cakobau had seen Mara at Ovalau and promised him a

---
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pardon if he would present himself at Bau. Fellow missionary Thomas Baker, who visited Bau in early May, found “that the King was not at home, having gone to Ovalau in order to capture the principal rebel chief Mara”. Upon Mara’s arrival at Bau three months later, he was bound, and hanged within 24 hours. Waterhouse called on his colleague Thomas Williams to “watch the results of this unfortunate affair. The day is passing in Fiji when might makes right”. So it was, but if Ma’afu was aware, he kept his own counsel.

Although Ma’afu’s presence in Levuka in September followed Swanston’s urging, he told Williams that he had come in response to the Consul’s letter, written more than six weeks earlier. He reassured Williams concerning specific grievances raised in the letter and, more importantly, expressed unqualified support for the free flow of commerce. He also stated his determination that no Christian sect should suffer interference. Ma’afu showed Williams the earlier letter he had received from Cakobau, drawing the Consul’s attention to the writer’s admonition not to pay attention to “advices” from foreigners, except for English Wesleyan missionaries. Williams commended Ma’afu for the way he had concluded peace with Solevu, in contrast with the Fijian habit of feasting on the bodies of slain enemies. He also reminded Ma’afu that in commercial matters, it was his responsibility to consult the resident Consuls, himself and Swanston. Ma’afu readily agreed, calling on Williams again five days later to assure him that he wished for peace on Ovalau. He was urged not to make war against Bau and to remember the dictum “peace and commerce”. In reporting these meetings to his State Department, Williams appeared confident that Ma’afu would follow his advice. Ma’afu was able to smooth the Consul’s ruffled feathers as well as he could those of any Wesleyan missionary.

Pritchard returned to Levuka on 1 November, bringing with him the news that the British government was still considering cession. One missionary expressed “sore” disappointment, believing that only cession would put an end to wars such as the recent one in Macuata. Cakobau quickly appealed to Pritchard to help “check the intrigues of Ma’afu” on the ground that since Fiji was already ceded to the Queen, Ma’afu was upsetting the status quo. From his position of greater strength, Ma’afu was ready to meet Pritchard on his own terms. Foreseeing an eventual British administration, he appeared anxious to throw in his lot with the eventual victors. The Consul reported Ma’afu’s words:
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Thakobau is an old savage. He has grown old in the customs of Fiji. He does not love the white man. I have been brought up with the white man. I have sailed the sea in their ships and lived in their houses on shore. I am the white man’s friend. If you will not support Thakobau, I shall soon be the only chief in Fiji, and then I shall give the whole group to you … I shall rule Fiji for England, under any chief the Queen may send … Let me become the Chief of Fiji, and I shall give it all up to England … Let us be friends and work together.\textsuperscript{108}

Despite his gains in Vanua Levu during Pritchard’s absence, Ma`afu’s longer-term plans received a profound check with Pritchard’s appointment and, more particularly, the Consul’s unmitigated desire for cession. As always, Ma`afu knew well how to make the most of the situation. If the British were destined to come, Ma`afu would be their ally and friend, and govern Fiji for them. He would not be absolute master of Fiji, but he would be supreme over his great rivals, the indigenous chiefs. The “old savage” would be marginalised and Fiji would enter the brave new world of the European Pacific with Ma`afu firmly at the helm.

Following Pritchard’s return, Ma`afu did not cease attempts to extend his influence whenever opportunity arose. On 25 November two Tongan canoes reached Kadavu “sent by Ma`afu to secure Kadavu for his rule”. James Royce, the resident missionary, at first believed that the Tongans’ purpose was to promote the \textit{lotu} in unconverted Kadavu villages, but quickly acknowledged his error. Pritchard arrived on board HMS \textit{Elk}, a visiting British warship, only one day after the Tongans, intent on convincing local chiefs of the benefits of cession, in readiness for a council of chiefs to be held at Levuka on 12 December. The consequence of these visits was that within a few days, Kadavu was \textit{lotu} and under the authority of chiefs appointed by the Tongans. The chiefs, “of one accord”, had also expressed their support for cession.\textsuperscript{109} Pritchard later wrote that the missionaries on Kadavu were so wary of Ma`afu that they instructed their teachers to ignore all instructions from him. Only one had the courage to do so.\textsuperscript{110}

Ma`afu also despatched a \textit{folau} to Beqa, an island indirectly subject to Bau through Rewa. When Williams heard reports that the Beqan chiefs, faced with a superior force, had ceded their island to Ma`afu, he wrote immediately to Cakobau, seeking clarification.\textsuperscript{111} In reply, John Fordham, stationed at Bau, advised Williams that Cakobau had heard the same reports. Furthermore, the Vunivalu believed “that Ma`afu has accepted the offer and now claims the Sovereignty of that island inasmuch as he has twice sent canoes there for property

\begin{itemize}
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without a messenger from either Bau or Rewa”. Cakobau proceeded to state, through Fordham, that neither Ma’afu nor the Beqa chiefs had consulted him and that he strongly deprecated the cession of the island to the Tongans. The Beqa chiefs were later reported to have been “overmatched and surprised”. About the same time, another party of Tongans, under orders from Tui Bua, was despatched to Rakiraki on the north coast of Viti Levu. Rakiraki was also indirectly subject to Bau, in this case through Viwa. Pritchard later accused Ma’afu of seeking “to foment quarrels” in Rewa and Rakiraki in order to provide himself with an excuse for intervention. While Ma’afu’s motives might not have been as direct as Pritchard would have them, the greatly enhanced danger to Bau could not be denied. In early December 1859, Ma’afu’s power in Fiji was at its zenith, since he now controlled Lau, Bua, Macuata, Beqa, Kadavu and Rakiraki, while the large matanitu of Cakaudrove was his firm ally. These were the realities confronting Pritchard and the indigenous chiefs at their meeting in December.

Before the meeting took place, Pritchard engaged in intense lobbying of several important chiefs. Visiting Wairiki, he interviewed Tui Cakau in the presence of Joseph Waterhouse, who acted as interpreter. Tui Cakau expressed his reluctance to cede his domains, saying that his “trifling” portion of Fiji was independent of both Bau and Tonga and “did not wish to be connected with England”. Pritchard responded with an aside to Waterhouse: “Might makes right”, whereupon the missionary diplomatically advised Tui Cakau that he would be acting wisely if he accepted the Consul’s proposal. After Tui Cakau duly agreed to attend the forthcoming meeting at Levuka, Pritchard advised Waterhouse similarly to use his influence with Ritova, Bete and Tui Nayau. The missionary sought the aid of Ma’afu who, after expressing his hesitation, was advised “that further objection would be quite useless”. Ma’afu was urged to help Pritchard “either by leaving Fiji entirely, or settling down quietly as a private Chief, or accepting office under the Administration of Government”. Ma’afu appeared convinced and urged the chiefs of Bau, Macuata and Lakeba to attend the meeting. When Tui Nayau proved especially obdurate, Waterhouse called in Ma’afu again “and told him that if the Lakeba Chief did not go to Ovalau it would be laid at his door, and the consul would have no further confidence in him. In consequence … Ma’afu insisted on the Lakeba chief accompanying him”. Ma’afu was at least prepared to talk to the Consul, although to what end remained unclear.
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Three days before the meeting’s scheduled start, Ma`afu again called on Williams. He informed the Consul that he had conferred with Cakobau at Bau and that both men had agreed “to go earnestly to work and pay off the American claims”. Cakobau had supposedly admitted having told “a great many lies” in the past concerning the debt, but was now prepared to seek a proper settlement. This apparent change of heart, astonishing if true, was reported to the State Department. The details of Williams’ interview with Ma`afu, set out in his despatch to Washington, may be contrasted with the hearsay account of Isaac Brower, referred to above, concerning Ma`afu’s alleged overtures to the Consul.

In view of the manifest injustice of the American “debt” as it then stood, and of Cakobau’s acknowledged inability to pay, it seems most unlikely that he would have accepted the American demands so readily, especially in conversation with Ma`afu. It is more likely that Ma`afu deliberately deceived Williams in order to mitigate the Consul’s anxiety concerning payment. With Williams placated, Ma`afu was better placed to deal with Pritchard and the Fijian chiefs over the question of cession.

Despite his strengthened negotiating position, Ma`afu attempted to head off the meeting by urging Pritchard to agree to a division of Fiji, even offering to pay the American “debt” himself, one of the principal conditions of the proposed cession. He then proposed to Pritchard “that Feejee be divided, for himself to have one half; subject to, or rather acknowledging the Vunivalu as his superior, and the Vunivalu the other”. Pritchard, apparently wise to Ma`afu’s schemes, “kept [him] in a state of uncertainty” until the meeting. Williams was apparently convinced “that the British intended” to divide Fiji in the manner suggested by Ma`afu. He need not have worried, since Pritchard was determined both to maintain the existing balance of power and, as far as possible, to stop the Tongans in their tracks.

Even though Ma`afu could speak to both Consuls from an unprecedented position of strength, he realised that his power would be significantly weakened once he was faced with an assembly, not only of Fiji’s principal chiefs, but more especially Pritchard and Commander Hubert Campion of HMS Elk. If he could placate the American Consul and then persuade Pritchard to agree to a division of the islands, he would not only steal the meeting’s thunder, but also reduce the possibility of cession. His fears about the meeting proved well founded. On the first day of the gathering, held in the mission schoolroom at Levuka, Ma`afu was asked to withdraw. All the remaining chiefs, from Rewa, Viwa, Bau, Ra and
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Nadroga, then acknowledged Cakobau as supreme. All of these men, including Tui Levuka, also in attendance, then readily agreed to the proposal for cession. Ma’afu was summoned and asked if he were a Fijian chief and possessed any authority in Fiji. He replied that he was a Tongan chief and claimed no authority in Fiji. He stated that he was acting as a “deputy” for Tupou, who had appointed him “to look after the Tonguese in these islands”.

Ma’afu had been out-maneuvered. By first excluding him and then causing him to acknowledge his lack of authority as a Fijian chief, Pritchard effectively precluded his participation in the debate over cession. It was as if his gains in war and intrigue during the Consul’s absence counted for nothing. With the rug pulled from under his feet, Ma’afu was presented with a prepared document and asked to sign it, if it met with his approval. During the ensuing hour and a half, Ma’afu prevaricated. “He would have evaded if he could … as though it were something he could not comprehend”. When he was “compelled” to understand it, he declined to sign saying “I cannot agree … If the Tonguese come to Feejee there will be no place to which they can go and get what they want”. Pritchard responded by saying that the only alternative was to send the Elk to Tonga to request Tupou to withdraw all the Tongans from Fiji. They would then have to visit the islands “as other foreigners and pay for what they get”, including canoes. After further consideration Ma’afu signed, albeit with great reluctance.122

The document was witnessed by Pritchard and Campion, with interpreters William Collis and Edward Martin certifying that Ma’afu had understood its content.123 If the instrument is accepted at face value, it represents an astonishing reversal for Ma’afu, especially given the ascendancy he had achieved in Fiji during Pritchard’s absence. His apparent withdrawal from his position of strength was not solely the consequence of the Consul’s intimidation, however. Ma’afu had all his life been exposed to European modes of thought and, more especially, European military strength. He harboured no illusions about the power represented by Pritchard, a power manifested in part by the bulk of HMS Elk, at anchor off Levuka. The most significant of the instrument’s six clauses is number five, wherein all the Tongan lands in Fiji were declared to be “wholly and solely Fijian”. If that clause were ever implemented, the Tongans living in and visiting Fiji would be reduced to the condition of unwanted visitors subject to the authority and whim of the local chiefs. In the end, Ma’afu signed the instrument because he realised he had no choice. His acquiescence at this

122 This account is based on Collis to John Polglase (see above, n. 119). Collis acted as an interpreter at the meeting. See also the evidence of the other interpreter, Edward Martin, in Report of the Commission…, 15.
123 Quoted in J.H. de Ricci, Fiji, our new Province in the South Seas, London 1875, 228–229. See also Seemann, 250–251; Letter to the Editor, dated 16 Nov 1860, in Richard Lyth, Newspaper Cuttings and Fijian Vocabulary. For the full text of the Instrument, see Appendix A.
early stage gave him a breathing space while the question of cession was under consideration by the British government. In any case, an agreement on paper did not alter the status quo. For the present, Tongan power in Fiji remained intact.

A separate agreement between Pritchard and the chiefs ceded the islands to Great Britain, thereby ratifying the so-called Act of Cession of 14 October 1858. The Consul advised the Colonial Office that the chiefs had agreed because “they [could not] resist the encroachments of the white race”. They viewed the Act of Cession “as a choice of the least of many evils”. In later auxiliary agreements, the Consul secured the chiefs’ compliance in matters including trade, protection of Christian teachers and prohibition of practices such as cannibalism, human sacrifice and infanticide. More importantly, British subjects resident in Fiji were accorded certain legal and commercial privileges as well as the right to hold land. The Consul granted himself unrestricted rights to enact any “laws, regulations and measures he may deem necessary, proper and expedient”. When Williams, not present at the meeting, reported its outcome to the State Department, he noted that Ma’afu’s renunciation of the Tongan lands in Fiji had gained the ready approbation of Cakobau. He also noted a subsequent visit from Ma’afu, who told him that had the chiefs not ceded, “the French government would [have] come … in six months and taken the islands”. Ma’afu also advised Williams that the chiefs signed the instrument of cession “some seemingly compulsory [sic], others voluntarily, and the residue [were] frightened into it”. Ma’afu’s assertions were later supported by Edward Martin, who recalled Pritchard’s use of “strong language [to the chiefs which] would hardly be called persuasion, but overbearing”. The same “overbearing” attitude was directed to Ma’afu himself with Pritchard’s insistence that the Tongans could remain in Fiji only on the same footing as other “foreigners”, no longer able to compel Fijians to make oil or collect bêche de mer or sandalwood.

Pritchard’s peremptory manner towards the chiefs was later to attract adverse comment from Whitehall. Nevertheless, following receipt of the chiefs’ offer, extensive lobbying commenced in London, with deputations from the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society calling on the Prime Minister and the Colonial and Foreign Secretaries. Although Whitehall expressed some interest
in Fiji’s strategic position and in the islands’ potential for cotton cultivation, the government continued to view further colonial expansion with disfavour. A Commission of Enquiry, headed by Colonel William Smythe, was appointed, with the task of determining the views of as many leading chiefs as possible and submitting a report to the Colonial Office, before a final decision were made.\(^{129}\) In Fiji itself, with the renewed offer of cession and Ma`afu’s apparent capitulation, Cakobau’s prestige received a welcome boost. He had secured at least grudging support from all the principal chiefs, thus endowing his “title” of Tui Viti with greater authority than hitherto. Berthold Seemann, a naturalist who accompanied Smythe during his tour, was later to write that the chiefs had fallen in with the Vunivalu and the Consul “to escape the unsupportable exactions and tyrannies of the Tonguese”, a view which echoed Pritchard’s reference to cession as the least of many evils from the Fijians’ standpoint.\(^{130}\) As soon as John Binner heard the news of Ma`afu’s agreement with the Consul, he wrote from Levuka:

> We shall get rid of a lot of marauders who have been for some time past a perfect pest to the Fijian natives, slaying some, dishonouring women and plundering and tyrannising over the whole, gratifying their own wicked propensities, in the name of religion.\(^{131}\)

Despite the missionary’s optimism, Tongan power on the ground was unaffected by the various agreements, which were inoperative pending a favourable decision from Whitehall. Lau remained subject to Ma`afu and, in that sense at least, a Tongan dependency. Ma`afu’s armed followers, wherever they were, continued to be a source of “uneasiness” to the Fijians.\(^{132}\) What had changed were the powers of the British Consul: if Pritchard could put into practice the concessions wrought from the chiefs and the authority he had assumed for himself, he would possess an ascendancy in Fiji previously denied anyone else.

Ma`afu appears to have carried on life as usual. Early in 1860 Williams sought to prevent his sailing his schooner Elenoa to Tonga, where he apparently intended presenting it to the King. The Consul urged Ma`afu to liquidate his debt of two years’ standing to Brower, who had spent $300 on copper, canvas and rigging for the Elenoa and had never been reimbursed.\(^{133}\) Ma`afu already regretted his actions of December, since in January he was reported to be “galled” and

\(^{129}\) For the detailed instructions to Colonel Smythe, see Henderson, ed., The Evolution of Government in Fiji, 9–15; Mrs Smythe, Ten Months in the Fiji Islands, Oxford and London 1864, Appendix, 191–196.


\(^{131}\) Binner to Eggleston, 14 Dec 1859, MOM 165.

\(^{132}\) Seemann, Viti..., 255.

\(^{133}\) John B. Williams to Ma`afu, 2 Jan 1860 and Brower to Williams, 2 Jan 1860, both enclosed with Williams to State Dept, 21 Feb 1860, USC Laucala 4.
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anxious to fight Bau, claiming that Cakobau had deceived him. He was also indirectly fomenting trouble in Rakiraki, where a rebel chief, Mulasi, had erected a defensive fortification supposedly on orders from Tui Bua “in the interests of Ma’afu”. Rakiraki was directly subject to Ratu Isikeli, the chief of Viwa, who assured Pritchard that Tui Bua was “abetting the revolt of Mulasi in the interests of Ma’afu”. The Consul disbelieved the assurances of Ma’afu’s envoy, Semisi Fita, that Ma’afu was not involved. On 15 January, Ma’afu arrived off Levuka aboard the Elenoa, accompanied by six drua and a force of about 1,200 men. He brought with him Tui Nayau, Tui Macuata, Tui Bua, Ritova and the chief of Lomaloma, for a further meeting with Pritchard. In an attempt to lessen the impact of the agreement he had signed a month earlier, Ma’afu called initially on Williams and stated that if he were made chief of eastern Fiji, including Vanua Levu, “he was willing to take office under the English Government and not as chief. Otherwise the British Consul could send him to Tonga”. Williams thought that Pritchard would be unlikely “to send him away”. Before the formal meeting began the next day, Pritchard asked Williams which chief would be the best to rule in Lau and Vanuabalavu, especially in view of the “hatred” felt all over Fiji for Cakobau, among both Fijians and Tongans. Williams believed that Pritchard intended to divide Fiji along the lines suggested earlier by Ma’afu. But it was not to be, with Pritchard confining himself to negotiating the supplementary agreements referred to above. As the weeks went by, missionary William Moore in Rewa noted a more “cheerful” aspect for Fiji, since Europeans from Australia were beginning land purchases and commercial activities. His colleague James Royce was less sanguine, noting that Ma’afu’s wars in Vanua Levu the previous year had resulted in the “conquered heathen” there acknowledging him, rather than Cakobau, as their ruler. As a consequence, some eastern chiefs at first rejected the idea of cession, saying, “Oh, we belong to Tonga”. Royce repudiated the Tongans’ belief that they had “as much right and as much power to govern Fiji as the British”. The consequences of Ma’afu’s renunciation of power were yet to be felt.

Despite Ma’afu’s apparent inactivity during much of 1860, the Tongans’ impact on eastern Fiji did not diminish in the aftermath of the offer of cession. The missionaries continued to regret that “the constant presence and great influence of Tonguese residents and visitors [has] an injurious affect on Lakeba”. Ma’afu’s absence from the record during these months suggests that he might

136 Williams to State Dept, 7 Feb 1860.
137 William Moore to Elijah Hoole, 28 Feb 1860, WMMS LFF.
138 Royce to GS, WMMS, 27 Mar 1860, WMMS LFF. See also William Wilson to GS, WMMS, 9 Apr 1860, WMMS LFF.
have visited Tonga in the wake of the agreement of December 1859. In eastern Fiji, one of the first land sales that would cause so much debate in the future occurred on 30 May. Kuli Kavaci, owner of Adavaci, a small island inside the Vanuabalavu reef, sold it to George Henry, the Tahitian-born son of a missionary, for $100.\textsuperscript{140} It is probable that the sale was approved by Tui Cakau, within whose customary domains Vanuabalavu lay. One month later Consul Williams died of dysentery, having the same day appointed Brower as Vice Consul. In Britain meanwhile, the Foreign Office was urging the Colonial Secretary, the Duke of Newcastle, to make a decision concerning cession.\textsuperscript{141} Colonel Smythe, armed with his instructions weighted against the proposal, reached Levuka on 5 July to begin his investigations.\textsuperscript{142} A few days later, Smythe and his wife met Ma`afu there, although there is no record of what was discussed. Sarah Smythe, who of course did not know Fiji well, believed Ma`afu’s influence in the group to be “generally for good” because of his support for Tongan teachers. The “good deal of mischief” done by the Tongans in Fiji occurred, she believed, out of Ma`afu’s sight.\textsuperscript{143} Berthold Seemann thought differently, later writing of the Tongan teachers:

They were spread over the whole country and … became in Ma`afu’s hand, ready instruments for the execution of his plans. They supplied him with reliable information about the quarrels, weaknesses and resources of the different territories, were never tired of praising their great chief, and ever ready to prompt the Fijian rulers to apply to him in cases of dispute and war.\textsuperscript{144}

In view of Ma`afu’s record in extending his influence in Fiji, and in the light of current apprehension concerning his plans should annexation not proceed, Seemann’s appraisal appears more accurate than that of Mrs Smythe.

Colonel Smythe himself observed that Ma`afu had no desire to return to Tonga and was waiting anxiously for the decision from London. If that decision were negative, “the conquest of the whole group by Tonguese arms might become a reality”. Ma`afu had meanwhile urged his followers to remain quiet and to refrain from fomenting discord.\textsuperscript{145} He certainly remained quiet himself, because his July meeting with the Smythes resulted in the first documented reference to him for six months. Shortly after the conference, Smythe, Seemann and their entourage left Levuka aboard HMS Pegasus to commence their tour of Fiji. There was then “no slight excitement” among many Fijians, who now realised that
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even though their commitments to the British Consul had been made in writing, Pritchard’s promises to them were merely verbal. Pritchard began his round of consultations at Bau, where several meetings with Cakobau and other chiefs occurred. Cakobau declared that he still favoured cession and that “he was afraid only of America and France”. He stressed Fiji’s weakness, owing to endemic “enmity” between the matanitu, which he blamed for the disproportionate power enjoyed by the Tongans. Cakobau saw the offer of cession as a relief from another external threat: he told Smythe that “King George … was dead with crying … on hearing of the cession. He saw that his chance of getting Fiji was gone”. Whether or not Cakobau’s fears about Tupou’s ambitions were justified, they remained real in the Vunivalu’s mind.

After meeting Cakobau, Smythe advised the Colonial Office that his instructions were “inexact” on one important point: “Cakobau … although probably the most influential chief in the group, has no claim to the title of Tui Viti … nor would the other chiefs submit to his authority except through foreign compulsion”. At Rewa, his next call, the chiefs favoured cession, although they appeared confused about the matter of land sales. At Kadavu, the Commission heard that a “circular letter” had been received from Ma’afu, “advising his countrymen how to act, so that the policy of England with regard to the cession of Fiji might be frustrated, and the country ultimately fall into the hands of Tonga”. A similar letter had been sent to Beqa. When the visitors called at Beqa early in September, they met an Englishman who claimed to have purchased some land. “The natives, under pressure from the Tonguese, wished to compel him to [return] … the land … as they had given … Beqa to the Tonguese”. Pritchard, accompanying Smythe’s party, told the principal chief that any gift to the Tongans was invalid, since Ma’afu had publicly renounced all claims in Fiji. If Kadavu and Beqa are any indication, Ma’afu was manoeuvring to reverse the agreements of the previous December. What he could not achieve by war, he sought to gain by intrigue.

Pritchard, too, was active during the Commissioners’ visit. Ritova, the former Tui Macuata whom Ma’afu had deposed, appeared off the Macuata coast in early September, “announcing that he was authorized by the Consul to declare war”. When the Commissioners and Pritchard reached neighbouring Bua later in the month, Tui Bua asked Joseph Waterhouse, acting as an interpreter, where was the “British uprightness” of which the missionary had spoken? Tui
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Bua faced a dilemma, since he announced to Smythe that he now placed all his trust in the British and no longer in the Tongans. Waterhouse tried to reassure the chief that Pritchard would deal with Ritova. When the visitors later arrived off Naduri, the chiefly village of Macuata, Bete came on board the Pegasus and complained to Smythe that Ritova “was using the name of the Consul”. Smythe offered the same advice as Waterhouse had done: not to act against Ritova, but to wait for the Consul to deal with him.152

Having by now held eleven public meetings, Smythe informed the Colonial Office that Fiji was “composed of a great number of independent Kingdoms, the rulers of which are moved not less by jealousy of one another, than by fear of foreign aggression, to solicit the domination of England”.153 Proceeding with his enquiry, Smythe reached Lakeba on 5 October. At the meeting with chiefs there four days later, Smythe and his party felt the Tongan presence as never before. Wishing to determine Tui Nayau’s “real sentiments” concerning cession, Smythe rather tactlessly asked the chief to ensure that only Fijians were present at their meeting. When he found many Tongans in attendance he expelled them, with consequent loss to their prestige. During a difficult conference, Tui Nayau, “entirely under the influence of the Tongans”,154 appeared at a loss without their support and would only vouchsafe his approval of cession. The following year, a resident missionary would describe Tui Nayau as “in many respects the tool of others, who with fair and crafty words lead him astray…. The old King … is careless, ignorant and misled”.155 In discussions with the Smythe delegation, however, Tui Nayau did assure his visitors that Lakeba and its subject islands formed an independent state, as did the Yasayasa Moala. Vanuabalavu, Tui Nayau declared, belonged to Cakaudrove. Tui Nayau appeared not to accept as customary the control Ma’afu had exercised among those islands for several years.156

One of Smythe’s most important meetings was the last, at Fawn Harbour in Cakaudrove on 22 October. Present were Tui Cakau, Bonaveidogo, Ritova and other chiefs, as well as Consul Pritchard, Seemann and missionaries Jesse Carey, Thomas Baker and Joeli Bulu.157 Enquiring first into Ritova’s recent depredations along the Macuata coast, Smythe was assured by Pritchard that he had not condoned the chief’s actions, as Ritova had claimed. Smythe resolved to do nothing to aid Ritova and advised that Bete, installed as Tui Macuata in the presence of Ma’afu and Cakobau, should retain that dignity.158 Tui Cakau,
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echoing his claim to Pritchard of the previous year, asserted that Cakaudrove was an independent state. After the meeting, Pritchard informed Carey and Baker that he wished to return Ritova to Macuata. The Consul later claimed to have been approached by Ritova and asked to help him regain his position by force of arms, which Pritchard declined to do. Ma’afu supposedly had plans to send Ritova, still living at Matei in northern Taveuni, as a prisoner to Tonga. He also wanted to consign all Ritova’s lands to Bonaveidogo, the chief to whom he had given eastern Macuata. On 27 October, an “arrangement” between the parties restored Ritova’s lands, including his home island of Nukubati, while Bete was to remain as Tui Macuata. Both chiefs agreed to keep the peace and to “disavow all dependence on Ma’afu”. Pritchard conveyed Ritova on board his schooner to Matei, where his followers were joyful at the news of their imminent return to Nukubati. Ma’afu, remaining at Lomaloma, was formally advised of what was to happen and warned not to interfere.

A few days later, Ritova, still on board Pritchard’s schooner, reached Naduri, Bete’s home. Seeming to accept that Ritova and his people were to return to Nukubati, Bete shook hands with his rival for the first time. When the parties reached Nukubati, they found that the Tongans had destroyed all the houses and gardens, “with the exception of one [house], the residence of Ma’afu during the night”. Within a few weeks, seven Macuata villages belonging to Wesleyan converts had also been destroyed, with more than 40 people killed. The atrocities occurred because of Ritova’s supposed sympathy for the Catholic cause. Pritchard was willing to blame Bete and the other Tongan “agent” at Naduri, a teacher named Filimoni. On Wainiqolo’s suggestion, Ritova invited Bete to a solevu, a large ceremonial feast. Bete declined to attend, sending instead his brother Rataqa and two other chiefs, who were made prisoners and sent to Ma’afu at Waisasa. Further atrocities committed by raiding parties under Wainiqolo’s command finally provoked Ritova’s people into action. They resisted a second Tongan force, while Ritova begged Pritchard’s permission to attack Bete.

Seeing Ma’afu’s hand behind these hostilities, Pritchard wrote to remind him, firstly, of the powers “granted” to him (the Consul) by the chiefs and secondly that the Tongans enjoyed no political status in Fiji. Faced with Pritchard’s demand that Wainiqolo be withdrawn and Rataqa and his fellow chiefs be released, Ma’afu complied. Pritchard wrote of “positive evidence that all these disorders
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on the Mathuata coast are the results of plans deliberately conceived and matured by Tonguese leaders in concert with Henry [Ma`afu]. He lamented that owing to the hierarchical nature of Tongan society, no Tongan teacher in Fiji could ignore the orders of a chief. One such was Filimoni, an “active and subtle agent”. So long as any Tongans remained in Macuata, Pritchard believed, there would be “intrigue and conspiracy”.

At the end of 1860, Pritchard squarely blamed Ma`afu for the renewed violence in Macuata. The Consul’s own conduct had aroused complaint from missionaries, most particularly Waterhouse, who accused him of lying. While the case against Pritchard does not concern us here, it is important to note the Consul’s reasoned defence of his position, submitted to Smythe in January 1861. Prompted by Smythe’s recognition that Cakobau had no claim to be Tui Viti, Pritchard referred to several precedents where various officials of the British, American and French governments had acknowledged the Vunivalu in that role. He made no mention of the Tongans, but while he was defending himself to Smythe, a letter arrived for Cakobau from Tupou. It demanded “the payment of $60,000 (£12,000) worth of Fijian produce as the price of the assistance he rendered to the Vunivalu in the war of 1855”. Cakobau was given 17 months “to collect his property” and was to take it to Tonga during the eighteenth month. Ma`afu, as “George’s representative in Fiji”, had caused the letter to be written.

It seems incredible that Tupou could have been serious, since the amount requested was greater than the so-called American debt that, as he must have known, Cakobau could never pay. Tupou might have been preparing the ground for future intervention, fixing an 18-month period so as to allow Whitehall time to make a decision. When James Calvert reached Nuku’alofa on 19 May, on his way back to Fiji, he reported that Pritchard and Smythe had asked Wesleyan missionaries John Whewell and Shirley Baker, who were working on Tongatapu, whether Tupou desired British protection for Tonga. Pritchard also requested the King to prevent Ma`afu “from taking lands and engaging in Fijian wars”. The Consul had reportedly seized from Ma`afu lands “ceded to him by persons for whom he and his people have fought”.

Ma`afu was in Vava`u in May 1861 to attend Tonga’s third annual Parliament. Following its close, the King remained there awaiting the return of the Elenoa, which was probably conveying Ma`afu back to Fiji. Attention in Fiji was then
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focused on Smythe and his official Report, submitted to the Colonial Office on 1 May. In his accompanying despatch, Smythe noted Cakobau’s “ambitious disposition” and his “great apprehension” of danger from the United States and France. In the Report itself, he laid emphasis on the fact that Cakobau could not justly be called Tui Viti, owing to the divisions entailed by 40 “independent tribes”, the real seats of power. Smythe made particular reference to the Tongans’ taking “an active part in Fijian wars … invariably with success” and to their “ready obedience” to Ma`afu. He noted how Ma`afu had extended his influence through his interference as the “protector” of Tongan teachers who were ill treated by “heathen natives”. The Tongans in general were castigated for conduct “in direct contradiction to their profession of Christianity” and it was finally noted “that they could easily make themselves master of Fiji, an enterprise which George, King of Tonga, has been said to meditate”.

Smythe recommended against cession, stating his belief that “the influence of a great power in the Pacific is dependent entirely on its naval force” rather than on territory. He also deprecated the great expense which annexation would entail. Smythe favoured a minimal British presence in Fiji, consistent with the development of cotton cultivation and the continued Christian evangelisation of the “natives”. There is also evidence that some missionaries in Fiji influenced Smythe against the notion of cession, believing that they should have the responsibility of “civilising” Fiji. Whitehall’s later decision not to annex came as no surprise, given its predisposition before Smythe began his enquiry. It was some time, however, before that decision became known in Fiji and in the meantime hostilities recommenced in Macuata. Following a raid on Nukubati by Wainiqolo’s forces, Pritchard, whose intervention had been requested by both Bete and Ritova, sailed from Levuka to the coast off Naduri. After Bete, through Pritchard, invited Ritova to a “feast” to discuss peace, Wainiqolo again appeared with four canoes, supposedly to dissuade Bete, Ma`afu’s firm ally, from his peace efforts. Pritchard, sailing aboard his schooner, managed to secure Ritova from Wainiqolo’s clutches. After a lull in hostilities of some weeks, Bete again invited Ritova for a feast, intending that his followers would ambush and kill the visiting chief. Unaware of the plot, Ritova and his son Vunivalu
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landed at Naduri on 10 June. One inconclusive meeting was held between the two rivals and, after the plot was exposed the following day, Vunivalu shot Bete dead. Acting at Pritchard’s orders, Ritova forbore from exacting revenge killings among Bete’s followers. After this, in the Consul’s words, “all went on quiet until Ma’afu despatched his lieutenant, Wainiqolo, to Macuata, and troubles at once recommenced”.

Ma’afu had once again been absent at the commencement of hostilities. He had troubles elsewhere, in fact; during the same month as Bete’s death, George Henry of Lomaloma preferred a complaint of assault against him. Then, early in July, Ma’afu agreed to settle a debt of $300 owed to a Levuka firm, Hicks and Company. During a lengthy interview with him, Pritchard proposed that they proceed to Macuata together, “to try and settle the troubles and jealousies on that coast”. Ma’afu was not enthusiastic. When the Consul read him a letter of complaint from some Europeans on Ovalau, Ma’afu denied the unspecified charges it contained. Concerning his alleged assault on Henry, he admitted having “hustled” him to the ground at Lomaloma, but denied having kicked him down. In reporting the interview, Pritchard referred to a matter of personal enmity, apparently of long standing, between Ma’afu and Henry. He cautioned Ma’afu “to be very careful not to originate disputes between whites and Tonguese”. On the same day Calvert, now returned to Fiji, “had [a] talk with Ma’afu – who went to Bau”.

Ma’afu was not to remain long in Cakobau’s den. On 15 July, HMS Pelorus, commanded by Commodore J. Beauchamp Seymour, arrived at Levuka. Pritchard quickly informed Seymour that the trade in sandalwood and beche-de-mer along the Macuata coast had “entirely stopped”, owing to the hostilities between the two rival chiefs, “one of whom was supported by a body of Tongans whose residence is in Lakeba”. Seymour asked Pritchard to propose to both Cakobau and Ma’afu that they accompany the Commodore to Macuata, which “after a little diplomatic shuffling they agreed to do”. Before he left Levuka, Ma’afu had been quietly admonished by Calvert, who reminded him of the “unsatisfactory end” of the Tongan chiefs who preceded him in Fiji. Ma’afu was urged, in the interests of Fiji, to ensure that “his own heart [was] in a proper
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state”. Calvert was also to express the hope that the claim for $60,000 sent by Tupou would be “commuted and settled … The Tongans ought to have something, and it is a Fijian practice to pay … liberally what is called de ni valu – doing of war”.

When the Pelorus anchored off Naduri on 19 July, Seymour learned that Wainiqolo’s Tongan force and their Fijian allies had forced Ritova and his party to take refuge on Kia, an island 16 kilometres offshore. The Tongans had wrought destruction on the plantations and drua belonging to Ritova’s followers, several of whom were murdered. Seymour sent for Ritova who conversed on the quarterdeck with Cakobau and Ma`afu for an hour before they were joined by Wainiqolo and two Fijian chiefs. Before leaving the chiefs to settle their differences, Seymour reminded them that European trade interests had been severely disrupted by the renewed hostilities. He noted that Ma`afu “throughout the entire business was less manageable than either his associates or his enemies”.

The following day, the chiefs concluded two agreements. The first, between Ritova and Bonaveidogo, provided that their past grievances should be forgotten, Christian teachers should be protected, trade and commerce be encouraged and contact with the Tongans should be confined to “legitimate and friendly intercourse” free of “political connexion”. The second agreement, between Ritova and other Fijian chiefs on the one hand and Ma`afu on the other, was of greater importance. It provided:

1st. That Wai-ni-golo shall, within 14 hours, retire for ever from … Macuata.

2nd. That no Tongans shall visit … Macuata …

3rd. That Tongans in the service of Wesleyan or other missions are exempted from the above restrictions.

4th. That if any of the above articles are infringed, Ma`afu agrees that Wai-ni-golo shall be sent from Fiji to [Tonga].

Seymour had recommended the inclusion of the last three clauses, since he knew that the agreements’ beneficial effects would be lost “if the Tongans were allowed to remain in Vanua Levu”. Accordingly, at dawn on 22 July, Wainiqolo and his followers departed in two large drua “with a … fair wind for Lakeba … beating their drums and cheering most lustily”.
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The agreement was meant to reduce, as far as practicable, Ma’afu’s influence in Macuata. Nevertheless, at the meeting on board ship, Ma’afu neither acknowledged Wainiqolo’s responsibility for the renewed hostilities nor commented on his banishment. According to Wainiqolo himself, Ma’afu disagreed with the first two clauses of the agreement he signed. Yet, in circumstances similar to those prevailing at Levuka seven months earlier, Ma’afu had no choice. On this occasion, it was not necessary for Pritchard to out-manoeuvre the Tongan. Seated with Wainiqolo, Cakobau and the other chiefs on the quarterdeck of the Pelorus, Ma’afu needed no further reminder of British power. He could only sign, thereby giving Pritchard and Seymour what they wanted, and bide his time.

Jesse Carey believed that the visit of the Pelorus had “quelled … by pacific means, the civil war”. Nevertheless, ten days after the warship’s departure, Ritova’s forces recommenced hostilities against many villages whose inhabitants had been allies of the Tongans. With one of his chiefs successfully seeking help from Tui Cakau and his brother Ratu Golea at Somosomo, many atrocities followed, part of a “reign of terror” which had not ceased one year later. Ma’afu, who apparently accompanied Cakobau to Bau after the meeting on board Pelorus, called at Rewa in August, on his way back to Beqa and Kadavu. During this period Tongan forces, denied further intervention in Macuata, wrought destruction in the Yasawas, a group of islands in north-western Fiji that was subject to Bua. One of the Yasawas had reportedly been ceded to the Tongans. During a visit there by Tui Bua and Semisi Fifita, six men were flogged, supposedly for plotting against their chief. Shortly afterwards, a French corvette, the Cornélie, Captain Lévêque, arrived in Levuka. Father Bréheret quickly sought out Lévêque, preferring a complaint against Fifita on the grounds that the men flogged were professing Catholics. The captain called both Ma’afu and Cakobau on board, requesting the latter to summon Fifita from Kadavu. Cakobau, failing to comply with alacrity, was detained on board as a hostage until such time as Fifita appeared.

Pritchard told Lévêque that he believed Fifita’s action had been an attempt to prevent the cession of the Yasawas to Queen Victoria and to promote instead their cession to Tupou. The Consul later recorded a statement by Togitogi, one of the men flogged, to the effect that during the flogging Fifita had urged him to adopt the lotu weseli and to give the Yasawas to Tonga. Fifita apparently enjoyed the full support of Tui Bua. When a Levuka trader named Hicks, who happened to be visiting, intervened, Fifita threatened to ask Ma’afu to send Wainiqolo
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down. Further floggings were circumvented only by Hicks’ intervention, while the local chief escaped being deposed because he was half-Tongan. Pritchard wrote of a “common system” whereby Ma’afu and Fifita replaced an unfriendly local chief with another prepared to be “a ready tool of the Tongans”, in order to “retain any place where they once obtained a foothold”.\(^{191}\) Such a “system” had been Ma’afu’s favoured means of securing his interests since the early days of the *valu ni lotu*.

Following Cakobau’s detention, Fifita duly arrived, to be placed in irons and “tried” on board the *Cornélie* in the presence of both Cakobau and Ma’afu. The latter acknowledged that Fifita had flogged the men, but not because of their religion. Bréheret thought otherwise, and his view prevailed. On 10 October the *Cornélie* sailed for New Caledonia, with Fifita confined on board, supposedly “to be employed for two years on the public roads”.\(^{192}\) While Fifita’s movements for the next few months are unknown, he had returned to Tonga by September 1862 and was present with Ma’afu in Fiji two months later.\(^{193}\) Pressure was also exerted on Tupou with the despatch of a French warship to Tonga to “punish” him.\(^{194}\)

The events on board the *Cornélie* were not the only drama unfolding in Fiji during October 1861. A serious rift developed between Pritchard and Cakobau following a meeting at the British Consulate in Levuka on 30 September. The Vunivalu refused Pritchard’s request to sign a deed of sale for the island of Wakaya, in Lomaiviti, part of his domains. The next day, Cakobau was detained by the French commander. Calvert, present at the meeting, later asserted that Cakobau “was not detained until after he had refused to abandon his claim to … [Wakaya] which another chief had sold … to the American Consul, which Mr Pritchard much desires”.\(^{195}\) A week later a British warship, HMS *Harrier*, Commander Sir Malcolm MacGregor, anchored in Laucala Bay in south-eastern Viti Levu. It had been sent from Sydney by Commodore Seymour following complaints by Pritchard of mistreatment of Europeans in Vanua Levu and Kadavu.\(^{196}\) MacGregor’s intervention was instrumental in securing Cakobau’s release from the *Cornélie*. Then, on 17 October, Pritchard again broached the subject of Wakaya with Cakobau on board the *Harrier*. Cakobau refused to discuss the matter, since he was not then in his own domains. Greatly annoyed, Pritchard told Roko Tui Dreketi: “I have shielded Cakobau, but to-day I abandon
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him, and give him up to the Tongans to do their own pleasure with him”.  

In this display of petulance, the Consul made particular reference to Tupou’s claim for £12,000, saying “he would let the Tongans loose upon Bau, to insist upon their … demand”.  

According to Pita Fangalua, a Tongan residing at Bau, Pritchard further threatened to request Ma’afu and Tu‘i Ha‘apai “to enforce their claim in Fiji”.  

“Great excitement” followed among the Tongans in Rewa who, in alliance with some Rewan chiefs and under Ma’afu’s leadership, were preparing to attack Bau. An attack did not eventuate, possibly because, as Fangalua believed, “King George … would not approve of war against Bau”.  

Nor did Fangalua think that Ma’afu, present on board the Harrier, would have been influenced to attack Bau by the Consul’s remarks. Ma’afu told Fangalua that he “still felt the humiliation of ‘having been ordered away from the Fijian chiefs when they assembled at Ovalau to sign the documents’” in December 1859. Twenty months later, he was still “ashamed” to come to Bau. While Ma’afu’s “humiliation” in 1859 is certain, it is impossible to credit him with any sense of shame in 1861, following Pritchard’s confrontation with Cakobau. Ma’afu had asked Pritchard’s “permission” to attack Bau, which the Consul now felt inclined to grant. The acrimonious situation meant that once the Harrier had departed, the potential Tongan threat to Bau was greater than it had been since the days before the 1859 agreement.

Ma’afu was supposedly “drawing in his net” by assembling a folau in Rewa on the pretext of visiting a “tribe” said to be descendants of shipwrecked Tongans. The Consul, suffering from an injured leg, described a social call from Ma’afu at the Consulate:

‘Consul, let your leg be bad for one more moon. I shall be chief at Bau, and Thakobau shall cook for me. Then I shall come to you with the land, and you shall do as you like with it’. – ’Ma’afu, there is something that stops the sun from rising any higher when it has gone high enough’. – ‘Consul, do you apply that to me or to Thakobau? Who is to be turned when he has gone far enough?’ – ‘It only becomes known that the sun is stopped from rising any higher when it is seen going down. You had better return to Rewa’.

Ma’afu “chose to think that Cakobau’s sun had reached its zenith”.  

---
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The first half of November 1861 was the most dangerous period for Fiji since the weeks before the battle of Kaba in 1855. On 4 November, a message reached Bau to the effect that a force of Rewans and their Tongan allies under Ma`afu were ready to wage war against the Vunivalu. Four days later Calvert arrived at Bau and with John Fordham succeeded in persuading Cakobau to adopt a conciliatory approach to the Consul. Fordham immediately wrote to Pritchard on Cakobau’s behalf, apologising for the Vunivalu’s disrespectful behaviour and seeking the Consul’s “influence and authority” to prevent the Tongans both from beginning hostilities and from enforcing their monetary claim. The letter enclosed the written claim for $60,000 addressed to Cakobau by Ma`afu. Calvert left in great haste for Ovalau, where Pritchard immediately reassured him that the claim “was referred to King George”. The Consul had seen Ma`afu the previous day, when the latter agreed that there would be no war. Pritchard wrote to ease Cakobau’s mind on the subject, informing him that a solevu would be given to Ma`afu, “then he will retire, and bring away his people and canoes”. Tui Dreketi was powerless to make war on Bau on his own. In return, Bau was neither to undertake nor threaten war on Rewa, a condition Cakobau was very pleased to meet. This settlement of an extremely volatile situation came about largely through the energy and astute diplomacy of James Calvert.

Although Ma`afu’s aggressive intent had been deflected before Calvert’s visit, he still aspired to the conquest of Bau. Pritchard, grateful to the missionary for his intervention, referred to the “arrangements” with Ma`afu and Tu`i Ha`apai as “provisional” until he knew the outcome of Calvert’s visit to Cakobau. He further reassured Cakobau in a second letter, saying he had “attended to” the claim and that he had made it impossible for Ma`afu and Tu`i Ha`apai to move, pending a decision from Tupou. Tu`i Ha`apai had sailed to Tonga to consult the King. “Pay no attention to what people may say”, urged the Consul. “The matter stands over, and while this arrangement continues nothing can be done to Bau by the Tonguese”.

Whatever the real origins of the Tongan demand for payment, it is likely that Ma`afu pursued the matter for propaganda purposes, hoping to take advantage of the rift between Pritchard and Cakobau. The Vunivalu’s closest European advisers, missionaries Fordham and Calvert, harboured no illusions about the threat that Ma`afu and his forces had posed to Bau and to peace in general. Fordham wrote of his long-held conviction “that for years [the] one great
object of the Tongans [had] been to get possession of Fiji, in whole or in part”. The proposal for cession, endorsed by Cakobau and all the principal chiefs, had “interfered with [the Tongans’] prospects and somewhat dampened their hopes”. Fordham alleged that when Ma’afu asked Pritchard’s advice concerning the Tongan claim, the Consul replied, “that the Vunivalu had property and ought to be made to pay it”. Such advice could only have come before the reconciliation between Pritchard and Cakobau. The Consul further “intimated” to the Tongans that Cakobau’s unfriendly attitude constituted grounds for war, a view with which Fordham profoundly disagreed. The missionary recalled that Pritchard had “bullied … bewildered and … flattered Cakobau”, while turning a blind eye to the “excitement” and warlike demonstrations in Rewa. He wrote after Pritchard and Calvert had brought Ma’afu back from the brink but with the Tongan forces still in Rewa. Fordham’s eloquence in a letter to his Society articulated the peril that had so recently confronted Bau and which might be renewed at any moment.  

Ma’afu, no longer intent on fighting Bau, quit Rewa and arrived at Levuka with seven canoes on 15 November. The following day, a Sunday, Fordham observed in Bau that “the storm of war which threatened us is likely to pass away”, for which mercy he gave deep praise to Calvert as well as to God. In Levuka on the same day, Ma’afu and his entourage attended the two services Calvert conducted. “The wild Tongans”, the missionary enthused, “who had been running about Fiji eating food they did not work for, looked tamed down … and appeared to resolve to lead a new life”. Ma’afu, as of old, resolved to meet in class and “to try to rule in the fear of God”. Calvert struck a more reasoned note when he observed of the Tongans: “They fear nobody, and all Fijians fear them”. Ma’afu and about 300 followers, including women and children, soon returned to Lau, leaving behind them in Rewa a rumour that he “had gone for soldiers and ammunition” which would “tend to augment and perpetuate the bad feeling already great”. On leaving, Ma’afu even sent “a friendly message” to Cakobau. His departure left Fiji “still in a disorganized and distracted state”, not least because of Pritchard’s anomalous position. He had, Fordham noted, “the name without the power of governor”. Although he had returned to his lair, Ma’afu might re-emerge, while in the meantime everyone waited for the long-delayed decision from London.

Calvert, for all his peacemaking, felt that if war did ensue, Pritchard would be entirely to blame. His view appears to have at least partly prompted Pritchard to dissuade Ma’afu from his plans to attack Bau. Calvert also believed that
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the Tongan claim for £12,000, to be paid in oil, would be “a very awkward affair, if King George should think more of dollars than religion”.216 Like many missionaries, he strongly favoured cession, while expressing anxiety lest it should be refused.217 Aside from a probable revival of the Tongan menace to Bau, the ever-present American debt would again raise its head. The Americans, Calvert believed, would much rather be paid off by Great Britain than attempt to enforce a debt they knew could never be collected. The missionary believed the Tongan claim to be “an after consideration”, made in an attempt to extort as much as possible from Fiji before the expected cession. Pritchard “discarded the idea of paying”, despite his petulance during his dispute with Cakobau. Calvert’s view was that “King George does not give up easily”; after all, the King had sent Tu’i Ha’apai to join Ma’afu on board HMS Harrier to enquire into the claim.218 The future course of conduct for both Tupou and Ma’afu seemed to depend on the eventual British decision.

The rapid succession of events in November 1861, culminating in Ma’afu’s return to Lomaloma, caused others besides Fordham, Calvert and Pritchard to take stock of the situation. Joseph Waterhouse wrote of his “anxiety” over the behaviour of Cakobau, whose “ill-faith and dishonour” caused him “to banish his best friends and allies the Tonguese from Bau”. For Waterhouse, the Tonguese were Cakobau’s “best friends” because they, like Cakobau, were professedly Christian. The missionary’s political acumen seems to have deserted him, since the banishment had all to do with politics and nothing to do with religion. He believed that Cakobau had “made use of the … Consul”, who no longer viewed the Tongans as an unmixed evil. Waterhouse was more perceptive in his view that the Tongans would easily prevail in any war.219 Meanwhile, Ma’afu’s reputation had reached as far as London. “The desire of power in excess caused the angels to fall, but not Ma’afu”, the Colonial Office informed the Foreign Office. “Not even this signal discomfiture could make him forsake the land of his adoption … he has forsaken his own ways [and] is liked and respected in [Lau], notwithstanding the constant efforts to get rid of him made by the Fijian chiefs, who are yet jealous of his position and influence”.220 At the end of 1861, the dilemmas posed by Ma’afu’s power and ambition were as far from resolution as ever.

Ma’afu’s departure from Rewa did nothing to diminish Calvert’s “anxiety”, already expressed in relation to Cakobau. In January the missionary noted that Tupou was about to purchase 1,000 muskets, “but whether he has hostile feelings towards … Fiji, to get £12,000 for fighting, we do not know … Fiji is not safe

216 Calvert to GS, WMMS, 19 Nov 1861, WMMS ILTF.
217 See, for example, Binner to Eggleston, 19 Nov 1861, MOM 165.
218 Calvert to Rowe, 19 Nov 1861.
219 Joseph Waterhouse to GS, WMMS, 16 Dec 1861, WMMS ILTF.
220 James Murray to Sir Frederick Rogers, FO, 31 Dec 1861, quoted in de Ricci, 233.
from the Tongan grasp”. Then in May, Seymour wrote to the Admiralty from Sydney concerning “information” he had received about the expected arrival in Fiji of Tupou with “a large force” to exact the indemnity. In the middle of these various alarms, Cakobau sought to send a message, through Pritchard, to Tupou, saying he desired peace and inviting the King to visit him as a friend. Because the matters of immediate concern were otherwise settled, the message was never delivered. Much was feared of Tupou at this time, but very little known of his intentions.

The Tongan demand for reparations remained the focal point of fears shared by the Consul, missionaries and commodore. Ma'afu was supposed to have instigated the claim since, having been thwarted by the 1859 agreement, he now sought a fresh excuse to pursue his “projects of aggrandizement”. His earlier appeal to the Consul to let him become “chief at Bau” demonstrates the extent to which he acted independently of Tupou, his nominal master. The King appeared resolved to enforce the claim, having been assured of its justice both by Pritchard and Brower. Calvert wrote to the King “expostulating with him” on the claim’s injustice and suggesting that, as a compromise, Tupou should accept from Cakobau a more modest “payment” which was within the power of the Vunivalu to make. He was not sanguine, however, expressing to Pritchard his view that Tupou “[in] his heart appears to covet these valuable islands, and their productions”. He strongly urged Pritchard to visit Tonga as the only means of averting the expected calamity.

The Consul required little persuading, consulting Consul Brower and Père Bréheret, who both urged him to make the voyage. Before his departure, he assured the Foreign Office that the Tongan indemnity was manifestly unjust, while the threat to the peace of Fiji and to British commerce posed by the number of refugees from justice in Tonga could not be overlooked. Pritchard considered the claim in the light of the “custom” prevailing in western Polynesia “as to the mode of payment for services rendered in war”. His reasoned conclusion was that Tupou had not “substantiated a case” against Cakobau so as “to authorise

---
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a departure from the settlement contained in the declaration signed on the 14th of December, 1859, by Ma’afu, as King George’s representative, in which are the words, (Article III, ‘All Tonguese claims in or to Fiji are hereby renounced’)."  

Shortly before his departure for Tonga, where he hoped to thwart Tongan hopes of acquiring further property in Fiji, Pritchard made sure that British interests were safeguarded. On 2 April Cakobau, probably following pressure exerted by the British and American Consuls, confirmed in writing “the lands of the foreigners in Fiji – the lands that are confirmed in the office of the British Consul”. The requisite declaration was signed with Cakobau’s mark and witnessed by both Pritchard and Brower. In acting against the perceived Tongan threat, Pritchard was securing European interests in Fiji above those of the Fijians themselves. He duly reached Nuku’alofa on 23 April, and over the next 13 days the matters of the indemnity and Tupou’s intentions towards Fiji were discussed, always with a Wesleyan missionary present. Pritchard claimed to have “wormed out an admission [from the King] of his designs upon Fiji”, designs to be matured when the Tongan Parliament met on 23 May. Ma’afu, to the Consul’s surprise, had preceded him to Tonga, having come to attend Parliament. According to Pritchard, Tupou later acknowledged that Ma’afu’s purpose was to mature plans for war, although evidence for such an admission is lacking. Pritchard had always considered that Ma’afu posed the greatest danger to Fiji, a belief based not only on the events of the previous four years but also on “the real skill in Ma’afu’s military dispositions”, a skill expounded to the Consul by Ma’afu himself. Such was Ma’afu’s success, Pritchard asserted, that he was “as much dreaded by his own king and countrymen in Tonga ... as ever he was ... by the Fijians”. Any agreement achieved between Pritchard and Tupou, if it were to prove effective, would have to ensure that Ma’afu were contained. The renunciation of all Tongan claims in Fiji, which the Consul had forced on Ma’afu in 1859, was not enough.

Tupou signed an agreement on 5 May providing for the removal of Wainiqolo from Fiji, although one month later that chief remained, still “talking of war”. His departure could not come soon enough for Pritchard. The May agreement also sought to forbid Tongan interference in commerce and in the sale of land to
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Europeans and effectively authorised British, in place of Tongan, exploitation of Fiji. In the light of the concerns expressed over several months by Pritchard, Cakobau and the missionaries, the final clause can be considered the most significant. It forbade Tongans from commencing any war in Fiji until the decision concerning cession was known, a provision described by Pritchard as “the main object of my visit [to Tonga]”. Implementation of the clause would depend on Ma`afu, whose name does not appear in any of the treaty’s provisions. Whatever concessions Tupou was prepared to make, Ma`afu remained what he had always been: the wild card.

One other reason for Pritchard’s voyage to Tonga was the official appointment of Joshua Cocker, a resident British trader, as “British Vice Consul for the Friendly Islands”. While in Nuku`alofa, Pritchard handed Cocker his official seal of office, accompanying the document with a letter clearly setting out his duties. The letter conveyed to the new Vice Consul punctilious instructions concerning his relations with the Tongan government, British residents and missionaries, and the representatives of other foreign powers. This formal communication, usual for such an appointment, was accompanied by a second letter, wherein Pritchard’s instructions were even more rigorous:

With reference to any question respecting Fijian affairs, which may be submitted by King George, you will invariably refer to His Majesty’s Consulate at Levuka for instructions, upon each separate point brought before you, previous to giving any statement or making any admission, to His Majesty.

The new Vice Consul, inexperienced in diplomacy, would have required precise instructions to assist him in the performance of his duties. Yet Pritchard, always apprehensive of Tongan designs on Fiji, remained determined to retain full control of all British dealings, official and otherwise, with the Tongan King.

Pritchard’s accounts of his negotiations with Tupou reveal the King’s extreme reluctance to acknowledge the dangers posed to Fiji and to British interests there by the menace, real or imagined, emanating from Tonga. Tupou’s mind seems to have been swayed by the realisation that the British government would consider him ultimately responsible for any Tongan aggression against Fiji. Following the treaty, he retained his hope of submitting his indemnity claim.

---
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to the British, should cession be approved.\textsuperscript{239} Despite the setback to his plans, whatever their precise nature was, Tupou proceeded to convene Parliament in June. The official list of the 57 chiefs in attendance, including Fijians, Samoans and Uveans as well as Tongans, placed Ma`afu second in order of precedence, following Tungi Halatuituai`a, great-uncle of the King.\textsuperscript{240} Among the Fijians were several Lakeban chiefs, whose presence appears to have evoked some anxiety on Pritchard’s part. The King hastened to assure him that “the chiefs of Lakeba attended the forthcoming Fakataha as His Majesty’s friends, and in no other way”, after the consul “protested against their appearing in any other capacity”.\textsuperscript{241} The importance of this Parliament lies in its provision of an expanded code of laws, which included provisions for the emancipation of the serfs and for the allocation of land for all Tongan males aged 16 and over, provided they paid their rent and taxes. By way of contrast with Fiji, the sale of land to foreigners was expressly forbidden.\textsuperscript{242} Missionary Shirley Baker, whose influence was paramount in the formulation of the code of laws, would later describe his handiwork as “the Magna Charta [sic] of [the Tongans’] freedom”.\textsuperscript{243}

The code’s provision for security of tenure in return for payment of taxes would influence Ma`afu’s administration of Lau in years to come.

The placing of Ma`afu as second in order of precedence among the chiefs recalls the question of succession. This chapter began with a consideration of Ma`afu’s position early in 1857, when Tupou expressed to the chiefs of Tongatapu such unbounded confidence in his young cousin.\textsuperscript{244} Since then, a fundamental change had occurred: Vuna, Tupou’s only surviving legitimate son, had died on 2 January 1862.\textsuperscript{245} Although a system of primogeniture was not to be established in Tonga until 1875, Vuna must have been considered as Tupou’s heir, in view of missionary prejudice in favour of “legitimate” succession. With Vuna gone, the King’s oldest son, Tevita `Unga, came into consideration, but Tupou had never been married to Tevita’s mother. In any case, `Unga was placed only fourth among the assembled chiefs in 1862, two places behind Ma`afu. As the son of Aleamotu`a, Ma`afu was probably seen as the most likely successor, in view of established Tongan custom. In Fiji meanwhile, following the treaty wrenched
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\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
from Tupou, all depended on the British government’s decision regarding cession. Ma’afu returned to Fiji with his prospects uncertain, but fraught with possibilities, in both groups of islands.
7. “Tonga is too small for him…”

News of the British government’s decision concerning Fiji, so eagerly awaited by so many there and in Tonga, finally arrived several months before Ma’afu’s return from his long visit to his homeland. As often with momentous news, trickles of information preceded the formal advice. In May 1862, a letter from Commodore Seymour reached William Hennings at Levuka, advising the trader that cession was declined and that HMS Miranda, Captain Robert Jenkins, would visit Fiji with an official party instructed to advise the chiefs that they were to be neither governed nor protected by Great Britain. In addition, the officials would participate in a Commission of Enquiry to investigate various charges levelled against Consul Pritchard.¹

In finally declining cession in September 1861, the Colonial Office took particular note of the recommendations of Colonel Smythe. He had placed emphasis on the near impossibility of avoiding involvement in “native wars” and in “disputes with other civilized countries”.² The Foreign Office needed no persuading, and in March 1862 the Colonial Secretary, the Duke of Newcastle, advised the Governor of New South Wales, Sir John Young, that Great Britain would not assume sovereignty over Fiji. Young was appointed to lead the delegation formally to advise the Fijian chiefs of the decision.³ In Fiji itself Pritchard, who had laboured so long to make cession a reality, notified his American colleague of the decision on 28 July.⁴ In submitting his report the previous year, Smythe had recommended to the Colonial Office that Pritchard be dismissed, principally on the grounds that irreconcilable differences had arisen between him and the Fijian chiefs.⁵ Disquiet in London concerning several aspects of Pritchard’s administration led the Colonial Office to instruct Sir John Young to appoint a Commission to investigate 12 charges against the Consul, most of which arose from Smythe’s representations to the Foreign Office. The Commissioners voyaged to Fiji in HMS Miranda and held hearings into the charges at Levuka in July 1862.⁶

¹ James Calvert to GS, WMMS, 25 Jul 1862, WMMS ILTF; Calvert to John Eggleston, 25 Jul 1862, MOM 99.
² Sir Frederic Rogers to E. Hammond, 7 Sep 1861, CO 83/1. For an informed critique of the Smythe Report, see F.W. Chesson, *The Past and Present of Fiji*, London 1875, 6–8.
³ FO to CO, 19 Sep 1861, FO 58/95; Duke of Newcastle to Sir John Young, 26 May 1862, quoted in J.H. de Ricci, *How about Fiji?*, London 1874, 39. See also Lord Clarendon to Sir Edward March, 20 May 1862, GB PP 1869, xliii [4222], 31. In Australia, reaction to the decision was adverse. Melbourne’s leading newspaper, *The Argus*, editorialised that “the Colonial Office has committed a very grave mistake” (9 Apr 1862, 4). See also “W.H.” to the Editor, *TA*, 17 Apr 1862, 4.
⁴ William Pritchard to Isaac Brower, 28 Jul 1862, BCFP. See also Brower to Pritchard, 28 Jul 1862, ibid.
⁵ William Smythe to Newcastle, 9 Nov 1860, CO83/1.
⁶ FO to Rogers at CO, 15 Mar 1862; Sir John Young to Newcastle, 21 May 1862, CO 83/1.
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The hearings, which accorded Pritchard unjust treatment and resulted in his dismissal from office, are not of immediate concern here. More important is the other reason for the *Miranda*’s visit to Fiji: to inform the chiefs of the British government’s rejection of cession. Once the vessel was in port, Captain Jenkins requested Pritchard to summon Cakobau “and the other chiefs who signed the document offering the sovereignty of Fiji to Her Majesty’s Government, to a formal meeting”. Four days later, Young informed the assembled chiefs “that Her Majesty’s ministers regret that they cannot advise Her Majesty to add the Fiji Islands to Her Dominions.” The most notable absentee from the gathering was Ma`afu, who was still visiting Tonga. For Cakobau, the refusal of cession, on which he had set his heart as a way out of his troubles, meant a return of the threats posed by American cupidity and Tongan ambition.

The *Miranda* soon left Levuka to undertake a tour of Fiji, so that other leading chiefs, including Tui Nayau, Tui Cakau and Tui Bua, could receive official notification of the decision. James Calvert wrote of Tongan indignation because “the Consul has shut them out for twelve months from their friends on the Macuata coast”. The imminent withdrawal of Pritchard, and the knowledge that cession would not occur, meant that there would no longer be any cause for indignation. The missionaries hoped that following the unfavourable decision from London, the Fijian chiefs would now form “a native government”. Cakobau, they asserted, had long wanted to do so, “but was kept back by fear of the Consul”. Joseph Waterhouse, aware of the inability of the *matanitu* to act in concert, favoured “a Tongan–Fijian Government” whose “Tongan elements” were needed “to cement and keep the fabric together”. Even Calvert, previously so supportive of the Tongans, now believed that “the Tongan influence of 1855 [was] quite a different thing from the Tongan influence of 1860–62”.

Although Ma`afu remained in Tonga during the Commission’s hearings, his name was several times heard in evidence. Waterhouse confirmed that Pritchard had “given permission” for the Tongans to attack Bau, a reference to the Consul’s petulance in the face of what he saw as Cakobau’s obduracy.

---
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10 Jenkins to Commodore William Burnett, 30 Aug 1862, quoted in de Ricci, 41–43.
11 Calvert to George Stringer Rowe, 31 Jul 1861, Personal Papers.
12 Edward Martin to William Collis, 3 Jul 1862, Letters to William Collis 1855–1876, MOM 129.
Waterhouse was adamant that Ma’afu and those chiefs over whom he exercised influence would not recognise any treaty which Cakobau might make with a foreign power. Interpreter Edward Martin confirmed Ma’afu’s “great political influence in Fiji” as the representative of Tupou I. According to Martin, Ma’afu recognised Cakobau as Tui Viti, “nevertheless he goes about collecting property in derogation of Cakobau’s rights”. Now that the decision to refuse cession was known and with the restraining hand of Pritchard likely to be removed, the threat posed by Tongan power and influence in Fiji would increase. Cakobau would enjoy a breathing space only until Ma’afu’s return.

Despite Ma’afu’s absence, or perhaps because of it, Tongan forces again intervened in hostilities in Fiji at the very time the Commission was conducting its hearings. Golea was expected at Fawn Harbour in July, bent on “exterminating” the local Christians, who sent a canoe “to beg the Tonguese to come and protect them”. Two days later, news arrived that a force of Tongans under Wainiqolo “had taken Taveuni, where four towns were burnt and Tui Cakau taken prisoner”. Although Thomas Baker approved, since Golea’s home was on Taveuni, he remained pragmatic: “The majority of the people seem disposed to yield to the strongest party. Christianity is a secondary matter”. His comment neatly encapsulated the Realpolitik of contemporary Fiji. Anxiety in the mission and surrounding villages increased daily, until on 25 July Wainiqolo himself arrived on board the canoe which had been sent to seek further Tongan help. The chief, bent on capturing Golea, informed Baker that he had removed “the entire population on the east side of Taveuni” and formed them into three large towns, one in northern Taveuni and the other two on the islands of Laucala and Qamea. Not surprisingly, in view of the people’s apparent disposition, the Christian party was augmenting its numbers hourly, while the enemy, seeing the size of their opposition, fled and suffered pursuit.

Joeli Bulu, the Tongan assistant missionary who had worked in Fiji for over 20 years, has left an account of this renewal of Tongan armed intervention. According to Bulu, Ritova had sent a tabua to Golea seeking his help in Macuata. In preparing to depart, Golea sought assistance from the Christian village of Waikava, adjoining the Fawn Harbour mission, and when that assistance was refused, threatened to raid the town after his return from Macuata. Alarmed, the lotu people at Waikava sent for Wainiqolo, who was then at Vanuabalavu. The immediate consequence of this request was the successful Tongan campaign in Taveuni. When the European missionaries, assembled at Levuka for a circuit meeting, heard of the hostilities, they requested help from Pritchard, still

---

13 Evidence of Joseph Waterhouse and Edward Martin, Report of a Commission of Enquiry...
15 ibid., 18 Jul – 2 Aug 1862. During this time of danger, missionaries Jesse Carey and Joseph White, with their wives, took refuge with the Bakers at Fawn Harbour.
preoccupied with the Commission. The Consul referred the request to Tui Cakau, who declined to intervene. Bulu then appealed directly to Golea, whose promise to stop fighting soon proved to be false. Bulu indicates that when Wainiqolo visited Fawn Harbour, relations between then two Tongans, missionary and warrior, were greatly strained. Bulu exchanged only formal greetings with Wainiqolo and, in an effort to avoid further contact, left the mission to preach and baptise in the outlying villages. On his return, he was pleased to find that Wainiqolo had departed. He reported an eavesdropped conversation between Wainiqolo and Kuila, Raivalita’s cousin, “who joined himself to [the Christians] not because he loved the lotu, but because he wanted to kill Golea, who stood in his way”.16

Another indigenous aspect to these events is found in the account of the Toga yavusa in Lomaloma recorded in the Tukutuku Raraba.17 This 1923 narration, likely to have been modified during the 60 years since the events it described, holds that when Ma’a’fu departed for Tonga, he ordered Wainiqolo not to engage in hostilities during his absence. While such instructions were by no means impossible, and in the political circumstances of the day even likely, there can be no certainty that they were given. Wainiqolo, so the Tukutuku Raraba contends, heard of Ritova’s renewed campaign in Macuata and wanted to participate.18 Lacking sufficient strength, he actively sought fighting men throughout Cakaudrove until he amassed a large enough force. The appeal for help from the lotu people at Waikava apparently reached him while he was recruiting at Vanuabalavu. The Tukutuku Raraba records an attack by Wainiqolo’s forces on Somosomo, where the Tongan, taking advantage of Golea’s absence in Macuata, made the ailing Raivalita prisoner and conveyed him to Laucala. When Golea heard of these events, he hastened back for what was to prove the dénouement of this particular Tongan drama.19

The Tongans’ raids on Taveuni and their capture of Raivalita were undertaken to punish those villages whose warriors had gone to Macuata in support of Ritova. “Incensed” by Pritchard’s actions in returning Ritova to his home, the Tongans were now bent on revenge, in Macuata as well as Cakaudrove.20 Tui Cakau had shifted his support to the Macuata faction that Ma’a’fu had defeated.21 He had earned missionary disfavour because of his support for the Catholic cause, support given as a means of countering the Tongans, self-proclaimed champions of the lotu weseli. Kuila, ambitious for the chieftainship of
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Cakaudrove, “was energetic for the lotu”. For these intriguing rivals, Raivalita, Golea and Kuila, the denomination they endorsed was determined entirely by political considerations. Wainiqolo’s presence at Waikava was in response to an invitation from Kuila “to assist him in defending the Christian party”. Kuila was not the only person to seek help against Golea, since Joeli Bulu, at Carey’s request, had written to Ma’afu in Tonga “to help in the war”.22

Despite Thomas Baker’s awareness of the secondary place of Christianity in the chiefs’ rivalries, he and other missionaries wrote of the contest as one between the lotu and heathenism. He described Golea as “a thorough heathen chief” whose object was the destruction of Christianity in Cakaudrove.23 Baker made no mention of Golea’s supposed conversion to Catholicism,24 although the missionary would have regarded heathenism and the doctrines of the church of Rome as two sides of the same coin. Wainiqolo’s response to Kuila’s summons is not surprising since, as a declared supporter of the lotu, Kuila would be far more sympathetic than Golea to Tongan interests. At all events Golea, from his stronghold at Wairiki, “invited” Kuila, Wainiqolo and Bulu to come across to meet him. Declining to walk into the trap, the three instead sent a canoe to Golea, with the message that should he “wish … any explanation, let him come here [Waikava] where justice will be attended to”. A refusal by Golea would be seen as a “declaration of war”.25

American Vice Consul Isaac Brower, at his post in Levuka, was distanced from these urgent communications across the Somosomo Strait. He nevertheless envisaged danger from Tonga in a much broader context, advising his State Department of the “strong probability that the natives of … Tonga … will try to overrun and conquer this group … I do not doubt their ability to do so. I am aware that they have been restrained thus long only by the fear of interfering with the Cession … and thereby exacting the displeasure of the British Government”.26 Three days after Brower penned his gloomy missive, HMS Miranda, with Calvert on board as a guest of the official party, arrived at Fawn Harbour.27 In view of the hostilities, past and threatened, the arrival was opportune. A “reign of terror” had continued since Ritova’s return to his home and the assassination of Bete, with Tui Cakau “a prisoner of war for assisting Ritova and breaking faith with his old allies from Tonga”.28 Pritchard, despite his rift with the missionaries, found himself in agreement with them over the origins of the troubles. The Consul believed that the Macuata fighting had

23 Baker, 15 and 29 Jul 1862.
24 Calvert to Rowe, 3 Mar 1863, Personal Papers.
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26 Brower to U.S. State Department, 30 Jul 1862, USC Laucala 4.
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28 Carey to Joseph White, 4–5 Aug 1862, quoted in White to GS, WMMS, 18 Oct 1862, WMMS ILTF.
arisen from Smythe’s protests about him, following his decision to return Ritova to Nukubati. These differences between Commissioner and Consul, Pritchard claimed, caused Wainiqolo and his forces “to make a descent upon the [Macuata] coast”. These contemporary shades of opinion, instructive as they are, were then of far less moment than the need to overcome the crisis to whose origins Pritchard and the missionaries had devoted so much reasoned eloquence.

There appeared to be hope of a solution. Referring to the Tongans’ opponents as those whom Pritchard had encouraged, Calvert hoped “for success” in the mission’s efforts “to keep the Tongans and Bau united”. Pritchard later observed that the missionaries on board the *Miranda* were so incensed at Golea’s open declaration of Catholicism that they praised Wainiqolo to the limit. More considered, perhaps, given the antipathy between Consul and missionaries, was the conversation overheard by an associate of Bulu. Wainiqolo promised Kuila that he would do whatever Kuila wished, and Kuila sought Golea’s destruction. But it was not to be; on Saturday 16 August, in response to the so-called “declaration of war” thrust upon Golea by his enemies, Wainiqolo led a force of about 1,500 men against Golea and his party of 250 at Wairiki. Wainiqolo was killed on the beach in front of the Wairiki war fence, with about 60 of his Tongan and Fijian forces also meeting their deaths. Kuila managed to escape back to Waikava, while Golea received two serious wounds. The ailing Tui Cakau escaped to his home at Somosomo, and several villages on Taveuni hitherto favouring Wainiqolo redirected their allegiance to their restored paramount chief. Tongan power in Fiji had received its most severe check in the 15 years since Ma`afu had lived in the islands, at a time when Ma`afu himself, perhaps fortunately, was still visiting his homeland.

Following this unexpected defeat, much would depend on Ma`afu’s reaction upon his return to Fiji. Calvert thought that the loss of Ma`afu’s “principal man” would constrain him and would “embolden the Fijians to defy such a foreign power”. Four days after Wainiqolo’s death, there were expectations of Ma`afu’s imminent arrival “with two canoes … he may be able to cause quietness”. As with all mounting crises, rumour ran ahead of knowledge: there was a report that several Tongan chiefs were at Lomaloma, “on their way towards Waikava”.
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while another rumour had Ma’afu already at Lakeba, whence “a canoe was dispatched to report the defeat at Waikava”. Calvert believed, correctly, that Ma’afu had not yet reached that island.35

So important was Wainiqolo’s defeat, in the context of longer-term Tongan involvement in Fiji, that it is useful to consider other views of him, especially those emanating from people who enjoyed his acquaintance. Pritchard, contemptuous of the Tongans’ claims to be champions of the lotu, noted Wainiqolo’s defiance before the fortifications of Wairiki: “Prepare to die; in three days I attack your fort, and you fall by my bullet if you dare to meet Wainiqolo”. Undaunted, Golea is supposed to have responded: “Does hair grow on the soles of your feet? Come quickly, lest the hairs grow too long for you to run”.36 The Consul’s account bids fair to turn tragedy into farce, although the chief’s hubris did, as in all good tragedy, become his nemesis. Another view was that of Henry Miller, the half-Tongan son of a Wesleyan missionary. Miller, who was Ma’afu’s personal assistant and interpreter at Lomaloma during Ma’afu’s years as Roko Tui Lau, later observed that Wainiqolo had acted without Ma’afu’s consent in attacking Wairiki. He attacked out of “private enmity”, the inevitable consequence perhaps of Wainiqolo’s close involvement with the internecine rivalry among the Cakaudrove chiefs.37 More than 20 years after Wainiqolo’s death, John Bates Thurston, future British Consul and Governor of Fiji, recorded his view of Wainiqolo, one not based on personal observation. The chief, Thurston wrote, had been “a cruel and treacherous Tongan marauder … whose whole career had been one of torture, mutilation and murder”.38 Posterity was not kind to Wainiqolo. Yet his defeat and death, certainly a setback for the Tongan cause in Fiji, must be seen in a wider context. The Cakaudrove chiefs achieved a Pyrrhic victory, since they would never again enjoy unfettered mastery in their lands. Golea, soon to become Tui Cakau, had already begun selling land to European settlers, while in 1867 Cakaudrove would become part of the Lau Confederation, its fortunes tied to those of Ma’afu and the Tongans. The demise of Wainiqolo gave the Cakaudrove chiefs no more than a breathing space.

During the weeks following Wairiki, nothing was known, and much speculated, concerning Ma’afu’s return and his likely reaction to the loss of his “principal man”. Less than a fortnight before Wainiqolo’s death, Tupou wrote to Cakobau on the subject of future Tongan involvement in Fiji. The King indicated he would wait to learn the decision concerning cession before deciding on his
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future actions in respect of Tongan interests in Fiji. He noted that many lands in Fiji were Tongan by right of conquest, while elsewhere the *taukei* preferred subjection to Tongans. Probably influenced by the advice of his missionary mentors in Nuku`alofa, Tupou observed that if it were wrong for Tonga to rule such lands, it was equally wrong for Great Britain to rule India and New Zealand and for France to rule Tahiti.39

Calvert, although noting his continued respect for Tupou’s character and past achievements, was contemptuous of the King’s comparison of Tonga, “a few small patches that are just out of the water”, with Britain and France. Yet the missionary remained apprehensive of Tupou’s plans, unstated and undefined as they were. Calvert had written to Tupou on Cakobau’s behalf in late August, when he still feared that Pritchard’s expressed wish for the Tongans to take Fiji might offer undue encouragement in Nuku`alofa.40 Despite these precautions, Calvert and his colleagues remained ignorant of the intentions of both Tupou and Ma`afu for more than two months after Wairiki. The missionary Joseph White, stationed at Fawn Harbour, apprehended Bau’s involvement in hostilities unless peace were made upon the return of Ma`afu, “daily expected with a large army”.41 Ma`afu was in fact still in Tonga, apparently in no hurry to leave. On 16 September, he arrived at Nuku`alofa from Ha`apai and the next day “seemed quite agreeable” during a meeting with missionaries George Lee and Frank Firth.42

Despite his derision for Tupou’s placing Tonga on equal footing with Britain and France, Calvert noted the “assumed predominance” of the Tongans in Fiji, stating that if the Tongans were wrong, “they are only guilty with England and France”. Unwittingly echoing more of Tupou’s views, he referred to “a new era” in Fiji. “Tongans are now owners of land – buyers of tribute – ruling Fijians; but not allowing themselves to pay tribute or be … controlled by the chiefs and owners of the lands where they reside and visit”.43 Such was the dilemma posed by the Tongan presence in Fiji in 1862, a dilemma similarly addressed by Tupou in his letter to Cakobau. How could the lands under Tongan control be reconciled to the existing Fijian polity, in which Tongans might be seen as interlopers? The fact that their position lacked definition was an invitation for further intervention, inasmuch as either Tupou or Ma`afu, if they arrived in force, could claim that they sought only to defend the rights and privileges of the Tongans already resident in the group. The dilemma was not to be resolved in the short term. In October, Calvert recorded that “the Somosomo party”,
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as well as Ritova, “are properly Papists, and are united to destroy people and
towns connected with us”. Moreover, “active war” had recommenced between
Ritova and Ma`afu’s long-standing ally Tui Bua, a situation where Ma`afu
would be likely to intervene after his return. On a more promising note, there
was “peaceable intelligence” from Tonga, with Tupou apparently blaming
those Tongans resident in and visiting Fiji for much of the trouble. They were
“required” by the King “not to meddle with Fijian troubles and wars”. The
seeds of the dilemma described by Calvert lay with those very people. They
would continue to reside and visit in considerable numbers and would always
be requested to take part in Fijian disputes: “They cannot look on”. Resolution
of the dilemma would have to emanate from outside Fiji. Calvert hoped that after
Ma`afu’s arrival, he would proceed to Bau and reassure Cakobau “that Tonga
and Bau are united … If he does so, many little troubles will be quelled”.44

Ma`afu had still not returned by the end of October, nor was there any word of
him. Calvert expected that when he did come, he would effect a reconciliation
between Fawn Harbour and Taveuni, but would likely go to the aid of Tui Bua
against Ritova. The missionary spoke to a young Lakeban chief, Sakiusa Tu
Kivei, who had just returned from attending the Tongan Parliament. Sakiusa
was impressed by the Code of Laws Tupou had introduced, as indeed was
Calvert. In a conversation with Sakiusa, the King had asked him what would
be done in Fiji by way of similar reform. “We will watch the tree which you
have planted”, Sakiusa replied, and later repeated to Calvert. “If it bears good
fruit, we will plant the same”.45 How far such a measure would affect the many
Tongans living on the island was another matter. With Ma`afu still absent,
rumours persisted, one of which being that Tupou “was on the eve of a visit to
Fiji, with a fleet of sixty double canoes”.46 The first evidence we have of Ma`afu’s
presence is on 9 December, when Calvert recorded that Ma`afu and Tu`i Ha`apai
were in Fiji.47 The missionary learned from the captain of a vessel newly arrived
in Levuka that “upwards of 200 kegs of powder [had] been purchased in the
Friendly Islands”, in case enquiries made by Ma`afu and Tu`i Ha`apai indicated
that further Tongan “interference” was required.48 Calvert remained convinced
that Tupou was designing “something” in relation to the Tongan lands in Fiji,
although he was “persuaded that [the King] will not be allowed to accomplish all
his wishes”.49 By 20 December Ma`afu was at Waikava with the King’s schooner
and four canoes. He had brought with him a “document” from Tupou, on which
he was “to gain the signatures of the Bau and other chiefs, to confirm to Tongans
certain Fijian lands which they claim”. Here at last was Tupou’s response to
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the British decision not to accept the offer of cession. If Ma’afu did not gain “satisfactory concessions”, preparations were being made in Tonga “to come in force”. In the meantime, Ma’afu’s intentions were apparently peaceful. He was “under strict injunctions from King George not to engage in war”.  

The “document” which Ma’afu brought contained a clause seeking “to bind the Fijians not to sell or lease any more land to foreigners – without first gaining permission from George”. Such a provision fell little short of an attempt by Tupou to attain the ascendancy of Fiji through the back door. Leaving aside the question of land sales and leases, Tupou, through his “document”, sought to confirm the status quo with regard to Tongan lands in Fiji, thereby minimising any untoward consequences of Wainiqolo’s defeat. The threat of force, whether implied or explicit, if Tongan control of those lands were not confirmed rendered the terms of the document an offer which Fiji’s leading chiefs could scarcely refuse. Of equal importance, at least in the short term, was the question of whether Ma’afu had prior knowledge of Wainiqolo’s activities in Cakaudrove or whether Wainiqolo had acted partly on Ma’afu’s orders. Notwithstanding the tradition that Wainiqolo had defied Ma’afu, Isaac Brower contended in 1880 that Wainiqolo had advised an American settler named John Macomber that he had Ma’afu’s consent to wage war on Tui Cakau. Such a report, hearsay at best, was from a deponent disbelieved in other matters at hearings of the Lands Claims Commission. Bulu’s letter to Ma’afu in Tonga is no proof of any instructions from Ma’afu to Wainiqolo before the former’s departure. The evidence of Ma’afu himself at the Commission should be considered:

I remember going to Tonga and leaving Wainiqolo … I remained there three months and in the fourth returned. When I left for Tonga I had no idea that any war was about to take place. It was Wainiqolo’s doing I had no part in it.

Since Ma’afu had a history of denying intent, his evidence cannot be accepted without question. Brower pertinently observed that Wainiqolo, a minor chief, could hardly have raised such a large force around Cakaudrove and openly attacked the fortress of one of the most powerful chiefs of that matanitu without Ma’afu’s prior consent. The most that can be said is that the case against Ma’afu is not proven, since any consultation with Wainiqolo would have been verbal, very likely away from prying ears.

---
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The *Tukutuku Raraba* recounts Ma`afu’s anger with the survivors of Wainiqolo’s force when he met them at Waikava, anger provoked by their supposed disobedience. Appearing determined to effect a reconciliation with Golea, Ma`afu took two young men with him in a *takia* across the Somosomo Strait in the pre-dawn darkness. Upon reaching Wairiki, Ma`afu approached Golea and his army. When he recognised Ma`afu’s voice calling him, Golea invited him into the compound, where Ma`afu convinced Golea, now Tui Cakau, of his peaceful intentions. After daybreak, a party of Ma`afu’s men, believing their chief had been taken prisoner to Wairiki, themselves traversed the strait, only to be greeted by Ma`afu, who told them not to do anything foolish. Some of the older men came ashore with offerings of food for Golea, as tokens of friendship. Reconciliation had been achieved.  

The above account should not convey the impression that Ma`afu’s aim was peace for the sake of peace. He owed much of his prestige in Cakaudrove to Golea’s father, Tuikilakila, who had granted him levying rights over several islands and under whose protection Ma`afu had lived for about 18 months. Ma`afu’s later influence in Macuata and Bua was largely a consequence of his early contact with Cakaudrove. Now, with Golea recovering from his severe wounds and probably displeased with his Tongan guests, Ma`afu had every reason to effect a reconciliation. Nevertheless, many of Golea’s people, both Fijian and Tongan, had flocked to aid Wainiqolo, and their lands were now in jeopardy. Among those lands was Vanuabalavu which, although ceded to Ma`afu in accordance with custom, remained nominally subject to Cakaudrove and its paramount chief. Golea was much better placed than Cakobau to put a spoke in Ma`afu’s wheel.

Giving evidence before the Lands Claims Commission, Ma`afu referred to his disquiet over the Tongan lands in Fiji:

> I found on my return a change in the relations and conditions of my lands ... When I heard of it I went to [Tui Cakau] ... I said ... 'The war arose when I was at a distance and the result has been no good and you have sold portion of the land. What profit is there in the death of all these people? I have come that there may be peace.'  

According to Swanston, Golea had felt that selling some of the lands of his people who had sided against him was the only way he could hope to defy Ma`afu.  

Among the lands he sold during the next few months was Vanuabalavu, where Ma`afu now lived, to George Henry for $400, a sale which included most of the islands within the Vanuabalavu reef. One exception was Munia, sold separately.

---
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to Macomber. Lauca, Mago and other islands were also sold, with Mago being conveyed to William Hennings for $350 in merchandise and cash. Golea claimed that he had not been motivated solely by a desire to punish those of his people who had betrayed him. He also apparently believed that the whites who purchased his lands would help to protect him against the Tongans, although he was later to tell Ma`afu that he sold only after the whites had made him drunk.

Golea’s land sales exemplified the “defiance” accorded Ma`afu, who responded by asking Tupou to come to Fiji with a force of 1,000 warriors. Again rumour predominated: the “enquiries” being undertaken by Ma`afu and Tu`i Ha`apai were supposedly part of a pretence which would end in the invasion and occupation of Fiji by Tupou’s forces. It was only in December that Cakobau finally received Tupou’s letter of 7 August, written in response to the Vunivalu’s letter to him. The King’s tone was provocative:

You say I am to govern Tonga and you will govern Fiji. What Fiji is it that you speak of? Do you rule over Thakaundrovy? Do you rule over the Windward Islands? Do you rule at Mathuata? Or, do you rule at Rewa? And, as it regards Bau, that you have given to Britain. So what Fiji is it that you govern?

Since, on 7 August, Tupou did not yet know the British decision concerning cession, his words can be regarded as a fair statement of Cakobau’s actual power, although he takes no account of the great prestige attached to Bau and to the Vunivalu. The implication of Tupou’s admonition is that whatever future action he might take respecting the Tongan lands in Fiji need not concern Cakobau unduly, since those lands lay beyond Cakobau’s control. The King spoke of the “ill-treatment” accorded Tongans in Fiji, a comment Calvert correctly regarded as “sadly one-sided”, in view of Tongan rapacity over many years. Tupou appeared to have been offended by Cakobau, and whether that offence were genuine or feigned scarcely mattered. When Calvert learned on 30 December that Ma`afu had failed to secure another interview with Golea at Wairiki and had sent his schooner to Tonga for reinforcements, his alarm was genuine. Whether or not he had been manipulated by Ma`afu, Tupou was clearly prepared to act

---
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decisively and quickly in defence of Tongan interests in Fiji. Like the news of
the stockpiling of gunpowder, Ma`afu’s requests for reinforcements strongly
suggests that active plans for an invasion had been made.

The origins of Tupou’s displeasure with Cakobau lie with the Vunivalu’s offer of
cession in 1858 and especially with Ma`afu’s forced renunciation of the Tongan
lands in Fiji in 1859. Tungi Halatuitui’a, governor of Tongatapu and second
in precedence to the King, stated later in 1863 that Tupou and all the Tongan
chiefs had been “pained” by Ma`afu’s signing away Tongan rights in Fiji.
Later, they were relieved to learn from Ma`afu himself that he had only signed
through “fear”. Relief on the part of the King and chiefs could not alter the
fact of the document’s existence, however, and their uneasiness would not have
waned during the intervening three years, despite the fall from grace of Consul
Pritchard. The defeat and death of Wainiqolo must only have heightened anxiety
in Tonga. Were the Tongan lands in Fiji to be lost, partly at the behest of a Fijian
chief who claimed an authority he did not possess? Even though the British
government, in deciding against cession, had largely put paid to Pritchard’s
coercion of Ma`afu, the European settlers in Fiji could not be indifferent to the
plans of Tupou. The King was influenced, although to what extent cannot be
determined, by a message from a group of settlers:

Now is your time, Tupou. England will not accept Fiji; if you go over
the Europeans and half-castes will to a man join you, and you will walk
through Fiji without difficulty.65

This invitation might have been an attempt by some settlers to have Tupou on
side before his expected invasion since, according to the Foreign Office, the
Tongans were expected to forbid further alienation of land in Fiji and “to use
the Fijians to make oil and sailmats (for canoes) ... there will be an end to the
commerce of Fiji, in so far as white men are concerned”. Whatever its purpose,
the settlers’ invitation enhanced the fears and temptations playing in Tupou’s
mind as he waited for the results of Ma`afu’s mission to Cakaudrove.66

Cakobau remained bewildered by the refusal of cession and apprehensive
concerning Tongan intentions. Early in January he called a meeting of chiefs,
who were reported to be “united and determined to resist Tongan aggression”. In
a move not devoid of irony, Cakobau announced plans to prepare a set of laws
after the fashion of those proclaimed by Tupou at the 1862 Tongan Parliament.
The Vunivalu, for once the statesman, urged the chiefs not to forget that Tupou
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and his warriors had been his saviours at Kaba. The chiefs were urged to do
nothing to provoke the Tongans now.\textsuperscript{67} Meanwhile, crews of vessels recently
arrived at Levuka confirmed that ammunition was indeed being laid up at Tonga.
“100 kegs of gunpowder had been purchased at Ha`apai from one vessel as a
preparation for war in Fiji, should Ma`afu fail to get matters settled”, Calvert
noted, alarmed at the prospect of a war which he thought would last for ten
years and cost thousands of lives.\textsuperscript{68}

Ma`afu called on Calvert soon after the missionary reached Fawn Harbour in
January, informing him that after the Tongan Parliament the previous year,
Tupou had intended to send him to Bau to restore friendship between the King
and Cakobau. But before Ma`afu was ready to leave Tonga, news arrived of
the events at Wairiki. Ma`afu and Tu`i Ha`apai were instead sent directly to
Waikava to enquire into the circumstances of Wainiqolo’s defeat. “In the event
of any difficulty [Ma`afu] was not allowed to fight, but to send the schooner
with the report to King George”. So much had Ma`afu done. He stated that
he would gladly negotiate peace if Cakobau and Tui Cakau were willing. He
appeared genuinely desirous of peace:

\begin{quote}
We do not wish for war – war is poverty, starvation, sleeplessness,
death of the body, and frequently followed by everlasting misery in hell
… We are blamed for fighting in Fiji; but whoever heard of Tongans
commencing war in Fiji. The Fijians get into trouble with other Fijians,
and entreat us to help. We have again and again complied; and I have lost
many of my best attendants by engaging in Fijian fights when requested.
\end{quote}

Calvert did not forbear to add that Ma`afu had “abandoned the drinking of
spiritoius liquors”. Ma`afu’s words might serve as a classic statement of the
guiding principles of his career in Fiji. How often had he sweetened missionary
ears with a recitation of the evils of violence; how often had he plausibly denied
his active involvement in the instigation of war, insisting that it was always
thrust upon him? The missionary cannot have been surprised when, following
his eloquent speech and again according to old habits, Ma`afu sought permission
to meet in class. The following Saturday, by coincidence the anniversary of his
baptism in Nuku`alofa 33 years earlier, Ma`afu and his henchman, the notorious
Semisi Fifita, “prayed with great humility and earnestness in the chapel at Fawn
Harbour”.\textsuperscript{69} Great also was their capacity to deceive, and great the
\textit{naiveté} of James Calvert, although the missionary gave the errant Tongans some credit for
the example vouchsafed to their people.
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The degree of reconciliation Ma`afu had achieved with Golea, recounted in the *Tukutuku Raraba*, can be questioned. Although Ma`afu had apparently sent three messages to Golea requesting a meeting, the latter refused to cross to Waikava, insisting instead that Ma`afu should come to Wairiki, which he was reluctant to do. The impasse caused Ma`afu to despatch his schooner back to Tonga. At the same time, the British Consul received a “requisition” signed by many resident Europeans, including the French priests, urging the Consul to “request any British ship of war that may come to prevent the Tongans from over running”. Despite the invitation from some of their number to Tupou, the state of anxiety among the white community appeared to match that of Cakobau.

Ma`afu meanwhile continued to impress Calvert both with his humility at prayer and his ardent desire for peace. On 20 January Calvert and Joseph White were at Wairiki, where the former advised Golea, as he had Ma`afu and Cakobau, to work towards peace. Golea assured his visitors that he much preferred peace to war. His land sales to Europeans might be seen as evidence of this preference although, if such sales are considered blameworthy, not all of the blame attaches to Golea. George Henry, the “purchaser” of Vanuabalavu, had in 1860 persuaded the inhabitants of Adavaci, an island within the Vanuabalavu reef, to sell their island to him. Henry had assured the people that such a sale was the only way they could retain their land in the event of British annexation of Fiji. Ma`afu’s attempts to dissuade them were futile. Now, amid the uncertainties of early 1863, Henry successfully pressed Golea to sell him the whole of Vanuabalavu, in spite of the agreement between Tuikilakila and Ma`afu. The latter’s customary rights were ignored, another example of Golea’s mistrust of the man with whom he was supposedly reconciled. Ma`afu later wrote in protest to Acting British Consul William Owen, reminding him that “all Vanuabalavu is Tongan … it is my wish that you should not enter that sale until I see you with some of the aged or principal men of that land”.
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who seemed to enjoy Golea’s confidence, also noted that Tui Cakau had “sold two good and large islands for ammunition”. Calvert hastened to inform the chief “that Ma‘afu had kind feelings towards him”.

At the end of January, Calvert was ready to escort Cakobau, accompanied by Owen, on a visit to Wairiki to discuss peace with Golea. The missionary continued to heap praise on Ma‘afu who, he hoped, would “adopt the Tongan laws at Lakeba so far as they are practicable in Fiji. He appears to be disposed to be one with Cakobau”. Calvert was sanguine concerning the prospects of a “united and strong government” under the two chiefs, so often rivals in the past.

Owen, although very much the new chum in such company, lost no time in advising Tupou that although Great Britain had declined the sovereignty of Fiji, “it by no means ceases to watch over and protect (through me) the lives and property of its subjects in these islands”. Owen urged the King to do nothing “which might disturb those friendly relations which now exist”. Owen’s courteous tone contrasted with the belligerence of Brower, who warned the King that if Ma‘afu and his “agents” interfered with arrangements being made in Fiji for payment of the American “debt”, Tupou would be held personally liable for the debt, as well as “sums in damages”. The King was solemnly warned not to prosecute his “ambitious designs” on Fiji.

At Waikava, on 4 February, Owen duly read to the local chiefs the Proclamation that cession would not occur. When Ma‘afu arrived with three canoes the following day, Owen took the opportunity to confer with him, urging him towards “a continuation of peace”. Despite the Consul’s efforts, defensive preparations for war were being made, with White noting the next day that Tupou “was daily expected in Fiji with a large army”. The people were still able to offer a formal welcome to Cakobau, who was received in Tui Cakau’s house and presented with “an immense package” of masi as well as a tabua. Two days later, after some prevarication, Cakobau, accompanied by Calvert, decided to call on Ma‘afu as the best means of settling matters. The Vunivalu reached Waikava on 12 February, firing off two swivel guns “which were responded to by Ma‘afu on shore”. Immediately on landing, Cakobau proceeded to Ma‘afu’s house, where he presented a tabua and a root of yaqona.

---
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The following day, Ma’afu hosted a three-hour meeting between himself and Cakobau at Carey’s house. Fifita and Bulu were also present. “It appeared clear that there should not be any war, but Ma’afu wished the matter to be left open for consideration and conclusion”. He spent a day on board Cakobau’s schooner where, in an apparent indication that relations were amicable, Cakobau presented him with “a double-barrelled rifle lately sent to him by the King of Hanover”. The two met again two days later, “when they arranged that peace should be established”. While such an agreement was obviously welcome, provided Ma’afu could be trusted, its implementation would be impossible without the approval and co-operation of Tui Cakau and Tupou.

Negotiations remained extremely delicate during the ensuing week. When Cakobau asked Ma’afu and Kuila to accompany him back to Wairiki, the chiefs proposed that Fifita and a local chief named Silas should go as their representatives. Although Cakobau agreed, Calvert was apprehensive that the substitution of “inferior persons” would offend Golea and prevent peace. When the missionary threatened to return to Ovalau immediately unless Ma’afu agreed to accompany Cakobau, Ma’afu acquiesced, so anxious was he for Calvert’s continued involvement in the peace negotiations. Cakobau, however, continued to demur, sending instead Fifita and Silas, accompanied by his own son Epeli, to seek Golea’s wishes. The two chiefs returned, laden with vegetables and live turtles as well as Golea’s assurance that he desired a visit from Ma’afu. He even promised to come over to Waikava himself if Ma’afu were afraid. After much further exchange of messages, occasioned by the pessimism of chiefly advisers on both sides of the strait, Ma’afu and Cakobau, in their respective schooners and escorted by five canoes, set out on 21 February. Bulu, with orders from Calvert to remain close to Ma’afu, accompanied them.

During the short voyage, Bulu attributed the orderliness of the fleet to Ma’afu’s “earnestness in religion”. This was music to Calvert’s ears; he was delighted that Ma’afu, like Tupou before him, had “got right in his soul”, a change that boded well for the future of the Tongan community in Fiji. The missionary noted in passing that he had many times urged on Ma’afu “the necessity of having a fixed residence and of having a well-ordered township – of having laws, and of keeping all in order”. If Calvert was the dupe of Ma’afu concerning the latter’s “earnestness”, so too was Bulu. Either Ma’afu had deceived both of his religious mentors, or he was subject, in the light of his uncertain political prospects, to a spiritual rebirth that as yet showed no signs of flagging. In his defence, it should be remembered that Joseph White was convinced of his sincerity and remained so 18 months later.

---

88 Calvert to Rowe, 3 Mar 1863; Calvert, Journal, 13–16 Feb 1863.
89 Calvert to Rowe, 3 Mar 1863.
90 White to GS, WMMS, 24 Aug 1864, WMMS ILTF.
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

The arrival of the folau off Wairiki caused alarm and preparations for battle, but Tui Cakau’s forces were reassured by the presence of Calvert and Bulu. The party went ashore and, in the presence of Cakobau and the missionaries, Ma`afu and Golea shook hands, “had a comfortable conversation, and agreed to have peace”. A meeting of Cakaudrove chiefs two days later passed equally pleasantly. Cakobau subsequently suggested a written agreement involving Ma`afu, Tui Cakau and other leading chiefs in a pledge never to renew hostilities against each other. The Vunivalu also favoured regular meetings of chiefs at Bau. Ma`afu later appeared “manifestly delighted” at the prospects both of the treaty and the chiefly conclaves.

After these various arrangements Ma`afu, professing himself anxious to dissuade Tupou from coming to Fiji with a large force, asked that one of the schooners be sent to Tonga to convey news of the proposed treaty to the King. Even with peace having been agreed, the potential dangers from a large Tongan force were great. Cakobau meanwhile urged Calvert to visit Tonga to discuss the Tongan indemnity with Tupou. The missionary was tempted to comply, since he also wished to raise with the King the question of Tongan land acquisition in Fiji and the need “to send a fine fellow who would work with Ma`afu – and require Ma`afu to settle down”. Because of the possible implications of such a visit, however, Calvert decided to remain in Fiji. To read the missionary’s correspondence from these weeks is to gain the impression that Ma`afu was content with the agreements made at Waikava. Yet he was not, since he appears to have lost no time in laying claim to large portions of Fiji, “under the right of property given or services rendered”. The claim included not only Lau, the Yasayasa Moala and Vanuabalavu, but also Cakaudrove, Macuata, Bua, the Yasawas, Nadroga, Beqa and part of Kadavu, in fact all parts of Fiji that had ever possessed a connection with Tonga. Ma`afu was later to write formally on two occasions to Owen on the same subject, protesting in his first letter against Golea’s sale of Vanuabalavu to George Henry. His second letter referred to “the land belonging to Tonga in Fiji”. He stated that he was writing himself “as the King has not arrived yet” and signed himself as “the assistant of the King”. He was to claim in 1864 that he intended the letters principally as a protest against this sale to Henry.
Apprehension mounted in Fiji after news arrived in April of Tupou's impending visit. Although the King's intention was supposedly "not to fight", most commentators believed his arrival in force could have no other consequence than hostilities, given the determination of Cakobau and other chiefs to lose no more land to the Tongans. Ma'afu, having earlier announced his wish to prevent Tupou's force from coming, now admitted that he no longer wished to do so, since only discussions with Tupou could resolve matters to everyone's satisfaction. In the meantime Tevita 'Unga arrived at Vava'u on 14 February in order to attend a meeting of Tonga's principal chiefs, including his father the King, to discuss the situation in Fiji. The Vava'u chiefs were initially opposed to plans by their counterparts from Ha'apai and Tongatapu to send an expeditionary force to Fiji, in order to protect Tongan interests there. However, unanimity of purpose was achieved at a second meeting, where the chiefs resolved to raise a force of 1,000 men from the three archipelagos "to go in twelve canoes to Lakeba, to investigate the matters causing the war between this group and Fiji". Tupou was to lead the expedition and to head the enquiry at Lakeba. Missionary George Lee was not impressed, lamenting, "It all seems a farce".

Despite the determination of the chiefs and the European community in Fiji to resist the Tongans, some Fijians were thought likely to ally themselves to Tupou's force when it arrived. Fear and apprehension quickly dissolved into relief in both Fiji and Tonga with news that "the projected visit of King George and his warriors is quite given up … [the] king seems to have become ten years younger since he gave up the affair". Missionary John Whewell believed that the letters from Consuls Owen and Brower had caused Tupou to change his mind. The letters in fact made the King realise "that the whites and half-castes were one with the Fijians – and that any aggression by Tongans in Fiji would interfere with the interests of Foreigners (who have possessions in most parts of Fiji) and would be at their peril". Instead of leading an expeditionary force, Tupou was sending a commission of enquiry consisting of the governors of Tongatapu and Vava'u and the chief judge of Ha'apai. Their brief was to resolve the question of the Tongan lands in Fiji during consultations with the British and American Consuls. Ma'afu was evidently not to be included, although he
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expressed his agreement with Calvert that the Tongans were an integral part of Fiji and would prosper if they would settle down in orderly communities, “become industrious” and cease their vagabondage and aggression.\textsuperscript{103}

Even though plans for the Tongan force had been abandoned, the future of the Tongan lands in Fiji remained the most pressing question facing the Fijian chiefs. Maʻafu’s absence from the deliberations on Vavaʻu and especially his exclusion from the planned consultations in Fiji, suggest a degree of marginalisation. Calvert expressed “grave doubts” about Maʻafu:

\begin{quote}
He does not like George … Tonga is too small for him … he much prefers having Fijians in subjection and getting [more] out of them than the scanty fare he obtains at home. He and his people have not planted for years – but have lived out of what has been required by the industrious Fijians for their own stomachs and families … What is a person’s, or people’s, religion worth – who lives in idleness and oppression?
\end{quote}

Although acknowledging that there was “much good” about Maʻafu”,\textsuperscript{104} Calvert saw the chief’s way of life as a microcosm of all that was wrong with the Tongan presence in Fiji.

The missionary was right in his belief that only when the Tongans lived in orderly, law-abiding communities, at peace with the Fijians, would the islands achieve any degree of prosperity. He was thinking especially of the Tongan settlement on Lakeba, where he hoped to see laws based on the new Tongan Code of Laws introduced. Maʻafu though had opposed those laws even in Tonga, where Tupou had appointed him as a judge at a salary of £80 per year, woefully inadequate for a chief of Maʻafu’s reckless ways with money. To remain in Tonga under the new regime, a public servant on salary, would have been anathema to Maʻafu, especially after “rolling in wealth in Fiji for years”. So he returned, “though he [had] the prospect … to be king of all when Tupou dies”.\textsuperscript{105} His letters to Owen seeking that the sale of Vanuabalavu not be recorded were preceded by a similar request from Tupou, with the King informing the Consul that he was “pained” about the sale to foreigners of Tongan lands in Fiji.\textsuperscript{106} Owen was asked to curtail the practice and to nullify earlier sales.\textsuperscript{107}

Tupou had not forgotten the insulting letter he had received from Brower warning him against any form of Tongan intervention.\textsuperscript{108} Sending a reply with the Commissioners in May, the King forcibly reminded the Consul that Tonga’s
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purpose “was never to bring the whole of Fiji into … subjection … if that had been so would we have failed to do so?” Tonga’s sole purpose in Fiji was “to judge actions of the Fijians towards the Tongans” and to make war on them if circumstances warranted. The King also admonished Brower for the perfidy of many European settlers who sold ammunition to the Fijians for use against Tongans and tricked them into selling land. Tupou declared that all Tongan lands in Fiji were held by right.109 Nevertheless, the objections of Brower and Owen had alerted the King to the dangers of too close a Tongan involvement in Fiji at a time when the Americans were pressing for payment of the debt and when the restive European community’s demands would likely call British interests into play as well.110

The King’s defiance augmented the apprehension already felt by many Fijian chiefs and missionaries. The Commissioners, Tungi Halatuitui’a and Josaia Lausi’i, first visited Ma’afu at Waikava, bringing with them some land deeds given them by the King. Ma’afu contributed to the collection several other deeds in his possession. He was anxious for the Commissioners to visit Bau next and not to leave Wairiki until last, in order to avoid causing offence. But Bau did not feature on the visitors’ itinerary, set by Tupou, from which the Commissioners declined to depart. Both Tungi and Lausi’i wrote lovingly to Bau before proceeding to Bua, Kadavu, Beqa and elsewhere, all areas including land claimed by Tonga. Despite the Commissioners’ attempts to soothe Cakobau, the Vunivalu felt insulted, as did the Consuls at Levuka, who had anticipated an early visit. Most foreign landholders in Fiji, chiefly British and American, were alarmed at the prospect of their land coming under Tongan jurisdiction, since it was known that in Tonga itself, alienation of land to foreigners was forbidden by law. Cakobau, disappointed by the British decision about cession, was thought likely to seek French protection if the Tongans proved determined to take formal possession of the lands they claimed in Fiji. Brower, concerned about the clash between Tongan and American interests, believed that Cakobau should attempt to rally the whole of Fiji towards armed resistance.111

At least one chief visited by the Commissioners willingly placed his land under Tongan rule. Lausi’i’s investigations in Nadroga, in western Viti Levu, revealed that Nanovo, Tui Nadroga, had sought Ma’afu’s help against his enemies. Nadroga had been offered to Ma’afu in recompense, but the latter’s visiting representative, Semisi Fifita, declined to accept the offer in Ma’afu’s absence. He

109 King George Tupou I to Dr Brower, 6 May 1863, Archives of the Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga, Nuku’alofo. Quoted in H.G. Cummins (compiler), Sources of Tongan History. A Collection of Documents, Extracts and Opinions in Tongan Political History 1616–1900, 254–255.
110 Twelve years later, Tupou spoke to the Tongan Parliament of his gratitude concerning Tongan disengagement from Fiji. It had helped to guarantee Tonga’s independence. (Ko e Boobooi, Vol. 11, No. 6, 1875: the King’s speech at the opening of the 1875 Parliament).
111 Calvert to Rowe, 24 Jun 1863, Personal Papers; Calvert to GS, WMMS, 24 Jun 1863 and 30 Jul 1863, WMMS ILTF.
Ma’afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

did however vouchsafe that if Britain did not take Fiji, arrangements would be made to hand Nadroga over to Tonga. When the Commissioners visited Nadroga, a document was prepared, signed by Tui Nadroga and three other chiefs, which “solemnly declared” that their land “is part of Tongan dominions under the King of Tonga”.112

Cakobau, visiting Levuka on 27 June, announced that the Commissioners would call on the Consuls there after their tour was concluded, so that the matter could be negotiated and a settlement reached.113 Throughout the Commissioners’ visit, life in Fiji continued in a kind of suspended animation, pending the outcome of their enquiries. Owen wrote of “a feeling of insecurity which has pervaded the Fijian population” because of the threat of a Tongan invasion,114 while missionary Francis Tait made reference to the “trying circumstances” in which the Tongan teachers in Fiji now found themselves, partly owing to their own “too strong political tendencies”.115 Calvert was convinced that if the Tongans insisted on taking the lands they claimed without the consent of the chiefs, armed resistance was inevitable.116 Ma’afu meanwhile took pleasure in the return from Tonga of his new vessel, the Tabu Soro, “just purchased by oil exacted from Fijians mainly”.117 The “suspense” in Fiji continued and, pending the expected settlement, Calvert looked to Owen for a statement that the British government would not allow the Tongans to overrun Fiji: “all would then be quiet”.118

The crucial meeting between the Tongan Commissioners and Owen occurred at the British Consulate on 11 and 12 August 1863.119 Tungī informed the Consul that although he had the principal Fijian chiefs’ authority to settle some disputed land claims, others would have to be referred to Tupou. He addressed a crucial aspect of the matter by claiming that Ma’afu, as Tupou’s representative in Fiji, had been compelled to sign the 1859 document renouncing all Tongan land claims. He told Owen that the King had disapproved of Ma’afu’s conduct and that he, along with the leading chiefs of Tonga, had been relieved when Ma’afu had assured them that he had only signed through “fear”. In response, the Consul made an assertion which illustrated how widely different were

112 Abstract of Papers in Possession of the Government connected with Ma’afu’s claim to “Nadroga”, BCFP, Miscellaneous Papers.
113 Calvert to GS, WMMS 24 Jun 1863.
114 Report on the Productions and Commerce of Fiji Islands for the half year ending 30 Jun 1863, BCFP.
115 Francis Tait, Journal, 7 Jul 1863, quoted in WMN(A), Jan 1864, 430–431.
116 Calvert to Henry Nisbet, 8 Jul 1863, Nisbet Papers; Calvert to Rowe, 13 Jul 1863, Personal Papers.
117 Calvert to Eggleston, 16 Jul 1863, MOM 165.
118 Calvert to GS, WMMS, 20 Jul 1863, WMMS ILTF.
119 Present at the meeting were Owen; Viliame Tungī, Governor of Tongatapu; Ma’afu, “Representative of King George in Viti’; Josaia Lausi’i, Judge of Ha’apai; David Ahome’e, Judge of Tongatapu; Josadeck Vuna, Judge of Ha’apai; Methuselah Fifita, Judge in Fiji; Reverend William Moore, Consul Owen’s interpreter, and Joeli Bulu, Tongan interpreter.
European and Polynesian concepts of the process of negotiation. Owen said that he considered Tupou's failure to protest after the document was signed as signifying the King's approval of its content.

Tungī accurately described the land question as the "special object" for which the King had sent him to the Consul. With this object in view, he asked Owen what would "constitute a sufficient claim to Lands in Fiji". Owen's response was that all lands "purchased and paid for either by property given [or] services rendered there being no prior claim" would be acknowledged as subject to Tonga. Tungī was satisfied. He listed for the Consul all the lands in dispute, which ranged from very small islands to entire matanitu such as Bua, Macuata and most of Cakaudrove. The Commissioner stated that each of the lands in question would rule itself, under a Fijian chief, but would be vakarorogo (subject to Tonga). 120

Owen wisely conceded nothing to the Commissioners beyond advice that a commission would be appointed to investigate the claims. He reminded them that the rights of British subjects in Fiji were his chief concern and that the interests of Fijians, who were not represented at the meeting, would have to be considered. He felt it within his province to protect Fiji "from all foreign oppression, whether Tonguese or otherwise". No Tongan claim would be acknowledged until Owen had communicated with the British government. In the meantime, Tupou would be held responsible for any Tongan-inspired hostilities in Fiji. Declaring that he feared a famine in the group unless the Tongans ceased their "numerous arrivals", Owen added that Tupou should have sent a "Declaration", instead of a "Fleet", which, because of its size, had assumed a threatening aspect. Once he had communicated with London, Owen would call a meeting of the principal chiefs of Fiji in February 1864, for the purpose of deciding on the disputed lands. 121

An agreement signed between Owen and Tungī on 12 August established guidelines for the projected meeting. The two Consuls were to preside, with four European settlers present, two British and two American. Four Fijian chiefs and four Tongan chiefs would also participate, the first to be nominated by Cakobau and the last by Tupou, while any decisions made by the conference should be unanimous and would be binding on all parties. 122 These provisions, ostensibly

120 The lands specified were Lakeba, Totoya, Matuku, Moala, Mago, Kanacea, Naitauba, Yacata, Cikobia-i-Lau, Munia, Susui, Yanuca, Katavaga, Yanuyanu, Avea, Taveuca, Rabe, Cakaudrove (except Kioa), Macuata, Bua, Yasawa, Beqa, Nadroga, Nabukulevu, Yanı, Nukutubu and Gasele.
121 This account is based on Report of an Interview between Mr Consul Owen and the Commissioners appointed by King George of Tonga to wait on Her Britannic Majesty's Consul in reference to certain unsettled differences concerning Lands in Fiji, BCFP.
122 Agreement signed this Twelve Day of August eighteen sixty-three between WILLIAM TUGI, Commissioned Representative of King George of Tonga, of the first part, and WILLIAM OWEN Esquire, Her Britannic Majesty's Consul, of the second part..., BCFP.
made to ensure that all interests were represented, would place the Tongans at a distinct disadvantage. They would be outnumbered by the Europeans and Fijians, with the result that their land claims would never be recognised. Divided as the Europeans were from the Fijians, and as the leading chiefs were among themselves, they were united in their desire to dilute Tongan power in Fiji. When a document was prepared for signature, following conclusion of a verbal agreement between Tungi and Owen, the Commissioner refused to sign. A second document was then drawn up, but Owen declined to sign it on the grounds that it did not reflect the agreements that he had made with Tungi following their lengthy discussions. Owen blamed Joseph Waterhouse, acting as an interpreter, for encouraging the Tongans not to sign away their prospects. The most significant difference between the two documents was that the second provided that any land disputes should be settled by a committee of four, consisting of the relevant Consul, one European, one Fijian and one Tongan. The Commissioners reasonably claimed that they had come to the Consul to discuss land disputes between Tongans and Europeans, not between Tongans and Fijians. While such an arrangement would have ensured a better hearing for Tongan interests, fundamental disagreement from the beginning effectively stultified prospects for a resolution of the Tongan lands question in the manner envisaged.

Despite these difficulties, Owen was quick to advise Tupou of the essentials of the unsigned agreement, expressing his hopes for the preservation of peace and reminding the King that the prosperity of the Tongans in Fiji depended on the agreement’s provisions being honoured. Yet the cause was already lost. In addition to the disaffection of Tungi and his fellow Commissioners, the actions of Golea rendered impossible the implementation of whatever resolutions might result from the planned conference. Golea, who would have been one of the chiefly participants, had no interest in allowing the agreement to run its course. So anxious was he to rid himself of the meddlesome Tongans, and of Ma’afu in particular, that he quickly resumed land sales to Europeans. Only a week after the agreement was signed, Golea sold the islands of Mago, Kanacea and Katafaga, all subject to Tongan claims, to various European settlers. Not that it mattered very much: by mid September, Calvert was advising his Society that “the arrangements made between the Consul and the Tongans failed – and were laid aside, as the Tongans refused to sign”.

The most significant absentee from the conference at Levuka was Cakobau, whose apprehension concerning Tongan plans mounted during the Commissioners’ visit to Fiji, especially when they failed to make an early call at Bau. They
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125 Owen to George Tupou, 15 Aug 1863, BCFP, Miscellaneous Papers.
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finally arrived in late August, accompanied by Ma’afu. Missionary Frederick Langham, stationed at Lakeba, reported that Cakobau had written to the governor of New Caledonia, asking that a French warship be sent to protect him if the Tongans came in force.\textsuperscript{128} Cakobau took the step partly through fear, since he became increasingly suspicious of the Commissioners’ motives as their tour proceeded.\textsuperscript{129} When he finally had their collective ear, he expressed his displeasure at the lateness of their visit, but also assured them of his strong desire for peace. He urged them to return to Tonga and to ask Tupou to write at once, asserting the same desire on his part. If the Commissioners agreed to those requests, Calvert believed, Cakobau was likely to agree to the Tongan land claims.\textsuperscript{130} Fortunately, the decision was not Cakobau’s to make, not only because he did not rule all of Fiji, but also because none of the so-called Tongan lands was subject directly to him. While the Commissioners were at Bau, Owen, incensed by Tungī’s objections to the original agreement, wrote both to him and Tupou “to [withdraw] from any recognition of your unsettled differences with the Fijian chiefs”.\textsuperscript{131}

Despite Cakobau’s request, Tungī and his party proceeded to their next scheduled stop, Wairiki, where they were deterred from landing by the warlike appearance of the people. Enraged at what he considered an insult, Tui Cakau again announced that he and his people would become Catholics. Golea cited his “shameful treatment” by the Tongans and the Wesleyan missionaries, including Bulu, as reasons for the decision. His defiance was buoyed by advice from a priest who assured him that a French warship was near at hand, ready to offer protection against the Tongans. The resident Tongan teachers, seriously alarmed, prepared to seek refuge at Fawn Harbour. When Calvert heard of these doings, he encouraged Cakobau to send a conciliatory message to Tui Cakau. Cakobau was reluctant to comply until reassured that Tupou’s intentions were friendly. Calvert was optimistic on that point, but fearful that in the meantime Golea, prompted by his long-standing hatred for Bau, would seek to place Taveuni under French protection. In any event, the Commissioners left Wairiki without having landed and proceeded to Fawn Harbour, where Owen, who was visiting, urged them to return to Tonga with all haste to report to the King.\textsuperscript{132}

\textsuperscript{128} Langham to Eggleston, 26 Aug 1863, MOM 165.
\textsuperscript{129} Calvert to GS, WMMS, 14 Sep 1863. Calvert believed that Cakobau had been persuaded to seek French assistance by settler George Winter, who had come to Fiji from Victoria in early 1862. Winter had earlier voiced strong disapproval of the Wesleyan missionaries’ support for the Tongans in Fiji. See Winter to late Chief Secretary of Victoria, 12 Aug 1863, TA, 15 Oct 1863.
\textsuperscript{130} Calvert to Rowe, 23 Sep 1863, Personal Papers.
\textsuperscript{131} Owen to William Tungī, Commissioner, 31 Aug 1863; Owen to George Tupou, 31 Aug 1863, BCFP, Miscellaneous Papers.
\textsuperscript{132} Calvert to GS, WMMS, 5 Oct 1863, WMMS ILTF; The Report of the Australasian Wesleyan-Methodist Missionary Society for the year ending April 1865, Fiji District, Thakaudrovy Circuit Report, 44.
With his future plans dependent on the results of the Commissioners’ visit, Ma‘afu nevertheless continued to figure in Calvert’s vision of the best of all possible worlds for the Tongans in Fiji. “There should be a Tongan town, church, laws and government at Lakeba … they should cultivate the ground – and learn to behave well at … home – and should be under full restraint … the Governor of the Tongans in Fiji should be responsible to the Tongan government – and at one with Bau”. This utopian vision was contrasted with the present situation where Tongans were “sailing about” Fiji, producing nothing, wreaking havoc and occupying lands which rightfully belonged to others. On a more pragmatic level, Calvert sailed to consult Golea at Wairiki where, finding the chief absent, he could only attempt to dissuade the Tongan teachers from abandoning their posts. At the end of the month, Calvert remained confident that “the whites generally and I believe all the half-castes will be one with Fiji against the Tongans – should war commence – as they feel that Tongan rule in Fiji would be damaging to their interest”. All depended on Tupou’s attitude once he had heard the Commissioners’ reports. Retired missionary Thomas Williams wrote from Australia: “The Tongans say the reward for their services and losses has been withheld from them … Ma‘afu is the Tongan Hengist”.

In November, after the Commissioners had returned home, Cakobau announced that Tupou did not plan any “aggressive steps” towards Fiji and was “at rest”. Written confirmation from the King was all that was needed. Cakobau’s determination to keep Tupou’s forces out of Fiji remained, however; when visiting Ovalau, George Henry persuaded him to sign a document acknowledging his approval of Golea’s sale of Vanuabalavu to Henry. The document was registered at the British Consulate, although Owen refused to recognise Henry’s subsequent sale of the island to another settler. Golea had originally sold through resentment over Ma‘afu’s control of the island, while Henry had resold when he realised that he had no realistic prospect of gaining possession. Ma‘afu’s rights remained in doubt, however, and by the end of 1863 his difficulties concerning all “his” lands in eastern Fiji had been augmented. On 3 December, three Vanuabalavu chiefs signed a declaration that Vanuabalavu and the islands within its reef were properly subject to Cakaudrove. By the same instrument, the chiefs agreed to abide by any sale of those lands “at the time
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Whatever the political pressures behind this disaffection, it appeared that Tui Cakau’s policy of selling land from under the Tongans’ feet was achieving at least partial success. Cakobau was supposed to have been under the influence of grog supplied by George Henry when he agreed to Golea’s first sale of Vanuabalavu. Now it was fear of the Tongans that drew him into alliance with his erstwhile rival.

Long after Henry’s sale of Munia, Ma’afu lamented his loss of the island and also the forced removal of its inhabitants, both Tongan and Fijian, to nearby Avea. He had also protested at the time about these and other sales. Calvert, aware that the Vanuabalavu taukei had given the island to Ma’afu in 1854, claimed they had done so without the consent of the then Tui Cakau. Although the issue was decidedly murky, in 1880, the Lands Claims Commissioner, Henry Williamson, would aver that Tui Cakau was not justified in selling Vanuabalavu against the wishes of the taukei. There is also the question of whether that taukei possessed an unqualified right, in Fijian custom, to give the soil to Ma’afu without the consent of their paramount, Tui Cakau. In 1863, Calvert was possibly unaware of the 1849 grant to Ma’afu by Tuikilakila of levying rights, a grant which should have rendered unnecessary the consent of Tuikilakila’s successor. In any case, Tongan “ownership” of Vanuabalavu existed by virtue of the taukei’s gift of the soil to Ma’afu. Fijian custom could accommodate the intrusion of the Tongan chief, but not the alien concepts of title deeds and land alienation introduced by the Europeans.

In late 1863, the rival encampments of Ma’afu at Waikava and Tui Cakau across the Somosomo Strait at Wairiki manifested the danger confronting Fiji. About the end of November, the two rival chiefs held a surprise meeting, under the auspices of Calvert, on the island of Kioa in Bua Bay. While no definite agreement was forthcoming, both Ma’afu and Golea appeared resolved not to wage war. The meeting was followed by a call at Wairiki by some members of Ma’afu’s entourage and the visit to Waikava of Golea’s matanivanua, Mai Kavula, to invite Ma’afu to Wairiki. Although the Tongans at Waikava, apprehensive about Golea’s intentions, sent Mai Kavula back without their leader, Ma’afu secretly left Waikava the next night “in a small paddling canoe”. The following morning, Elenoa joined a large group of Tongans that set out in search of her husband. Calvert and other missionaries, also setting off a day later in their schooner, were alarmed on hearing noise of musket fire early in the morning.
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coming from the direction of Wairiki. Later, they heard news that Ma`afu and Elenoa had been honourably received at Golea’s house and that the musket fire was by way of bidding them welcome. The Tongan party was feasted, peace was concluded and Ma`afu and Golea even discussed plans for a joint campaign in Macuata against Ritova. Calvert saw the establishment of peace as a “cause of great rejoicing”, following as it did accounts from Tonga of Tupou’s peaceful intentions after the return of his Commissioners. Yet the problem of land remained, since the Commissioners had failed to achieve any written agreement and Golea continued to sell land to settlers. As the missionary observed, “there will doubtless be trouble ere long on the land question”.

Whether or not in consequence of the peace between Golea and Ma`afu, the latter’s authority in Vanuaabalavu seemed to have evaporated during the ensuing months. In January 1864, the island appeared in “abject subjection” to Cakaudrove, when Tui Cakau, “having for many months kept from oppressing the people”, was visiting with a large entourage. Food and canoes were requisitioned in large quantities and “the poor people” were thought likely “to endure a closer grinding, as it is known that they ceded their island to the Tongans”. Golea, clearly determined to remind the Vanuaabalavu people who their master really was, nevertheless kept the peace with Ma`afu, while Tupou was apparently still favourably disposed towards Fiji. Ma`afu returned to Lakeba after making peace with Golea and for the next nine months he and his forces appeared quiet, avoiding overt involvement in local squabbles. Ma`afu was able to exercise the rights in Lakeba that were denied him on Vanuaabalavu. The divisions within Fiji were seen as leaving the islands as “potential prey to Tongans, half-castes and whites”, while Bau and Lakeba remained “distant with each other”.

There was soon to be a new and important player on the Fijian stage: Captain Henry Michael Jones VC, a hero of Crimea and new British Consul. He had been advised by the Foreign Office that the exercise of magisterial jurisdiction over British subjects and other Europeans, established by Pritchard, was illegal without a treaty between Britain and “the bona fide ruling authorities of Fiji”. He was required to determine the expediency of properly obtaining such jurisdiction and also to ascertain “whether a chief or chiefs of the group have authority to enter into Treaty arrangements with other Powers”. After spending time in Tonga, Jones reached Fiji on 2 October 1864. He had noted
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Tupou’s undisputed authority in Tonga and in particular the King’s “excellent code of laws”, a copy of which he despatched to the Foreign Office. Jones recorded Tupou’s desire to conclude a formal treaty with Great Britain along the lines of Tonga’s treaty with France of 1855. In Fiji, by way of contrast, Jones advised his masters that there was “no law … but little order and no sovereign chief”. He referred also to the “nominal sovereignty of Bau” and expressed his hopes, as yet undiluted by real experience of Fiji, that a centralised authority and a code of laws might be established. No mention was made, in this early communication, of the Tongan presence in the islands.

Remarks about Ma`afu later attributed to Jones do not bear the light of scrutiny. Giving evidence before the 1880 Lands Claims Commission, Brower stated that he had met Jones in Tonga when the new Consul was on his way down. Jones had “promised to do all he could to make Ma`afu king of Fiji” and, after arriving there, had sought Brower’s aid in effecting this end. Brower had advised Jones of his opposition to such a plan, since Fiji could only advance if the Europeans, not the Tongans, were supreme. Brower went on to say that in 1867 “King George himself told me at Tonga that had it not been for my official interference [as American consul] he would have that day been king of Fiji, and Ma`afu his viceroy. He spoke of Ma`afu as his agent in Fiji, and that all property held by Ma`afu in that group belonged to Tonga, as Ma`afu was a Tongan, and owed allegiance to Tonga”.

The only credible part of this account is the King’s reference to Ma`afu as his agent and to that chief’s ultimate allegiance. Whether or not Tupou spoke to Brower on the subject, it was true that in 1864 Ma`afu still owed allegiance to Tupou, both as King of Tonga and as Tu`i Kānokupolu. Concerning Jones’ supposed wish to make Ma`afu king of Fiji, the best response is probably that of John Thurston, also a member of the Commission and a friend of Jones’. In a minuted comment on Brower’s evidence, Thurston accused the former U.S. Consul of “drawing upon his imagination”. He referred to Jones’ later support for the Fijian chiefs’ opposition to the Tongans raising their flag in various parts of Lau. Brower, speaking 16 years after the events, was an unreliable witness. Nevertheless, Jones’ attitude to Ma`afu would evolve during the years of his consulship and he would play a vital role in the process that culminated in the creation for Ma`afu of the title of Tui Lau in 1869.

---

As a consequence of his Tonga visit, Jones recommended to the FO the confirmation of Pritchard’s 1862 appointment of Joshua Cocker as British Vice Consul in Tonga. (Jones to FO, 6 Oct 1864, BCFP, Miscellaneous Papers, and FO 58/102).
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Jones’ plans, soon after his arrival in Fiji, were the reverse of those later alleged by Brower. When he called at Vanuaabalavu in October, on his way to Levuka, “he told some white men at Lomaloma that his instructions were to recognise only one chief in Fiji – the Vunivalu”. In the same month, missionary Francis Tait on Lakeba noted a new Tongan incursion: bureaucracy:

Two schooners are here from Tonga. Tubou has sent instructions to Ma`afu to collect taxes at Vanuaabalavu and Muala this year, and next year he will extend the taxation to other lands claimed by him in Fiji. He has sent Mr Moss, his Secretary for Foreign Affairs, to consult with Consul Jones on Tongan interests in Fiji.

David Jebson Moss, actually the King’s private secretary, brought with him news that Ma`afu had been appointed “Tongan Governor in Fiji”. Since this appointment is undocumented beyond Calvert’s correspondence, it is not clear what extra responsibilities, if any, now rested on Ma`afu’s shoulders. Tupou possibly wished to reassert Ma`afu’s existing status as governor in the light of circumstances prevailing in 1864, when Tongan control of Vanuaabalavu appeared to be in abeyance. More importantly, emphasis had to be given to Ma`afu’s authority now that he was charged with enforcing the King’s taxation policy.

Tupou had instructed Moss “to tear up all Deeds of Land, where there has not been war and conquest: but to take possession of the lands in Fiji gained by conquest”. Among such lands “particularly named” were Vanuaabalavu and Moala. Taxes were to be levied immediately and Tongans “scattered about Fiji” were required “to assemble on Tongan land”. In contrast to Tonga itself, where land alienation was forbidden, unwanted Tongan lands in Fiji could be alienated “for adequate remuneration”. The policies enunciated by Moss were an innovation in two important ways. Firstly, in making a clear distinction between lands conquered by Tongans and those merely settled, they provided an unprecedented and precise definition of the basis of Tongan claims. Secondly, in respect of the proposed taxation system, the Tongan lands were to be subjected to an inchoate bureaucratic process equally new to Fiji. What rights or privileges the residents of these lands were to receive in return was not defined.

Brower, whose intense dislike for the Tongans was well known, predicted that the taxation system would be introduced in lands which the Tongans were sure to conquer in the future. Moss meanwhile, after consulting Ma`afu at
Lakeba, sailed to Bau with “freight”, or gifts, from Tupou to Cakobau. He then proceeded to discuss the new taxation system with Consul Jones at Levuka. The King’s emissary “intimated” to Jones “that should there be any difficulty in establishing Tongan rights, they will be enforced by power”.\(^\text{159}\) According to a disgruntled European settler at Levuka, Moss caused the Tongan flag to be raised on some Tongan lands “purchased” by settlers from their Fijian owners and had caused damage to property.\(^\text{160}\) Père Bréheret told Swanston that a French man-of-war would soon visit the group and suggested that either Swanston or Brower should advise Cakobau to request the French captain to drive the Tongans away. Brower would have willingly provided such advice, given his statement to Jones that their only purpose in Fiji as Consuls was to facilitate the acquisition by their countrymen of “large tracts of country, as cheap[ly] as they can … and the Tongans always prevent that”.\(^\text{161}\) After noting Brower’s rapacious attitude, Calvert observed that Jones “does not see the justice … or propriety of attempting to drive the Tongans away from Fiji”. In contrast to Brower, Calvert and Jones recognised Tonga’s inalienable links with eastern Fiji. The missionary’s constant theme was that all would be well if they would settle down and lead an orderly existence. He could not imagine Cakobau seeking French assistance in the manner described, since the Vunivalu had to know better than “to drive away those to whom he owes a weighty debt of gratitude [and] who rescued him by the sacrifice of some Chiefs and other Tongans”.\(^\text{162}\) True enough, but Cakobau was being pressed from several quarters, and no one could be sure whose influence would prevail.

Cakobau articulated his dilemma to Jones as well as to his old friend Calvert. He said, “‘I am not like the man chosen to become captain of a ship. I was born captain – born a chief’”.\(^\text{163}\) So he was, but so long as his direct rule extended over such a small area of Fiji, the dilemma would remain. In the immediate context of the Tongan land claims, Cakobau announced on 23 November that he would never relinquish Lau, while Brower, realising that the Tongans could never be driven away, agreed to their possession of Lau, “provided they undertake to pay a portion of the American claim”.\(^\text{164}\) During a meeting at the British Consulate the following day, Cakobau declared that he had no land he would relinquish to the Tongans. “If Ma’aafu and the Tongans were to go to Tonga”, he said, “that would not interfere with a continuance of friendship”. Calvert interpreted this as a desire by Cakobau to retain all lands in Fiji while remaining on good terms with the Tongans and able to request their help when

\(^{159}\) ibid.
\(^{161}\) Calvert, Second Notebook labelled Missions, 5 Nov 1864, Personal Papers.
\(^{162}\) ibid.
\(^{163}\) ibid., 23 Nov 1864.
\(^{164}\) Calvert, Journal, 23 Nov 1864.
needed. The Vunivalu was reminded that when he first interviewed Ma`afu and Moss at Bau, he had expressed himself as satisfied with their proposals to take possession of those lands gained through conquest. Then, the blow had been softened by the Tongans’ assurances that the £12,000 indemnity would be forgiven and that they would “require the chiefs of Rewa, Bua and Mathuata to become his dutiful subjects”. 165

Concerned over Cakobau’s failure plainly to state his views to Ma`afu and Moss, in the presence of the Consuls, Calvert made haste to have a private word with Ma`afu before the Tongan party left Levuka. He found the chief alone with Cakobau. The missionary sought from him a statement “of his mind and purposes”, a declaration such as had not been forthcoming from Cakobau. The latter spoke first, saying that Ma`afu had announced his intention to take Matuku, Moala and Vanuabalavu. “He talked very kindly to Ma`afu – and all appeared to be settled”. Cakobau enquired of Ma`afu whether he expected any difficulties with Golea over Vanuabalavu, given Tui Cakau’s reoccupation of the island. Concerning the continuing troubles in Macuata, Cakobau proposed a joint expedition to pacify that warring matanitu. Ma`afu demurred, but promised his support, if requested, for any endeavours Cakobau might make in that direction. Despite the apparent affability with which the meeting ended, Cakobau had again failed to state what Calvert had firmly believed was in his mind: that the Tongans should have no lands in Fiji. 166 Yet the Vunivalu must have known that such a policy would have been both unenforceable and certain to raise the ire of both Ma`afu and, later, Tupou. Ma`afu had at least stated his intentions; each of the protagonists now knew, or thought he knew, where the other stood.

Tongan occupation of their claimed lands would work against the interests of the Europeans and “half-castes” living there, since oil, land and labour would become more expensive. Nevertheless, Jones was convinced of the justice of the claims, not only to the three islands nominated by Ma`afu, but also to Rabe, ceded to Tupou in 1855. Expressing his annoyance with Cakobau, whom he felt had been unduly influenced by the Europeans, the Consul “plainly told the Tongans to go at once to take possession of Vanuabalavu, Moala and Matuku”. 167 They lost no time in doing so: on 3 December, Tui Yaroi and six other Matuku chiefs acknowledged, in a deed prepared by Moss, that Matuku belonged to the Tongan government and was subject to Tongan law. A similar deed had been signed on Moala three days earlier. 168 Finally, on 9 December, some chiefs of Vanuabalavu also acknowledged that their island had long been Tongan and that only Ma`afu had the right to sell their land. Jones later acquiesced in the

165 ibid.
166 Calvert to Rowe, 29 Nov 1864, Personal Papers. See also Calvert to GS, WMMS, 29 Nov 1864, WMMS ILTF.
167 Calvert to Rowe, 29 Nov 1864.
168 Deeds No. 372 [Matuku] and 373 [Moala], CRD.
cases of Matuku and Moala, but would not countenance the conveyance of Vanuabalavu, since it had been purchased by a British subject. The Consul was also concerned that no influential chiefs on Vanuabalavu favoured Tongan rule and that “messengers were sent to Tui Cakau entreating him to protect the island against the Tonguese”. Moss was instructed to have the Tongan flag lowered on Vanuabalavu and not to pursue Tongan claims there until George Henry’s purchase had been fully investigated. Jones also declined Moss’ suggestion for a commercial treaty between Britain and Tonga on the grounds that “there is no precedent for … the British Government recognising one of its own subjects as the responsible agent of a foreign power”.

There is mention of Ma`afu’s activities in northern Fiji in the reminiscences of George Ryder, an Australian who arrived in Fiji in 1864. His brother Thomas purchased the island of Mago from trader William Hennings for £300 in November. The Ryders, soon joined by another brother, were atypical among the European settlers in that they possessed both sufficient capital and an adequate knowledge of cotton cultivation. They had been informed, correctly, that the sale of Mago and other islands to various Europeans had been undertaken to prevent Ma`afu’s gaining possession of them. When Jones visited Lomaloma in late December, he was asked to adjudicate in several ownership disputes involving Ma`afu’s people and resident Europeans. On 29 December Jones awarded Mago, one of the disputed islands, to the Ryders, although Ma`afu was successful in gaining possession of 11 of the other 14 islands, including Vanuabalavu.

Ma`afu’s imposing physical appearance and his “genius” impressed George Ryder. “If he had been born a white man … [these qualities] would have placed him in the highest rank in his country”. Known apparently as “the Bismarck of the Pacific”, Ma`afu was friendly towards the Ryders. They reciprocated, “knowing that his protection was worth a great deal”. He was, after all, “heir to the throne of Tonga, after the King’s demise”. So the year closed with Ma`afu in possession, lawful as far as it went, of most of the lands he coveted, including the prized Vanuabalavu. With Jones determined to play a part in any future land disputes, it seemed unlikely that the Tongans could be seriously threatened either by Cakobau or Tui Cakau.

Tui Bua, who had remained aloof from the various disputes which, since late 1862, had involved Ma`afu, Tui Cakau, the European Consuls and the Tongan Commissioners, accompanied Ma`afu to Tonga in that year when the Parliament passed the new Code of Laws. Now, when Ma`afu and Moss paid their formal visit to Bua in January 1865, they and Tui Bua concluded a treaty of “perpetual

169 Jones to Tubou Ha`apai, 9 Jan 1865, BCFP. See also LCC R960.
170 George L. Ryder, Pioneering in the South Seas, being Reminiscences of G.L. Ryder, of Mango Island, unpublished MS, 16. For details of the Ryder brothers’ background and activities in Fiji, see John Young, Adventurous Spirits: Australian Emigrant Society in precession Fiji, St Lucia 1984, Ch. 3.
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peace” between the province and Tonga. The treaty also provided for reciprocal rights between Bua and Tonga, including the right of residence, and allowed the citizens of one entity the privilege of attaining high office in the other. It was signed by Ma`afu, Tui Bua and four other Buan chiefs. Witnesses included Moss, Thomas Baker and David Wilkinson, an Australian who had settled in Bua and become Tui Bua’s secretary.171 This orderly process contrasted with news from Tonga that the king had “six tons of powder ready to help in demanding and defending what he believes to be his rights”.172 The day before witnessing the treaty with Bua, Moss had written to the Foreign Office seeking “price lists of cannon, shot and other ammunition”.173

Following his visit to Bua, Ma`afu demonstrated his goodwill towards the Ryders. They had heard a rumour that several months earlier, Ma`afu had consulted Tui Cakau on the subject of the inhabitants of Mago, although details were unknown. Early in 1865, when five large canoes suddenly appeared at Mago, the Ryders learned “that Ma`afu had sent them to remove the Mango natives to Lomaloma”. Apparently the sanction of Tui Cakau had been obtained for the removal. Repeated trips were made between Mago and Lomaloma, conveying the people and their possessions, with the Ryders providing a vessel of their own to hasten the process. “At last [the people] were all gone, and Mago was an empty land”.174 Ryder was later to state at the Lands Claims Commission that he and his brothers had neither urged the removal nor offered any inducement to Ma`afu for his actions. When the people arrived at Lomaloma, Ma`afu allotted them land for cultivation.175

Ma`afu’s activities in northern Fiji and the actions of the Tongan Commissioners left Cakobau increasingly marginalised. Distracted by minor hostilities in Rewa and with French help increasingly unlikely, the Vunivalu still refrained from showing his hand. Calvert believed that the best option for Cakobau now would be to accept Tupou’s proffered friendship and his offer to waive the claim for £12,000 compensation. In return, Cakobau would have to recognise Tongan control of those parts of Fiji claimed by right of conquest. However, he was still under pressure from resident Europeans to oppose the Tongans by all available means. In Vanuabalavu confusion also prevailed. Despite Ma`afu’s presence and his resettlement there of the Mago people, Tui Cakau still visited to exercise his arbitrary rule, while the Europeans’ claims for possession remained unresolved.176 The repudiation by Jones of the “treaty” between nine Vanuabalavu chiefs and Moss cast further doubt on the island’s legal and
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171 CRD No 371 [Bua], 3 Jan 1865.
172 Calvert to GS, WMMS, 12 Jan 1865, WMMS ILTF.
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174 Ryder, 18.
175 Statement by George Lyon Ryder, LCC R6.
176 Calvert to GS, WMMS, 12 Jan 1865; Calvert to Rowe, 12 Jan 1865, Personal Papers.
customary ownership. In January, Ma`afu went to Rewa, avowedly to seek a witness for Jones’s impending arbitration of the Vanuabalavu dispute. Calvert apprehended that the disaffected Tui Dreketi would take advantage of Ma`afu’s presence to draw the Tongans to his side against Cakobau. When the latter finally protested to Jones about the Tongan occupation of Matuku and Moala he was, Calvert believed, showing his true colours at last. In view of Cakobau’s continued opposition to the Tongans’ occupation of their lands, Ma`afu might be only too willing to heed Rewan entreaties.177

The dispute concerning the ownership of Vanuabalavu was finally resolved by a Court of Arbitration, presided over by Consul Jones, held at Lomaloma on 1 and 2 February 1865. The Consul’s magisterial powers in disputes involving British subjects placed the matter within his jurisdiction. Before the Court was convened, Ma`afu submitted a formal statement to Jones, in which the basis of his customary claim was outlined:

[Tuikilakila] begged from Ma`afu a large canoe named the ‘Falike’, and desired Ma`afu to accompany him to his home. In sailing down from Lakeba to Somosomo, Tuikilakila pointed [out] all his islands between Lakeba and Taveuni, and said that Ma`afu was to rule over them all, and at all times to send for and take whatever he required; he kept Ma`afu with him … for one year.

After Ma`afu’s return to Lakeba when Mualevu and Lomaloma were at war, even he [Ma`afu] was accustomed to go to both districts to fetch bread, yams, sinnet etc, which were always readily supplied to him, as the chiefs knew of the arrangements made with him by Tuikilakila.178

The controversy lay in whether Tui Cakau gave Ma`afu only levying rights, which were never in dispute, or whether the right to “rule over” the islands, which Ma`afu was later to do, was also implied. In his Petitioner’s Plea, Ma`afu referred to his voyage with Tuikilakila in 1849 from Lakeba to Lomaloma. En route, Ma`afu declared, Tuikilakila said to him, “I here give you all the islands between Lakeba and Taveuni”. Ma`afu deposed that he lived at Lomaloma for 18 months thereafter before returning to Lakeba, having commenced “to lay [Vanuabalavu] under contribution for sinnet, yams etc”. The Plea further stated that during the valu ni lotu, the Christian chiefs of Lomaloma sent one of their number, Mafoa, to Tui Nayau with a request for help. When Tui Nayau refused, Mafoa turned to Ma`afu, who sailed with two canoes to Susui, where the Lomaloma Christians had fled. Subsequent hostilities between Ma`afu’s forces and those from Yaro vanua in northern Vanuabalavu resulted in the capitulation of the Yaro chiefs, who presented tabua and baskets of earth to Ma`afu as tokens of submission.

177 Calvert to Rowe, 20 Jan 1865, Personal Papers.
178 Statement by Ma`afu regarding the Tongan claim to Vanua Balavu…
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The most revealing evidence heard at the hearing was that of Golea. He deposed that he had sold Vanuabalavu to George Henry, knowing it belonged to Ma`afu, because he was vexed with the Tongan. The sale, made at Henry’s suggestion, took place at Wairiki. Henry, who had reminded Golea of Ma`afu’s renunciation of all Tongan land claims in Fiji, duly presented Golea with guns and percussion caps in payment for the island, a payment the chief returned because he was afraid of Ma`afu. Golea said that his initial anger against Ma`afu had arisen because Ma`afu had come to Waikava prepared to fight. Golea acknowledged to Jones that Ma`afu’s sovereignty derived from the surrender of the people of Vanuabalavu and also from his father’s gift. Of these, Golea believed, his father’s gift provided the better title.

Whatever Tuikilakila’s intentions had been in 1849, Ma`afu’s sovereignty was accepted as a fait accompli by 1865. The Court admitted a further petition, signed by 34 chiefs, stating that Vanuabalavu and 12 specified islands nearby have for a long time past belonged to the Tongan government … we have never sold any of the said islands, or consented to the same by other party, we knowing well that Ma`afu, as representative of the Tongan government was the only party who had the right to do so.

… we again state that we wish to belong to no other power except Tonga. We also desire Tongan laws to be promulgated in our country, to which said laws we shall render due obedience.

The chiefs’ apparent unanimity probably owed much to pressure from Ma`afu. It is important to note, however, that the chiefs, some of whom gave evidence in person, believed that Ma`afu’s rights derived from sources other than Tui Cakau’s gift. Evidence was heard concerning Ma`afu’s intervention on the side of the Lomaloma Christians against the heathen chiefs of Yaro in 1854. Following the defeat of the Yaro forces, that vanua’s chiefs presented tabua and baskets of earth to Ma`afu, “expressly stating that they gave themselves and their district, and during the same week that chiefs of the Lomaloma district for the second time they having presented earth to Ma`afu on his first arrival”.

As their gifts of tabua and baskets of earth reveal, the Vanuabalavu chiefs recognised Ma`afu as the legitimate owner of their island. Samate, a matanivanua to Tui Cakau, had voyaged from Lakeba with Ma`afu at the time of the latter’s intervention on Vanuabalavu. Samate gave evidence that the gifts were presented in order “to beg pardon” of Ma`afu. Samate had continued to Somosomo, where
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he informed Raivalita of the chiefs’ submission to Ma`afu. Raivalita’s response had been to say to Samate, “All right we could not have interfered being ourselves at war on Vanua Levu”. He acknowledged that his father Tuikilakila had given Vauabalavu to Ma`afu. Another chief named Tavaki deposed that when Raivalita heard of the submission, he said, “Very good, if ever I want to go there I will ask Ma`afu”. Other chiefs supported Samate and Tavaki; one of them, a Lomaloma chief named Tevita, stating that “we thought we had only to do what Ma`afu told us”, indication enough of how little choice the chiefs really had. Mafoa declared that he and the other chiefs were Tongan subjects who acknowledged Ma`afu as their head chief. Tui Mavana, in response to the question, “Did you give the earth to me?” from Ma`afu himself, answered that he had done so through friendship. Finally, an unnamed chief from Mualevu declared that the gifts to Ma`afu were “a request for our lives”.

Ma`afu confirmed everything the chiefs had said, declaring that the baskets of earth were given him “for the land”, while the “whales’ teeth [were] for their lives”. In view of this seeming unanimity, the question arises as to why Golea had sold the island in apparent violation of Ma`afu’s customary rights. According to George Henry, he had done so because “he was afraid of Ma`afu and wished the Tongans away”. Golea shared the resentment his brother had felt, and when opportunity in the form of George Henry came along, he was not slow to take advantage.

Finally, Ma`afu himself attempted to place the question of sovereignty beyond dispute with another written submission:

Be it known to all men that Vanua Balavu and all other Lands situated in Fiji and which were formally given to me, that in the year eighteen fifty-five I gave the said lands to George Tubou and the Government of Tonga, and the only connection I have now with the same is that I am Governor of the people and Lands belonging to the Government of Tonga and situate in Fiji.

In giving his evidence under oath, Ma`afu claimed to have placed the Tongan lands in Fiji under Tongan law “when we got laws printed”, meaning after the introduction of the 1862 Law Codes in Tonga itself. He claimed to have given
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his Fijian lands to the Tongan government, an action Golea acknowledged to be Ma`afu's right. In his judgment, Consul Jones found that Vanuabalavu and the islands within its reef were lawfully subject to Ma`afu, both through the original gift from Tuikilakila and by recognition from the chiefs and people of the islands. The only exceptions were any islands since alienated by lawful deeds of sale.\(^{190}\)

Jones had been opposed on principle to the Fijian chiefs’ selling lands to Europeans. He had apparently advised Henry, *apropos* of the latter’s deed of sale of Vanuabalavu, “‘You can get a way of [the chiefs] for a glass of grog. … Your deed is not worth the paper it is written on’”.\(^{191}\) Despite the presiding officer’s predisposition on a matter of principle, however, evidence at the Court strongly suggested that Tui Cakau acquiesced at Ma`afu’s control of Vanuabalavu and was unlikely to oppose it in the future.

There was one brief exchange between Jones and Tui Cakau during the latter’s evidence that contained the seeds of future constitutional debate in the islands of Lau:

> Jones: Was the grant by Tui Kila Kila to Ma`afu or to the Tongan government?
>
> Tui Cakau: I don’t know.
>
> Jones: Was it to Ma`afu and the Tongans?
>
> Tui Cakau: Ask Ma`afu.\(^{192}\)

The Consul’s question, in the context of the times, was unfair. For him, there was a clear distinction between the Tongan government at home, in the persons of the King and the chiefs, and another Tongan chief operating independently in Fiji, albeit as an official representative of the King. For Tui Cakau, however, no such distinction existed. For him Ma`afu, as Tupou’s representative, was the government of Tonga. Evidence at the hearing made it clear that those chiefs who saw themselves as subjects of Ma`afu were also Tongan subjects. It was little wonder that Tui Cakau threw this arcane constitutional distinction back at Jones and suggested that he ask Ma`afu.
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Mention has been made of evidence given by Samate, a matanivanua of Golea, at the Commission that Tuikilakila had given only the magiti of Vanuabalavu and adjacent islands to Ma`afu. “That did not give Ma`afu any title to the soil but only to the produce”, Samate said. He further declared that, about the time of the Court of Arbitration, Ma`afu had approached Golea and said, “Be good-natured and give me Vanuabalavu to live on. If you refuse I will either go to Uea [the Tongan settlement on Lakeba] or Rotuma as I cannot go back to Tonga. If you give me that land and I do return permanently to Tonga, it does not come to Charley [Ma`afu’s son Siale`ataogo]”. Golea assented, telling Ma`afu “Vanuabalavu and all the islands within the reef belong to you but all outside still belong to me”.\(^{193}\)

On the basis of this evidence, the 1880 Lands Claims Commissioner would report that “from his evidence it clearly appears that the rights conferred upon Ma`afu were merely those of lala (chiefly requisition) and of levying (feasts)”.\(^{194}\) That distinction was far from clear in 1865, however. Ma`afu had managed to control proceedings to the extent that he was able successfully to enlarge the terms of the original gift as a more secure basis for the Vanuabalavu chiefs’ later customary submission to him. If Samate’s evidence is to be believed, Golea in particular had been subject to a degree of manipulation by Ma`afu in order to help secure a favourable finding. Nevertheless, the accommodation reached between them, sanctioned by Jones, suited both chiefs. Its result was a division of power between them that reflected realities on the ground.

Consul Jones’ finding became a milestone along Ma`afu’s road to power. In 1887, six years after Ma`afu’s death, an official enquiry into the disputed ownership of 80 acres of land on Lakeba drew the following opinion from Charles Swayne, Stipendiary Magistrate for Lau in the British administration:

The right of Ma`afu to deal with lands of his government has been so often referred to me in cases of a similar kind … in past years that it will be sufficient if I draw attention to the fact that Ma`afu had beyond his power in Lau and Fiji generally peculiar rights in Vanua Balavu – first from the chiefs and people themselves then from Tui Cakau Supreme Chief and finally from the British Government represented in the first instance by Consul Jones who in … 1865 declared that after enquiry he found that Ma`afu was the owner of Vanua Balavu.\(^{195}\)
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At another hearing, this time concerning disputed land in Vanuabalavu, Mafi, Native Stipendiary Magistrate and former *matapule* of Ma`afu, referred to “the time when Consul Jones held Court at Loma Loma and Vanua Balavu was given to Ma`afu by Tui Cakau. Then commenced the law, the making roads, division of lands and tax making”.

Recognition of Tongan control of Vanuabalavu and the Yasayasa Moala in 1865 by the British Consul and by most of the leading chiefs marked a new era in Lau. Henceforth, Ma`afu would be considered as a *de facto* chief of Fiji. The events of the mid 1860s, culminating in Consul Jones’ ruling, made abundantly clear the extent to which Ma`afu and the Tongans, alongside other “outsiders”, had become genuine competitors for power in Fiji. They were indeed more significant in most respects than the other contenders, a fact largely obscured by Fiji’s subsequent colonial history.
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8. “A man of great energy and ambition”

The ruling by Consul Jones in February 1865 established Ma`afu’s sovereignty over Vanuabalavu and nearby islands under both Fijian custom and English law. Although Ma`afu was now placed on a footing comparable to that of Fiji’s most powerful chiefs, notably Cakobau and Tui Cakau, his status required more precise definition within the wider polity of Fiji. In the meantime, the Tongan Commissioners had yet to conclude their enquiries.

Before he returned to Tonga, David Moss further consolidated Tongan power in Fiji when a formal treaty between Tui Nayau and Tupou I, the latter represented by Ma`afu and Moss, was signed at Lakeba on 14 February. The treaty, similar to that made with Bua, provided for perpetual peace between Tonga and the Lakeban state. It formally granted Tongan subjects the right to visit Lakeba, a practice followed for many generations. Tongans were also permitted to receive land from Tui Nayau on which “to reside or plant”, while Tui Nayau’s subjects were accorded reciprocal rights in Tonga. Most importantly, the treaty’s third provision guaranteed that in the event of hostilities against Lakeba from any Fijian power, Ma`afu would provide rapid assistance to Tui Nayau, who was similarly sworn to assist Ma`afu in any dispute he might have against a Fijian power.¹ These provisions effectively separated the Lakeban state from Bau and Cakaudrove, where its traditional links lay, and placed it firmly within the orbit of Tonga. Yet, among all the treaties signed by Ma`afu and Moss, this one represented less of a break with tradition. Aside from the long history of intimate contacts between Lakeba and Tonga, Ma`afu was kin to Tui Nayau and was recognised as family by the Vuanirewa. Now he possessed an authority based more on the realities of power than on traditional ties of kinship. The various treaties to which he was a signatory finally laid the ghost of the 1859 agreement whereby William Pritchard had forced Ma`afu to renounce all his claims in Fiji.

All seemed to be moving in Ma`afu’s favour during these months. On 2 March, Jones issued a Proclamation to all British subjects resident in Fiji, enjoining them “not to oppose … Tui Cakau and Ma`afu in their lawful endeavours to establish peace and security”.² Jones was attempting to organise the long-projected meeting of Fiji’s principal chiefs for 29 April, but was frustrated by Cakobau’s persistent desires to be recognised as “king” and to drive the Tongans

¹ Treaty between George Tubou, King of the Friendly Islands, represented by Henry Ma`afu and Tubou Ha`apai, and Tui Nayau King of Lakeba and its surrounding islands..., 14 Feb 1865, BCFP.
² CRD, No. 382, 2 Mar 1865.
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from Fiji. That the Vunivalu persevered in this attitude might be seen as a mark of his diminishing relevance, as the future directions of eastern Fiji were being decided by Consul Jones, Tui Cakau and the representatives of Tupou. Yet the blame was not entirely his, since he was constantly encouraged by “half-castes” in the belief that he would become Tui Viti once the Tongans were expelled. It was certainly “too late” for such aspirations, as Calvert noted. The missionary wrote, with some naïveté, of Cakobau’s enthusiastic response to professions of friendship and good will from Tupou and Ma`afu. When Ma`afu and Moss had called at Bau with their message of peace, the Vunivalu appeared “overjoyed, and wept in gratitude and gladness of heart, and immediately called upon Ma`afu to pray and thank God – and the three knelt and prayed and praised before the Lord”. But the mood inevitably passed, and Cakobau again withdrew into his contemplation of the chimera of genuine power.

“Governor Ma`afu is in charge”, Calvert declared. “He has engaged a scamp as secretary at £100 a year … [a man] of bad renown … educated, but a rogue for all that”. The miscreant was Robert Swanston. More importantly, Calvert was not sanguine concerning the approaching meeting of chiefs, which Ma`afu would also attend. Cakobau was reportedly preparing to ask the others to join him in a united effort to drive away the Tongans which, even if the chiefs were disposed, would have been impossible. Not only did several matanitu and districts already possess treaties with Tonga, but every chief, in true Fijian tradition, wanted “to be independent, and as large and influential as possible”. “Trouble” was anticipated once the people living on the Tongan lands felt the first impact of Ma`afu’s taxes. Of more immediate concern than the missionary’s musings were the “instructions” penned by Jones to “Ma`afu Governor of the Tongans” on 12 April. Jones’ attitude was apparent in his opening words:

I wish to impress on you the absolute necessity of proving your superiority in civilized ideas to the Fijians around you. You must decidedly separate yourself from their barbarous practices and degrading indolence…

Jones proceeded to offer Ma`afu several “counsels”, stating that “my friendship for you will depend on your following them”. The “counsels”, briefly stated, were:

1. Ma`afu’s people were to produce sufficient food for themselves and for sale.
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2. Cotton should be planted on an extensive scale.

3. Profits should be divided with the people, not retained by the chiefs, Fijian style.

4. Cultivation of coffee should also begin as soon as practicable.

5. Taxes should not be severe, since the people were “very poor”.

6. Fijian chiefs should not be allowed to land on Tongan possessions with armed followers or to requisition property, as of old.

7. Ma’afu should administer strict justice. He was admonished for fining thieves £25 for stealing two bottles of gin, which Jones described as “tyranny”.

8. Ma’afu was to avoid meddling in “the miserable little quarrels of the native chiefs”.

Ma’afu was enjoined to prove to the Fijian chiefs that he was “the most enlightened governor in Fiji”. If he reverted to the traditional Tongan ways in Fiji, Jones would become his enemy and withdraw all support.

Finally, Jones wrote “I wish you particularly to bear in mind that I have not written this letter in order that you should read it and throw it aside”. Whatever the inherent merits of the programme devised by Jones, he was stepping well beyond the boundaries of his consular jurisdiction in issuing such a manifesto. He was attempting, in the interests of British trade and commerce in general, and of the resident British subjects in particular, to do what no man had ever done: to make Ma’afu dance to his tune. Ma’afu, however, possessed his own agenda and would heed the Consul or not, as best suited his interests.

Jones was similarly prompted by the rapid expansion of European commerce and settlement in Fiji in calling the assembly of chiefs. With cession to Britain a lost cause, Jones hoped that a federation of the matanitu would promote the stability essential for European interests. The meeting, which took place at Levuka on 8 and 9 May, comprised Cakobau as well as chiefs from Rewa, Cakaudrove, Macuata, Bua, Naduri and Lakeba. Eight resolutions were adopted:

1. The seven head chiefs would meet annually.

2. At each meeting they would elect a president from among their number.

3. A code of laws, to be modified only with the chiefs’ consent, was to be in force in their domains.

4. Each chief was to retain existing rights in his own domains, including taxation.

---

7 Jones to Ma’afu Governor of the Tongans, 12 Apr 1865, BCFP.
5. The boundaries of the states were to be defined.

6. Each state was to be self-supporting, with an annual stipend to be paid to the elected president.

7. No wars were to be permitted without the consent of the Assembly of Chiefs.

8. A national flag was to be created.

The next meeting was fixed for 1 May 1866. Cakobau was nominated as first president of the Assembly, a move which owed more to the immense prestige enjoyed by Bau than to his diplomatic skills. The nomination posed irreconcilable dilemmas for the future: would Cakobau ever be willing to yield the position, whose tenure was annual, to a lesser chief, and would other members of the Assembly acquiesce if the Vunivalu’s tenure assumed an air of permanency?

The Assembly’s unexpected unanimity seemed to promise much for the development of the new settler-based industries such as cotton, coffee and, fleetingly, wool. However, its inherent weaknesses were apparent even before the chiefs returned home. Apart from potential problems with the presidency, the most notable absentee was Ma’afu who, although he had been invited, arrived only at the end, just before the chiefs went their separate ways. He “appeared to rejoice” that the Tongan lands were to be left as they were, a matter in which the chiefs had no real choice. Ma’afu was “directed to withdraw the Tongans from other parts of Fiji where they are settled, and not to oppress the people he governs”.

His lack of participation in the Assembly’s deliberations placed its resolutions on a very insecure footing. The chiefs’ subsequent “directions” to him were devoid of any authority and could safely be ignored.

The 1865 Confederation, which fell far short of the kind of centralised government then existing in Tonga, represented the greatest degree of co-operation between the great chiefs then feasible. Even so, the agreement was premature, since implementation of its resolutions required a degree of political sophistication which was beyond most of the assembled chiefs. They had been nurtured in a polity where chiefs acted solely in the interests of their own domains and co-operated with their rivals only when it suited them. The Confederation established no permanent organisation, beyond the envisaged annual assembly,

---


10 Calvert to Rabone, 9 Aug 1865.

11 Consul Jones acknowledged as much. See Jones to FO, 24 Nov 1865, FO 58/124.
to render effective the proposals apparently so heartily endorsed. Even aside from the growing menace of Ma’afu, the chiefs’ resolutions were doomed from the beginning.

Jones, aware that the unity established by the Confederation was at best insubstantial, lost no time in reminding Cakobau where his priorities as president should now lie:

the White Settlers now look to you for redress of all grievances … You must not think that your situation is simply one where you can enjoy your ease and be supported by other chiefs in lazy idleness … If you are too old or indolent for the duties of your office, you had better retire from your position … It is a scandalous matter that Fiji should remain weak and barbarous, merely through the timidity and obstinacy of one old man…

Jones’ letter, breathtaking in its arrogance, bespoke the Consul’s ignorance of the extent of Cakobau’s power and of the absence of any real authority residing in the post of president. Elsewhere in Fiji, evidence of Ma’afu’s earlier rapprochement with Tui Cakau was noted by John Thurston, who arrived at Wairiki in June. Visiting Golea in company with Calvert, Thurston remarked “an immense canoe” which Ma’afu had recently presented to the chief. In similar vein, Ma’afu had apparently not objected to Golea’s sale of the island of Naitauba to a European, even though Naitauba was included among the lands Ma’afu claimed to have been given by Tuikilakila. Ma’afu himself appeared to be following the straight and narrow at home in Lomaloma. A missionary visiting Vanuabalavu was impressed when he paid the Tongan governor a visit:

This man, so knowing, so powerful and resolute, seems to be now throwing all his influence into the scale of good, as he before threw it into that of evil. He must be either a really changed man or a most finished hypocrite, and I have seen or heard nothing to make me doubt his sincerity.

The missionary stressed that he was referring only to Ma’afu’s spiritual state and not to his political activities. Ever since his youth in Tonga, Ma’afu had sought to veil his actions with a veneer of sincerity and righteousness. That yet another missionary fell under his spell was a tribute to his powers of dissimulation.

Consul Jones believed that Tupou’s supposed intention to make himself “master of Fiji” had been relinquished when the islands’ cession to Great Britain was first

12 Jones to Vunivalu, 7 Jun 1865, BCFP
13 John Bates Thurston, Diary of a passage from Rotuma to Fiji on Board the Brig “John Wesley”, 17 Jun 1865, Thurston Papers.
14 LCC R9.
15 Unnamed missionary to Rabone, 4 Jul 1865, WMN(A), No. 38, Jan 1867, 601 (italics in original).
mooted. He noted that resident Europeans opposed the Tongans because they were aware that Tongan rule would render land purchases immeasurably more difficult. He also mentioned the Tongans’ “superior intelligence and courage”, qualities which made them eagerly sought as allies. Repeating the laments of the missionaries over three decades, Jones observed that chiefs who engaged Tongan help usually regretted their actions, since their “rapacious allies seldom leave any district so long as it contains anything to excite their insatiable cupidity”. While Jones engaged in rueful contemplation of Tongan “superiority”, a visiting naval lieutenant was unabashed in his praise. Bouverie Clark, writing on board HMS *Esk*, at anchor in the mouth of the Rewa river, regarded the Tongans he encountered in Fiji as “much finer men than the Fijians”, although he felt it advisable not to “get to leeward of them on a hot day”. Ma’afu, who visited the *Esk* in company with Cakobau, appeared to be “a very fine man, but rather fat”. Ma’afu’s social call occurred during an apparent quiet period following Confederation, when the great dilemma posed by the islands’ disunity remained shelved rather than solved.

Inspired perhaps by this atmosphere of uncharacteristic calm, Jones reassured the Foreign Office that, as a consequence of Confederation, peace now reigned in Fiji. More importantly, trade in *bêche de mer* along the Macuata coast was regaining its former importance. Cakobau, though, remained a doubtful quantity: Jones wrote of the difficulty for the Vunivalu to learn, at his advanced age, ideas of Government opposed to the old Fijian system of “spoliation and distortion”. Despite the semblance of unity achieved by the chiefs, “the only laws that have any force among them are those relating to the privileges and prerogatives of the chiefs all having their origins in the caprice or personal vanity of these rulers”. Jones, despite his attempts to bully and manipulate both Cakobau and Ma’afu, and his unrealistic expectations of the Vunivalu, was very much aware of the realities of power in Fiji. A growing problem was the settler community, which “[found] itself freed from the restraints of British law and [had] no respect for any other”. In eastern Fiji, peace appeared to be threatened only on tiny Mago, owing to the return of some of the inhabitants removed by Ma’afu earlier in the year. Following complaints from the Ryders, Jones wrote to both Ma’afu and Golea urging them to remove the people yet again. Their “mischievous and thievish propensities” posed a threat to that small corner of European commerce in Fiji. These minor difficulties aside, the Confederation, at the end of 1865, did appear to have achieved at least some measure of stability for Fiji.

---

16 Henry M. Jones, Report on the present condition of the Fiji and Tonga Islands, sent to Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 17 Jul 1865, BCFP.
18 Jones to FO, 4 Nov 1865, BCFP.
19 Jones to Lord Russell, 24 Nov 1865, FO 58/124.
20 Jones to Ma’afu, 5 Oct 1865 and Jones to Tui Cakau, 5 Oct 1865, BCFP.
As always when Ma`afu was involved, much depended on his response to the strictures he received from others in authority. Jones was moved to write to him again early in 1866, reporting that the returned Mago people had stolen yams and pigs from the Ryders. The Consul admonished Ma`afu: “You surely must be sufficiently powerful in your own territories to chastise the perpetrators”.21 Jones appeared unaware of the facts concerning the Mago people who had returned to their home. When a party of about 200 arrived, they asked the Ryders “with great respect” for permission to recuperate for one month as they had no food at Lomaloma. The Ryders agreed, only to see the returnees build a defensive fence around one of the villages. Ma`afu had been away from Lomaloma when the party left for Mago. Hearing of the exodus three months later, he immediately sent a party of 50 men to deport them once again.22

Anxious no doubt to promote the “peace” which he claimed as a consequence of Confederation, Jones sought to clarify once and for all the status of the Tongan land claims in Fiji. Hearing that George Henry had appealed to London against his decision concerning Vanuabalavu, Jones looked to Tupou’s secretary David Moss (Tupou Ha`apai) for help. He suggested to Moss “that King George should draw up a full statement of the nature of his claims to lands in Fiji, the dates of surrender to him by Ma`afu and the steps taken by him to disallow the act of surrender made by Ma`afu”.23 Jones was anxious to secure his defence against further legal moves by Henry. Ma`afu himself was probably in Tonga at this time, since he was reported absent from Lomaloma for at least three months. His canoe was seen in Nuku`alofa in May, although there was no mention of him.24 He was certainly back in Fiji by 12 September, when he faced growing antagonism from Fijian and European alike.

As was often the case in Ma`afu’s life, it is impossible to define any direction or definite policy on his part during the period between the formation of the Confederation in 1865 and its final collapse in 1867. Throughout 1866, we know almost nothing of him beyond his activities on Mago and hints of a visit home to Tonga. Yet there might have been sinister undertones to his apparently quiet existence in the form of a plot against his life. An English traveller, Herbert Meade, who visited Nuku`alofa in October 1866, noted reports that a conspiracy against Ma`afu had occurred at Lomaloma. Ma`afu supposedly spared the conspirators’ lives, sentencing them instead to banishment to different islands.25 No evidence survives concerning the origin of the supposed conspiracy or the identity of the plotters. When Meade, continuing his voyage,

21 Jones to Ma`afu, 4 Jan 1866, BCFP.
22 Ryder, George L., Pioneering in the South Seas, being Reminiscences of G.L. Ryder, of Mango Island, 36.
23 Jones to Tubou Ha`apai, 6 Feb 1866, BCFP.
24 Lee, 1 May 1866.
25 Herbert A. Meade, A Ride through the Disturbed Districts of New Zealand, together with some account of the South Sea Islands, London 1870, 299.
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reached Lomaloma in November, he described the village, under the dominion of Ma’afu, as “dirty and uninteresting”. During the same month, Jones wrote to admonish Ma’afu yet again for his unpaid debts. “This conduct is undignified in the extreme and unworthy of one who professes to be superior in civilization to those … surrounding him”. The year closed with something of a mystery: James Calvert, having left Fiji, wrote from Australia that Jones had been to Tonga and extracted a written agreement from Tupou to withdraw “the troublesome Tongans” from Fiji. Whatever the facts behind this unsubstantiated claim, it was clear at year’s end that the two dilemmas long facing Fiji remained unresolved. Firstly, some form of union, which subordinated the great chiefs to a central authority, would be required sooner rather than later. Secondly, that union, whatever its form, must include Ma’afu who, as governor of the Tongans in Fiji, had to be accepted in the role of a Fijian chief himself.

The maintenance of traditional chiefly power and the lack of a centralised authority, significant weaknesses as they were, did not by themselves signal the end of the Confederation. On a practical level, the “refractory, overbearing and rapacious proclivities of the young Bau chiefs” and “their marauding aggressions” throughout the Confederation caused great resentment. In any case, the agreement had only papered over the divisions between the matanitu, of which the most significant was the growing rift between the eastern and northern states on the one hand and the Bau dominions on the other. Lau, Cakaudrove, Macuata and Bua, with their various links to Tonga and with arrangements of some kind with Ma’afu, were always unlikely to admit of common cause with Bau. Following the treaties with Tonga and the consolidation of Ma’afu’s rule on Vanuabalavu, the division could not but widen. It was to assume a definite form on 13 February 1867, when Tui Cakau, Tui Bua and Ma’afu met to bind their respective realms in a new grouping, the Tovata ko Natokalau kei Viti, or Confederation of North and East Fiji, usually known in English as the Lau Confederation and in Fijian as the Tovata ko Lau. Although most of the Tovata’s provisions were never to be implemented, the new arrangement at least provided some measure of bureaucratic structure and appeared, in its provision for taxation and alienation of land, to be more reflective of the prevailing conditions in the lands under its control. Ma’afu was to be the first Chieftain

26 ibid., 316. See also Julius Brenchley, Diary on board HMS Esk, c. 27 Oct 1866, Brenchley Papers.
27 Address by Robert Swanston to meeting of white residents at Lomaloma, 20 Dec 1870. FT, 7 Jan 1871.
28 Jones to Ma’afu, 20 Nov 1866, BCFP. The debts specified by Jones were $200 to Thomas Ryder, for articles purchased in 1863, and $12 to Horace Morrell in compensation for a cart that had been stolen by Ma’afu’s people.
29 Calvert to Rowe, 23 Nov 1866, Personal Papers.
30 David Wilkinson to Secretary of State for the Colonies, 21 Dec 1905, FM Doc. 642.
31 For the full text of the Lau Confederation, see Appendix C. See also Henderson, 19–21.
Supreme. Consul Jones, apparently mindful of the realities of power, lost little time in expressing his support: “I have reason to expect that the energy and authority of Ma`afu assisted by honest and enlightened counsel will go far to ensure the security and prosperity of the Confederation of which he has been appointed supreme chief.”

Many of the changes embodied in the new constitution were the creation of the two men who were to be the Tovata’s secretaries. They were Robert Swanston, already secretary to Ma`afu, and David Wilkinson, secretary to Tui Bua. Swanston had advised the Smythe Commission in 1862 that he “wished to see Ma`afu head chief in the Fijis”, a view unlikely to have changed five years later. The Tovata immediately created a focus of power to rival that of Bau and placed Ma`afu in a better position to assert a significant degree of independence from the Tongan crown. While his cession in 1855 of his Fijian lands to Tupou had been largely, though never formally, superseded by subsequent events, the acknowledged Tongan rule over those Fijian lands claimed by right of conquest had, by 1867, become centred on Ma`afu himself and on the power he had acquired. A newspaper report six years later would claim that Bua and Cakaudrove had withdrawn from the 1865 Confederation because of resentment over Bauan attempts to assert dominance. The resentment emanated largely from Ma`afu himself, who had never been party to the earlier agreement. In the wake of the new alliance of February 1867, the most immediate concern was the attitude of Tui Nayau, who had not joined Ma`afu and the other two chiefs in forming the Tovata. Cakobau meanwhile was attempting, as so often, to adapt to a changed political landscape not of his own making. He was reportedly seeking to form a government “after the model of the Government of the Sandwich Islands with a fair prospect of success”. On Lakeba, missionary Lorimer Fison, a sepulchral voice of doom, “[did] hereby prophesy … [the] day is not far distant where … all Fiji [will fall] under Tongan sway”. 

---

32 Constitution and Laws of the Chiefdom of Lau, Fiji, Sydney 1871. The published Constitution referred to Ma`afu as Tui Lau, a title that did not exist in 1867. It was created, expressly for Ma`afu, in 1869. See also Wilkinson to Secretary of State for the Colonies, 21 Dec 1905; Swanston to Cakobau, 28 Feb 1867, Swanston to Jones, 1 Mar 1867, Jones to FO, 15 Jul 1867 GB FO BCFP.
33 Jones to Swanston, 17 Apr 1867, BCFP. See also Jones to Tovata chiefs, 17 Apr 1867. This letter, which has apparently not survived, was tabled at a meeting of Tovata chiefs in May-June 1869. Minutes of Meetings of the Tovata chiefs, May 1869 and Aug 1870, no pagination.
34 Sir Arthur Gordon, Governor of Fiji 1875–1880, was to describe David Wilkinson as having “a far better knowledge of native affairs, and a far juster [sic] appreciation of them, than any other man in Fiji”. Lord Stanmore [Sir Arthur Gordon] to John T. Arundel, 22 Sep 1897, John T. Arundel, Correspondence, chiefly with Lord Stanmore 1897–1912, PMB 493.
37 Lorimer Fison to his sisters [fragment], Lakeba, Feb 1867, Miscellaneous Papers of Lorimer Fison 1865–1868.
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Cakobau’s ideas of forming his own government had arisen from a meeting of European planters at Levuka in April called by his American secretary Samuel St John. Resenting the collapse of the 1865 Confederation and apprehensive as always about Ma’a’fu’s ambitions, Cakobau would have welcomed this revival of his political fortunes under European auspices. Among the “laws” of the new kingdom of Bau was a provision whereby he would receive a royalty of one shilling per acre on all land sales. This, the planters believed, would ensure his continued approval of such sales and provide for the protection of settlers.39 The climax of this push for a pliable form of government under settler control came in an absurd “coronation” of Cakobau in the Levuka church on 2 May.40 His designation as “King of Bau and its Dependencies” reflected the limits of his personal control.41 The U.S. Consul’s support for the new Bau kingdom and its ruler provided Cakobau with some comfort in his efforts to accommodate Tongan power in the north and east of Fiji.

The proposed assembly of the new kingdom’s chiefs never met, nor did the expected taxation revenue eventuate.42 Lack of revenue prevented the new “government” from making even a pretence of exercising its functions. The oath of allegiance to Cakobau, made by 297 chiefs at the behest of St John during the last week of May, was relevant only in European eyes. The chiefs already owed customary allegiance to the Vunivalu and needed no formal expression of that obligation.43 While echoes of the “kingdom” were to reverberate for a few more years, the greatest political strength in mid 1867 lay with the Tovata. Its head, Ma’a’fu, was better placed than any indigenous chief to augment his existing power, although he received a setback on 28 May, after Swanston had gone to Lakeba with the text of the Tovata agreement. Tui Nayau wrote to Ma’a’fu to say that they could not federate “because we are a weak people and cannot confederate with powerful Chiefs; we wish to stand alone and serve … God”. No further reason was given, but in a minute dated 1 June, Swanston was to ascribe the refusal to the “interference” of Lorimer Fison. Swanston predicted that the Tovata would “fall to the ground” and that “Lau and Bua will hoist the Tongan flag”.44 Ma’a’fu was strongly opposed to any use of the flag, since it was to be his influence, not his country’s, which should prevail.

39 Thurston to FO, 31 Dec 1867, FO 58/111.
40 For a detailed eyewitness account of the ceremony, see Frederick J. Moss, A Planter’s Experience in Fiji, Auckland 1870, 26–27. For details of the ceremony inside the church, see Edward March, Report on State of Affairs in Fiji, enc. in March to Lord Clarendon, 31 Mar 1870, FO 58/118. See also Henry Britton, Fiji in 1870…, Melbourne 1870, 32–34; Colman Wall, “Cakobau’s Flag”, TFS, 1910 (unpaginated). For Swanston’s reaction, see Swanston to Jones, 7 Jun 1867, BCFP.
41 The “dependencies” which Cakobau claimed to rule were Viti Levu, Kadavu, Ovalau, Koro, Gau, Batiki, Nairai and nearby smaller islands (Jones to FO, 15 Jul 1867). Over much of Viti Levu, he possessed no authority whatever.
42 For the text of the Bau constitution, see enclosure in March to Clarendon, 18 Jul 1870, FO 58/118.
43 For the text of the oath of allegiance, see Frederick J. Moss, Through Atolls and Islands in the Great South Sea, London 1889, Appendix E, 300–301.
44 Edward Tui Nayau, Lote Loganimoce [and] John Wesley to Swanston, 28 May 1867; Minute by Swanston, 1 Jun 1867, BCFP.
Swanston felt that the long-standing links which Lau and Bua enjoyed with Tonga had contributed to Tui Nayau’s decision. Since Article 14 of the Tovata constitution forbade any member state’s entering into alliance with a foreign power, Tui Nayau might have concluded that he could not ally himself with both northern Fiji and Tonga. With a choice to be made, he chose Tonga. It is significant that he saw a distinction between Tonga on the one hand and Ma’afu on the other. His decision can be seen as evidence that Ma’afu was now regarded as a power entirely in his own right in Fiji, one who acted independently of the Tongan government. Tui Nayau’s rejection of alliance with that independent power was the most severe blow Ma’afu had received since his forced renunciation of the Tongan lands in Fiji in the days of Consul Pritchard.

It was not the only blow Ma’afu received during these months, a period accurately described as a time of “transition”. In June, USS Tuscarora, Captain Fabius Stanley, arrived in Fiji to renew pressure for payment of the American “debt”. A bewildered Cakobau was forced to make yet another agreement to pay, this time in four annual instalments, the first of which would fall due on 1 May 1868. Three islands within his domain were liable to forfeiture if he reneged. Cakobau sought to gain some advantage from his predicament by writing to U.S. President Andrew Johnson seeking American protection against Tonga for the four-year period covered by the new agreement. Acting Consul Brower supported the Vunivalu, acknowledging that the menace posed by Tonga acted as a hindrance to his ability to pay the indemnity. Cakobau’s fear of Tongan intentions appeared undiminished. When the Tuscarora called at Tonga the following month, Stanley advised Tupou not to permit any Tongan interference with the collection of the “debt” in Fiji and urged him to confine Tongan “raids” in Fiji within the Exploring Isles. The captain’s letter was timely, since the King still believed that Vanuabalavu, the Yasayasa Moala and Rabe “were his by right” and that he was justified in enforcing that right, “by force of arms if necessary”. Tupou’s views on Tongan “rights” in Fiji were increasingly divorced from the actions of Ma’afu, who had formed the Tovata without consulting the King. It is likely that once Tupou became aware of the depth of American concerns, he saw the advisability of dissociating himself, and the Tongan government generally, from Ma’afu’s activities in Fiji.

46 The islands were Nairai, Batiki and Moturiki.
47 Indenture made at Bau 12 June 1867 between Cakobau and Captain Stanley, signed by Cakobau and S.A. St John, Secretary of State, enclosed in Brower to SD, 25 Jun 1867, USC Laucala 4.
48 Fabius Stanley to George Tubou, King of the Friendly Islands, 15 Jul 1867, USC Laucala 4. The name “Exploring Isles” includes Vanuabalavu and the islands within its reef, principally Namalata, Susui, Munia, Cikobia, Suvu islets, Avea, Qilaqila, Adavaci and Yanucaaloa.
49 The King so informed visiting Wesleyan missionary Martin Dyson at Nuku’alofa in July 1867. (Martin Dyson, Papers, Vol. 6, Life History, no pagination, but 793 in ML photostat).
Ma`afu himself did not escape notice from the visiting Americans. Before the *Tuscarora* proceeded to Tonga, it called at Lomaloma, where Ma`afu was invited on board for a meeting with Stanley. The captain raised a number of minor claims brought against Ma`afu by resident Americans, involving in some cases unpaid debts. Ma`afu readily acknowledged them and, in an attempt to avoid liability, gave Stanley a draft payable by Tupou.\(^{50}\) The claims included disputes over the ownership of the islands of Munia and Yanuyanu within the Vanuabalavu lagoon. Ma`afu had claimed to be the owner of both islands by virtue of Tui Cakau’s gift of levying rights and of Consul Jones’ finding at the judicial hearing in 1865. Stanley informed him that since Americans had purchased both islands, their legal ownership had not been within Jones’ jurisdiction. Ma`afu was forced to remove the inhabitants, who were later dispersed to Avea and to the village of Mavana on Vanuabalavu.\(^{51}\) The consequence of the enquiry on board the *Tuscarora* was a written agreement signed by Ma`afu renouncing in perpetuity all claim to Munia and Yanuyanu.\(^{52}\)

Although Ma`afu regarded these two small islands as rightfully his, it is probable that he was not unduly concerned about their loss. In any case, Tongan involvement in eastern Fiji continued without reference to the wishes of either Ma`afu or Tupou. In June, a 600-strong Tongan war party descended on Lakeba, where the Tongan flag was temporarily hoisted. The only blood shed was that of numerous Lakeban pigs.\(^{53}\) Whether this raid was a consequence of Tui Nayau’s rejection of the *Tovata* a few weeks earlier cannot be determined. Ma`afu, however, following the loss of Lau to the *Tovata* and his treatment at American hands, appeared to withdraw in high dudgeon to his lair at Lomaloma, leaving the *Tovata* as a house built on sand. He articulated his reasons:

\[
\text{because of the continued outcry raised against me by many of the foreigners resident in Fiji, that I am the root of all evil in Fiji; and because the Lau chiefs have decided to abandon the confederation, and because Tui Cakau is wavering in his adhesion … and because … quarrels … among the different chiefdoms of Fiji are imminent, I write to tell you that I intend never again to meddle in the management [of any chiefdom apart from Lau]. What I have done in times past in the political troubles of Fiji has been done with the desire to aid the chieftains in preserving order…}^{54}\]
So Ma`afu could not have his way and, as was his wont, withdrew from the sordid world of politics, nursing his wounded pride and purporting to wonder how he could have been so treated. But his withdrawal was tactical; within two years he would be recognised as Tui Lau, a new chief within the polity of Fiji and no longer simply governor of the Tongans under Tupou I.

He left further explanation to his secretary. Swanston advised Acting Consul Thurston that the “Confederation … of Bua, Cakaudrove and Vanua Balavu [had] broken up”, as a result of Tui Nayau’s failure to participate.\(^\text{55}\) Swanston thought that the main consequence of the Tovata’s collapse would be “the direct political connection of Lau and Bua with Tonga”. He regretted the change, since he had regarded the Tovata as an entity Tonga would have recognised and within which Ma`afu “could have acted more in accordance with his own views, which are far in advance of those held by Fijian Chiefs”. He emphasised to Thurston that he so opposed the extension of Tongan political power that he could no longer support Ma`afu officially, since Ma`afu “by force of circumstances must now represent Tongan interests solely”.\(^\text{56}\) Although Swanston was apparently not aware, the time had arrived when Tupou had to weigh the merits of the Tongan lands in Fiji against his kingdom’s relations with the encroaching wider world. His conclusions would leave Ma`afu very much his own man in Fiji.

For the moment, the man led a settled existence. In October HMS *Brisk*, Captain Charles Hope, visited Fiji. Hope wished to proceed to the island of Niuafo`ou, in northern Tonga, “to call the natives to account for the ill-treatment of the crew of an English vessel”. The captain took on board Thurston and Ma`afu, referring to the latter as “the proper heir” of Tupou. Hope also made mention of the tale of Ma`afu’s banishment from Tonga for his “wild and lawless conduct” in his youth, a story which would follow Ma`afu well beyond the grave. On board ship, Ma`afu earned Hope’s praise as a “gentleman” who was “respected by all who came in contact with him”. On arrival at Niuafo`ou, Ma`afu went ashore, extracted an apology and a fine from the erring chief and was treated with a deference befitting his rank by the inhabitants. On the return of HMS *Brisk* to Fiji, Ma`afu was left at Lomaloma, where he had commenced the cultivation of cotton.\(^\text{57}\)

Charles Hope was an interested observer of Fiji and produced a revealing account of the political circumstances he encountered there. He acknowledged Ma`afu’s supremacy in eastern Fiji, remarking that although he and Cakobau were often regarded as great rivals, “the two chiefs have generally been on good terms and have exchanged friendly visits”. Of the two, Ma`afu appeared the

---

\(^\text{55}\) John Bates Thurston had been given charge of the British Consulate on 18 Jul 1867, the day of Henry Jones’ departure for England. (See Jones to FO, 18 Jul 1867, FO 58/111).

\(^\text{56}\) Swanston to Thurston, 25 Sep 1867, BCFP.

\(^\text{57}\) Charles W. Hope, Letter-Journals of Captain Charles W. Hope of HMS *Brisk* 1865–1868, 22 Oct 1867. See also Frederick Crowe, Letter to his father written on board HMS *Brisk* 1867.
more powerful: his influence, “if he chose to exert it, would now be all powerful throughout [Viti Levu]”. In view of the general support for Cakobau from the resident Europeans, Hope saw an urgent need for recognition of the Vunivalu as king “of Viti Levu and its dependencies”. Ma`afu’s “position with respect to [Lau should be] assimilated to that of Cakobau, and … the succession [in Lau should be settled] on his eldest son”. Fiji could thus become two independent kingdoms, with the possibility of union in the distant future. “At present this is out of the question”, Hope believed, “as … Ma`afu is not a man to play a subordinate part”. Significantly, Hope in his detailed survey made no mention of any menace, real or imagined, from Tonga.  

While Ma`afu's sovereignty in Vanuabalavu was now beyond dispute, George Henry continued his attempts to circumvent the 1865 judicial finding. In August he sought to “cajole” Ma`afu into handing over the deeds to Vanuabalavu, so that he (Henry) could undertake a fraudulent sale of the island to an American. This attempt was made despite Henry’s having signed a deed of renunciation of all rights to Vanuabalavu at the Consulate in June. Thurston called Henry into the Consulate again and required him to destroy a “deed” from Tui Cakau, recognising the validity of that chief’s original sale to Henry. A document from Cakobau also recognising the sale was similarly destroyed. Henry was threatened with deportation on the next British man-of-war to call. Ma`afu, while assured of the Acting Consul’s full support, was warned to stop his people from slaughtering Henry’s livestock on Adavaci. The reality was that Henry had ceased to pose any threat to Ma`afu. The latter’s chief concern at the end of 1867 was the consolidation of his power in eastern Fiji, including especially the need for an accommodation with Tui Nayau, who still apparently considered Lakeba’s links with Tonga to be of primary importance. Hope had been right in stating that neither Ma`afu nor Cakobau would willingly place himself under the authority of the other. Of the two, it was Ma`afu whose power was in more urgent need of resolution.

From early 1868, the increasing numbers of European settlers in Fiji, mostly attempting to cultivate cotton, formed an element no contender for power in the islands could ignore. Reports of high prices being fetched for Sea Island cotton in England, sustained by favourable press comment in the Australian colonies, attracted great interest, with Sea Island cotton being successfully grown in Fiji, most notably on Wakaya. Ma`afu himself cultivated cotton on Vanuabalavu in partnership with Swanston. In an editorial based more on hearsay than on

---

58 Charles W. Hope, Memorandum on the Fiji Islands, 21 Nov 1867.
59 Thurston to Henry, 2 Dec 1867, Thurston to Ma`afu, 5 Dec 1867, Henry to Thurston, 6 Dec and 19 Dec 1867, BCFP. Henry valued the losses to his livestock, occasioned by Ma`afu's people, at $850.
factual reporting, one Melbourne newspaper, *The Argus*, mentioned Tupou’s reputed long-standing ambition to annex Fiji, an ambition thwarted only by the “policy” of the British and American Consuls. “If the whites will not take the sovereignty [of Fiji] the Tonguese are sure to do it”, *The Argus* warned.⁶¹

Most residents of Fiji were not moved with such a sense of urgency. Thurston commiserated with Tui Bua over the collapse of the *Tovata*, while also assuring Swanston that Ma`afu was quite right to exercise a “proper and wholesome authority” over visiting and resident Europeans, provided his laws were “not in violation of civilised ideas”. The new American Consul, Kintzing Pritchette, apparently shared Thurston’s views.⁶² Ma`afu himself was well aware of the need, expressed the previous year by Captain Hope, for his power base to acquire a new and if possible permanent definition. On his return from a trip to Ra, he met Cakobau at Moturiki, where the Vunivalu bared his soul to his old adversary:

> I was a fool to abandon you and Tubou, everything has gone wrong with me, and see where they have placed me. I lately received a letter from them stating that they would have nothing more to do with me, and the Secretary had left. I cannot pay the American claim.

Ma`afu appeared unmoved:

> It is the result of your own folly. We had agreed before Mr Williams died that … I should arrange with Tubou to help us and we would jointly and easily paid the claim, but you listened to Mr Pritchard, and where are you to-day?

True to his resolution of five months earlier, Ma`afu refused a request to advise some Rewan chiefs on certain matters, reminding them that he had informed the British Consul of his determination not to involve himself in Fijian affairs. Tui Bua and Tui Cakau were similarly rebuffed, despite the former’s making a special voyage to ask Ma`afu personally. But Ma`afu did go some way towards revealing his hand to Swanston:

> You whites will never be able to do anything with the Fijians, they cannot understand you and you cannot understand them, and there never will be any confidence between you; towards us they lean … we
Ma’afu, who saw the future sovereignty of Tonga “as undoubtedly open to him, … would decide at once on the Tongan throne with Lau annexed did he not believe in the probability of extended power in Fiji!” He wished to keep himself free of any complications in Fiji, so that no future option should be closed to him. With Swanston’s backing, he might yet gain the support of the whites, while his succession in Tonga would all but guarantee his sovereignty in Lau.63

Swanston continued to further the cause of his employer and business partner by acquainting Consul Pritchette with Ma’afu’s background and present importance in Fiji. Quoting the maxim “the man in power is the man to be recognised”, he told Pritchette:

Ma’afu is no myth in … local politics … he is an incontestable fact … He is a political necessity … That Ma’afu means Tonga is a catchpenny cry, and those not acquainted with the subtleties of native politics, appear to hear truth on the face of it. Ma’afu is Tonga so far as we choose to allow it; and Ma’afu is not Tonga where we choose to object.

Ma’afu’s personal influence aided by the weight of his position as a Tongan … has placed him and held him where he is … this influence can be used to immense advantage, for Fiji at large and for our race. It is a power … which is hopelessly beyond the farthest ken of the most insanely ambitious Fijian, and which any endeavour on the part of the whites to overthrow I view as a suicidal mistake.

For the two Consuls, entrusted with the interests of the vast majority of the Europeans resident in Fiji, Ma’afu was far and away the strongest force with which they had to come to terms. Swanston believed that, despite the earlier rebuff from Cakobau, Ma’afu would willingly pay the American claim, if the chiefs of Bau and Rewa were “disposed to meet [his] views”.64 Meeting Ma’afu’s views would entail nothing less than a surrender of power.

Cakobau meanwhile seized an opportunity to surrender the American “debt”. A private limited liability enterprise, called the Polynesian Land Company, was formed by some Melbourne businessmen with a view to obtaining land in Fiji for cotton cultivation. Two of the company’s principals voyaged to Levuka in May 1868. There, they persuaded Cakobau to sign an agreement transferring 200,000 acres of Fijian land to the company and granting certain trading privileges. In

63 Swanston to Thurston, 29 Feb 1868, BCFP
64 Swanston to Kintzing Pritchette, 13 Apr 1868, BCFP
return, the company agreed to settle the “debt” in full and to pay the Vunivalu $1,000 annually.\textsuperscript{65} The land “granted” by Cakobau consisted of blocks in four different parts of Fiji, mostly areas over whose inhabitants he possessed no authority. The agreement was made unbeknown to Thurston who, as soon as he heard of it, obtained an injunction against the Company’s men “to stay further action”.\textsuperscript{66} Thurston, fearing that the United States might gain possession of the lands offered by Cakobau, wrote to inform Commodore Lambert of the Royal Navy’s Australia Station that the lands in question were not Cakobau’s to convey.\textsuperscript{67} He also protested to the Foreign Office, emphasising the threat the agreement posed to the existing investments of capital and labour by British subjects in Fiji.\textsuperscript{68} Following the injunction, Cakobau repudiated the May agreement with further action concerning the Polynesian Land Company deferred until the expected arrival of Lambert in July.\textsuperscript{69} The Company eventually failed to achieve almost all its objectives, owing largely to the impossibility of securing the 200,000 acres “granted” by Cakobau and to the eventual collapse of the cotton boom in Fiji. Its story is not among our concerns here since, during these early days, Ma’afu was in no way involved. His future was being decided in Tonga at the very time when the Company’s representatives were negotiating with Cakobau.\textsuperscript{70}

Ma’afu had gone to Tonga to attend the fourth Tongan Parliament, which began its deliberations at Nuku‘alofa on 21 May. Jone Waqaimalani and Lote Loganimoce, two leading Lakeban chiefs, also attended, as did Tui Bua. The assembled chiefs unanimously resolved, “that the Tongan government should withdraw from Fiji altogether, that all Tongan possessions in Fiji should be sold, and that Ma’afu should remain in Tonga”. When the Fijian chiefs present protested against the last provision, the Parliament allowed that Ma’afu could return to Fiji to gather documentary proof that his presence there was welcomed by the leading chiefs, particularly those of Bua, Cakaudrove and Lakeba, the

\textsuperscript{65} CRD 917, NAF.
\textsuperscript{66} Cdre Rowley Lambert to Sir J.H.T. Manners Sutton [Governor of Victoria], 14 July 1868, Copies of Extracts of Correspondence relating to the Feejee Islands, in so far as the same relate to their Annexation to the Colonial Empire of this Country or otherwise affording Protection to British subjects resident in those Islands, 8 Aug 1871, GB PP [C.-5039]. Twenty-five years earlier, missionary Thomas Williams had predicted the interest in Fiji of “the speculating class of gentry … we are shortly to expect a torrent of hungry emigrants … I know enough to satisfy me that they are men of base principles”. Williams to his parents, 25 Apr 1843, Thomas Williams Letters to his Father.
\textsuperscript{67} Thurston to Lambert, 1 Jun 1868, BCFP. See also Thurston to Stanley, 12 May 1868, ibid. Thurston’s fears were not unfounded. \textit{TA} of 4 Dec 1868 would quote an editorial in the San Francisco \textit{Bulletin}, which expressed the view that U.S. Secretary of State William Seward might claim he was entitled to possession of the lands “by default of payment”.
\textsuperscript{68} Thurston to FO, 1 Jun 1868, FO58/113.
\textsuperscript{69} Thurston to FO, 27 May 1868, FO58/113.
states with the closest links to Tonga. The only one of the Tongan lands in Fiji to remain unsold was Rabe, since 1855 the private property of Tupou. Parliament passed a series of “resolutions relating to Fiji” which were designed to define future relations between the two countries. Chief among them were:

1. The Tongan flag hoisted at Lakeba in June was to be lowered when Ma`afu returned to Fiji.
2. The cession of lands and requested use of the Tongan flag by Bua was to be declined.
3. Ma`afu, if permitted to return permanently to Fiji, should not enter into any alliance with Fijian chiefs without the explicit approval of the Tongan government.
4. Ma`afu would be at liberty to establish laws in his Fijian lands according to his discretion, even if such laws were at variance with those prevailing in Tonga.
5. Ma`afu was at liberty to sell any Tongan lands in Fiji that the people were unable to cultivate.

In an accompanying Law relating to Governors, it was forbidden for any Governor to contract debts on behalf of the Tongan government without express permission. This law was apparently prompted by the numerous debts Ma`afu had accrued on Tupou’s behalf and by the paucity of tribute he had sent home.

The writing had long been on the wall concerning these first formal steps taken by Tupou and his chiefs to disengage their country from Fiji. More than five years earlier, William Owen had written a courteous letter to Tupou, urging him to do nothing to disturb the existing friendly relations between Tonga and Fiji. At the same time and in a very different tone, Isaac Brower had sent the King a belligerent message, advising that he would be held personally responsible if Tongan “agents” in Fiji interfered with measures taken to collect the American debt. Tupou was warned to abandon his “ambitious designs” on Fiji. Although Tupou had informed missionary Martin Dyson in July 1867 that

---

71 Swanston to Thurston, 5 Jun 1868, BCFP.
72 Rabe was eventually sold to three Sydney men in 1870 for £1,300. See LCC R1; FT, 30 Jul 1870; Minutes of the Executive Council Siting for the Rehearing of Claimants' Lands 1879–1880, Appendix C, 83B and 83C.
73 See above, n. 44.
74 For the full text of the resolutions, see Appendix D. See also Swanston to Thurston, 8 Aug 1868, enc. A, BCFP. For an account of the meeting of Parliament, see The Fijian Weekly News and Planters Journal, 21 Oct 1868; “Spectator” to Editor, 20 Feb 1874, FT, 11 Mar 1874.
75 Swanston to Thurston, 8 Aug 1868, enc. B. For the text of the Law relating to Governors, see Appendix E.
76 Tupou Ha`apai to Thurston, 2 Apr 1869, BCFP.
77 William Owen to George Tupou, 31 Jan 1863. See Ch. 7, n. 82.
78 Isaac Brower to George Tupou, 31 Dec 1862. See Ch. 7, n. 83.
8. “A man of great energy and ambition”

he was still prepared to use force to protect Tongan interests there,\(^79\) the visit of USS *Tuscarora* during the same month, with further warnings from Captain Stanley against “interference”, left its impression on the King.\(^80\) Following the resolutions of June 1868, the Tongan lands previously considered to be under the rule of Tupou were permanently assigned to Ma‘afu. Further, if Ma‘afu could demonstrate that the chiefs of Fiji welcomed his permanent presence among them, Tupou would not stand in his way.

Ma‘afu remained in Tonga for at least a month and, following his return, appears to have been occupied in efforts to secure the support of the eastern and northern chiefs. Thurston, preoccupied with the Polynesian Land Company, devoted no attention to Ma‘afu’s concerns.\(^81\) The Acting Consul wrote to the governors of New South Wales and Victoria, informing them of the impossibility of the Company’s gaining title to the proffered 200,000 acres. He also emphasised that Cakobau lacked the authority to protect European settlers who might come to occupy the lands.\(^82\) Largely because of Thurston’s energetic opposition, Cakobau on 23 July signed a new charter describing him only as “King … of the Bau Dominions” and offering the company monopoly rights and freedom from taxation, rather than legal title, over the land.\(^83\) Neither investors in the Company nor its directors knew the true extent of Cakobau’s rule, while for the Vunivalu himself, relief to be rid at last of the American “debt” remained his principal concern. His later claim not to have understood the contents of the instrument he signed in May cut no ice with Thurston.\(^84\) Ma‘afu became involved when Cakobau wrote to him in August concerning Beqa, which formed part of the lands “granted” to the Company by Cakobau. Since the island owed allegiance to Ma‘afu, Cakobau wrote asking him “if Beqa is really yours, give it to me so that I may give it to the Europeans”.\(^85\) This request, as James Calvert noted, was “an acknowledgment on [Cakobau’s] part that Ma‘afu is the owner of the island”.\(^86\)

In the meantime, the Vunivalu had not forgotten his quarrel with Tonga. He wrote to Tupou, asking that their long estrangement might end and seeking a visit from Tevita `Unga.\(^87\) The King’s reply, six months later, reflected the Tongan Parliament’s resolutions relating to Fiji. His secretary Moss wrote
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\(^{79}\) See above, n. 49.
\(^{80}\) See above, n. 48.
\(^{81}\) Before his return, Ma‘afu had the Tongan flag removed from his vessel. See address by Swanston the meeting of Whites at Lomaloma, 20 Dec 1870.
\(^{82}\) Thurston to Governors of New South Wales and Victoria, 23 Jul 1868, BCFP.
\(^{83}\) Charter signed by King Cakobau, granted to the Polynesian Land Company, July 23, 1868, Henderson, 22–23.
\(^{84}\) Thurston to FO, 8 Sep 1868, BCFP.
\(^{85}\) Cakobau to Ma‘afu, 25 Aug 1868, NAF; Notes of a Conversation which took place on board Her Majesty’s ship “Pelorus” between Cakobau and Sir Hercules Robinson on Friday 25th September 1874, CO 881.
\(^{86}\) Calvert to Adm Erskine MP, 25 May 1869, CO881/2.
\(^{87}\) Cakobau to George Tupou, 26 Aug 1868, BCFP.
that `Unga was usefully employed at Vava`u, and that as Tonga had ceded all her possessions in Fiji to Ma`afu, the King did not desire to mix himself in any way in Fijian politics, and therefore Cakobau had better apply to his friends in Fiji for assistance...  

While Cakobau waited for answers from his correspondents, the Tongans were not forgotten by the European residents of Fiji. A debate in the letters column of the Levuka weekly, *The Fijian Weekly News and Planters Journal*, led one settler to refer to the American “debt” as “a protection against the Tongans”, which opinion was borne out by the resolutions of the Tongan Parliament.  

Thurston meanwhile reminded Ma`afu of the serious inconvenience caused to British subjects in Fiji by his failure to meet his debts, a neglect which had the potential to “detract from the harmony of our present relations”, as the Consul delicately advised him. Of Ma`afu himself, nothing was heard.  

Tui Bua, inspired by his recent visit to Tonga, opened the third Legislative Assembly of Bua on 3 October by urging the Buan chiefs to give up “all idea of returning to the old state of things”. He sought closer ties with the rest of eastern Fiji. Intermittent hostilities were occurring on Vanua Levu at the time, involving Solevu, the *vanua* which Cakobau had lost to Bua six years before, and also Macuata. While both Ma`afu and Tui Cakau were reportedly involved, the details are mostly unrecorded. Concerning matters more easily managed than war, Hennings Brothers, traders at Levuka, had taken over a debt of £100 which Ma`afu had owed a deceased settler. Ma`afu re-emerged into the spotlight of history on 10 November when he advised Cakobau that he would not surrender Beqa for cession to the Europeans. His view was fully in accord with that of the island’s chief, Emosi Tui Beqa, who referred to Ma`afu as his friend and partner in the land. Ma`afu’s whereabouts during the exchange is unclear, although during the same month his schooner, the *Caroline*, “mounting eight guns, and another … belonging to Tui Cakau, together with six large Tongan war canoes, were lying at Solevu”. The two chiefs were supposedly anxious for peace, while Cakobau wished Solevu to remain part of Bua, instead of coming under Ma`afu’s control. Cakobau, the Levuka newspaper contended, “has reason to dread the
power [of Ma`afu], for his known connection with the King of Tonga". If such were indeed Cakobau’s view, he must have placed little faith in the resolutions of the Tongan Parliament.

In the outside world, interest in Fiji was still largely confined to its potential as a primary producer of cotton, coffee and other tropical products. The Argus reported in January 1869 that one of the major difficulties facing settlers was “the want of a settled government”. Thurston unwittingly lent credence to such reports when he advised the Governor of New South Wales that some beleaguered settlers in western Viti Levu, placing no faith in Cakobau for protection, had petitioned Ma`afu to come to their assistance. Thurston correctly advised the Governor that only British and American influence had prevented Ma`afu, “a man of great energy and ambition”, from subjugating Fiji. Having waited for years for “a plausible pretext” to enter Fiji, Ma`afu had now been offered one, or so Thurston believed. It was all to no avail, since Ma`afu was in Tonga at the time. He had secured from the chiefs of Lakeba, Cakaudrove, Macuata and Bua documents stating their wish that he be allowed to remain in Fiji, exercising the functions of a chief. True to its resolutions of the previous June, the Tongan government presented Ma`afu with a deed, ceding to him and his heirs “all her rights sovereign and territorial” in Fiji. In a formal statement dated 3 February 1869, Tupou ceded all the Tongan lands in Fiji to Ma`afu, “late Governor of the Tongan possessions in Fiji”, except Rabe, for himself and his successors. Ma`afu was denied use of the Tongan flag, which was not to be raised anywhere in Fiji. Moreover, Ma`afu was explicitly granted all the responsibility vested in the Tongan government among the Tongan lands in Fiji. These measures were undertaken, Tupou declared, to release the Tongan government “from embarrassment and difficulty”. The King’s secretary later claimed that “the greatest difficulty with the King and Chiefs of Tonga is the giving up of Ma`afu himself … making him an alien”. These regrets notwithstanding, the break appeared both definitive and final.

Tupou’s secretary, David Moss, Tupou Ha`apai, was later to outline the King’s reasons for relinquishing the Tongan lands in Fiji. One was Ma`afu’s long residence in Fiji and another the expenses involved in keeping “Colonies”. Among those expenses, the heaviest were the bills signed by Ma`afu and payable by Tupou. Tribute sent by Ma`afu had amounted to a motley collection of mats, sailcloth, sinnet and sandalwood with a total value of less than $100. Finally, there was

96 TA, 20 Jan 1869.
97 Thurston to Earl of Belmore, 2 Feb 1868 and enclosure A: Petition to Ma`afu, ‘King of the Windward Isles’. BCFP See also James Calvert to Admiral Erskine, MP, 25 May 1869, FO58/116.
98 Swanston to Thurston, 5 Jun 1869, BCFP.
99 Statement of George Tupou, 3 Feb 1869, enclosed with Swanston to Thurston, 25 Feb 1869, BCFP. For the full text of the statement, see Appendix F.
100 Tupou Ha`apai to Thurston, 4 Feb 1869, BCFP.
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

more land available in Tonga for cultivation than people to work it. Significantly for Ma`afu’s longer-term future, Tupou Ha`apai denied Australian press reports that Ma`afu was Tupou’s chosen successor. The question of succession had been put in the hands of Parliament in 1865 and when the chiefs had failed to agree, they swore an oath to support anyone chosen by the King.\textsuperscript{101}

Among the weighty considerations of Ma`afu’s future status in both Tonga and Fiji, during his visit to Tonga early in 1869, an episode of much smaller moment occurred which sheds some light on the personal side of his administration in Lau. Ma`afu’s secretary, Robert Swanston, who accompanied his master on the trip, made a complaint to both David Moss and Tevita `Unga, Governor of Lau. Swanston declared that he would have to leave his master, who had not been “liberal enough” to him. When Moss and `Unga asked Swanston what he wanted, I said I wanted a deed in fee-simple for my land at Dalidoni [in Vatuabalavu] which Ma`afu had refused to give me as it was against Tongan law. They spoke to King Tubou on the matter and I received a deed from Ma`afu, endorsed by Tubou. This was done very much against Ma`afu’s inclination. I found on my return, that his discontent interfered with our official relations.

Seeking to remedy the situation, Swanston proposed to Ma`afu that if he would add a block called Masomo to the Dalidoni holding, Swanston would be content to hold both parcels of land as leasehold, in keeping with Ma`afu’s usual practice in Lau. When Ma`afu agreed to the request, Swanston destroyed the original deed.\textsuperscript{102} The episode shows that, as a Tongan chief, Ma`afu was still obliged to respect the wishes of his king. It also reveals that he was not prepared to tolerate any deviation from the rigid pattern of control he asserted in Lau through his leasehold system of land tenure.

Part of the process of disengagement involved the formal termination on 1 March of the treaties between Tonga and both Bua and Lakeba.\textsuperscript{103} The demise of these treaties, following his alienation from Tonga, gave Ma`afu unprecedented freedom to pursue his political fortunes in Fiji. Several months earlier, several Cakaudrove chiefs had advised Ma`afu of their willingness for Lau to join the Tovata and for Ma`afu to be its leader.\textsuperscript{104} Now, the changed attitude of Tui Nayau was especially significant, since that chief’s desire to remain within the orbit of Tonga had thwarted Ma`afu’s ambitions concerning the Tovata. An agreement signed at Lakeba on 15 February stipulated that “all the islands formerly under

\textsuperscript{101} David Moss to Thurston, 2 Apr 1869, NAF.
\textsuperscript{102} LCC R958 Dalidoni, evidence of Robert Swanston and of Ma`afu, NAF.
\textsuperscript{103} Tupou Ha`apai to Thurston (2 letters), 4 Feb 1869, BCFP.
\textsuperscript{104} Letter from Cakaudrove chiefs to Ma`afu et al, 21 Aug 1868. The letter, which has apparently not survived, was tabled at a meeting of Tovata chiefs in May and June 1869. Minutes of The Meetings of the Tovata i Viti, May-Jun 1869 and Aug 1870, ML.
Tupou [are] now Vakarorogo to Ma`afu. Moala, Matuku, Totoya and Vanuabalavu directly, and Lakeba to pay tribute, but to be ruled by its own chiefs”. Ma`afu was formally installed as Tui Lau in a ceremony at Lakeba, where most of the principal chiefs were his kin, with the name Lau being officially applied to the united chiefdoms of Lakeba and Vanuabalavu. The agreement was signed by nine Vuanirewa chiefs, who chose two flags for the new matanitu.

At the time Ma`afu assumed his new dignity, “a sort of constitution and Code of Laws” was drawn up for the new Chiefdom of Lau. Included among the chiefly signatories to the constitution were Tui Nayau and his designated successor Ratu Tevita Ululakeba, son of the late Vuetasau. The constitution included the provision that Tui Lau possessed the right to lease all unoccupied public lands with a limit of 500 acres for any one lessee. According to Swanston, one of the underlying principles of Ma`afu’s land policies as Tui Lau was his determination not to deprive the taukei of lands that were, or could be, under cultivation. Only unoccupied lands could be leased, with a view “to introduce white capital and energy into the country”. To encourage European settlers, who mostly preferred freehold land obtainable elsewhere in Fiji, Ma`afu was to establish 99-year leases. Allotments, known as magimagi (sinnet) because their beach frontages were usually measured with ropes of sinnet, were made to local residents, often on the basis of rank, with the size and resources of the allotments determining the amount of tax to be paid. Such a system had been in operation on Vanuabalavu for several years. Despite some teething problems relating especially to boundaries, the system proved to be a success. One less laudable feature of the new system enshrined in the rudimentary constitution of 1869 was the provision that all taxes raised in Lau, with the exception of those gathered on Lakeba, were the property of Ma`afu “to do with as he pleases”. In similar vein were the ten tons of “produce of the sea” which Tui Nayau was to pay as tribute to Ma`afu annually, although that chief’s rights in central Lau were confirmed. The Lands Claims Commissioners of 1880 would recommend that these absolute powers over leases and taxation should not be extended to Ma`afu’s successors.

Moss wished Thurston to understand the finality of the King’s break with Ma`afu and the Tongans in Fiji. He wrote again to the Acting Consul on 2 April, reminding him the Tongan government “would no longer be responsible for the acts of … Ma`afu and … you will please look upon all Tongans residing...
in Fiji as the subjects of Ma`afu”. Any Tongans dissatisfied with those new arrangements were given the opportunity to return home.\textsuperscript{110} Two months later, Thurston was further informed, this time by Swanston, of the final act in the drama of disengagement. From 28 May to 1 June, the chiefs of Lau, Cakaudrope and Bua met at Lomaloma, where

Ma`afu was recognised as Tui Lau, and acknowledged to be, and received as, a fellow Chieftain of Fiji by the Assembly. The Cession from Tonga to Ma`afu was approved and accepted and the united chiefdom of Lau was recognised as one of the Tovata, and Ma`afu was elected to be the head of the Confederation according to the tenor of the Constitution…\textsuperscript{111}

According to Swanston, the chiefs were of one mind:

Laws were passed to Consolidate the Actions of the Chiefs and Ma`afu Tui Cakau and Tui Bua in the presence of the principal chiefs of their respective territories reiterated their united resolve to maintain and enforce the Constitution as heretofore done, expressing their conviction that it was the way whereby peace and confidence could be ensured throughout Fiji.\textsuperscript{112}

The resolutions of the meeting demonstrated that the chiefs were indeed “of one mind”. Having decided that “the chief who is appointed leader shall have total authority over the affairs of the confederacy until his death”, they expressed unanimity that the leader of the Tovata “should be Ma`afu, the Tui Lau and his deputy be the Tui Cakau”. Concerning the ruling from Tupou Ha`apai that all Tongans in Fiji should be considered as Ma`afu’s subjects, the chiefs stated, “we … have heard and approve the decision that they [the Tongan chiefs] have given Ma`afu Tongan land and everything else under Tongan ownership in Fiji to be solely owned by him. We accept and cherish him to unite with us the chiefs of Fiji”. The chiefs further agreed on a flag and seal for the Tovata and defined in detail the boundaries of Lau, Cakaudrope and Bua. They defined strategies to deal with conflicts arising from “people who cause problems and dissension” and tabled letters from various Cakaudrope chiefs “indicating their … agreement for Lau to be in the Tovata, and for it to be led by Ma`afu”. Moss’ letter from Tonga, announcing that the King and the chiefs “had given Ma`afu all lands and everything belonging to Tonga” was also noted, as was a letter stating the decision of the chiefs of Lakeba that they have agreed to unite with Vanuabalavu and were “unanimous in their decision to create Ma`afu as Tui Lau”.\textsuperscript{113}

\textsuperscript{110} Moss to Thurston, 2 Apr 1868 (second, “non-official” letter).
\textsuperscript{111} Swanston to Thurston, 5 Jun 1869.
\textsuperscript{112} Book of Council of Chiefs, June 1869, unpublished MS (no pagination), NAF.
\textsuperscript{113} Discussions which took place at the meeting of the Tovata held in Lomaloma 28th, 29th, 31st May and 1st June 1869, NAF. I am indebted to Mr Sitiveni Yaqona for the English translation.
If Tui Cakau harboured any regrets over the loss to Cakaudrove of Vanuabalavu and other islands, he kept his own counsel. One administrative measure that revealed the chiefs’, or Ma’afu’s, foresight was the appointment of Tevita Uluilakeba as governor of the Lakeba division of Lau. While Lakeba would continue to maintain its identity, the focus of the new administration had now shifted permanently to Lomaloma. This alliance, in effect a reorganisation of the Northeastern Confederation, was to be known as the *Tovata e Viti*. Although its political evolution and administrative achievements still lay in the future, its formation was, for Ma’afu, the most decisive event of his 22 years’ residence in Fiji. The long process of his transformation from a Tongan chief into a chief of Fiji was now complete. His political career still had a long course to run: two years after his appointment as Tui Lau, he became Viceroy in the short-lived planter oligarchy known as the “Cakobau Government”, before being given office as Roko Tui Lau in the British administration, a post he retained until his death in 1881. Nevertheless, the power placed in his hands at Lomaloma in June 1869, a power recognised throughout Fiji and in Tonga, surpassed the imaginings of anyone who might have witnessed the young chief climb down from his canoe and wade ashore at Lakeba in 1847.
Ma’afu’s recognition as Tui Lau and his formal separation from Tonga placed his rivalry with Cakobau in a new perspective. With the European population of Fiji growing, and increasing demands for their protection coming from their home governments, Ma’afu’s triumph in Lau brought the question of his future role in Fiji into sharper focus. Cakobau, intent on retaining favour with “the people from Melbourne”, lost no time in attempting to restrain his rival. The Vunivalu reminded acting British Consul John Thurston that the new Tui Lau was often seen in Beqa: “he obtains his food and wood from there”. Asserting that Beqa rightfully belonged to him and to Tui Dreketi, Cakobau told the Consul that Ma’afu should keep away from the island.1 Although the question remained unresolved, the ownership of Beqa would never be of great moment. More pertinent to Ma’afu’s future in Fiji was a meeting of European settlers held at Levuka on 14 June 1869, under the auspices of Thurston. The meeting adopted a resolution, supported by Cakobau, Ma’afu, Tui Cakau and Tui Bua, urging the British government to establish a protectorate over Fiji to last for up to 20 years in order that, since annexation to the crown is opposed to the policy of Her Majesty’s Government, the native chiefs, with the assistance of competent foreign residents, may be permitted and assisted to cultivate a form of government analogous to the Sandwich Islands. Your memorialists pray your Lordship may dwell upon the large and increasing connexion with the Australian colonies, and the apparent necessity of providing due protection alike to settlers and natives.2

More than 100 European residents supported the resolution, which Thurston undertook to forward to the Foreign Office. The Fiji Times suggested that had the petition “been properly made known throughout the group, the signatures would have been ten times more numerous”.3 Yet Thurston was unwilling to despatch it immediately, probably aware that if “some form of government” were established, outright annexation would be delayed indefinitely. American settlers addressed a similar petition to their government, although the U.S. Consul, Isaac Brower, believed it would be more suitable for the British to assume the protection of Fiji, in view of the composition of the settler community.4 Because
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1 Cakobau to British Consul, 11 Jun 1869, BCFP.
2 FT, 30 Apr 1870. The petition was signed by Cakobau, by Ma’afu on behalf of himself, Tui Bua and Tui Cakau, and by 129 Europeans. See also TA, 3 May 1870; Messrs Emberson and Smith to BC, 13 Nov 1869, BCFP; WMMS Lakemba Circuit Report, April 1870, MOM 11. An earlier “private circular”, advocating the formation of a “native government”, had been signed by 37 Europeans on 14 Apr 1870. Frederick J. Moss, Through Atolls and Islands in the Great South Sea, London 1889, Appendix B.
3 FT, 30 Apr 1870.
of the volume of primary exports to Australia, Thurston declared, "Fiji is a necessity to, almost the birthright of the Australian colonies". The Melbourne Argus agreed, stating, "Already the Fiji islands are ours by right of commercial conquest and occupation" and urging British protection. In Fiji itself, even the North German Confederation was petitioned, a move which resulted in Chancellor Otto von Bismarck’s appointment of Frederick Hennings as German Consul in Fiji. The Colonial Office, wary of further distant wars, believed that if the British government were to involve itself in the affairs of the large number of foreign settlers, “it may be expected that Fiji would soon become a second New Zealand in point of trouble and expenditure”. Informed observers of Fiji, such as Captain Charles Hope, believed that British annexation was only a question of time. Despite the unwavering reluctance of the governments approached, nothing short of annexation by the British would satisfy the demands of settlers for some form of outside intervention to impose order on their undisciplined and fast-evolving society.

Ma’afu, like the indigenous chiefs, was unaffected by the European settlers’ attempts to influence their home governments. He remained at Lomaloma, where Percival Friend, a schoolmaster attached to the Wesleyan mission, had been sent “to put up a Mission house and to keep hold of Ma`afu till a missionary come”. During the Fiji Wesleyans’ 1870 Synod, Frederick Langham wrote to Ma`afu and Swanston, explaining that the failure to send a missionary to Lomaloma was the consequence of a worldwide shortage of manpower. Settlers who devoted attention to Fijian affairs, rather than their own, sometimes made pertinent and revealing comments about local politics. Robert Swanston, Ma`afu’s secretary, observed it was “impracticable for these savages … to establish any political structure that we should be able to dignify with the title of Government”. Failing occupation of Fiji by any “civilised power”, Europeans should recognise all chiefs as heads of their matanitu and “hold them responsible for peace and good order therein”. The purpose of such an arrangement would be an eventual
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5 John Thurston to Editor, TA, 3 May 1870, 6.
6 TA, 3 May 1870, 5.
7 Thurston to Charles Webley Hope, 18 Dec 1869, C.W. Hope, Letter-Journals (of HMS Brisk 1865–1874), III. Hennings was born in Bremen, Germany in 1837. He came to Fiji in the 1850s, from Samoa, as an agent for Godeffroy and Son of Hamburg and Apia. See Biographical Notes on Hennings, HP.
8 G.F. Bowen [CO] to Lord Granville, 20 May 1869, enclosing a copy of a letter from Lord Belmore, transmitting copies of a letter to him from John Bates Thurston, acting British Consul in Fiji.
10 Jesse Carey to Joseph White, 30 Jun 1870, Carey Letterbook. See also Methodist Church of Fiji, Synod Minutes 1869, resolutions 250 and 251, PMB 1138.
11 Langham to Ma’afu and Robert Swanston, 11 Jun 1870, Methodist Church of Fiji, Synod minutes 1870, PMB 1138.
union of the chiefs. Despite Swanston’s weary disillusion with the various “governments” which had appeared in Fiji during the 1860s, his employer remained the most likely of all the chiefs to bring a genuine union to fruition.

Thurston sought to direct settler disquiet into channels which might be conducive of results. The resolution adopted at Levuka in June advocated protection for up to 20 years because that period was the longest considered feasible, given the British government’s manifest disinterest in Fiji. The Foreign Office, unmoved by the settlers’ appeal and by news of the American petition, considered that an American protectorate over Fiji would pose fewer disadvantages than British annexation. In Australia, editorials referred to Fiji’s future as “the depot of tropical productions” and spoke of Australia’s “manifest destiny … to colonise the islands of Melanesia”. Ma’afu, secure in the paramountcy of Lau, might have wished for a freer hand to consolidate his power.

Cakobau’s signature appended to the settlers’ petition was not the only evidence of his continuing unease. He invited “foreign military settlers” to come to Fiji and place themselves under his authority, although to what ultimate purpose remains unclear. When the governors of New South Wales and New Zealand issued proclamations advising that acceptance of the invitation from Fiji would constitute a breach of Great Britain’s Foreign Enlistment Act, the Foreign Office hastily concurred.

While it is likely that Cakobau remained apprehensive about Ma’afu’s intentions, his chief fear, as always, concerned the American “debt”. His invitation to “military settlers” might have arisen from suggestions from his secretary, one of several Europeans who had attached themselves to Fiji’s leading chiefs. Thurston deplored the influence of these men, describing them as “illiterate and factious” and as “active partisans in the many tribal quarrels of Fiji”, seeking to “enforce their monstrous designs against the chief they profess to serve”. The secretaries certainly possessed their various agendas, as indeed did Thurston. There arose a widening gulf between the acting Consul’s views and those of several of his most prominent constituents.

Aside from his approval of the petition to London, Ma`afu was not an active player in Levuka during his first few months as Tui Lau. In August, probably accompanied by other chiefs, he visited Nadroga in western Viti Levu. This

12 Statement by Swanston 7 Jul 1869, John Dunmore Lang, Papers, Vol. 9, Personal and Miscellaneous, 1838–1873, 134. There was Australian support for such a scenario: see, for example, The Age, 4 Jan 1870, 2.
13 Pall Mall Gazette, 28 Dec 1869, enc. in FO to CO, 31 Dec 1869, CO 201/554. See also CO to FO, 4 Feb 1870, ibid; SMH, 12 Oct 1869; Lord Belmore to Lord Granville, 23 Nov 1869, quoted in de Ricci, 46–48.
14 The Age, 14 Aug and 9 Nov 1869.
16 A reasoned and eloquent argument in favour of a British reappraisal of the annexation question, and against the iniquity of the American demands on Fiji, is found in [Hope], “Sketches in Polynesia…
17 One of Cakobau’s secretaries was Samuel St John, an American.
18 Thurston to FO, 23 Aug 1869, FO58/115.
19 Lorimer Fison to William Moore, 22 Aug 1869, FO58/115.
visit was likely prompted by a petition organised by George Rodney Burt, a local planter who, disaffected by incessant hostility from inhabitants of Viti Levu’s mountainous interior, begged Ma`afu “to come and clear out the mountains, and reign there”. According to James Calvert, 70 “white men” signed the petition, but William Drew, Cakobau’s private secretary, prevailed on Burt to abandon the petition in return for a promise from the Vunivalu “to punish the cannibals and get him redress”. News arrived that the captain of a French man-of-war, visiting Tonga “to talk strong to King George”, became “satisfied that the expatriation of Ma`afu was bona fide, and that the Tongan government was not responsible for his actions in Fiji”. French opinion, official or otherwise, was of only marginal relevance, given France’s lack of involvement in Fijian affairs. Of greater concern to Ma`afu was the mundane matter of his debt to the trading firm of F. and W. Hennings at Lomaloma. So large had it become that in July 1869 he was forced to mortgage some of the jewels in his crown, the islands of Vatuabalavu, Moala and Totoya, as security for the amount of $5,261, due on 31 July 1870. These islands were specified as Ma`afu’s own property, “to do with as he pleases”, under the rudimentary Lauan constitution formulated the previous February. Despite this intrusion of commercial reality, Ma`afu appeared undismayed, signing an agreement with merchant Charles Mcfarland of Apia on 5 September. Ma`afu undertook to give Mcfarland his schooner Eliza Ann as well as 30 tuns of coconut oil, in exchange for Mcfarland’s schooner Mary. The vessels were to be exchanged at Apia on 1 November and the deal concluded six months later.

The mortgage agreement provided for Ma`afu’s debt to be partly met from taxation revenue accruing from the three islands. This provision highlights the important role taxation had already assumed in Lau, where the constitution stipulated that the inhabitants of the islands considered to be Ma`afu’s private property were to pay annual taxes to him. Laws giving effect to this provision were passed at a “local parliament” held at Lakeba in August. The existing requirement of 15 gallons of coconut oil per man, having been found “insufficient to meet the expenditure”, was augmented by a five-gallon “supplementary tax”, levied to avoid public debt. Each man was to pay the taxes before the end of April, while women had to pay an annual tax in kind equivalent to three shillings per head. “Men with large families are beginning to tremble lest the next Parliament should impose a tax on babies”, missionary Jesse Carey wryly
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24 Agreement 5 Sep 1869 between Charles Mcfarland merchant of Samoa and Ma`afu “Governor of the Tongans in Fiji”, BCFP.
noted. Ma’afu lacked nothing in devising new sources of revenue, even taxing, at 24 shillings per annum, young men who were training as Native Assistant Missionaries on Lakeba. Carey was aghast: “It will be impossible for the Society to pay the [tax]; and where are the poor young men to get it from? Ma’afu must only be thinking that the Lord will send big fish into our bay, each with silver pieces in their mouth, or he must intend to cramp our work, which I cannot believe, or he must be dreaming”. Ma’afu was no dreamer, however; he was thinking solely of revenue. Meanwhile, as the Fiji Times did not fail to note, “Tui Nayau is said to be as fat as ever”.

The system of taxation in Lau encouraged development of the islands’ agricultural resources within the framework of their traditional economy. While Ma’afu continued to spend most of his time in the province, enabling him to play an active role in its administration, anxiety over the immediate future of Fiji continued. Following a meeting of leading chiefs at Bau in early October, a letter urging annexation, signed by 11 of their number, was addressed to Queen Victoria. The meeting had been summoned by Thurston in an attempt to gain further chiefly endorsement of the Levuka resolution, two months earlier, seeking British protection. After meeting Thurston, Ma’afu added his signature to those of the Bauan chiefs. The situation nevertheless remained confused, to the initial dismay of Commander William Truxton of the USS Jamestown, which arrived at Levuka on 22 October. Truxton, sent to investigate further the various American claims, convened a court of enquiry on board the Jamestown. The enquiry surprisingly recommended that if the Polynesia Company, already in default, discharged the debt, a refund should be made to Cakobau in view of the excessive nature of former Consul Williams’ original claim in 1849. More importantly, the court found against Ma’afu in respect of claims made by the American John Macomber, who complained that Ma’afu refused to relinquish the island of Munia in the Vanuabalavu lagoon. Truxton wrote to Ma’afu threatening the use of force by the United States should the chief not allow Macomber peaceful possession of the island.

Threats and complaints from a visiting American naval commander would have caused Ma’afu little disquiet. An illuminating if brief debate ensued in the Fiji Times concerning the true state of authority on Fiji, with an editorial suggesting that “all acknowledge [Cakobau] as supreme”. This drew fire from “Lewa Dodonu”, who asked the editor if it were not true “that more than half of Fiji acknowledge [Cakobau’s] rival as supreme?” Ma’afu was seen as possessing
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“the power … energy and … influence” to deny Cakobau supremacy. It was Ma`afu who collected the largest revenue and who offered effective protection to European settlers living at Lau, a protection not enjoyed by many settlers in Viti Levu. He was the “one man” who prevented Cakobau from becoming King of Fiji. The editor, seemingly admonished, soon advocated “a union between Cakobau and the President of the Lau Confederation” as a means of establishing “a strong Native Government”. Debates among the settler population, like the resolutions of the American shipboard court, would do little to influence the chief whose ascendancy, at least in Lau, occupied so much column space in the Fiji Times.

Ma`afu was back in Levuka in November, calling on Thurston at his home after first writing to remind the acting Consul that Beqa remained his (Ma`afu’s) property, despite having been “given … to some Britishers” by Cakobau. Meanwhile, the question of the relative powers of both Cakobau and Ma`afu, so often the subject of political comment, was considered by Lorimer Fison, a missionary closely interested in Fijian politics and ethnology. Writing at the end of 1869 about problems occasioned by the rapid growth of European settlement, Fison articulated the absurdity of considering Cakobau as King of Fiji. Taking the “lawless” inhabitants of the interior of Viti Levu as his example, Fison stated that they had never paid any tribute to, or been under the control of Cakobau, and yet whenever they committed any depredations against Europeans, the title of King of Fiji was used against Cakobau in order to make him “a sort of Royal sponge to be squeezed whenever a hill tribe quarrels with a planter and burns him out”. The missionary pointed out that Cakobau’s real title was Vunivalu (Root or Source of War) of Bau and that even the sacred title of Roko Tui Bau belonged to another chief. There had never been “even the faintest tradition of any one man having ruled over [Fiji]”. Quoting other European observers, including missionary John Smith Fordham and Colonel William Smythe, Fison wrote that Cakobau himself acknowledged the title of Tui Viti to be incorrect and one used by outsiders. Describing “the king of Fiji doctrine” as “false in fact … unjust in law [and] most disastrous in its consequences”, Fison predicted that “chaos and confusion worse confounded” would be left to Cakobau’s successor, unless “a great political revolution take place, and … Ma`afu be called to the head of affairs”. It is significant that the most reliable of all contemporary observers of Fiji, one who, unlike Thurston and others, had no political cause to champion, saw Ma`afu as the one chief standing between Fiji and the threat of widespread violence in the aftermath of Cakobau.

29 FT, 6 and 13 Nov, 4 Dec 1869. On the question of protecting lives and property of settlers in the face of Cakobau’s limited authority, see also Carey to Fison 19 Dec 1869, Carey Letterbook.
30 Ma`afu to BC, 20 Nov 1869, BCFP. The “Britishers” were the directors of the Polynesia Company, all from the Colony of Victoria, Australia. See Ch. 8 for the earlier dispute between Ma`afu and Cakobau over ownership of Beqa. See also Thurston to Hope, 22 Nov 1869; Ch. 8, n. 85.
31 Fison to Goldwin Smith, 18 Dec 1869, Lorimer Fison Letterbooks, Vols 1–7, 1867–1883. Fison’s views were applauded by Jesse Carey, a missionary formerly stationed at Lomaloma but by 1869 principal of the Fiji Training Institution, known as Richmond, on the island of Kadavu. See Carey to Fison, 14 Jan 1870, Carey Letterbook.
Accurate as Fison’s analysis is, the missionary’s views had no influence on Ma’afu himself, then spending considerable time in Levuka. He was away from Vanuabalavu in late November 1869, when Wesleyan missionary Isaac Rooney praised the hospitality of Elenoa and the local chiefs. Rooney especially commended Ma’afu and Elenoa for their contribution of £40 to the mission, a benefaction that came at a time when Ma’afu was contending with a severe food shortage in Lau. In February 1870 the Prince, a vessel belonging to Tupou I, arrived in Lau accompanied by a large double canoe being sent as a present for Tui Bua. Both vessels “were loaded with native bread, which [was] distributed among the Windward Islands, where scarcity of food has been severely felt during the last few months”. The formal separation of Lau from Tonga did not prevent Tupou’s manifesting an apparently humanitarian interest in the Tongan diaspora. Ma’afu’s responsibilities for the lands entrusted to him by Tupou included Rabe, the only part of Fiji that remained the King’s personal property.

Probably with a view to the forthcoming sale of the island, the British Consul had asked Tui Cakau to remove Rabe’s inhabitants. This Tui Cakau refused to do without instructions from Ma’afu. The prospective purchaser, John Hill, already resident on Rabe, wrote to the new Consul, Edward March, asking him to advise Ma’afu to act. Ma’afu’s own views remain unknown.

Neither the fate of Rabe nor food shortages in Lau occupied the attention of settlers or Consul. Meanwhile, the question of annexation loomed ever larger. Although Consul March was relieved when the Foreign Office advised that neither France nor the United States had any plans to establish a protectorate over Fiji, his chief concern lay with the two petitions arising from the meeting of settlers and chiefs the previous June. Thurston had at last submitted the petitions to March, stressing the detrimental absence of any authority sufficiently strong to control both settlers and “natives”. The Consul forwarded them to the Foreign Office, along with a new statement from the “memorialists” giving reasons in support of their petition. Although he made no recommendation, March enthused about Fiji’s fertility, the rosy future of the cotton industry and the availability of cheap labour from neighbouring islands. He did not neglect to
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Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

mention that Ma`afu had visited Levuka in order to inscribe his own name “and that of the Confederation of which he is President”. March also enclosed a letter from Ma`afu advocating British government action, a letter written on behalf of Ma`afu himself, Tui Cakau, Tui Bua and the *Tovata ko Tokalau*.38

The most important of the several items March forwarded to Whitehall was his lengthy report on the current state of Fiji. Working largely from consular archives, March outlined the history of the American claim, of French contacts with Fiji and of British settlement in the islands. Writing especially about the new settlers, March advised his masters that

the Fiji islands will not continue long in their present state … The increasing immigration from the Colonies, the firm hold settlers have already acquired to large areas of land, and the pressure exercised by commercial enterprise will probably produce the same results that the other countries have witnessed. The only hope for the people and for the prevention of future trouble and maybe bloodshed lays on the possibility of some civilized government consenting to accept the responsibility of guiding the affairs of this infant Settlement.39

In advocating a “civilized government”, March was referring to one which ensured the interests of both planters and merchants, but which also would offer some protection to indigenous Fijians against removal from their lands and engagement in the labour trade. Such sentiments were largely alien to the European community, most of whom were concerned only for their own protection and prosperity.

Settler opinion found expression in a circular prepared by a disparate group of planters and merchants advocating, in the light of British and American disinterest, a form of independence for Fiji. The circular referred to the settlers’ “precarious position” and suggested a security force of up to 100 men “to punish any aggressor” among the chiefs.40 The one concession proposed, and that because of the chiefs’ power, was the aim “to bring about an influence with Cakobau, Tui Cakau, Ma`afu and the other ruling chiefs so that their assistance and support may be given in all matters where the [proposed] association decides that punishment is to be awarded to the natives”.41 The June 1869 meeting had revealed some difference of opinion between the British subjects and the Germans, with the latter wishing “to have Ma`afu as king. Their business connections and influence with Tonga made them lean to him”. The British mostly advocated

38 March to Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 31 Mar 1870, FO58/118.
40 FO 58/118. See also Frederick J. Moss, *Through Atolls and Islands in the Great South Sea*, London 1889, App. B, 286–293.
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Cakobau as the nominal ruler of a settler state, since they felt better able to control him.\textsuperscript{42} Principal among the German settlers were the Hennings brothers, at whose Lomaloma store Ma`afu was already a long-standing customer and debtor.\textsuperscript{43} His reaction to the settlers’ proposals was never recorded.\textsuperscript{44}

The outcome of the Levuka meeting was the formation of a “Corporation of Fiji Settlers” which, owing to settler apathy and uncertainty over cession, proved to be short-lived.\textsuperscript{45} The European settlers of Lau, in contrast with their fellows in Levuka, were cognisant of the need for the active involvement of local rulers if any political organisation were to prove stable. At a meeting in Lomaloma in May, chaired by planter Rupert Ryder of Mago, a resolution was passed to abide by the existing laws of Lau. Although white magistrates would be appointed, they were to be formally subject to Ma`afu, as a mark of respect. While “foreigners” were liable to pay tax, they should be represented in the government of their chieftain. A final resolution suggested that a delegation wait on “the ruling chieftains … for the purpose of securing their sanction and co-operation”.\textsuperscript{46} The settlers’ views were further articulated by Swanston, who declined an invitation from Levuka to organise local committees of whites in Lomaloma. In reply, he stated that the only likely consequence of unanimity among all of Fiji’s European settlers would be “Lynch-law”. He continued:

Our policy … is to work with the native rulers of the land, if we are really seeking for a peaceful solution of the question now under agitation. Many of the chieftains … continue to exhibit a strong desire to act in concert with our race, in the establishing of some approach to a systematic Government. I believe this to be practicable…

Louis Boehm, who had issued the invitation, assured Swanston that no independent government was envisaged.\textsuperscript{47} Nevertheless, the difference in philosophy between the Lauan settlers and those who met in Levuka was marked. More than two years earlier Swanston, and through him Ma`afu, had been reassured that acting Consul Thurston approved the right of a chief to enforce Lauan laws on all nationalities, “provided always that such laws are not
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in violation of civilised ideas”. The determination of the Lomaloma Europeans to ensure Ma`afu’s co-operation reflected the greater stability of the chiefdom of Lau and the surer authority of its chief.

Notwithstanding the good sense prevailing in Lomaloma, a state of anxiety, ever fuelled by rumours, persisted among both Fijians and settlers throughout Fiji. During May there was a brief conflict between Bua and neighbouring Solevu, still a nominal dependency of Bau, highlighted by the capture at sea of Tui Bua’s schooner by the crew of Cakobau’s cutter. The Fiji Times considered that the Vunivalu possessed a “perfect right” to the seizure, given the state of “war” between Bau and Bua. Matters were speedily resolved, however, with the newspaper’s Bua correspondent reporting that the matanitu was “a model of peace and quietness”. Tui Bua appeared determined to seek help from Ma`afu and Tui Cakau should Cakobau further interfere in Solevu. Unspecified rumours emanating from Taveuni, doubtless in reference to the Solevu problem, raised the spectre of an impending “war” between Cakobau, Ma`afu and Tui Cakau. Nevertheless, the three-day annual Assembly of the Lauan Chieftains evinced nothing but stability when it convened at Lakeba during the last week of May. In his opening address, Ma`afu “spoke in strong terms of the perceptible improvement in matters social and political in the Chiefdom”. The chiefs’ principal preoccupations at the Assembly were to make alterations and additions to the laws formulated at the 1869 meeting and to listen to Ma`afu’s suggestions for a more efficient administration. Tui Lau noted particularly the need for magistrates to demonstrate greater consistency in the administration of justice. He also announced the resignation of Swanston as Secretary for Lau and his replacement by Louis Biganzoli, while Ratu Tevita Uluilakeba was to be Ma`afu’s personal representative in Lakeba and Ono districts.

Henry Britton, a correspondent for the Melbourne Argus, commencing a visit to Fiji, witnessed the Assembly, where proceedings were conducted in both Fijian and Tongan. Like others before him, he was impressed by Tui Lau:

Ma`afu is a handsome man, about 48 years of age. He is over six feet in height, and weighs 20 stone, but his limbs being well knit, and his body properly proportioned, he does not give the impression of being
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nearly so bulky as that weight implies. He was very becomingly dressed in a black frock coat, with white ducks and patent-leather boots, and wore a cloth cap, with a long peak, covered by a white pugree. He looks every inch a chief, and his face expresses kindliness as well as great resoluteness of character.\(^{53}\)

Britton attested to the efficient manner in which the Assembly was conducted and made mention of the immensely old and decidedly rotund Tui Nayau, seated on a mat in the corner and seemingly uninterested in the proceedings around him.\(^{54}\) It was not only age and corpulence that had sidelined Lakeba’s paramount chief. In the 23 years since Ma’afu had arrived from Tonga and placed himself under the authority of his kinsman, power had shifted entirely from Tui Nayau’s hands into those of his erstwhile guest. Now, as “President” of the Assembly, Tui Lau revealed his chiefly mettle:

Ma’afu, who is a fluent speaker, and is considered one of the best native preachers in the group, addressed the Assembly on the business of the day, and expressed a hope that none of them would hold up their hands for or against a question without thoroughly understanding what they were voting for…\(^{55}\)

In contrast to the uncertainties and rumours prevailing amid the power vacuum in Levuka, the administration of Lau rested in firm hands indeed.

The picture of Ma’afu as undisputed master of Lau offers an opportunity to consider his land practices in the chiefdom. Throughout Fiji, since the advent of European settlers in the 1860s, chiefs had been willing to abuse custom for their own gain. Sometimes the same land was “sold” twice to different settlers, with taueki occupiers dispossessed if it suited chiefly whim. Often, “purchasers” had to pay “five times over” for the same piece of land, paying off various spurious “owners” for the sake of “peace and quietness”.\(^{56}\) The chiefs themselves were often swindled by “deeds” untranslated into Fijian and whose purpose the chiefs did not understand. In Lau, the legal basis of Ma’afu’s rule, and of his rights over land distribution, had been established at the 1865 hearing conducted by Consul Jones, when Ma’afu’s position as chief of Lau was acknowledged to conform to Fijian custom.\(^{57}\) According to Stipendiary Magistrate Charles Swayne, who heard many Lauan land disputes after Ma’afu’s death, “at that time [i.e. 1865] it was

\(^{53}\) Britton, 36.
\(^{54}\) ibid., 37. Britton’s very detailed description of the Assembly in session has been described as “the first and possibly the only outsider’s observations on a pre-Colonial Constitutional assembly in Fiji”. A.C. Reid, Ma’afu and the new Lau State, unpublished TS, 22.
\(^{55}\) Britton, 36.
\(^{56}\) Stephen Smith to Editor, \textit{FT}, 9 Oct 1875.
\(^{57}\) See above, Ch. 7.
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understood that every man should have land and pay ... tax in money or oil”.

In 1887, hearing evidence concerning various disputes involving Tongan lands on Lakeba, Swayne noted that the claims had arisen “not through any doubt of Ma`afu’s right to settle lands on this island but simply from the idea that times might have changed”. At a contemporary hearing concerning ownership of lands on several Lauan islands, a Tongan named Vilami Saiogo stated that at the Division of Lands in 1865 following Jones’ judgment, Ma`afu had allocated him land known as Vagareke, on the island of Susui, in the Vanuabalavu lagoon. Some eight years later, when Ma`afu wanted Vagareke to plant cotton, he resumed it and gave Vilami another piece known as Bureni in exchange. Another Tongan resident in Lau, Tevita Nuku of Sawana, gave evidence that deftly illustrates the range of Ma`afu’s rights:

I am Tongan ... resident in Fiji for 32 years, since Kaba. Narocake [on Susui] is my land. Ma`afu gave it me ... as my portion. I was not in Lau when the Division of Lands was made. I was at Kadavu building a canoe for Ma`afu ... for eight years. ... Ma`afu sent for me and told me to settle down at Lomaloma and gave me Narocake ... I have planted coconuts ... The land is mine. I hold it ... as other lands are held in Lau. Taxes are to be paid for the land as from all lands in Lau. If I die the land goes to my son ... Tui Susui claims the land I hold.

The island’s paramount chief, Tui Susui, who indeed sought to resume control of the disputed lands, stated that Ma`afu, after leasing Bureni to a European settler who cultivated cotton there, resumed the land when the crop failed. Tui Susui acknowledged that Ma`afu had the right to give the land to the settler for cultivation.

In his report following another enquiry concerning land on Lakeba, Swayne referred to a statement he was instructed to make to the Boseniyasana on the Lauan island of Moce:

My instructions were to inform the Roko Tui and the chiefs that the Roko’s petition for the restoration to Fijians of lands leased by Ma`afu to Europeans and confirmed by the Government could not be granted and

58 Charles Swayne to Acting Colonial Secretary, 15 Sep 1885, CSO 87/2160.
59 Swayne to Native Commissioner, Lau, 2 May 1887, CSO 2160/1887. See also Ch. 7, n. 196.
60 Nuku was referring to the battle of Kaba, which occurred on 7 April 1855.
61 Land enquiry, Bau, Lakeba, 4 Dec 1886, resumed 30 Aug 1887, CSO 2160/1887. Numerous other claims involving land on Lakeba, Vanuabalavu, Moce, Totoya and other islands in Lau are found in CSO 2160. All acknowledge Ma`afu’s untrammeled right to apportion the lands.
that further agitation to that end must cease. It would be a benefit to this
district particularly if the hope of resuming lands in the possession of
Tongan Taukeis was finally taken away from the Fijians.62

The legal integrity of Ma`afu’s practices, both in leasing land to settlers and
allocating land to resident Fijians and Tongans, survived his death in 1881. He
had in fact influenced land allocation in Vanuabalavu as early as 1860, when he
approved the sale by three local chiefs of the districts of Kauvula and Matadravu
to William Beddoes, an American who had arrived in Fiji as a beachcomber
several years before. The three chiefs, according to Ma`afu, had been “afraid
to go on” with the sale and had sought his advice. “I said very good”.63 Ma`afu
developed a close friendship with Beddoes, often visiting his house to “open his
boxes and turn them upside down”, a practice Beddoes reciprocated in Ma`afu’s
home.64 The American was able to profit from the friendship by subdividing and
selling some of the land he had purchased in 1860. He had further ambitions:
it was probably Beddoes who placed an advertisement in October
1868, advising that “three of four small plantations of about 150 acres” would
come on the market in Vanuabalavu in about July of the following year.65 Ma`afu
agreed to sell Beddoes more land as an extension to the Kauvula block for a price
of £75, with a deed of sale being prepared in May 1869 and registered at the
British Consulate in Levuka.66 When Beddoes died on Adavaci in 1871, Ma`afu
arranged for his body to be brought to Kauvula for burial, in accordance with
the planter’s wish.67 Altogether, Beddoes made considerable profit from sales
of his land on Vanuabalavu. He did so by Ma`afu’s leave, illustrating not only
the extent of their friendship, but also the nature of Ma`afu’s power on the
island, a power which Beddoes effectively exploited. Following the 1860 sale,
unprecedented on Vanuabalavu, no land in Lau could change hands, whether
by allocation or lease, without Ma`afu’s approval.

During the 1860s, especially after the 1865 ruling that Vanuabalavu properly
belonged to him, Ma`afu was able to impose the Tongan practice of leasehold on
the island. In Tonga itself, land alienation was forbidden, while under the 1862
Code of Laws, all land was deemed to belong to the Crown. This rule effectively
shifted control of land from chiefs to the King, who in turn divided it among the
people. In Fiji, by way of contrast, land was traditionally held in common by the
mataqali, or clan. With his rights on Vanuabalavu confirmed, Ma`afu set about
adapting land tenure there to the Tongan pattern. As we saw in Chapter Eight,

62 Land enquiry “Muanira” held at Lakeba 4 Dec 1886 before Hon. J. Blyth, Native Commissioner, ibid.
Blyth found that Semisi Fifita had purchased the land for “powder, shot, axes etc”.
63 LCC R 948 Kauvula, evidence of Ma`afu.
64 ibid., evidence of Ma`afu and of Robert Swanston.
66 LCC R948, evidence of Ma`afu.
67 ibid.
the system of allotments known as *magimagi* was adopted. Since *magimagi* were measured from the shoreline and could be extended inland as far as the centre of the island, each landholder possessed fishing rights, land for cultivation, groves of coconuts and bush land which might be cleared for planting if needed. Here was a basis for each landholder, whether Fijian or Tongan, not only to support his family, but also to pay his taxes in kind. Those taxes would help with any future weapons purchases that might be contemplated, as well as the support of any Tongan troops summoned to Vanuabalavu. Ma`afu was able to exert a degree of control that utilised the island’s resources to best effect, as well as reinforcing his own power as paramount chief.

Ma`afu also determined that lands not required for the support of the population could be leased to foreigners, a practice which differed from the freehold title available to settlers in some other parts of Fiji. In referring to land disputes such as those on Lakeba, Basil Thomson, Stipendiary Magistrate at Lomaloma after Ma`afu’s death, described Ma`afu’s practice:

> According to Mafi NSM who used to divide the land in Ma`afu’s time, it was not uncommon to turn out native owners in favour of white men who paid rent, and if the white men left, the land was supposed to return to Ma`afu for redistribution.\(^68\)

Leases were generally made for 50 years, on a renewable basis. As in the case of lands allocated to Fijians and Tongans, boundaries were sometimes marked with *magimagi* and were, wherever possible, defined by natural features that could be readily identified.\(^69\) Ma`afu sought to provide his lessees with security of tenure, which would, in theory, help to ensure a steady revenue for him and discourage settlers from looking to foreign annexation of Fiji as a means of advancing their prospects. Both Robert Swanston and William Hennings, already resident on Vanuabalavu, leased land from Ma`afu under these arrangements, while other Europeans took up blocks, usually of several hundred acres, on Vanuabalavu and other islands in Lau.\(^70\) There were to be 22 leases, varying from 100 to 550 acres, made to European settlers, as well as several smaller town lots in Lomaloma.

Despite the apparent efficiency of Ma`afu’s practice of leasing lands not required for support of the population, the policy caused hardship to the *taukei* of Vanuabalavu, Cicia and other Lauan islands. At the Lands Claims Commission of 1880, detailed evidence was heard concerning all of the leases allocated by Ma`afu. Depositions from heads of numerous *mataqali* and other chiefs revealed that Ma`afu usually failed to consult them concerning the proposed leases. Further, every chief who gave evidence stated that neither he nor his people

---

\(^68\) Basil Thomson to Swayne, 24 Mar 1886, CSO 86/677.
\(^69\) LCC R953 Vagariki, evidence of Swanston.
\(^70\) See, for example, LCC R933, R941, passim.
had ever received any share of the rents paid to Tui Lau by the settlers who leased and, in most cases, cultivated their lands. In some instances, Ma`afu said in evidence that he believed the mataqali of the lands in question were dead or, more often, claimed that he simply did not know who the mataqali were. Typical of the evidence given by taukei chiefs was that of Sanaila, belonging to the Uruoni people of Vanuabalavu, 300 acres of whose lands Ma`afu leased to the Hennings brothers. Sanaila stated that Ma`afu had neither consulted his mataqali nor given them any share of the rent. “There is not enough land for us to plant upon”, Sanaila declared. His people were now forced to plant “back on the hills”. Ma`afu had leased a small 15-acre section of this land to a “half-caste”, John Brown, who regularly paid Tui Lau his annual rent of £7–10–0 and thus had his lease confirmed by the Commission. Mataqali were unable to pay rent in cash. In the case of Doloca, a 100-acre block belonging to the Kai Na Vau Vau, a chief of that mataqali, Marika Raleka, stated, “We want to get back our land … We have very little land left. We would not be content with a share of the rent. We want the land”. In similar fashion, Naibuka, a chief from the Kai Nabutu, said that the lease of some of his mataqali’s land, a 400-acre block called Na Yaca, had been against his wish. Ma`afu, according to Naibuka, had leased the land even though he knew it had earlier been apportioned to the Kai Nabutu. Although Ma`afu gave the people bush land in compensation, it had proven insufficient. When Naibuka had raised the matter with Ma`afu at a Bosevakaturaga, Tui Lau again told him “to take land in the bush”. One case, possibly exceptional, involved 450 acres known as Ba Vatu, which Ma`afu leased to William Hennings. Marika Raleka, speaking on behalf of the Bati mataqali, stated, “Tui Lau made war with them conquered them and brought them prisoners to Lomaloma. Then the land was leased. The towns of Bavatu, Adavaci, Dalidoni and half of Malaka were against Ma`afu and their people were removed to Lomaloma”. Ma`afu could be ruthless in dealing with any threat to his absolute power in Lau. While this case was atypical, it is certain that Ma`afu, despite his later claims of ignorance concerning some of the affected mataqali, gave careful consideration to each lease he authorised. The former Secretary of Lau, Robert Swanston, giving evidence at the Commission in respect of his own lease, said:

Every lease was carefully read over to Ma`afu before he signed it. [Swanston’s lease] must have been read by Ma`afu as he has added in his

---

71 See, for example, LCC R931 Rara Levu, evidence of Ma`afu; LCC R940 Buca Levu, evidence of Ma`afu.
72 LCC R933 Daku Uruoni, evidence of Sanaila.
73 LCC R973A Uruone.
74 LCC R939 Doloca, evidence of Marika Raleka.
75 LCC R935 Na Yaca, evidence of Naibuka.
76 LCC R941 Ba Vatu, evidence of Marika Raleka.
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own handwriting two pieces of land . . . . I often used to have to call three or four times on Ma`afu before he would make up his mind to sign. He knew every word of the leases.77

Ma`afu was content to ignore the wishes and needs of the taukei in the interest of putting the lands of Lau to their most productive use, productive at least in terms of revenue for himself.

By the time of his installation as Tui Lau, Ma`afu had assumed an unprecedented degree of control on Vanuabalavu. With detailed knowledge of the land and of the men who worked it, he sought to ensure that each allotment was being used to its full potential. In this way, his tax revenue would not suffer, while his “subjects”, the population of Lau, would continue to look to him as the sole source of their livelihood. If, as in the case of Viliame Saiogo’s allotment on Susui, Ma`afu considered that the land could be put to better use, he was quick to effect the necessary changes, while on the death of a landholder, the allotment would normally revert to Ma`afu for redistribution. On the other hand, a landholder who paid his tax could usually rely on his security of tenure, a fact which helped to ensure that most leaseholders were happy with Ma`afu’s system. A Fijian teacher described his impressions in about 1865:

I have seen in Vanuabalavu a new thing, a road four fathoms wide, it is called tukuwau . . . this is a law which Makafu [sic] has established . . . by which men are freed from their worldly troubles. It is what the Bible calls a Jubilee by which men are freed from their worries and can be confident. By this law the land is shared out, and the taxes are paid to the chief.78

Ma`afu’s control remained absolute and was to prove lasting.79 It went beyond individual allotments, as provided for under the Laws of Lau:

After the lands are apportioned out to the native taxpayers, the residue shall be considered as government lands, and the head of the Chiefdom shall have sole control thereof, and he shall do what he may please with the same.80

In December 1939, when there were “many disputes” concerning land in Lau, Ma`afu’s ultimate successor as Tui Lau, Ratu Sir Lala Sukuna, in his capacity as Provincial Commissioner, conducted a major enquiry at Lomaloma. The enquiry was known as Leva ni Magimagi (Ruling on Magimagi), a reference to the method of marking boundaries initiated by Ma`afu. It seemed that every

77 LCC R953 Na Rua Rua Vagariki, evidence of Robert Sherson Swanston.
79 For details of other individual examples of Ma`afu’s absolute control, see Land Enquiries, K.J. Allardyce Commissioner, 1906–1907, Vol. 1, Tailevu, Nadroga, Colo East, Lau, Namosi, Macuata, Cakaudrove, NLC.
80 Constitution and Laws of the Chiefdom of Lau, Fiji, Sydney 1971, Clause XIV.
Tongan claim in Lau was contested, often bitterly, by Fijians. In Vanuabalavu, outsiders, whether Tongan or Fijian, who held magimagi allotments had come to believe that they possessed unencumbered rights to the land and the trees on it. Sukuna determined that any land whose ownership was brought before his enquiry for resolution had to conform to certain requirements. Only boundaries operative during Ma`afu’s time were recognised, while earlier holdings, if they were not confirmed by Ma`afu, were void. No magimagi established by Ma`afu could be the subject of any dispute. Sukuna considered changes to Ma`afu’s rulings on land ownership and usage only if ownership had become extinct since Ma`afu’s time. The first Tui Lau’s land allocations, seen by Swayne and Thomson to have endured beyond Ma`afu’s lifetime, were now confirmed in perpetuity.

Ma`afu’s authority extended well beyond land allocation and taxation. He controlled the appointment of all officials, from the Secretary and the magistrates down to the village chiefs. Daily administrative tasks were the province of the Secretary, who collected the revenues and maintained all government records. Ma`afu’s co-president of the Lauan Assembly, Tui Nayau, was responsible for the administration of the central and southern islands, remaining always subject to Tui Lau, to whom Tui Nayau, like all adult Lauans, owed tax obligations. The basis of chiefly authority had clearly changed in Lau under Ma`afu’s administration, particularly in relation to land practices. While doubt should be cast on published references to a claim by Ma`afu that “he was like William the Conqueror who divided the land in England among his Norman knights”, the absolute nature of his rule in Lau remained unchallenged. With his sovereignty confirmed at the 1865 enquiry, the basis for his land policy under the laws of Lau was defined in Clause XV of the 1867 Constitution.

Clause XV authorised Tui Lau to lease all unoccupied public lands, that is lands not in actual possession of Fijians, to a maximum of 500 acres per lessee, subject to the annual payment of rent. According to Ma`afu’s then secretary, Swanston, the leasing arrangements were designed to remove control of land from the mataqali “for the express purpose of bringing into cultivation lands which were suffered to lie uncultivated”. Equally important for Tui Lau was the need “to

---

82 Evidence Book, Ratu Sukuna Lau, Lewa ni Magimagi, Vol. 3, Folio 325, 5 Dec 1939, NLC.
84 Constitution and Laws of the Chiefsdom of Lau, Sydney 1871, Clause XV. Although the Constitution was not published until 1871, its provisions had been in practice since 1865. The full text is also found in G.C. Henderson, ed., The Evolution of Government in Fiji, Sydney 1935, 28–42.
introduce white capital and energy into the country”. Supreme in his authority, Ma`afu acted “as his own treasurer, chancellor of the exchequer, auditor and everything else”. 85

Consistent with Ma`afu’s resolution to allow no land to remain idle was his policy “not to deprive natives of lands that were … turned to account by them”. He was to be the sole judge of what lands might properly be described as waste. 86 There were practical difficulties, nevertheless, particularly in connection with surveying, which led to the omission of any description of boundaries on most of the leases effected during Ma`afu’s lifetime. Such niceties were never of major import in Lau, at least according to Saimoni Lausi`i, a deponent at a hearing convened by Charles Swayne in 1885. Referring to the boundaries of his own land, Saqani on Vanuabalavu, Saimoni stated in evidence: “The buli and Native Magistrate saw the land and heard us speak and they said that Ma`afu had fixed the boundary and they could not alter boundaries”. 87 As in all things in Lau, Ma`afu had the last word. His land policies incorporated two basic principles that differed from practices elsewhere in Fiji. Firstly, land could never be alienated: only leasehold was permitted, although Tui Lau reluctantly agreed to long leases of 50 years in an effort to attract settlers whose first preference was for freehold, available elsewhere in Fiji. Secondly, lessees were required to continue in occupation of their lands and to plant crops, with any unoccupied land being subject to reallocation. 88

A representative example of Ma`afu’s policy of leasing unoccupied lands to settlers was Buca Levu, a tract of 500 acres fronting the beach close to Mavana village on Vanuabalavu, opposite the island of Avea. On 7 March 1871, Ma`afu approved a 50-year lease of Buca Levu to Gideon Vecsey, a Hungarian who had arrived in Fiji from Sydney 11 months earlier. Vecsey, who leased the land through the agency of William Hennings, was to pay rent of one shilling per acre per annum, with an option to renew. After nine years’ occupation, during which time he was naturalised as a British subject, Vecsey had 250 acres under cultivation, mostly with cotton. He had built a house for his family, as well as a yam shed, a drying shed for the cotton and even a “hospital”. The rent was paid to Ma`afu, while Saimoni, the turaga ni koro of Mavana, would later state that although Ma`afu had consulted him before leasing the land, none of the rent ever reached the Kai Lota, the mataqali to whom the land rightfully belonged. Ma`afu had moved the inhabitants of a village on the land before the

86 ibid.
87 Evidence of Saimoni Laujii, 1 Sep 1885, Enquiry at Lomaloma ordered by His Excellency the Administrator into the right of occupation of Saimoni Laujii in the land known as Saqani on Vanuabalavu, FCSO 87/2160.
88 For a discussion of some of the European lessees on Vanuabalavu and elsewhere in Lau, see John Young, Adventurous Spirits: Australian Migrant Society in pre-cession Fiji, St Lucia 1984, Ch. 3.
lease was arranged. By September 1885 Vecsey had failed, in common with most other cotton planters in Fiji, defeated by falling commodity prices, new labour regulations and growing debts. At the Lands Claims Commission, Saimoni declared that his people, who owned Buca Levu, had “never received any share of the rent from Mr Vecsey”.

As with all other Lauan leases, the rent had gone to Tui Lau. Vecsey’s land was occupied by the Hennings brothers, at whose store in Lomaloma the Hungarian, like Ma’afu, had accumulated substantial debt. Vecsey duly returned to Australia, leaving behind his estranged part-Tongan wife, as well as two of their four children.

The need to raise revenue was not the principal reason for the strict regimen governing land allocation. That need was to be met by taxation. Under the Constitution, each male aged 16 years and over was required to pay an annual tax of 15 gallons of oil or the equivalent in cash. Females aged 16 and over had to pay three shillings in cash per annum or its equivalent “in Fijian property: mats, screens or fishnets”. Furthermore, Tui Lau was reserved the right “to increase the amount of tax to be levied at his pleasure”, should the exigencies of his government require it.

It quickly became Ma’afu’s practice to ensure that any Lauan, whether Fijian or Tongan, who sought to be allocated land was a regular taxpayer. So important was the taxation law that even Ma’afu’s strict land allocation practice could be amended if there appeared to be a threat to revenue. In 1872, for example, Ma’afu was required to reallocate a piece of land known as Selavu on the Lauan island of Cicia. When the European lessee died, Ma’afu was approached by the taukei who “begged” him to return the land to them, contrary to his usual practice. Ma’afu was later to state: “I pitied the Cicia people as they were gathering nuts from this piece to pay their taxes with”. Because insufficient good land was available elsewhere on Cicia for taukei cultivation, Ma’afu wanted Selavu to return to them, so that their tax requirements could be met. An able administrator, Ma’afu knew when principle could be sacrificed for the needs of the moment. While his taxation policies promised to ensure a steady if unspectacular revenue, much would depend on the way Ma’afu, always “his own treasurer”, disposed of the proceeds.

With the substance of power clearly his, Ma’afu was able to turn his attention to a style befitting his status. In June 1870 the Xarifa, the finest racing yacht in Sydney, was sailed to Fiji by its new owner, Sydney Burt. On the voyage, she
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“tore along in a gale of wind with all sail set”. 93 Burt, a failed auctioneer and member of the Royal Sydney Yacht Squadron, acted as Cakobau’s commercial agent. 94 He planned to sell the Xarifa to Cakobau but Ma`afu, with the revenues of Lau at his disposal, was able to pay the asking price of £1,000. 95 There is evidence that, in order to raise part of the Xarifa’s price, Ma`afu sold a piece of land named Navoavoa in Bua, given him by Tui Bua, to a settler named Albert Manton. 96 Apart from the prestige of owning such a fine vessel, the Xarifa possessed practical advantages in that it would facilitate Ma`afu’s movements around the islands of Lau, where communication remains a problem to this day.

In the face of Ma`afu’s taste for the good life, an effort by missionary Jesse Carey to send someone to Lomaloma “to keep hold of Ma`afu and his people till a Missionary come” seems futile. 97 While Ma`afu’s intervention in the fighting in Solevu remained a possibility, he remained focused on a bigger picture. 98 In the middle of 1870 he wrote to the Foreign Office, on behalf of Tui Cakau, Tui Bua and the other Tovata chiefs, requesting British protection for Fiji on the grounds of increasing trade between the islands and the Australian colonies. 99 If, however, the British declined to act, protection from Hawai`i would be sought as an alternative. The letter, which mentioned the Levuka meeting of chiefs and settlers in May, renewed the requests made by that gathering. 100 The fact that Ma`afu added his weight to the meeting’s resolutions indicates a significant degree of confidence in the outcome. Although he might have sought to gain favour with the British in the event that the request was heeded, it is more probable that he knew British policy would not change. He would be left with

93 There were then between 30 and 40 other racing yachts from Sydney in Fiji. SMH, 7 May 1873.
94 In October 1870, Thurston described Burt as “Cakobau’s business factotum”. Thurston to Lang, 23 Oct 1870. Consul March described Burt as “Thakombau’s private agent [who] sold him a yacht”. March to FO, 11 Oct 1871, FO58/118. Burt and a relative had earlier “purchased” the island of Matuku from Cakobau for $500. CRD 919, 20 Feb 1871.
95 A.C. Reid, personal communication to John Young, 1980, quoted in John Young, “Lau: a Windward Perspective”, JPH, Vol. 28, No. 2, 1993, 168. According to settler G.H.W. Markham, Ma`afu had merely leased the yacht: G.H. Wolseley Markham, Diary in Fiji, 22 Aug 1870. NAF. The Xarifa had won the first ocean race in Australian history, from Sydney to Noumea and return, in 1864. For evidence that the Xarifa had been intended for Cakobau, see G.A. Stead to Charlotte Stead, 15 Jun 1870, George Augustus Stead Papers, NLA; March to FO, 11 Oct 1871. For a full account of the Xarifa’s illustrious racing career on Sydney Harbour, see Percy R. Stephenson, compiler, Sydney Sails: Royal Sydney Yacht Squadron 1862–1962, Sydney 1962, 48–62. I am indebted to Mr Peter Bradford, Honorary Archivist at the Squadron, for further information about the Xarifa. An oil painting of the yacht hangs at the Squadron’s headquarters in Kirribilli, Sydney.
96 Evidence of David Wilkinson [Secretary to Tui Bua], 18 Nov 1880, LCC R783A: Supplementary Nasavawaqa. Manton appears to have owned the Xarifa in August 1870, since on 26 Aug he discharged a mortgage on the yacht to Hennings brothers for £260. The following day, the FT reported that Ma`afu had completed the purchase of the Xarifa. Register of Sale and Mortgages of British Ships, BCFP; FT, 27 Aug 1870.
97 Carey to Joseph White, 30 Jun 1870, Carey Letterbook.
98 FT, 25 Jun 1870.
99 Much Australian opinion supported him. The Age advocated Victorian control of Fiji: “We want trade: the Fijis want protection”, 24 Aug 1870. See also The Age, 1 Sep 1870.
100 Enele Ma`afu Tui Lau to FO, n.d. [c. Jun 1870], FO 58/118. One settler wrote to the FT expressing the hope that “every man of us” would join Ma`afu and the other leading chiefs in signing the petition. “A Representative” to the Editor, FT, 30 Jul 1870.
a freer hand further to enhance his own power beyond Lau, while being able to assert that he had done his best to co-operate with the collective wish of his fellow chiefs and the majority of settlers.

In the meantime, representatives of the Australian colonies, meeting in Melbourne, resolved that British control of Fiji was “of the utmost importance” for the colonies’ commercial interests. Although a petition was despatched, the home government apparently remained unmoved.\footnote{Lord Canterbury [Governor of Victoria] to Lord Kimberley [Sec. of State for the Colonies], 12 Aug 1870, CO309/94. See also Resolutions of the Intercolonial Conference in Melbourne, 20 Jun 1870, de Ricci, 3.} In Fiji itself, Consul March despaired of any effective government being formed under the control of Cakobau who was “barely emerged from the most profound barbarism, full of duplicity and cunning”, with “much to learn before he is capable of comprehending even the principles of government”.\footnote{March to FO, 18 Jul 1870, FO58/118.} Despite its seeming intransigence, however, the Foreign Office possessed at least one voice cognisant of the need for action over Fiji. “With a constant influx of Australian and foreign settlers, many of them desperate characters, it is evident that law and order must be expressed by stronger authority than exists there at present … Some decision should be taken as to what we shall do”.\footnote{FO minute dated 18 Jul 1870 on March’s despatch of 31 Mar 1870. FO58/118.} With the demonstrable need for a central government in Fiji, Ma`afu was better placed than any indigenous chief to fill the vacuum.

Whatever his thoughts concerning the need for “stronger authority”, Ma`afu remained unchallenged in Lau. In late July, he voyaged to Wairiki, there to participate in a “monster political feast”. He “arrived in great state, his fleet consisting of one large ketch … and about forty canoes”, proceeding “with great pomp … flags flying, men chanting and drums beating”. He also brought “a large number of men and … quite a bevy of fine looking Tonga girls”.\footnote{FT, 23 Jul 1870. For an account of proceedings at the meeting, see Minutes of the Meetings of the Tovata i Viti, May-Jun 1869 and Aug 1870, ML.} Over 5,000 Fijians were present on the occasion, a meeting of the “parliament” of the Tovata. The host, Tui Cakau, who feared assassination from his supposed supporters, asked Ma`afu in a private conversation “to exterminate them all” should the worst happen. Ma`afu, whose response to the request is not known, later intimated that he would visit Sydney and Melbourne before the end of the year, “if the state of affairs will allow his absence from the country for a time”.\footnote{Britton, 64.} Such a visit would afford him the opportunity to meet Colonial leaders and establish some measure of support for any future administration he might establish in Fiji. Meanwhile, as if to demonstrate his statesmanship, he dominated the Wairiki “parliament” as surely as he had the Lauan Assembly at Lakeba a few weeks earlier. His oration at the commencement of deliberations on 3 August laid stress on unity above all else:
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

[Ma`afu] said that the Confederate chiefs were ... unanimous as to the benefits to be derived from ... continued union .... Tonga is strong in itself because the chiefs are united. ... What has become of the meetings at Bau? ... The root of Tonga's present position is that old tribal divisions are done away with, and there is unity of purpose among the chieftains ... At Lau we distinctly admit the benefits we have derived from the new state of affairs, and our desire is that we work together to advance all Fiji. 106

Laws approved by the assembled chiefs included the appointment of a General Secretary of the Tovata, the power of Tovata laws to overcome those of individual chiefdoms, the chiefs' secretaries to act as ex-officio magistrates, and the forfeiture of all rebel lands to the Tovata government. Ma`afu's final word on the new laws revealed a clarity and depth of vision no other chief of Fiji could emulate:

the laws are but few, yet they are all we require at present to meet the circumstances of the times. ... We must legislate gradually. In time there will be laws enough. 107

At the close of proceedings, Ma`afu announced the imminent installation of Tui Cakau as Tui Vanua Levu, a new dignity within the Fijian polity. Similarly, Katonivere was named as Governor of Macuata and Tui Bua as Governor of Bua. These appointments were undertaken partly to strengthen Ma`afu's grip on the Tovata lands and partly to isolate further Ritova, Tui Macuata, the one senior Tovata chief absent from Wairiki:

[The chiefs] had met to carry out an idea he had held for some years, ... creating Tui Cakau to be Tui Vanua Levu. Hitherto the want of union had been an obstacle, but now it had been done 'and would be maintained' (with emphasis). [Ma`afu] was sorry that Ritova was so persistent in absenting himself, he ought to have been here, and he would have to account to Tui Cakau. [Ma`afu] explained to [the chiefs] what rebellion was, and that now opposition to Tui Vanua Levu was rebellion and would entail its consequences. They knew well that he, the Tui Lau, and Tui Cakau, could together march through Vanua Levu in a few weeks, and that none of this trouble would have existed as it is today without white interference. 108

Further to emphasise his theme of unity, Ma`afu read to the gathering a copy of a letter he had sent to Cakobau, reiterating the Tovata chiefs' view that only

106 FT, 20 Aug 1870.
107 ibid., 10 Sep 1870, where the complete list of the new laws is found. See also Lang Papers, Vol. 9, Personal and Miscellaneous 1838–1873, 139–140; n. 80 above. Robert Swanston, formerly Ma`afu's secretary, was appointed as first secretary of the Tovata. Also present at Wairiki were David Wilkinson, Tui Bua's secretary, and William Ross, attached to Tui Cakau.
108 FT, 8 Aug 1870.
Bua possessed proper jurisdiction over Solevu. The letter informed the Vunivalu that the Tovata chiefs would await the outcome of an enquiry conducted by the captain of a British warship, sent following an agreement between Cakobau, Consul March and Tui Cakau. With the Cakaudrove chief his firm ally, Ma`afu sought both to place his control of the Tovata chiefdoms beyond dispute and to demonstrate to Cakobau the Tovata chiefs’ common purpose. Unquestioned unity would enhance any future possibilities of further extending his power. Pursuing the theme of European interference, Ma`afu acknowledged that while many of the whites were “good men and true”, others were “evil disposed and opposed to law”, who “come among us and because we carry dark skins they think we are wild beasts and that they can carry out any iniquity without being called to account”. Yet “iniquity” was not confined to the intruders: “The sea is white with the sails of white men’s vessels, some of these will … occasionally get ashore and be wrecked. In old times you used to kill and cook such castaways; that day is past, and we must study to give such unfortunates all the aid they need”. Although Tui Lau, resplendent in the cloak of statecraft, spoke of conciliation, his discerning words were alarming in their perspicacity, alarming, that is, to any of the settlers who chose to take heed. They carried the implication that, following the boost given to the unity of the Tovata, the threat posed by the “evil disposed” settlers would have to be met and overcome.

Ma`afu’s first step in meeting this threat was to write to the British Consul on behalf of all the Tovata chiefs. His letter, drafted by Swanston, was translated for the assembled chiefs and discussed by them clause by clause. Only when they expressed unanimous approval was the document forwarded. Ma`afu complained about intervention in Solevu by the American Consul, which action “strengthened the spirit of anarchy existing at Solevu”. He informed Consul March that, although the chiefs acquiesced in the proposed investigation of the Solevu troubles, they were not sanguine concerning its outcome. Muted as the letter was, its message was clear: “the disturbance at Solevu … is … but a trifling affair, provided that we, the Chieftains of Fiji, be allowed to deal with it ourselves”. The Consul took offence; several days after the gathering at Wairiki ended, Ma`afu called on him at Levuka, only to meet with a rebuff. March, considering that the letter contained both “an accusation against [and] a censure upon” the British government, refused to speak to Ma`afu until it was withdrawn. “Grieved and annoyed”, Ma`afu left the Consul’s office “feeling that he had been snubbed”. He overcame his chagrin, however, almost certainly at Swanston’s behest. Writing again to the Consul, Ma`afu withdrew the earlier

109 ibid., 27 Aug 1870.
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111 Quoted in FT, 27 Aug 1870. For a contemporary copy of the letter, see Royal Navy, Australia Station, Reports, Vol. 28, Fiji 1868–1879. A copy in Fijian is found in Proceedings of the meeting of the Tovata held at Wairiki in … Aug 1870, ML.
112 Swanston to the Editor, FT, 22 Aug 1870; FT 27 Aug 1870.
letter, describing it as “foolish and offensive”, and apologised. He asserted that “some white man” acting on his own authority had printed it in the newspaper against his instructions. Possibly somewhat distressed following his apparent diplomatic setback, Ma`afu was not himself at a public ball in the Levuka Reading Room, held in honour of the officers of a visiting American warship, USS Resaca. “Present for a short time, [Ma`afu], although invited, declined to trip the fantastic toe”.  

Ma`afu’s apology to the Consul was disingenuous. On the same day as his first letter to March, he also wrote to Cakobau, again on the subject of Solevu. He reminded the Vunivalu that following the Tovata chiefs’ decisions the previous year concerning provincial boundaries, Solevu belonged unequivocally to Bua. Acknowledging discussions Cakobau had held with both Tui Bua and March, Ma`afu agreed that the Solevu dispute could be “held over” for Cakobau to “adjudicate when the British warship arrives … We will wait to see whether some good will come out of this reconciliation. If not, we will carry out what we set out to do. … If evidence is seen of a problem occurring, we will adopt appropriate defensive measures and it is up to God to determine … who is the cause of evil”. Cakobau was left in no doubt concerning the course of any future “adjudication”.

In the face of Ma`afu’s initial defiance, Consul March’s position is worth greater consideration. Before Ma`afu’s letter of apology arrived, the Consul drafted a response to the earlier missive that had caused such offence, castigating Tui Lau for entering “into official intercourse with me by casting imputations upon my office”. In high dudgeon, March, seeking to ascertain Ma`afu’s true feeling behind the screen of Swanston’s eloquence, requested Ma`afu “to be so good as to address me in your own language and handwriting should you feel disposed to favour me with any further communications”. Since the offending letter had cast aspersions on American interest in the Solevu troubles, March passed on a copy of it to U.S. Consul Isaac Brower. The latter, repudiating Tui Lau’s comments, expressed solidarity with his colleague:

Ma`afu has been for many years past and still is the head and front of the disturbing element to the peace and harmony of native affairs in Fiji and though to a certain extent held in check by influences … of the

---

113 Ma`afu to March, 16 and 22 Aug 1870 (copies), Royal Navy, Australia Station, Reports, Vol. 28. Ma`afu also apprehended interference in Fiji by elders of the Wesleyan church, a view that prompted an appeal to him by Frederick Langham, Chairman of the Fiji Synod, to explain how the elders had offended the Tovata chiefs. Langham to Ma`afu, 24 Sep 1870, Robert Swanston, Letters 1870–1875.
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115 Ma`afu to Cakobau, Wairiki, 6 Aug 1870, Proceedings of the meeting of the Tovata held at Wairiki…. I am indebted to Sitiveni Yaqona for a translation of the original Fijian.
116 March to Ma`afu, 15 Aug 1870 (copy), Royal Navy, Australia Station, Vol. 28. The letter was not sent “in consequence of [Ma`afu’s] having taken immediate steps to retract his communication of the contents of which he was ignorant”.
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United States Government with the legitimate authorities in Fiji, it is evident that he has not abandoned his ambitious schemes [and] that he is now being made a tool of faction, who perhaps share his ambition for notoriety and hope to profit thereby.

Brower contended that Ma`afu's failure to further his ambitions in Solevu had prompted his letter to March. The two Consuls were one, or so it seemed, in their repudiation of Ma`afu and all his works. Their condemnation of what they saw as naked ambition and a determination to foment discord blinded them to a major force for political change in Fiji.

Swanston, and no doubt Ma`afu as well, were determined that the reading public should recognise Ma`afu's tactical withdrawal for what it was. Swanston reminded the editor of the Fiji Times that Ma`afu's opinion remained unchanged; having more than once felt the weight of British consular displeasure, and hoping to be invited on board an American warship then in port, Ma`afu could not be blamed for the appearance of failure “in his duties as delegate”. Swanston advised that the Solevu rebels had surrendered as soon as they became aware of impending action against them by the Tovata chiefs. He saw “no folly in the ruling chiefs of a large portion of Fiji expressing their opinion on weighty matters connected with the peace of the country”. He was right, of course, even if March was not aware. With the power of Tui Lau as the nominated representative of the Tovata undiminished, the British Consul, offended or not, would do well to take cognisance.

The Consul's Pyrrhic victory over Ma`afu failed to prevent Tui Lau's further involvement in the power struggle that continued to gain momentum. Wishing to profit from official displeasure, Cakobau expressed to March his fear that “evil will come upon Fiji through the warlike disposition and tendency of Ma`afu”. With the American debt now paid, Cakobau asserted, Ma`afu thought his time had come “for the conquest or seizure of Fiji”. Cakobau saw the correspondence between Ma`afu and the Consul as “a cloak to put that evil upon others of which he is the root”. In order to avoid a “great war” in Fiji, he beseeched March to send “the Chief of the British ships of war” to side with the indigenous chiefs against Ma`afu. The Vunivalu's words express far more than general paranoia and fear of Ma`afu's designs. With his American secretary and numerous contacts in the settler community, Cakobau embodied the desire of the planters and traders of Levuka and further afield to be rid of a chief they could neither control nor manipulate. The settlers' purpose was to promote the interests of a co-operative Cakobau, a chief whom they continued to see as their willing tool.

117 Brower to March, 17 Aug 1870 (copy), Royal Navy Australia Station, Reports, Vol. 28.
118 Swanston to the Editor, FT, 22 Aug 1870.
119 Cakobau to March, 31 Aug 1870 (copy), Royal Navy Australia Station, Reports.
Consul March, however, was more attuned to the *Realpolitik* of the day than his reaction to Ma’afu’s approach might suggest. He advised Lord Belmore, Governor of New South Wales, of measures taken “in view of the impending war between … Cakobau and Ma’afu”. According to March, Ma’afu saw the Solovu difficulties as a pretext to commence open hostilities against Cakobau, whose letter to the Consul suggests that Vunivalu and Consul were of one mind. Ma’afu had sent emissaries into Cakobau’s lands, sowing the seeds of discontent, while Ritova, appointed as Tui Macuata by Commodore Seymour, sought American protection against similar incursions into his territory. Growing unrest among the Fijians, occasioned by increasing land alienation, was also on March’s mind. The hostilities envisaged between Ma’afu and Cakobau were but part of a general race war which March thought increasingly likely.\(^\text{120}\)

However much angst permeated the correspondence of the Europeans in Fiji, the chiefdom of Lau continued to manifest the outward trappings of an efficient and peaceful regime. Everywhere, or so it appeared to *The Argus* correspondent, the flag of Ma’afu flew, while his uniformed police, their hats adorned with the appellation OFISA, patrolled the villages. Civil administration had attained the sophistication of maintaining records of births, marriages and deaths.\(^\text{121}\) On Vanuabalavu a road, 14 miles long and shaded on each side by breadfruit and banana trees, ran along the coast from Lomaloma. Many European families had settled on leasehold land on the island to cultivate cotton.\(^\text{122}\) The Hennings brothers, proprietors of Fiji’s largest commercial house, owned both coffee and cotton plantations in Lau and were building a cotton gin at Lomaloma. The finest cotton plantation in Fiji, using only Fijian labour, was operated by the Ryder brothers on nearby Mago.\(^\text{123}\) The Ryders’ cotton had been appraised by spinners in Manchester and adjudged to be “equal to the best available in Liverpool”.\(^\text{124}\) Not only Europeans leased Lauan land: Henry Miller, son of an English Wesleyan missionary and a Tongan mother, paid rent to Ma’afu for land he occupied on Vanuabalavu.\(^\text{125}\) According to his erstwhile secretary, Tui Lau heard “every part of every deed” read to him before he appended his signature.\(^\text{126}\) In consequence of his firm hold on the reins of power in Lau, Ma’afu could not, even had he so wished, disengage from the politics of the rest of Fiji.

\(^{120}\) March to Lord Belmore, 24 Aug 1870 (copy), Royal Navy, Australia Station, Vol. 28. For March’s fears of a race war, see March to FO, 30 Aug 1870, FO58/118. Missionary Lorimer Fison also foresaw an “inter-racial war”. Lorimer Fison to William Fison, 29 Aug 1870, CO 201/562.

\(^{121}\) Britton, 37.

\(^{122}\) ibid., 63.

\(^{123}\) For Ma’afu’s long-standing and cordial relations with the Ryders, see above, Ch. 7.

\(^{124}\) TA, 17 Aug 1870, 6.

\(^{125}\) LCC R953.

\(^{126}\) Swanston, ibid. For three examples of the wording of Vanuabalavu leases, see LCC R954/5/6 Navadugu, Nasigani and Navetau.
For once, Cakobau appeared to steal a march on his rival when he attended a meeting of Taveuni planters, hastily arranged at the Vuna Point Hotel at the southern end of the island. Expressing pleasure and astonishment at the changes wrought on the landscape by the apparently industrious planters, and following dark hints of Ma`afu’s plans to act against the planters’ interests, Cakobau obtained from the meeting a pledge of unqualified support. Ma`afu, then visiting Tui Cakau up the coast at Wairiki, appeared discountenanced. Hoping to regain the initiative, he sent a canoe to Vuna Point “requesting the planters to come up and explain their grievances”. This they did, with the result that Ma`afu, feigning to distance himself from Tui Cakau, denied he was the latter’s advisor.127 While at Wairiki, the settlers resolved not to interfere “with Fijian politics or internecine quarrels”, to appoint magistrates subject to Tui Cakau’s approval and to establish a Legislative Assembly which would meet biennially “to revise the laws and add others (subject to the approval of the Tui Vanua Levu) if required”.128 Significantly, Ma`afu signed a copy of the resolutions “only as a witness to Tui Cakau’s signature”.129 Tui Cakau, now enjoying the added dignity of Tui Vanua Levu, a title he owed to Ma`afu, was in theory paramount chief of the *matanitu* of Cakaudrove, Macuata and Bua. The Wairiki resolutions established, on paper, an administration of these chiefdoms nominally under Tui Cakau’s control and with the essential involvement and co-operation of the settlers, the new element in the polity of Fiji. No such arrangement was anticipated in Cakobau’s dominions. Despite Ma`afu’s attempt to disassociate himself from the collective will of Tui Cakau and the Taveuni planters, in an effort to mollify the planters’ concerns, his influence on the outcome of the Wairiki meeting was plain. He sought, through his influence over Tui Cakau, to undermine Cakobau’s *rapprochement* with the planters and to bring them firmly if unwittingly under the control of Tui Cakau, long Ma`afu’s most important chiefly ally. The Wairiki resolutions, if they could be properly effected, would enable Ma`afu to reassert an apparently benign rule over the *Tovata* lands. His skilful reassertion of control, less a realignment than a masterstroke of statecraft, placed the three *matanitu* even more firmly beside Lau in readiness for the coming confrontation with Bau.

John Thurston, one of the two most astute resident observers of the Fijian scene, noted that the principal chiefs in the domains of Tui Lau and Tui Cakau enjoyed considerably more benefits than their written laws and constitutions might have suggested. “The heads of the two native governments have their banking accounts and can afford to buy such yachts as the Xariffa, or Vivid, for their pleasure … Tui Lau’s bill for £2,000 or £3,000 would be eagerly taken

127 *FT*, 24 Sep 1870.
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by any Fijian mercantile man”. Ma`afu, content with neither the perks of office nor with his recent diplomatic gains in Cakaudrove, sailed to Levuka and from there to Macuata, Rewa and Kadavu. Accompanied by one of the Gwynne brothers, shipbuilders, of Lomaloma, and doubtless to Thurston’s displeasure, Ma`afu voyaged in style aboard the Xarifa, escorted by his schooner Caroline and his ketch, Tui Nayau. Tongue in cheek, the Fiji Times noted “it is rumoured that Tui Lau’s mission is political and that he aims at a union with the chiefs of the two districts”. Inasmuch as a political motive was seldom absent from Ma`afu’s voyages around Fiji, such a move indicated a desire, not only further to undermine Cakobau’s support in the islands, but to encircle him with disaffected if not actively hostile chiefs. First, though, he proceeded to Macuata, where he joined hostilities against Ritova, who continued to “repudiate” the Tovata. He then proceeded quickly to Rewa, where Roko Tui Dreketi, the paramount chief, “determined to leave Bau and join the ‘confederate chieftains’”. Cakobau responded several weeks later by sending emissaries to enquire. The response from the Roko Tui was unambiguous: “‘We chiefs of Rewa like the Tonguese form of government and wish Ma`afu to rule over us, we are for peace, but if you want to fight, come to us for we are ready’”. Missionary Frederick Langham would later state that Ma`afu’s visit to Rewa was made with the purpose of negotiating with the chiefs there “to declare war jointly against the Vunivalu”. According to Langham’s colleague Jesse Carey, Rewa was now firmly allied to Lau, Cakaudrove, Bua and Macuata. Nevertheless, Carey believed, in spite of the “little nasty breezes” emanating from the “Tongan” [i.e. Ma`afu’s] fleet, “other breezes will blow soon and take the miasma all away”. The “other breezes” were expected to blow from Whitehall, from which direction all was yet calm.

From Rewa, where some degree of secrecy and decorum had prevailed, Ma`afu and his fleet proceeded to Beqa, where 230 prisoners were taken. The men, whom he viewed as Bauan sympathisers, were sold as labourers to European settlers in Lau. This action, unlike the Rewan alliance, threw down the gauntlet to Cakobau, who had long claimed absolute authority over Beqa. The Vunivalu responded quickly, advising the British Consul that the alliance between Rewa and the Tovata would certainly lead to war. Both the Consul and the captain of the Rosario, a visiting British warship, were besought to act against Ma`afu,
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with the consequence that Tui Lau was requested to wait on Consul March at Levuka. Arriving there on 5 December, the day before a proposed interview with March, Ma`afu engaged his men to spend the day working under contract to build a stone wharf for St John Keyes, a local publican, storekeeper and shipping agent. The Fiji Times, in detailing the ensuing “Battle of Levuka”, noted the hostilities as evidence of “the inestimable benefit conferred on the noble savage by his intercourse with the whites”. Publican Keyes, wishing to expedite the construction of his wharf, had engaged the services of “Ma`afu and Gwynne, warriors and contractors, of Loma Loma”. During initial construction work, the Tongans were supervised by “an experienced and amiable looking Tongese gentleman dressed in a black coat and a large gun”. The Tongans, naturally, were not bound to respect local laws and customs, “it being understood that the earth was created for the Tongese and their adherents”. “It is scarcely to be believed, but it is true”, the newspaper continued, “that the Fijian residents actually dared to remonstrate with the Tongese, or Ma`afuans, who were expropriating their property”. The Tongans were forced to retreat. “Onward rushed the routed army, `anywhere, anywhere out of the way’, closely followed by infuriated Fijians and excited papalangis”. The pursuing Fijians reached Hennings Brothers’ jetty “in time to throw volleys of stones and Fijian curses at the `noble two hundred’ … here most of the casualties occurred and the demoralisation of the Ma`afuans [was] completed”.

His men safely on board their vessels, Ma`afu was urged to seek advice from the Consul as to his best course of action. He did so, only to be confronted by the Consul striding “about the room gesticulating in an excited and violent manner”. Tui Lau, in contrast, “sat with the coolness and dignity becoming his position as a chieftain and a gentleman”. Reminding the Consul that he had come to Levuka at the Consul’s request, Ma`afu demanded compensation for the wounds his men had suffered. Tui Levuka, part of a council of chiefs called to assist “the Emperor of Fiji and Tonga [i.e. Consul March]”, admitted that his people were in the wrong. During the discussion, which involved several European residents as well as various local chiefs, “the Fiji Times was excluded on account of its revolutionary tendencies. As the Emperor was particularly requested by Lord Clarendon … to settle all native disputes, he ordered the Fijians to indemnify Ma`afu for the cost of the war and all forts or obstructions to Ma`afu swaggering along the beach are to be demolished”. Safe from scurrilous newspaper hacks, Ma`afu hinted that should adequate compensation not be forthcoming, he would incite the Lovoni people, who lived in central Ovalau, to retaliate on his behalf. Eventually, Consul March agreed that the fines apportioned to the Levuka people should be in accordance with English law.
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Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

The *Fiji Times*’ feature writer recognised an element of farce in the day’s events on the Levuka waterfront. Yet, amid the ridicule, scarcely to be dignified even by the name of sarcasm, truth resided. Although apparently rebuffed, Ma`afu had in fact triumphed yet again: the Consul had bowed to his will, while the local Fijians, so intent on preserving their privileges, ended the day with the indignity of fines levied for their troubles. The newspaper correspondent had been right to deride Consul March as “the Emperor of Fiji and Tonga”: it was Ma`afu, rather than the Consul, who remained free to swagger along the beach.

On a distant shore, Royal Navy Commodore Frederick Stirling, less sanguine than Jesse Carey although removed from the scene, reported from Sydney March’s opinion “that a general war [in Fiji] between the two principal chiefs is imminent”.140 The United States had politely declined an earlier invitation to extend a protectorate over Fiji, with President Ulysses Grant noting that such a move would be “incompatible with the national interests committed to his charge”.141 Little could be hoped from a contemporary petition to the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales, similarly seeking annexation.142 In the meantime, Ma`afu was ceaseless in his efforts further to consolidate his already established pre-eminence. His hint to March concerning potential danger to the Europeans of Ovalau from the Lovoni people was not without substance. It was reported that during Ma`afu’s eventful if short visit to Levuka, about 7 December 1870, he had sought to communicate with the fiercely independent Lovoni. Although often said to have been in some kind of tributary relationship with Bau, the most senior Lovoni chief stated in 1880 that no such relationship had existed in 1870. “Bau was on one side and Lovoni on the other”, the chief declared. “Only in the case of war would we vakarorogo to Bau”. Although the Lovoni sometimes presented *tabua* to Bau, this was done because “we were warriors and they wanted our assistance … The Vunivalu always paid us for the services rendered in war to him”.143 The so-called Lovoni war, which began in 1870, ended with the submission of the Lovoni to Bau and the dispersal of most of the Lovoni warriors throughout Fiji as agricultural labourers, a dispersal that rankles to this day in Lovoni.144

In contrast with the disorder prevailing in Levuka on 5 December, a decorous meeting of European settlers on Vanuabalavu took place in Lomaloma shortly before Christmas. Its purpose was to investigate the settlers’ political status and “to devise some practicable joint course of action with the chief whereby the

---
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two races might work harmoniously together”. Swanston addressed the settlers, advising them of his wish to see the authority of Tui Lau consolidated and the Executive of Lau strengthened within the framework of the rule of law. Swanston envisaged only one way in which the settlers might achieve these goals: to work in concert with the “native rulers”. “Ma’afu and the Lau chiefs are most anxious that we should assume our share of the cares and responsibilities of government”, he declared. More importantly, he told his fellow Europeans that “the position we assume towards Ma`afu and the Lau chiefs will be accepted by the natives as an index of how our race will act throughout Fiji”. To this end, the laws of Lau were read and discussion of them invited, with a committee appointed to recommend any changes. Further measures, including the commencement of surveying and the appointment of magistrates, were adopted. When the committee reported in favour of formal adoption of the existing laws, Ma`afu signified his approval. The laws were to be published a few months later as the Constitution of Lau. In a conciliatory move, he granted the committee, and through them the European residents of the Tovata, a charter granting the right of veto, should committee members feel that any existing or future law was prejudicial to the interests of the Europeans:

I, Ma`afu … grant to the committee nominated by the whites of Lau for that purpose the right to veto as regards application against the whites of Lau, of any law passed in the Tovata or Lau assemblies, which the committee may deem inconsistent with the feelings and privileges of their race.

The proceedings were followed by a dinner at the Lomaloma hotel, where Ma`afu and several followers were the guests of the committee and the white residents of several islands of Lau.

The charter granted by Ma`afu was yet another tactic to enable him to rely on the support of the whites in any coming move against Cakobau. European settlers in Lau were promised security of leasehold tenure in return for taxation liability and an implicit acknowledgement of Fijian sovereignty. With their interests effectively secured and peaceful relations with their Fijian hosts assured, they would be unlikely to side with their disaffected, fractious and even paranoid counterparts in Viti Levu. It was in the Vanuabalavu settlers’ interests to submit to Ma`afu’s rule, guaranteed as it was by the Constitution, and to pay taxes to him as their legally constituted government. Even though their lands were leasehold, the settlers in Lau possessed significantly greater security of tenure than those in
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146 The committee members were Thomas Ryder of Mago, Leonard Boehm of Kanacea, Sydenham Bowden of Uruone, George Browning of Susui and Herbert Levick, William Hennings and John Gosling, all of Lomaloma. Planters in Lau were to pay a tax of sixpence per acre, or two guineas per annum in the case of town allotments. *FT*, 7 Jan 1871.
Ma’aifu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

Viti Levu, where freehold largely applied. Cakobau, by way of contrast with his rival, could never hope to attain so effective a rapprochement with his uninvited guests. Ma’aifu’s charter was likely to prove yet another guarantee of stability in his already peaceful chiefdom, thereby further strengthening his position on the broader political stage in Fiji.

At the close of 1870, Henry Britton, the correspondent whose visit earlier in the year has been noted, made further reflections:

Ma’aifu, though only a savage, is a very superior man for a Polynesian, and has an advantage over Thakombau in that he has been accustomed from his youth … to the systematic forms of government adopted in Tonga, while he has always been intimately associated with the Europeans. In his kingdom printed books are kept for the official record of sentences inflicted, the births, deaths, marriages and divorces … The prestige of his personal character has always been great, while Thakombau, whose introduction to the civilised modes of government occurred at too late a period of his life for him to properly understand them, bears the reputation of being a thorough shuffler.

With due allowance made for a visitor whose acquaintance with Fiji was of short duration, the contrast between the orderly processes of Lau and the chaos of Bau and Levuka, and between the minds and outlook of Tui Lau and the Vunivalu, did not admit of a fairer definition.

More pertinent to any coming dénouement between the two chiefs was the opinion of Fiji Times editor George Griffiths. Endorsing Swanston’s speech to the planters’ meeting at Lomaloma, Griffiths stated that Swanston “is to Ma’aifu and Lau what Bismarck is to King William and … Germany”. The Lauan policy of acknowledging the rights and aspirations of the Fijian inhabitants was stated to be “wise”, with the Constitution of Lau “sure to produce good results”. Furthermore, the white settlers in Lau were described as Ma’aifu’s “debtors” for the “establishment of law and order under difficulties”, while the Lauan administration offered a blueprint for the rest of Fiji. “A careful observation of the working of the Lau constitution may prove the advisability of Bau having a government as well as Lau and Bua”. Consul March, however, sought to deal with the exigencies of the moment. He appealed in vain to Commodore Stirling, then in New Zealand, to despatch a ship to Fiji as soon as possible. News that the United States would not consider a protectorate over Fiji likely made the anxious

147 See above, notes 52–55, 105 and 121.
149 FT, 11 Jan 1871.
March even more uneasy.\textsuperscript{150} He despaired of continual appeals to him from the settlers, who were “ignorant or forgetful that the office is not a government”. If he did not dance to the settlers’ tune, he told the Foreign Office, they resorted to drunken public meetings. He did not exaggerate, since in May a petition, signed by 42 Europeans resident in Fiji, pressed the Foreign Office to remove March. “I am at the mercy of the mob”, the Consul lamented, while the \textit{Herald’s} correspondent, although confident that March was a gentleman, recognised that the Consul remained “unpopular among some sections of Levuka’s white community”.\textsuperscript{151} March was caught between the unreasonable and selfish demands of the settlers, the steadfast refusal of Whitehall to contemplate any form of control over Fiji and the rapid increase in tension between the Vunivalu and Tui Lau.

The two rival chiefs must have been aware of growing planter discontent and of the likelihood that some form of foreign control of Fiji could not be far distant. In Sydney, a meeting of about 150 people at the Town Hall on 13 April evinced both anxiety about “the political conditions and prospects” of Fiji and a desire for New South Wales to assume the administration of the islands, since the British government had “positively” declined to do so.\textsuperscript{152} A deputation appointed by the meeting waited on Lord Belmore to present him with a petition seeking the co-operation of Whitehall in allowing the Colony to assume responsibility for Fiji.\textsuperscript{153} In forwarding the petition to the Foreign Office, Belmore suggested the possibility of the kingdom of Hawai`i forming a protectorate over Fiji, a move which might meet the difficulty “which undoubtedly exists at present”.\textsuperscript{154} The idea had been suggested to him by Charles St Julian, now Hawaiian Consul-General “to the Independent States and Tribes of southern Polynesia” and was apparently favoured by William Hennings.\textsuperscript{155} Whitehall, however, rightly observed that “the Hawaiian state [did not possess] the means to exercise any control over the European settlers, and native population of [Fiji], and a nominal

\textsuperscript{150} Commodore F.H. Stirling to March, 30 Jan 1871, Despatches from the Senior Naval Office of the Australia Station 30 Jan 1871 – 10 Nov 1871 (with gaps), BCFP; March to FO 30 Jan 1871, FO58/120.
151 March to W.H. Wylde, FO, 21 Apr 1871, FO58/120; James Turner to Lord Granville, 17 May 1871, FO58/121; \textit{SMH}, 22 Sep 1871. There had been a proposal for the British Consul to be given magisterial powers over British subjects in Fiji: see FO to Treasury, 30 May 1871, CO201/567.
152 \textit{SMH}, 14 Apr 1871; HO to Belmore, 1871, FO 58/121; Kimberley, FO, to Canterbury, 16 Mar 1871, FO58/121, CO 309/94; PP 1871 xlvii (H.C. 435), 58.
153 \textit{SMH}, 26 Apr and 3 May 1871; \textit{The Empire}, 26 Apr 1871; \textit{FT}, 20 May 1871. For a contemporary British opinion describing Fiji as potentially “a valuable appendage to New South Wales”, see Charles Cowper to John Dunmore Lang, 3 Nov 1871, Lang Papers, Vol. 7, Correspondence 1855–1877, ML.
154 Belmore to Kimberley, 17 May 1871, FO58/121.
155 Charles St Julian to Belmore, 26 Apr 1871, FO58/122; Charles St Julian, His Hawaiian Majesty’s Chargé d’Affaires and Consul-General, to Charles Harris, Dept of Foreign Affairs Honolulu, 31 May 1871 and 26 Oct 1871, AH.
Hawaiian protectorate would afford no protection for the maintenance of law and order or punishment of crime”. These considerations were precisely those uppermost in the minds of the citizens who had met in Sydney.

Featherbrained as it seems, the idea of a Hawaiian protectorate over Fiji remained real in the mind of St Julian, who brought the state of affairs in Fiji to the attention of Hawai`i’s king, Kamehameha V. Following a suggestion from St Julian, Hawaiian Foreign Minister Charles Harris financed the Sydney Consul to travel to Fiji in order to urge both Ma`afu and Cakobau to visit Hawai`i, where Kamehameha could “show them the country and the working of all its institutions”. Kamehameha wrote to both chiefs, inviting them to Hawai`i so “that you might see, the manner in which My Government is administered for Natives and foreigners”. St Julian saw the possibility for a Fijian kingdom along the lines of the Hawaiian. Even without the very different conditions prevailing in Fiji, such an eventuality remained unlikely in the face of Cakobau’s limited power and his ever-increasing rivalry with Ma`afu. Unsurprisingly, neither chief ever set foot in Hawai`i.

The situation in Fiji remained too fraught for either the Vunivalu or Tui Lau to contemplate any overseas travel. Settlers in Nadroga met in February to acknowledge the sovereignty of Bau, while their counterparts in Rewa did likewise, even agreeing to pay a tax to Cakobau in return for protection. These declarations, yet further symptoms of settler unease, came in the face of press reports of Ma`afu’s continuing support of Fijians whom the Fiji Times coyly described as being in “`quasi´ rebellion” against Cakobau. The Vunivalu appealed to the newspaper’s editor to publish an account of Ma`afu’s “treachery” towards him. He wanted the European settlers to be aware that Ma`afu is doing his best to weaken him, and that Ma`afu has sent four muskets, a keg of powder, ten dollars, and one large cedar box, contents unknown, but probably filled with infernal machines, as a bribe to the Levoni [sic] tribe to kill all the men on the coast. The magnitude of the bribe, and the purpose for which it is given, will not fail to fill the world with wonder at the riches, and abhorrence at the treachery of the Fijians.

156 HO to Belmore 1871, FO58/121. See also FO to CO, 5 Aug 1871, FO58/122.
157 Kimberley, writing privately to the Prime Minister, described the idea of a Hawaiian protectorate over Fiji as “preposterous”. Marion Diamond, Creative Meddler: The Life and Fantasies of Charles St Julian, Melbourne 1990, 133.
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159 Kamehameha to Ma`afu, 31 May 1871, AH; Kamehameha to Cakobau, 31 May 1871, ibid. A copy of the latter is also found in Cakobau Government, Chief Secretary’s Office and Colonial Secretary’s Office, IC, general, 30 May 1871 – 31 Aug 1875.
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Cakobau, seemingly reduced to desperate straits, sought to influence settler opinion almost as a last chance to steal a march on his rival. At the same time, there appeared a press report of a “standing army” formed by Ma`afu at Lakeba, where the “soldiers” were drilled by his son Siale`ataogo. “We hope they will keep to ‘play’”, declared the Fiji Times, “and never be tempted to try their strength against the peaceful body of cotton planters”. “Armed neutrality is now the order of the day”, the newspaper went on to say, tongue yet again planted in cheek, “and the Tui Lau intends not to be behind other civilised monarchs”.\(^\text{163}\)

Armed Ma`afu’s men certainly were, if their neutrality were tenuous at best. At his instigation, the Lovoni launched an armed insurrection against Tui Levuka, a chief whose lands lay under the nominal suzerainty of Cakobau. Reportedly “disaffected” with Cakobau, the Lovoni planned an attack on Natokalau, a coastal village loyal to the Vunivalu. Although the plan was postponed when Cakobau sent a tabua, an informer who had alerted the Vunivalu was murdered.\(^\text{164}\) When the village was eventually destroyed, Ma`afu awaited the outcome with his “army” in Lakeba. His surrogates had over-reached themselves, however, being forced into abject surrender some four months later.\(^\text{165}\) The subsequent trial of 13 Lovoni for high treason provided irrefutable evidence of Ma`afu’s involvement in the insurrection. Having pleaded guilty, the 13 “threw themselves on the mercy of the court”. Their counsel “said that they had been led into the crime [of treason] by the false representations of Ma`afu”. Leoni, a chief from Totogo, a village adjoining Levuka, stated in evidence that “Ma`afu had come to him and persuaded him that it would be much to his benefit that an alliance against the Bau Government should be made. Ma`afu presented him with a bag of shot, and he yielded to his representations”. Two other Totogo men, Saru and Draunidalu, deposed that Ma`afu had promised them “guns and powder” if they “would join the Lau confederation against the Bau government”. The final decision by the Lovoni to seek revenge on their old enemies, the people of Natokalau, came about following Draunidalu’s presentation to them of guns and powder acquired from Ma`afu.\(^\text{166}\) The defeated warriors, convicted of treason in the Supreme Court of Fiji, were dispersed throughout the country, with many hired out to planters as labourers. Frederick Langham later stated that Cakobau “would not have the Lovoni people [in Ovalau], with Ma`afu in arms against him”.\(^\text{167}\) The loss of their lands by the Lovoni came about because Cakobau wished to punish them for their failure to provide him with political support.

\(^{163}\) ibid.
\(^{164}\) Nettleton to Rabone, 8 Feb 1871, WMN(A), Apr 1871, 247.
\(^{165}\) FT, 22 Feb, 28 Jun and 1 Jul 1871; Nettleton to Rabone, 22 Feb 1871, WMN(A), Apr 1871, 247–248. Consul March had requested a supply of ammunition from Lord Belmore: March to FO, 17 Aug 1871, FO 58/120.
\(^{166}\) Proceedings of the Provisional Supreme Court of Fiji, 4 Jul 1871, FT, 5 Jul 1871. See also evidence of Frederick Langham, 9 Sep 1880, LCC R929.
\(^{167}\) Evidence of Langham, LCC R929.
Despite the ignominious failure of Ma`afu’s Lovoni allies, their defeat did nothing to undermine his support beyond the shores of Ovalau. In May, a meeting of planters in Bua resolved to request Tui Bua to grant them a charter “giving a similar right of veto on the laws of the Bua kingdom to that which Tui Lau has granted to the white residents of Lau”.168 Such a resolution reflected, not a desire by the planters to be governed by an enlightened administration, but a resolve to preserve their privileges in the light of chiefly power that, although absolute in Fijian custom, was considered despotic by many ambitious planters. Ma`afu himself, before his visit to his “standing army” in Lakeba, presided over a church meeting on Vanuabalavu on what missionary John Leggoe described as “a red-letter day”. After singing and prayer, Ma`afu addressed the gathering, “congratulating the people upon their cleanliness and liberality, and expressing pleasure at the presence of missionaries”. Declaring “‘love and endurance’” to be the themes of his address, he spoke of the difference between Fijian and English love. If a Fijian gives a present, Tui Lau asserted, he expects one in return, whereas if an Englishman gives a present, he expects nothing in return. Referring to the earlier collection, Ma`afu added:

perhaps some of you have given from a Fijian point of view this morning, and you will go to your homes discontented because you have nothing to take back with you. Wait a while! Let me tell you what you have given in return. You have given to the Lord, and has he not given you something? Has he not given you life and sustained it? Has he not given his Son to die for you? Has he not given you teachers to teach the way of salvation?

Ma`afu proceeded to ask the visiting missionaries to send one of their number to Vanuabalavu, stating that he and his people were willing to suffer the long delay until one was appointed.169

While Ma`afu’s eloquence was music to Leggoe’s ears, not all of the missionary’s colleagues were willing to praise Tui Lau. Several months earlier, Langham had reported on Ma`afu’s suspicions of some missionaries and on the question of which missionary should be sent to Lomaloma. Langham opted for Isaac Rooney:

He is the man for the place, and Ma`afu would rather have him than anyone else now in Fiji. Ma`afu is suspicious of some of us – tho’ if he knew all – without any good reason – that we are thorough Cakobauites. He quite believes that Brother Rooney is a Ma`afuite and I think we ought to send the Brother, who has the confidence of a Chief, to live with that Chief in preference to one who is not known to have his confidence.170

168 *FT*, 31 May 1871.
170 Langham to Rabone, 2 Jan 1871, *MOM* 103.
A wise move, seemingly, since a missionary who did not enjoy Ma`afu’s confidence would find the Lomaloma station devoid of spiritual and material succour.

Ma`afu sought to assert proper control over the local missionary as over his entire realm. Not all was smooth sailing, however, since Macomber, the American who occupied Munia, appealed again to Ma`afu to remove the “natives” occupying the island. More pertinent was the disordered state of Ma`afu’s finances. He enjoyed a substantial income from leasehold land throughout Lau, an income supplemented by “presents” from leaseholders. However, in violation of the Micawber principle, his expenses exceeded his income. Since the late 1860s, he had maintained an account at Hennings’ store in Lomaloma, where his purchases typically included household goods and groceries. Some three years earlier, acting Consul Thurston had written to Ma`afu urging him to settle his debts to various creditors. Despite receiving a credit of £1,000 to his account with Hennings in August “on account of land sold to the Fiji Government”, Ma`afu remained “heavily in debt” to the firm two months later.

The summary trial of the Lovoni rebels occurred during the very early days of the new administration in Fiji that came to be known as the Cakobau Government. When a group of Europeans met secretly at Levuka on 5 June 1871, the situation was becoming desperate. Sydney Burt, whose close business and personal alliance with Cakobau has already been noticed, instigated the meeting. Through his friendship with William Hennings, Burt was, according to March, able to influence Ma`afu. One consequence of that influence, the Consul believed, was Ma`afu’s later acceptance of the title of Viceroy. The clandestine meeting enabled Burt and his friends to form “the nucleus of a government”, which involved a revival of the 1867 Constitution, and to convene a meeting of delegates on 1 August. The British Consul later described this process as “a coup d’etat”.

The rapid increase in European influence in Fiji arose from the recent influx of settlers. Europeans in the islands had increased in number from about 40 in 1860
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176 March to FO, 11 Oct 1871. For the text of the proclamation, dated 9 Jun 1871, see Moss, Appendix D, 298–299.
to considerably more than 2,000 by 1871. More significantly, the bulk of them were now planters and merchants, rather than traders. The planters, often living in isolated parts of Fiji, required security of land tenure, while the merchants were concerned to see the rule of law established and a regular currency in circulation. In one of its earliest issues, the *Fiji Times*, a new forum of European discussion, had reminded its readers of “the necessity of forming some bond of union among us for the purpose of securing peace and order in our midst”. The acknowledged need for stable government was accompanied by a hardening of race relations, an area where prevailing attitudes were demonstrated at the New Year’s Day Regatta in 1872. At the corresponding event one year earlier, there had been a race for Fijian *drua*, won by Edward Miller, of mixed Fijian and European descent. In 1872, however, the *drua* race was abandoned, with only Europeans permitted to enter other events.

The boom years for cotton, which had sustained the rapid expansion in settler numbers, were over by 1871. Although the average plantation exceeded 80 acres, poverty was widespread among smaller holders, especially those who had lived in Fiji for a relatively short time. Many of the resident Europeans were derided in Australia as “defaulters, embezzling clerks and fraudulent debtors who have … succeeded in making their escape to Fiji”. Nevertheless, those settlers remaining solvent amid the inevitable bankruptcies were often disposed to recognise the need for a rapprochement with Fijian society. Some were prepared to acknowledge the validity of Fijian social obligations, especially in relation to land. Others, mostly newly arrived in the islands and ignorant or heedless of Fijian interests, sought to establish a constitution “as will secure to the white race the pre-eminence in the government of the country to which it is entitled by intellect and civilisation”. No such “pre-eminence” could be brought into existence without conflict with the Fijians, whose interests would not be protected if such a regime were ever established. Fortunately, aside from a pervading conservatism, the Europeans who met on 5 June manifested little unity of purpose and were in fact opposed by the majority of their fellows resident in Levuka.

Aside from such divergence of opinion, security of land tenure remained the most pressing concern of Europeans throughout Fiji. Land could only be obtained and held while Fijians considered that its alienation served their
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best interests. A pervasive attitude amongst settlers was that “purchases” of land from Fijian chiefs gave the new “owners” freehold title, while most chiefs regarded the newcomers as temporary occupiers with limited rights. It was not until the Lands Claims Commission was established six years after the British assumed control of Fiji that a concerted effort was made to regulate ownership of land. The land question was a paramount consideration to the few merchants and traders who met in Levuka on 5 June. The *Fiji Times* declared its lack of sympathy for indigenous rights when it reprinted an 1867 news item from *The Sydney Morning Herald* that described Cakobau as incapable of understanding the term “moral support” as an abstract concept. The Vunivalu supposedly interpreted the offer of settler support as “armed assistance when asked for to drive the Tongans out of Fiji”. The dilemma facing Cakobau and the other chiefs of Fiji remained in 1871 as it had been four years earlier: was settler recognition of their authority to be achieved at the price of permanent alienation of their lands?

Consul March apparently thought so, believing Cakobau to have been manipulated by Europeans “seeking their own interests”. He pursued this theme with the Foreign Office, writing of the “notorious fact that these native chiefs are but mere tools in the hands of designing white men”. As well as casting aspersions on the characters and aspirations of most of the Europeans who influenced Cakobau, March apprised his masters that one of the Vunivalu’s “principal objects” was “the extension of his rule over all … Fiji and the annihilation of his powerful rival Ma’afu”. Cakobau cherished such “idle hopes” only because “he is being flattered by his present advisers with the prospect of attaining his wish. Already the acts and edicts promulgated by these irresponsible ‘Ministers’ apply to all Fiji and should they attempt to enforce them, war will assuredly be the consequence”. Whitehall remained unconcerned, however, advising March of its view that the European community in Fiji was now large and diverse enough to govern itself. That community seemingly agreed, with its self-appointed spokesman, the editor of the *Fiji Times*, reminding his readers that

the Europeans will rule; the power of education and civilisation must come to the front, and if the prominent figure be a native … it is only a puppet, the strings of which are pulled by the white man.
As for the Australian colonies, the New South Wales Attorney-General, Sir James Martin, advised the Colony’s governor that any scheme for the Colony to assume control of Fiji would be impossible to effect.\footnote{Sir James Martin to Belmore, 8 Aug 1871, quoted in de Ricci, 60–62.} With a constitutional convention due to meet in Levuka on 1 August 1871, much would depend on the views of Europeans in more distant parts of the islands and, more importantly, on the reactions of the principal chiefs.\footnote{The \textit{FT} believed that prior consultation with the principal chiefs was essential, 28 Jul 1871.} Settlers in Nadroga were reportedly “bitterly opposed” to the new regime, with Tui Nadroga unlikely to attend the convention unless supported by the local whites.\footnote{\textit{FT}, 15 Jul 1871.} In Naitasiri, however, two delegates were elected to represent the Upper Rewa district, although a local resident, Joseph Reece, alarmed a residents’ meeting with news “from a most reliable source … that Ma`afu was on the point of coming to Rewa to join the disaffected tribe there in a demonstration against the Bau government”. The gathering evinced a “very decided” view that everything possible should be done to rebut any “interference” by the Tongans.\footnote{\textit{FT}, 29 Jul 1871.} While this intelligence proved to be rumour, and despite the failure of his surrogate rebellion in Ovalau, the co-operation of Ma`afu above all other chiefs would certainly be needed if the new regime were to enjoy any prospects of success. The new premier, George Austin Woods, requested Tui Cakau to stop armed parties of his subjects entering Macuata, while simultaneously advising Ritova, “Governor in Chief” of Macuata, that he was authorised to resist by force of arms should Ma`afu or Tui Cakau attempt to take “forcible and unlawful possession of your territory or usurp any power of your people … The King has given instructions [for] Tui Cakau and Ma`afu to be communicated with on this matter”.\footnote{George Austin Woods to Ritova, 24 Jun 1871, CG Set 31. See also Woods to Tui Cakau, 24 Jun 1871, ibid.} At least in the case of Ma`afu, no reminder appeared necessary.

With his immediate future within the new regime so delicately balanced, Ma`afu was never in greater need of a secure power base in his “home” province of Lau. A somewhat curious sequence of events there revealed both the full extent of that power and the Tui Lau’s inherent statesmanship. A well-attended meeting of white residents of Vanuabalavu, held in Lomaloma on 17 June, was addressed by William Hennings on the subject of “rumours which he had heard during his late visit to Taveuni, about the price of yams there”. A Tongan named Feke had gone to Taveuni, claiming Ma`afu’s authority to levy a price of £10 per 1,000 yams. As a consequence, “a feeling hostile to Ma`afu has arisen to leeward, which it behoves us to do our utmost to counteract”, Hennings told the meeting. He stated his disbelief that such an instruction could have emanated from Ma`afu and moved that “Ma`afu be requested to call a meeting of his people on Monday next, and that he then and in our presence, proclaim
that there is no law at present, and that hereafter no law shall be made to control trading between whites and natives, and that his people shall understand that the laws and customs of Tonga, with regard to buying and selling, shall not be enforced”. The motion was carried unanimously.

The meeting further expressed its “earnest wishes that this act of Ma`afu’s may tend towards … maintaining good will between himself and the whites here, and that especially in other parts of … Lau …, Ma`afu’s influence may prevail so as to foster the same good understanding between the whites and natives which is apparent in those islands which he personally controls”. There was a resolution that Ma`afu be requested immediately to recall Feke from Taveuni, where the latter had established “objectionable laws”. Respectful though the tone of the meeting was, Ma`afu could have been left in no doubt concerning his immediate course of action. When a delegation waited on him the same evening, Tui Lau “readily offered to comply with all the requests of the meeting, and asked that all the whites should assemble at his house the following Monday …, when he would call together and address all his people in Vanua Balavu”.

Ma`afu revealed his statesmanship in converting the ultimatum from the whites of Vanuabalavu into an opportunity to remind his Tongan and Fijian subjects that he alone directed the course of their lives, so long as they lived on lands under his control:

I have learnt for some time … that there are some of you who seriously interfere with trading …. Henceforth I shall severely punish all those who in spite of what I say will endeavour to interfere…

There are many of you whose unauthorised acts and words implicate me. If one of you by act or speech annoys and troubles a white man, it is I who have to bear the blame, and as I know many of you have repeatedly been guilty of that about which I am now speaking, so have I been repeatedly blamed for acts of which I am innocent. There is a feeling abroad that I am the cause of the dissatisfaction of the whites generally with my government and my interests in Fiji, but I can tell you that the cause of such dissatisfaction can be traced to some of you. … I have suffered for this long enough, and I now command you to mend your ways. The first complaint which reaches me from a white man about any one of you, whether chief or not, whether Fijian or Tongan, shall be redressed in such a manner that few of you will dare to be guilty another time. … I want you especially to remember that the white men are our friends, and you must endeavour … to avoid every source whence quarrels and disturbances may spring.¹⁹³

¹⁹³ For the full text of Ma`afu’s speech and details of the meeting two days earlier, see FT, 5 Jul 1871.
A resident of Fiji referred to “the sound sense” of Ma`afu’s address, claiming it to be “the declaration of one who feels himself in the position of an independent chief and not that of a vassal or subject”. Such indeed was the impression Ma`afu successfully sought to convey. His admonitions to his people reminded them that his authority was always to be respected, while reassuring the Europeans that the same authority would be asserted in their interests. Ma`afu’s swift response to the whites’ latent disaffection ensured that his role in the new “government” of Fiji would remain unhampered by any unnecessary political difficulties in Lau.

In discussing the dubious prospects for any form of government in Fiji with Cakobau as its nominal head, the Fiji Times adopted a more measured tone than usual when it considered the influence Ma`afu was likely to wield on such an administration. As delegates prepared to meet at Levuka “to arrange for a Constitution”, the newspaper reminded its readers that “we see in the windward islands a powerful confederation – the Lau Confederation – with Ma`afu, an intelligent man at its head, which is not only a strong power but also exerting an influence … daily increasing over the chiefdoms of Tui Cakau and Vuni Valu”. In an attempt to exercise that influence, and probably buoyed by his adroit diplomacy at Lomaloma, Ma`afu called on Cakobau in Levuka on 22 July. At their conference, the two chiefs reportedly “settled all their rival claims and quarrels. Ma`afu is said to have given up all claims on Vanua Levu, Viti Levu, Beqa [and] Kadavu, and to have acknowledged Cakobau as King of Fiji and taken the oath of allegiance to him as such”. In return, Ma`afu was appointed Viceroy and Commander-in-Chief of Lau, with an initial grant of £1,000 and a promised annual salary of £800. March later asserted that the £1,000 constituted “an indemnity … for certain lands to which he laid claim”.

Ma`afu also became a member of the Privy Council and was given clear title to the Yasayasa Moala, where his rule, despite the findings of Consul Jones in 1865, was still subject to some dispute in both Bau and Lau. A director of the Polynesia Company later wrote that Ma`afu had received his salary in return for “surrendering his claims” to Lau, thus permitting Cakobau to become the true “sovereign” of Fiji. This was true to the extent that the chiefs’ salaries were seen as a means of ensuring their loyalty, as well as encouraging them in “the belief that they could become much greater than they otherwise could
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According to a tradition not documented until 1907, it was William Hennings, the first delegate from Lau to the Legislative Assembly, who, “after a deal of persuasion”, convinced Ma`afu to proceed to Levuka, make his peace with Cakobau and take the oath of office as Viceroy. This assertion is lent credence by a contemporary report in the Fiji Times claiming that Ma`afu’s adhesion had been brought about through “foreign influence”. The report added, significantly, that Cakobau, having always dreaded Ma`afu’s power, now formally recognised the latter’s rule in Lau. Consul March believed that Ma`afu had accepted the post as Viceroy because he had been “flattered with the hope of eventually succeeding to the throne of Fiji”, while the Fiji Times declared that Ma`afu, “whose ideas are more progressive and politic, yielded [to Cakobau]”. The newspaper considered that Tui Lau was influenced by the prospect of formal recognition as a chief of Fiji and by the “much higher understanding in the eyes of foreigners” he would enjoy. It is likely, too, that Ma`afu and other leading chiefs were partly swayed by the promise of a regular salary and formal recognition of their status. Ma`afu had of course been created Tui Lau in 1869, although no such formal recognition from Bau was then forthcoming. Now, he also secured the approval of most influential Europeans, whose views he had always been willing to accommodate, at least in Lau, as a means of strengthening his power. As Viceroy, with both the Vunivalu and most influential whites reconciled to his enlarged power base, Ma`afu was in a position, not merely to await developments, but to use his influence to manipulate them to his advantage.

The new “government of Fiji” was inaugurated at “a large meeting on a hill overlooking … Levuka”, where Cakobau made a short speech and introduced the new “ministry”. Its members were greeted by the “astonished silence” of the Fijians present, accompanied by the jeers of the whites. The same evening, a “monster indignation meeting” in Levuka, reflecting the wide divergence of opinion among Europeans, “strongly condemned” the ministers and declared the new “government” to be “an impertinence and an absurdity”. Although the new regime, despite the derision of Consul March, succeeded in establishing
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itself, its adherence to the constitutional monarchy was never more than a facade. Despite the farcical nature of its inauguration, the “government” maintained itself in office because both Cakobau and Ma`afu had, for widely different reasons, been won over to its cause. The common ground of the two great chiefs lay in the fact that in both their cases, “self-interest was made the moving power”. The nature of chiefly authority in Fiji meant that minor chiefs in both Cakobau’s domain and throughout Lau were bound to adhere to the authority of their rulers. While Ma`afu would support the “government” only for as long as it suited his purpose, there could be no dissenting voice in Lau.

Ma`afu, introduced by Premier Woods and interpreted by settler David Wilkinson, sought to adopt the role of go-between when the “convention” met to draft a constitution. He reminded the delegates that since they were discussing “a question of the greatest consequence”, each clause in the Constitution, as passed by the white delegates, “should be submitted to the native chiefs for discussion in their own language, and in their own Assembly, and if disapproved by them, be referred back to the whites for reconsideration”. Possibly in consequence of this request, “a perfect storm of disaffection” arose in Levuka, with Consul March later declaring that many white settlers, especially those removed from areas controlled by Cakobau and Ma`afu, were “disposed to revolt” against the “burlesque constitutional government”. Albert Manton, despite his commercial dealings with Tui Lau, censured the “government” for taking heed of a chief who “but a short time ago had by evidence produced in their own court been proved the prime cause of the Lovoni war”. The convention nevertheless proceeded, with J.S. Butters, a planter in Macuata, elected as speaker. After some delegates refused to share their meeting room with “natives”, the chiefs eventually resolved the difficulty by sending a message through Ma`afu to the effect that they preferred to deliberate by themselves. The Assembly rejected the notion that Fiji should be controlled “by a government of whites alone, recognising the different native chiefs and recognised by them”. Instead, “the alliance made between Cakobau and Ma`afu was considered to be a sufficient guarantee for the stability of the proposed kingdom”. There was to be a House of Representatives elected by the Europeans, with all cabinet ministers chosen from among its members. Resolutions of the new Assembly would be submitted to the Privy Council, to be composed of Fijian chiefs and the King’s Cabinet. Unable to initiate legislation, the Council could only refer suggested amendments back to the Assembly. The Privy Council came into existence largely as a consequence of Ma`afu’s suggestion that the chiefs should discuss
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each proposed clause of the Constitution at a separate meeting. As the Fiji Times recognised, the creation of separate chambers was designed “to obviate the necessity of the two races mingling in the Assembly and voting together”.\textsuperscript{212} Laws enacted by the two Houses were to be administered by Fijian governors of districts, assisted by a council of Europeans who would be empowered as magistrates. Finally, a Supreme Court would be established, consisting of a chief justice and two assistant judges, one of whom would be Fijian.\textsuperscript{213} Although there was considerable opposition among the white community, principally because of the absence of prior public consultation, the “ministers” of the new administration, including two leading Fijian chiefs, represented a reasonable cross section of the population.\textsuperscript{214} The new “premier”, Sydney Burt, published, along with “The Constitution Act of the Kingdom of Fiji”, a letter to the residents of Fiji, wherein he explained the lack of preliminary meetings and outlined the reasons for Cakobau’s appointment of an Executive.\textsuperscript{215}

Delegates to the Assembly formally submitted to the Vunivalu a “Bill to establish a Constitution in and for the Kingdom of Fiji”. Cakobau, as a constitutional monarch, gave his consent. The new kingdom was to be divided into provinces, along the lines of the existing matanitu, while five ministries were established: a Chief Secretariat and Ministries of Trade and Commerce, Lands and Works, Finance and Native Affairs. Once the royal assent had been given, Consul March adopted a more pragmatic approach, advising Whitehall that whatever the legality of the “present so-called Government”, it was necessary in order to prevent further abuses by the settlers.\textsuperscript{216} However much he had been influenced by his European advisers, the Vunivalu appeared optimistic when he formally closed the Assembly on 18 August. “Ma`afu and I are now of one spirit”, he declared to the delegates. “If there is any difficulty in carrying out this Constitution, it will not be with us but with you white residents”.\textsuperscript{217} How much confidence Cakobau placed in his apparent unity of purpose with Ma`afu is unclear. He was not alone in his optimism, however: missionary Joseph Nettleton in Levuka described the new government as “likely to be permanent”, with the two rival chiefs as “working together very well”.\textsuperscript{218} His colleague
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Frederick Langham, stationed at Bau, appeared only slightly more cautious, noting that “Ma`afu and ... [the] Vunivalu will be able to keep the peace in Fiji”, with Cakobau “fully set to do all that his Ministry tell him to do”. Even the correspondent for The Sydney Morning Herald commented favourably on Ma`afu's agreement to become Viceroy: “That this move will strengthen the hands of the Government is certain”. The Fiji Times saw pragmatism as the reason for the new consensus: since the proposed regime “was largely concerned with the white man's interests”, the chiefs “have met on what may be termed neutral ground and ... have joined ... with the white man, to effect the desired object”. Chagrin was to be the requital of these hopeful observers. Cakobau and Ma`afu meanwhile, apparently steadfast in their desire to remain on cordial terms, appeared conscious of their new status. Consul March lamented that they no longer called at the Consulate “as was their wont and their whole bearing both to the whites and natives is totally different to what it was formerly”.

The acceptance of the 1871 Constitution by the chiefs of Fiji, who entertained no notion of a “kingdom” along the lines of Tonga or Hawai`i, served to confirm Cakobau's status and prestige, especially in relation to the European settlers. Consul March ascribed the chiefs' altered demeanour to the influence of their European advisers. More politically astute than many of the missionaries and sceptical of the “rapprochement” between Cakobau and Ma`afu, the Consul well knew that most other Fijian chiefs were unlikely to “submit” to Cakobau's newly proclaimed status as Tui Viti. Tui Cakau, in particular, continued to resist all overtures from Levuka. “He has lately been making a tour of his dominions [which] include Vanua Levu and Taveuni and ... has everywhere been received with marked signs of respect and recognition ... Tui Cakau has it in his power not to submit to the rule of Cakobau”. Seeming to echo Consul March, the Fiji Times correspondent working at Vuna Point in Taveuni reported that “Tui Cakau refused to listen to the ‘voice of the charmer’ (Ma`afu)” and had decided against visiting Levuka or recognising the new government. “He knows very well that however willing he might be ... to join the new government, his tribe would not do so”. March would remind Whitehall that Tui Cakau, adamant that he was at least as powerful a chief as Cakobau, scorned the leaders of the new “government” when he learned that they possessed no authority from Queen Victoria for their actions. March also doubted whether the chiefs of Fiji understood the proposed constitutional arrangements “in the light in which those framing the present government present it to the world”. Ma`afu, in
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particular, seemed not to understand that he was “made to appear as a subject of Cakobau. Were he free of external influences and asked the question, he would ...

whether or not Ma`afu brought his “charm” to bear on the recalcitrant Tui Cakau, the latter finally came down to Levuka where, after some persuasion and reportedly under the influence of alcohol, he took a verbal oath of allegiance to Cakobau. Present were his putative sovereign as well as Ma`afu, members of the government “and several gentlemen”. Despite swearing allegiance “in a very decided manner”, Tui Cakau refused to append his mark to a written form of the oath. Since his verbal oath in the presence of witnesses was considered sufficient, a further apparent obstacle to the future unity of Fiji was removed.226 In the face of continuing settler disquiet however, the loyalty or otherwise of Fiji’s great chiefs was not the most pressing concern. John Thurston was approached by some other settlers, ostensibly in the name of the new King, “to step up and take the lead”. Thurston quickly declined, looking rather to the day when he might be reappointed as Consul, “which compared to a Fijian portfolio is as a house built on rock, to one upon sand”.227 At the same time, Charles Harris, foreign minister of Hawai`i, compared the new government ministers in Fiji with their counterparts there. In the northern kingdom, most of the Cabinet had been resident in the islands for upwards of 20 years. “With such men”, Harris declared, “[their] identification with the community and knowledge of and sympathy with the native race is perfect”. Displaying remarkable prescience, Harris described the situation in Fiji:

the foreign population, being small in numbers comparatively, and considering themselves settlers only, looking to themselves as entirely superior … [and] think that the Government is made for their convenience … [They] will avoid taxation as much as possible and [will] probably resort to borrowing to defray expenses.228

While the loyalty of powerful chiefs such as Tui Cakau was essential, it could never secure even the short-term stability of the new regime.
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During these early days, attention remained primarily focused on Cakobau, on occasions resplendent in the outward trappings of his high office. “His costume is dark blue cloth, with white facings and cocked hat. He is surrounded by Right Honourable Gentlemen of the Privy Council”. So wrote Thurston, whose tongue rarely quitted his cheek during this time, to his friend Captain Hope. On 30 September, the new monarch took an oath, promising not to be false towards “the Constitution of the Kingdom of Fiji” and to “govern the land and the people according as written therein”. On the same day, 11 leading chiefs swore similar allegiance to Cakobau as King of Fiji. At least one of the subordinate chiefs appears to have repudiated his oath within a month, however: Ratu Kini, Tui Nadroga, claimed “exclusive jurisdiction over his own people and does not acknowledge Cakobau as King of Fiji”. Consul March had earlier described Ratu Kini as “a man of character and ... considerable ability” who “ridiculed the idea of being governed from Bau”. Despite this and similar difficulties, all would depend on the attitude of Ma`afu, who held the future of the “Kingdom of Fiji” in his hand.

Charles St Julian, still Hawaiian Chargé d’Affaires although resident in New South Wales, visited Levuka in August. Upon his return to Sydney, he wrote at length to his friend Charles Harris in Honolulu concerning the Viceroy:

Ma`afu … is a very different man from Cakobau. A splendid looking fellow and a gentleman in his manners whenever he chooses to conform to the usages of civilised society. He is the great chief of the Archipelago. A shrewd far seeing man, with a very large share of ambition, yet with that ambition so tempered and guided by wisdom that he will always prefer the substance to the shadow, and will never lose the one by heedlessly grasping at the other. He has generally acquired an influence in Fiji which is really greater ... than that of Cakobau, although the unquestionably superior Fijian rank of the latter and Ma`afu's Tongan birth renders Cakobau the only person, at present, in whose name Fiji could be made one kingdom. Hence Ma`afu, although he might have successfully opposed the claim of Cakobau to this kingship over the whole archipelago, could not himself ... have acquired this position, found it more politic to give his support, to secure to himself, without question, under the designation of Vice Roy of the Windward Islands, all the power which he already had as Tui Lau and to be placed in the best position for watching events. By most of the settlers and by many even of the superior Fijian chiefs, Ma`afu is regarded as decidedly the
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most fitting man to rule; and when Cakobau dies it is very probable that Ma`afu will be chosen King although there may be some ‘troubles’ thereupon, for there is no relative of Cakobau fit to succeed ... in all probability it will not be very long ere, in some shape or other, [Ma`afu] is the actual ruler of Fiji and the Fijians – native-born and foreign-born. ... [He] thinks ... the success of the present administration is very doubtful [and] ... will remain to watch events and act as circumstances may require.

Although St Julian had “carefully cultivated [Ma`afu’s] acquaintance” during his visit, and unerring though he is on the subject of Ma`afu’s character and motives, his summary of Ma`afu’s views of the new government suggests a degree of dissimulation on the part of the Viceroy. St Julian recounted that Ma`afu, despite his pessimism, felt that “by watchfulness, prudence and energy some governmental superstructure for the entire archipelago may be sustained upon the foundation which has thus been laid down”. If Ma`afu was indeed telling St Julian what he knew the visitor wanted to hear, the visitor appeared alert, if only to a small extent, to the sophistry of his host. St Julian advised the Governor of New South Wales that while Ma`afu appeared sincere in his submission to Cakobau, “he has the ulterior intention of succeeding him as King of Fiji”. While purporting to devote his energies to ensuring the stability and survival of the Kingdom of Fiji, Ma`afu was preparing to profit from the regime’s inevitable demise.

During his visit of three weeks, St Julian discussed with Ma`afu the latter’s invitation to visit Kamehameha in Hawai`i. Ma`afu’s response was that the need “to watch events and act as circumstances may require” precluded an early voyage north. Nevertheless, St Julian reassured Harris, “if [Ma`afu] requires serious advice he will not hesitate to apply to His Hawaiian Majesty’s Government for it, and will continually and especially correspond with myself on the understanding that I will advise him as circumstances may require”. St Julian’s fastidious and affected prose reveals the condescension, even disdain, which appear to have characterised his relations with both chiefs and settlers in Fiji. Ma`afu was ready to promise anything to placate his irksome visitor, while no whit intending to depart from his own agenda.

St Julian’s imperious tones aside, his views concerning Fiji’s constitutional arrangements are worthy of attention, not least because they reflect a genuine understanding of conditions in which Ma`afu’s larger ambitions could be achieved. St Julian believed parliamentary government to be “quite unsuitable” for Fiji, in part because “no government can be permanent or can materially
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advance the prosperity of the country and its people under which there is any such distinction of races or classes as to create any legal inequality”.

The constitution then in the process of formation included precisely such distinctions. “The present Kingdom of Fiji”, St Julian averred, “is ... nothing more than a federal union of chiefdoms ... under regal presidency”.235 The mutual rivalries and jealousies which St Julian recognised not only militated against the survival of a central government, but also provided the potential for a chief such as Ma`afu, who combined ambition with the substance of power, to gain control of the entire archipelago.

Whatever the immediate future held, the adhesion of Ma`afu and Tui Cakau to the new regime was generally welcomed. William Scott, a settler on Ovalau, expressed his “great satisfaction” at the news, which he saw as “a sure guarantee that ... efforts now made for the introduction of law and order will be successful”.236 Settlers in Vanuaabalavu, meanwhile, met at Lomaloma on 16 September to hear the report of their delegates to the recent congress at Levuka. William Hennings reminded his friends that although Ma`afu was no longer “the presiding genius of the Tovata”, his importance was enhanced now that he had accepted the post of Viceroy. His elevation would be “no loss to us”, thought Hennings, “and must be a gain to him and his friends”.237 The settlers of Ma`afu’s “home” province were sufficiently attuned to the constitutional complexities of the day to appoint a five-man committee for the purpose of considering the proposed Constitution clause by clause. The committee was to report back to the residents of Vanuaabalavu a week later, when the residents’ views of the Constitution “as a whole” would be handed to the district Representatives, to be brought before the Assembly in Levuka. Ma`afu himself, apparently warming to the role of Viceroy, presided over a meeting of the Privy Council in Levuka on 24 September. The Council accepted responsibility for the debts of the kingdom, calling at the same time for new taxes due the previous June to be paid, at rates of ten shillings for men and eight shillings for women.238 Ma`afu’s support for the provision was not without irony, in view of future problems that would arise concerning the transfer of Lauan taxes to Levuka.

Comfortable as he might have appeared in his vice-regal role, Ma`afu was not long in expressing some misgiving about Fiji’s new constitutional arrangements. At the recent assembly of chiefs in Levuka, it had been agreed that Tui Bua should permit the chief of Raviravi village in Bua to reoccupy nearby Nabouwalu Point and to rebuild the former village situated there, destroyed during the troubles of the previous year. Cakobau, attempting to exercise his new function as “King” of Fiji
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and despite his earlier rebuff over Solevu, instructed the inhabitants of both that village and Raviravi that the reoccupation should not proceed. Ma`afu became “apprehensive” that Cakobau’s intervention might “cause trouble on [the Bua coast] as it will tend to unsettle the native mind and raise the question whether the establishment of a General Government is a true and real thing or not”. David Wilkinson, secretary to Tui Bua, endorsed Ma`afu’s views, adding that such intervention as that attempted by Cakobau “is just what upset the two previous attempts to unite Fiji under one Head of Government”. According to Wilkinson, “the old custom of [chiefs] interfering with local and internal management of any other chiefdom was to [cease] forever”. Bau had broken through that “law” once before, a move that resulted in the creation of the Tovata ko Lau. Now the Vunivalu was apparently set to repeat his former mistake although, within the dimensions of the traditional Fijian polity, his involvement was justified.

Wilkinson added that although Ma`afu “has joined the General Government with a good heart and is fully prepared to abide by and carry out its laws in their entirety”, he had acted “with the full understanding that all customs of the above kind were to be abandoned … [Ma`afu] fully believes that the General Government is a practicable undertaking … but impossible if such Fijian customs are not forever prohibited”. 239 Ma`afu had seemingly reassured Wilkinson, as he had St Julian, that the new regime would prosper if all concerned obeyed the rules. Was the new Viceroy expressing genuine concern over hindrances to Fiji’s new constitutional path, or was he seeking to expound a philosophy whereby, under the guise of constitutional principle, he might abandon his responsibilities and actively pursue his ambition to become master of Fiji?

10. “There is no doubt Ma`afu means mischief now”

During the second half of 1871, Ma`afu’s role as Viceroy in the new Kingdom of Fiji appeared to overshadow his function as Tui Lau. As trader William Hennings reminded the September meeting of Vatuabulavu planters and traders, Ma`afu now trod a different stage, although his new role was expected to benefit his Lauan “subjects”.¹ Ma`afu’s fortunes were tied to those of the administration, a “government” that was little more than an oligarchy of planters and traders, people described by a visitor to Fiji as “a heterogeneous lot, of whom a considerable proportion are not strictly British subjects”.² However self-interested many members of the government might have appeared, there were among them those who sought to establish a regime which would benefit both Fijians and Europeans. Nevertheless, with few potential sources of revenue and a dependence on the goodwill of local chiefs, the new “kingdom” would always be hard-pressed to enforce its authority, especially in the face of chiefly resistance to the government’s determination to hold them to account. The administrative machinery put into place in 1871 was decidedly top-heavy, involving a multitude of functionaries whose salaries far exceeded anticipated revenue.³ At whatever cost to his longer-term ambitions, Ma`afu would now exercise his authority close to the apex of this excessively large bureaucratic edifice.

Recognising Ma`afu’s overwhelming importance in the new order, The Sydney Morning Herald’s Fiji correspondent noted that his adhesion to the new administration “at once gave a reality to Thakombau’s assumed position as King of Fiji”. The Viceroy’s appearance seemed to enhance his power:

Ma`afu is one of the finest looking men I have ever seen; full in stature and admirably proportioned. His complexion is a clear brown, and his features regular; with nothing of the Negro cast about them. He wears no beard. Ordinarily he dresses in the native costume – a white shirt and an ample garment of tapa from the waist to the ankles, peeping from above the folds of which may be seen his gold watch chain and his white pocket handkerchief. Occasionally, however, Ma`afu dresses in full European costume, and seems quite as much at his ease in garments of broadcloth as in those of linen and tapa. Sometimes it is in a suit of well-fitting black, and at others in … uniform – something like the undress of superior officer in the British navy…

¹ See Ch. 9.
² Charles Cowper to John Dunmore Lang, 3 Nov 1871, Lang Papers, Vol. 7, Correspondence 1855–1877, 1,023.
³ Appropriations Act, 1871.
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As the correspondent was quick to add, “Ma`afu has been mixed up from time to time in all manner of native ‘difficulties’, and has always come out a winner”. His winning ways extended further back than his creation as Tui Lau in 1869, back indeed as far as the valu ni lotu in the 1850s. After the Tovata had been created in 1867, partly as a foil to Cakobau, there had been established in Lau a degree of systematic administration unprecedented in Fiji. Each local chief had retained sovereignty over his traditional domain, with periodic meetings to decide matters of general interest, while Ma`afu’s powers as the supreme chief involved matters affecting the Tovata as a whole. The question in 1871 was whether a similarly efficient administration could evolve in a larger and more complex society, where elements of the fast-growing European population demanded a regime which would satisfy their needs while keeping all Fijians, chiefs and commoners alike, in their place.

Ma`afu, more aware than any other chief in Fiji that the special circumstances of the new government were markedly different to those pertaining to the Tovata, appeared to settle well into his new vice-regal role. When Cakobau made a formal visit to the Legislative Assembly on 3 November, Ma`afu attended him, with the American and Hawaiian Consuls among other dignitaries also part of the King’s train. Prospects for the stability of the new administration received a boost a day later when Ritova, Tui Macuata, newly arrived from his matanitu, “took the oath of allegiance to Cakobau and his seat as a member of the Privy Council”. Ma`afu, seeking to profit from Ritova’s long-sought participation, left for Macuata the next day “on government business”, carrying despatches from both the government and Ritova and “armed with authority to stop the war”. His ostensible commitment to the stability of the new regime nevertheless appeared less than equivocal as early as December, when some members of the Polynesia Company petitioned Parliament, seeking redress of a grievance arising from Ma`afu’s actions. Despite having renounced all claims to Beqa on becoming Viceroy, Ma`afu had later prevented officers of the Company from surveying the island, although it is unclear whether his intervention occurred after he took the oath of office. He reportedly revived his former claim to half of Beqa, an island Cakobau had sold in its entirety to the Company. It appeared that the Viceroy’s probity was already being called into question.

Displaying an aplomb befitting his new role, Ma`afu chaired the Privy Council on 28 November when, in the presence of 28 chiefs and governors, the King
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4 SMH, 26 Oct 1871, 5.
5 FT, 4 Nov 1871.
6 FT, 11 Nov 1871.
7 ibid., 20 Dec 1871.
8 ibid., 18 Nov 1871.
formally opened proceedings. Two days later, the Viceroy could not attend the Council because of indisposition, although he resumed the Chair on 1 December. The routine press reports of these and other viceregal duties do not disguise the King’s dependence on his Viceroy, however irksome Ma’afu’s appointment was to Cakobau. When the King visited the Legislative Assembly again on 6 December,

He was escorted by a small number of his own bodyguard and a guard of honor composed of about forty of Ma’afu’s men under the command of His Excellency’s son. These latter marched to the beat of a drum in a very soldier-like manner keeping good step and time, and in white shirts and fringed sulus looked well. On arriving at the Parliament House the King’s soldiers accompanied him to the building but Ma’afu’s men plied arms … and remained in the roadway.

Ma’afu, as the Minister for Lands and Works observed in Parliament three days later, was to be the Commander-in-Chief of military and naval forces, with the governors of provinces acting under him as colonels. While his men, so smartly turned out, formed an honour guard for the King, the Viceroy might have been contemplating the day when the same forces might be turned against their putative master.

The first session of Fiji’s Parliament was inevitably very busy, with provision being made for postal services, land regulations, public works and the importation of labour, all measures meant to benefit the settlers. The estimated costs of this legislation would be met by direct taxation, with a poll tax, set at £2 per head for Europeans and £1 per head for Fijians, being imposed. The Viceroy appeared concerned at the severity of these amounts, urging that the King be petitioned to lower the tax for “the native population” to two and a half dollars, with “the native chiefs [to] be instructed to assist … forthwith the whole to be paid to His Majesty’s Treasury before 31 December”. After the prorogation of Parliament on 14 December, to reconvene on 2 May 1872, Ma’afu attended a ball at Levuka the next evening, given in honour of government ministers.

Whatever the eventual fate of the taxation regulations, the new regime appeared more secure when Golea, Tui Cakau, the islands’ third most powerful chief, took
Ma’afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

the oath of office as a Privy Councillor and assumed his seat as a Councillor on 21 December. His initial reluctance to swear allegiance to Cakobau and take his place in the new order had largely been overcome by Ma’afu, whose influence continued to guide Tui Cakau’s actions. At the end of the year the island of Rabe, traditionally belonging to Cakaudrove and the only part of Fiji owned by Tupou I, had finally been sold to three Sydney businessmen, one of whom, John Hill, resided on the island. Tui Cakau, who opposed the sale on the grounds that the island was properly his, refused to remove the inhabitants until directed to do so by Ma’afu. Hill appealed to the British Consul, asking him to bring his influence to bear on Ma’afu to issue to necessary direction to Tui Cakau. It was clear that, with the new Kingdom of Fiji less than six months old, all the eastern and northern islands of the archipelago, the domains of Tui Lau and Tui Cakau, would remain as integral parts of the kingdom only as long as the Viceroy was disposed to support the status quo.

While the Viceroy’s authority remained unchallenged, the same could not be said for that of the King. Debate in the first session of Parliament on the Crown Lands Bill, subsequently withdrawn, revealed contradictory views concerning Cakobau’s power in relation to the lands of powerful chiefs such as Ma’afu, Tui Cakau and Tui Nadroga. One Colonel Hamilton, representing Nadroga, declared that if Cakobau had visited that province, Tui Nadroga “would have scoffed him”. Tui Nadroga had certainly asserted his customary rights, albeit in a new guise, appointing two planters as his agents for land sales and advising Consul March that appeal would be made to him should “any attempt” be made by “Cakobau and his agents native or European to interfere with Tui Nadroga’s rights”. The chief required a guarantee that those rights would be respected before he would travel to Levuka and take his place in Cakobau’s Privy Council. In the case of Ma’afu, Hamilton claimed, without providing details, that the Viceroy “had participated in a certain arrangement between the King and Tui Nadroga”. The frustration of these and other chiefs can come as no surprise, since the Bill proposed to convert all Fijian land not occupied by Europeans into Crown land, in direct defiance of the traditional rights of the mataqali. Crown land would, in theory, be at the King’s disposal, with the King acting on the advice of his ministers. For the rulers of the matanitu, unacquainted with such an alien concept of land tenure and always jealous of their ascendancy, the proposed fundamental changes to Fijian custom were intolerable.

16 Statement by Sydney Charles Burt, Chief Secretary, FGG, 21 Dec 1871, quoted in FT, 23 Dec 1871.
17 John Hill to BC, Saturday, (no date), BCFP; re Rabi: Evidence before Commission 11 December 1875, Minutes of the Executive Council Sitting for the Rehearing of Claims to Lands 1879–1880, Appendix C, 83B and 83C. Agreement to sell had been made in June 1870, although the deed was not signed until 26 December 1871, in Nuku’alofa. Tupou I received a price of £1,300 from Hill and also Edward and John Dawson, both of Sydney. See Ch. 9, ns 34–35.
18 FT, 18 Nov 1871; CRD 1069, BCFP.
A subsequent Royal Commission into Quiet Land Titles, which met a few times in early 1872, merely shelved the problem. The Commission, in a statement of principle, articulated the dilemma facing the government:

In consequence of the variety ... of claims to land in Fiji, and the extreme difficulty of ascertaining the full force of native customs and traditions; and the prerogatives of rank, the Commissioners find it impossible to lay down fixed principles or rules by which they shall in all cases be guided...19

Gaining control over “unoccupied” lands in Fiji had been a prime motivation of Fiji’s new “Constitution”. The Royal Commissioners were saying, in effect, that the problem of land tenure was too hard of resolution now. It would remain so throughout the short life of the Kingdom of Fiji.

In “reviewing” a year of unprecedented change, the Fiji Times expressed greater optimism about the new regime than was reflected on the floor of Parliament. “The native chiefs have given ... their adhesion to the King and the Constitution, almost without exception ... Ma’afu and Tui Cakau, with a whole host of followers, are now the supporters of the [government]”.20 Other voices were markedly less sanguine. Charles St Julian, still Hawaiian Consul-General in Sydney, described the prospects of the new Fijian government as “anything but certain”, owing to the prevalence of faction and the likelihood of a successful challenge to the government, a challenge Cakobau would neither understand nor tolerate.21 While St Julian better represented the true situation in Fiji than did the newspaper, there was another observer even more closely attuned to Fijian Realpolitik. Lorimer Fison’s mordacious views of the settlers’ regime owed nothing to diplomacy: “They have everything belonging to a kingdom, excepting the king, the executive power, the subjects and the revenue ... Cakobau is no more king of Fiji than I am. They can act through the chiefs alone”. Although writing from Sydney, Fison relied on “thoroughly trustworthy” correspondents in Fiji, from whom he learned that “not a few of the chiefs are already bitterly incensed against the [government]”. Fison could never envisage Cakobau as a constitutional monarch: “He has never acknowledged any law [or] political action but his own ... If the white men think they can do as they like with him, setting him up as a sort of Roi fainéant, and making him their tool, they are very much mistaken. He is made of very different stuff”. More importantly, Fison saw the professed loyalty of Ma’afu as nothing more than a chimera: “Ma’afu ... took the oath of allegiance; but I learn from Fijian letters that he understood it in a sense very different from that in which the Government understood it,

---

19 Royal Commission into Quiet Land Titles, Minute Book 1872–74, NAF.
20 FT, 30 Nov 1871. The Australian press disagreed: see, for example, The Age of 8 Jan 1872, which predicted “a stormy future” for the Fijian government.
21 Charles St Julian to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Kingdom of Hawai’i, 24 Nov 1871, AH.
and will not consider himself bound thereby as Cakobau’s subject”. 22 Ma`afu himself, in the reservations he expressed to David Wilkinson concerning Cakobau’s “interference” in Bua, did much to confirm Fison’s pessimism. 23 Tui Lau’s oath of allegiance was conditional, dependent on a collective renunciation by Fiji’s chiefs of a practice in which they had long been nurtured.

Events were to demonstrate that Fison’s views, on the government generally and on Ma`afu’s participation in particular, could not be gainsaid. For the moment Consul March, no friend to the administration, seemed to echo the missionary in his advice to Whitehall:

Cakobau, in whose name the government … is conducted, has not the mental capacity to comprehend the meaning of the ‘laws’ to which he is represented as having assented, and consequently … the real governing power is in the hands of his advisers who, it is well known, do not command any confidence or respect. 24

The British government, concerned less with Cakobau’s “mental capacity” than with the new regime’s actual authority, was prepared to accord de facto recognition to the Kingdom of Fiji, while absolutely declining formal recognition “without much fuller information as to its character and prospects”. Stability, as well as protection of the lives and property of British subjects resident in Fiji, were Whitehall’s chief concerns. 25 The Fiji Times described the lack of public confidence in the government as a “political crisis”, while Premier George Austin Woods left for Sydney in order to secure a loan. 26 The Argus in Melbourne reflected popular opinion in Australia when it predicted “a stormy future” for the new Kingdom of Fiji. 27

As has been shown, the most difficult initial problem confronting the Cakobau Government was the question of land. Most of the ministers, nurtured as they were in the settler colonies in Australia and New Zealand, sought to replicate the settler ascendancy of their homelands. The Royal Commission’s failure even to attempt a resolution was an admission of defeat in the face of the maze of Fijian custom. For the time being at least, questions of individual landholdings would be dealt with on a makeshift basis. Ma`afu, acting as a private individual rather

22 Lorimer Fison to his brother [William Fison], 26 Dec 1871, Press Copy book: sermons, articles and letters, 1867–1873, ML.
23 See Ch. 9, n. 239.
24 Consul March to FO, 26 Jan 1872, FO58/131.
25 FO to Adm., 29 Dec 1871, FO58/122; minute to March to FO no. 32, 30 Dec 1871, FO58/120. See also Lord Kimberley to Lord Belmore, 3 Nov 1871, quoted in G.C. Henderson, ed., Fijian Documents, Political and Constitutional 1858–1875, Sydney 1938.
26 GB PP, C.124.
27 TA, 8 Jan 1872.
than as Viceroy, lost no time in asserting his rights to Vanuabalavu following an application by settler George Winter for a Crown grant of the island. Ma`afu protested, through John Thurston, to the Royal Commission:

I am requested [Thurston wrote] by His Excellency the Viceroy of Lau to inform you he enters a protest and caveat against [Winter’s application].

His Excellency states that Vanuabalavu is his private property and together with other private landed property was secured by him by treaty under date of 24 July 1871. That Vanuabalavu was his long before the establishment of Government in Fiji and that Mr Winter has not and never had any claim to the island.28

In similar vein, Ma`afu protested to the Minister for Native Affairs concerning another settler claim, that of Joseph and William Reece, immigrants from New Zealand, who had “purchased” Moala in January 1871. It was stated that when a deed of conveyance was executed between William Reece and Cakobau, Reece was aware that the title to Moala “was not perfect without Ma`afu’s consent”, which was never obtained.29 Ma`afu now refuted the sale in explicit terms:

in consequence of my treaty with His Majesty any such claim cannot be entertained by me. The quiet and undisturbed [possession] of the Yasayasa Moala … guaranteed by the Kingdom of Fiji must never be questioned … such quiet and undisturbed possession was held by me prior to the establishment of the General Government, and in order to preserve the peace of the country and not to disturb the welfare of the whites I accepted the guarantee from His Majesty being well assured at the time that His Majesty’s Government would immediately take such steps as to quiet any demands of the nature which Mr Reece now makes.30

His title was never in danger: the Royal Commissioners were unanimous in finding that, in the absence of Ma`afu’s consent, the Reece brothers possessed “no claim whatever … to Moala”.31 The Minister for Native Affairs minuted Ma`afu’s letter: “The Viceroy’s interest in Moala will be duly protected”.32 Ma`afu’s sovereignty in all of Lau had been seen to accord both with Fijian custom and English law at the 1865 enquiry conducted by Consul Jones. Now, the Tui Lau and Viceroy would brook no interference with his rights so unambiguously defined seven years earlier.

28 John Bates Thurston to Secretary, Royal Lands Commissioners, 23 Jan 1872, CG Set 43. Winter’s application exempted Susui, Munia and Avea, which had been privately sold by George Henry, and about two and a half acres in Lomaloma, purchased by William Beddoes.
29 FT, 20 Jun 1872.
30 Ma`afu to F.W. Hennings, Minister for Native Affairs, 24 Feb 1872, CG Set 41.
31 FT, 20 Jun 1872.
32 Ma`afu to Hennings, 24 Feb 1872.
With his sovereignty apparently in jeopardy, although safe enough in reality, Ma`afu was formally appointed as Governor of Lau on 10 February 1872. His kinsman Ratu Tevita Uluilakeba was made Lieutenant Governor, while Louis Biganzoli, a settler on Vatuva Balavu, became Secretary of Lau.\(^{33}\) One month later, William Hennings was formally designated as Warden of the Eastern Group, an appointment which would enhance his already considerable influence in Lau.\(^{34}\) Secure in office and with his subordinates in place, Ma`afu appeared to settle into the minutiae of his administrative responsibilities. After 40 labourers, alleging brutal treatment, absconded from the Vatuva Balavu plantation of a settler named Ducker, Ma`afu recommended to the Ministry for Native Affairs that Ducker “conciliate his people by a more liberal treatment”. Ma`afu subsequently failed to honour an undertaking to return the men to their plantation.\(^{35}\) He also reassured an American settler that the Lauan island of Vatu Vara, where the American had interests, would henceforth be tabu, in order to avoid a recurrence of “alleged depredations” by “His Majesty’s native subjects”.\(^{36}\) He even lent his yacht, the Xarifa, to join the pursuit of four Solomon Islander labourers supposedly involved in the “massacre” of four Europeans in Rewa.\(^{37}\) When a Macuata settler named Bardwell, avowedly disappointed following contacts with a local chief, sought the Viceroy’s help, Ma`afu admonished the settler for having laboured under a disillusion concerning “both my functions as Viceroy and my office as Governor of Lau”. While defending the rights of the chiefs, Ma`afu did not fail to reassure Bardwell “that any well founded claims will immediately cause my interference on behalf of the aggrieved party”.\(^{38}\) Louis Biganzoli’s constrained prose in reporting these matters creates an impression of impartiality and balance, where the Viceroy administers his Lauan realm with favour to none. What, then, can be made of the despatch from Lau to Levuka of 23 Tongan “troops” aboard Ma`afu’s cutter, the Vivid? The Fiji Times reported their arrival:

This is a valuable addition to the brigade already in Levuka, and swells the force at the command of the Ministry to such extraordinary dimensions that they will be able at last to take the Government of the country into their own hands, and enforce the laws of the realm.\(^{39}\)

Did the newspaper’s derision mask more baleful aspirations on the part of Ma`afu? His force was small, yet was he perhaps sending a less than subtle reminder to the precarious settler regime in Levuka of the power which the Viceroy and Governor of Lau could summon if need arose?

\(^{33}\) FGG, 10 Feb 1872.
\(^{34}\) ibid., 8 Mar 1872.
\(^{35}\) Ma`afu to F.W. Hennings, 5 Feb 1872, CG Set 43; Swanston to I.P.M. Ducker, 22 Jul 1872, Swanston to Biganzoli, 29 Aug and 7 Oct 1872, CG Set 44.
\(^{36}\) Ma`afu to E. Thompson, 19 Feb 1972, GHMP NAF 1/Temp. 18.
\(^{37}\) Joseph Nettleton to BC, 18 Feb 1872, MOM 1.
\(^{38}\) Ma`afu to Bardwell, 17 Feb 1872, GHMP NAF 1/Temp. 18.
\(^{39}\) FT, 6 Mar 1872.
Consul March was not sanguine concerning the regime’s prospects. Advising
the Foreign Office that the principal chiefs’ subjection to Cakobau was “of
appearance only”, he added that the government was one of “artifice [with]
no solid basis”. Immigration had ceased, there was “a regular exodus of
settlers”, commerce had reached “its lowest ebb” and “British subjects [had]
daily complained [to March] of the ‘despotism’” under which they lived.40
Such discontent was not surprising, given some of the unique features of the
kingdom’s government. The men who bore the grand titles of Prime Minister,
Minister of Finance and Minister of Trade were all retail traders in Levuka,
with shops adjacent to one another. An Australian newspaper correspondent
was to write of the “extravagant airs” and “absurd pretensions” of these “self-
appointed advisers of the king”.41 There was an opposition, also self-appointed:
the British Subjects’ Mutual Protection Society, which “found a sympathetic
ear” in Consul March.42 On a positive note, 60 bales of Fijian cotton, grown by
the Ryder brothers of Mago, was exhibited to favourable notice in Melbourne.43
The Viceroy’s apparent administrative zeal and devotion to duty must be seen
against this background of chiefly disquiet, latent settler hostility to their peers
set in authority over them, and the massive reliance on a single commodity
whose producers, with few exceptions, lacked sufficient capital and expertise
and whose price was, even then, launched into a downward trajectory.

During his early months in office, the Viceroy likely remained unaware of the
diplomatic and legal ferment that continued to envelop the “government” of
which he formed a part. In New South Wales, whence some of Fiji’s Ministers had
come, the Attorney-General, Sir James Martin, believed that “the establishment
[of a government] by so small and heterogeneous a body of persons” would
inevitably lead to foreign intervention. Further, the right of British subjects
“to throw off their allegiance, and … form themselves into an independent
state, has not … been recognised”.44 Martin advocated either annexation or
Imperial recognition of the novel regime. Whitehall, seemingly uninterested
in colonial opinion, peremptorily reminded Sydney that “the Colonial
Governments” should conform to the Imperial authorities’ decision to recognise
the administration in Fiji “as a de facto Government”.45 While not refuting such
a direction, the Chief Justice of New South Wales was careful to forward to the
Colonial Secretary, Lord Kimberley, a “Manifesto” from the British Subjects’
Mutual Protection Society in Fiji, declaring their government illegal on the
grounds that “British subjects cannot unite with a native sovereign to form a

40 March to FO, 5 Feb 1872 and 20 Mar 1872, FO 58/131.
41 Litton Forbes, Two Years in Fiji, London 1875, 324. For a discussion of settler discontent in Cakaudrove
and Lau, see John Young, Adventurous Spirits: Australian migrant society in pre-cession Fiji, St Lucia 1984, Ch. 8.
42 March to Lord Granville, 20 Mar 1872, FO58/131.
43 TA, 21 Mar 1872, 5.
44 Sir James Martin to Administration of the [NSW] Govt, 17 Apr 1872, Belmore Papers.
45 Lord Kimberley to the Officer Administering the [NSW] Government, 12 Apr 1872, GB PP C.509.
government”. More germane to the petitioners’ purpose was their expressed determination “to resist the government’s attempts to collect taxes”.46 This flurry of correspondence between Levuka, Sydney and London would bear fruit within three years, with Cession. In the meantime the Viceroy, impervious to these legal and constitutional niceties, went about his business.

Secure though Ma`afu appeared in Lau, his business could not be divorced from deliberations at the centre of the empire that looked on the strange new “Kingdom of Fiji” with an uneasy mix of puzzlement and disdain. Debate in the House of Commons over the question of annexation, while cognisant of “philanthropy and the growth of cotton”, remained mindful of the fact that “the British taxpayer must not be entirely forgotten”. On 15 June 1872, a motion calling for the annexation of Fiji was defeated by 135 votes to 84, a result influenced by Prime Minister William Gladstone’s view that such a move would be “impolitic” without a formal request from Fiji.47 Whether such a request should come from Fiji’s chiefs, or its government Ministers, or both, was not canvassed in the debate. In any case, the question was premature, given the divergence of opinion among both settlers and chiefs. The unease felt by adherents of the British Subjects’ Mutual Protection Society was reflected in the outcome of a public meeting held in Levuka on 14 June. A petition, praying that the British government would grant Fiji “Protection for ten, fifteen or twenty years”, was signed by “Ma`afu, King of Lau” on behalf of himself, Tui Bua and Tui Cakau. Cakobau “King of Bau” also signed, as did 120 white residents.48 Protection, in the eyes of the settlers who signed, meant nothing more than security for their vested interests, with no provision for the welfare of the Fijians. John Thurston, who became the government’s Chief Secretary in May, did not forward the petition to London until October, a delay probably inspired by his contempt for the Consul. Nevertheless, the existence of the petition meant that, whatever the British Parliament’s resolutions might be, Whitehall was not done with the matter of Fiji. In view of Ma`afu’s oscillating opinions about British control during cession negotiations 18 months later, the question of his motive in such a public declaration of intent at this time must be posed. He might well have realised that the kind of “protection” sought would give both chiefs and settlers much greater freedom to contrive a constitutional relationship than would be possible if annexation were to occur. At the very least Ma`afu, aware that London would show no interest, at least in the short term, felt that his own purposes would be best served by a show of common cause with his fellow chiefs and a representative body of settlers.

46 Sir Alfred Stephen to Lord Kimberley, 19 Apr 1872, No. 24, CO 201/569.
48 For the text of the petition, see FT, 30 Oct 1872.
Ma`afu, Viceroy since August 1871, retained the title of Tui Lau granted him two years earlier. As we have seen, it was as Tui Lau that his authority was invoked in the enquiry into the supposed purchase of Moala. He possessed yet another dignity: Commander-in-Chief of Lau.\textsuperscript{49} In that capacity, he made formal application for a further official appointment for his son Siale`ataongo, then aged in his late twenties and often referred to in Fiji as Charley Ma`afu. The Commander-in-Chief and Viceroy requested that Siale, already “captain commanding the military forces of the eastern group, may receive his commission as a captain in the Permanent Staff”.\textsuperscript{50} The request was granted when Cakobau formally appointed “Charles Ataogo Ma`afu” as “Captain of the Eastern Contingent of the Military and Armed Constabulary” in July.\textsuperscript{51} This appointment might also have owed something to a complaint by Robert Swanston to the Native Commissioner in Levuka. “Captain Ma`afu”, Swanston wrote, “has been overstepping his duties and in so doing is likely to cause disturbance”. Having arrested several people without a warrant, Siale, along with his father, was to be “notified that Charles Ma`afu is not in any way connected with the police and that he must not interfere with the duties of the police”. According to David Wilkinson, Siale had promised to mend his ways and not to interfere, an undertaking that might have prompted the official appointment.\textsuperscript{52} Whether Ma`afu senior was moved by pride or chagrin at the curious turn of events is not recorded.

It was as Viceroy, rather than as Commander-in-Chief, that Ma`afu’s name was most often heard during the short life of the Cakobau Government. During the eventful month of June 1872, the Minister of Finance proposed in Parliament that $4,000 be granted to “His Excellency Ma`afu” in compensation for the amount of £2,000 to £3,000 “of law revenue” which the Viceroy had transferred to General Revenue. This move was purely pro forma, to enable debate on the proposed Budget to proceed. Ma`afu, probably to his regret, did not receive this largesse. He did appear in his full dignity, however, on Saturday 15 June when, at 9 a.m., he took his seat as President of the Privy Council. The new Chief Secretary, John Thurston, formally tendered to “His Excellency the Viceroy … the congratulations of this Council and of so many influential chiefs of the realm”.\textsuperscript{53} The ritual bespoke order, stability and unity of purpose, with Ma`afu presiding over a body of chiefs and ministers who were content with their respective roles in the new order. The reverse was in fact true: when Thurston

\textsuperscript{49} See Ch. 9, n. 197.
\textsuperscript{50} Ma`afu to Minister of Lands and Works, 3 Jun 1872, CG Set 31.
\textsuperscript{51} FGG, 10 Jul 1872.
\textsuperscript{52} Robert Swanston, Memo for the Native Commissioner, 4 Jul 1872, with minute by David Wilkinson, CG Set 43. On 1 Aug 1872, Wilkinson was appointed as Native Commissioner and Chief Interpreter. FGG, 12 Aug 1872.
\textsuperscript{53} FT, 24 Jun 1872.
found time to describe the proceedings to his old friend Captain Hope, he described them as “a most extraordinary attempt to establish a Government with such incongruous elements”.\(^\text{54}\)

Incongruity or no, both Viceroy and King pursued their constitutional duties. On 20 June, they jointly wrote to the Ministers on behalf of themselves and “the Chiefs and Governors of the Provinces of Fiji”. Ostensibly, they wished “to enquire into certain administration matters which we are not well acquainted with”. They claimed to want only four “persons” to head the government: John Thurston, Robert Swanston, William Hennings and George Austin Woods. The last was criticised for too hasty an introduction of European ways, while the question of money, always a bugbear of the Cakobau Government, was raised. How were the many “officials, clerks and foreigners” in the administration to be paid? As chiefs of Fiji, the responsibility of Cakobau, Maʻafu and their peers lay with their people and their lands, especially during planting season, now upon them. They were all eager to return to their villages, but their new duties kept them in Levuka, trying to accommodate the routines and rituals of an alien administrative structure which appeared unduly large and, at least to some of the chiefs, difficult to comprehend. “Ship with big sail is easily capsized”, the chiefs reminded the Ministers. “The boom should be shortened so that we can sail on well”.\(^\text{55}\)

Wise counsel certainly, but the ministers were unlikely to pay heed. If the Viceroy, urging caution and restraint, possessed plans beyond the faithful execution of his duties, he had yet to reveal his hand.

The province of Lau, Maʻafu’s special responsibility in the new kingdom as it had been in the Tovata, seems, on the scanty evidence available for mid 1872, to have been administered efficiently. It was alone among the matanitu of Fiji in providing an increased subscription to the Wesleyan mission, which attributed reduced contributions elsewhere to “the people having to pay taxes”.\(^\text{56}\)

Towards the end of June, with Parliament still in session, Maʻafu was planning a trip to Vanuabalavu and Bua, in company with Tui Bua, in order to investigate problems brought to their notice by the wardens for Lau and Bua.\(^\text{57}\)

The Viceroy appeared likely to leave Levuka earlier than planned since, in what might well have been a tactical move, he complained of “indisposition” occasioned by “the annoyance and irritation to which His Excellency is subjected by the persistent visits of whites … by whom he complains he is greatly harassed in his position”. Maʻafu proposed to return home to Lomaloma for recuperation, a move which so alarmed the Cabinet that several Ministers were due to meet him on 27 June in order to urge him to remain in Levuka until the close of the Parliamentary

---
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session. Such harassment as Ma`afu complained about is feasible, given the fractious nature of political life in the kingdom and the need to gain the Viceroy’s ear. Nevertheless, Ma`afu might have welcomed an opportunity to distance himself, literally and figuratively, from the planter oligarchy that was the Kingdom of Fiji, a first inducement, perhaps, to abrogate his vice-regal role in the pursuit of wider ambitions.

Ma`afu found Europeans in his own domain decidedly less irksome, especially since, thanks to his proclaimed support for the government, the settlers of Lau were inclined to follow suit. The same applied to their counterparts in Cakaudrove and Bua, where Ma`afu possessed great influence and whose paramount chiefs also appeared favourably disposed to Levuka. At a meeting of settlers and European residents held in Lomaloma on 18 April, the Viceroy had been unequivocal in his support for the King. He spoke with particular reference to the actions of some Vanuabalavu chiefs who sought to prevent some of their men, who had gained government approval, from working as labourers for planters on the island:

> I am a member of the Government, and I will uphold that Government; the old style of going about with guns will not do, it might be Fijian fashion in past years – we have got rid of it in Tonga! Fiji is doing the same; Cakobau says ‘Have this done in this province, and that in that province’ and we obey his orders … It is not good … your trying to go against the Government and the Vunivalu. … Lau is at peace, you cannot disturb it. … When the men’s time is up, they will return, and not sooner.

The ramifications of Ma`afu’s participation in the government reached beyond Lau and even Fiji: Sir Alfred Stephen, Chief Justice of New South Wales, advised Consul March that “since the accession to [Cakobau’s] authority of Ma`afu and the only other unwavering chief”, Stephen felt “justified” in concluding that Cakobau was now “the acknowledged chief or king of the entire group or territory”. Stephen, versed in English constitutional law and practice, lacked acquaintance with the Realpolitik of Fiji. The rosy picture he painted nevertheless bore some relevance to the situation in Lau, as long as Ma`afu represented the authority, if only asserted, of “the acknowledged chief or king” of Fiji.

Even at play, if appearances can be believed, Ma`afu displayed his leadership qualities. In May, he joined in celebrations of Queen Victoria’s birthday at Lomaloma, when hundreds of Fijian, Tongan and European residents of Lau gathered for a sports carnival and regatta, events favoured by “a light south-easterly breeze with a calm sea”. The Xarifa, as well as Ma`afu’s schooner Tui
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Lau, “which latter was the flagship, were streaming from the trucks to the decks with gorgeous bunting”. In a “Handicap Sailing Boat Race”, the Viceroy, his energies apparently undiminished by his exertions in Parliament, steered a blue skiff himself, winning by five minutes. The second placegetter was “His Excellency Ma`afu’s Butcher Boat”. The day’s events, planned to offer something for everyone, included a “Swimming Race for Natives”, where the victor was “a plantation labourer”, and “climbing a greasy pole” – for labourers only – won by “a Santo man”. Festivities culminated with a dinner at the Lomaloma Hotel, described by a Lauan planter:

His Excellency the Viceroy was conspicuous throughout the day for his bonhomie and his evident desire to promote the harmony and success of the meeting; in fact, his exertions tired him so much, that he was unable to be present at the dinner. However, on the proposal of his health, the toast was duly and appropriately responded to by his son, who, amongst other things, said that his father was much pleased that his own people should have had an opportunity of witnessing and participating in the variety of amusements arranged by the whites, and that he thought meetings of the sort calculated to inspire and promote more good feeling between the different races than could be obtained in any other manner.61

While Ma`afu was demonstrating his nautical skills, the second session of Fiji’s Parliament opened in the capital. It was presided over, in the absence of King and Viceroy, by the group’s new Chief Justice, Charles St Julian, recently arrived from Sydney.62 When the ministry of Sydney Burt resigned a few days later, a new administration under George Austin Woods as Premier was formed. Ma`afu, having escaped the political fray in Levuka, could take his ease at home in Lomaloma, with none to gainsay either his loyalty to the Kingdom of Fiji or his place in the hearts of his Lauan people, whether Fijian, Tongan or European. The Fiji Times, ever alert to the slightest quiver from Lomaloma, reported at the end of May that “pigs, fowls, yams and provisions of all kinds are forbidden to be sold, as His Excellency is expecting a visit from his most gracious majesty King George of Tonga, who will of course bring a swarm of human locusts with him, which will leave the district in a state of famine”.63 Although the newspaper could deride the Tongans at will, it could never ignore their presence in Lau. The expected visit appears not to have taken place.

The political fray continued in Levuka, where Swanston, one of the four “persons” favoured by Ma`afu and the King, was appointed Minister for Native
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10. “There is no doubt Ma`afu means mischief now”

Affairs. He sought advice from the Viceroy’s secretary on a somewhat arcane constitutional question: “I wish to request that you will examine Ma`afu’s commission and ascertain therefrom whether Ma`afu is Viceroy of Lau or of Fiji and report to the Ministry”.64 Although the secretary’s reply, along with the commission itself, has not survived, it appears that Ma`afu was in fact Viceroy of Fiji, not that it mattered among the political ebbs and flows in Levuka. A more pressing concern for the new government was raising revenue: Howard Clarkson, Minister of Finance, was quick to remind provincial governors and secretaries of the necessity to gather outstanding taxes, even issuing advice about how they should be collected. The zealous minister was driven by more than his government’s immediate financial needs. The “natives”, Clarkson instructed the provincial secretaries, were to be reminded that “there is a power to which they are paying tribute and therefore rendering it easier for them to understand the new relations in which they stand to the government”.65 As a means of ensuring that the “natives” would be in a position to pay, Premier Woods advised the Executive Council to issue a proclamation “making it incumbent on every adult aboriginal male to plant and keep in order 200 cotton trees, or some other produce equivalent thereto”.66 During the following two years before Cession, Ma`afu was to prove efficient in the collection of taxes in Lau, albeit reluctant to see those taxes pass through his hands on the one-way journey to Levuka.

The Viceroy’s private financial difficulties, for which taxation revenue would, in the near future, suggest itself as a remedy, were already upon him. George Moore, a Levuka shipwright and creditor of Ma`afu, approached Swanston to seek the Minister’s aid in settling the debt. Swanston duly forwarded particulars to Biganzoli, at the same time reminding Moore that it was not the Ministry’s role “to collect accounts due by Governors of Provinces or other Native Chieftains … therefore you will understand that … no precedent is being established.”67 There is no record of whether the debt was ever discharged. For the moment, though, the Viceroy remained beyond reproach in the performance of his public duties. At 11 a.m. on 23 July, again deputising for an absent Cakobau and with his approach heralded by “a salvo of guns from the Government Battery”, Ma`afu, “dressed in a uniform of a Post Captain of the British Navy”, entered the House. Empowered by His Majesty’s Commission, which the Clerk of the House read to Members and visitors, all of whom were standing, the Viceroy gave Royal Assent to 20 bills, before proroguing Parliament until 1 May 1873.68 The King’s speech, couched in the formal language of administration, was a predictable summary of measures passed in the session just concluded, of which
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the Polynesian Immigration Act, designed to curb many evils of the labour trade, was the most important. The King concluded by expressing satisfaction with the visits to Fiji of foreign ships of war and enlarged on the favourable prospects for the cotton industry. It was left to the Viceroy, in his own speech, to awaken the members from their slumber. After thanking them for their diligence in the performance of their Parliamentary duties, Ma`afu warmed to his theme:

You who are English men, you who are Americans, and us who are dark skinned, we see new things now, what we behold today is strange to Fiji … I name it a good age … I am thankful and rejoice at our unity in thus making the laws … but … I have something on my mind I wish to say…

I ask you whites how is it that you cannot be of one mind or agree on what we are now endeavouring to do. It appears to me that as soon as it is thought well to do anything that is good, several rise up to oppose it and prevent it being accomplished. … We chiefs were formerly all divided amongst ourselves. I had my state and laws at Lau; there were different chiefs and different laws to leeward, and each followed his own way; but we are now one under the same laws, under the same King, and we are glad of it and desire it, but you (the white race) are divided…

I shall soon leave for Lau, but it will be to do my duty, and not as some have said to me, to go my own way. The position I hold is understood; if trouble arise in any part of the Laws, and I am required, I shall be at my post, with what help ever the Government may require, for in the matter of a government, I have but one mind, and the King of Fiji, who has appointed me to represent him here today, has but one mind, and we are agreed to stand or fall by our Government; and if you whites as a whole will not help us, we will do it ourselves in company with those few who will. We are the natives. It is our land. … if you will resist the Government … my mind is that we should request your Government to remove you from the group, in order to prevent evil. … you who do not want a Government leave us, so that we may be able to each do his duties without hindrance.69

Conscious of a different audience, the Viceroy presented a far sternier mien than he had done in Lomaloma five weeks earlier. He was reminding members that divisions among them and among the settler community generally were responsible for the failure of the previous government. There was also a hint that his expressed support for the rule of law, apparently unequivocal, would be withdrawn if dissension continued.
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The Viceroy had mentioned his imminent departure for Lau. Before leaving Levuka, he was able to enjoy some of the perquisites of high office, attending, with his wife, a “Dinner and Ball” on the evening of 23 July, when he appeared happy to respond to a toast “to the Viceroy”. In Vanuabalavu meanwhile, where he soon returned, prospects appeared as favourable as ever. Lomaloma had recently been declared an official port of entry for Fiji, while Mafi, Ma’afu’s long-serving matapule, was appointed as an Assistant Native Judge in the Supreme Court. In keeping with his established rights in Vanuabalavu under both Fijian custom and English law, Ma’afu was acknowledged as owner of the island by the Minister for Native Affairs. Swanston expounded the government’s official view in response to concerns raised about the sale by Ma’afu of a piece of ground north of Lomaloma. There was nothing new in this acknowledgement, but of greater import for Fiji’s future were appeals from Swanston requesting Ma’afu’s intervention in both Bua and Macuata. The former province’s paramount, Tui Bua, had complained of interference by Tui Cakau in Kubulau, an island in the Yasawas subject to Tui Bua’s authority. Swanston appealed to Ma’afu “as the representative of the paramount chief of that province … not to allow an illegal act to take place”. More significantly, following complaints from Europeans living on the island of Lutu in Macuata of threatening letters from Katonivere, a member of the province’s chiefly family, Ma’afu was similarly addressed. Swanston wrote to the Viceroy, “you alone can easily end the illegal letters from Katonivere”. This recognition of Ma’afu as the ultimate authority in Bua and Macuata, an authority which owed nothing to his official position as Viceroy, might have raised disquiet in the minds of any European in Fiji who had taken note of the veiled hints, carefully phrased so as to accord with the solemn tone of the occasion, which were found in Ma’afu’s formal address to Parliament two months earlier.

The authority of Ma’afu and other leading chiefs was not unrecognised among the settlers. A planter named Richard Philp, in describing the limitations of Cakobau’s power and influence, referred to Ma’afu and Tui Cakau as “great chiefs” who were “quite independent” of the King. Philp saw the plantations of Taveuni and Vanuabalavu as the principal reasons why the two chiefs had to be brought under Cakobau’s actual authority, as opposed to the legal fiction embodied in the Vunivalu’s nominal role as “King” of Fiji. The formal submission of the two “great chiefs” brought the planters living in their realms into the ambit of the settler regime at Levuka. The plantations of Lau and Cakaudrove were, according to Philp, “the sources from which the funds of the
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Fiji government were to come”. Although these outlying settlers, especially those in Lau, were largely prosperous, they looked askance both at their fellows in Levuka and at what they saw as the elaborate and increasingly irrelevant facade of constitutional government. With the settlers in Lau, as with the Fijians and Tongans living there, it was Ma’afu’s authority, rather than Cakobau’s, that counted in the end.

The question of British annexation loomed ever larger over these concerns. Chief Secretary John Thurston, who favoured Cession as the least of several evils, protested to the Colonial Office over a circular despatch submitted to the governors of the Australian colonies, instructing them to treat the government in Fiji as a *de facto* administration. How, Thurston remonstrated, could this direction “be reconciled with the rights of justice or the established principles of International Law?” With this principle in mind, he wrote in a less diplomatic vein to Captain Hope: “If England wants Fiji let her take it; if not do not let her rob the chiefs of their rights”. Thurston saw Cession as the best means of protecting the indigenous rights of the chiefs in the face of exigent settlers intent on nothing more than their own interests.

Settler discontent manifested itself in a series of meetings held in Levuka in December 1872. At the largest gathering, held at Keyse’s Hotel, a resolution was passed to re-establish the British Subjects’ Mutual Protection Society “to overturn a usurping Ministry by armed force, if necessary”. The delegates expressed the view that the present government had plunged the country heavily into debt, a situation that would influence the Home government against annexation. After meeting for two days, 46 settlers pledged themselves “to mutual assistance in our determination to depose the present Government with a view to the future annexation of Fiji to Great Britain”. According to a “Secret Circular”’, an oath of secrecy was taken and arrangements made for members of the new Society to visit settlers on outlying parts of Fiji in order to explain their purpose and gather support.

The revival of the British Subjects’ Mutual Protection Society, and the resolutions adopted by the meeting at Keyse’s Hotel, quickly involved Ma’afu, Cakobau and Tui Cakau in the spiralling demands for constitutional change. The day after the meeting concluded, a delegation of Society members waited on Thurston with a resolution, passed at the meeting, “requesting the King to annul the present Constitution”. Thurston had already visited Bau to discuss
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possible changes with Cakobau and while “the necessity for some reform was acknowledged”, the King would not entertain annulment of the Constitution. Such a course would, according to Thurston, accede to the wishes “of a small body of whites who appeared to be animated with a general spirit of unrest”. Thurston announced that he would consult Ma`afu and Tui Cakau concerning the best means of effecting reform, so that he could “advise the King as to the best course to pursue”. At year’s end, the questions of constitutional reform and annexation remained far from resolution.

Thurston believed that the settlers must accept the present government, as the principal chiefs had done, or the way should be made clear for annexation. He preferred annexation principally in order to “save the natives from the grasping proclivities and arrogance of our own dear race, or the rascals of it”. Thurston saw the present debt-ridden government as manifestly unsuited to the country it purported to govern: “The idea of a Ministry in this country ruling by a majority or not at all is simply absurd”. In the likely event that a loan could be raised in Australia, “every knave in the place would enter the lists, and try to lay hands on the Treasurer’s Chest”. With Whitehall seemingly uninterested in annexation, Thurston would direct his energies towards amending or abrogating the Constitution. He was prepared to travel to London with Ma`afu and Ratu Epeli Nailatikau, Cakobau’s eldest son, in order to devise the terms of Cession, if only Whitehall would say the word.

The Commercial Agent for Fiji in Sydney, Carl Sahl, while visiting London, interviewed the Foreign Secretary, Lord Granville, as well as Lord Kimberley and the Parliamentary Under-Secretary for the Colonies. Following these consultations, Sahl advised Thurston that recognition would depend on how well the Fijian government maintained law and order, with particular reference to control of the labour trade from Melanesia. Whatever hopes Whitehall entertained that the regime in Levuka might satisfy requirements were doomed in the face of factional rivalry among the settlers, hostility from Consul March and Cakobau’s lack of real authority beyond central Fiji.

Ma`afu’s absence from Levuka meant that his voice was not heard in the quickening debate over annexation. While the Fiji Times reported “general sympathy in favour of the project”, it spoke only for part of the settler community, as indeed did the “Secret Circular”, which appeared on 20 January. Chief Justice Charles St Julian revealed both perspicacity and restraint in his
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Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

comments on the constitutional question. He regarded petitions as “worthless” and considered unconditional annexation, without the consent of chiefs and people, as dangerous and likely to provoke a “race war”. Only through a proper consultative process, St Julian believed, could serious difficulties be avoided.\(^{83}\)

Considering settler attitudes manifested in the “Secret Circular”, there was small prospect that such a process would occur. In Britain meanwhile, opinion appeared to be moving, however slowly, towards a more favourable view of Cession. General William Smythe, whose recommendations against annexation had been accepted by Whitehall more than a decade earlier, had altered his opinion. He now saw the fractious nature of the settler community, and the lack of real authority vested in the British Consul, as reasons why Whitehall should make a move.\(^{84}\) Former Consul March, who had returned to Britain in January, recognised that threats of armed resistance among some settler groups could not continue. His impractical solution would involve a return to the status quo before extensive European settlement:

Granted that no adequate government exists in Fiji, the native race should be left to govern itself by its own laws and custom, improved from time to time by the example and teaching of civilization. Cakobau would then return to the position he has always held and govern the western portion of Fiji, whilst Ma`afu and Tui Cakau would hold sway as formerly over the Windward Islands.\(^ {85}\)

Aside from the fact that Cakobau had never “governed” all of western Fiji, March ignored the obvious implications of such a scenario. Left to his own devices in Lau and with no central “government”, however inadequate, in Levuka, Ma`afu would set his sights on an early confrontation with Cakobau, with the mastery of Fiji as the prize.

Following his consultation, which he later falsely claimed to be secret, with Ma`afu and Tui Cakau at Lomaloma, Thurston was authorised by the King “to put a question of Cession direct to Her Britannic Majesty’s Government”.\(^{86}\) He did so, asking the Foreign Office whether, in the event of a renewed offer from the King and people of Fiji, the government would “entertain a proposal … to cede the Kingdom to Her Britannic Majesty”.\(^ {87}\) Thurston also forwarded a
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confidential despatch to Sir Hercules Robinson, Governor of New South Wales, describing the “imminent danger ... of a collision between the white settlers ... and the natives”. He referred to the “oppression and spoliation” being visited upon the Fijians, describing the small settler community as “largely ... insolvent planters who are exerting themselves to the utmost to destroy the Government as the readiest way of escaping from their liabilities and from the consequences of their acts of tyranny and murder”. Thurston accurately ascribed the disfavour in which the government was held to efforts made by the regime to enforce civil law “against insolvent planters” and especially to raise taxes. The country moreover was overburdened with an executive, judicial and bureaucratic structure accurately described by Robinson as “preposterously large for the small Foreign Community which does not exceed 2,000 in number”.\footnote{88 Confidential Despatch from Sir Hercules Robinson, Governor of New South Wales, to the Earl of Kimberley, 27 Jan 1873, quoted in G.C. Henderson, ed., The Evolution of Government in Fiji, Sydney 1935, 58–64.} With more voices supporting annexation being raised in London and with Cakobau favourably disposed, a resolution of Fiji’s constitutional dilemma might have appeared possible. Ma’afu remained the wild card: although Thurston had consulted both him and Tui Cakau, the views of the Viceroy, unlike those of the King, remained unknown.

Captain Hope, ever an acute observer, accurately reviewed the role of the Windward chiefs: “It is a question whether the proud Tongan, Ma’afu ... or the crafty Tui Cakau of Vanua Levu, could continue their submission to the Fiji Constitution. While it is quite certain that if they did not, the Minster would have no power to coerce them”.\footnote{89 Memorandum on the State of Affairs in the Fiji Islands, 17 Jan 1873, Hope Letter-Journals.} Hope saw annexation as the only feasible solution. It must nevertheless have been evident, during these early months of 1873, that despite the quickening tenor of debate, no move in that direction was likely in the short term. What, in the meantime, was occupying the attention of “the proud Tongan, Ma’afu”? He was, in the words of the Warden for Lau, William Hennings, contemplating “the appointment of a gentleman” to the position of Secretary for Lau, vacant since Louis Bignanzoli’s resignation the previous October.\footnote{90 Hennings to Swanston, 29 Jan 1873, CG Set 41. See also Swanston to Bignanzoli, 7 Oct 1872, Swanston to Hennings, 7 Oct 1872, CG Set 42; Hennings to Giblin, 17 Apr 1873, CG Set 1.} Ma’afu, who wanted Bignanzoli back, refused to accept Swanston’s appointee, John Giblin and finally announced in April that one George Bayley had been chosen. Hennings wrote to Bayley, “His Excellency would be glad of your additional services as Private Secretary”.\footnote{91 Hennings to George Bayley, 7 Apr 1873, CG Set 10. See also Swanston to Hennings, 30 Jan 1873, Swanston to Ma’afu, 4 Mar 1873, Swanston to John Giblin, 4 Mar 1873, CG Set 42; Giblin to Swanston, 20 Jan 1873, Giblin to Woods, 17 May 1873, CG Set 41.} Earlier that month Giblin, who insisted that he had been appointed by the King, arrived in Lomaloma and called on the Viceroy.\footnote{92 Giblin to Swanston, 21 Apr 1873, Giblin to Bayley, 21 Apr 1973, CG Set 1.} Ma’afu officially appointed Bayley the day
following Giblin’s arrival, while nominating his previous secretary, Biganzoli, as Stipendiary Magistrate for Moala. During this period, Ma’afu was requested to put his house in order, quite literally: the Minister for Native Affairs wrote that, while the government had erected “the Mess room” at Lomaloma, “no attempt appears to have been made by Your Excellency to build your own residence”. He was urged to do so “forthwith”.

None of these housekeeping matters can shed any light on the Viceroy’s views on Fiji’s constitutional debate. There are moreover indications that his attention was engaged with the perennial problem of his finances. He was already heavily in debt, having owed the trading firm of J. Levick and Co. £225 since January 1872. Because the question of Ma’afu’s debts was to be linked, for the rest of his life, to that of tax collection in Lau, notice should be made of an agreement concerning the Lauan taxes, drawn up between Howard Clarkson and William Hennings early in 1873. Under the agreement, Hennings was authorised to collect all taxes in Lau, whether in money, oil or other produce, for the rest of the year. He was also to purchase all other coconut oil produced in Lau, “paying for the same in approved bills on Sydney”, at rates varying between 15 and 18 shillings per ton. Copra also was to be purchased “at fair market value”. Most crucially, Article Four of the agreement provided “That Mr Hennings be authorised to pay the Viceroy’s salary and Ratu Tevita Uluiakakeba’s salary out of said proceeds before handing the moneys to the Minister of Finance”.

Hennings, long a creditor of Ma’afu, sought, at the request of Ma’afu’s then secretary Biganzoli and of Swanston, to settle the debt to Levicks with a draft payable at a Sydney bank. Ma’afu had apparently arranged to pay in copra, which Hennings undertook to collect on behalf of Levicks, although he reported in March 1873 that he had been unable to do so. In the meantime, Ratu Tevita “took 2½ tons of oil belonging to the Government at Lakeba and sold it to [a settler]”. The Ministry of Finance in Levuka was informed that Ma’afu’s schooner Tui Lau had collected a cargo of oil and copra at Moala, Matuku and Totoya from the natives “on account of taxes for the Government, and that the said cargo had been sold at Levuka, and no returns had been made thereof to the Government”. Furthermore, two shipments of produce, “collected by the natives for their taxes”, had been conveyed to Levuka and sold to the trading firm of Messrs Hedemann. Howard Clarkson wrote diplomatically of “a misunderstanding … on the part of His Excellency the Viceroy as to his
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right of Disposition of Taxes received from Natives of his Province”. When an officer of the Ministry called at Lomaloma to investigate the sale of the cargo from the Moala group, Ma`afu “in a very decisive manner said it was not true”, at the same time indicating his annoyance that “the Government should interview his subordinates in regard to the amount of taxes collected”. The Tui Lau had indeed brought a cargo to Lomaloma, the Viceroy vouchsafed, but “it had nothing to do with taxes”, being rather destined to discharge the debts of both himself and Tevita Uluilakeba to Levick Brothers. Hennings confirmed his assertions. To cloud the issue further, John Giblin, in his capacity as the new Secretary of Lau, formally advised the Ministry that because all the Lauan taxes had been paid in oil and copra, and bearing in mind the “difficulties attending to the collection of same, no revenue can be paid into the Treasury from … Lau until after 1st May next”.

This misappropriation of taxation revenue would have come as no surprise to any who took notice of Ma`afu’s stated views on the principle of taxation, and indeed of his spending habits. The Fiji Times, having been “informed that Ma`afu had declined to submit any taxes to Levuka” and was moreover demanding his salary, soon reported a “rumour” that, during Thurston’s visit to Lomaloma, Ma`afu had announced that he would not pay taxes “as he was about to purchase a large vessel, and wanted the money”. Ma`afu had indeed requested that an amount of £24 from his salary be forwarded to him at Lomaloma, while letting down his guard to the extent of remarking to the Governor of Central Province “that we should not pay in any taxes at all”. His finances were enhanced by more than his salary and his booty from tax collections, since in December 1872, the Sydney firm of Rabone Feez had forwarded him a payment of £600, although for what purpose is not known. The Melbourne Argus, reporting a visit to the Chief Secretary of Victoria by a deputation of directors of the Polynesia Company, noted that one of the directors, Dr Macartney, had persuaded Ma`afu “to fall in with Cakobau’s views”. In return, Ma`afu received £800 a year “in consequence of surrendering his claims, so that now for the first time Cakobau became really sovereign of the islands”, a reference to Ma`afu’s salary. It is noteworthy that during this period of financial uncertainty, Ma`afu was careful to remain on good terms with the Wesleyan missionaries. He authorised Hennings to pay Isaac Rooney, the missionary stationed at Lomaloma, the sum of £31–15–0, an amount raised on the small islands of Vatoa and Vanua Vatu
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in central Lau. Rooney himself recorded that Parliament had “voted the Vatoa taxes for 1872 in payment”. While Ma`afu continued to receive rents for many other leased lands in Lau, the picture that emerges during early 1873 reveals a chief who, tempted by la dolce vita to which his position of power had long since opened a door, was ready to grasp at all financial straws, including those still drifting in the wind.

Immersed as he was during these days in the minutiae of provincial administration, the Viceroy could not avoid involvement in events elsewhere in Fiji. In February 1873, planter William Burnes, his wife and children were murdered on their plantation at Vinisamalua on the Ba River in north-western Viti Levu. The perpetrators, Fijians from the interior, were apparently motivated by rumours that the taukei would be killed if annexation were to occur. With some local settlers threatening armed rebellion against Levuka, Thurston lost no time in accompanying Major W. Fitzgerald and 50 soldiers to the Ba river mouth in March. Ma`afu offered to send all his men and even to come himself “to meet any whites in arms against the Matanitu”. While the presence of HMS Dido soon quelled any thought of settler rebellion in the area, the Viceroy’s intentions remained obscure during growing settler disaffection with the regime in Levuka. Planters in Ba, Nadi and Nadroga, provinces in western Viti Levu, had formed an “organised resistance” which, according to one of the British Commissioners appointed later that year, was only quelled by the swift intervention of the Dido’s commander, Captain William Chapman. Premier Woods, writing in his capacity as Commander-in-Chief, advised Ma`afu of the Dido’s successful intervention. Proposing, as a show of force, to lead the Western Contingent on a march through the mountains, to commence on 19 May, Woods requested Ma`afu to attend in person “if convenient”, in order to command the force. But the Viceroy, Commander-in-Chief or no, had already “declined to become involved in the Viti Levu wars”, thereby drawing a complaint from the Premier for his failure to respond to a request for the services of Captain Ma`afu, the Viceroy’s son, and one company of the Lau Regiment for field service in Viti Levu. An Australian newspaper meanwhile reported “rumours of trouble” likely to arise with Ma`afu who, “instead of raising legitimate revenues, and expending such revenues in a legitimate manner, had been coercing his dependents into contributions for the purchase of vessels to be presented to King George”. Succession to the throne of Tonga, as well as armed suppression of rebellious
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whites in Viti Levu, were said to be on Ma’afu’s mind. Rumours aside, the *Fiji Times* pointedly asked why, with Cakobau occupied with “war” in Ba and Rewa and “another little affair” looming in Kadavu, no help was forthcoming from the Viceroy and Tui Cakau. “In the time after Ma’afu joined the Government, we saw Tongan troops at Levuka, but now where are they?” Ma’afu had expressed loyalty and solidarity in the past, but now, in late April, “it is a significant fact that there is [no] aid from Ma’afu, neither in taxes nor arms. Why is this?”

Part of the answer lay in the nature of the still essentially frontier society, among the settlers, existing in Fiji. Planters, heavily dependent on the profits of cotton cultivation, had formed a government whose aim was to usurp ultimate power in the islands from the few powerful chiefs in whose hands it was concentrated. With their salaries, their grandiose titles and their hopes of consolidating their power within the new regime, Cakobau, Ma’afu, Tui Cakau and the other great chiefs had been seduced into compliance. Yet such compliance could only be transient. Some of the settlers sought to endow their regime with at least an air of permanence, while others looked to annexation as the best means of securing their ascendancy, fraught as it was with the perils of looming confrontation. There existed in the minds of most of members of the fractious settler society a notion of race pre-eminence, such as that articulated in the pages of the *Fiji Times*:

> True to the instincts of the Anglo-Saxon race we have come to this ultima thule of creation; to bring a savage race within the pale, and to partake of the benefits of our civilization; let us hope to bring them beneath the sway of the British sceptre, and thus to open up more fully a new and profitable field for British enterprise.

Among the settlers, there was at least one who opposed this view: John Thurston, who believed that the rights of Fijians in their own country had to be recognised. The increasing polarisation of the settler community came at a time when both sides were looking to annexation as the only viable solution and when two Fijian chiefs, however imposing their titles in the new administration, were becoming increasingly disillusioned with the Kingdom of Fiji.

The *Fiji Times*, writing in May of an “approaching crisis”, reminded its readers of the “immense importance” of the position of Ma’afu and Tui Cakau:

> In what relationship do they stand, friendly or otherwise; if friendly then why have not the taxes been enforced in those districts, and likewise the salaries of the native officials been paid? If unfriendly, what steps have been taken, or what negotiations have been entered into to bring back
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the recalcitrant natives to their allegiance? It will be remembered that with the exception of £1300 from Cakaudrovi there have not been any taxes paid from the windward islands for ... nine months.

Everyone, according to the editor, was aware of “rumours ... of disaffection” emanating from Lau. Meanwhile, in a final reply to the request for his personal attendance and for the despatch of a Lau contingent to central Viti Levu, the Viceroy announced plans to visit Levuka “at an early date” to consider what might be done about rebellious Europeans “at Ba and elsewhere”. Thurston, believing Ma`afu to be influenced by “pernicious advice” in Lau, suggested that Swanston should join the Cabinet. In that way, the Minister could proffer advice on how best to deal with Ma`afu. Even in Australia, the press warned of “rumours of troubles likely to arise with Ma`afu, who has not given such support to the Government as he promised since he found that its effects have been to seriously reduce his dignity and power”. Ma`afu had withheld tax revenue to purchase vessels for Tupou, vessels which might be his after Tupou’s death, since Ma`afu had some prospect of succeeding his cousin. “A collision between Cakobau and his Viceroy is far from improbable”, the Sydney Morning Herald declared. Thurston remained well aware that the government depended more on the Viceroy’s support than the Viceroy gained from his adhesion to the regime. For this reason, there could well have been substance to the persistent “rumours”.

The Chief Secretary was right: the rumours were not unfounded. A meeting at Lomaloma on 17 May, attended by a majority of the planters and European settlers of Lau, formally expressed “its entire dissatisfaction with the acts of the present government”. After waiting in the wings while the resolution was passed, Ma`afu joined the settlers, announcing that his views “entirely” coincided with theirs. With Parliament about to reconvene in Levuka, the Viceroy promised to do what lay in his power “to effect an alteration”. As one visitor to Fiji observed, the regime in Levuka would ignore Ma`afu’s views at its peril. In the event, Ma`afu could not, or more likely would not, effect any change. When Parliament reassembled on 31 May, with the King absent in Rewa, the Speech from the Throne, read by Chief Justice St Julian, envisaged constitutional amendments designed to increase the Fijians’ electoral rights. However, when the government lost a vote to authorise an investigation of its parlous finances, it was evident that its opponents were numerically stronger and would frustrate any reform. The King, ignorant of constitutional usage, declined to accept the subsequent resignation of his ministers and, doubtless acting on a quiet word
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of advice, dissolved the House. The Viceroy meanwhile, presiding in the Privy Council, appeared to do nothing to honour his commitment made at Lomaloma. From that place John Giblin, the official if thwarted secretary for Lau, attempted to exercise his duties in the face of the Viceroy’s refusal to recognise him. Giblin wrote to the Treasurer complaining of William Hennings’ right to collect taxes in the province. Although informed by Hennings that $965 had been collected and forwarded to the Treasury, Giblin would not be mollified:

During my stay at Lomaloma I saw nine casks of oil delivered at … Hennings’ store by the master of the ketch “Tui Nayau” as Taxes and was then told by the said master that the people of Lakeba and the surrounding islands had had their taxes ready for some time and were but waiting the arrival of a vessel with the necessary casks to deliver it … to the officer appointed to receive it.

Whilst on … Cicia with Ratu Tevita the Lieutenant Governor the natives informed me that the oil was lying ready for collection in every town on the island … I consider it my duty as Secretary for Lau to remark that I consider the person charged with the collection of taxes in Lau has been very remiss in his duty for had the matter been properly attended to a large amount of revenue would ere this have been received from the Province by Government.120

Hennings was quick to defend himself to the Chief Secretary, declaring that after taxes were collected, “it was distinctly understood that before my remittance to Treasury was made, the several salaries due here should be paid”.121 Seemingly sure of his ground, he advised Clarkson the following month that he had collected £192–13–4 in taxes “from the natives of the Windward Isles” and that he had “acquainted His Excellency the Viceroy … that the above amount is at His Excellency’s disposal as an instalment of his salary”. Hennings might have added “in settlement of His Excellency’s account at my store” since, according to a minute added to his letter, the amount in question was to be credited to that account.122 Hennings seems to have withdrawn from tax collection after the rebuke from Thurston, even sending his account books to Carl Sahl, who saw that they were “exact and thoroughly well kept”. Asked by Hennings to resume his role as collector of Lauan taxes, Sahl claimed that much of the collected tax produce never reached Ma’afu or his agents, being paid directly to the trader.123 If that were true, it must have been with Tui Lau’s compliance. Even rents from “Government Waste Lands” in the province, which had been paid to Ma’afu as Tui Lau during the days of the Tovata, continued to be so directed despite their
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now being “an asset of the Crown”. All the Treasurer could do was to request Hennings to obtain acknowledgement and a receipt from Ma`afu.\textsuperscript{124} Thurston, seemingly still optimistic, advised Sahl that he was “expecting [Ma`afu and Tui Cakau] in Levuka daily to confer with Ministers upon the present state of affairs”.\textsuperscript{125} This flurry of correspondence enunciated a recurring theme in Ma`afu’s administration of Lau: the efficient collection of taxation revenue, and its equally efficient disbursement within the province, always to the chagrin of those in power in Levuka.

The Treasury’s pathetic request for a receipt bears eloquent witness to its frustration, not to say impotence, in dealing with the black hole of Lauan taxes. Ma`afu’s long-standing account at Hennings’ store in Lomaloma had metamorphosed into an all-engulfing maw from which Levuka could hope to extract nothing. The Treasury, moreover, was effectively empty: Woods had borrowed money to pay ministerial salaries while, according to an Australian newspaper, the Fijian government now depended “on how long its credit can hold out in Australia and New Zealand”.\textsuperscript{126} That period was likely to be short, as long as settlers in Fiji remained opposed to an administration they believed had been established to squeeze taxes from them. While most of the government’s supporters were insolvent, almost all settlers, whatever their views of the administration, were principally motivated by self-interest. In the words of one among them who held a mirror, if not to their souls, at least to their overdrafts, “the grasping and rapacity of the Europeans is something quite marvellous”.\textsuperscript{127}

During this period, there arose some prospect of a solution when Cabinet announced the appointment of two Commissioners to investigate the situation in Fiji.\textsuperscript{128} They were Edgar Leopold (Leo) Layard, who had been appointed the previous January as British Consul, and Captain James Goodenough, Commodore of the Royal Navy’s Australia Station. Four possible courses of action were envisaged: investing the Consul with magisterial powers over British subjects in Fiji, recognising the existing government, establishing a British protectorate, or outright annexation. The last option, which would involve making Fiji a Crown Colony, was opposed by Prime Minister Gladstone but favoured by the Colonial Secretary, Lord Kimberley.\textsuperscript{129} Whatever decision the Commissioners eventually made would depend above all on the attitude of the chiefs, including of course the Viceroy. While one missionary castigated the chiefs over their adhesion to the regime for the sake of the baubles of office, his admonition was already
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somewhat dated. The great chiefs of Fiji, despite their seats in Parliament, their official titles and their uniforms, had become disillusioned with the cupidity and naked self-interest of their self-appointed masters. While that disillusion had yet to affect the functions of government, at least some of the planter oligarchy in Levuka appeared astonished to learn that the two principal chiefly supporters of the King, namely the Viceroy and Tui Cakau, had seceded from the government.

On Saturday 28 June, at a meeting of the Cakaudrove Provincial Council at Somosomo, Tui Cakau announced, through the Warden for Taveuni, Henry Parsons, that he had “in conjunction with the Viceroy seceded from the Fijian government. He gave no reasons for having taken this step”. Parsons was surprised at the suddenness of Tui Cakau’s actions, since “up to the very day he seceded he assisted me all in his power, in the discharge of my duties”. With the meeting abandoned, the secretary hurried down to Levuka with the news, arriving with Ma’afu aboard the Xarifa on 3 July. The same evening, Ma’afu climbed aboard HMS Dido, fortuitously at anchor off Levuka, in order to consult Captain Chapman. While Ma’afu’s intentions beyond the act of secession were unknown, much could be inferred from the presence of certain “visitors” then encamped in his and Tui Cakau’s domains. When Parsons made his announcement at Somosomo, Ma’afu was waiting on board the Xarifa, riding at anchor offshore. Tui Cakau, although not noticed by two Justices of the Peace who had travelled from Levuka for the meeting, was possibly on board as well. More significantly, some 150 Tongan “visitors” were camped on shore, with the same number reportedly present at Lomaloma. To the Taveuni correspondent of the Fiji Times, all of this came as no surprise, in view of the “rumours” which had long been “flying about”. For the government to attempt to compel the chiefs to withdraw their secession “would be absolute madness”, opined the correspondent. “There is no doubt Ma’afu means mischief now … with the assistance of Tui Cakau, whom he appears to lead by the nose, he will try his best to upset the government, at any rate as far as this part of the group is concerned”. The chiefs’ principal motivation was supposedly their disquiet over the prospect of one of Cakobau’s sons succeeding him as King. The settlers in Cakaudrove were expected to side with Tui Cakau.

Ma’afu’s early visit to the Dido involved more than a social call, with settler Edward Turpin claiming that Captain Chapman had “promised to protect Ma’afu from the Government”. Whatever truth lay behind that assertion, Ma’afu certainly had more than protection on his mind. Less than a week after
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meeting Chapman, he called at the Levuka store of German trader Frederick Hedemann. There, he signed an agreement for the supply of 200 rifles and 500 rounds of ammunition, to be ordered from Hamburg on account. The rifles cost £6 each, with ammunition “at current market price”. Payment was to be made in cash, coconut or copra within six months of delivery, which would be taken at Lomaloma.\textsuperscript{134} While this agreement, fraught with implications following Ma`afu’s secession, remained secret, the two chiefs’ secession was public knowledge.\textsuperscript{135} According to the Fiji Times, “the attitude of [Ma`afu and Tui Cakau] has been almost neutral, they have stood aloof from participation in the Government, have not paid their taxes, nor been paid their salaries”. Yet the editor, tongue in cheek as so often, excused the two chiefs’ lack of enthusiasm, owing to the “liabilities” with which Fiji was burdened. Ma`afu, readers were tactfully reminded, was “a man who knows the meaning of borrowing” and who could see moreover “that the resources of the country are overtaxed, and that there has been almost a cessation of immigration and influx of capital for private enterprise”. Discarding the cloak of irony, the editor articulated the dilemma now confronting Fiji:

Ma`afu is imbued with Tongan intelligence and Tongan hauteur. The progress of Tongan influence and … power in Fiji has been such as to cause Bau to look upon Lau … with considerable jealousy, and Ma`afu has felt that he was the rival of Bau, if not the superior of Cakobau. When … Cakobau [was] proclaimed … king, and Ma`afu was led to take allegiance to him, it was not unlikely that a man of Ma`afu’s foresight ambition and political strength would, upon seeing that … the country [was] in debt without any prospect of relief, secede from the Government and endeavour to retain his and … Tui Cakau’s territory intact. … Bau is too weak to coerce them, to compel their submission by force of arms.\textsuperscript{136}

Was it coincidence only that these words were published on the very day Ma`afu placed his order for the rifles?

Swanston, aware that Ma`afu was procuring arms, was not concerned, believing that “pressure could be placed on Ma`afu at any time to check any harmful action”.\textsuperscript{137} Whatever his immediate plans, Ma`afu sailed that day for Savusavu, having resisted pleas from government ministers to withdraw his secession. He did promise that, in the event of hostilities, he would protect the lives and property of white settlers in his domains.\textsuperscript{138} Missionary Frederick Langham,
still stationed at Bau, claimed to have foreseen the secession and noted that many more chiefs were likely to support Ma`afu than would remain loyal to the King. The chiefs had been “soured and irritated almost beyond endurance by many things” since the “new regime” was established. Particular chiefly grievances included loss of influence and the exactions of taxation. Yet within two days, Langham reported, Ma`afu had been indirectly informed by some ministers “that he must either continue as viceroy or be taken into custody as a Rebel”. In the latter case, he would probably be executed the same day. The missionary was not sanguine concerning Ma`afu’s intentions: “It will now be simply a question of time or circumstances with him”.

With Ma`afu having retired from Levuka, a curious public debate ensued among the European community, and doubtless among many Fijians as well, concerning the Viceroy’s intentions. Settler Duncan Murray, secretary to a Nadroga chief, declared that the secession would “hasten the decadence” of both supporters and opponents of the government, given the deleterious effect it would have on Fiji’s economic prospects. Astonishingly, the Fiji Gazette, ever at odds with the Fiji Times, claimed that two days before Ma`afu’s departure, government ministers had “cleared all misunderstandings” with the Viceroy, whose loyalty and co-operation was now assured. The Gazette was unconvincing, however: Ma`afu remained bent on secession. At Somosomo, he and Tui Cakau attended a gathering of more than 500 people from all over the province on 14 July. Then, according to the Fiji Times, “the leading chiefs spoke in favour of secession as after two years’ trial, the Government was found to be quite unsuited to the natives on account of its great expense, its extreme intricacy and its very barren results. [Ma`afu and Tui Cakau] proposed to set up a new and separate government having the lotu … as its mainstay and seeking to encourage and protect white settlement”. The latter assurance appeared to echo the one Ma`afu gave to some ministers before he left Levuka. The Cakaudrove chiefs’ reported views provide a consummate statement of the failings of the Cakobau Government from a Fijian perspective. Yet to secede was one thing; to form a new government quite another. Everything would depend on whatever plans Ma`afu and his apparently steadfast ally had for the immediate future.

Although Ma`afu and Tui Cakau were often uneasy in alliance, they demonstrated a marked solidarity following their joint secession. A report from Savusavu at the time of the large July gathering paints a picture of a province that, despite the formal and reluctant adhesion of its paramount chief, had never properly formed part of the new Kingdom of Fiji. Tui Cakau, it was said, had led his
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lesser chiefs to believe that the “Government of Tui Viti” possessed jurisdiction only over “the whites and their foreign labourers” in Cakaudrove, a reassurance which left intact the despotic powers of the lesser chiefs. The supreme authority of “Tui Viti”, acknowledged by Tui Cakau in Levuka, evoked no echo in Wairiki. Kept in ignorance, the lesser chiefs were not forced to tolerate the application of the kingdom’s criminal law within their local domains. However, with the impending establishment of Government Police Courts in Taveuni and Savusavu, the enforced repeal of the “old native laws” and the dispersal throughout Cakaudrove of magistrates and police loyal to the government, the end of the matanitu as an independent political entity was at hand. So long as Levuka did not attempt to enforce its authority, its existence was tolerated. Now that the chiefs were being told that “they would have to attend the white man’s court (as they persist in calling it) if they transgressed”, the time had come to “kick this monstrous and absurd creation of the white man’s out of the country”. Tui Cakau repudiated all connection with “Cakobau’s white government”, even threatening violence against the inhabitants of three Cakaudrove villages that had adhered to it. Emissaries had been sent to Macuata inviting that province to send men to meet Tui Cakau at Savusavu. Some of the petty chiefs declared “that if Tui Cakau would only give them orders for a secret rising, there would not be a white man alive in the morning”. That chief was stated to be “secretly in league with Ma’afu to overturn Cakobau’s Government”. Thurston placed the blame for the secession plans squarely with Ma’afu. Writing while Ma’afu’s guest on board the Xarifa, at anchor in Savusavu Bay, Thurston recorded that Ma’afu had just requested Tui Cakau to come on board so that the two chiefs could visit the King. Such was the state of mind prevailing at the Savusavu gathering, presided over by Tui Cakau in the presence of his honoured guest, His Excellency Ma’afu, Viceroy of the Kingdom of Fiji.

Ma’afu, subtler than Tui Cakau in his political manoeuvres, sought to define his secession in less inflammatory terms. With the Dido now at anchor off Savusavu, George Bayley formally advised Captain Chapman that Ma’afu and Tui Cakau had “withdrawn from the Fiji government solely on account of its maladministration, great expense and intricacy and the general inadequateness of the Constitution for the welfare and advancement of the country”. While these words accurately describe the Kingdom of Fiji, they only begin to reveal the reasons for the Viceroy’s repudiation of that kingdom and his part in its government. Bayley proceeded from obfuscation to prevarication, advising Chapman that the two chiefs “wish me to assure you that their secession is not a political combination against Bau. They wish to remain on friendly terms with that power and believe that the feeling is reciprocated”.
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On the day that Bayley wrote, the Fiji Gazette asserted “most distinctly that Ma`afu has not [italics in original] seceded from the National Government ... his loyalty to the monarchy and the principles of national union have become more firm and assured than ever”.147 This seeming defence of the Viceroy reflected the mounting acrimony between the Gazette and its rival, the Fiji Times, rather than any political acumen on the part of its editor. The secession was real, and Ma`afu and Tui Cakau, in conjunction with their European settlers, were to draft a code of laws that would be “laid before” Captain Chapman for his “information”. Most surprisingly, Bayley was to inform the US Consul that the two chiefs had been “threatened by the Honourable John Thurston with the forcible intervention of an American man of war ... pledged to assist Bau in maintaining ... the unity of the kingdom”.148 This letter was an attempt to maintain the goodwill of the British captain, clearly a valuable ally, by representing the secession as an act of altruism, while raising the spectre of American intervention, a development which, as Ma`afu well knew, would likely be held anathema by Captain Chapman. The reference to Thurston’s hostility might well have been an attempt to distance Chapman from Thurston, the Minister from whom Ma`afu had the most to fear.

There is no evidence that the threat of American intervention was any more than a flight of fancy on Ma`afu’s part. Thurston in fact proceeded to Savusavu at once, eager to influence both chiefs to reverse their secession. Fearful at first that he would have to request Woods to send down troops, Thurston was able to reassure the premier that “patient diplomacy will do it”. Again writing from Savusavu, he reported Ma`afu as “highly indignant” over the “lie” published in the Fiji Times that he had seceded, although it was a lie the Viceroy appeared curiously willing to tolerate. If he did nothing, Thurston warned him, “the consequences will be the same as if it were true”. Suspecting Ma`afu of “playing false”, he informed Woods that both the Viceroy and Tui Cakau “cannot grasp the nature of the situation”. Clearly doubting Ma`afu’s probity, Thurston, a Taveuni planter of years’ standing, sought ways to lessen his influence with Tui Cakau, with whom he possessed a strong rapport.149 He did succeed in persuading both chiefs to return with him to consult Cakobau, at the same time advising Woods of his belief that the origin of the secession movement lay with Ma`afu, “acted upon by certain persons”. Ma`afu, informing Thurston that he had not authorised Bayley’s letter to Captain Chapman, now sought to withdraw the letter.150 If the newspaper reports of Tui Cakau’s attitude are correct, Thurston appears to have underestimated the grievances of his old friend and his determination finally to sever connections with “Tui Viti”. As for
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Ma`afu, he was clearly “playing false”, as Thurston suspected, appearing intent on mollifying the Chief Secretary while gathering as much support, moral and otherwise, as he could.

Ma`afu’s denial of intent, manifested in his feigned indignation at the false reports concerning his actions, were characteristic of him on any occasion when he was confronted with his misdeeds. Thurston’s suspicion that Ma`afu was “playing false” marks the beginning of his disillusionment with the Viceroy, a sentiment which would culminate in his virulent denunciation of the Tongan in the presence of Fiji’s leading chiefs during the Cession conference eight months later. In the meantime, seemingly in response to Ma`afu’s dissimulation, the strange saga of claim and counterclaim resumed in the press. On 19 July, by which time Ma`afu had apparently conferred with the King, the Gazette again asserted that the Viceroy had not seceded and that his loyalty was firmer than ever. The Times was quick to contradict its rival, again recounting the events in Savusavu of 14 July, although emphasising that the Cakaudrove chiefs, so at odds with the whites of Levuka, sought peace rather than a confrontation with Bau.

It is important to remember that Ma`afu and Tui Cakau, united in their determination to secede, were pursuing different goals. Tui Cakau sought a truly independent Cakaudrove, subject to no interference from the turbulent whites of Levuka and enjoying peace between the taukei and the European settlers. If Ma`afu’s aims appear to us less clear and more sinister, many of the settlers in Cakaudrove were in no doubt concerning the Viceroy’s intentions. At a meeting held at Somosomo on 26 July, James McConnell, a planter on Taveuni, addressed his fellows on the subject of the recent secession:

I fear Ma`afu is a place hunter … feeling disappointed that his name was not placed in the Constitution giving him the right to be the successor of Cakobau, it is a well known fact that is his object, he now comes forward at the present crucial time … expecting to have the support of that portion of the public to secede from the Government, with a view to making him king of the Windward Isles or Tui Viti … will any Briton forget himself, so far as to become the tool of one of the most designing and ambitious men of this kingdom? Who is he that we should support him in becoming king of Fiji or any portion of Fiji? … If he has seceded I hope the Government have done their duty, and placed him in Totoga gaol; let him be impeached and vanished [sic] from the Kingdom … last year he made laws, and at the closing of Parliament said that is the
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whites wished to live in the country they would have to submit to the laws … Is there any white man in this Kingdom [who] would … submit to such insolence?\(^{153}\)

While McConnell’s words constitute one of the more savage diatribes levelled against Ma`afu, among many during his life, it should be remembered that these were the views of a settler in Cakaudrove and not in Lau. McConnell stood up at the meeting to denounce the Viceroy, but not the paramount chief of Cakaudrove, who had seceded along with the Viceroy. His views bear witness both to the divergence of purpose between the two chiefs and to the fear and deep distrust with which Ma`afu was often regarded beyond the boundaries of the province of Lau.

With the fact of the secession apparently still in dispute in Levuka, the Fiji Gazette, anxious as always to score points over its rival, published some correspondence between Ma`afu and Captain Chapman of HMS Dido. The letters, if accepted at their face value, appear to clarify the Viceroy’s actions. He wrote to the captain denying all knowledge of Bayley’s letter wherein the joint secession was announced. The Viceroy also absolved the Chief Secretary of having threatened American intervention. Significantly, Ma`afu did not deny that he had seceded. Chapman, in response, simply forwarded to him Bayley’s letter, the existence of which Ma`afu purported to doubt. Ma`afu wrote again, denying that he had authorised Bayley to write and asking the captain not to accept any letter from him unless it bore his, Ma`afu’s, signature. Further, the captain was enjoined to pay no heed to reports of Ma`afu’s intentions unless such reports came from Ma`afu’s own lips. He advised Chapman that he had indeed met various ministers at Levuka, “discussing with them certain matters of importance to the State, as well as certain matters which affected myself, and Tui Cakau more particularly”. Ma`afu had informed the ministers, Chapman was assured, that he was determined to adhere to the government “and to use his utmost power to assist in consolidating the Kingdom”. This correspondence passed back and forth on the same day, with Ma`afu on board the Xarifa as it rode at anchor off Levuka. He informed Chapman that he was awaiting the arrival of Tui Cakau “in order that with the King and Ministers the best mode of meeting our difficulties may be discussed”.\(^{154}\)

It is certain that pressure had been brought to bear on Ma`afu, pressure which Commodore Goodenough came to believe emanated from William Hennings in one direction and Captain Chapman in the other.\(^{155}\) There might have been some truth in this view, since both men, for different reasons, were likely to
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assert their considerable influence in support of stability and peace. Hennings, though, apparently caught unawares by Ma`afu’s secession, wrote to Carl Sahl seeking advice as to his best course of action. According to a letter to the Fiji Times, probably from Langham, during the Cession negotiations, Ma`afu, when on board the Xarifa at Levuka in July 1873, was confronted by several ministers who told him that he might land as Viceroy or as a rebel prisoner. If he landed as a prisoner, he would likely face a military court-martial and be shot the same day, since the King could not afford to let him live. Securing Ma`afu’s co-operation would have the added advantage of forestalling the expected arrival in Levuka of Tui Cakau “with two or three double canoe loads of armed men”. Bayley meanwhile, awkwardly placed following Ma`afu’s repudiation of his letter, asked the public, through the pages of the Fiji Times, to “suspend their judgment” until the matter had been resolved. Choosing his words carefully, Bayley wrote that the “flat contradiction” of his letter had been “instigated by men of such probity and honor as members of the present government”. As for Tui Cakau, rumour was to attribute his change of mind to the gift of a ketch called Maria Louise, very possibly from some of those same “men of … probity and honor”. It seems clear that Ma`afu had indeed seceded, as announced by Bayley in his first letter to Captain Chapman, only to succumb to the most intense pressure from ministers prepared to go to any lengths to preserve the facade of the kingdom’s administration. Thurston, writing again to Captain Hope at the end of July, made no mention of the Viceroy’s secession, probably considering the matter resolved. He did, however, touch the core of several fundamental problems then facing Fiji. Ma`afu and Tui Cakau, as well as the King, he said, “have discovered that the Europeans intend to thoroughly subordinate them socially and politically. The scheme of a mixed Legislature for a mixed people they find is a delusion and a snare”. The whites looked upon Fiji as their domain, with the conviction growing that the people of the land, the Fijians, must be content in the role of “husbandmen” or must be driven away. Such indeed were the concerns of Fiji’s great chiefs, concerns that would help sound the death knell of the Kingdom of Fiji. More pertinent to the present crisis were the views Ma`afu had expressed to Thurston one day earlier:

Ma`afu remarked yesterday that he was sick of the papalangis’ everlasting talk and bluster, and if there was any of it in the next session [of Parliament] and Ministers were abused again he should propose to the King to turn the members out of the house and lock it up. The notion was quite unusual in a Polynesian and remarkably Cromwellian.

---
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Ma`afu would pursue the struggle within the ramshackle framework of the kingdom whose Viceroy he remained. Having initially placated Thurston with a lie, Ma`afu had quickly been forced, probably at the threat of his life, to an unambiguous renunciation of his grasp for power. Required to work within the system he abhorred, Ma`afu, by his words to Thurston, revealed that he did so with gritted teeth. In the meantime, he was to join the King and the other great chiefs to meet the ministers at the House on 29 July. At that gathering, Thurston proposed to be clear in his advice: “The present Constitution must be either torn up and thrown to the winds and a shorter simpler one granted providing for a Legislature partly nominated and partly elected and for more power in Native lands – or the King and Chiefs had better offer the Kingdom to Great Britain without further delay”. With the stark choices confronting Fiji, Ma`afu, despite the forced disavowal of his secession, would remain at centre stage, even though, as Hennings had reminded the gathering of Europeans at Lomaloma two years earlier, the stage he now trod was a different one.\footnote{See n. 1 above.} The rifles were on their way from Germany and the armed Tongan “visitors” remained encamped to windward, while increasing chaos was descending on the querulous European community at Levuka.
11. “Ma`afu’s word is in the hills…”

Whatever Ma`afu’s immediate goals were when he announced his secession from the Kingdom of Fiji, he is unlikely to have been thinking of Thomas Jefferson’s aphorism, “a little rebellion now and then is a good thing”. After he had repudiated his own little rebellion, the issue of secession faded from public debate in Fiji, although not without a cautionary note from the Fiji Times:

Ma`afu … is a very ambitious man and has long been a formidable rival of the King’s, and whenever he may see a favourable opportunity of forwarding his power, he is not a man to let the chance pass by unimproved.

The newspaper also noted that, with Ma`afu and Tui Cakau now appearing “recalcitrant”, the latter chief had done nothing to quell “disturbances” which had been occurring in Savusavu for more than a month. The public was urged to keep a watchful eye on these two leaders, whatever chiefly humble pie might have then been on the menu. The larger question of the day was one of at least 15 years’ standing in Fiji: annexation. The only form of recognition the British government was prepared to extend to Cakobau was limited to his “jurisdiction” over those Fijian chiefs who, in accordance with Fijian custom, owed him some measure of allegiance. It would be they, along with Cakobau, who would ultimately decide on annexation. One British journal, reflecting the political savvy of many of the long-serving missionaries in Fiji, noted the growing support, in both Fiji and Britain, for the process to be concluded. The journal wisely added a caveat: “But before our Government take any steps in that direction, they would do as well to compare their ideas with the meanings of annexation with those of the Fijian chiefs. Much after-misunderstanding might thus be prevented”.

Wise words indeed, but who in Fiji would pay them heed? Despite the growing opinion favouring annexation, Whitehall continued to look askance at the prospect of yet another Crown Colony. The Times, raising the spectre of “a series of wars like those which have marked the occupation of New Zealand”, declared against annexation on the grounds that it “would contribute nothing to British wealth, prosperity and power”. These concerns, important to the makers of policy at Home, received scant consideration in Fiji itself. The settlers, placed at the end of a long and tenuous line of communication with Whitehall, were liable

---
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to seize whatever opportunities offered to state their increasingly diverse views. Commanders of visiting warships received social calls, official from those in power and informal from members of the settler community. Deputations were received, petitions or formal addresses were presented and opinions sought, all as part of a process that drew a visiting naval commander into the vortex of political life in Fiji in 1873. Commodore Frederick Stirling, officer commanding HMS Clio, which arrived in Fiji early in August, proved no exception, even though he came with “no official instructions relative to Fiji”. 6

When Stirling called formally on the King at Nasova, near Levuka, it was apparent, through the screen of official protocol, that certain settlers had already rushed to state their case to the Commodore. A deputation headed by Dr James Cruikshank, a Taveuni planter, had urged him “to protect the Whites’ rights ceded by the Chiefs of Fiji through the Constitution”. 7 Stirling duly presented Cakobau with “a statement of certain matters”, effectively an address of grievances. It sought the King’s acceptance of his ministers’ resignations, previously declined, and referred to the earlier dissolution of Parliament as illegal. Cakobau, supported to the hilt by Chief Secretary John Thurston, repudiated the “statement” and expressed full confidence in the ministers, whom he desired to remain in office. 8 The Viceroy, also present at the meeting, himself addressed to the Commodore:

I rise to confirm what the king has said. There have been two epochs in Fiji, one when Christianity was introduced, and the other when the present form of Government was adopted. When the missionaries came here, the resident whites told us that Christianity was an evil thing, and the missionaries were bad men. But we believed they were wrong, and we embraced Christianity and found it a good thing. Now we the Chiefs of Fiji have formed a Government, because we believe it will benefit our country, and the whites are united in saying that the government is no good, and the Ministers are bad men. … If any trouble arises, it will be caused by the whites, on account of their unceasing evil speaking, to which there is no end. We believe that if we retain [the Ministers] in office, it will be well with us, and the Kingdom will prosper; but that nothing but ruin would come of following the advice of the whites who are opposed to them … The king and I are of one mind in all these matters, and have one common desire: … the good of Fiji. 9

---

6 FT, 13 Aug 1873.
7 ibid., 6 Aug 1873.
8 “Reply of the King to the petition of grievances presented by Commodore Stirling” [drafted by Thurston], FG, 16 Aug 1873.
9 FG, 9 Aug 1873. See also Stirling to Adm., 13 Aug 1873, Adm 1/6261 and FO 58/153.
Ma`afu delivered what was, in the context of a meeting governed by Western protocol, at once an exemplar of chiefly eloquence and laconic statement of the ignoble history of settler self-interest in Fiji. Not for the first time, he sought to reassure his audience that Viceroy and King were one in their desire to ensure the peace and prosperity of Fiji. Stirling, new to the political factions of Fiji, appeared reassured. The others treated to Ma`afu’s oratory likely kept their fingers discreetly crossed behind their backs, well out of sight of the King, the Viceroy and their distinguished guest.

Four days later Cakobau and Ma`afu, accompanied by their usual entourage, paid a brief farewell call on Commodore Stirling on board the Clio. The Commodore, seemingly content with the united front presented to him at Nasova, noted that the two chiefs, as well as Tui Cakau, “appear … to have been much annoyed at the attempt of the Europeans to reduce them to a subordinate status”. It was reported in Australia that the Commodore’s visit to Fiji “had favourably impressed him with the desirability of annexing those islands”, an indication that he lacked sympathy for the partisan views brought to his notice. The outcome Stirling supposedly favoured was stated to be the only honourable course the British government could adopt. In the meantime, events occurred which, to one informed observer, rendered any form of British administration less likely than ever.

With the Clio barely over the horizon, Ma`afu sailed to Moala on 11 August “for the purpose of procuring supplies”, returning two days later. Still in port at Levuka was another warship, HMS Blanche, Captain Cortland Simpson, whose arrival had preceded that of the Clio. Although Stirling had expressed satisfaction with the determination of the King, and apparently also the Viceroy, to retain their ministers in office, the disaffected settlers who had sought the Commodore’s intervention, according to the Fiji Times, “would never be satisfied” until Thurston and the Premier, George Austin Woods, whom they considered as traitors, were removed from office. By the first week of September, several Levuka merchants, German as well as British, had closed their stores in protest against the taxes imposed by the government they despised. Frederick Hedemann, who had accepted Ma`afu’s order for the Snider rifles, attempted to send his clerk to open his bonded warehouse in Levuka. The clerk was thwarted by 20 armed men, acting on government orders, owing to Hedemann’s earlier refusal to pay duty on goods in the warehouse. The immediate consequence of this confrontation was a meeting later that day of Levuka inhabitants, which passed two unanimous
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resolutions. The Executive was declared unauthorised to receive “monies, taxes or duties”, while Levuka’s white residents were urged to “act as a deputation to the King at once, to represent the present state of affairs to him”.15

Hedemann meanwhile consulted the acting German Consul, Gustav Hennings, who invited Captain Simpson to intervene. As a consequence, an officer from the Blanche was sent ashore to order the Fijian soldiers, agents of the government, away from Hedemann’s store. The proposed “deputation” to the King was bent on intimidation rather than simply representing “the present state of affairs”. With the “deputation” thwarted from confronting Cakobau en masse at Nasova, its spokesman reiterated to him that the government and ministers had lost the confidence of the Assembly. If the King continued to accept their advice, it was claimed, he would no longer be acting as a constitutional sovereign. The “deputation” then agreed to return the following day at 2 p.m. to receive the King’s reply.

On the following morning, Friday 5 September, a fresh attempt by government troops to arrest Hedemann’s clerk would have led to bloodshed had not the clerk placed himself under Consul Hennings’ protection. Several British traders, most of them armed, appeared to support the Germans. That afternoon, some 150 Europeans proceeded to Nasova to hear Cakobau’s reply. Finding their way blocked by armed Fijians and Tongans, under the command of Ma’afu and appearing “in a terribly excited state”, the unarmed Europeans retired. There were a number of scuffles and a Tongan was wounded.16 The Fiji Times, in its narrative of the events at Nasova, gave no hint of their dire implications. Thurston however, writing urgently to Captain Simpson a few hours after the “affray”, referred to threats made to depose the King and the Viceroy, following other threats and abuse which they had suffered the day before. “Persons”, Thurston declared, were arming “in order to attack the King and Ministers tonight”. Thurston had learned that Cakobau and Ma’afu had ordered the Fijians and Tongans not to fire on the Europeans, although “the next time they come into contact with whites they will certainly be less considerate”.17 Simpson had already issued a proclamation on the Thursday, advising British subjects that he would hold them responsible for the consequences if they took up arms. Now, in a rapid response to Thurston’s letter of the following day, he issued a second proclamation from the Blanche advising “all British subjects that any armed resistance to the action of the Fijian authorities will be at their own peril”.18

Thurston, aware that the tactical retreat solved nothing, described Ma’afu’s part in the “affray” to Robert Swanston a few days later. The Europeans had retreated “at a rate of 8 knots – chased by Ma’afu and a party of Tongans – King
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raving mad – many whites bruised, 3 prisoners, one Tongan shot in shoulder – nasty wound”. Ma`afu again appeared as a force for law and order. Thurston emphasised to Swanston that the Viceroy had been “very staunch”, even joining with Cakobau’s son Ratu Epeli Nailatikau to place 200 men each “under drill” and to increase the permanent force to 1,200. Fearing more than ever for Fiji’s future, Thurston despaired of the British government’s “bothering” with Fiji, while “the chiefs now say if we are treated like this by a handful of men what would be our lot if the country was full of them”.19 Premier Woods, although describing as “great fun” the sight of one prominent trader running for his life, reminded Swanston that “the two days’ proceedings will not be forgotten by the chiefs of Fiji”.20 While there might have been fun for Woods, there is evidence that Ma`afu’s staunchness in support of the government lost him much sympathy among Europeans in Fiji. Writing in February 1874, a planter in western Fiji declared that Ma`afu finally and forever destroyed the confidence, which has been the growth of years, felt in him by the white settlers, by the very prominent part he took against the whites in the row at Nasova in September last. The officer from HMS Blanche, who accompanied the deputation that afternoon to Nasova and saw the whole affair, publicly stated (and which was a self-evident fact) that Ma`afu and his Tongans were responsible for that savage attack upon unarmed men.21

While the probable consequences for Fiji of the Nasova “affray” were lost on neither Thurston nor Woods, Ma`afu’s unequivocal support for King and Constitution possessed implications that appeared to pass unremarked. A few days after the riots, with Ma`afu and Ratu Epeli away “organising powerful supports in case of necessity arising”, the government determined to arrest the ringleaders of Nasova. Following his proclamations, Captain Simpson advised the government that “he would feel compelled to land his men with the object of avoiding bloodshed”. In an uncharacteristic move, Cakobau informed Thurston that he would regard such a landing “as a declaration of war and would act as the interest of himself and people may demand”. At a subsequent conference between the King, Thurston and Simpson, a “Convention” was arranged whereby Simpson agreed to confine any intervention to the suppression of “all resistance to ... arrests under due process of law ... made by this government”.22 The King’s assertion of his government’s authority and of the rule of law appeared
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unambiguous. Ma`afu, still Viceroy and acting in apparent contradiction of his attempted secession of a few weeks earlier, aligned himself firmly with a government whose interests he had so recently sought to abrogate.

The rebellious traders and settlers wished for more than simply a return to the 1871 Constitution. They were contemptuous of the government’s attempts to assert its authority in Fiji, refused to pay taxes to a regime they despised and were resolved never to accord indigenous Fijians any equality under the law. Commodore James Goodenough, one of the Commissioners sent to determine the wishes of Fiji’s chiefs concerning annexation, would describe Nasova as “a rough protest against the supposed unconstitutional action of the persons holding office in the Fijian government … intended to test their power and resolution”. Ma`afu’s support for the teetering government should be seen as a determination to oppose such obstreperous dissent, rather than a declaration of common purpose with Cakobau and his ministers. Thurston had already noted the awareness by Cakobau, Ma`afu and Tui Cakau that Europeans in Fiji intended “to thoroughly subordinate them socially and politically”. Now, the Chief Secretary was writing of the determination “by the whole of the whites … to get men returned to the Assembly whose declared intentions are to clear the niggers out”. The alternative to such a bleak prospect would have been “the establishment of a new Constitution with Thurston and Woods as permanent heads of the Government and [a] parliament composed of Natives and Whites elected on a Census basis by the two races”, a scenario described by missionary Jesse Carey as “not likely”. In the face of attempts “to clear the niggers out”, King and Viceroy could pass easily into open alliance.

The events at Nasova demonstrated the impossibility of the existing Ministry’s continuing in office. The government was unable to maintain order in Levuka, other than by armed force, and could collect only a small portion of the taxes it imposed. Goodenough, new to Fiji but enjoying the acquaintance of many in the islands, observed that the

taxes, imposed by an Assembly elected under that [discredited] Constitution … could have been collected in no other way short of the employment of Fijian soldiery, armed and commanded by Englishmen, against the majority of the white settlers, of whom five-sixths are also Englishmen. The proceeds of taxation are, moreover, being spent by the Government … Such a condition of things cannot be allowed to continue.  
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The sad story of the government’s finances is best summarised in the words of the two auditors who prepared a report as part of the Commissioners’ investigation of Fiji’s affairs:

Looking at the revenue received from October 1871 to 31 Dec 1873 … viz £42,063-18-0, we find that the debt contracted during that time was £82,000, so that the establishment and maintenance of the Government has cost £124,000, or three times as much as the revenue received. There does not appear much hope of relieving this under present circumstances…

Apart from the government’s imminent insolvency, Fiji’s nominal head of state, Cakobau, could not but be ignorant of the forms of constitutional government and would never be more than a puppet of those in power. Thurston and Woods, who claimed to hold such moral high ground as existed in Fijian politics in 1873, proposed a new constitution, to which the Privy Council agreed on 27 September and whose aim was to permit “the two races [to] meet on an equal footing”. The constitution would be submitted to provincial governors, including Ma’afu, who would consult the leading chiefs in their provinces. While Ma’afu’s views of the proposal were not recorded, he might have taken a passing interest in Paragraph 18:

The Successor to the Throne shall be the person whom the King in Privy Council may nominate, as such, during His (the King’s) life; but should there be no such nomination, then the Successor shall be chosen by the Native members of the Privy Council, by ballot, in Council assembled.

It is unlikely that these words gave the Viceroy any pause for thought. Given their years of enmity, and Cakobau’s rightful mistrust of his fellow chief, the King would never have nominated his Viceroy as his successor, nor would “the Native members” of the Privy Council have voted for him while “in Council assembled”. During these weeks Ma’afu, having renounced his attempted secession, appeared to devote himself to his vice-regal duties. Writing as “Viceroy and Chief Officer of the Army”, he expressed his appreciation of the efforts of Europeans who participated in the Ba campaign, making particular mention of their courage in the field. Ma’afu was also one of several signatories to a Memorandum of Association which provided for “The Fiji Banking and Commercial Company
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Limited” to commence operations in Fiji. Then, in the same week as the Nasova “affray”, Premier Woods wrote formally to Ma`afu asking him to convene a Court Martial to hear charges against the ringleaders of a recent rebellion in Naitasiri. Of greater significance for Fiji’s future than any of these events was an Order issued by the Privy Council on 22 September, with Ma`afu in the Chair. The Order forbade any subject of the King from selling land to Europeans until “the nature and terms of the proposed sale” had been endorsed by both the relevant provincial government and the Department of Lands and Works. This Order, if properly observed, would have addressed a long-standing source of disaffection between Fijians and settlers. The matter would not be properly resolved until the establishment, under British colonial rule, of the Lands Claims Commission in 1880. In the meantime, the same Privy Council awarded the erstwhile rebel, still Viceroy of Fiji, an annual salary of $4,000.

Once Ma`afu had returned to Lomaloma, away from the need to toe the line in Levuka, old tensions resurfaced. In October, both he and George Bayley, his unofficial secretary for the previous six months, requested Cabinet confirmation of Bayley, whom Ma`afu had appointed over the head of John Giblin, the government’s official nominee. Thurston and Woods both believed that Ma`afu had been urged to Bayley’s appointment by William Hennings, who knew it would not be approved, “or else the conduct of the Viceroy is of a nature not here to be characterised”. If Ma`afu insisted on formal confirmation, the question would have to be placed before the King in Cabinet. Thurston was hinting at corruption. The Viceroy and his perpetual creditor, Hennings, saw their own man as the best means of ensuring that nothing more than a trickle of taxes ever left the shores of Lau. As if by way of reassurance to a rightly cynical Thurston, Ma`afu advised the Minister of Finance that three tons of copra, “native taxes” to a value of £16–3–10, had been sent down to Levuka, while Bayley, apparently diligent at his unofficial post, proceeded with Lau’s next tax assessment. Ma`afu had long favoured copra production by the Fijian and Tongan residents of Lau, in contrast to the European settlers and their cotton, as a means of ensuring the prosperity of his matanitu. The three tons of copra sent to Levuka were but straws in the wind.

One of the greatest difficulties we face in assessing Ma`afu’s career in both Tonga and Fiji lies in reconciling the widely divergent opinions of him found in the
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voluminous missionary writings. Those opinions ranged from John Thomas’s
denunciations of the young chief’s moral calumnies in Tonga to Richard Lyth’s
exasperation at the frequent falls from grace evinced by the newly appointed
Governor of the Tongans in Fiji, still a young man, at Lakeba during the 1850s.
Ma’afu’s more mature years, as Tui Lau, Viceroy and finally Roko Tui Lau
under British rule, were sometimes characterised by missionary praise of the
enigmatic chief for his personal example and qualities of moral leadership. In
Lakeba again late in October 1873, Ma’afu was lauded by a resident Wesleyan
missionary, Thomas Rootes, for having issued a proclamation “favourable to the
cause of religion and morality”. Ma’afu had declared the ancient custom of
vasu, whereby a man enjoyed unlimited claims on the property of his mother’s
family, to be tabu sara, that is never to be practised again. Chiefly feasts, with
their concomitant burdens on people who were expected to supply immense
quantities of food, often at personal cost, were similarly outlawed. There was
even a move towards what would today be termed women’s liberation: “the
women of Fiji have found in His Excellency a friend”, Rootes enthused, “and
are no longer to be ‘hewers of wood and bearers of heavy burdens’”. Ma’afu
reassured the missionary: “I am constantly being made ashamed by what whites
say to me about our treatment of our women. Let them be vakamareqeti in the
future” (that is, people to be treasured and nurtured). The Viceroy had seized
upon three matters of which many Europeans, by no means all missionaries, who
enjoyed some acquaintance with Fijian society had long been critical. Was this
proclamation a manifestation of Ma’afu’s social conscience, a further example
of the leadership qualities evident in many other aspects of his rule as Tui Lau?
Or was it perhaps one of several carefully considered moves to ensure that the
missionaries of Fiji, who bore no love for the self-seeking settlers in the islands
or for the regime in Levuka, remained fully in sympathy with the Viceroy?

Cakobau kept a low profile during these weeks, despite his formal installation as
Tui Viti, at Ma’afu’s suggestion, in November. Annexation remained uppermost
in the public mind, at least among resident Europeans. The Fiji Times declared
itself encouraged by growing support for such a move in Britain, even though
a motion for annexation was defeated by 86 votes to 50 in the House of
Commons. Despite continuing opposition from the Prime Minister, William
Gladstone, it was said to be only “a matter of time until [the government] gave
way before the agitation on the subject”. No such “agitation” could bear fruit
unless supported by Fiji’s chiefs, including of course the Viceroy, who retained
his earlier dignity of Tui Lau. On 16 November, Commodore Goodenough,
Commander of the Royal Navy’s Australia Station, reached Levuka aboard HMS
Pearl to begin the consultation process. Several months earlier, New South
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Wales Governor Sir Hercules Robinson had described the Fijian government as a charade meant to retain power for a minority of self-interested Europeans.\(^{43}\) Earlier still, intervention by two naval commanders, Commodore Stirling and Captain Simpson, had been responsible for keeping the peace in Levuka’s highly volatile European community. Goodenough’s arrival may well have prevented the outbreak of civil war between the main factions, on one side Woods, Thurston, other government ministers and most merchants and professionals of Levuka and on the other the majority of planters living elsewhere in the islands. The planters’ principal motivations were a desire to further their own interests and a firm belief in the inherent superiority of the “white race”. Such a view was articulated in the Fiji Gazette:

> We are aware that annexation is regarded as the grand cure for all Fijian troubles. What is wanted by a certain class of men, is a utopia of rampant Anglo-Saxons, with a subject population of Fijians … among whom to live, and among whom to find, or make, hewers of wood and drawers of water…\(^{44}\)

Although, according to Goodenough, nine-tenths of the Europeans in Fiji favoured annexation, it was but one of four alternatives the Commissioners were bound to consider.\(^{45}\) Furthermore, the British government would not necessarily accept any recommendation the Commissioners might eventually make. Although Thurston welcomed them, he had earlier expressed concern that their brief did not allow for sufficient consultation with the existing government.\(^{46}\) Nevertheless, the wider process of consultation could now commence. Ma’afu, still at home in Lomaloma, was “requested” to come to Levuka immediately for a meeting to discuss “important things”.\(^{47}\) The Viceroy could not comply, his secretary advising the Premier that owing to Adi Elenoa’s “severe illness”, Ma’afu was unable to come down, but would do so “directly Elenoa gets a little better”.\(^{48}\)

At this early stage, Ma’afu’s absence was of no great moment. The Melbourne Argus spoke of Fiji’s “long-impending crisis”, while other newspaper opinion in both Australia and Great Britain increasingly advocated annexation as the only solution for the islands’ many problems.\(^{49}\) “The Government of Fiji is as bad as
it well can be ... [it is] kept in office in defiance of the wishes of the people”. In Fiji, among the more than 2,000 Europeans, there were few who thought differently. When missionary Samuel Brooks, writing from Vuna Point in Taveuni, declared, “the feeling in this neighbourhood is decidedly in favour of annexation”, he might have been speaking for Fiji’s entire planter community. For the present, such initiative as there was remained with Goodenough, whom one settler described as enjoying “the confidence and what is rarer still the respect of the whites in Levuka”. The confidence was not misplaced, since Goodenough later acknowledged that his sole intention in coming to Fiji was “that of seeking the interest of the English. ... The only reason for my being here is regard for 1,500 whites here of whom the greater number are British subjects”. Nevertheless the Commodore, working alone until the return to Fiji of his colleague, British Consul Leo Layard, had not been properly briefed on the situation in Fiji and, even more importantly, lacked authority to negotiate with the islands’ chiefs over annexation. Even if the chiefs were to offer to cede Fiji, an unlikely prospect at the end of 1873, Goodenough could not have accepted. Rather, he would convey the offer to his masters in Whitehall. Following his first meetings with Cakobau, it was clear that Goodenough would not accord him proper respect as Fiji’s nominal king and as spokesman for the principal chiefs. When Cakobau stated that, although he would certainly consult his fellow chiefs, his own preference was “to keep Fiji”, Goodenough described this view as “the exclamation of a semi savage not likely to part with any power or dignity now that he has ministers to help him”. Asked by Goodenough why, if he wanted to “keep Fiji”, he had raised the question of annexation with the British government, Cakobau replied, “I only asked that we might talk about it”. Goodenough also despaired of the Europeans, reporting to the Admiralty, “It would be difficult to find so bankrupt a community anywhere else”. He, too, saw annexation as Fiji’s one hope of salvation.

One additional difficulty during these days was the increasing tension between Goodenough and Thurston, who were never to achieve a comfortable working relationship. Their antipathy meant that Goodenough, in his dealings with Cakobau and the other chiefs, was unable properly to take advantage of Thurston’s long experience of Fiji and intimate knowledge of its people and, more importantly, its modes of thought. Goodenough reported to the Admiralty with characteristic candour:

Mr Thurston ... speaks of the white population as turbulent, treacherous and threatening personal violence, and even assassination, to the
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Ministers; self-government of natives being, in his view, the direction of affairs by himself, Mr Woods and Dr Clarkson, who, like many other bold, confident men, believe that they alone are honest and have the secret of ruling … The great majority of [the settlers] whom I have seen only wish for the security of a strong Government to enable them to prosecute their industrial pursuits … not one is favourable to the action of the present Government unless he is actually in receipt of a salary from it.\textsuperscript{55}

Thurston believed, with reason, that his views were being ignored.\textsuperscript{56} He deplored Goodenough’s overbearing attitude towards Cakobau when Commissioner and King met again on 22 Dec.\textsuperscript{57} When informed that the government of Fiji was not working properly, Cakobau admitted that he had signed many papers without being aware of their content. He also expressed concern at Goodenough’s attitude, accusing the Commodore of attempting to come between him and his ministers. According to Thurston, the Commodore had advised the King that “he must understand that I will have no persons between him and me”, meaning that the final decision concerning Cession must be his alone.\textsuperscript{58} “What can I do?” Cakobau lamented. “I shall be adrift”.\textsuperscript{59} Yet he remained the nominal King of Fiji, while for Goodenough, however much he desired an offer of Cession, none was likely to appear.

During this time of feint and counter-feint between Commodore and King, Ma`afu remained at Lomaloma. While it has been said that absence makes the heart grow fonder, that was patently untrue in the case of Ma`afu and his once and future opponents, Cakobau, Thurston and Goodenough. The Viceroy, both wayward and loyal as suited his purpose, was at least not forgotten. Thurston even mentioned him in the context of racial equality, recalling to Captain Hope Ma`afu’s earlier statement that “he only joined the Government upon the positive understanding that the whites and blacks were under one law. That they were not now one people but two people”.\textsuperscript{60} It was rare for a notion of moral principle and the person of Enele Ma`afu to be associated in John Thurston’s mind. More typical of the view normally taken of the Viceroy by others in power in Levuka were the words of Cakobau in one of his early interviews with Goodenough. The King had outlined for the Commodore the history of Ma`afu’s career in Fiji, regaling Goodenough with the inaccurate statement that the Viceroy “was now actually ousting the natives from their hereditary rights, and establishing [himself] in
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\textsuperscript{56} Thurston, Diary, 1 Jan 1874. See also Thurston to Hope, 24 Dec 1873, Hope Letter-Journals. For Goodenough’s thoughts, see his Private Journal III, 1 Dec 1873 et seq. For some insights into the strained relationship between the two men, see David Routledge, Pre-Cession Government in Fiji, PhD thesis, ANU 1965, 242 et seq.  
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sovereign power”. Although Ma`afu exercised customary rule in Lau, Cakobau, ever resentful of Ma`afu’s power and rightly distrustful of his ultimate ambitions, could not acknowledge that fact to Goodenough. The exchange that followed neatly articulated Ma`afu’s place in the rapidly crumbling edifice still dignified as the Kingdom of Fiji. Speaking of Ma`afu’s supposed usurpation of power,

the Commodore pointed out that this was what took place every day all over the world, and said, ‘Look at the hermit crabs on your coral beaches; they take the shells of others’. ‘True’, rapped out Cakobau, ‘but the hermit crab always takes the empty shell’.61

The year ended with Cakobau and Goodenough barely having cleared the ground for the negotiations ahead. The Fiji Times, rightly attributing Fiji’s failure to progress in 1873 to “the unsatisfactory state of politics” and to the low price of cotton in Britain, also railed against “the detrimental influence upon the progress of Fiji” of the attempted secession of Ma`afu and Tui Cakau.62 In the meantime those two chiefs had gone, if not to ground, at least to their respective matanitu, while during their absence the second Commissioner, Consul Layard, arrived in Levuka. Instructed to respect the de facto government, Layard formally called on Thurston on 2 January 1874.63 Goodenough, meanwhile, pursued a somewhat terse correspondence with Thurston, reminding the Chief Secretary that, in relation to Cakobau’s complaints of intervention between King and ministers, the King “owes the consolidation of his power to the intervention of English officers”, a reference to the actions of various naval commanders in Fiji in 1873 and earlier.64 The Commissioners also outlined for the King the conditions necessary for acceptance of an offer of Cession. It was emphasised to Cakobau that Cession could only be considered if it were freely offered by the chiefs of Fiji. If the chiefs were to conclude that they should remain in control of their islands, their decision would be respected, provided that indigenous Fijians and the increasing number of European settlers could live in peace. With the number of settlers increasing, the King was reminded that maintaining peace between them and his own people would become increasingly difficult.65 During the same few days, Layard also wrote twice to Thurston, warning that the Commissioners’ recognition of the government would cease if the government were to seek “to change its character … in any illegal or constitutional manner”, which effectively meant an attempt to introduce the proposed new constitution of 1873, wherein the franchise would be extended to indigenous Fijians.66
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the process of chiefly consultation having barely begun, the disparity of views between the Commissioners and Thurston was widening. Meanwhile, it was reported that Ritova and Tui Cakau wished “to speak to the commissioners in their own district where they can speak without fear”. Ma’afu could be relied upon to speak “without fear”, whether in his own district or elsewhere. There was no word, in early January, of what his thoughts might be.

The Viceroy, although delayed by Elenoa’s illness, seemed extraordinarily tardy in responding to the summons to come down to discuss “important things”. He was a chief among chiefs, of course, and would respond when it suited him. Perhaps, in the manner of those who know they are actors in an unfolding drama, Ma’afu was delaying his entrance so as to achieve a heightened effect. He knew that the negotiations over Cession bade fair to become the battle of his political life, a battle that would determine whether his ambition to rule Fiji would be forever dashed, or whether, in the event that the chiefs declined to offer the islands to Britain, the field might be cleared for a final confrontation with Cakobau. The Xarifa, carrying “Ma’afu and suite”, finally arrived off Levuka on 23 January, the “suite” including his son Siale’ataogo and Sione Mafi, Ma’afu’s long-serving matapule. Thanks to Mafi, we have some notion of what was in Ma’afu’s mind when he sailed down from Lomaloma. Sixteen years later, with Tui Lau long in his grave and Fiji peaceful under British rule, Mafi recalled, “On the way from Lau Ma’afu had been strong in mind that we should not seek to be annexed to Britain as the chiefs would lose all power in Fiji”. This was his private view, as he came down to enter the fray, and not one he was likely, so early in the process, to vouchsafe either to the King or the Commissioners.

It was well for Ma’afu to remain tight-lipped to all but his trusted confidant, since Cakobau’s manoeuvring to exclude him from the negotiations began only three days after Ma’afu reached Levuka. At another meeting on 26 January, the Commissioners asked Cakobau if he had any questions before they began consultations with the other principal chiefs. The King insisted that he knew the minds of all the great chiefs except Ma’afu and Tui Cakau: “All were for annexation but them and Ma’afu was not a Fiji chief but a Tongan and they wished him to go back but Ma’afu said, how could he go back? How could he … deputed by Tonga to rule parts of Fiji, give up his task?” Cakobau sought to influence the Commissioners against Ma’afu, whom Goodenough had yet to meet. Although Ma’afu’s rhetoric, as conveyed by Cakobau, was valid enough, Cakobau was disingenuous in attributing to the Viceroy the claim that he had been “deputed by Tonga to rule parts of Fiji”. Ma’afu, who had ruled Lau as
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a chief of Fiji since 1869, exercised an authority entirely legitimate within the polity of Fiji. Cakobau’s misrepresentation of the powers of Tui Lau sprang from his long-held fears of Ma`afu’s ambition to rule all the matanitu of Fiji.

Goodenough, in some measure prepared for Cakobau’s prevarication, assured them that if Ma`afu, alone among the chiefs, held out against Cession, he would proceed to Lau to consult the “lesser chiefs” under Ma`afu’s rule. Cakobau assured the Commodore that only “foolish people”, all of them Tongans, supported Ma`afu’s views. Hastening to bolster the Commissioners’ support against his Viceroy, Cakobau compared oppressive Tongan rule with the prospect of British control. “Tonga oppresses but … Fiji will be well governed by England. [Cakobau’s] only fear is Ma`afu; let him be sent away. The only chief who pays attention to Ma`afu is Tui Cakau. The chiefs under Ma`afu detest his rule”. Cakobau ended by reiterating to the Commissioners that, among the principal chiefs, “Ma`afu alone keeps off and would like to take a piece of Fiji and give it to Tonga … Ma`afu keeps his people in the old state of semi-slavery. All should not be made for the benefit of one man”. His diatribe against his rival was effectively a plea to the Commissioners to ensure the political integrity of Fiji by ridding it, once and for all, of the Tongan interloper. In a reference to Consul William Pritchard’s successful moves 15 years earlier to exclude Ma`afu from the decision-making process, Cakobau recalled, “on Ma`afu being declared a foreigner, it was twice agreed that he should not sit at the meeting as a Fijian chief. This was a manawa lailai [small man of war]”. Goodenough was wary, however, and sought to reassure the King without agreeing to dispense with Ma`afu:

if the chiefs were of one mind, with the exception of Ma`afu, and we were told that Ma`afu did not really represent the opinions and wishes of the … chiefs and people under him, we would then enquire directly from those chiefs and people, without necessarily calling in Ma`afu himself.

Even before this exchange, which Goodenough thought significant enough to record at length in his journal, the Commodore was well acquainted with the reputation, if not the ambition, of the chief of Lau. He had already advised Swanston, Minister for Native Affairs, that he and Layard could only “respect the rights and powers who are in existence, however they were acquired in the past”. Ma`afu could not be cast aside. Nevertheless, the Commissioners were prepared to proceed against his wishes, especially if they learned that the lesser chiefs of Lau were not of one mind with their paramount. A sensible approach, certainly, although the Commodore, after all he had heard, appeared already prejudiced against the Viceroy: “We could not, of course, listen for a moment
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to his [Ma`afu’s] claims of independence, when we know what he has said and done”.

Goodenough, in the face of his ill-concealed antipathy for Thurston and his growing familiarity with Cakobau’s various anxieties, evinced both confidence and a sense of moral rectitude in dealing with both the King and the leaders of Fiji’s embattled government. He must have been curious to lay eyes on the chief whose name had had heard above all others. Sailing from Levuka on 26 January, three days after arriving from Lau, the Xarifa pulled alongside HMS Pearl, which lay at anchor off the Rewa delta. The long-awaited meeting occurred when, after going ashore in the morning to confer with Cakobau, Goodenough returned at 11:20 “and sent for Ma`afu who came. Ma`afu staid [sic] to lunch. He is a man of the world and we were soon on winking terms”. Following some banter where the two men took each other’s measure, Ma`afu revealed something of his worldly wisdom in his response to Goodenough’s query about the perennial problem of Lauan taxes:

Ma`afu once very happily hit off the great blot in the Fijian government – the utter want of proportion between its expenditure and the results achieved. He had come alongside the Dido in his pretty little yacht, the Xarifa, once the pride of Port Jackson. After admiring for some time one of the two enormous guns the Dido carries amidships, he said to Captain Chapman, ‘Xarifa carry that gun, eh, Captain?’ ‘Oh no’, replied Captain Chapman, ‘Xarifa too small. Put that on Xarifa, and Xarifa go down’.

When this same chief of Lau was asked by Commodore Goodenough why he would not send his taxes down to the Government in Levuka, he gave a pointed answer, not at all flattering to the authorities. ‘Why should I?’ he asked. ‘I live in the Windward islands. When I cut down a coconut tree it floats down to the Leeward islands, but, like the taxes, no part ever comes back’.

Along with Ratu Epeli Nailatikau, a fellow luncheon guest, Ma`afu remained on board long enough to witness the anchor weighed before the Pearl’s departure.

He was able to enjoy a final riposte with his host, who asked him, “Have you an English secretary?” “No a Tongan”, Ma`afu replied. “When you take over the government, I will ask for an honest English man for my secretary”. Ma`afu did of course have an English secretary, or at least a British subject, in the person of George Bayley. In speaking of the day when Goodenough would “take over the government”, Ma`afu judiciously neglected to mention that that task was one he hoped to fulfil himself.
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Early in February, the *Fiji Times*, lamenting the “prostrate” economy of the islands, expressed optimism at the prospect of imminent change. “Cakobau and Ma`afu are both favourable to the project [of annexation],” the editor enthused, an ingenuous view considering the opinion the Viceroy privately expressed to his *matapule*. Many parts of Fiji were certainly in need of change: following a visit to Cakaudrove, Swanston reported that “the people are crying out in despair at the lala of their chief, and their women are turned by the chief to his own account without stint”. These were some of the same afflictions Ma`afu had recently outlawed in Lakeba. Macuata, Swanston added, was reputed to be “in an utterly disorganised state so far as Government is concerned”. Moreover, despite Ma`afu’s reforms “favourable to the cause of religion and morality” at Lakeba, there was dissension even there. Percival Friend, Government Agent on the island, complained of Ma`afu’s decree that the old *Tovata* laws should be the only legal authority, an edict that earned the displeasure of his kinsman Ratu Tevita Ululakeba, Lieutenant-Governor of Lau. Further, the chiefs refused to submit their taxes in kind “without an order direct from [Tui Lau]”. George Bayley had come down to collect, on Ma`afu’s behalf, rents from European leaseholders on the island. Friend correctly observed that “the future prospects of good government … depend on Tui Lau”, as long as he understood “that the laws of the Kingdom alone be in force … and that Tevita has power to act on his own responsibility in Ma`afu’s absence”. Even Hennings protested about Ma`afu’s hold over the Lakeba chiefs, with the consequence that Cabinet formally conferred with Ma`afu on the subject. The Viceroy ordered a messenger to proceed to Lakeba with instructions for them to hand over their taxes, although with what result is unknown.

Ma`afu unintentionally brought an uncharacteristic unity to Fiji’s cabinet. On 9 February, co-incidentally the day Tui Cakau arrived from Wairiki, Thurston recorded “dissension” in Cabinet, with the Premier and Treasurer at odds over the means to reduce expenditure. “The harmony of Cabinet is destroyed”, Thurston lamented. Yet there was one matter on which Cabinet was unanimous: Tui Lau’s unpaid taxes. The next day, a letter was despatched instructing him to submit “without further delay” the native taxes from Lau for the year ending 30 June 1873, as well as rents from the same period for Lakeba, Moala, Totoya and Cicia, altogether estimated to be worth £2,500. Ma`afu was also required to “cause” the immediate collection of the equivalent taxes and rents for the first half of the
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current financial year. Cabinet viewed “with extreme regret” Ma`afu’s failure to honour his promise of five months earlier, when he had agreed to submit the taxes and, in the event of his failure to comply now, would consider the overdue revenue a charge on his personal estate, which appears to indicate a willingness to sue the Viceroy. In the light of pressures building on the government, it is likely that Cabinet sought to force Ma`afu either to offer his support, through payment of his outstanding taxes, or to leave Fiji altogether. These instructions were sent to Ma`afu on the same day as Consul Layard advised Thurston that the Commissioners’ support for the government would be withdrawn if any attempt were made “to change its character in an illegal and unconstitutional manner”.

Following his delayed arrival from Lau and despite these peremptory instructions from the government, Ma`afu would remain a central figure in the continuing negotiations over Cession. He returned to Levuka from Bau on 12 February, much to the puzzlement of Thurston, always suspicious of the Viceroy’s activities. Frederick Langham, superintendent of the Wesleyan mission in Fiji and a long-time resident of Bau, who might be considered an impartial observer, reported at this time that Ma`afu, “hitherto … opposed to annexation”, had changed his mind after realising that the Fijian chiefs were unanimous in their support for the idea. The Viceroy moreover, Langham believed, had undergone “a most satisfactory interview with the Commissioner”, a reference to the meeting on board the *Pearl*. Langham noted that Woods and Thurston were both seeking to influence the chiefs against ceding their islands to Britain, “notwithstanding the Kingdom is in a state of bankruptcy, heavily in debt … and with such an uncertain revenue”. More significantly, the Commissioners, in a confidential despatch to the Colonial Secretary, reported their discussions with Ma`afu and advised that “both Cakobau and Ma`afu have assured us of their desire that the country should be Governed by Great Britain and have severally told us that the chiefs and people will follow their leading”. The two chiefs, along with others whom the Commissioners interviewed on Viti Levu, reported widespread resentment “on account of the poll tax”, which was fixed at 15 shillings per head for males aged 15 and over and four shillings for females, “far beyond the capacity of natives to pay”. The “general indebtedness of the country” was also a matter for chiefly concern. The Commissioners were preparing, reluctantly, to assume a temporary protectorate over Fiji, in order to prevent bloodshed. They favoured the British government’s assuming a much closer interest in the islands’ affairs: “the formation of … Fiji … into a Crown Colony seems to us … the surest
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and best mode” of dealing with the islands’ difficulties.\(^{86}\) If Cakobau and Ma`afu were indeed of the same view and able to carry the lesser chiefs and people with them, prospects for a smooth path to Cession appeared favourable indeed.

One explanation for Ma`afu’s apparent change of mind was that suggested by the Commissioners and Langham: he became aware, after his first consultations at Bau, of the unanimous opinions of the principal Fijian chiefs. By this time Tui Cakau, Katonivere from Macuata and other chiefs from Rewa, Namosi, Nadroga, Serua and Kadavu had all arrived at Bau, although Tui Cakau, perhaps finding the prospect of lengthy negotiations somewhat daunting, was reported to be “drinking hard” and “surrounded by hordes of Tongans”.\(^{87}\) An urgent message was sent to summon Ratu Tevita Uluilakeba from Lakeba,\(^{88}\) although there was a report, one month later, that Tevita had been “kidnapped” and sent to Tonga “as … a kind of hostage”. The Fiji Times considered the report to be part of “a tissue of misrepresentations indulged in with respect to [Ma`afu]”.\(^{89}\) It emerged later that Ma`afu, while purporting to obey the recent direction from Cabinet to submit Lakeba’s outstanding taxes forthwith, had sent a message to authorise their collection, while secretly ordering that they be retained at Lomaloma.\(^{90}\)

There is also evidence that when the message was sent to summon Ratu Tevita, Ma`afu was aware that Tevita was not on Lakeba and was, in fact, in Tonga. According to Percival Friend, Tevita had left the island on 2 February for Tonga “in consequence of having received a private message from Ma`afu to do so”.\(^{91}\) There was, however, more to Ma`afu’s change of heart in Bau than the apparent solidarity of the indigenous chiefs. The Commissioners had assured Tui Lau that he would continue to rule his province if Cession did eventuate.\(^{92}\) It is unfortunate that, during this crucial time of decision for both Ma`afu and Fiji, we lack reliable evidence of his true state of mind. His seeming unanimity with the indigenous chiefs might have arisen because he believed that, as a minority of one among them, he could not hope to see his opinion prevail. It is also possible that the assurance of his continued rule in Lau was enough to ensure his support for Cession. The most politically astute among all the chiefs of Fiji, Ma`afu must have realised, following the Nasova “affray” and its aftermath, that some form of British rule was inevitable. Yet there remained the order for the rifles: was Ma`afu quietly confident that the chiefs would, in the end, decide against offering their islands to Britain, thus enabling him to pursue his dream,
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expressed to William Pritchard a decade earlier, to become “chief at Bau”? Whatever was in his mind, the problem of Lauan taxes, on which Cakobau and his ministers expressed common purpose, would not go away. There also remained the matter of the labourers Ma’afu had removed from Beqa in 1870 to undertake plantation work in Lau: after three and a half years, they had still not been repatriated. Ratu Emosi, Tui Beqa, wanted them back. As Ma’afu sailed aboard the Xarifa back and forth from Levuka to Bau, it seemed that, despite the Commissioners’ declared satisfaction over the unanimity of outlook, all would not be plain sailing in the quest for an agreement over Cession.

Goodenough had been disingenuous in reporting to the Colonial Office that Cakobau and Ma’afu both favoured Cession. It is rare, among the annals of nineteenth century Fiji, to find the King as articulate and as animated as he was in his early discussions with the Commissioners. He was effectively pleading with them to rid him of the turbulent Tongan and was willing to engage in prevarication and even outright deception to achieve that long-desired goal. But Ma’afu could not be sent away and, as his secret message to Lakeba revealed, he was pursuing his own agenda in defiance of his assurances to the Commissioners, the King and the ministers. They all distrusted him: Swanston, following a discussion with the King and Ratu Epeli at Bau on 20 February, noted their determination “that Ma’afu shall not be considered in any way in connection with annexation”. Cakobau went further only three days later, asserting to Swanston “that in order to assure unanimity in the future, [Ma’afu] must retire from Fiji. The whole of his conduct … since joining the government has been so false as to render any faith in him impossible. And this is the general feeling among the great bulk of the Fijian chieftains”. Thurston noted on the same day, “Ma’afu seemed very uneasy and shifty. [He] asked me if it was true he was to be reduced in rank and placed below David [Ratu Tevita Uluilakeba]. He is evidently playing a double game all round”. The Commodore had been long enough in Fiji to appreciate these sentiments. With the assembled chiefs apparently resolved to exclude Ma’afu from their councils, the Commissioners “determined to let it be no business of ours”. So anxious was Goodenough to see his mission to a successful conclusion, which could be achieved by an offer of Cession, he was willing deliberately to distort the situation to the Colonial Office, as Cakobau had in turn distorted the facts to him, in order to coax into action a government which, as he well knew, remained reluctant to extend Great Britain’s imperial sway.
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The consequences of Ma`afu’s “double game” would not become apparent until the formal chiefly conclave began at Bau on Monday 2 March. In the meantime, the Commissioners attended a public meeting at Levuka on 25 February, where they were presented with a petition in favour of annexation, “signed by all but three settlers who have refused”. Later the same day, prompted by news of the imminent chiefly gathering, the Commissioners sailed for Bau. The “grand council”, initially planned for Levuka, was moved to Bau on the orders of Cakobau, who declared, with reason, that whatever decision was reached should be communicated from Bau, “the recognised seat of authority among Fijians”. Thurston was also aware that the chiefs could never be free of interference if they conferred at Levuka. By 25 February, all of Fiji’s principal chiefs, with the exceptions of Ritova from Macuata and Tui Bua, had reached Bau. Ritova had been in Levuka in January, supposedly bringing down his taxes, but was the victim of an attempt “to seize him and carry him off, a prisoner, to Bau”, owing to his refusal to submit his taxes to the district warden “until the new government is formed”. He possessed “a troop of his own”, drilled daily, ready to resist any attempt to prise the taxes from him. It was probably during this visit to Levuka that Ritova sent a tabua to Ma`afu “for armed help”. If these claims, made three months later, were true, it must have been apparent that Ma`afu was not the only provincial chief ready to use armed force to resist the waning authority of the central government.

During preliminary discussions in late February, Goodenough reminded the chiefs that the impetus for Cession had come from them rather than from the British government, which would prefer to see an effective local administration in place. Touching on the chiefs’ principal concern, the Commodore advised them that their customary privileges would be preserved, should they decide in favour of Cession. On 26 February, after returning to the Pearl from discussions on shore at Bau and noting the Xarifa riding at anchor nearby, Goodenough invited Ma`afu on board. The chief was asked to stay to dinner, where he joined two other guests, Thurston and Swanston. During the meal, Thurston thought Ma`afu “cold and sulky”, a demeanour which probably resulted from the announcement by his fellow guests that his place in the new order would be “considered a Fijian question entirely”; neither Thurston, Swanston nor the Commissioners would play a part. Sione Mafi remembered that during the “splendid dinner”,
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Goodenough asked Ma`afu why he now favoured annexation. “Because it was to give peace to the land’. The Commodore asked if he had any other reason. ‘No, I have worked in Fiji to stop cannibalism and fighting but it cannot be done’. Then we talked and looked around the ship”. 108 Goodenough, in marked contrast to Thurston and Swanston, appears to have developed a liking for Ma`afu, whom he described as “a fine fellow certainly”. Paying a social call to the Xarifa on the day after the memorable dinner, the Commodore, finding the Viceroy “out of sorts”, invited him to breakfast the next day. 109

During these preliminary discussions, the chiefs sought to guarantee their place in any new order with a series of proposals, put to the Commissioners by Thurston, which involved matters of status and salaries. It was envisaged that Cakobau would be Tui Viti for life, with £2,000 per annum and a yacht, while other chiefs were to receive lesser salaries determined by their places in the hierarchy. Also, the principal chiefs were to be appointed as governors of their matanitu. While the Commissioners’ initial reaction was to advise Thurston that these requests were “absurd”, they were careful to note Ma`afu’s delicate position in the imminent deliberations, informing the Colonial Office that Tui Lau was “detested by the Fijian chiefs [who] were … seeking to turn him out of Fiji”. “We may here remark”, the Commissioners added, “that the result is that he is not turned out, but remains in possession of the Windward Islands”. 110 This last piece of advice was given in hindsight, following the Cession deliberations. The Commissioners’ words nevertheless bear eloquent witness to the sense of frustration felt by the indigenous chiefs in the days before the Council. Even though they “detested” Ma`afu, their only hope of “turning him out” lay in British intervention.

Although the chiefs’ initial demands would never be met, they arose in part from the chiefs’ awareness that, in any transfer of sovereignty to a foreign power, something of their prestige as rulers of the Fijian people would be sacrificed. They also appear to have held a degree of mistrust for the Commissioners, whom they saw as representing European interests in Fiji and whom they knew to be consulting Ma`afu frequently. In the latter respect their fears were well founded, at least as far as the frequency of meetings was concerned. Goodenough, who evinced some sympathy for Ma`afu’s position if Cession were to come about, conferred with him again on Saturday 28 February, the last working day before the chiefs’ formal deliberations began:

Ma`afu came and we gradually got on to politics. I told him that the chiefs did not want to treat him as a Fijian chief and would not so
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consider him, and he folded his arms and braced himself for the fight. I see some men shirk in time of danger but you rise superior to fate and are ready for a fight. ‘Ah,’ he said, ‘I don’t mind these Fijians but the whites are too many for me. What can I do?’

With Thurston still hoping that the existing government could continue in some form, albeit with a vastly reduced expenditure, Ma’afu, having retired to the Xarifa, came on board the Pearl later the same day. Goodenough, still in sympathy, “advised him to go to the Council of chiefs on Monday and to see Mr Thurston in the evening”. The suggestion that Ma’afu consult Thurston, although probably made in good faith, was unwise, in view of pressure the Chief Secretary had recently placed on the Viceroy. Having privately accused Ma’afu of “playing a double game”, Thurston was less than straightforward himself. On Friday 27 February, he questioned Ma’afu privately as to his views, and in learning that he was for annexation left him to return next day … and to inform him that he was to be deposed from office as Viceroy. This before any trial had taken place, before accusations had been formally made or inquiry instituted in the presence of the other Governors, as was afterwards done. The object evidently was to frighten him, and thus induce him to acquiesce in views held by a few. But he was not to be frightened...

Thurston’s threat to Ma’afu was a measure of his desperation to preserve the existing government, rather than accept the loss of power which Cession would involve.

It is not difficult to discern Ma’afu’s state of mind on the eve of the Council. Gazing from the deck of the Xarifa, he must have contemplated the bulk of HMS Pearl and the power it represented, a power with which he could never compete and which lay behind the European community, about whom he had despaired to the Commodore. There remained the Fijian chiefs, whom he felt he could overcome, despite their unremitting hostility, if only he and they were the only players on the field. On Sunday 1 March, the final day before the Council began, there is no record of Ma’afu’s movements. It is certain, however, that thoughts of his looming confrontation with the chiefs, and perhaps also his plans for armed intervention against Bau, occupied his mind. He was not forgotten in discussions that day when Goodenough paid an afternoon call on Swanston. The Commodore was blunt with the Minister:

[I] told him very seriously that he must tell Cakobau that Ma’afu’s position must be respected whatever happened and that nothing must be
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done to make our presence here an injury to him. If there be annexation then we must take things as we find them and if there be no annexation Ma`afu must go back to his land untouched.

Swanston was requested to deliver these injunctions to Cakobau on the morrow, before the Council commenced, while interpreter Marshall Moore, also present, was to remind the other chiefs at the conclave, “especially Ratu Savenaca”, Cakobau’s brother. Goodenough, always ready to dictate to chiefs and ministers alike, was alone among the Europeans involved in Cession in his efforts to offer some support to Ma`afu.

The Viceroy’s moodiness during the preceding few days bore witness to the fact that he harboured no illusions about the Council, where he knew he would have to fight to retain his power. Soon after deliberations began on the Monday, Ma`afu took the initiative by stating that he had come only to listen, not to speak. “I hear I am superseded”, he added. When a vote of no confidence in the ministers was mooted, Ma`afu declined to participate, saying, “Let no-one do anything he does not understand. Why were we told last year that the great Powers believed in us and now we are talking about giving the land away?” His tactics failed, since “the King, Savenaca and others said they did understand, and Ma`afu was left in a minority of one”. Seemingly undaunted and displaying a “very unpleasant” demeanour, Ma`afu asked for details of the charges against him. They were “appropriating the whole revenue of Lau for two years and a half, carrying on the Tovata laws and getting $45,000 out of Treasury on the strength of his good faith and honour”. After lunch, Ma`afu answered the charges by claiming that Louis Biganzoli, former secretary for Lau, had told him that he was to collect all revenues, pay his own salary and submit the balance to Treasury. Unfortunately, Ma`afu claimed, the revenues had never been sufficient even for his salary, much less payments to Treasury. He unwisely added that he had never believed in the government or the ministers, who possessed too many clerks. “Yet when shown Orders in Council signed by himself, he said he had forgotten”. He proved himself a minority of one indeed, but worse was to come. “The King ordered Swanston to state his views to the Council which he did, reviewing all Ma`afu’s antecedents, and finishing by telling him that he was no longer Governor of Lau and that he must … go back to Tonga in three months”. Ma`afu thereupon left the meeting, but was expected to return next day.

Goodenough effectively summarised the day’s proceedings with his comment that the chiefs had not gone into Cession at all but had “only spit out their venom against Ma`afu”. Tui Lau’s defence against the charges could have
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Ma`afu’s manoeuvres were in any case a side issue from the confrontation in Council between Cakobau and Commodore Goodenough. When Goodenough adopted a peremptory tone, advising the King on the Tuesday that he expected to learn that night, at “what hour tomorrow he will give his reply”, Cakobau’s response was, “If the Commodore asks me for some yams or a pig I will tell him the hour he can send for them. If he is asking me to give him the country I must take my own time to consider and reply. He should remember that if our country is given to England it is parted with … forever”. For the King, this consideration eclipsed, at least for the moment, even his antipathy towards his Tongan nemesis. He was forced to retreat from this intransigent position when, on Tuesday evening and early on Wednesday, informal meetings of the other chiefs expressed their determination that he should not cede their islands to Britain. When formal deliberations resumed on Wednesday morning, Cakobau “expressed regret at his hasty actions of yesterday and stated [they] arose from his annoyance that Ma`afu had been reinstated”. Ma`afu absented himself from a meeting of provincial governors, called to discuss Cession, instead sending word to Swanston that he wished to see him. At their conference, after complimenting Swanston for having “exposed the true mind of the Bauan chiefs”, Ma`afu asked for his views on Cession. “I think with you if we do not have annexation we
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shall have trouble’, was Swanston’s careful reply. ‘True’, said Ma’afu. Then, after a pause, he added, ‘These men are going to reject annexation’, [whereupon] he turned on his heel and left.” \(119\)

An account of Ma’afu’s state of mind, recorded almost 50 years later, presents a picture of a deeply troubled chief pacing the beach at Bau, “none of his followers daring to go near him”. \(120\) While there is no contemporary evidence to support this anecdote, the picture it paints of Ma’afu wrestling with the decision confronting him is convincing. One evening during the Council, Ma’afu sent Tui Bua to consult Swanston, who was to recall the meeting:

‘Ma’afu has sent me’, said the chief, ‘to learn your true mind about annexation, as he is undecided … and Tui Cakau hates the idea’. Ma’afu was a very reticent man. He would listen but express no opinion until the moment for action arrived. I had already spoken with him twice on the subject of annexation so as to … acquaint him with my reasons why I urged it should come about … I entered fully into the matter with Tui Bua. I pointed out to him that Ma’afu, although a de facto ruling chief in Fiji, was a Tongan, feared, not loved by the Fijian chiefs, and that his value as a political weight to keep things from being whipped into confusion at the expense of any Fijian-born chief was a thing of the past… \(121\)

The fears Ma’afu had expressed to Swanston were confirmed. During the afternoon, the chiefs prepared a letter for the Commissioners, stating their “desire … that we should retain, in connection with our King, the Government of our country Fiji, and not give it up to any foreign nation”. Sixteen chiefs, including Tui Cakau but not Ma’afu, signed. \(122\) Much to Ma’afu’s subsequent ire, Sione Mafi signed in his place, having been persuaded to do so, against his better judgment, by Tui Cakau. \(123\) It is possible that Ma’afu’s sudden support for Cession had some effect on the chiefs, although most of them, concerned over loss of status and power, were not willing to see the British take control of Fiji. That evening, Ma’afu again ventured on board the Pearl to ask Goodenough whether he should add his signature to those of the other chiefs. He informed the Commissioner that Woods had warned the chiefs that, if annexation went ahead, they would be driven into the mountains and shot like pigs. \(124\) The Commissioners, when meeting the chiefs the next day, pointed out that a return to the previous debt-ridden government should not be contemplated. They advised the chiefs that, in the event of Cession, existing land tenure in Fiji would
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be respected.\textsuperscript{125} Thurston took offence at the Commissioners’ manner, writing of “a general attack upon the Ministers” and “specious promises”.\textsuperscript{126} Despite the reassurance and perhaps because of the Commissioners’ bullying, the chiefs became alarmed when Goodenough repeated the apparent warning about the consequences of annexation, with Ma`afu adding that the dire prediction had come initially from Thurston, who was present. Furious, Thurston “abused Ma`afu roundly calling him names and saying that he was the source of all the trouble in Fiji”. Thurston went on to call Ma`afu a liar to his face, in the presence of the King, other chiefs and the Commissioners.\textsuperscript{127} He was to record his horror the same evening: referring to the supposed statement that Fijians would be driven into the mountains and “shot like pigs”, the King said,

‘Several chiefs have told me this’, and I asked him to name one. He said, ‘Ma`afu, who else’. Ma`afu had said several chiefs heard it. I asked Ma`afu who said [it] and to my horror the wretched liar said, ‘Mr Thurston I heard you’. [I] put it all to the chiefs and the King who all said it was false. Then I told Ma`afu he was a liar and he looked so.\textsuperscript{128}

When the senior chiefs denied having heard the supposed remark from Thurston, “Ma`afu stuck to his story, only saying that it was said of India and of Tahiti”, meaning that some indigenous people in those countries had met a similar fate.\textsuperscript{129} His words might have touched a nerve already raw, since the chiefs were aware of the fate of the Aborigines after European settlement in Australia and of the loss of land sustained by the Maori in New Zealand. Cakobau was later to confirm the falsehood of Ma`afu’s slur against Thurston, although Sione Mafi, who was present, later asserted that “all the chiefs” had agreed with Ma`afu that it was Thurston who made the remark about the British shooting Fijians.\textsuperscript{130} There was also a contemporary press report to the effect that outside the Council, some of the chiefs confirmed that Thurston had indeed made the statements attributed to him by Ma`afu.\textsuperscript{131} Whatever the truth of the matter, Ma`afu’s cause was not well served by the antagonism of Thurston who, as Mafi would relate, bore him a grudge ever after.

After the King had retired, in order to permit the other chiefs to put questions to the Commissioners, Ma`afu asked if there were a war among the chiefs under
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the present government, “what part would be taken by the Commodore?”

Goodenough’s reply was that “he should not interfere except to forbid all …

English subjects to take part with the military of either side and that he should
not allow native quarrels to interfere with British interests”. One of the most
dramatic moments during the negotiations followed: “Ma`afu was asked … to
speech and said, ‘What is the use of my speaking? You know … I am in favour
of annexation and that I have said … the Nasova government cannot last’”. Swanston agreed, reminding the chiefs that only the presence of a British man-
of-war had prevented bloodshed at Nasova. An astonished Tui Cakau asked
Ma`afu the question he above all the chiefs was entitled to ask: why had he
changed his mind? Ma`afu replied that the affair at Nasova had caused him
to alter his opinion: “without a strong government, matters will become more
complicated. The whites do not respect the Fijian government, you the chiefs do
not, you do not work together and troubles will arise which will result in our
fighting”. While nobody could dispute Ma`afu’s reasoning, his words reveal
his lack of probity. His apparent lie concerning the dire fate awaiting Fijians
after annexation was a measure of his desperation. When Tui Cakau reminded
him of his earlier plea to Cakobau not “to give their land to England”, Ma`afu
left, “silently angry”. Shortly afterwards the meeting broke up for the day,
with the King expected to give a final answer on the morrow.

While the import of the events at Nasova would have been apparent to a chief
of such political acumen, Ma`afu’s principal motivation for changing his mind
was a desire to preserve his power in Lau after Cession, which he viewed as
inevitable. Swanston was to record his final discussion with Ma`afu, held before
dawn on the day of decision:

I pointed out to him that in consenting to annexation, he would have an
assured position with a good salary from which he could at any moment
retire if displeased with it, or if he was called to Tonga; that I believed
that England would deal liberally and generously with the chiefs, and
that to oppose annexation was but to postpone it for a short while. [I
quoted] an old Fijian proverb equivalent to abandoning the substance
to chase the shadow. Ma`afu listened in silence some time and then said,
‘Tui Cakau wants us to return to our old Tovata, Rewa will join and then
we have Lau, Cakaudrove, Macuata, Bua and Rewa, and let Bau look to
itself’. He was then silent. I waited a while and urged again the certainty
of trouble eventuating, and of assured evil resulting to him … I quoted
another proverb: He who kicks the spear point will hurt himself.
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Ma`afu replied that he would do as Swanston advised, but unwillingly. He did not forget to add that if things turned out badly, he, Swanston, would bear the blame.\footnote{136 Swanston, undated notebook.}

As his words to Swanston reveal, Ma`afu was well aware of the strength of the alliance he could command against Bau. Yet, with heavy pressure being brought to bear on the King and the chiefs to accept annexation, Ma`afu also knew that the British were not going to leave Fiji. Despite his change of tactics, his position was equivocal at best when the King formally rejected annexation the next morning, Friday 6 March. Cakobau’s advice read, in part, “Although Fiji is a small and weak country we [the chiefs and I] can govern it, if the governments of foreign nations are friendly towards us”.\footnote{137 Goodenough and Layard to Lord Carnarvon, 19 Mar 1874, enc. 1: Cakobau to Commissioners, 6 Mar 1874, CO 83/5. See also “Meeting of the Commodore with the King and Chiefs of Fiji at Bau, 6th March 1874”, \emph{FT}, 11 Mar 1874.}

While the Commissioners assured the King of their support, they urged that government expenditure be reduced and Cabinet reformed. But the King had already accepted the proffered resignation of the Cabinet and the accompanying recommendation from Woods that Thurston be summoned to “construct” a new government.\footnote{138 Woods to Cakobau, 5 Mar 1874, Cakobau to Premier, 6 Mar 1874, \emph{FG}, 11 Mar 1874.} According to one settler, who spoke to several chiefs and others, Thurston had advised Cakobau not to agree to annexation but instead to establish a government of chiefs with Thurston himself as Premier.\footnote{139 W.H. Bruce to Swanston, n.d. [c. Mar 1874], Swanston, Journal, Vol. 2.} Cakobau did ask Thurston to carry on the government, with Parliament to reassemble under the 1871 Constitution.\footnote{140 \emph{FT}, 18 Mar 1874; \emph{FG}, 11 Mar 1874; Thurston to British Consul, 7 Mar 1874, FO58/145; Thurston, Diary, 6 Mar 1874; Swanston, Journal, 6 Mar 1874; Goodenough, Journal, 9 Mar 1874; Layard to FO, 17 Mar 1874, FO58/142; Layard to FO, 19 Mar 1874, Enc. 3, FO58/145.} Goodenough privately disapproved of the decision, however, later noting that he “must think less well of chiefs who are unable to know their own minds”.\footnote{141 Goodenough, Journal IV, 6 Mar 1874.} He ascribed the chiefs’ prevarication to their fears, exacerbated by claims from “some persons”, of loss of authority and land under Cession.\footnote{142 Goodenough to Lord Kimberley, 18 Mar 1874, Goodenough Letter-Books 1873–1875.} Ma`afu reportedly attributed the rejection of Cession “to the influence of Mr Thurston, although flatly denied by that gentleman”.\footnote{143 Charles St Julian to W.L. Green, Hawaiian Minister of Foreign Affairs, n.d., quoted in \emph{FT}, 4 Jul 1874.} The chiefs authorised Thurston to include Ma`afu in “a special Council of Advice” formed to discuss future strategies with the Commissioners.\footnote{144 Thurston, Diary, 10 Mar 1874.} Ma`afu was named as Lieutenant Governor of Lau, given £1,000 and a clear title to the Yasayasa Moala.\footnote{145 \emph{FT}, 11 Mar 1874.} Although this largesse was to encourage his adhesion to whatever new administration emerged, he was not to be swayed. On 12 March, Ma`afu formally advised the Commissioners, “it is my
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

wish that the chiefs of Fiji give up the government of Fiji to Great Britain”.¹⁴⁶ He left for Lau on the same day amid much speculation and no little fear concerning his immediate plans.¹⁴⁷

Thurston, still smarting from his confrontation with Ma`afu, had been reassured on the evening of 6 March when most of the leading chiefs promised him their support in his efforts to carry on the government. Woods even offered Cakobau’s ring to Tui Cakau “as my loloma to you [and] in support of Mr Thurston”.¹⁴⁸ Ma`afu was not present. Attempting to thwart the Viceroy at every turn, Thurston had been scheming against him on his home ground. William Hennings, writing to Thurston from Lomaloma, stated his belief that in the event of war, Ma`afu’s government in Lau would not accept Cession and that Ma`afu would be most unlikely to apply to Tonga for help. Rather, “one or other of the chiefs who charge him with treachery would be glad to join him in a raid upon Bau”.¹⁴⁹ Thurston would advise a group of Levuka merchants that “Tui Cakau had been informed by Tongans that it was the intention of the Government to deprive him of his authority, and put in his place Ratu Kuila a subordinate chief”.¹⁵⁰ If this is true, it is highly likely that the misinformation represented an attempt by Ma`afu to influence his fellow chiefs against Cession. Thurston had warned Tui Cakau “not to heed Ma`afu”, promising that he would be restored as Tui Vanua Levu should annexation not proceed. Thus was Tui Cakau induced to vote against the proposal.¹⁵¹

The most damning evidence concerning Thurston’s relations with Ma`afu was provided by Frederick Langham, who recalled Thurston’s threat, before the Council began, to dismiss Ma`afu as Viceroy if he persisted in supporting annexation.¹⁵² Langham believed Ma`afu’s secession to be imminent and that war would inevitably follow.¹⁵³ Cakobau’s order for Ma`afu and all the Tongans to quit Fiji, even if it had not been rescinded, would have been impossible to enforce. Sione Mafi recalled Ma`afu’s reaction:

The Commodore … asked him what he was going to do now that he and all Tongans were told to leave. Ma`afu laughed and said, ‘They want to fight, very well it must be so’. The Commodore then asked him if he thought he could prevail against Bau. Ma`afu said, ‘With ease if you do not interfere’. The Commodore said, ‘I am inclined to assist you’.

¹⁴⁶ Statement of Ma`afu, 12 Mar 1874, FO 58/145; Goodenough – Layard Report, 323.
¹⁴⁷ FT, 14 Mar 1874.
¹⁴⁸ Thurston, Diary, 6 Mar 1874.
¹⁴⁹ Hennings to Thurston 1 Apr 1874, CG Set 10.
¹⁵⁰ FT, 18 Mar 1874.
¹⁵² See above, n. 112.
¹⁵³ Langham to McArthur, 18 Mar 1874.
The Commodore and Consul then went away to the Pearl. Ma`afu sent for Forakau [skipper of the Xarifa] and told him to get plenty of wood and water on board the Xarifa. He said to me, `Get ready to go to Tonga. You will not land again until you land in Nuku`alofa’. He gave me all I was to say to Tupou.

Had I gone, I was to come back with an army.154

Lest it be thought that Ma`afu was the only one making plans for armed conflict, notice should be taken of advice to the Foreign Office by Consul Layard that government ministers had spent a large sum organising an army, consisting of “several thousand” men, which had been drilled at Nasova by Premier Woods. This “army”, as Thurston supposedly informed Goodenough, was meant to intimidate the white opponents of the ministers.155 Since a force of “several thousand” would have had to involve every white man in Fiji, to say nothing of those whose intimidation was sought, little credence can be given to Layard’s assertion, beyond the fact that Thurston was apparently prepared to use armed force against his opponents. Ma`afu, on the other hand, would have had little trouble in collecting reinforcements in Tonga sufficient to ensure victory over Bau. After giving orders to Mafi to proceed to Tonga and return with “an army”, Ma`afu himself, still at Bau, had a vessel ready to sail to Samoa to collect the rifles ordered from Germany. He changed his mind when visited by Goodenough, who persuaded him to return home to Lomaloma and wait for him there. In the meantime he had, according to Mafi, received a death threat from Savenaca, although a force of Buan people, waiting at Levuka, was ready to defend him.156 Such were the circumstances surrounding Ma`afu’s departure from Bau on 12 March.

In Levuka, meanwhile, the reaction to the chiefs’ decision not to cede Fiji, coyly described in the press as one of “disappointment”, was in fact closer to shock and anger.157 Layard referred to “angry knots of men … everywhere … The White Residents … would not have a repetition of the farce of Responsible Government, nor would they be domineered over, and trampled under foot, by the trio who had so long oppressed them”.158 An overstated case, certainly, but Layard never lost hope that Cession would eventuate. Particular resentment was felt against Thurston, who was believed to have acted deceitfully in advising the chiefs against Cession, despite earlier professing to favour the idea. In his own words, he was seen as “a triple-eyed villain and traitor”.159 Like some other parts of
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Fiji, Levuka was in turmoil, with no effective government in place. Nevertheless Thurston, as he formally advised the Commissioners on 7 March, had consented to the King’s request to form a government and proposed to call Parliament into session. His policy was to reduce expenditure, re-establish overseas credit, secure recognition from foreign governments and, in the reconvened Parliament, to amend the 1871 Constitution Act which had never been repealed. With the previous government bankrupt in all but name and the taxation system in a state of chaos, such goals could never be achieved. Yet Thurston proposed a range of salaries from £2,000 per annum for Cakobau, who was to be Tui Viti for life, down to £100 per annum for some of the provincial chiefs. In the face of an inherited debt of £82,000, Thurston’s injunction to provincial governors to collect taxes “to the full” assumes an air of pathos. Goodenough remained opposed to this new regime, however, and was to work tirelessly during the fortnight after the Council at Bau to reverse the chiefs’ decision.

Thurston, still at Bau, was initially undaunted by the Commissioners’ lack of support. On 10 March, the day he returned to Levuka, he called a Council of Chiefs. Informing them “that the Queen’s representatives had taken umbrage at [his] appointment and policy”, Thurston diplomatically sought the chiefs’ instructions. Playing things very safely, they authorised him to confer with the foreign Consuls before deciding on future policy. “After discussion, the chiefs named Ma’afu, Ratu Epeli, Tui Bua, Ratu Savenaca, Tui Levuka, Na Cagi Levu and Tui Cakau [agreed] to accompany [Thurston] to Levuka as a special Council of Advice”. Despite this apparent common purpose with the Chief Secretary, Ma’afu sailed to Levuka separately from Thurston, with whom he remained in open enmity. Indeed, the Council appeared a strange creature, given that another of its members, Savenaca, had supposedly threatened Ma’afu’s life. Yet Ma’afu made a short stay in the capital, attending the first meeting of the Council of Advice on 12 March, when Thurston adopted a tactical approach. He read the chiefs a letter from Goodenough to the King, wherein the Commodore accused Thurston of lies and deception and recommended that Cakobau send for Robert Swanston instead. Although the Commissioners refused to admit the King’s right to appoint any minister without the express approval of themselves and the Consuls, the chiefs vehemently rejected their advice. During a seemingly animated discussion, “Ma’afu alone remained silent”, finally deciding to follow
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Tui Cakobau in support for Thurston. With the breach between Thurston and the Commodore appearing beyond repair, it must have been easy, then, to overlook the ominous implications of Ma`afu’s brooding silence.

While Thurston considered the Commissioners’ “insulting and aggressive” attitude to be part of their determination to dictate the course of the new administration, Goodenough determined to “forbid Mr Thurston accepting office … It is the only way”. But Cakobau was having none of it; in reply to the letter Thurston had read to the Council of Advice, the King blithely informed Goodenough that “Mr Thurston is my Minister. I have appointed him and I desire he may be recognised”. In the meantime Langham, writing from his hilltop mission at Bau, expressed to the Commissioners his view that the chiefs’ decision against annexation was not their own and that both King and Viceroy had been united in their support for the idea. Langham had not been present at the Council, which might explain his apparent naiveté, although his accurate comments about the dangers facing Fiji suggest that he was doing what he could to ensure that the question of Cession be reopened.

The missionary made no mention of Ma`afu, beyond his supposed unanimity of purpose with Cakobau, yet if the feared war did eventuate, Ma`afu, former Viceroy and still Tui Lau, would certainly be involved. With Cession rejected, Fiji’s future, along with Ma`afu’s, remained fraught. Visiting the Pearl on 12 March, Ma`afu signed a terse and formal statement: “It is my wish that the Chiefs of Fiji give up the Government of Fiji to Great Britain”. It is likely that pressure in some form, possibly the promise of future advantage, was brought to bear on Ma`afu by the Commodore as an inducement to make the declaration. There remained much anxiety concerning Ma`afu’s future plans, not least because of the role of Levuka’s German traders in encouraging him, well before the Council at Bau, to work against annexation. Swanston later claimed that in 1873 and early 1874, he had been aware that Ma`afu was procuring arms with the co-operation of William Hennings. Swanston had paid little heed, “as pressure could be laid on Ma`afu at any time to check any harmful action initiating on this point”. Years afterwards, a German trader vouchsafed to Swanston that he and other traders knew it was “all over” when they saw Ma`afu arrive at Levuka from Bau, knowing that he had voted in favour of annexation. On being pressed by Swanston, the trader added that he, Hedemann and others “had combined to urge Ma`afu to refuse annexation and return to Lau with the Tovata chiefs”, awaiting the arrival of an “army”, as well as the rifles from Samoa. Whether the “army” was the force Ma`afu stood ready to summon from

11. “Ma`afu’s word is in the hills....”
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Tonga was not revealed. Tui Bua was supposedly involved in the conspiracy.\textsuperscript{171} Beyond Ma`afu’s order with Hedemann for the 200 rifles, there is little evidence that such plans were indeed afoot. Yet the story is plausible; indeed the absence of evidence during the days following the Council at Bau must have added to the rumour and apprehension prevailing at Levuka.

Every shade of opinion, and indeed every shade of story, could be heard on the Levuka Beach as the import of the chiefs’ decision was absorbed. Not unexpectedly, many of the stories involved Ma`afu. The \textit{Fiji Gazette} contented itself with a formal tone in its leader: “We … unhesitatingly say that in the present state of Fiji, Annexation is the best remedy”.\textsuperscript{172} The \textit{Fiji Times} in contrast spoke of “high jinks” at Bau that involved Ma`afu. The decision to depose him as Viceroy had supposedly been made because he was “an avowed annexationist” and “a troublesome customer”. The newspaper referred to Ma`afu’s defence against the charges that he had failed to submit tax revenues from Lau. He had done so, declared the \textit{Fiji Times}, “because he knew that the central government were such rogues, and that the balance would be safer with him”.\textsuperscript{173} The leader writer, for all his levity, was presumably unaware of the order for the rifles or of the “army” waiting in Tonga. The more serious question remained unanswered: why had Ma`afu, having earlier seceded from the central government of Fiji, come to favour annexation, a scenario which would extinguish forever his hopes for a definitive confrontation with Bau? One contemporary visitor to Fiji, likewise unaware of Ma`afu’s secret plans, ascribed the change of heart to the proffered title of Lieutenant-Governor of Lau, an annual salary of £800, an ex-gratia payment of £1,000 and a clear title to the Yasayasa Moala.\textsuperscript{174} While such trinkets might have soothed Ma`afu’s troubled heart, the fact remained that his name did not appear in Thurston’s schedule of chiefly positions and salaries. The Council at Bau during the previous week had seen Ma`afu suffer the most severe humiliation of his life. Chiefs and ministers alike had revealed their enmity, leaving Ma`afu no choice but to acquiesce in the decision against annexation. Thurston, writing later of the reasons why that decision was made, mentioned their resentment against the “constant intercourse” between Goodenough and Cakobau’s “most bitter enemies”, including Ma`afu, “against whom the King and the Principal Fijian Chiefs have the most deep-seated hatred and jealousy, and by no means without cause”.\textsuperscript{175} In the immediate aftermath of the decision, Thurston who, according to Mafi, would forever carry a grudge against Ma`afu, was now bent on Ma`afu’s permanent exclusion from whatever form of government might ensue in Fiji. When, on 12 March, only two days

\textsuperscript{171} Swanston, undated notebook.\textsuperscript{172} \textit{FG}, 14 Mar 1874.\textsuperscript{173} \textit{FT}, 14 Mar 1874.\textsuperscript{174} Forbes, 300.\textsuperscript{175} “The True Story of the Annexation of Fiji”.
after returning to Levuka and immediately following his visit to the *Pearl*, Ma’afu set sail for Lau, Layard reported Ma’afu’s return to his Viceroyalty “in high dudgeon … he, Tui Cakau and Tui Macuata are ready for revolt”.176 Even Goodenough “had not withheld his countenance” from Ma’afu’s plans, Thurston would later write, a claim lent credence by the Commodore himself when he visited Lau at the end of the month.177

Layard was not alone in expressing fears about Ma’afu’s future course of action. Langham, describing Ma’afu as being “disgusted” and “disappointed” at the treatment he had received, noted that the Viceroy had “gone to his home, no doubt fully intending to secede from the Government … others will join him. The Government will try to coerce him. A war will be the result”. The missionary believed that the presence of a British warship in Fijian waters was the only way to ensure peace.178 Langham, like the Commissioners, believed that Ma’afu had been “from the first a strong advocate of giving up the government to Great Britain”.179 Thurston thought otherwise, as he explained to a delegation of six Levuka merchants who called on him on 18 March. He reminded them that while Ma’afu “was professing an ardent desire for Annexation” during the Council, he had been sending “emissaries” all over Bau,

In every house, working on the minds of the younger men, instilling … an idea that whereas [it] did not much matter to King Cakobau, who was an old man, whether the country was ceded or not, it was robbing the younger chiefs of the territorial and seignorial rights they had so long enjoyed.

Thurston recalled for the merchants the advice to Tui Cakau “by Tongans” concerning the supposed consequences of annexation. The force of Thurston’s argument was weakened somewhat by his reference to Ma’afu’s being “constantly on board” the *Pearl* for consultations with the Commissioners, returning with charges “of various kinds” against Thurston himself. The Chief Secretary, chosen by Cakobau to direct a new government, saw a conspiracy. Throughout the Cession negotiations and since, he concluded, “The natives had … seen Ma’afu made more of, as they thought, than the King, though the fact really was that he had made more of himself”.180

Thurston was determined that Ma’afu’s days of making more of himself should be over for good. The day after his interview with the merchants, Thurston met the chiefs in Council at Draiba. The meeting was notable in two important ways: firstly, Thurston explained to the chiefs that he “could not form a Cabinet
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176 Layard to FO, 17 Mar 1874.
177 “The True Story of the Annexation of Fiji”.
178 Langham to McArthur, 18 Mar 1874.
179 Goodenough and Layard to Lord Kimberley, 19 Mar 1874, FO 58/145.
180 FG, 21 Mar 1874.
or carry on with the opposition offered by the British Commissioners. They passed a resolution asking me to hold office until things were settled”. Only a reversal of the decision made at Bau could results in matters being “settled”. Of almost equal significance was a Resolution passed by the Council dismissing Ma`afu from the governorship of Lau.\textsuperscript{181} Thurston wrote to the foreign Consuls, to the King of Tonga and to Ma`afu himself, seeking that “all extra territorial authorities” withhold recognition of “Henle Ma`afu, a naturalized Tongan Chief, and late Governor of Lau, whom the King and natural born Fijian chiefs have deposed”. The King in Council, Thurston added, had no wish to interfere with Ma`afu’s private rights,

but moved by the constant treachery and official malversation of the man, his incessant intrigue and spoliation they decree that Ma`afu no longer shall exercise guvernatorial [sic] authority or control over this and their people the natural born Fijians residing in … Lau.\textsuperscript{182}

Ma`afu had, according to Thurston, “wilfully and wholly broken” the 1871 agreement whereby he joined the government of the Kingdom of Fiji and was recognised as a chief of Fiji.\textsuperscript{183} The Chief Secretary’s reasons for initiating the dismissal are complex, although they certainly involved the “grudge” arising from the Council at Bau. Thurston resented Ma`afu’s continual intrigues behind the scenes at Bau and especially his evident lack of moral scruple, demonstrated by his continual changes of tack during the Council. Above all lay what Thurston saw as the Tongan’s guile and deceit during the Council: his fury over Ma`afu’s lies had metamorphosed into a determination to drive him forever from his adopted home.

Hennings, in his letter to Thurston referred to above, castigated him over Ma`afu’s dismissal: “Twenty years’ supremacy are not destroyed by a stroke of the pen”.\textsuperscript{184} Thurston’s action was indeed fraught with potential for trouble. Swanston, still Ma`afu’s confidant, would note that Ma`afu had been “in deadly earnest” concerning his plans for Fiji should annexation not eventuate. Swanston had warned Cakobau before negotiations began “that Rewa and Ma`afu had an understanding … that Ma`afu and Rewa are prepared to go against you, and Ma`afu’s word is in the hills”. Ma`afu’s resolve arose from his conviction that “the near future of Fiji and … his own prosperity … rested absolutely on the
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decision he might arrive at [concerning annexation]”. Ma`afu believed that “for the moment, [he] had the power to say the word that would … influence for all time … the future of the group and its people”.185

When the Council of Advice, under Thurston’s direction, passed its resolution dismissing him, Ma`afu was at home in Lomaloma, whence William Hennings was to write the most illuminating contemporary comment on the Council’s action. Having been advised by Thurston of the dismissal, Hennings responded by informing the Chief Secretary that he could not act as the Warden for Lau in the new government without the authority of Ma`afu to back him.186 He further declared that he would not proceed against Ma`afu until the various charges had been proven to the King and the chiefs. Hennings admonished Thurston for having sent “emissaries to preach revolt against Ma`afu’s authority” in Lau, an action he properly described as “most ill-advised”. According to Goodenough, who read Thurston’s letter when he visited Lomaloma early in April, Thurston had advised Hennings that “mercenaries would probably be sent from Bau to order the people not to recognise Ma`afu as Tui Lau or to pay taxes to him, and saying that Ma`afu could not form an idea of the active and passive forces which would be brought to bear against him”.

Hennings, in his response to the Chief Secretary, said it was he, Thurston, who could not “form an idea of the impossibility of removing Ma`afu”. Hennings might have been referring to the rifles awaiting Ma`afu’s pleasure in Samoa, as well as the “army” on standby in Tonga, arrangements of which the German trader was almost certainly aware. Furthermore, Thurston had not indicated to Hennings “to whom taxes were to be paid, or in whose name collected. A very proper letter”, the Commodore thought Hennings’ reply, with its measured response to Thurston’s litany against his bête noire. Hennings advised Goodenough that Ma`afu, rather than applying to Tonga for help, would be more likely to launch a raid on Bau with the willing assistance of some Fijian chiefs. Ma`afu, Hennings declared, “can gain nothing by war, unless, of course, he is driven to defend himself and his position in Fiji”. Hennings expressed the hope that the emissaries Thurston had sent would not retard the undeniable progress of Lau under Ma`afu’s rule.

Hennings’ letter effectively warned Thurston to abandon his plans to drive Ma`afu from Fiji. The trader was writing when the matter of Ma`afu’s immediate future had been superseded as an issue of the moment by the announcement that the unexpected decision at Bau had been reversed. The Fiji Times articulated more moderate settler opinion in an uncharacteristically restrained leader on 18
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March, when it referred to the exercise of “extraneous influence” on the chiefs at Bau, an influence that resulted in the decision against annexation. “We are now without any Government. The Commodore and Consul both state that”. More ominously, “Ma`afu and Tui Cakau have gone to their chiefdoms with a mutual understanding as to what their future action will be”. Although the editor, referring to the settlers’ bleak prospects, made no reference to the condition of the indigenous Fijians, his forebodings were real enough. A prospect of resolution had arisen the previous day when the Commissioners met the King at Nasova. Goodenough expressed his “surprise” at Thurston’s appointment as Minister, against his specific advice. The interview was marked by a bullying tone on the part of Goodenough, who reminded Cakobau that he could not hope to govern the resident Europeans and rebuked the King for the continuing excess of expenditure over income. Stating that it was “impossible to carry on the Government in the same way in future”, Goodenough advised the King to consult the foreign Consuls before another meeting the following day when, Goodenough declared, he would expect Cakobau “to listen to [his] advice about the Government”.187

The Commodore’s tactics were successful. On 19 March, the King formally withdrew his letter of 6 March, wherein he announced that he and the chiefs would continue to govern Fiji. A formal offer of Cession, conveyed to the Commissioners on 20 March, stated, in part, “We offer to Her Majesty the Queen the Government of the Islands, but not the soil or the Fijian people”. As the Commissioners reminded the Colonial Office, the form of words reflected the principal chiefs’ greatest fears: loss of land and chiefly authority. Only the sovereignty of Fiji, and not the lands or their produce, was offered. Cakobau did not wish Fijians to become strangers in their own country “like the Tana or Api men who have come to work on European plantations”.188 On 21 March, Cakobau and his chiefly entourage sculled out to the Pearl aboard the King’s drua. After being received with a 21-gun salute, Cakobau formally presented the Commissioners with a letter stating the chiefs’ desire “to cede the government of our state” to Queen Victoria, and advising that he had authorised Thurston to prepare the document outlining the conditions of Cession.189 The King observed protocol to the extent of requesting Thurston to present the letter to the Commissioners “with English formality”.190 A detailed account of the proceedings in the press noted that “the King and the chiefs had shaken off the sullen puzzled look of the last fortnight, and were particularly cheerful and friendly, and in high spirits, as if a weight were off their minds”. Among Fiji’s leading chiefs, Ratu Epeli, who
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was ill, and Ma`afu and Ritova, both absent from Levuka, were the only ones not present. Ma`afu was not thought likely to cause difficulties, being “known to have signified independently [his] wish for annexation”.191

The Commissioners had achieved their object, although many of their difficulties along the way could be ascribed to Goodenough’s heavy-handed approach which displeased the King and alienated Thurston, the most influential minister in the former government and one for whom the interests of the indigenous Fijians remained of crucial importance. Thurston, accepting the inevitable, expressed his hope “that when the British flag was hoisted [the Fijians] would cheer it instead of sitting down and regarding the change with dislike or sudden apathy”.192 Consul Layard, who had never taken the lead in the Commissioners’ dealings with the chiefs of Fiji, offered astute advice to the Foreign Office: “it is time Great Britain put down with a strong hand the pride and vagaries of a few upstart and dishonest British subjects”.193 While that day might soon be dawning, everything in the meantime would depend on Fiji’s most powerful chief, nursing a wounded *amour-propre* at home. It is tempting to picture Ma`afu sitting alone in the Tongan enclave of Sawana, contiguous with Lomaloma, brooding over his defeats of the previous few weeks and making plans for his final move against Bau. In truth, the workings of his mind were closed to all those who recorded the historic change in Fiji’s destiny witnessed in the brief ceremony on board the *Pearl*.

The reasons why Cakobau and his chiefs reversed their decision and presented their islands to Queen Victoria have been examined at length elsewhere. The King and chiefs, as Goodenough had observed, could not have governed Fiji’s settler community, which in turn possessed no confidence in Thurston, Cakobau’s appointee, whom they correctly considered as antipathetic to their largely selfish interests. There was no feasible alternative to Cession. On the day of the ceremony on board the *Pearl*, the *Fiji Times* spoke for many, both in Fiji and abroad:

> And now at last the long-winded and expensive farce is drawing to a close. We have had an absurd Government, which has been to some the cause of inextinguishable laughter, and to others has suggested

> ‘Thoughts that do lie too deep for tears’.194

Aside from relief at the end of the “farce”, the conditions accompanying the offer marked a crucial moment for Fiji. They were elaborated in a document of 19 Articles prepared by Thurston with the King’s approval. The Articles detailed the future titles and salaries for Cakobau and other chiefs and, most
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importantly, articulated the “broad principle ... that, the Fijian chiefs and people, in changing their allegiance retain all existing private rights real and personal”. On this basis, “the ruling chief of every tribe [was] to be recognised as the owner of the lands of his tribe, and guardian of their rights and interests”. These provisions, enshrining continuing Fijian ownership of land, were the reasons why the Colonial Office at first declined to accept the conditions. The new Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Carnarvon, “Twitters” to his friends, had been in office barely a month. He was an avowed imperialist who might have been expected to welcome a new Crown Colony to the Imperial embrace. Yet the Colonial Office, considering as “inadmissible” the principle laid down in Article 15 of the terms of Cession that the Fijian chiefs were to “retain all existing private rights, real and personal”, recommended to Carnarvon that the offer not be accepted. Carnarvon did not agree, seeing annexation as the only means whereby the evils of the Melanesian labour trade could be eliminated, the anarchy prevailing in the large settler community and beyond brought under control, and the indigenous Fijians accorded a proper degree of protection which was conspicuously lacking under the settler regime. In Australia, people looked to “the restoration of commercial confidence in Sydney and Melbourne” which Cession might help to foster. The conditions of Cession, so disquieting to bureaucrats of Whitehall, arose because of the chiefs’ determination never to relinquish control of land, the essence of their authority.

Cakobau, ever bewildered by the niceties of European constitutional debate, yet seemingly determined to preserve the traditional powers of Fiji’s chiefs, might have been motivated by cupidity as much as by a wish to preserve the ancient usages of his islands. According to a visiting naval officer, Thomas Suckling of HMS Renard, the King, who had lost two cutters through “carelessness”, was jealous of Ma’a’fu because of the fine yacht, the Xarifa, which that chief possessed. “Who says that Ma’a’fu can have a yacht and I can’t?” he was reported to have lamented. After a schooner, the Lurline, was built for him in Auckland and sailed to Fiji, Cakobau found himself unable to pay for it. Motivated by a promise from “that arch scoundrel Thurston” that he would be given the Lurline if he managed to prevent Cession, Cakobau ensured that the chiefs’ decision would be to retain control of the islands. When the schooner’s owners were apprised of Thurston’s offer, they in turn promised to present the King with her once the British flag flew at Levuka. “So the old boy came … in a great hurry to withdraw his letter declining to annex the islands and has now signed … It seems as if he were quite a little child and had set his heart on this toy”.  
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While the truth or otherwise of this assertion, which provides some comic relief from all the high drama of politics, cannot be determined, it was feasible, given Cakobau’s delight in the trappings of office which had come his way from Europeans. Ma’afu, meanwhile, at home in Lomaloma with the Xarifa riding at anchor in the lagoon, took no part in the formal offer of Cession. Article Six of the offer formally appointed Ratu Tevita Ululakeba as executive officer of the province of Lau in Ma’afu’s place, with an annual allowance of £300.\textsuperscript{198} Ma’afu remained absent from Levuka when a new and temporary administration was established, following consultations between Cakobau and Goodenough. The King appointed an Executive, later known as the Ad-Interim Government, comprising Thurston, who retained the designation of Chief Secretary, the two Commissioners, the American, German and Hawaiian Consuls, the Chief Justice Charles St Julian, and Ratu Epeli Nailatikau and Ratu Savenaca. A smaller Executive Council was also appointed, which included Thurston, planter Rupert Ryder as Minister of Finance and Trade, and Ratu Epeli and Ratu Savenaca as Minsters without Office.\textsuperscript{199} This government was to administer Fiji until the decision of Whitehall concerning the Cession offer should become known.\textsuperscript{200} Although this new, streamlined administration succeeded, within three months, in paying the bulk of its outstanding debts, Fiji’s economy remained severely depressed. The cotton industry had collapsed, many planters and traders had left Fiji and there was no significant inflow of capital. Yet, to read much of the official correspondence from the months following the offer of Cession is to gain the impression that, despite economic difficulties, Fiji had largely settled down following the turbulence of the Cakobau Government and the passions prevailing during the long and anguished debate over the future of the islands.

Frederick Langham believed that had the King and the chiefs not offered Fiji to Great Britain, Ma’afu would have remained distinctly aloof from government, as indeed Cakobau, the chiefs and Thurston were determined that he should.\textsuperscript{201} Yet the earnest Langham, anxious as he was for Fiji’s future, remained unaware of Ma’afu’s plans. Ma’afu himself, in the aftermath of his deep humiliation at Bau, had seemingly been placated by the promise of a visit at home by Commodore Goodenough. The promise was kept on 31 March, when the Pearl, piloted by Ma’afu’s coxswain, anchored “very neatly” inside the Vanuabalavu lagoon. The Commodore’s social call has provided us with a rare picture of the public and private Ma’afu at his Fijian home.
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Shortly after the *Pearl* cast anchor, Goodenough and Ma’afu held an initial conference on board. Also present was missionary Isaac Rooney, who spoke “well” of Ma’afu and “highly” of King Tupou of Tonga. The Commodore then accompanied Ma’afu to his home, where he made the acquaintance of Elenoa, “a nice fat old lady”, and remarked on Ma’afu’s pet hawksbill turtles, which the chief kept in a trough and fed with small bivalve shellfish. At a subsequent meeting, evidence emerged of a growing rapport between Goodenough and the former Viceroy: “I told him, as a friend, of his deposition, letting him see that I thought very little of it indeed. He was a little bothered and confused but seemed gradually to pluck up heart as he saw that I was friendly to him”.

On shore again in the evening, Goodenough and Ma’afu sat by the green in Sawana to listen to the ship’s band. They were joined by “all the people of the town”, sitting in circles talking and enjoying the music. The Tongan community in Sawana, “very pleasant fellows” according to the Commodore, themselves sang in turn with the band. Goodenough appeared moved by the hospitality of a small, ordered society, seemingly at peace with itself, and by the quiet festivities held beside the engaging loveliness of the tranquil Vanuabalavu lagoon with its circle of small islands, while behind the village, massive in the encroaching night, rose the steep, brooding hills of the island’s mountain spine. The Commodore appeared at one with his hosts, calling out “Vinaka” when the songs finished, an acknowledgement which the Tongans returned in kind after the band ceased playing, shouting “mālie, mālie” in their turn.202 “I certainly like those Tongans”, Goodenough would enthuse, “and wish they had been allowed to work their way in Pritchard’s time”.

The Commodore was referring to the actions of the former British Consul, William Pritchard, in thwarting Ma’afu’s rapidly maturing scheme for a final confrontation with Bau in 1858.203 Now, he had to consider whatever plans Ma’afu might have to achieve his long-held ambitions. On the morning after the musical treat, the beach at Lomaloma presented a very different scene: 180 of “Ma’afu’s men” were drilling there, “140 with rifles or arms of some sort and 150 in red jackets”. The red jackets were “cleverly always away from ships so as to be hidden”. Goodenough thought “amusing” the manoeuvres executed by the four companies of soldiers, although “they did a bayonet charge admirably”. Such a display would not have taken place unless Ma’afu had wanted the Commodore to see something of the military resources at his command. Goodenough proceeded from the beach to Ma’afu’s home, where he was presented with a great quantity of food, comprising a turtle weighing at least 450 pounds, as well as tons of fowls and yams. The ship’s company were in for a feast. Returning to watch the drill, Goodenough was in time to see

202 *Vinaka* (Fn) = thank you; *mālie* (Tn) = good, pleasing, splendid.
203 See above, Ch. 6.
the exercise conclude with a Fijian war dance and a shout, in unison, which the Commodore translated as “This is the club that shall destroy your enemies. With this weapon I will confound all who oppose you”. Was the visitor meant to understand that Ma’afu would confound all those who opposed him in his long-delayed quest for power in Fiji?

Ma’afu and Goodenough held their final conference that evening, in Ma’afu’s compound, with only Tongans present:

I told Ma’afu to abolish flogging the women and he promised to do so. Took him a present of £5 worth of … soap, drill, blue jean, scissors combs etc which I hope will filter through to the people. He said it was the biggest present he had ever had. He is certainly a pleasant fellow to deal with. A rascal perhaps but a man and an open bold man without lying devices. Fearless and inviting confidence. 204

On his final morning on Vanuabalavu, Goodenough rode with Siale’ataongo to visit local planter Charles Swayne, a future European Stipendiary Magistrate, and Henry Miller, son of a Wesleyan missionary and assistant to Ma’afu. 205 His praise of the Tongans was undiminished: “They have brains”. Furthermore, “all these [Tongan] girls seem to have the run of Ma’afu’s house”. Commodore Goodenough had clearly been impressed, both with Ma’afu and with the well-ordered and contented community of which he was the head. He had also witnessed a degree of military preparedness unequalled in Fiji. Given Goodenough’s declared inclination, according to Mafi, to “assist” Ma’afu in the event of hostilities, it is likely that he parted company with his attentive host well disposed towards any move which Ma’afu might make towards a confrontation with Cakobau, should the offer of Cession be declined. 206

Only a few days after the Pearl sailed from Vanuabalavu, Thurston received a “not very pleasant” letter from Goodenough concerning Ma’afu. 207 Although the letter is apparently lost, it is likely that Thurston was displeased to read of the Commodore’s favourable impressions of Tui Lau at home, as well as, perhaps, Goodenough’s views concerning the illegality of the former Viceroy’s dismissal. Whatever the nature of the unpleasantness, Thurston remained undaunted, writing to Captain Hope that he had “won the victory for the Fijians” in helping to achieve the offer of Cession. 208 Part of that victory, in Thurston’s eyes, entailed the dismissal of Ma’afu as Viceroy and Governor of Lau and, the Chief Secretary hoped, his final expulsion from Lau. Thurston lost little time in
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Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

formally advising the King of Tonga of Ma`afu’s dismissal from his posts and of the offer of Cession. He felt it his duty, he wrote to Tupou, to “protest against any further dealings by Your Majesty’s Government with [Ma`afu]”. He also warned the King of the “disastrous results” of any favourable response by the King to Ma`afu’s application for military assistance. Thurston’s confidence was misplaced since, as Goodenough’s visit had shown, Ma`afu remained firmly entrenched in Lau and in full command of his people. Percival Friend’s earlier advice to Thurston had also shown Ma`afu to be in equal command of tax collection and distribution, and of the “executive officer”, Ratu Tevita, who had been packed off to Tonga.

By apparent coincidence, a “Memorandum dated 6 April 1874 upon the Native Ownership of Land in Fiji”, not published until 12 years later, made mention of Ma`afu’s rights in Vanuabalavu under Fijian custom. “[The gift of] North Vanuabalavu by Tuikilakila to Ma`afu was in effect the disposition of the land … and the services of the inhabitants. It was the services of the inhabitants, not his person, which was the subject of such a gift”. While such might have been the intention of Tuikilakila 25 years earlier, the position was now very different. Ma`afu had long since established, through conquest and chiefly submissions, a sovereignty which Consul Henry Jones’ enquiry in 1865 had found to be consistent with Fijian custom. Now, as Consul Layard reported to the Foreign Office, Ma`afu, despite his dismissal and the unremitting hostility of Fiji’s de facto head of government, was determined to fight for his rights if the British rejected the offer of Cession. Indeed, an Australian newspaper correspondent reported on 16 April that “[Ma`afu] threatens war, and it is said he will commence hostilities against Cakobau shortly”, although such a view reflected nothing more than idle gossip in Levuka. For its part, the Fiji Times considered “a war between Cakobau and Ma`afu … entirely out of the question at the present time”. The leader writer, to take him at his word, believed Ma`afu to be “desirous of annexation”, although “ready, in case of a negative reply from England, to swoop down on Cakobau”. Thurston was sufficiently concerned by this editorial to enclose it with a letter to Layard warning the Consul, as he had warned Tupou, against “any official recognition” of Ma`afu. Layard took note, while wisely reminding Thurston, “I never recognise newspaper reports”.

While a decision from Whitehall was awaited, Ma`afu, at home in Lau, was probably little concerned either by Thurston’s obsessive campaign against him
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or by rumours about his immediate intentions. Of greater significance for his prospects was the *Report* of Commodore Goodenough and Consul Layard, which they submitted to the Colonial Office on 10 April. In a lengthy consideration of Ma`afu’s history and present circumstances, the Commissioners expressed the view that “had it not been for the influence of white men, and for the direct intervention of the Foreign Consuls and ships of war, Ma`afu would, before this, have become the principal, if not the sole, chief of Fiji”. They also observed that in governing his people in Lau and in the management of his property, Ma`afu revealed “greater ability” than the other chiefs, who were “jealous of his influence and position”. The *Report* suggested that the Commissioners had Ma`afu’s measure, since they referred to efforts by the indigenous chiefs “to make use of British presence here” to turn Ma`afu permanently out of Fiji. They also observed, for the information of the Colonial Secretary, that “in his own district … [Ma`afu] is greatly looked up to and is not disliked by the lesser Chiefs; and he is respected and liked by the white planters”.

The Commissioners had shown fairness and objectivity in their consideration of Tui Lau. They continued in similar vein, referring to Ma`afu’s absence from Levuka when the offer of Cession was signed and to the “paper” which he had earlier given them, “confirming his spoken wish and opinion that the islands should be offered to Great Britain”. Revealing their distance from Thurston on the subject of Ma`afu, the Commissioners wrote that “We think [Ma`afu] would be the proper person to retain in the position of Chief of Lau … though he has not attempted to make terms for himself. He has hitherto been in receipt of £800, and has probably made much more than that by contributions from natives”. The Commissioners avoided any reference to Ma`afu’s undoubted tax anomalies, knowledge of which might have influenced Lord Carnarvon against acceptance of the Commissioners’ recommendations concerning Ma`afu’s future. The Commodore and Consul had been unable fully to appreciate the cultural context in which Ma`afu operated. The prerogatives of a chief, whether Tongan or Fijian, had never included the enforced payment of taxes to a central bureaucracy.

The Commissioners, meticulous in the details they passed on to the Colonial Office, were careful to correct Thurston’s comments on Ratu Tevita Uluilakeba, made in his paper accompanying the offer of Cession. As they reminded Lord Carnarvon, “Tevita was merely a chief of the island of Lakeba, and has acted hitherto under Ma`afu, against whom he dare not do anything”. Ratu Tevita was heir to his aged uncle, Taliai Tupou, as Tui Nayau, although his degree of subservience to Ma`afu was accurately described. The Commissioners erred in one other important respect, advising the Colonial Secretary, “It is true that Ma`afu is a Tongan and a stranger”. A Tongan he certainly was; a stranger he could never be, considering the long history of Tongan involvement in Lau, to say nothing of Ma`afu’s blood ties to the Vuanirewa family. The Commissioners
also described Cakobau’s claims to control the Yasawas and other areas of western Fiji as “no better than those of Ma`afu over [Lau]”. They might more accurately have stated that Ma`afu’s claims, in respect of Lau, were considerably better that those of Cakobau in the west.

The Commissioners’ final word on Ma`afu in their Report places Tui Lau in a correct context within the contemporary polity of Fiji. It also reflects their recent visit to Lomaloma:

It would please the Fijian chiefs to see Ma`afu expelled, but the rights of the latter in Lau are as good as many of theirs elsewhere, and his personal government of his own portion of the group is much more real and evident than that of any other Chief in Fiji.216

Considering the circumstances surrounding the offer of Cession, to say nothing of the apprehension felt in Fiji about Ma`afu’s future course of action, he had been well served by the Commissioners’ accommodating remarks. He continued to administer Lau as though there were no momentous changes in the wind: visiting Lakeba in early May, he announced that there was no government in Lau except himself, in co-operation with the Commissioners.217 Whether or not this statement was meant for Thurston’s ears, it did constitute an effective refutation of the Chief Secretary’s efforts to undermine his authority. Of course, no opinion of Ma`afu’s, however prescient, would stop Thurston, who on 12 May moved in the Legislative Council that “a letter be written … to Ma`afu, chief of Vanuabalavu, demanding an immediate payment of the taxes due for the Province of Lau up to 1 January 1874, and acquainting him that the same estimated to value £3,750 will remain a charge while unpaid against his personal estate. Question put and passed”.218 The Fiji Times, accurately describing this demand as “preposterous”, questioned the right of the Ad-Interim Government, “appointed to maintain order and to prevent us from falling into a state of anarchy”, to call on Ma`afu “to pay up for past delinquencies”. The old Constitution had been abrogated, yet Ma`afu was being called to account under the old laws. The question was also asked as to how the Legislative Council had arrived at the figure of £3,750.219 Layard supported the government, of which he was a member, to the extent of telling Ma`afu that he had no right to keep the taxes and reminding him that if he were patient, the Commissioners’ promises to him would be kept. “The end is not yet come”, wrote the Consul, who signed himself as “Your friend”.220 It was hypothetical in any case. On Lakeba, Ratu Tevita, back from Tonga, handed over £67 worth of taxes in kind.

---
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to the Government Agent, Percival Friend, while Ma`afu had given all the oil collected in southern Lau to William Hennings. In the meantime, he continued to collect his rents for plantations leased to Europeans.\textsuperscript{221} Ma`afu even found time to send his secretary, George Bayley, to complete a trigonometrical survey of the island of Cicia.\textsuperscript{222} As for Hennings, aside from the money owed him by Ma`afu, the firm of which he was a partner, F. and W. Hennings of Levuka, Lomaloma and the Rewa River, had passed under “annexation” to the house of Rabone, Feez and Co. of Sydney. That firm’s agent, Carl Sahl, told a meeting of creditors in Sydney that Hennings was indebted to Rabone, Feez for £60,000.\textsuperscript{223} With all these considerations, to ask Ma`afu to submit taxes to Levuka, however lawful or otherwise such a request might be, was to ask for the moon.

Although Ma`afu, no longer Viceroy or Governor of Lau but still Tui Lau, continued to administer his province, he did so in a kind of political limbo during the months of waiting for a decision from Whitehall. His position was considered with some discernment in a Fiji Times leader which, questioning the validity of the Ad-Interim Government’s dismissal of Ma`afu, referred to that government’s curious determination to maintain the laws of the former Kingdom of Fiji, even though the Commissioners had declared that the Kingdom’s Constitution was annulled. If the old laws were considered to be still in force, then the Ad-Interim Government should have sought to impeach Ma`afu, as Governor of Lau, under the Executive Act, which defined a set of procedures for so doing. The Act provided for a “memorial” to the King, through the Legislative Council, after which the King would appoint three Supreme Court judges to hold a hearing to determine the justice or otherwise of any accusations raised in the “memorial”. If the government were not prepared to follow the letter of the law, the newspaper opined, it should “leave Ma`afu alone”. The government had no authority or right “to sit in high and irresponsible court over any man … in the kingdom”, especially since the Commissioners had informed the chiefs at Bau, during the Council in March, that they possessed no right to dismiss Ma`afu from his offices as Viceroy and Governor of Lau.

The newspaper’s well-argued case recalls the Commissioners’ assertion in their Report that Ma`afu enjoyed respect and support among Europeans living in Lau. It appeared from the Fiji Times’ defence of his rights that he enjoyed such support elsewhere in Fiji. The newspaper mentioned the “iniquitous” demands on Ma`afu to pay taxes, demands based largely on estimates. The leader writer went to the heart of the campaign against Ma`afu:
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We can understand Cakobau being in favor of the course pursued, because he is ignorant of the principles of liberty, and moreover is jealous of Ma`afu’s power and would gladly see him driven from Fiji at any price. We can comprehend Mr Thurston favoring the scheme because he has some spite to serve.

Other Fijian chiefs, readers were reminded, had failed to furnish their taxes. Why should Ma`afu alone be singled out? “There appears to be neither law nor equity about it”.224

Such a defence of Ma`afu’s rights would have awoken some sympathy among readers, although Thurston was unlikely to pay it heed. He was not to have his way, however, receiving a check from an unexpected quarter. Ratu Tevita, whom Thurston had appointed as Governor of Lau, advised Thurston that he was unable to act in Ma`afu’s place. “I have always followed him hitherto and your letter [of appointment] does not alter my position or that of Ma`afu”. Although expressing his willingness to act for the government of Fiji, Ratu Tevita urged Thurston “to leave matters as they were”. In the meantime, he would attend “to the speedy gathering of taxes overdue”225. Although the newly appointed Special Commissioner for Lau, Charles Drury, believed that Ma`afu had pressured Tevita to resign, he was right in recalling Tevita’s belief that Ma`afu was his father.226 Ma`afu was Tevita’s older kinsman and one time companion in arms of Tevita’s actual father, Vuetasau. Under Tongan and Fijian custom, Tevita could not but defer to Ma`afu in all things. In attempting to put Tevita in Ma`afu’s place, Thurston had seriously miscalculated, evidence of a judgment clouded by “spite”. Altogether, Thurston lacked the finesse necessary to deal with Ma`afu who, as so often, had made promises in Levuka and Bau which he had no intention of keeping. If Thurston had succeeded in expelling Ma`afu from Fiji, he would have effectively removed Cakaudrove and Macuata, as well as Lau, from government control, leaving the Ad-Interim Government exercising its authority only in Lomaiviti and a few other areas of central Fiji.

There is some evidence that Ratu Tevita, despite manifesting an unwavering loyalty to Ma`afu, might at least have tried to take up his proffered appointment. Lieutenant Suckling recorded that Tevita had come up to Lomaloma “to take up his new title”, accompanied by about 50 followers. “Ma`afu saw his chance and at once sent 250 men under his son down to (Lakeba) on a visit all armed with muskets so that the new Tui Lau was in a fix”. With Ma`afu’s men having easily secured Lakeba and Tevita a virtual prisoner at Lomaloma, he wisely resigned “his new dignity” after ten days.
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Like many other visitors, Suckling took time to record his impressions of Tui Lau. “He is a fine fellow stands about 6 ft 3 and big in proportion”. Ma`afu’s determination to have his people learn trades was also noted. “There is not a carpenter’s tool in existence he … does not know how to use. He has a most wonderful collection”. In addition, Ma`afu was “the possessor of some 4 or 5 breech loading double-barrelled guns [and] some half dozen breech loading rifles”. Suckling continued:

On going into his house you will generally find him sitting on the floor (which is boarded) smoking and doing something generally sharpening some of his carpenters tools etc but always doing something. He will offer you a chair which I always decline. We are great friends and he laughs and pats me on the arm or shews me some other mark of friendship. His wife Eleanor is generally by him she is some what large and I should say weighs some 20 stone but she also is always busy. Charlie their son was away … Charlie is a most veritable scamp and his father has often banished him for different periods.227

Ma`afu, it seemed, carried on his domestic life unconcerned by the various anguished debates elsewhere in Fiji, while public opinion, in so far as it was reflected in the press, remained sympathetic to him. One settler wrote of Ma`afu’s help in securing the offer of annexation and cautioned against “assisting Thurston in venting his spite against Ma`afu”.228 Although such sentiments were directed more against Thurston than in favour of Ma`afu, there remained a feeling that for all his admitted misdemeanours in respect of Lauan taxes, Ma`afu had, when dismissed as Governor of Lau, been denied an opportunity to defend himself. A resident of Levuka, writing to a friend in Sydney, declared that “Ma`afu is a vigorous, stern and (when it suits his purpose) cruel ruler”, who denied some rights to his Lauan subjects, whom he nevertheless kept “in good order”. Furthermore, it was “nonsense”, the resident supposed, to imagine that in the event that Whitehall rejected annexation, the Commissioners would support Ma`afu in a “war”.229 The *Fiji Times*, ever more vehement in its denunciation of the Provisional Legislative Council’s edicts against Ma`afu, thought that the ministers must consider him “an utter fool”. After all, the “Agreement on Windward taxes” had expressly permitted William Hennings to collect taxes in Lau, in money or kind, and to pay the Viceroy’s salary from the proceeds, before submitting any surplus to Treasury. Under the terms of the Agreement, Hennings had placed the sum of £739–6–11, representing the proceeds of native taxes collected from 30 June 1872 to 31 May 1874, to Ma`afu’s credit in his account at Hennings’
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While these opinions are illuminating, they tell us nothing of Ma`afu’s life on Vanuabalavu while he, along with the rest of Fiji, awaited news from London. Charles Drury, diligent in his duties, arrived at Lomaloma and found Ma`afu “in a very docile frame of mind”, keenly aware of his position and seemingly ready to “fall in” with Drury’s plans to gather overdue revenue. Drury, finding many irregularities in the administration of justice in Lau, sought permission from Thurston to have Tongan laws abolished in the province, as a means of reducing the magistrates’ tyranny over the people. Ma`afu, to Drury’s surprise, both acquiesced in the planned reforms and agreed to see that taxes were collected promptly. Drury, whose acquaintance with Ma`afu was as yet brief, would not have recognised a reversion to old habits when Ma`afu blamed the taxation difficulties on Hennings and Ratu Tevita. The Special Commissioner would soon learn, however.

Ma`afu’s assurances to Drury recalled the “firm views against the passage of tax money out of Lau” which he had expressed to Commodore Goodenough five months earlier. Ma`afu enjoyed long experience of soothing the ears of his interlocutors with words he knew they wanted to hear. Now, though, with Thurston and his emissary baying at his heels, words in his defence from another would not go astray. They came in the form of a long letter addressed to the “Ministers … representing the Government of Fiji” from William Hennings, who presented a reasoned defence of Ma`afu’s relations with the government. Ma`afu, Hennings declared, had exceeded all other chiefs of Fiji in “liberal and generous spirit”. Moreover, from July 1871 until March 1874, affairs of state had made Ma`afu almost a stranger to his people in Lau. Hennings outlined in some detail Ma`afu’s long service as Viceroy, while his influence was declared to be crucial in persuading Tui Cakau to join the Cakobau Government. Ma`afu’s “troops”, despatched to Levuka and elsewhere in defence of the Kingdom, were all “taxable men” who could not be expected to pay their taxes while absent on active service. Furthermore, the enforced departure from Lau of all Tongans “not properly settled” had deprived the province of much revenue. Most Fijians in Lau were “unable to work up the raw material” of their taxes, to say nothing of damage caused by successive “gales”. Finally, Hennings loftily advised Thurston, “I am not aware that [Ma`afu] has ever looked upon the fact of being deposed by men most of whom are his personal friends and some of
whom owe their very existence to him – as a very serious matter”. There was something in Ma`afu’s soul, Hennings would have Thurston believe, that rose above the sordid politics of Levuka.\textsuperscript{234}

Thurston, predictably, was uninterested either in Ma`afu’s soul or in his reputation. In a detailed memorandum on Hennings’ letter, apparently penned the day it came to hand, the Chief Secretary declared that the government had not impugned Ma`afu’s career, as Hennings implied. It simply required Ma`afu to submit to Treasury the amounts of taxation he had misappropriated. Precise as always, Thurston pointed out that the taxation agreement cited by Hennings in Ma`afu’s defence was no longer operative. He was right: the agreement, dated 4 January 1873, permitted Hennings to collect all taxes in Lau “which are or may become due at any time during this present year, 1873”. The agreement was as much with Ma`afu as it was with Hennings, Thurston claimed, since it provided for Ma`afu’s salary to be paid from taxation revenue. Thurston had long since done his homework on the subject of Lauan taxes; he was aware, for example, that Hennings had shipped taxes in kind from Moala and some nearby islands to Hamburg “in a German barque”. He queried Hennings’ claim that the amount of £739–6–11, deposited into Ma`afu’s account at Hennings’ store, was the most that could be gathered from the rich province of Lau.\textsuperscript{235} Other less well-endowed provinces had provided much greater revenue and in any case the 1873 agreement had provided for all taxes to be collected, not merely those sufficient to pay Ma`afu’s salary.

Thurston’s measured attack on Hennings, and through him Ma`afu, was not confined to the many shortcomings of Lauan tax arrangements. He explicitly refuted the German trader’s assertion that Ma`afu, as Viceroy, had provided his services to the King “in a liberal and generous spirit”, and that only Ma`afu had been able to quell “disturbances and troubles” in parts of Fiji beyond Cakobau’s direct authority, such as western Viti Levu. Thurston recalled, again with reason, that Ma`afu had ignored requests to assume his responsibilities as Commander-in-Chief of Fiji against mountain people in Viti Levu who had murdered European settlers. With fighting under way in three separate quarters (upper Rewa, Wainunu on Vanua Levu and the mountains near Ba), Ma`afu had merely said that he would consult the other chiefs concerning the course of action “‘most conducive to the interests of Fiji and the welfare of the Whites in the disturbed Provinces’”. “All the while”, Thurston declared, “‘Ma`afu remained inactive in Lau, waiting for the final overthrow of the King’s forces, which he did not believe could sustain the effort it was called upon to make’”.
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It was not the first time that Ma`afu’s influence had been felt in the mountains of Viti Levu. Writing from England in 1869, missionary James Calvert recalled an appeal from two settlers whose plantations had been destroyed in raids by mountain tribes. The settlers, George Burt and Archilles Underwood, had “got up a petition to Ma`afu to come and clear out the mountains and reign there. Seventy white men on the Rewa river signed the petition, but Drew, the Vunivalu’s secretary, prevailed upon him to give up”. Now, though, the speed with which Thurston produced his diatribe against Ma`afu was as remarkable as the breadth and detail of its content. Not satisfied to portray a dissembling Viceroy waiting to pounce on a weakened King, the Chief Secretary denied that Ma`afu had been sent on “frequent political missions” in his official capacity. His vaunted mission to Cakaudrove in July 1873 had been “for the purpose of staying a general war throughout Vanua Levu – a war solely instigated by him”. In a charge others levelled against Ma`afu, Thurston asserted that Tui Lau had sent Tongan missionaries to Macuata, Cakaudrove and elsewhere, “secretly inciting the people to resist the government”. While such espionage, of its nature undocumented, can never be proven against Ma`afu, using the Tongan missionaries, in modern parlance, as secret agents, would have been fully consistent with his wider ambitions. In 1874, though, no proof was needed. Thurston would no more see the missionaries as innocent purveyors of the Gospel than he would accept that the European residents of Lau had applied to Ma`afu for protection, as Hennings claimed. The Chief Secretary’s final verdict on Ma`afu, as a decision on Cession was awaited, was that “the records of Government and the experience of the oldest Foreign officials unite in proving Ma`afu to be an active instigator of treachery – a dangerous, dissembling man”.

While, as the Fiji Times was never loath to point out, Ma`afu was by no means the only tax defaulter among the chiefs of Fiji, there is no doubting the justice of many of the charges, at least those concerning native taxes, levelled against him by Thurston. Charles Drury, whose correspondence reveals his intimate knowledge of tax arrangements in Lau, expressed to Rupert Ryder, the new Finance Minister, his puzzlement concerning the fate of the bulk of those taxes, given that the people had apparently contributed the full amount. Drury, initially willing to accept Ma`afu’s assurances, was becoming disillusioned. He believed that George Bayley, still Ma`afu’s secretary, was influencing his master not to honour his assurances to Drury. If only six months’ taxes were paid for the current year, instead of 12 months’, the resulting large surplus would permit Bayley to recoup the back salary Ma`afu owed him. The idea was Bayley’s, rather
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than Ma`afu’s, Drury advised Ryder.\textsuperscript{240} Drury, although a new chum in Lau, had quickly taken the province’s pulse. Agreeing with Thurston concerning the need to rid Lau of the “tyranny” of Tongan laws, he announced plans to appoint Fijian magistrates in place of Tongans. Ma`afu had promised to co-operate, Drury assured a sceptical Thurston. Further, Drury would raise with Ma`afu the matter of Beqan labourers brought to Lau in 1870 and still awaiting repatriation. Drury pronounced himself aware of Ma`afu’s talents for making “fine promises”, although he was willing to use Ma`afu as far as he could without compromising the government. The greatest danger, Drury felt, lay in the possibility that the sympathetic opinion appearing in almost every issue of the \textit{Fiji Times} might lead Ma`afu to believe that he was being hardly used.\textsuperscript{241}

This chapter began with a consideration of a chastened Ma`afu cooling his heels at home in Lomaloma following the failure of his attempt to secede from the ailing Cakobau Government. His fortunes had improved a year later, largely in consequence of the tumult accompanying the chiefs’ offer of Cession. Yet, after one year, a time when he had occupied centre stage during some of the most dramatic days in Fiji’s history, Ma`afu was again at home and again facing an uncertain future. In June, he generously lent his “paddock” for a match between the Lomaloma Cricket Club and an XI from the visiting HMS \textit{Rosario}.\textsuperscript{242} If Ma`afu strolled across to watch play, he could have been excused for appearing \textit{distract}. A greater game awaited, if only the field could be cleared for a final confrontation between Tui Lau and his oldest rival. He must have been aware, as he watched the motley Lomaloma XI do battle against the sailors, that his chance of mounting a final challenge for Fiji had all but vanished.
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The last chapter closed with an imaginary glimpse of Ma`afu watching a cricket match at Lomaloma, distracted by thoughts of the greater game being played in Whitehall, a game that would determine the course of his future life. To venture a description of his state of mind during these months of waiting is merely to speculate, since there was no window into Ma`afu's heart. During the six months following the chiefs’ offer to cede their islands, Ma`afu, along with most people in Fiji, awaited the response of the British government.

While, in the eyes of Whitehall, Ma`afu was the chief of the Windward Islands and, in consequence, of less moment that the “King” of Fiji, he was not forgotten in the corridors of power. During a debate about annexation in the House of Lords, Viscount Canterbury referred to the Commissioners’ Report:

It was a remarkable fact that one of the most influential chiefs in Fiji – Ma`afu – of whom it was said that other chiefs `had always been jealous of his influence and position’ was not mentioned by the Commissioners as among those who assented to the arrangement they proposed; and the question was, whether he would consider himself bound by it?

It was seen, well before the British government had made a decision, that Ma`afu’s adherence was essential if Cession were to proceed. In Fiji itself, the correspondence of the Ad-Interim Government officials revealed no sense of unease concerning Ma`afu. Indeed, the Governor of Lau appeared to be fulfilling his role to perfection. In July, Charles Drury, Special Commissioner for the province, noted that “everything has gone on smoothly” with tax collections, thanks to arrangements he had made with Ma`afu. The church, too, reported favourably on Ma`afu’s realm, with missionary Isaac Rooney advising his General Secretary in Sydney that “we are all lotu here [in Vanuabalavu] – a quiet civilized community”. According to Rooney, every missionary meeting at Lomaloma was a “gala day” for which people prepared carefully and dressed their best, under instructions from Ma`afu, while on Lakeba, adult schools had been resumed at Ma`afu’s suggestion. “In this, as in every department of our work, much is due to Ma`afu for his active and willing co-operation and support”. Writing at Lomaloma while a meeting was in progress, Rooney bestowed on Ma`afu the highest praise the chief had yet received from a missionary:

---
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the church is crowded now, and Ma`afu, the head chief of the island, is called to the chair. Ma`afu is perhaps the most liberal supporter of the Mission funds in the Southern Hemisphere. His annual contribution is £70. This year he gave £90. Only one third of this amount is in his own name. The remainder is in the names of his nephews, nieces and dependents. Every year he gives four sovereigns in memory of two of his children who died young. Ma`afu had money laid by for this occasion; but last week, while he was away at another island, it was stolen; so he actually sold his steam launch yesterday in order to get money for the meeting. Not many chiefs in Fiji would do that, or a Papalangi either. But while I am telling you about Ma`afu, he is going on with his speech. He is a fluent and powerful speaker, and is giving good advice to his people, interspersed with telling illustrations. Then he calls on two or three speakers, and the meeting concludes with a Hymn and prayer.  

Rooney’s tribute stands in contrast to some earlier missionary opinion, most notably from John Thomas and Richard Lyth, who castigated a younger Ma`afu for his dubious moral character and failure to set an example as a Christian chief. Now Tui Lau appeared to have metamorphosed into a moral exemplar whose leadership qualities could not be gainsaid. Yet during the same month, as we saw in Chapter 11, Ma`afu was castigated for “tyrannical conduct” and “barbarity” for having “sold” 240 Beqa men for £3 per head to planters in Lau. After supposedly promising to repatriate them after six months, Ma`afu had instead rehired them in various parts of Lau, where they remained three years later. Drury found on enquiry that there were only 100 Beqans, most of whom, in July 1874, were working on three different plantations. Arrangements were made to return them all to Beqa once the current crops were picked and the men were paid their full wages. Owing to the verbal nature of “contracts” Ma`afu made with different planters concerning these men, it is not possible to determine the extent of his culpability in failing to honour his original agreement. Even though the men appear to have been paid wages on their plantations, there seems little doubt that Ma`afu exploited them and their labour for personal gain, conduct at odds with that praised so fulsomely by Isaac Rooney. While there was nothing new in the dilemma posed by such conflicting views of Ma`afu, this time the dilemma was easier of resolution. He had made an agreement with Hedemann and Company of Levuka for the supply of 200 rifles and 500 rounds

---
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of ammunition. A second agreement, dated 6 June 1874, some 11 months after the first, indicated that Ma`afu still intended to take delivery of his order. All would depend on the decision from London.

In the face of widespread ignorance of Fiji among British Parliamentarians and the opposition of Prime Minister William Gladstone to either protection or annexation of the islands, a campaign by one Member “to rouse public opinion” resulted in a growth of public sentiment in favour of annexation. Even Queen Victoria took an interest, advising her Ministers that the offer of Cession could not be accepted under the conditions imposed by the chiefs and Thurston. She approved the plan by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Carnarvon, to send the Governor of New South Wales, Sir Hercules Robinson, to Fiji with instructions to advise the chiefs of the British government’s position. Robinson would be authorised to accept the offer if it were made unconditional. During these weeks, with Ma`afu having retired to Lomaloma, the War Office advised Carnarvon that, despite the “alarm” caused by his “incursions” into Fiji in years past, “he has always expressed himself anxious for British rule”.

Such a view reflected Whitehall’s ignorance of the Realpolitik of Fiji. Ma`afu and his old Tovata allies remained a threat to the integrity of any Fijian administration, whether the present Ad-Interim Government or any colonial regime which might succeed it. Ma`afu’s deposition as Governor of Lau in March 1874 had caused him to withhold taxes from the central government and to insist that only the Tovata laws held sway in Lau. With a response from Britain still awaited in July and August 1874, Ma`afu remained in absolute control of all the Tovata lands. Should the British decide against Cession, he was ready to challenge Cakobau. Charles Drury advised Thurston from Lomaloma that Tui Cakau had arrived there and “Rumour says that he will remain … until the annexation question is settled”. In addition, a visiting naval officer noted in July the presence of “about 150 Tongans over on a visit” at Lomaloma, where Ma`afu “keeps them in case annexation does not come off”. Drury, concerned for the immediate future, had made extended enquiries among the European residents of Lau “as to what course they thought the natives of this province would take in case of non-annexation. The universal reply was that they thought Ma`afu, Tui Cakau and Tui Macuata would join together to fight Bau, and then each

8 Agreement at Lomaloma between Frederick Hedemann and Enele Ma`afu, Hedemann versus Ma`afu papers, CG Set 31.
9 W. MacArthur to G.L. Griffiths, 1 Jun 1875.
10 Henry Ponsonby, Private Secretary to Queen Victoria, to Lord Carnarvon, 20 Jun and 14 Jul 1874, Carnarvon to Ponsonby, 21 Jun 1874, Carnarvon Papers.
11 War Office to CO, 24 Jul 1874, enc. 36 in CAFI.
12 Letters of Thomas Suckling, 11 July 1874.
of the three chiefs would govern their own respective territories as in former days”. Even the missionaries considered that war was inevitable if the British declined to accept Fiji. Drury continued:

I have never heard a word on this point … from Ma`afu, but I know that Ma`afu has been keeping all the Tongan mob that Tui Cakau had down at Nasova … a year ago from returning to their homes (to the disgust of all who have to feed them) until he knows whether annexation takes place or not.13

The presence of this “Tongan mob” under Ma`afu’s aegis did not pass unnoticed in Levuka. The Fiji Times reported a “native feast” at Lomaloma in September which appeared “to have a political significance of an extraordinary kind”. The newspaper’s correspondent noted:

The more than common friendship of Ma`afu and Tui Cakau, the close secrecy [sic] observed as to the immediate object of those two powerful chiefs, the preparation for hostilities, under the ostensible reason of chastising some refractory tribes, and the general call for contributions in money and food, all point to concerted aggressive movements in contemplation. If … Fiji should not be annexed a war may be expected … Ma`afu and Tui Cakau are it would seem determined to shake off at once and for ever the restraining yoke of Bau.14

In fairness to the opinion of at least a few settlers in Fiji, mention should also be made of a refutation of the Fiji Times’ views that appeared in the pages of its rival, the Fiji Argus:

There is not a word of truth in [the Fiji Times’] assertion and innuendo as to a combination between Ma`afu and Tui Cakau for hostile purposes against Bau. Ma`afu, who has been all along held up as a bugbear and a bogy, is effete. That he is indeed a perfidious man, who would like to kick up a row for the purpose of enriching himself, there cannot be the shadow of a doubt: a treacherous withholder of the revenue; a renegade to his sworn fealty; a traitor to his oath of allegiance. But that he has any fangs to bite with left, is out of the question. He is perfectly effete. … The native taxes are being paid [in Lau] … without any fear of menace or hurt from the Tongan usurper.15

The purpose of this tongue-in-cheek journalism by the Fiji Argus was to heap scorn on its rival, rather than to offer any balanced view of current politics. Yet The Sydney Morning Herald’s correspondent was of like mind, describing the notion

13 Drury to Thurston, 26 Aug 1874, CG Set 10.
14 FT, 12 Sep 1874.
15 FA, 18 Sep 1874 [italics in original].
that Ma`afu and Tui Cakau were preparing for hostilities against Bau as “nothing more ... than a mischievous piece of bosh”. More significantly perhaps, Isaac Rooney saw no menace in Ma`afu and his “Tongan mob”. The missionary averred that Tui Cakau had for several years been building a large canoe for Ma`afu. With the canoe at last complete, Tui Cakau had brought it to Lomaloma and presented it to his old friend “in the usual Fijian style”. He was now waiting for Ma`afu “to present property to him in return”, after which he would return home. In the meantime, cooked food was being presented to the visitors every day. Rooney could not resist the opportunity to rise to Ma`afu’s defence:

This fabrication is of a piece with the series of gross misrepresentations of which Ma`afu has been made the victim during the last nine months. Why do not those who charge Ma`afu with appropriating the Lau revenues hold a court of enquiry and investigate the matter? They know better. They know than an enquiry would clear Ma`afu, and inculpate others whom I need not mention. Much is said about Ma`afu by people who know nothing about him. All who are acquainted with him know that he is the friend of the white man, and at the same time the protector of the native. In no province in Fiji is such order maintained as in Lau, and if Ma`afu were to leave the group tomorrow, both whites and natives, in this part of Fiji, would soon wish him back again. Ma`afu is not immaculate. Doubtless he has his faults like other people. But, notwithstanding that he was born and brought up a heathen, he will compare favorably with some who have had all the advantages of education and civilisation.17

Rooney forbore to add that Ma`afu was also a generous contributor to the mission. If the missionary’s words are accepted at face value, it is difficult to credit such a degree of naïveté to someone who had lived close to Ma`afu for several years. Could he have been Ma`afu’s dupe, or perhaps his ally? Did he harbour a desire to see Ma`afu, so long an ardent supporter of the Wesleyan cause, achieve supremacy in Fiji? While it was true that Lau was the best administered of Fiji’s provinces, it is unlikely that Rooney would have found many to agree with such a benign assessment of Ma`afu’s activities. Thurston certainly did not; he had been informed that Ritova, still in name Tui Macuata but facing dissent in his matanitu, had repudiated his allegiance to the Ad-Interim Government. The fractious chief was supposed to be in communication with Ma`afu and to have hoisted the Lauan flag in Macuata. Thurston urged Consul Layard against visiting Ma`afu at Lomaloma “lest the King and chiefs think there is a connection between you and Ma`afu”.18 Rooney’s apologia for
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Ma`afu, widely read as it would have been among the settler community, was unlikely to have convinced many that the former Viceroy was, as Whitehall apparently believed, eagerly awaiting Cession.

Thurston’s intransigence towards Ma`afu arose as much from the long-standing antipathy between them as from any apprehension the Chief Secretary might have felt concerning Ma`afu’s plans if Cession did not eventuate. Yet he was not overly cautious in urging Layard to keep his distance from the dragon’s lair. Thurston had instructed the Governor of Lakeba and Ma`afu’s subordinate, Ratu Tevita Uluilakeba, to proceed to Bau, where he would join other chiefs in discussions with Robinson, shortly expected from Sydney. Ratu Tevita demurred, with his secretary, Edgar Reid, advising Drury that Ma`afu had prevailed upon Tevita not to go to Bau. According to Drury, Tevita was “offside” with Ma`afu and found himself in a dilemma: how could he adhere to Thurston’s wishes without further offending his paramount chief? There was more to this story: Thurston, having “dismissed” Ma`afu as Governor of Lau and appointed Tevita in his place, later invited Tevita to proceed to Lomaloma “to take up his new title”. Accompanied by about 50 followers, Tevita complied, only to find himself a virtual prisoner of Ma`afu when he arrived. No longer formally Governor, but still Tui Lau, Ma`afu sent 250 men under his son Siale`ataongo, all armed with muskets, to Lakeba, leaving Tevita “in a fix”. After ten days, he sent his resignation to Thurston. Ma`afu had himself gone to Lakeba, where he advised the local chiefs that there existed no government in Fiji and that he, along with Goodenough and Layard, were the “principal rulers”. Although, in Lau, Ma`afu could always defy the Ad-Interim Government, he was safe from interference only while there was no agreement between Fiji’s other chiefs and the Queen’s representative concerning Cession.

Robinson’s task was to ensure that the chiefs of Fiji were content, even anxious, to cede their islands unconditionally. In April, Commissioners Goodenough and Layard had concluded in their Report that no government of Fiji established within the islands, however constituted, “could become tolerable to the native or white planter”. Any such government would be bound to consider the indigenous Fijian only “as a payer of poll-tax, a possible labourer and a consumer of imported goods”. Annexation in the form of a Crown Colony was seen as much the best solution by the Commissioners and by the European community in Fiji. Yet, “the broad principle [that] … the Fijian chiefs and people, in changing their allegiance, retain all existing private rights, real and personal”, could not be accepted. When Robinson reached Fiji on 23 September, one of his officers
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noted that much land had been cleared “on account of the probability of war between Ma’afu with Tui Cakau Ritova etc against Cakobau”. The officer was not alone in anticipating such an outcome if Cession did not proceed.\(^{24}\)

Robinson’s instructions from Lord Carnarvon were precise:

> I request you … to proceed to Fiji and explain to all parties that Her Majesty’s Government cannot accept cession on conditions proposed by Mr Thurston, but if all questions as to constitution, titles and land, compensation and pensions are freely left to their decision all claims and interests will be fully enquired into and fairly dealt with. … Reasonable rights and interests of chiefs would be recognised as far as consistent with British sovereignty and colonial form of Government.\(^{25}\)

Despite what the Melbourne Argus described as Fiji’s “condition of suspended animation” and the “fretful uncertainty which had prevailed for so long”, difficulties were anticipated because of “the peculiar nature of native land tenure”, peculiar, of course, from a colonial European perspective. The position of the Colonial Office was that, in a Crown Colony, all land should be at the disposal of the Crown. The Cakobau Government had been anxious to resolve the many problems associated with land tenure but had been unable to do so, owing to the uncertainty over the question of annexation and to the risk of alienating either settlers or indigenous Fijians. In pre-Cession Fiji, there was no equivalent of Crown land, which could be defined as land at the disposal of the government in the name of the nominal king, Cakobau. Most land was vested in a local *mataqali*, while some holdings had been “sold” to Europeans who would be averse to any administration that did not recognise their tenure. Meanwhile Ma’afu, according to the Argus, was preparing for war with Cakobau who, “in the absence of any interference from the whites, must … go to the wall”.\(^{26}\)

While the need for such a warning had largely passed by the time it was published, the threat posed by Ma’afu and his allies remained real when, on 25 September, Cakobau came aboard the *Dido* for a formal “Conversation” with Robinson on the question of Cession. The Governor’s essential task, in this and subsequent meetings, was to ensure that Cakobau and the other principal chiefs understood all the implications of “giving” their country to Queen Victoria. The King quickly announced his acceptance of the need for the offer to be unconditional:

> If I give a chief a canoe, and he knows that I expect something from him, I do not [attach conditions], but I give him the canoe right out, and trust

---
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to his generosity and good faith to make me the return ... he knows I expect. If I were to attach conditions, he would say, `I do not care to be bothered with your canoe; keep it yourself'.

Robinson's purpose was to leave no doubt in the minds of Cakobau and the other chiefs of the implications of the Deed of Cession. The Governor appeared to do his work well, quietly insisting on an unconditional transfer of sovereignty and assuring Cakobau that chiefly status would be respected and maintained. Cakobau quickly revealed a comprehensive and indeed statesmanlike view of the question, by way of contrast with his past ineptitude in the face of constitutional matters. With respect to English law that would prevail in Fiji after Cession, the king informed Robinson that “law, peace and rest is [sic] what we want. These are our riches ... Tumult and disquiet are poverty. If matters remain as they are, Fiji will become like a piece of drift wood on the sea, to be picked up by the first passer-by”. The chiefs were indeed more concerned with the dire consequences of continued misgovernment, such as they had experienced for several years, than they were with any loss of sovereignty entailed in Cession. Yet there remained two “elements” to be considered: the whites and Ma`afu. The former could be summarised without difficulty: “The whites who have come to Fiji are a bad lot. They are mere stalkers on the beach”. Ma`afu, though, could not be dismissed so easily:

Ma`afu’s desire has been and is to conquer Fiji. Some years ago, he took possession of an island south of Rewa, and sent an insulting message to me: ‘Fiji is now divided, but when I take Rewa it will be united’, that is under his own government. I disliked his policy, not his race, when he joined us the dislike ceased on my side. This is my mind. It is otherwise with him. Since he has joined the present Government he has found it impossible to carry out his plans, so he is trying to foment discords as to prevent Cession, and thereby further his own ends.

Robinson reassured Cakobau that after Cession, he, Ma`afu and all other Fijians would be subjects of the Queen. Cakobau declared his belief that the presence of Robinson as Governor of Fiji would render harmless the “seeds of disaffection” which Ma`afu had always sought to scatter in the islands.27

Ma`afu, it may safely be assumed, was uninterested in becoming a subject of Queen Victoria. Remaining at home in Lomaloma, he did not attend a meeting of chiefs which Cakobau called at Nasova on 28 September, following the apparent success of the King’s two meetings with Robinson. Cakobau, “sick and tired of the ceaseless anxiety and worry caused to him by his difficult and
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undefined position as King *de facto*, and not *de jure*, was determined to see Cession a reality. He “declared his intentions in respect of annexation, and directly invited the concurrence of the chiefs in his views, which was very cordially given”. If the words of the *Herald* correspondent accurately reflect proceedings at the chiefly conclave, it was apparent that, for Cakobau at least, the days of consultation were past. “Concurrence”, rather than discussion, was invited from the assembled chiefs, who included Tui Bua and Isa Keli, the latter representing Tui Cakau who, although ill and unable to attend, declared through his spokesman his support for Cession. The correspondent noted, tongue in cheek perhaps, “The wily chief Ma`afu is said to have been quite taken aback at the unexpected news – completely floored at it, in fact. Isa Keli … says that Ma`afu’s face lengthened when [in advance of the meeting] he heard what was about to take place: “Ma`afu sa dua tani sara matana”, literally, “Ma`afu has quite a different face on him ever since”, meaning that Ma`afu’s demeanour changed considerably as he absorbed the news.”  

Ma`afu, of course, throughout his career in Fiji, had shown himself adept at changing face, in the metaphorical sense, and was to do so again before the Cession of Fiji became a reality. The *Herald*’s view of Ma`afu’s reaction to the news was not shared by all commentators of the Fijian political scene. The *Fiji Argus* protested against such a “wholesale condemnation” of Ma`afu, “more especially because it is asserted that he has lost the confidence of the whites. Ma`afu has always been spoken of by the whites … [in] Lau as the most straightforward and intelligent Chief in the group. [He] seemed only to desire the abolition of the abortive de facto Government, and that, we believe, he was determined to effect by force, if not done by cession to Great Britain”. In publishing this view, the newspaper was probably motivated by a wish to subvert the influence of Thurston, whose hand they claimed to discern in the *Herald* report. In its attribution of benign intent to Ma`afu, the *Fiji Argus* is unique among contemporary journals.

Cakobau, secure in the belief that Ma`afu’s fangs were to be drawn at last, offered the unconditional cession on which Robinson insisted. The Governor, authorised to make formal acceptance of the offer “if unconditional or virtually unconditional”, nevertheless welcomed reassurance and support from other quarters. He was not alone in his need for reassurance: four days after the “Conversation” with Cakobau, Thurston wrote at length to Robinson to advise that Cakobau and other chiefs had been pressing him for advice as to whether Cession “would be good or bad for them”. They were especially anxious about the question of land tenure under colonial rule. While Thurston, as Chief
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Secretary, did well to report these approaches to Robinson, he was disingenuous in advising the Governor “that Thakobau is not only styled Tui Viti but he is Tui Viti in fact … Every ruling chief of Fiji, including the Tongan Ma`afu in full Council assembled – and according to ancient Fijian forms and customs elected him King of Fiji and did him service and homage. They still regard him as their King – not in name but in fact”.

Ma`afu would have had something to say about that, had he been in Robinson’s company when the letter was read, instead of at home in Lomaloma sharpening his tools and feeding his “Tongan mob”. Thurston, who knew as well as any that such a description of Cakobau’s powers was wildly inaccurate, was probably seeking to take advantage of Robinson’s recent acquaintance with the Realpolitik of Fiji. He was somewhat more truthful in advising Robinson that most chiefs would not sign the Deed of Cession unless urged to do so by Cakobau.

That Robinson was well aware of the true extent of Cakobau’s power, and of the essentially farcical nature of the Fijian “government” with which he had to deal, is revealed in a private letter to Sir Henry Parkes, Premier of New South Wales, written the day after his meeting with the chief who, Thurston insisted, was “Tui Viti in fact”:

The farce they try to keep up of magnifying old Cakobau’s pretensions to the undivided sovereignty of Fiji, by use of European expressions and forms is simply ludicrous. But the climax of absurdity took place yesterday when they dressed up the poor old fellow in [a] “go-to-meeting” English suit to meet me – He had on an old white bell topper, and a long black Noah’s Ark frock coat – and looked a cross between a native teacher, and an Ethiopian serenader…

It was nevertheless Cakobau, bell topper and all, with whom Robinson had to negotiate. On the morning of 30 September, the Governor, accompanied by Goodenough, proceeded to Nasova, where “the King read and handed to me the formal resolution of the Council giving Fiji unreservedly to the Queen. The Deed of Cession was then read in Fijian, and the instrument was executed by the King and the four other ruling chiefs who were present”. Wishing to lose no time, Robinson invited Cakobau to accompany him at once on a tour to Vanuaabalavu, Taveuni and Macuata, where the signatures of Ma`afu, Tui Cakau and Ritova, chiefs “whose assent was necessary to the validity of the Cession” could be obtained. The Pearl, carrying the Governor and the Commodore, escorted by the Dido, with Cakobau and Consul Layard on board, set sail at 4 p.m. Their first port of call, as befitted the status of its paramount chief, was...
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Vanuabalavu, where the ships arrived off Lomaloma early on the morning of 1 October, noting, as they passed by nearby Mago, the Xarîfâ “bearing at the gaff, rather insolently”, or so the Herald correspondent thought, “[with] the viceregal flag hoisted as if in defiance”.

Before the official signing, a shore party from the Pearl, not including Robinson, called at Ma’afu’s house, where they found Tui Lau seated on “native mats”, surrounded “by good chairs, tables, pictures [and] chiffonieres … The chief himself did not look well, having recently been suffering from … bronchitis”. Nearby, the official party noted “Ma’afu’s large canoe, the Ra Marama”, which had once been presented to Cakobau by King Tupou and which was “said to be very old and to be capable of carrying 400 men”. In the course of their stroll, the visitors encountered “a very handsome young girl, with a scanty purple silk bodice on. She was a Tongan”. With the Dido, carrying Cakobau, yet to arrive, the party was content to meander around Ma’afu’s compound and beyond, noting, as other visitors before and later, the orderly nature of Lomaloma and the contiguous Tongan village of Sawana, as well as the spirited independence of the local residents. Another attractive young woman, met along the road, told that Cakobau and his sons were very soon to arrive, “looked pensive for a few seconds, then the light played in her lustrous dark eyes, and she said in vigorous Fijian, ‘You lie!’”

It was, perhaps, hard to credit that the King, so long Ma’afu’s bitter rival for supremacy in Fiji, was about to pay a social call. Yet call he did, bringing with him the end of all hope for Ma’afu to achieve the ambition that had for so long determined his every move in his adopted islands.

Among the visitors was Robinson’s private secretary, George de Robeck, whose enthusiastic descriptions of Ma’afu at home provide us with a glimpse of the chief far removed from those who sought either to tame his ambitions or to impugn his integrity. As the visitors walked towards his house, they encountered “a woodland avenue … bordered on each side by a neat reed palisade, within which breadfruit trees cocoa-nut palms and bananas flourish in tropical abundance”. People were seen carrying baskets of produce, while the sounds of women making tapa could be heard. De Robeck soon came to the heart of Ma’afu’s turf, “the enclosure within which dwelt his immediate retainers and domestics, not to mention the soldiers forming his bodyguard”. De Robeck also noted Ma’afu’s double canoe, 60 feet long, “drawn upon the beach ready for its owner’s use … But its owner’s ideas of locomotion by water have long since gone beyond canoes. More recent additions to his navy have included a neat little yacht and a steam launch”.
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De Robeck and his companions found Maʻafu “lolling backwards” in a chair on the lawn. Seeing his visitors approaching, the chief retreated indoors to receive them formally. De Robeck was impressed:

Maʻafu is certainly a man of stately presence, with an inimitable dignity of carriage and gait ... His body is muscular and well proportioned, and ... His oleaginous skin is in colour a light bronze. The shapeliness of his small round head is the better shown by his thick hair, now slightly grizzled, being shorn close. His features are small and regular, and his face is smooth. It is difficult, nay, it would be impossible, to guess his thoughts by taking his visage as a guide. I read thereon an indifference slightly contemptuous, and nothing more. Singularly arched eyebrows, and eyelids drooping down heavily may cause this, together with the fact that the corners of his mouth turn downwards.

The room in which the visitors were received was “lofty and cool”, boasting “matting scrupulously clean”:

There was a curtained bed ... a harumonic (on which I afterwards heard its owner producing anything but a `concord of sweet sounds'), and ... four very common clocks, each recording a different hour, dispersed about the room. On the walls were coloured prints in wooden frames, such as one often sees in a peasant’s chimney-piece...

The visitors’ conversation with Maʻafu, described as “uninteresting”, touched on Sialeʻataogo:

Inquiries were made after the chief’s eldest son, Charles by name; but Charles, like many other eldest sons, had chosen to be a rake, and had incurred the paternal wrath in consequence. A protracted course of misconduct had ended, some time before, by his being banished to ... Lakeba, where we heard it asserted afterwards, he amused himself far better than at home. His most pronounced weakness is said to be for gin. At the mention of this hopeful’s name, Maʻafu’s expression became a little stonier, a little more inscrutable, than it had been before.

Impressed as they were with the scene, the visitors did not fail to remark their host: “Maʻafu looks apathetically at the scene, and keeps looking on till the entertainment ends”.36 Was his apathy induced by several months of enforced inactivity while a decision from London was awaited, or more likely, by his realisation that he would now have no choice but to add his signature to the
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Deed of Cession? And would he continue to “look apathetically at the scene” until the “entertainment” provided by the transfer of sovereignty of Fiji to Great Britain should similarly put paid to his ambitions for all time?

By the evening, the *Dido* had arrived and Robinson had come ashore from the *Pearl*. The *Dido*’s band played at the back of Ma`afu’s house, after which a meke was performed in the Governor’s presence as a gesture of welcome. Following a *kava* ceremony, the shore party returned to the ship. The business side of the visit occurred early the next morning, when the official interpreter, David Wilkinson, came ashore to acquaint Ma`afu with all that had occurred at Nasova. Tui Lau at once went on board the *Pearl* to pay his respects to the Governor. Meanwhile Wilkinson, alerted to the continued presence of Tui Cakau in Lomaloma, set off in search of him. Discovered asleep in his big canoe, Tui Cakau required a little time to dress before he, too, was taken on board the *Pearl*. With the *Dido* having anchored close by, the time was almost at hand for a meeting between Ma`afu and the King. First, though, in accordance with custom, Ma`afu and Tui Cakau sent presents to Cakobau. Ma`afu’s was “a small cluster of a peculiar kind of cocoanuts (tabu to all but the chiefs)”, while the people of Lomaloma sent a roll of sinnet, five feet long and two feet thick, as well as a *tabua*. When the presents were taken on board the *Dido* by “two old Tongans and a couple of Fijian household officials”, the King’s reaction was carefully noted. With Ma`afu’s envoys seated respectfully on the deck before him, Cakobau, who had brought no *matanivanua*, himself formally accepted the gifts with the words “I take this present in the spirit in which it is given, desiring the peace of the land, and the successful consummation of your present negotiation”. Cakobau’s endorsement of Cession was now beyond doubt but, as all present knew, everything would depend on the reaction of Ma`afu when he shortly came aboard to face his rival and, later, sign away the dearest wish of his life. Once he and Tui Cakau were on board, Cakobau, “in the course of a general conversation”, suggested that they should all return to the *Pearl* the following morning, so the Deed could be signed. When Ma`afu indicated that “he was perfectly willing and desirous to sign … and doubly so as he could sign it in connexion with the King himself, the king and he being of one mind respecting the cession. Cakobau remarked, ‘If you and I are of one mind we need not ask a second chief in Fiji’”. Wishing to reassure Robinson, Cakobau said, “The only two men who could possibly cause any trouble are now in our presence”. As some present must have thought, these were fine words, but would the ancient foes still be of one mind the next morning?

The signing ceremony took place on board the *Pearl* at 10 a.m., when Ma`afu and Tui Cakau were formally received by Robinson in the presence of Cakobau, Goodenough and Layard. Ma`afu’s arrival was described in the Australian press:
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Ma’afu came up the gangway, and, on gaining the deck, shook hands with Captain Chapman, but did not even look towards the King. What was said to him by those who stood near I cannot tell, but he folded his arms on his chest and stood looking straight before him, anything but fraternal or communicative. Near him stood the machiavellian and resolute Tui Thakau, bothered, as much as a braver man could be, with the unpromising aspect of affairs. By a sudden impulse, the King rose with great dignity from his chair, and descended to the quarter-deck, where Ma’afu (with a grave and cold politeness) at once advanced to meet his feudal superior. Then the two chiefs met (like a King of France and an ancient Duke of Burgundy), his Majesty, with an easy grace, held out his hand, which was taken by Ma’afu. A few words of formal civility were exchanged by the two, and then Tui Lau resumed his stage-like attitude, while Thakombau turned to Tui Thakau and overwhelmed him by the cordial warmth of his reception.38

After David Wilkinson read the Deed in Fijian, both chiefs indicated they understood the document and concurred with its contents. Ma’afu, observed by Goodenough to be “grave and dignified”,39 “fixed his own seal and wrote his own name. Tui Cakau held the pen while his name was written”.40 The Commodore took the opportunity to remark to Robinson, “Ma’afu has always been perfectly truthful and straightforward to me since the first day of our acquaintance”.41 There followed a private meeting between Ma’afu, Cakobau and Tui Cakau in the ship’s cabin. What was discussed was not revealed, but “after the lapse of half an hour or so, Ma’afu came out again with a wounded air, and went ashore at once”. Since, as Cakobau observed, it was no longer necessary to proceed to Taveuni, Tui Cakau having signed the Deed on board, the Governor announced that the *Pearl* and *Dido* would sail for Macuata the following day. There, Ritova, the one remaining great chief of Fiji whose assent was necessary, could add his signature to those already gracing the Deed. In the meantime, Ma’afu and Tui Cakau were enjoined to come down to Levuka within ten days for the formal annexation of Fiji.42 According to one newspaper report, Robinson, knowing well Ma’afu’s likely state of mind, had “with great tact” refrained from signing the Deed himself “until Ma’afu had given his adhesion … to the document”.43 Although Goodenough somewhat tersely recorded that Ma’afu was “pleased” with the signing,44 franker observers had noted a very different demeanour.

38 TA, 30 Oct 1874.
40 TA, 30 Oct 1874. See also FT, 10 Oct 1874.
42 The account is based on TA, 30 Oct 1874.
43 The Southern Argus, 3 Nov 1874.
Early the next morning, before the official party left Lomaloma, the Herald reporter visited Ma`afu’s home. “The house is certainly a great improvement upon the present houses built in Fiji”, he recorded, “but what it has gained in comfort it has lost in the picturesque. It had a vulgar public-house sort of air about it that I did not like”. Accompanied by a sub-lieutenant from one of the ships, who knew Ma`afu, the reporter entered the house, noting, as others before him, the furniture, ornaments and lithographic prints. Then they came face to face with their host:

By direction of my friend, I sat down on one of the wooden sofas … and we rose and bowed respectfully to Ma`afu as he came into the room. The big man only acknowledged our presence by a contemptuous half-nod, and supercilious elevation of his eyebrows … I was not impressed by Ma`afu’s manner, which (as compared with that of the King), was not only undignified and needlessly uncivil, but even vulgar.⁴⁵

As on the previous day, on board ship, Ma`afu was out of temper and clearly unconcerned with the impression he left with his visitors. The reason is not difficult to guess: when he executed the Instrument of Cession, he signed away all hope he might have retained to achieve his long-held ambition to become, in his words to Consul Pritchard 12 years before, “chief at Bau”.

The ship’s call at Macuata was not without incident, since Cakobau took the opportunity publicly to berate Ritova, Tui Macuata, for the chaotic and dangerous state of his matanitu, the most backward in Fiji, where internecine warfare still raged between his supporters and those of his kinsman Katonivere.⁴⁶ Ritova duly made his mark on the Deed, however, much to Robinson’s relief and Cakobau’s pleasure and, along with Katonivere, was taken on board in order to be present at the annexation ceremony. On the return voyage to Levuka, a brief stop was made at Nadi in Bua, so that Tui Bua could join the party on shipboard. However, as Robinson reported to the Colonial Office, even before his arrival in Macuata, “practically … with Cakobau’s, Ma`afu’s and Tui Cakau’s unconditional tender of cession, the question may be considered as disposed of”.⁴⁷

When he, Cakobau and Ma`afu were all back in Levuka on 9 October, ready for the Cession ceremonies, Robinson might well have felt even more confident that the matter had been “disposed of”.⁴⁸ With Cession almost a fait accompli, the question raised in the House of Lords concerning how long Ma`afu would
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⁴⁶ For a full account of the visit to Macuata, see TA, 30 Oct 1874, 6.
⁴⁷ Robinson to Carnarvon, 3 Oct 1874, Despatches from the Governor of Fiji to the CO, FCSO.
⁴⁸ The *Dido* and *Pearl* reached Levuka on 7 October, while the *Xarifa*, “with Ma`afu and suite”, arrived on 9 October. FT, 10 Oct 1874, Shipping Intelligence.
consider himself bound by his oath no longer appeared relevant. Yet concerns remained, and indeed the Herald sounded a warning: “no-one who has anything like a thorough knowledge of people such as the Fijians will suppose that they will consider this act [of Cession] to be binding upon them any longer, or any further, than their convenience might dictate”. For the moment, at least to many in Fiji, such a cautionary note appeared unnecessary. The formal annexation ceremony took place at Nasova at 2:30 p.m. on 10 October, when the British flag was raised in the presence of all Fiji’s principal chiefs, except Tui Cakau, as well as Robinson, Commodore Goodenough, Consul Layard and various government officials, with marines from the Pearl and Dido, in full dress uniform, participating. Cakobau made a formal presentation of his war club to Robinson, as a gift for Queen Victoria, and all the chiefs, including Ma`afu, signed a duplicate of the Instrument of Cession. Fiji, in the words of its first Governor, Sir Hercules Robinson, was “from this time forth a possession and dependency of the British Crown”. Following cheers for Queen Victoria and for the “King of Fiji”, the Governor’s words were translated for Cakobau, who responded in kind:

‘Then we have really joined together, and have become one community.’ Then, turning to Ma`afu, he remarked, ‘Well, Ma`afu, it is all over now, and the end is come. We are now one for ever, and we shall have no more contentions with the whites.’ Ma`afu remarked that everything now was firm. Cakobau rejoined: ‘Yes, the vessel is anchored. Her anchor is in good holding ground, and our future will be one of peace and rest’.

The English rendering of these chiefly utterances does not convey the drama of the moment. The actual Fijian words used by Cakobau, terse and doubtless with a hint of triumph, were “Sa oti, Ma`afu”: “It is finished, Ma`afu”. Cakobau’s tenure as soi-disant King of Fiji, fraught with uncertainty and indignity, was indeed finished. Also finished was Ma`afu’s chance to become “chief at Bau”: he did not need his old rival to remind him.

One correspondent believed that the ceremony at Nasova had been “effected with a most undiplomatic ingenuousness of language and absence of fuss and formality”. All proprieties were nevertheless observed and the Governor’s mission well accomplished. Annexation was the pragmatic solution for Fiji’s woes because it was the only means to ensure an end to the many abuses occasioned by the labour trade, abuses involving men who, unable to pay their
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taxes, were hired out as labourers with a fixed term of service, sometimes far from their homes. Often, when their terms had expired, employers were unable and indeed unwilling to send them home. Altogether, the short period of European domination of Fiji had witnessed a breakdown of governance in the islands which, Whitehall now realised, had to be remedied. The British government, anxious to bring order to a wayward expatriate community consisting largely of British subjects, also felt a moral obligation to protect the indigenous population whose rights and prospects had long been jeopardised by the strangers in their midst. Clause Four of the Instrument of Cession provided that all land in Fiji not in occupation by a mataqali, or necessary for its support, or which had not been lawfully alienated to Europeans, would become Crown land, while title disputes would be duly investigated and resolved.\textsuperscript{55} For Cakobau, his remarks on the likely future of Fiji if Cession did not proceed, to say nothing of his relief that the menace of Ma`afu was finally curtailed, are evidence enough that he favoured the change. He was to retain the title of Tui Viti, the shadow without the substance of power, with an annual pension of £1,500 as well as a yacht named the \textit{Victoria}, presented to him on the express recommendation of Robinson.\textsuperscript{56} This largesse was given in return for Cakobau’s surrender of the sovereign rights which, according to the constitutional fiction enunciated by the previous two governments, were his. Cakobau’s gift of his war club to Queen Victoria symbolised the passing of an age.

The new Provisional Government, to administer Fiji until the Colonial Office could establish a permanent structure, was headed by a five-man Executive Council, consisting of Layard as Administrator, Thurston as Colonial Secretary, Thomas Horton, the manager of the Fiji Bank, as Treasurer, Robert Swanston as Minister for Native Affairs and George Innes, Attorney-General of New South Wales, as legal advisor.\textsuperscript{57} The new Colony’s administrative structure, designed to reflect the traditional polity of Fiji, involved the division of the islands into 12 provinces, each presided over by a roko tui, with a Fijian appointed as Stipendiary Magistrate, while there were to be 82 sub-divisions, tikina in Fijian, each administered by a buli. They were to deal with local matters of welfare and good order. There were also to be four European Stipendiary Magistrates “for the trial of European and mixed cases throughout the whole group”.\textsuperscript{58} The provinces approximated the areas of existing matanitu, while the rokos were, as far as possible, chiefs with an existing customary authority. Formally installed and presented with a staff of office, the roko tuis, effectively deputies to the Governor of Fiji, were to be paid a salary, as were the bulis. The roko tuis were

\textsuperscript{55} For Robinson’s views of Clause Four, see Robinson to Carnarvon, 3 Oct 1874.

\textsuperscript{56} Robinson to Carnarvon, 20 Oct 1874, Despatches from the Governor of Fiji to the SSC, 3 Oct 1873 – 4 Jan 1877.

\textsuperscript{57} For the complete list of government officials, see Fiji Royal Gazette, 1874, No. 1; FT, 14 Oct 1874; FGG, 14 Oct 1874; TA, 27 Oct 1874; CAFI.

\textsuperscript{58} Robinson to Carnarvon, 16 Oct 1874, CAFI.
Ma’afu, who did not welcome the new regime with the same equanimity as did Cakobau, was among the Governor’s appointments. On 17 October he was formally gazetted as Roko Tui Lau at an annual salary of £600. This amount was less than his earlier remunerations: he had received £800 under the 1871 Constitution and £640 under the financially streamlined Ad-Interim Government, although the latter salary was withheld following his dismissal from office as Governor of Lau. Among the Native Stipendiary Magistrates appointed for Lau were Ma’afu’s long-serving matapule, Sione Mafi, and Ratu Tevita Uluilakeba in Lakeba, who was also made buli of that district. Lau was divided into the first class district of Lakeba, the second-class districts of Lomaloma and Moala and the third class districts of Ono and Mualevu. Throughout Fiji, the core of the new structure, as Thurston noted, was that “The chief of every qali [was] to be acknowledged and recognised as owner, absolute, of the lands of the qali and guardian of the interests and rights of the people”. Ma’afu survived the transition to remain supreme in Lau, with his existing hierarchy intact and the loyalty of his people seemingly assured. The difference was that although he remained Tui Lau, he became, in his new dignity of Roko Tui Lau, an officer of the British colonial administration and a de facto British subject. The days when he could menace the prestige and authority of Bau, as a means to becoming master of Fiji, were over. The locus of power had shifted to a distant shore; while the chief had once boasted that Cakobau would cook for him, there was no prospect that Queen Victoria would ever preside in Ma’afu’s kitchen.

Ma’afu, like Fiji itself, was passing into a new era, a change remarked by many. It was probably more than coincidence that on the very day of Cession, the Fiji Times published a reference to “a flagrant piece of barbarity on the part of Ma’afu”. The editor was referring to the 240 Beqa men whom Ma’afu had supposedly taken by force from their island and sold to Lauan planters for £3 a head. The matter of the Beqa labourers, which had long attracted adverse
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comment in Fiji, was rightly considered to reflect shame on Ma`afu. The men were finally repatriated in February 1875, some four and a half years after they had been taken from their home. In reporting their departure, the Fiji Argus saw fit to add that Ma`afu “intends giving up his peculiar ways now, and notwithstanding his trade in guns and lead, won’t make a fight of it”, an illusion to Ma`afu’s contract with Messrs Hedemann. In September, Hedemann advised him that the rifles were in Samoa, while balls and cartridges could be ordered from Sydney if Ma`afu so wished. A month later, with Cession a fait accompli, Ma`afu called at Hedemann’s store and advised Frederick Hedemann “that the Governor has prohibited him from taking the guns … Ma`afu has made the contract with us and certainly he cannot expect us to be the loser”. The matter remained unresolved.

Despite these difficulties with a contract he wished he had never made, Ma`afu took his place at a meeting with Robinson, Cakobau and many leading chiefs at Draiba on 15 October, when the Governor asked the chiefs to return to their matanitu and explain to the people what had transpired during the previous weeks. In particular, the Governor wished the people to understand that the new provincial governments were designed to accord as far as possible with Fijian custom and practice, the vaka vanua in which the chiefs and people had been nurtured. Following his address, Robinson gave way to the chiefs. Cakobau, after signing in vain to Ma`afu to speak first, rose to acknowledge that he and all the other chiefs of Fiji were now subordinate to the British Crown. He continued:

Any chief attempting to pursue a course of disloyalty must expect to be dealt with on his own merits, and not to escape by any subterfuge, or by relying on any Fijian customs or upon his high family connections.

These words, music no doubt to the ears of Robinson, would have sounded a discordant note to those of Ma`afu. He responded with sang-froid, pragmatism and even a hint of grace:

What more can any of us say? The unity of today has been our desire for years. I have now been twenty years in Fiji, and I have never before seen such a sight as I see today – Fiji actually and truly united. We tried a Government ourselves; we did not succeed. That has passed away. Another, and a better and more permanent state of things has been brought into existence. I believe I speak the mind of all present when I
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69 Robinson to Carnarvon, 17 Oct 1874, CO 83/5. See also SMH, 29 Oct 1874, 5.
say that we are really and truly united in heart and will, and we are all gratified with what we have heard. We are true men, and will return to our homes knowing that the unity of Fiji is a fact, and that peace and prosperity will follow.\(^{70}\)

This was the chief who, 15 months earlier, had walked into Hedemann’s store in Levuka and ordered 200 rifles on account. Now, a different account was being settled, one which impeded, rather than eased, Ma’afu’s path to power in Fiji.

With Ma’afu’s thwarted plans not yet widely known among his new colonial masters, Lord Carnarvon was able to reassure Queen Victoria that “Sir Hercules Robinson anticipates the concurrence of Ma’afu, who is the only considerable chief and power after King Cakobau”. The Queen duly expressed her “satisfaction” with the turn of events.\(^{71}\) Satisfaction seemed the order of the day in Fiji as well, with Robinson asserting that the Provisional Government was “capable of working efficiently for a year or more” while “prospects of revenue” were ascertained.\(^{72}\) As for Ma’afu, who knew that his new role as Roko Tui Lau marked the apogee of his long career in Fiji, whatever satisfaction he might have felt was never made known.

Whether or not because Ma’afu’s days as a menace to the peace and good order of Fiji were thought to be over, his reputation appeared enhanced by the events at Nasova. The Sydney Morning Herald declared, “Ma’afu is a voluntary and perfectly conscious party to the cession and not only so but is a chief employed as a subordinate administrator”.\(^{73}\) It is unlikely that Leo Layard, appointed Administrator of the Colony after Robinson’s return to Sydney, felt a similar degree of composure when he considered Ma’afu’s new “subordinate” role. He advised the Foreign Office that only annexation could have saved Fiji from a “furious war”:

> I have for some time had the clues in my hands to a widespread plot between Ma’afu and the Windward chiefs against Bau (the King’s party and the white man’s government) and during a late visit to Lomaloma I acquired much fuller information. Rifles and ammunition had been largely supplied and promised by European merchants here, and at least 1,000 Tongans were ready to come to the help of their brethren of the Windward Islands. All this is now over…\(^{74}\)

Later, he informed the Foreign Secretary that he had been “cognizant of a plot in which Ma’afu and Tui Cakau were chief movers, which would have involved

\(^{70}\) ibid. Ma’afu had in fact lived in Fiji for 27 years.

\(^{71}\) Carnarvon to Queen Victoria, 17 Oct 1874; Lord Cairns to Carnarvon, 19 Oct 1874, Carnarvon Papers.

\(^{72}\) Telegram, Robinson to Carnarvon, Oct 1874, FO 58/145.

\(^{73}\) SMH, 31 Oct 1874.

\(^{74}\) Layard to FO, 19 Nov 1874, FO 58/142.
these islands in a savage war, had they not been annexed by Great Britain”. 75 Although he was one of the Commissioners sent to Fiji to consult the chiefs about annexation, Layard, in retrospect, fades into the background somewhat in the face of his colleague Commodore Goodenough’s more forceful personality and greater output of despatches and correspondence. It can come as a surprise to students of nineteenth-century Fiji to discover that Layard had long been aware, not only of Ma’afu’s plans, but also of the sorry outlook for Fiji had the chiefs’ initial decision against Cession been confirmed.

Almost nothing was heard of the Roko Tui Lau during these days. He appeared to be asserting himself in his new “subordinate” role, advising William Hennings to “let the people know I am Ma’afu” and appointing Hennings as magistrate for Lau. 76 Yet he was overruled, being advised by Robert Swanston, Secretary for Native Affairs, that Lauan planter Horace Emberson had been chosen. Instructed to select a site for the new magistrate’s house, Ma’afu chose Navavua, in Lomaloma, formerly Swanston’s residence when he was Ma’afu’s secretary. 77 As Roko Tui Lau, Ma’afu received detailed and precise instructions on the duties of both European and Fijian Stipendiary Magistrates. 78 His duties did not end there, since Commissioner Drury was in consultation with Layard concerning some 300 to 400 men and women “held in servitude by chiefs, magistrates and officers” in Lau, having been convicted in the old Tovata courts. Although Ma’afu had promised several months earlier to free the prisoners, he had not yet done so. Drury saw this problem as an example of the need for “the new laws of the land” to become effective in Lau, so that the most objectionable of the old laws, such as those under which many of the prisoners had been convicted, “will be among the things of the past”. 79 Responsibility for the diffusion of the new laws in Lau, and with them the authority of the colonial administration, lay firmly with the Roko Tui Lau.

Ma’afu, who left Levuka for home on 22 October, faced a dilemma: as the laws of the Crown Colony of Fiji came into effect in Lau, there would be a concomitant circumscription of his own power as Tui Lau, exercised now for more than 15 years. Despite the policy of the British government that the new administrative structure should conform to Fiji’s traditional polity, the islands’ principal chiefs, newly dignified as they were as rokos and bulis, had themselves to conform to the new rule of law. Swanston neatly defined the balance between the rokos’ chiefly powers and their legal responsibilities when, in accordance
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with Layard’s instructions, he reminded magistrate Emberson that “the only person who can pardon prisoners duly sentenced is the officer administering the Government”, that is the Roko Tui Lau. However, it would henceforth be necessary for “a statement of the reasons why certain prisoners should be released [to] be forwarded with the names by the Roko Tui Lau for the action of His Honor [sic] the Administrator in the matter”. 80 Tui Lau could once have freed prisoners according to his whim. The Roko Tui Lau, invested with his staff of office and dignified as the representative in his province of a distant Queen, was now obliged to state his reasons and await official sanction before he could exercise his authority as paramount chief. Ma`afu can scarcely have known a greater chagrin.

The Roko Tui Lau seems to have ruefully accepted his new role. Aside from the question of the prisoners, he was instructed to carry out a population census in Lau, noting how many people were taxable and recording the seasons of planting, working and “visiting”. Swanston who, as Secretary for Native Affairs, issued this instruction, even used a little incentive to goad his erstwhile master into action: “I look forward to seeing your progress at the end as compared to the Rokos of other Provinces”. 81 It was to be six months before this Roko could oblige. 82 Swanston continued to apply bureaucratic strictrures to Ma`afu, reminding him that the government could not recognise any secretary of European descent whom he might employ without prior departmental approval. Ma`afu was permitted to retain Vanuabalavu as his private property, doubtless because the colonial government was committed to respecting traditional land tenure in Fiji. The Roko was, nevertheless, reminded that rents from all leased Lauan lands beyond Vanuabalavu were public revenue: “I desire that you will notify this fact to Ma`afu”, Emberson was instructed. 83 Ma`afu himself, anxious perhaps to conform to the bureaucratic straitjacket being inexorably imposed on his chiefly powers, sought guidance concerning the disposal of fines imposed by the Native Courts. “All fines, fees etc are Government Revenue and must be paid into the Treasury” was the stern response. 84 He was even reminded that “monies from the Foreign Office are not to be spent without permission”. 85

Seeming to take all these strictures on the chin, Ma`afu at last arranged for the repatriation of “a number of Beqa men”, although with their taxes still unpaid. Doubtless wishing to end this long-standing scandal at any cost, Emberson let Ma`afu off the hook to the extent of recommending to Swanston that the Roko of the men’s home district should account for the taxes. 86 Ma`afu was to end the
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most momentous year of Fiji’s history, and indeed of his own life, on a positive note when he presented a building and its enclosed grounds at Lomaloma to the government, with the request that it be used as a courthouse and gaol. He even requested a “deed of transfer” to sign, but John Thurston, churlish as ever in matters concerning his bête noire, asserted that no deed was necessary as Ma’afu’s ownership was unclear: “Let His Excellency take and occupy the buildings. It will be gazetted”.  

For Ma’afu, settling into what was to be the final stage of his long career in Fiji, there remained two questions, one public and one personal, to engage his immediate attention. The first was the matter of taxes, defined for the information of rokos in their formal Instructions:

All males from 16 to 60 must pay the capitation tax of which there are three rates: first on the Districts where money is easily obtainable the rate is ten shillings each man, the second rate is seven shillings and sixpence and the third rate is in Districts where money is difficult to procure, in inland and mountain tribes, and is five shillings yearly … Any roko failing to collect the taxes for his district will be called to account for the same.

For the moment, by way of contrast with his years as Viceroy and as Governor of Lau, there appeared to be no taxation clouds darkening Ma’afu’s horizon. Of greater importance for him at the beginning of 1875 was the personal matter, that concerning the coup d’état he had been planning, with his order for rifles from Hedemann’s store and the “army” awaiting his summons in Tonga. The moment had passed now, but in the case of the rifles, Ma’afu was still faced with his legal contract for their supply. Having failed to convince the trader that he was “afraid” of the government, he caused his unofficial secretary, George Bayley, to write four times to Frederick Hedemann during November 1874, arguing that the contract was now void. Hedemann would have none of it, asserting that if “Ma’afu thinks he can back out of his contract, we are convinced … that other influence is brought upon him … Ma’afu ought to be aware that nobody can relieve him of the contract he has entered into”. The trader, threatening legal action, was planning to visit Lomaloma to arrange “a final settlement”. Still seeking to avoid that outcome, Ma’afu told Hedemann in January 1875 that he had sold 100 tons of copra to a visiting ship and “that this copra was intended for us to pay against his account … for the payment of
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the Snider carbines”. Bayley was urged to advise Hedemann as soon as 40 or 50 tons of copra had been made at Lomaloma, so the trader could send a vessel to collect it.\textsuperscript{91} Bayley, of course, could do nothing without Ma`afu’s approval.

Whatever the precise nature of the “influence” on Ma`afu from other quarters was, the matter quickly engaged the attention of Emberson, who wrote to Layard:

Ma`afu is again applied to by Messrs Hedemann … for some £2,000 as payment for Snider rifles ordered by Ma`afu some time back by written agreement. \textit{Delivery to be taken in Samoa}. Ma`afu says he was told by … Sir Hercules Robinson, by yourself also with the Commodore that he \textit{should} not and \textit{need} not pay for these rifles. Did you know … that it was agreed that delivery was to be taken at Samoa. Ma`afu says [Hedemann] suggested this in order to save him the duty. I imagine they … had other reasons and more foresight. Ma`afu is very anxious on this matter and wants me especially to request your advice and opinion. Will he have to pay and how do you advise him to set about collecting such a large amount.\textsuperscript{92}

Layard sought immediate advice from Robinson in Sydney, expressing some scepticism: “I am not aware that either Your Excellency or Commodore Goodenough gave Ma`afu any advice upon the subject of his contract for Snider rifles – I certainly never said anything of the kind to Ma`afu”. Layard believed that Messrs Hedemann sought merely to frighten Ma`afu into paying his debt.\textsuperscript{93} Robinson was clear in his response:

Ma`afu is mistaken in stating that I told him that he should not and need not pay for the rifles … I told him that as a subordinate British official, he had no need of a large supply of rifles and should not possess them.
I accordingly advised him to come to some arrangement with Messrs Hedemann for disposing of the arms which he had ordered.\textsuperscript{94}

All this seems clear enough, but Ma`afu had, as Hedemann apparently knew, received contrary advice. Swanston, who could hardly have been ignorant of the views of both Administrator and Governor, flatly contradicted both men when he advised Emberson: “In reference to the Snider rifles said to have been purchased from Hedemann and Ma`afu’s statement that the Governor had said that he need not pay for them is quite true. Tell Ma`afu to ignore the whole matter”.\textsuperscript{95} As a veteran of Fiji, and Ma`afu’s former secretary, Swanston might be supposed to have retained some sympathy for the Roko Tui Lau, although
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he could address him in peremptory fashion when it suited his purpose. The Secretary for Native Affairs had, though, attracted official displeasure for his “swash-buckler manner”, and was in fact suspended from office only two days after his astonishing advice to Emberson. His suspension and its subsequent confirmation were the consequences of his action in freeing prisoners under sentence of the Supreme Court. Under the circumstances, Emberson might have refrained from passing on the advice to Ma’afu. Not that it mattered, since Hedemann remained adamant that only payment according to the contract would satisfy him. Failing that, the Levuka trader would see the Roko in court.

The Hedemann contract was not unconnected with the perennial problem of Ma’afu’s personal debt. In January 1875 the Colonial Office, at Layard’s behest, approved a “Confidential advance to Ma’afu to enable him to clear himself from debt”. Layard wrote:

Ma’afu is a very intelligent man, and one of the most enlightened of the chiefs. He will, under proper guidance, be a valuable subordinate administrator under British rule, and it is desirable therefore that he should not be exposed to other than legitimate official influences. Heretofore, Ma’afu has been, in money matters, very much in the hands of Mr Hennings … I had reason to think, from circumstances which came to my knowledge, that it would be well if Ma’afu were free from any such financial entanglements.

Ma’afu, unsurprisingly, “quite shared the same view”. He believed his debt to Hennings to be about £200 although, with feigned ingenuousness, “he never could understand how white men made out their accounts, for whatever amount of produce he sent to them, they nevertheless always brought him a little in their debt”. After Layard authorised Thomas Horton, the Treasurer, to examine Ma’afu’s account with Hennings, Horton was instructed to advance £200 to Hennings and to deduct £25 per month from Ma’afu’s salary until the Treasury was reimbursed. “Ma’afu was very grateful for this assistance”, Layard was careful to note, “and I feel assured the kindly act will attach him firmly to British rule and will render him … an efficient instrument … for the good government of the country”.

So the reins restraining Ma’afu were slackened, the better to ensure he remained firmly in harness. The debt to Hennings was one thing, of course, and that to Messrs Hedemann quite another. Word reached the seemingly omniscient Department of Native Affairs that Ma’afu, while visiting Lakeba, had sent instructions to Lomaloma “that all natives [were] to prepare copra to enable them
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96 Goodenough to Carnarvon, confidential, 17 Apr 1874, CO 83/5.
97 Swanston to Robinson, 31 Dec 1874, CG Set 43; Thurston to Swanston, 11 Jan 1875 and 1 Mar 1875, CG Set 13.
98 Layard to Carnarvon, 15 Jan 1875, CO 515/1.
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

to pay for the muskets he purchased from Hedemann”. The Department was not amused. “I am to inform you”, its chief clerk wrote to Emberson, “that the natives are free from lala of this kind – you will please notify Ma`afu from this Department to this effect … a letter will be written to Ma`afu on this subject”.99

As so often in Ma`afu’s life, we have no word from the man himself, during these early days of the Crown Colony of Fiji, to inform us how he felt in the still new role of “subordinate administrator” in a white man’s bureaucracy. He was also receiving directions from a more customary source: Tonga, in the person of his cousin King Tupou. In February, after the departure from Fiji of “the remainder of the Tongans who so distinguished themselves at Nasova”, the King sent a ship “to fetch every Tongan back that wishes to leave Fiji”, with Ma`afu given “strict orders not to hinder anyone that wishes to leave”. Tupou clearly felt that with Fiji now under British rule, it was time for the Tongan diaspora, or at least those without permanent roots in Fiji, to return home. Ma`afu, seeking perhaps a taste of the freedom he had once enjoyed, left “for Somosomo and a cruise down the Vanua Levu Coast to Bua, in the Xarifa, but does not intend visiting Levuka”.100

The Roko Tui Lau had in fact adapted to his new circumstances. An unnecessary note of caution was sounded in February, deep in the Levuka bureaucracy, when someone thought it useful to note, “If anything could tempt Ma`afu to resume his designs of making himself Sovereign of … Fiji …, it would be a manifestation of weakness and unpreparedness on the part of the Imperial Government”.101 The efficient and indeed relentless working of the Colony’s administrative machinery reveal that such a “manifestation” was most unlikely. Ma`afu was in fact soon to demonstrate qualities of initiative and leadership during a period of national trauma unique in Fiji’s history. Cakobau and two of his sons had left Fiji in November 1874 for a visit to Sydney, whence they returned two months later, bringing with them an unwelcome and sinister travelling companion: the measles virus. Because the Fijian population lacked immunity, measles spread rapidly throughout the islands, leaving in its wake a death toll of more than 40,000. The population of indigenous Fijians would not reach its pre-measles level until after the Second World War. No part of Fiji was spared: among the casualties were a son, daughter and brother of Cakobau, as well as “his faithful Tongan”, teacher Pita Vi, who all succumbed. Cakobau and his wife, Adi Samanunu, both became ill but recovered.102 From Vanuabalavu, Emberson advised the Secretary for Native Affairs in April that “death, desolation and woe” prevailed at Lomaloma: “whole families carried off

99 Robert Robertson, clerk to Emberson, SM Lau, 19 Jan 1875, MNA OC (italics in original).
100 FT, 3 Feb 1875.
101 Memo by K. Featherston, 12 Feb 1875, CG Temp. 18.
– starvation rampant”.103 Altogether, about 334 died in Vanuabalavu, some one-quarter of the population, including 75 in Lomaloma.104 On Lakeba, there were about 130 deaths, including 104 in Tubou. By June, the epidemic had “nearly run its course”, albeit with drastic consequences, and we read that, by the end of May, “measles have disappeared from Lomaloma”.105 Ma’afu did not escape: in April, he was in Lakeba “to recruit his health” after measles. The Fiji Times gives us the details:

Ma’afu when attacked with the measles lost heart like all natives, he had, however, some good friends round who insisted on his obeying their instructions, and although he has recovered from all effects of the illness, it has aged him considerably; his hair has turned almost white. He caught the disease when he last visited Levuka, and even at that time he expressed fears of the consequences if he became infected.106

We can surmise that only illness permitted Ma’afu to tolerate his friends “insisting on his obeying their instructions”. According to an oral tradition, he was left “drained” by the measles, with “an elderly, grizzled appearance”.107 By the time of the Queen’s birthday on 24 May, he was back in Lomaloma, where he attended a quiet celebration dinner chaired by William Hennings, with “Ma’afu just looking in for ten minutes and making an appropriate little speech”.108

The Roko Tui Lau had little time to bask in the sun following his recovery. Thurston, the Colonial Secretary, reminded him in April that with tax collectors now in training, it was the duty of all rokos to collect their taxes and send them to Levuka. “If your Province fails to collect these taxes”, Thurston warned, “only you will be blamed for it”.109 Advised of these responsibilities five months earlier,110 but delayed by his illness, Ma’afu told Thurston that as soon as repairs to the Xarifa were completed, he would undertake both the tax collection and the census. Emberson, certainly at the Roko’s behest, wrote to Thurston: “Ma’afu wishes to enquire if any allowance will be made him for the use of his vessels or not”. Swanston, now a clerk in the Colonial Secretary’s Department, minuted that the salary of a Roko Tui “is in consideration of his performing his duty” and that no extra allowance was warranted.111 If Ma’afu saw this rebuff as another humiliation, he was still able to reach Lakeba a fortnight
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later, “collecting the census and receiving the taxes. He is very zealous in his work, and … makes a good and popular officer; he will not visit Levuka until the arrival of Vice-Royalty, when he will probably put in an appearance, accompanied by a numerous retinue in the several vessels he is the owner of”. In spite of his zeal, or more likely because of it, Ma’afu was expressly forbidden from demanding overdue taxes from the period before Cession.

The new regime in Levuka likewise displayed zeal and indeed efficiency in its system of taxation collection, certainly when compared to the earlier administrations that purported to govern Fiji. Yet the zeal lay in the government’s determination that taxation revenue would reach its coffers, while collection methods on the ground remained a means of oppression for the Fijian people. In Lau, the process looked well in theory: Lauans were required to pay up to ten shillings per year, with the option, should they possess insufficient coin, of paying in copra. With the province only beginning to participate in the money economy, almost all landholders did pay in copra, a practice both encouraged and often required by their chiefs. The chiefs would then sell the copra to white residents or traders, with the proceeds submitted to the Roko Tui Lau, who passed them on to the Stipendiary Magistrate. However, with the local chiefs permitted to retain surplus cash or copra, once taxation liabilities had been satisfied, the system was often abused by chiefs who placed unjust burdens on the people, requiring them to produce much more copra than they needed for their tax obligations. The fact that the collection agents, appointed by the Roko, operated away from his supervision, often resulted in further exploitation, with some agents retaining for themselves more than half the proceeds collected.

In August 1875, Emberson reported that with accurate census figures still unavailable, it was “impossible for anyone to know whether the Lau District Native taxes have been paid or not”. With a taxation system so open to abuse, no benefits that might have been expected from the new regime were likely to accrue to the Lauan people. Recognising the system’s shortcomings, the Fiji Times urged relief for “the native population … from petty tyranny and unlawful exactions, [so as to] increase their sense of freedom and self-respect, and, by securing to every man an indefeasible property in all he earns, foster industry and the pursuit of wealth”.

For Lau, part of the problem lay in the nature of its land tenure. Once available land had been apportioned to the taxpayers, the residue was at the sole disposal of the chiefs. Each tax-paying man, having been allocated a plot large enough to support his family, was expected to pay a certain specified portion of the produce
as a tax, in support of the authority of the chiefdom. In return, the proprietor was free from lala, the bane of so many lives elsewhere in Fiji. Lala, meant to regulate the employment of communal labour for communal purposes, almost always applied to labour alone, rather than to property. In practice though, a chief could order work to be done for himself, often for house building, sometimes requisitioning large numbers of people who were in consequence denied time to cultivate their gardens and so ensure their food supply.\(^\text{116}\) The absence of lala would have promoted “freedom from petty tyranny and unlawful exactions” had not the colonial administration, an alien bureaucracy, imposed a taxation regime that opened the door for other forms of chiefly oppression. For the Lauan people, life in the early days of the Colony of Fiji was a case of plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose.

In 1875, Ma`afu was continuing the practice, begun before he was formally created Tui Lau in 1869, of ensuring that all available land was under cultivation and that all proprietors were given enough land to meet their needs. As we saw in Chapter Nine, Ma`afu sought to ensure that land was put to its optimum use, with everyone planting whatever land they had been allotted. Unfortunately, his idea of optimum use included leasing productive lands to European settlers, a practice which boosted his income through the rents the settlers paid, while denying to the mataqali access to some of their lands and to a rental income from them. Although the Lauan system ensured that most proprietors were able to meet their taxation requirements, as long as they were not inflated by unscrupulous chiefs or agents, the geography of the province with its widely scattered islands militated against efficient supervision of those to whom collection of the taxes was entrusted.

The Lauan state, enlarged during the previous two decades by Ma`afu and now known as the Province of Lau, continued its evolution under British rule. The Roko likewise continued to play his vital part in that process. By June, the long saga of repatriating the visiting Tongans, begun at the behest of Tupou, was largely complete. As the Fiji Times announced, with more than a hint of glee, “the Marie Louise is daily expected [at Lomaloma] to convey to their homes the remnant of this predatory picnic who came down in February 1873”.\(^\text{117}\) While their departure would not be a loss to Fiji, the retirement of many Tongan teachers, some of whom had been working in Fiji for upwards of 20 years, would be felt. Missionary James Waterhouse at Navuloa advised his Society’s secretary in Sydney, Benjamin Chapman, that many of the teachers who wished to return home should be conveyed without cost on the Wesleyan mission ship John Wesley. If that could not be arranged, then the Society should

\(^{116}\) For a contemporary discussion of land tenure in Lau, compared to that elsewhere in Fiji, see FT, 7 Aug 1875. See also Constitution and Laws of the Chiefdom of Lau, Fiji, Sydney 1871, Clause XIV: Government Lands.

\(^{117}\) FT, 9 Jun 1875.
pay for their passage. Several of the teachers, some of whom were aged, had addressed Waterhouse on the subject. While there is no record of how their repatriation was finally organised, Waterhouse duly informed Chapman “that Ma`afu has expressed his great satisfaction with the arrangement made for the return passage of Tongans to their country and intimates that King George also will be pleased”.  

If the repatriation of the teachers owed something to Ma`afu’s benevolence, that quality might also have been evident in Ma`afu’s gift to the people of Lomaloma of “a large and picturesque piece of ground to be converted into a People’s Park … Mr Emberson has been mainly instrumental in obtaining this grant … shrubs and fruit trees have been judiciously planted, and seeds sown … a short time will allow of Lomaloma possessing really beautiful recreation grounds”. Altogether, 33 varieties of ornamental shrubs and trees, as well as fruit trees, sugar cane and tea plants were ordered from the Royal Botanic Gardens in Sydney. Although Ma`afu was accused of “studying his own interest” in enhancing the value of his property with the gardens, that view was a peculiarly European one. The *Fiji Times* could nevertheless not resist a customary gibe at Ma`afu when it noted that while the idea for the gardens had come from Emberson and Herbert Levick, a long-term settler, all the work “has been done by the Tonguese, and Ma`afu seems to delight as much in beautifying Lomaloma as King George does in improving his sovereignty at Tonga”.  

While Ma`afu had little to do in the garden’s creation beyond organising the labour, he did take an active role in arranging relief for Ono-i-Lau, in the far south of the province, where people were reported to be starving following many deaths in the measles epidemic. He despatched the *Xarifa* and the *Caroline* with food supplies for the Ono people, said to be living on yaqona roots and old coconuts. The supplies were well received, although there was later much dissatisfaction when the island’s chief “appropriated to himself a cargo of yams” which Ma`afu had sent as relief. Ma`afu also tried, without success, to persuade the islanders to abandon Ono, an island he described as “barren, unfruitful and [too] small to support the people”. Probably to the Roko’s chagrin, a medical practitioner who visited Ono did not think the people’s removal justified, since the islanders seemed “attached to their homes and very
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comfortably situated”. Thurston, acting Colonial Secretary, reminded Ma`afu that should “it appear desirable to remove or otherwise materially affect the existing state and condition of the people” he should submit the matter to the Governor, whose “instructions must be awaited”. Once again, Ma`afu was reminded that his role as Roko Tui Lau was to carry out instructions and not, as he had used to do, formulate them as well.

It was as well for Ma`afu, a “subordinate administrator”, to be again reminded of the limitations of his powers. On 26 June, Sir Arthur Gordon, Fiji’s first resident Governor, arrived in the Colony. In the weeks before his formal installation on 1 September, Gordon familiarised himself with his new responsibility and consulted many people, including Ma`afu. During this period, Ma`afu had to be content with the minutiae of administration in Fiji’s most remote province. In July Malakai Vakameitagake, a Tongan appointed by Ma`afu as chief of the Yasayasa Moala, was deposed, although his reinstatement seemed likely, while from Lakeba came complaints from settlers against the Fijian Stipendiary Magistrate, Ratu Tevita Uluilakeba. The Roko was also reminded to keep a close eye on the bulis and to ensure that they reported to him weekly on their work in the villages. These were mundane administrative matters, but all the while Ma`afu’s mind must have continually returned to a matter now of two years’ standing: the contract with Messrs Hedemann for the rifles. In March, despite the crazy advice he had earlier received from Swanston, Ma`afu again advised Hedemann that he still considered himself bound by the contract and was willing to pay for the rifles but was “afraid of the Government”, which had forbidden him to take the rifles and “if he did he was only a black man and might be hanged”. Hedemann, unsurprisingly, declined to accept this excuse and wrote to Bayley that, if the Roko “cannot come to terms by return of mail, we shall … proceed at law against him”. Apart from the contract for the rifles, Ma`afu’s account with Hedemann’s was, on 13 May, in debit for a further £72, representing “needle guns, ammunition and sundries”. With the trader’s patience finally at an end, “Enele Ma`afu, gentleman” was served with a summons on 21 July 1875 at his home in Lomaloma. He was held liable for damages of £300 as well as costs of £4–6–0.

When the matter was heard in Levuka over three days in August, with Mr Justice Garrick presiding, Ma`afu was represented by the Levuka legal firm of Forwood, Truscott and Sullivan. Much of the time was taken up with evidence from Hedemann, who outlined details of the contract and stated that the rifles had been delivered to Apia, Samoa as arranged. He also informed the court that
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during the two years since the first contract was signed, Ma`afu had several times promised to pay. The transcript of evidence suggests some adroit cross-examination by Ma`afu’s counsel. Some of Hedemann’s claims were hardly credible: he stated, for example, that when the second agreement was made in July 1873, he did not know that it was illegal to deliver guns to Ma`afu in Fiji. He also claimed not to know that Ma`afu and Cakobau were mutually antagonistic, nor did he consider why Ma`afu purchased the rifles. “I did not know at the time these rifles were ordered that they were for the purpose of waging war against Cakobau’s government”. Unbelievably, he also said that at the time of the second agreement, he was unaware that the offer of Cession had been made by Fiji’s chiefs. “I am aware that Ma`afu has communicated with the late Fiji Government or the Ad-Interim Government about these rifles. Mr Emberson told me this … I was afraid of no consequences to me had I landed [the rifles] at Lomaloma”.

There is no record that Ma`afu gave evidence. Finally, Mr Justice Garrick “allowed the Plaintiff, on his own election, to become non-suited with costs”. Ma`afu’s counsel requested that the non-suit judgment be reserved for further argument, “which application was conceded”. The final decision, handed down on 12 August, was that the Plaintiff’s election to become unsuited had come too late. The Court ruled in favour of the Defendant, with the Plaintiff ordered to pay costs. In the words of the ruling, “The contract was between aliens, one being a Sovereign Prince”. The Court had no jurisdiction. Hedemann was left with the rifles but without his money, while the “Sovereign Prince”, although doubtless pleased with the outcome, was left with the rueful contemplation of a “principality” now forever beyond his grasp.

Ma`afu’s probably unexpected victory over Hedemann came during a period which might be called the end of the beginning of his years as Roko Tui Lau. The court settlement laid the ghost of his troubled years as Viceroy and, briefly, Governor of Lau. As far as we can judge from the voluminous official records of the time, Ma`afu appeared to be reconciled to his role as a “subordinate administrator” in the Colony of Fiji, during the months when the islands were undergoing the difficult transition from the chaos of the preceding five years to their new place within the British Empire. That reconciliation entailed for Ma`afu a degree of humiliation, of which there is only a hint among the reams of correspondence. There appeared to be an awareness during these months that Fiji was indeed entering a new era. Ritova, the one great chief of Fiji who could never put his house in order, had died suddenly on 27 February 1875.
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In Lakeba, the ancient Taliai Tupou, Tui Nayau, who was so old that very few of his people could recall a time before he assumed that rank, had also died shortly after Cession.\textsuperscript{134} The passing of Ritova prompted an uncharacteristic reflective mood in the \textit{Fiji Times}, as if its editor could sense the passing of an age:

Who is there in Macuata that can replace Ritova, or Ratu Kini in Nadroga, or Tui Cakau at Cakaudrove, when he is called away, or Ma`afu at Lau? These men are the resultants of causes now non-existent, and whose like Fiji will never again produce.\textsuperscript{135}

Ma`afu remained very much alive, and it is appropriate to conclude this chapter as it began, with words of praise for him from missionary Isaac Rooney at Lomaloma. Following a meeting at Mualevu, in northern Vanuabalavu, Ma`afu donated £28 out of £100 raised for the mission. “I think we might shame some of the wealthy folks in the Colonies”, Rooney enthused.\textsuperscript{136} A month later, at the Lomaloma meeting, £172 was subscribed; “Unfortunately Ma`afu was away at Levuka – had he been present yesterday we should have done better still”.\textsuperscript{137} While Ma`afu might have been judicious in arranging his absence, his identification with the mission, indisputably not one of the “causes now non-existent”, was a link with his past that he fully intended to retain.

\textsuperscript{134} Taliai Tupou had been Tui Nayau since 1833, when he succeeded his half-brother Malani.
\textsuperscript{135} \textit{FT}, 19 June 1875.
\textsuperscript{136} Rooney to Chapman, 28 Jul 1875, MOM 165.
\textsuperscript{137} Rooney to Chapman, 12 Aug 1875, MOM 165. “The Colonies” refers to the then six British colonies in Australia.
13."He is regarded with much bitterness and ill-will"

When Sir Arthur Gordon, first resident Governor of Fiji, arrived in Levuka on 26 June 1875, he brought with him a comprehensive set of instructions from the Colonial Office concerning the policy he was to pursue in office. While it is beyond the scope of this work to consider that policy in detail, his Native Affairs Ordinance is worthy of notice, since it incorporated “the great body of custom that … had been understood for generations”.1 Mention should be taken of those aspects of custom that were of greatest relevance to the Province of Lau: land titles and *lala*.2

Elsewhere in Fiji, Europeans claiming to have acquired land by purchase prior to Cession were to provide satisfactory evidence of the transactions with Fijians on which they relied in establishing their title. If, after enquiry, it was found that the land had been acquired at a fair price and to the satisfaction of the original owners, a Crown grant in fee simple would be made. In Lau, where Ma`afu had forbidden alienation of land and permitted only leasehold, a different approach, to be considered below, was required. In the case of unalienated and unleased lands in Lau and elsewhere in Fiji, “native titles” were to be simplified and the lands left in the occupation of those already in possession. Under an Ordinance enacted in September 1875, it became illegal for “Natives” to engage in land transactions with “any persons not being Natives”.3 Finally, with respect to *lala*, the Colonial Office recognised that a much closer acquaintance with this customary practice was necessary before any definitive policy, perhaps involving “improving [or] developing tribal organisation”, could evolve.4

Implementation of this policy would require several years. Gordon commenced a process of consultation with members of the two previous administrations, leading chiefs and others, in preparation for his formal assumption of office in September and a subsequent *Bosevakaturaga*, or meeting of the Great Council of Chiefs. Along with the other roko tuis, Ma`afu was instructed to be in Levuka by 1 September, in readiness for Gordon’s installation at Bau six days later. He was to bring with him four “lesser chiefs”, including Ratu Tevita Uluilakeba and Sione Mafi.5 The new Governor’s consultations included at least one
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meeting with Ma`afu, whom Gordon “lectured … as to the iniquity of dynamite fishing and delayed reports”. 6 Ma`afu was again reminded of his requirement to function within the new bureaucracy and to defer to his superior, the Governor, in all things. Much is revealed of Gordon’s conscientious approach and acuity of mind by his comments on social organisation and the taxation system prevailing under the ancien régime. As a general principle, Gordon recognised the wisdom of preserving the “the existing native organisation of village communities [and] to uphold the authority of the chiefs and local councils”. Respecting taxation, Gordon found it “impossible to suppose that revenue had been the object contemplated in the imposition of [the] tax” of one pound per man and four shillings per woman per annum. The “main design … was that of furnishing … a large supply of labour to the plantations of the white settlers”. He noted “a species of absurdity in the imposition of pecuniary taxation on a population, nine tenths of whom possess no money”. 7 Under the Cakobau Government, Robert Swanston and John Thurston had been concerned both with raising revenue and the welfare of the Fijians, rather than simply with the provision of labourers to planters. However, Gordon’s observations were correct to the extent that the absence of money in coin had forced people to offer their labour as the only feasible means to meet their obligations.

Gordon’s efforts to familiarise himself with Fiji and its people necessarily involved much entertaining at Government House, Nasova. In August, he had a house guest: Baron Anatole von Hügel, future Curator of the Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology. One afternoon during his visit, von Hügel unexpectedly encountered Ma`afu, “the great chief of the Windward Isles”. The baron, as so many before and after, was moved to record his impressions:

Ma`afu is a splendid specimen of humanity of Herculean make without being coarse, he carries a head that would be looked upon as beautiful even among `high caste’ Europeans. Such earnestness and depth of thought speak out of every feature, and as to intellect – those deep hazel eyes speak for themselves, even were they not shaded by a brow and forehead of quite unusual beauty. The stately grace of his bearing and model politeness are quite in keeping with his character, which though perhaps not one of the best, is turned now to good account in ruling his people and administering justice. The Governor was delighted with him. His submission was most characteristic. He presented … a large fishhook made of tortoiseshell, pearl and sinnet. ‘You have got the land,

7  ibid., 199–200 and 203.
I bring you the water, as a land without water is useless. Here it is with all the fish and living creatures in it’. It was a most characteristic offering, for the Tongans are great sailors and fishermen.\(^8\)

Ma`afu’s new role as “a subordinate administrator” had not robbed him of his grace. He was in Levuka en route for Bau, one among “a large arrival of native potentates” expected for the installation of the Governor and subsequent Bosevakaturaga.\(^9\) While the press noted that his “warlike attitude to Bau” had rendered annexation “inevitable”,\(^10\) Ma`afu could now arrive at Bau with benign intent. First, though, came the ceremony at Nasova, when Gordon took the oath of office as Governor. As if to symbolise a joint patronage of their new master, both Ma`afu and Cakobau had caused their yachts to be “nicely placed on either side of the landing stage to Government House”. In a brief ceremony watched by many of Fiji’s great chiefs, including Ma`afu, the oath of office was administered to Gordon, who formally assumed control of the government.\(^11\) In the new Colony, the administration would be shared with an Executive Council, with laws prepared by a Legislative Council chaired by the Governor. Executive Councillors were also members of the Legislative Council, as were the Chief Justice and certain unofficial members chosen by the Governor. The link between the executive arm and government departments on the one hand, and the Fijian people on the other, was provided by the Rokos, of whom Ma`afu was one, at once officers of the colonial government and members of the traditional polity of Fiji.

The new government’s task would not be easy. The planter oligarchy which had purported to govern Fiji before Cession had sought to mould the Fijians and their lands to suit the needs of a plantation economy. Now, under the colonial government and to the dismay of many settlers, the Fijians were to be confirmed in possession of their hereditary lands, with the right to manage their affairs under the authority of their chiefs. Gordon’s philosophy in these respects was shared by Thurston, who had been in effective control of Fiji since the middle years of the Cakobau Government. When Cession had finally been arranged to the chiefs’ satisfaction, Thurston recorded that he had won a victory for the Fijian people. Gordon was now determined that the Fijians’ victory would be confirmed.

With the first formalities over and the “native potentates” preparing for the Bosevakaturaga, Gordon could further his acquaintance with the chiefs who were, as Rokos, effectively the Governor’s deputies. On 7 September, he entertained Ma`afu, Tui Bua, von Hügel and the Native Commissioner, David Wilkinson, at dinner. The two chiefs, Gordon did not fail to record, “behaved
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perfectly, with ease and good breeding, and conversed freely enough”. They discussed environmental matters: “balolo – sandal wood – horses – volcanoes – earthquakes – sequence of trees on burnt lands”. We have already noted, in Chapter Three, details of Ma`afu’s brief incursion into his past, when he expressed much interest in a *civitabua* collected by von Hügel in the mountains of Viti Levu. For Ma`afu, this discussion was a rare departure from his usual guarded reticence. Gordon, in describing the dinner with the two chiefs, noted that “Tui Bua … is the more interesting of the two men”.

Two days later, Ma`afu was present at Bau when Gordon was formally received by Cakobau and invited to participate in a ceremony on the *rara*. With a chair for the Governor placed at the foot of a mound where a heathen temple had once stood, Cakobau and nine of the ten Rokos, including Ma`afu and Tui Cakau, gave a *tama*, a shout of respect to a chief, and so swore allegiance to Gordon as the Queen’s representative. There followed a *kava* ceremony, where each chief, “in proper succession”, drank to the Governor. Finally, Gordon presented each Roko with his official staff as a symbol of office. The Governor also took the opportunity to put to the chiefs a number of questions for consideration at the *Bosevakaturaga*, to be held at Draiba, Ovalau a few days later.

The Fijian chiefs accepted Cession because their rank and privileges would be preserved under British rule and they would continue to be recognised as sources of authority. The *Bosevakaturaga*, meant to act as an advisory body to the Governor in Council, was to become an annual gathering under British rule, in part “a product of the interdependence of the British and Fijian governing hierarchy in a colony understaffed, weak in financial resources and reliant on much of the indigenous social and political structure inherited from pre-Cession government”. The Council was a manifestation of the “continuity of Fijian aristocracy and its governance within a British dispensation”. With the chiefs’ loyalty dependent on their perceived advantage, the *Bosevakaturaga* would acknowledge their status and make effective use of their obligations to the people. On the first day of the Draiba meeting, attended by all ten Rokos as well as many bulis, magistrates and chiefs of lesser importance, consideration was given to the question, “What is true *lala*, and who are the Chiefs who have the right to its exercise and privileges?” Ma`afu, in speaking against the abrogation of this time-honoured custom, seized the opportunity to enlarge on a theme close to his heart, the diminution of chiefly power since Cession:
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the last twelve months have changed the whole face of the land: its evils are great, and through the doings of the disobedient the land stinks. When I have been stirred to rise and put it down, I have been met and hindered by the culprits saying, Oh, it is `Vakapiririania', and `Vakapiririania' is thus the shield of evil-doers. … should it become law that all men are to be free to follow their own minds, then chieftains' authority and position come to an end and `Vakapiririania' commences. But our people will still be Fijians; in name only will they for a long time to come be British subjects. I fear much the good of the past was greater than the future good in store for us. When we and all Fijians of mature age now living are dead, and children of this age and those yet to be born occupy the land, then they may become anglicised in nature, but it is not with them we have to do; we have to do with ourselves and our dark-minded half-wakened people. Let us solicit the Governor to hear us … Let the lala be retained … also implicit obedience to Chiefs…

Ma’afu was supported by two of his closest allies. Tui Bua addressed the assembled chiefs:

If we cease to exercise the lala over our people their day of destruction is near. We all know our people have no desire to work, or to do anything for their own real good, and if we, their Chiefs, leave them to their own ways, their improvidence and laziness will eat them up.

Ratu Tevita Uluilakeba also took his stand against the abolition of the old custom:

Do away with the lala and the appearance of the whole land will be changed. Who of himself can build a good house? … Whoever heard of a man who plants a garden by himself, and whose family always have plenty to eat? … How could one man build his house, and plant his garden, and build his canoe and sail it all alone? To do this we must cease to be Fijians.¹⁷

While some Europeans saw lala as a means whereby the chiefs exploited the people, many planters urged its abolition because they realised that the custom prevented them taking full advantage of the people’s labour. Fijians could not become fully integrated into a planter economy if they were obliged to continue their subservience to chiefly power. The chiefs, however, were determined to muster the resources of the land and the people, so that the land and the people might continue to be. To abolish lala would be to destroy the soul of Fijian society.

The next question put to the Council concerned punishment for disobedience to chiefs. Ma`afu pursued his theme:

seeing daily before me the evil effects amongst the people I have had to restrain myself from putting it down with a strong hand, waiting the assembly of this council that we might lay the whole matter before the Governor and hear his decision. From what I have already heard my mind is peace regarding the future...

In subsequent debate, Ma`afu addressed the matter of “evil-speaking and spreading false and malicious reports … There is no cause of evil in Fiji greater than this”. When the chiefs also considered Macuata, where conditions remained unsettled, Ma`afu blamed the deceased Ritova and Consul Pritchard for having set Ritova at liberty some sixteen years earlier. It was resolved to recommend the creation of Katonivere as Tui Macuata.¹⁸ Ma`afu revealed his statecraft in urging caution on his fellow chiefs:

[The Governor] desires to consult us, and expects us to help him. If it be his duty, a stranger among us, to show such concern and seek the welfare of the people, what [should] be expected of us? For it is our proper work, although as a chief he shares it with us. How inconsiderate of us if we reap only weariness and fatigue. … We may live to see Fiji’s peace firmly established, Christianity and civilisation firmly advancing … This is the day I have sought and desired to see.¹⁹

Gordon shared Ma`afu’s sentiments concerning chiefly authority. The Roko Tui Lau, in Fiji now for 28 years, knew that the chiefs’ authority would inevitably diminish under colonial rule, with the magistrates and the law they enforced emerging as alternative sources of authority. Ma`afu, along with the other rokos, great chiefs all of them, now formed part of “a co-opted indigenous hierarchy”.²⁰

His experiences with the new bureaucracy emphasised the change of which he was already well aware: there could be no return to the days when chiefs were the ultimate source of authority in the islands of Fiji.

Ma`afu had made his presence felt at the Bosevakaturaga, as Gordon was to note:

There, somewhat ill at ease, in a place where, though treated with much outward politeness, he is regarded with much bitterness and ill-will, was Ma`afu the Tongan, the bold and ambitious foreigner who has secured a master’s hold upon the half of Fiji…²¹

¹⁸ Ritova’s four sons were for various reasons excluded from succeeding as Tui Macuata. Katonivere was a son of Bete, Ritova’s classificatory brother and rival. See Gordon to Carnarvon, 12 Nov 1875, Fiji: Records…, 1, 311.
¹⁹ Notes and Proceedings…
²⁰ Newbury, 84.
²¹ Gordon to Carnarvon, 20 Sep 1875, quoted in Fiji: Records…, 1, 215.
While the Fijian chiefs indeed harboured bitterness in their hearts towards Ma`afu, that sentiment was not shared by Lady Gordon when the Roko Tui Lau dined at Government House in September, buoyed perhaps by his successes at the Bosevakaturaga. Lady Gordon appeared almost as captivated by the memorable Tongan as von Hügel had been: “[Ma`afu] is an extremely clever man, and the handsomest of them all. If it were not for his brown colour he would be like a very high-bred, rather large Frenchman!” Despite his various anxieties articulated at Draiba, Ma`afu must have looked with satisfaction on his role in the first month of the new Governor’s administration.

Any such satisfaction probably extended to his £600 remuneration as Roko Tui Lau, the highest salary paid to any roko or buli. Although their total salaries of £3,219 were “a very heavy item” in the government’s budget, no reduction in the chiefs’ stipends could be contemplated, since their willing participation in the colonial administration remained essential. Gordon who, with his wife, visited Lau in November 1875, might have been tempted to consider Ma`afu’s salary as money well spent:

[I was] much struck by the neatness of … Lomaloma … laid out with rectangular streets and squares, each house standing by itself within its own trim hedge or fence of reeds, in the midst of flowering shrubs and fruit trees. I visited the schools both Tongan and Fijian, and was much struck with the latter, in which not only the writing of the scholars was … remarkably good, but their knowledge of arithmetic and geography appeared to be … advanced … There is a good road in Vanuabalavu, and the use of horses by natives of wealth as well as by Europeans is not … uncommon.

Lady Gordon was similarly impressed by “the home-like English look of comfort” at Lomaloma, with “the fences of all the houses vaka Tonga”. Like her husband, she especially remarked the 14-mile long road, as well as the school with its “picturesque” children and stained glass windows. Visiting Ma`afu’s home, the vice-regal couple were received by Sione Mafi, who “did the honours in Ma`afu’s absence”, offering yaqona to his guests “Tonga fashion, each name called out separately”.

If the Gordons were aware that, despite appearances, all was not well in Lau, that was not evident in their journals or correspondence. The cotton industry, which had brought prosperity to Lauan planters during the late 1860s, was
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now defunct, with no other crop having been found to encourage planters to retain large areas under cultivation. Commercial activity was centred on copra which, as well as constituting the bulk of the mission collections, ensured the employment of many Lauans in its preparation and of Europeans who worked the vessels transporting it throughout Lau. Yet the trade had received a check: with the people required to pay, in copra, an annual tax of ten shillings, the chiefs needed to reserve the entire annual copra production, worth between £10,000 and £12,000, for taxation requirements. This was seen as a return to the “old arbitrary despotism”, with taxpayers subject to lala as previously, while the chiefs ignored directions from the European magistrate concerning the proper administration of the tax laws. The situation was described in the press as “robbery” and conducive of “a most prejudicial and demoralising effect on the native population”. The chiefs judged responsible were described as “unfit and unable to impartially administer our civilised laws”. Ma`afu was condemned in the press for “carrying out the new regulations … in a rather high handed manner”, sentencing people to terms of imprisonment without a court hearing, “divorcing people, issuing marriage licences … and all sorts of little games”. Both chiefs and people were confused, a situation many of the former were willing to exploit. The Lauans, seemingly, had no incentive to better themselves, since a man was “liable at a moment’s notice to be despoiled of the labour of months”. Lala, undesirable in principle, was proving impossible to limit in practice. In the face of chiefly exploitation, the Lauans had come to regard the new regulations as a “myth”. Lorimer Fison, Superintendent of the Wesleyan Lakeba Circuit, noted examples of profiteering in the copra trade by agents of Hennings Brothers, while a detailed press report outlined the widespread abuses prevalent in Lau.26 This report, which contrasts markedly with the superficial impressions recorded by the Gordons, suggests that despite the progress made during Ma`afu’s rule in the province, something was now rotten in the state of Lau.

As usual, we have no window into Ma`afu’s mind. His circumstances, and more especially his prospects, were during these months the subject of much discussion in both Fiji and Tonga. Reference was made in Chapter Six of Tupou’s statement to Parliament outlining his reasons why Ma`afu had not been named as his heir in the newly promulgated Constitution of Tonga. The King explained that while it had been in his mind that Ma`afu would succeed him, in accordance with “our … Tongan ideas”, he had determined that the succession was to be “from father to children”, that is in lineal descent from the reigning monarch.27 The new Constitution provided that the throne should pass to Tupou’s son Tevita

26 Lorimer Fison to Benjamin Chapman, 27 Nov 1875, MOM 104; FT, 1 Dec 1875.
27 See Ch. 6, n. 2.
‘Unga and thence to ‘Unga’s son, Wellington Ngū. Should that line become extinct, the Constitution stipulated that Ma`afu should succeed, and thereafter his legitimate descendants.\(^{28}\)

Leo Layard, now British Consul to Tonga, forwarded to the Foreign Office a lengthy despatch whose errors of fact and interpretation provoked much comment in Tonga and Fiji. Layard incorrectly referred to Ma`afu as the son of Tupou’s elder brother and “his legitimate successor”. The Consul was wrong in both respects: Ma`afu’s father Aleamotu`a was a younger half-brother of Tuku`aho, the King’s paternal grandfather, and thus, in Tongan custom, a classificatory brother of Tupouto`a, Tupou’s father.

![Chart 5: Descent of Ma`afu and Tāufa`ahau from Mumui.](chart.png)

Source: Author’s depiction

Tupou’s words to Parliament in 1875 had been: “I said in my mind that Ma`afu should succeed me. By our Tongan ideas it was his turn”. Ma`afu belonged to a line of kings: many of his paternal bloodline had been Tu`i Kānokupolu. Layard was not entirely wrong in his observations, however: he saw, in the replacement of an elective monarchy by descent through primogeniture, the influence of the Wesleyan missionaries in Tonga. Apart from whatever influence

\(^{28}\) See Appendix H. For the full text of the 1875 Constitution, see Sione Latukefu, *Church and State in Tonga*, Honolulu 1974, 252–284.
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they might believe themselves to hold over Tevita `Unga, the missionaries had been nurtured in belief in a monarchy governed by strict laws of descent through the male line.

Layard went on to refer to Tupou’s view, again probably missionary-inspired, that Ma`afu’s position as Roko Tui Lau in the Crown Colony of Fiji effectively made him a British subject. Layard demurred, advising the Colonial Office that contrary to the King’s belief, Ma`afu had not taken an oath of allegiance. The Consul was mistaken, since Ma`afu had sworn an oath of allegiance to Queen Victoria, administered by Sir Arthur Gordon, at Bau on 11 September 1875. Layard also considered Ma`afu’s likely prospects if he pursued a claim to the Tongan throne, asserting that he would enjoy “a much larger following” in all the islands except Ha`apai, with Vava`u as the source of his greatest support. Layard appeared to assume that in the event of the King’s death, Ma`afu would seek the throne. The Consul wrote that Ma`afu “owes the present Dynasty a grudge for having detained him a prisoner for some years on Tonga Tabu, and putting David Unga in his stead as Governor [of Vava`u]”. With `Unga supposedly disliked by the Europeans in Tonga, Layard foresaw chaos there after the King’s death.29

Ma`afu had of course never been “detained” as “a prisoner” by Tupou. Layard’s despatch inevitably attracted much critical comment, some of it concerned with Ma`afu’s succession rights. The Consul’s most serious error was his description of Ma`afu as Tupou’s “legitimate successor”. As Lorimer Fison would point out, Ma`afu, under Tongan custom, was but one of several legitimate successors. Before promulgation of the 1875 Constitution, Tupou could have chosen his successor from among his sons, his brothers and his father’s brothers. Ma`afu, half first cousin to Tupou’s father Tupouto`a, was considered Tupouto`a’s brother in Tongan custom. Fison believed that Tupou’s effective choice lay between four family members: Ma`afu, Siale`ataongo, `Unga and Ngū. As the King himself stated, his choice would have been Ma`afu.30

Fison’s views were echoed by Gordon, who reiterated that Ma`afu was not Tupou’s legitimate successor, “although he is one of those from among whom his legitimate successor might be chosen”. Gordon also observed that Layard had been mistaken in describing `Unga as Tupou’s illegitimate son. Certainly Tupou had never married `Unga’s mother in a Christian ceremony, but `Unga’s birth had occurred about a decade before the first resident Christian missionaries arrived in Tonga. Moreover, `Unga was universally recognised in Tonga as Tupou’s son and a contender for the succession. Gordon added that if `Unga were considered illegitimate, the same might be said for Ma`afu. The Governor

29 E.L. Layard to FO, 8 Mar 1876, FO 58/150.
30 Fison to Frederick Langham, 16 Aug 1876, Fison Letterbooks.
was probably unaware that Ma`afu’s parents, Aleamotu’a and Mary Moala, had been married in a Wesleyan ceremony in Nuku’alofa in 1830, when Ma`afu was aged about five. What counted in Tongan custom some 45 years later was that Ma`afu clearly belonged to the race of Tu`i Kānokupolu, had proven himself as a great and charismatic chief, and enjoyed the favour and confidence of the King.

In 1877, following an official visit to Tonga as High Commissioner for the Western Pacific, during which he had lengthy consultations with Tupou, `Unga and Ma`afu, Gordon wrote of `Unga’s prospects to succeed his father:

Uga is a dignified and silent person, nervously cautious, as one who knows that, though ‘heir apparent’ according to missionary ideas, it is quite within his father’s power to nominate any other member of the royal house as his successor, and that such nomination would be unanimously accepted by the people, whatever might be said to the contrary.

Alone among those who considered Ma`afu’s succession rights in Tonga, Gordon recalled that Ma`afu, “along with all the other Rokos of Fiji”, had taken the oath of allegiance at Bau, administered by Gordon himself. While it is unlikely that the oath legally made him a British subject, it constituted no impediment to his assumption of the throne in Tonga. Had he succeeded as King, whether in accordance with Tongan custom or under the terms of the 1875 Constitution, Ma`afu could simply have resigned as Roko Tui Lau and proceeded to Tonga. That was not to be, of course; in the meantime, there was, according to Gordon, no rivalry between Ma`afu and `Unga, as Layard had claimed. Rather, Ma`afu, avowedly not wishing the throne for himself, supported `Unga as successor. Gordon quoted Ma`afu’s supposed views: “‘If Uga be accepted, it is good. If another is appointed, we (i.e. `Unga and himself) will turn Tonga upside down’”.

If accurate, these words indicate a lack of interest by Ma`afu in becoming King, should Tupou predecease him. The Governor was not alone in stressing Ma`afu’s reluctance, although his reasoning appeared dubious. “Ma`afu’s reluctance is due, I believe, partly to a real hesitation in regarding the formal renunciation of his rights when he first came to Fiji, and partly to a superstitious feeling connected with his stay in these islands”. If Gordon was referring to Ma`afu’s forced renunciation of the Tongan lands in Fiji in 1859, that act referred only to the lands in Fiji claimed by Tonga, and not to the throne of Tonga.

Gordon’s views on the matter of Ma`afu’s succession were properly those of Frederick Langham, who had corresponded with the Governor. According to Langham, when Ma`afu threatened to “turn Tonga upside down” if “another”
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were chosen, he was referring to Tungi Halatuitui’aa who, although a great-uncle of the King, had long been a rival of the Tupou family. Old Tungi, as he was known, was, after the King, the highest-ranking chief in Tonga and would have held the dignity of Tu’i Ha’atakalaua had that title not been abolished. Tungi had declared himself “pained” by Ma’afu’s forced renunciation of the Tongan lands in Fiji in 1859. Langham believed that the King had written to Ma’afu over and over again ... urging him to attend the annual gathering of chiefs in Tonga, but Ma’afu always evaded going, tho’ he knew King George wished to appoint him as his successor ... it is only recently that King George has yielded to the earnest solicitations of the high chiefs in Tonga, seeing that Ma’afu would not accept the position which George so earnestly [urged] him to have, and nominated Uga, between whom and Ma’afu there is no antagonism.

Ma’afu had attended Parliament more than once during the 1860s, before he was appointed as Tui Lau in Fiji, and if there were letters to him from the King, apparently none has survived. In any case, the two chiefs had many opportunities to meet in Tonga, following the King’s long visit to Fiji in 1855. Tupou’s address to Parliament 20 years later made it clear that Ma’afu had long been his first choice as successor.

It is curious that the debate over Ma’afu’s rights of succession continued for months after the 1875 Constitution had named ‘Unga, once described by missionary Jabez Watkin as “a vile man”, as Tupou’s heir. One man closely involved in the decision to name ‘Unga as heir was the Reverend Shirley Baker, head of the Wesleyan mission in Tonga and future Premier. Baker had devised the Constitution, following legal and constitutional advice in Australia and New Zealand, and would certainly have urged Tupou to “regularise” the succession along the lines of European monarchies. In a reply to Consul Layard’s error-laden despatch, Baker correctly stated that until the 1875 Constitution was introduced, the kingship had been elective, with successors chosen from among those with a close blood relationship to the King through the male line and whose mothers were of sufficiently high rank. Baker was effectively referring to the choice of new incumbents for the three great offices of state in Tonga, of which only one, that of Tu’i Kānokupolu, still existed. Tupou had been chosen as Tu’i Kānokupolu in 1845, following the death of the previous incumbent, Ma’afu’s father Aleamotu’a. The choice was made, in accordance with Tongan custom, by senior members of the ha’a. Baker denied that he had sought ‘Unga’s
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designation as heir because of his great influence over that chief. He also asserted that Ma`afu had always been friendlier to the missionaries than `Unga, a claim that might have been accurate if Ma`afu's early years in both Tonga and Fiji were not considered.\(^{39}\) While Baker's controversial career in Tonga suggests that his views on the succession should be treated with caution, implementation of the new Constitution rendered the question of Ma`afu's customary rights an academic question. In the event, the four principal candidates for the succession before 1875, Ma`afu, his son Siale`ataongo, `Unga and his son Ngū, all predeceased the King. Tupou, like Louis XIV of France, was succeeded by his great-grandson, who reigned as Tāufa’ahau Tupou II.\(^{40}\)

One reason why debate on the Tongan succession continued after the new Constitution came into force was that many people expected chaos and even civil war to ensue after the death of the aged Tupou. Alfred Maudslay, British Vice Consul in Tonga, claimed that no Tongan, including the King, actually understood the Constitution.\(^{41}\) Maudslay believed that the missionaries would inevitably support whichever candidate most favoured their cause and that the best solution would be a willingness on Ma`afu's part to accept the throne. The Vice Consul stated that Baker was directly responsible for Ma`afu's exclusion as heir apparent, an injustice which he believed Tupou acknowledged in his 1875 address to Parliament.\(^{42}\) Henry Symonds, a successor to Maudslay as Vice Consul, writing two months after Ma`afu's death, was in no doubt about Ma`afu's prospects during the final years of his life:

> Ma`afu was the last of the elders of the Kanokobolu [sic] who could have succeeded the present king, and the family is represented now by Gu, the present Crown Prince [ `Unga died in 1879]. Although by Act of Parliament Gu is appointed to succeed his grandfather, yet the people always looked on Ma`afu as the rightful heir and successor, and had he lived until the death of King George and contested the throne, the people would, to a man, have declared themselves for him.\(^{43}\)

Whether such a situation would have arisen must remain an intriguing question. What is certain is that in late 1875, whatever his attitude to the Tongan succession might have been, Ma`afu faced difficulties as Roko Tui Lau. Those difficulties, however, did not prevent his making “such a pretty sight” when he sailed the Xarifa, all pennants flying and escorted by eight canoes, to escort

\(^{39}\) Rev. S.W. Baker’s reply to despatch of 8 Mar 1876, 21 Oct 1876, Baker Papers. See also Consul Layard's despatch and Baker’s reply thereto, 21 Jul 1876, WPHC 21/5.

\(^{40}\) The present King, Taufa’ahau Tupou VI, who succeeded in 2012, is a direct descendant of both Ma`afu and Tupou I.
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the departing HMS *Barracouta* on 8 December. All was not well, nevertheless, with Stipendiary Magistrate George Le Hunte, stationed in Lomaloma, advising Gordon of a scarcity of food and a severe epidemic of influenza in Lau. Problems arose too from the practice of Lomaloma people preparing feasts for labourers who had completed their contracts and were returning home. Many labourers, in the course of their entertainment, were induced to exchange their “trade”, the proceeds of their years of work on Vanuabalavu, for some *masi*, which became all they had to take home. Le Hunte was concerned for the harm this would do to local planters’ prospects of recruiting labour in future. In addition, by way of embellishment to the picture of a debilitated Lau painted by Le Hunte, the *Xarifa* was stated to be one of only three vessels at Lomaloma sufficiently seaworthy for use in the copra trade.44

Lau shared with the rest of Fiji problems associated with implementing the regulations of the *Vakapiritania*. Ma`afu’s success as Roko Tui Lau would depend on his ability to smooth the transition for his province and to counter chiefly tyranny arising from taxation anomalies. On Matuku, as elsewhere in Lau, poverty prevailed, with many people, according to a European resident, J.W. Anderson, dependent on wild roots for their daily sustenance. Le Hunte had come down to advise the Matuku people on “the various alterations to their customs” occasioned by the *Vakapiritania*, but as soon as he left the old ways of chiefly exaction returned:

> By and bye Ma`afu and his host of magnates arrived at Moala … with their heads full of their own superiority, and then came Malachi, the Tongan chief of Moala, to explain the now revised laws which seemed to be quite opposed to what were given out by the stipendiary magistrate.45

Anderson was not alone in referring, not only to chiefly misrule, but also to the people’s bewilderment in the face of complex and contradictory instructions. For the meantime, though, Ma`afu had enough on his plate at Lomaloma. In the matter of a Tongan woman wishing to divorce her husband for adultery, Ma`afu was advised that if NSM Mafi found the case against the man proven, Ma`afu could order the couple to live apart, but neither could remarry until Ma`afu received instructions from Levuka. Le Hunte informed Ma`afu that he could pronounce judgment once Mafi had heard the case.46 Once again, Ma`afu’s powers were circumscribed by the *Vakapiritania*.

While Ma`afu’s manner did not impress J.W. Anderson, his person certainly did:

44 George Le Hunte, SM Lau, Monthly and Quarterly Report on Lau Islands, 10 Dec 1875, FCSO; Le Hunte to Gordon, 3 Dec 1875, *Fiji: Records…*, 1, 375.
[He] strikes one as being a superior man. He is of large stature, and a decidedly heavy weight, not under 15 stone, and withal a shrewd man, quiet in manner and bearing: every inch a chief. He is a wonderfully correct judge of character, and soon finds out what qualities are inherent in any one with whom he comes in contact. He knows how to manage a papalangi schooner…\(^{47}\)

In similar fashion, an English visitor to Lomaloma in 1875 found that Ma`afu's house reflected nothing of the *malaise* which had spread across the face of Lau:

Ma`afu's house, which stands in extensive grounds, surrounded by a six foot reed fence, and shaded by splendid trees, seems to be very comfortable. The interior is worthy of a civilized Tongan, being furnished with tables and chairs, sofas, and a French clock. Tea is made by a very pretty Tongan girl, and an acceptable breakfast is quickly served. The whole atmosphere of the settlement is quicker, and the appearance of the Tongans is more refined than is usually the case in Fiji and amongst Fijians. That well kept road which is shaded by palms and bread-fruit trees, and lined with bananas, extends for about ten miles, affording a splendid ride or drive. The hill is covered with tree-ferns, over which the blue and white convolvuli are hanging in garlands. Beyond the ground rises gently, and there are some of the cotton plantations for which Lomaloma was once celebrated.\(^{48}\)

An Australian newspaper reporter was less enthusiastic:

Ma`afu, Prince of Tonga … a nephew of King George, and a better educated man than his uncle, was … given to relapses into native habits, although he would sometimes put on a blue naval uniform and patent leather shoes when he called on Sir Arthur Gordon at Levuka. Ma`afu's lapses … took such a form as a liking for roast dog. The catholicity of his taste in strong liquors was also astonishing in one brought up a Wesleyan. Ma`afu at Loma Loma had a chamber fitted up in European fashion. There was an elegant walnut bedstead; there was a suite to match; there was a toilet service of beautiful and costly china. But the bedstead, wardrobe and chairs were being eaten by white ants. The cheval glass was cracked; half the china ware was broken; the bed was laden with cartridges, pipes, whips and canes. Rifles and revolvers and swords were stowed in one corner. In another, illustrated books and cheap lithographs were mixed up with photographs of distinguished people. There was dust and rust over everything. Ma`afu slept in another room on a pile of mats, as his
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\(^{47}\) J.W. Anderson, *Notes of Travel in Fiji and New Caledonia with some remarks on the South Sea Islanders and their Languages*, London 1880, 44.
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ancestors had done, but he had a sort of delight in the possession of this old curiosity shop, and showed his bed to strangers with pride, and generally let you know he was acquainted with the uses of everything in his collection. But it was much easier to walk into the sea or into his private waterhole at the back than to bother in using a china basin for washing. The *papalangis* had queer ways of doing things, but they certainly made very excellent whips, good for chastening servants … Ma`afu bought these whips from a store on the beach at Levuka for a high price, and kept his household in order therewith.49

For all his modest needs in personal grooming, Ma`afu, freed from his debts by gubernatorial intervention, had resorted to old habits. He was in debt again, this time to George Bayley, while the Governor complained that the Roko Tui Lau “has never sent me his monthly *tukutuku* [report] of his doings”.50 Ma`afu was not alone in revisiting the past, since George Henry applied to Gordon to renew his claim to Vanuabalavu, disputing Consul Jones’ 1865 ruling that the island properly belonged to Ma`afu. Henry based his new claim on Ma`afu’s renunciation of all the Tongan lands in Fiji and on a “confirmation” by Cakobau of his, Henry’s, purchase. Another settler, George Winter of Levuka, made similar application, asserting that he had purchased Vanuabalavu from Henry in 1863 and that he, too, held a “certificate of confirmation” from Cakobau.51 This tangled web of claims would not be unravelled until the Lands Claims Commission hearings in 1880. In the meantime, Ma`afu held the field on Vanuabalavu.

The difficulties associated with implementation of the *Vakapiritania* in Lau and elsewhere were not likely of easy resolution. The most pressing of all was taxation, which Gordon addressed in his message to the Legislative Council at the end of 1875. The “Native Tax”, redeemable in money, had come in practice to be repayable in labour, which led to abuses such as those we have considered and which Gordon described as “an exceeding waste of both power and money”. He saw the tax as unsatisfactory because it dealt with individuals instead of communities. A new system was to be community-based, with the Legislative Council assessing, by annual Resolution, the amount of “Native Taxes to be paid by each Province or District”. Such taxes were to be paid “from the proceeds of native produce to be raised in such time and manner as may be hereafter described in Law”. Lau was assessed at £1,500 for 1876, a figure within the middle range of all the provincial assessments.52
Taxation was regulated by an Ordinance passed in February 1876. Seeking to stimulate “native industry” as well as trade, Gordon was successful to the extent that, in 1876, taxation revenue, partly under the old system and partly under the new, amounted to £9,342, compared to £3,499 in 1875. By 1878, revenue would amount to almost £19,000. If the proceeds of taxation were to become significant, Fiji’s resources had to be developed quickly, with Fijians themselves playing an active role. Taxation in kind was meant to assist them to remain cultivators of their own soil, rather than paid labourers in a plantation economy. Since Fiji’s traditional political and social divisions were retained under British rule, the islands’ economic system had also to be maintained. Retention of the existing communities would also act as a means of social control, since unrest would be less likely if Fijians continued to cultivate their land and pay their taxes within a framework to which they were accustomed. Chiefs would continue to be responsible for organising plantations, as well as growing and collecting produce for taxation. Assessments for tax would be made by the Colony’s Legislative Council and would be “based, as regards each province, on mixed considerations of the amount of the population, the nature and productiveness of the soil, and the degree of civilization which the province has attained”.

Lau began less than auspiciously in the new system when Gordon wrote to both Ma`afu and Le Hunte that he was not “at all pleased about the copra business”. The new Ordinance was in fact experiencing teething problems throughout Fiji. Fison, perennial observer of the Fijian scene, had written in January that “The Governor … can’t get his full amount of taxes, and yet we [i.e. the Wesleyan mission] can raise so much money … if he would manage his affairs as well as we manage ours, he would have no difficulty whatever”. The missionary forbore to add that the mission had more than 40 years’ experience in Lau, while the British administration had been in place only a few months. Fison reported from Lakeba that while sufficient copra had been collected in Lau without difficulty, the government had disposed of it to a German trader in Levuka who lacked enough small vessels to collect it. As a consequence, most of the copra rotted. If the copra had been sold instead to local traders, who possessed “plenty of small vessels”, the loss would not have occurred. “If [Gordon] would just say to Ma`afu: ‘I want £2,000 from Lau. You and Messrs Rooney and Fison get it for me’, we would take the thing in hand, and send him the money without one farthing expense in collection”. In similar vein, Isaac Rooney at Lomaloma regretted that “The action of the Government with reference to taxes has precluded the idea of missionary meetings up to the present time”, since the people could not afford
to support the mission as well as paying taxes. “So far as Lau is concerned, the policy is a very unwise one. We however have no power to interfere and have just to stand by and see the country go to ruin”.57

Despite these difficulties, Fison could report later in the year that his “lads” at Lakeba had “made all their copra, which is now awaiting the Governor’s pleasure. I hope he will be liberal enough to let them off scot free”.58 Ma’afu, meanwhile, had acted a chiefly part at Ono, where, accompanied by Le Hunte, he had sailed in haste aboard the Xarifa to quell incipient civil disturbance. “You would have been pleased to have heard the Tui Lau’s speech; he did give it to them”, Le Hunte reassured Gordon. The magistrate did not neglect to inform the Governor of other weighty matters: “I saw Tui Lau’s Queen at Lakeba: she is not as fat as Adi Lydia, but much less refined-looking”.59

In the wake of his successful intervention at Ono, Ma’afu was involved in a case of possible corruption. According to Le Hunte, every man in Lau was ordered to make two bags of copra “to go towards the payment for a schooner which Tui Nayau wants at Lakeba”. Ma’afu explained that since the Lakeba people had once helped him to buy a vessel, “it was vaka viti for him to help Tui Nayau in return”. The schooner, under construction in Auckland, was to be employed collecting copra in Lau. “It is not difficult for my mind to see that this is a piece of Ma’afu and Hennings’ work”, Le Hunte averred. Hennings and Ma’afu apparently had a secret agreement: the trader had paid for the schooner in return for Ma’afu’s selling him, at a low price, all the copra he could supply. Hennings then exported the copra to England, where with current high prices he would secure a handsome profit. With most Lauans resentful about their unwilling part in the scheme, Le Hunte had sought to reassure them. “If your Chief tells you to do what he is not allowed to enforce, he will be stopped”. 60 Le Hunte told Gordon that “such a thing as this savours very much of a private bit of business, the results of which will be a considerable enlargement of Mr Hennings’ balance at the bank”. While not attributing “sharp practice” to Hennings, Le Hunte blamed him for influencing Ma’afu to agree to the arrangement. “Tui Lau should get your permission before doing such a thing, so that the influence of anyone else should not lead him to exceed his recognised, or tacitly acknowledged, power”. While Ma’afu argued that the Lakebans did not have enough money to pay for the vessel, Le Hunte’s chief concern was that Tui Lau should “take care that every penny’s worth of tax-produce is to be made for the Government first”.60 With Tui Nayau also having ordered the Lakebans to make 100 tons of copra, again to be sold to Hennings, the Lauans were likely to have few coconuts

57 Fison to Chapman, 31 Jan 1876, MOM 99; Rooney to Chapman, 18 Sep 1876, MOM 165.
58 Fison to Chapman, 5 Jun 1876, MOM 104.
59 Le Hunte to Gordon, 18 Feb and 2 Mar 1876, Records..., 1, 466 and 468 (italics in original).
60 Le Hunte to Gordon, 3 Mar 1876, Records..., 1, 469–470.
left for themselves.\textsuperscript{61} When the schooner, called the \textit{Ululakeba}, finally reached Lau from Auckland in December, it was seized by Ma`afu, since Tui Nayau had died three months earlier. Le Hunte would note that Ma`afu appeared “a little ashamed” about the yacht, shirking any discussion of the matter. The magistrate believed that Ma`afu was “being done horribly” concerning the schooner, with the chief blaming “the late Tui Nayau”, Ratu Tevita, for his involvement.\textsuperscript{62}

Le Hunte had been uncertain how he should approach Ma`afu about the matter of private \textit{lala}, especially since its imposition, although an undeniable burden for the people, was in accordance with custom. Gordon did caution Ma`afu about the scheme, which was also objectionable on the grounds that most men in Lau were unable to work for their own benefit or to raise tax produce in the face of the demand, while the price Hennings paid Ma`afu for the copra was well below the market rate.\textsuperscript{63} The evidence does not allow us to determine how willing a partner Ma`afu was: while he probably had little choice, given his eternal debt to the trader, the schooner would eventually be his.

In the face of admonitions from both Gordon and Le Hunte, Ma`afu continued as Roko Tui Lau, spending time in March breaking up the old \textit{drua}, the \textit{Ra Marama}, now rotten. “A relic of olden times”, Le Hunte described it,\textsuperscript{64} with reason since Cakobau had presented the \textit{drua} to Tupou I in 1853. A new courthouse at Lomaloma, erected by the Tongan community there under Ma`afu’s direction, earned praise, along with Ma`afu’s other creation, the botanical garden, as “handsome and valuable additions” to the village.\textsuperscript{65} He was quick to take action against a teacher and his sister who were convicted of incest, “an offence particularly odious to the natives here, who do not allow a brother and sister to have the most ordinary intercourse in everyday life”.\textsuperscript{66} The governor permitted Ma`afu to impose whatever penalty he thought appropriate, short of death.\textsuperscript{67}

In the exercise of his authority as Roko Tui Lau, Ma`afu seemed undeterred by the realisation that he was now subject to a superior. For reasons unknown, he strongly objected to the appointment of the Reverend David Wylie to succeed Isaac Rooney as missionary at Lomaloma, when Rooney wanted to transfer to the Wesleyan training institution at Navula in Rewa. “There was nothing for it but for me to remain and … [for] Wylie to put down for Navula”, Rooney lamented.\textsuperscript{68} Ma`afu’s unique position among the chiefs of Fiji remained undiminished, as Gordon acknowledged when, advising Lord Carnarvon of
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prospective savings in rokos’ salaries, wrote that “No successor to Ma’afu need receive more than half the salary enjoyed by that Chief“.69 Considerations of mission personnel and of salaries were insignificant, however, in the face of the Kai Colo wars on Viti Levu. After warriors from the interior of Fiji’s main island attacked some Christian villages in the Sigatoka Valley, Gordon realised that he had to deal with the problem quickly, without help from outside Fiji, if the disaffection were not to spread. The “little war”, as the Governor would call it, was over by August, although not without loss of life and much disruption. As part of a large mobilisation of all available forces, both Ma’afu and Tui Cakau sent troops to aid the government, with the former using the Xarifa to convey men to Ra.70 Gordon described the Lau and Cakaudrove contingents as “the 60 finest men … I have yet seen in Fiji. They must have been carefully picked. Their arms are … wretched, but que faire?”71 When the yacht was no longer needed as a troop transport, it conveyed “Ma’afu and suite” down to Levuka, where he dined with the Gordons on 5 July. Lady Gordon again enjoyed his company:

Ma’afu dined here last night; he is a very great chief – a bitter enemy of Cakobau. He comes from Lomaloma in his yacht with a large suite. When he heard that Cakobau had arrived after dinner for yaqona, a change came over his face, and he said he felt tired and should go home. Ma’afu is a very handsome man, with a remarkably fine head. He is the cleverest of them all.72

Ma’afu had clearly lost none of his charisma. He was to need that quality in abundance to deal with a strange occurrence on Matuku, an episode which ranks as the most bizarre of his years as Roko Tui Lau. Lorimer Fison vouchsafed the essentials to his Society’s secretary in Sydney:

A man at Matuku has given himself out to be an angel, and … appears to have succeeded in imposing on our Native Minister in charge of that island … he has been allowed to preach, and according to … Ma’afu, he has been preaching some most extraordinary doctrine, and doing no little mischief.73

Ma’afu and Fison sailed down to Matuku, where they learned that two class leaders from Natokalau village named Eremasi and Aminio “had proclaimed themselves to be angels”. Almost all the local people, including Caleb Tuvunuvai, the Native Minister, lent credence to the two men, Caleb even permitting one of them to preach in the mission chapels. Eremasi had announced himself to

69 Gordon to Carnarvon, 7 Jun 1876, PP [C.1624].
70 Fison to Chapman, 15 Jul 1876, MOM 104.
71 Gordon to Capt. Knollys, 10 Jul 1876, Records…, 2, 73.
72 Lady Gordon to Mrs Ryan, 6 Jul 1876, Records…, 2, 65–66.
73 Fison to Chapman, 15 Jul 1876, MOM 104.
Caleb late one night with the words, “My name on earth in Eremasi. In Heaven I am called Lagilagi, and in Hell my name is Seru-i-degei. I am sent from Heaven to preach in this town”. He and his fellow “angel” announced that they had received a letter from Heaven, but when Caleb went to their village to hear it read, “they said it had been withdrawn from them again because of the disbelief of the king of Matuku, who had spoken scoffing words concerning it”. When Caleb eventually saw through the hoax, the “angels”, furious at his disaffection, announced that his village of Yaroi would be destroyed by fire from heaven. After many villagers fled in fear to Natokalau, “a number of young men in that town were seized by a sort of madness, impelling them to frantic howlings and leapings, and all manner of violent gymnastics” which continued for several nights, even though Yaroi was spared destruction. Eremasi and Aminio were joined by a woman who also proclaimed herself an angel. The three made threats of retribution against the people, announced that Yaroi had been superseded by Natokalau as the chief village of Matuku, “and threatened with summary vengeance all who should oppose this decree”. Such was the situation when Ma`afu and Fison arrived in Matuku.

Fison’s questioning of the two “angels” convinced him they were “madmen” suffering from hallucinations which they mistook for “Divine promptings … They are too hopelessly stupid to be thoroughpaced impostors”. Ma`afu had a decided view of how to deal with the miscreants: “Ma`afu is going to try the spirits with a cat o’ nine tails. If they are really angels the application would [not] hurt and if they are impostors it would be well deserved, when in any case all things will be lovely”. In the event, Ma`afu decided to remove them and keep them in custody “until he should receive instructions from the Government as to their disposal”. As for the woman, Fison supposed she had been “taken in by a dream”. When he and Ma`afu departed on the Xarifa, they took the two male “angels” with them, leaving the woman behind. The Governor praised Ma`afu for the way he dealt with the Matuku “angels”:

[Ma`afu] showed in his treatment of the matter his usual shrewdness and sense of humour. He summoned the `Angels’ before him. The woman appeared with a baby in her arms. `Are you married?’ asked Ma`afu. `Yes’, answered the woman. `And is that your child?’ `Yes’. `And you think you are an angel?’ `Yes I know it’. `Pooh pooh my good woman, you have mistaken your vocation. Can’t you read your bible? Look at
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the 23rd Chapter of St Matthew, and you will see that the angels neither marry nor are given in marriage, but you are both married and have a child’.

In a similar way, he made the male ‘angels’ thoroughly ridiculous, and then gave judgment. ‘Let the female angel go home and take care of that baby of hers – the charge against her is dismissed. As to the men, I am rather puzzled. It is a crime to personate a policeman, but I don’t know that it is an offence, against either white or native laws, to personate an angel. However this may be, I know it is an offence to obtain money under false pretences, as they have certainly done, or to be rogues and vagabonds as they certainly are; and for these offences I sentence them to a year’s imprisonment, and work on the roads at Lomaloma’. And he carried them back with him in the ‘Xarifa’ … [and] … lectured the people on their egregious folly.79

Fison also approved, writing that “Ma`afu’s visit was in all probability just in time to prevent serious disturbances at Matuku which would have doubtless resulted in blood shedding”.80 The missionary was “by no means sure that our visit, Ma`afu’s and mine, and the taking away of the ‘angels’ has put a stop to the mischief”.81 Their return voyage to Lomaloma, with the “angels” in custody, was enlivened by further humour from Ma`afu, who seems to have enjoyed the whole episode. On leaving Navucimasi passage in rough seas, Ma`afu sought the “angels’” help: “Pay attention, angels, for the bow is heavy”. Later at sea, Ma`afu remarked to Fison, “‘Let the angels cut firewood in the deep’”. At one island stop, when the “angels” asked if they should sleep ashore, Ma`afu replied, “Yes, spread your wings and fly to the forest yonder and rest there”.82 The episode of the Matuku “angels” is one of the very few occasions in Ma`afu’s life when we are enabled to discern his sense of humour through the fogs of time.

A few weeks earlier, Lady Gordon had described her dinner guest as “a very great chief”, a description he merited by his manner of dealing with the social disruption on Matuku occasioned by the advent of the “angels”. Here was a glimpse of the old Tui Lau, unrestricted by the demands of the new colonial hierarchy. In the light of Ma`afu’s long years in Fiji, there remains an air of unreality in the many accounts of his need for the Governor’s leave to undertake certain tasks. When, for example, a new church was needed on Lakeba and Fison sought Ma`afu’s willing help, the missionary reported enthusiastically:

80 Fison to Langham, 13 Aug 1876, Fison Letterbooks.
81 Fison to Arthur Webb, 11 Sep 1876, Fison Papers.
82 Fison to Rooney, 13 Aug 1876, Fison Letterbooks. I am grateful to Mr Sitiveni Yaqona for translating Ma`afu’s words from the Fijian.
“we can build [a church] which will be a credit to the place. Ma`afu is pledged to this, and has received the governor’s permission to come and live at Lakeba in order that the work may be done”.

For decades, Ma`afu had voyaged at will between Vanuabalavu and Lakeba but now, as Roko Tui Lau, he needed “permission” to quit his post at Lomaloma.

Ma`afu enjoyed good relations with Fison, writing to him in August that he had received reports from Tonga indicating that the people were “sorely harassed beyond measure and discontented”. Several Tongans, arriving in Lakeba seeking to settle there, presented “a petition on behalf of many more who want to come … in consequence of harassing laws”. Fison, describing the situation in Tonga and doubtless mindful of the need to maintain good relations with his colleague Shirley Baker, contented himself with an aside he knew would be understood in Sydney: “The baker there seems to be making his loaves too crusty”.

The Governor, on his way to open the 1876 Bosevakaturaga, to be held at Waikava in Cakaudrove, took Ma`afu on board the Nymphe at Levuka and sailed to Lomaloma, “a place I particularly like”, for a short visit. As well as dining with Ma`afu in his house and on board ship, Gordon recorded his favourable impressions of both the new courthouse and the botanical garden. He was entertained at a yaqona session:

I do not like the Tongan fashion of yaqona so well as the Fijian. There is no clapping of hands or chanting, and none of the weird gesticulation and beating time one is accustomed to. And I think the Fijian custom of assuming that every one’s rank and precedence is thoroughly known is more dignified than the Tongan custom of naming each person to whom the bowl is to be taken. On the other hand, it must be admitted that when they do sing, the Tongan singing is much more pleasing to the ear than a Fijian meke.

The Governor and Ma`afu proceeded separately to Waikava, where the Bosevakaturaga opened on 23 November. Ma`afu’s first address to the Council revealed him in an unaccustomed light, apologising to his fellow chiefs because “we of Lau have been unable to subscribe our share of food for the assembly such as turtle pigs and fowls”. His reason was that he had received the Roko Tui Cakaudrove’s notice of meeting only four days before the Governor reached Lomaloma. “We had absolutely no time to gather provisions”. Most of this initial speech was devoted to the Matuku “angels”, with Ma`afu informing the Council that the great deception had originated with the unnamed woman and
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that “the whole of them believed it both at Matuku and Totoya”. In dealing with “a matter of moment”, Ma`afu had wanted to “flog” the two class leaders but, as we have seen, he conveyed them to Lomaloma, where they remained. Despite his jocular dealings with the “angels” en route from Matuku, he remained concerned about conditions on that island: “At the present moment I am quite convinced that these absurdities had gained a complete hold on the people’s minds. Although these men have been a long time in Lomaloma since, yet they still have faith in their new belief”.

Mafi, Native Stipendiary Magistrate at Lomaloma, expressed to the Council his frustration concerning interference by the European Clerk of the Court who, during Le Hunte’s absences, prevented Mafi from holding court. In the matter of conflict generally between European and Fijian magistrates, Mafi was supported by Tui Cakau, Tui Bua and some of their bulis. Finally, Ma`afu informed the gathering of the death at Lakeba four days previously of Tui Nayau, Ratu Tevita Uluilakeba. To replace Tevita, he suggested Eroni Logainimoce, son of Taliai Tupou, the previous Tui Nayau, and grandson on his mother’s side of Tuikilakila, a former Tui Cakau. Eroni held *vasu* rights at Lomaloma, a distinction that would have counted for much with Ma`afu.

A brief consideration of the remaining matters to which Ma`afu devoted his attention at the *Bosevakaturaga* will provide an insight, not only into the kinds of issues which came to his notice as Roko Tui Lau, but also into the nature of his relationship with the indigenous Fijian chiefs. During a discussion about prisons, Ma`afu told the chiefs that all prisoners at Vanuabalavu and Lakeba ate the same food as he did and were employed in provincial works such as road maintenance. The *Bosevakaturaga* resolved that prisoners not under central government control were to be employed and fed by the rokos and securely housed at night, while officers who supervised them would be paid from provincial funds. Five resolutions concerning prisoners, to be applied throughout Fiji and all supported by Ma`afu, were adopted, an indication both of his mastery of detail and of his skill in seeing his ideas through to fruition. There were few dissenting voices, and those only on minor points.

Five days later, during a lengthy debate over the division of lands in Fiji, Ma`afu declared that the topic interested him but little, since all had been arranged in Lau “and I have seen the good results”:

The division of lands is a good thing, the people have rest through it; if there were no divisions made, the people would be stubborn and, as a vain excuse, one would say – “It is difficult for me to pay my tax, because I have no land”.

---
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At Lau, when the land is divided and a portion with few cocoanuts on it falls to the share of any person, he is given another piece in a place where cocoanuts are plentiful.\(^{88}\)

Tui Ba agreed, since such a system meant that no land remained “unused or unoccupied, the chiefs and people alike would be landowners, but let tribute be paid by people for the occupation of the lands”. It was resolved that once the division of lands in Fiji was complete, nobody should be allowed to claim other lands or fruit-bearing trees as his own. Inevitably, there arose the question of chiefly \textit{lala} and of the difficulties that practice caused people required to pay their taxes. When Tui Ba proposed limiting such \textit{lala}, Ma`afu responded:

There are two things, owing to which bad reports have been spread. First, on account of bad natives of low origin, and, secondly, that some Europeans are in the habit of writing what is not true.

As regards the division of time, this was tried at Lakeba by Tui Nayau. He gave the people three days a week, on which they were not called upon to do any “\textit{lala}” work, still there was a scarcity of food in the land.

Plenty depends on the providence of the people, and the care of the Chiefs, and not on the days appointed for \textit{lala}.

Towards the end of the Bosevakaturaga, during a discussion of planting requirements, Ma`afu stated that the regulations for planting “500 hills of yams” was too onerous, especially in some Lauan islands, where the land was “not good”. However, a resolution on favour of compulsion was adopted against Ma`afu’s wishes. He was nevertheless allowed the right to reduce the “500 hills” in those parts of Lau where it was not possible to plant so much. He approved a further resolution whereby idlers were to suffer four months’ imprisonment.

On the final day of the Bosevakaturaga, with all 12 rokos, as well as the Vunivalu, in attendance, a letter to Queen Victoria was drafted. The Queen was thanked for her expressions of sympathy at the time of the measles epidemic, and the Governor, Sir Arthur Gordon, praised for his wise administration. Ma`afu joined the other rokos in signing the letter.\(^{89}\) The Great Council of Chiefs, in large part Gordon’s creation, had been a success. Although the chiefs of Fiji were no longer answerable to themselves alone, their authority as a “co-opted indigenous hierarchy” remained. In the Council of 1876, the first full Bosevakaturaga since the experimental conclave at Bau the previous year, Ma`afu and Mafi loomed larger then any of their fellows, exercising their will in many sessions of debate. Tui Lau had lost none of his lustre.

88 \textit{Published Proceedings of the Native Councils, or Councils of Chiefs, from September, 1875}, 23 et seq.

89 The letter was duly received and “laid before the Queen” by the Colonial Secretary. SSC to Gordon, 26 Apr 1878, FCSO.
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The death from influenza of the Buli Lakeba, Ratu Tevita Uluilakeba, had removed one of Ma’afu’s family links with his adopted home. Ratu Tevita had become sau ni vanua, chief of the land, on the death of his great-uncle Taliai Tupou in 1874 and had functioned briefly as Governor of Lau after Ma’afu’s dismissal from office under the Cakobau Government. His wife, Adi Asenaca, a daughter of Cakobau, had died during the measles epidemic. Tevita’s premature death, which precluded his formal installation as Tui Nayau, meant that the title would revert to the direct descendants of Taliai Tupou. The new Sau, later formally Tui Nayau, was Eroni Loganimoce, who would eventually be chosen as Roko Tui Lau after Ma’afu’s death. According to the Fiji Times, Ratu Tevita had been regarded as a tyrant by the people of Lakeba, a description borne out by Ma’afu. Tevita’s tyranny involved frequent demands for copra throughout central and southern Lau, random imposition of fines, flogging of defaulters and kidnapping young women for his use as concubines. After investigating complaints from Tongans and Europeans resident at Lakeba, Ma’afu had advised Gordon that because of his gross maladministration, Tevita should be removed from office as Buli Lakeba and that he, Ma’afu, should replace him. Gordon duly issued a severe reprimand to Tevita shortly before the chief’s death. All district meetings in central and southern Lau had to be postponed until after the Tevita’s burial, which in turn had to await Ma’afu’s arrival from the Bosevakaturaga.

In Tonga meanwhile, none of the social disruption occasioned by the severe hand of Shirley Baker was reflected in a speech by the King to mark the fiftieth anniversary of the arrival of the first permanent Wesleyan missionaries in the country:

There are many things which ought to cause rejoicing today. Tonga is still owned by the Tonguese, and governed by Tonguese. We are not subject to any land. Remember how Fiji is forever lost to the Fijians … Other groups of islands have been fined by the various men of war, but during the last fifty years Tonga never was…”

In November, the King signed a Treaty of Friendship with Germany, whereby the German Emperor recognised Tonga’s independence in return for the establishment of a coaling station at Vava‘u. The treaty would have been of little moment to Ma’afu who, having returned to Lomaloma in January 1877, following a tour of Lau, found his attention occupied by the mundane. After confiscating a large shipment of tobacco that had arrived unexpectedly from Tonga and on which no duty had been paid, Ma’afu gained a windfall when
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the Governor recommended that he should be allowed to keep it. He was not so fortunate when he sought Gordon’s advice about payment of rents by European leaseholders. He was instructed, probably to his chagrin, that rent should be paid to those who leased the land and, by implication, not to the Tui Lau. As we saw in Chapter Nine, Ma’afu never fully complied with this direction. He was also enjoined to see that all public roads, including those passing through Europeans’ lease holdings, should be maintained in good condition. Meanwhile, Lau’s Native Taxes for 1877 had been assessed at £2,000, part of a total of £19,300 for the whole of Fiji.

While Ma’afu had loomed large over the Bosevakaturaga, the minutiae of his routine as Roko Tui Lau did not constitute the career he envisaged when, 15 years earlier, he revealed his great ambition to Consul Pritchard. While “building a little house … made from the top of a great canoe” on his pier at Lomaloma, Ma’afu became unwell and “so cross that no one cared to go near him. He sent one white man out of his house at the ‘double’ the other day”. By mid January, he was reported as “all right again now”. Two months later, after “a very pleasant cruise”, he arrived at Levuka aboard the Xarifa with Le Hunte as his passenger. Dining with the Governor on 19 March, in company with other chiefs, Ma’afu “talked of various ships he had had”, while after dinner some of his Tongan entourage came to sing for his host. A few days later came news of a yacht race planned for May: the Xarifa was to sail Against the Victoria, the vessel presented to Cakobau by the British government. Ma’afu nevertheless had more than the Levuka social whirl to occupy his mind. Gordon had written to “my deputy, the Roko Tui Lau” to remind him to “get on with” the 1877 tax collection, details of which the Governor had at his fingertips. All copra from Lau was to be sent to Messrs Stuart Cooper and Co., who would pay £13–7–6 per ton, while linseed oil was to be sold to Messrs Caine and Co. at £7–10–0 per ton. Ma’afu, admonished for making the people work for long hours on tax produce, was told to ensure that their hours of labour were strictly regulated and that all surplus production be returned to them. Further, improvement in the quality of dried copra was needed, with Ma’afu enjoined to pay special attention to the smaller districts in this regard, while ensuring that people there received their due rewards.

While enjoying cordial relations with the Governor, Ma’afu could have been in no doubt that his rule as Roko Tui Lau was subject to an unprecedented degree of scrutiny. In May he was ordered to cease unnecessary logging on various Lauan islands including Kabara, Vulaga and others nearby. The controversial yacht Uluilakeba, the subject of much correspondence the previous year and
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reported now to be Ma`afu’s property, had arrived at Levuka in March without necessary papers and logbook. It sailed for Lakeba a week later without being cleared. Ma`afu was not forthcoming with the papers, and remained so quiet that Gordon reported from Levuka that the Roko was showing “no signs of life”. Gordon feared moreover that Hennings Brothers had “entrapped him into some sort of timber-supplying contract”, which explained the excessive logging in southern Lau. A planned trip to Tonga appeared to have been postponed. Le Hunte, replying to the Governor from Lomaloma, could not enlighten him:

Ma`afu – I can’t understand what it all means. I am afraid he is one of those people who would rather let himself be cheated than bothered. I am surprised that he has bought the schooner, but I am not in the least surprised that Hennings has done him into the timber contract. If you remember I said that it was not unlikely to happen.

When Gordon, who was similarly puzzled, heard that Ma`afu was in Bua, he announced plans to sail to that province especially to meet him and “to discuss a few things together”. While the significance of Ma`afu’s visit to Bua is unknown, it might well have concerned the voyage to Tonga by both Ma`afu and Tui Bua later in the year, and with rumours of a plot by Vava`u chiefs to overthrow Tupou and replace him as King with Ma`afu.

Despite the strictures being applied from Levuka, Ma`afu was able to continue, at least in some spheres, to pursue his own agenda with only sporadic interference from his superior. It is significant that the Governor thought it necessary to run him to earth in Bua, instead of waiting to meet him more conventionally in either Levuka or Lomaloma. Gordon was concerned about something. Nevertheless, the bureaucracy bade fair to tighten its grip, even in distant Lau. A new Code of Regulations for all Fiji, which came into force on 31 May, was effectively summarised by the Governor for his masters in Whitehall:

[The Code] constituted the threefold system of councils and district and provincial courts; regulated the authority of the chiefs and the custom of lala and dealt with crimes, with marriage and divorce, registration of births and deaths, schools, Sunday observance, fines, pounds and planting…

The new Code was all very well, but on the ground in Lomaloma, the continuing absence of both Ma`afu and his Native Stipendiary Magistrate Mafi was causing real difficulties. William Seed, the acting Stipendiary Magistrate, complained that with the two chiefs away, police officers were often forced to discharge people
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arrested. There was worse: “on several occasions, Ciale [sic] Ma’afu has sat on the bench and biased the cases brought before it. This ... is highly injudicious as Ciale is not a magistrate, and in some cases the evidence has not been taken and the accused told he is guilty and condemned”. Siale’ataongo’s acting as a magistrate was akin to a fox supervising a hen house. Mafi, before leaving Lomaloma, had liberated a Tongan man sentenced to 14 months’ imprisonment for adultery when the condemned man presented him with a canoe worth £50. Seed pleaded for a replacement magistrate and a Tongan interpreter.105 Despite his success in a milieu such as the Bosevakaturaga, Mafi, who could “hardly read or write”, should not have been employed as a magistrate, even if he were honest. Clearly, the absent Roko needed to return home quickly and get his teeth into the many problems. That, however, was likely to prove difficult:

Ma’afu … has been weather bound at Levuka. He looks somewhat the worse for wear, but says a dentist will improve his appearance. We hope the Sydney dentist will make him a good fit, but we are disposed to think a dentist should have been on the spot to do full justice to such a fine mouth. The stormy weather having abated, Ma’afu left for Lomaloma last Tuesday.106

Seed was not alone in his complaints about the justice system in Lomaloma. A settler, writing of Native Stipendiary Magistrates in general, added, “If Mafi … is a fair sample of his class, the doing of these gentlemen is enough to drive the people into rebellion. He seems to have no idea of justice, and deals out fines and penalties at random”. Mafi was in the habit of levying fines against people who did not meet their planting quota of 500 yams and 100 bananas, exacting both money and labour, without the defaulter ever appearing in court.107 This practice was said to form part of the greater oppression that had befallen the people since British rule. Much dissatisfaction, not only among the Fijians, existed concerning lala and especially the roles of Ma’afu and Tui Cakau, those “doughty warriors”, and “their rather loud talking followers”.108 While often vague references in the press to “bondage” cannot be accepted as reliable evidence of social disquiet, specific complaints such as those made by Seed reveal many of the shortcomings of the administration of justice in Lau under Ma’afu’s rule. Mafi again came to notice when H.L. Tripp, the harbourmaster at Lomaloma, complained of his interference. Tripp had seized Ma’afu’s schooner Favourite for a breach of the Quarantine Ordinance and for having a false name on her stern. He was swiftly upbraided by Mafi, who told him he must wait for the Roko. In the presence of Tui Lomaloma and Tui Mavana, Mafi, according
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to Tripp, said “that my way of doing things here is like stealing, that I do not tell the natives the laws but all at once put them up for breaking them”. Tripp disavowed Mafi’s claim, pointing out that when the Caroline, with Elenoa aboard, sailed for Tonga, he (Tripp) “particularly warned Ma’afu about the Quarantine laws and he said he would write to Tonga”. Ma’afu “distinctly refused” to allow Tripp to take the Favourite to Levuka.109 Mafi was using his chiefly status, and his mana as Ma’afu’s matapule, to exploit the Fijians of Vanuabalavu within the framework of a judicial system alien to him.

Ma’afu’s mind, if not his heart, seemed to lie elsewhere during these months. Against the background of the Fiji Times’ view that Great Britain could assume the administration of Tonga after the death of the King,110 Ma’afu was intent on visiting his homeland. “Ma’afu will go to Tonga”, Gordon lamented, “it cannot be helped, but it would be much better if we met at Lomaloma. I cannot work well without seeing the driver of the engine – the stokers and oilers are not satisfactory people to deal with when he is away”.111 The Governor wrote to Ma’afu, strongly urging him to come to Levuka for a meeting before proceeding to Tonga. Gordon had already spoken to Mafi, who “confessed” to having urged the people to pay their taxes in money rather than in produce.112 With overwhelming evidence that Mafi was both incompetent and corrupt, it was Ma’afu’s responsibility to meet the Governor and resolve the problem before leaving Fiji. It appears that no meeting took place, since the Governor wrote again in September saying, “I have nothing more to say because your trip to Tonga has been finalised”.113

Gordon valued his relations with Tupou and sought to use Ma’afu’s trip, irksome though it was, to advantage. Wishing Ma’afu to convey to Tupou a letter expressing his personal regard for the ageing monarch, Gordon wrote to the King, “Ma’afu, Roko Tui of Lau, is preparing to sail to see you in compliance with your request”. Gordon regretted that pressure of work, in particular his forthcoming appointment as “High Commissioner for Western Polynesia”, prevented him visiting Tonga himself.114 By late September, Ma’afu was reported to be “cutting a great dash” in his homeland, having, accompanied by Elenoa, sailed down in the Xarifa escorted by his other two vessels, the Uluilakeba and the Favourite.115 Tui Bua was also in the kingdom, reportedly for a seven-week stay and taking with him “a large quantity of mats, sandalwood and cloth”.116 While Ma’afu’s visit was apparently at the King’s request, we are
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uncertain why Tupou sought the company of his kinsman. There appeared to
be something afoot in Tonga: an English visitor, Constance Gordon Cumming,
called at Neiafu, Vava`u in September 1877. There, she made the acquaintance
of the governor of Vava`u, Wellington Ngū, grandson of Tupou and son of Tevita
`Unga, whom the visitor reported to be in poor health. “At present the Vava`u
chiefs are in some disgrace”, she laconically noted, “as they are suspected of
plotting against King George”. This would not be the last reference to moves
in Vava`u to depose the King in favour of Ma`afu. With Tonga still a non-literate
society, so far as contact between chiefs was concerned, any such “plot” was
most unlikely to have been documented.

Ma`afu duly gave the King the cordial letter from Gordon, in which the Governor
stressed his reliance on Ma`afu as a trusted counsellor. Tupou replied in kind:

I have received your letter brought by Ma`afu to me in which ... is
manifest your sympathy and love to me, to my land and to my people,
and oh it is not becoming to of me to give thanks, to rejoice, as I now
know your regard and love .... Who brought Christianity to our land
but the English? Who printed for us the sacred book? Who gives us
missionaries but the English? Who were the first who traded with
us Tongans? ... The love [and] consideration of the English is clear,
disinterested...

While such exchanges were nothing more than diplomatic niceties, the press in
Fiji was aware that Ma`afu’s visit “may not be altogether without some political
significance”. It was however noted that Ma`afu’s formal severance of ties with
Tonga and the fact he was no longer young rendered his prospects of becoming
King of Tonga somewhat limited.

The dignity which `doth hedge around a crown’ is not ... to be attained
by any or every body, and may still present sufficient temptations to
induce the astute and proud old chief to assert a claim thereto. Ma`afu
is a clever man, and if in the course of nature he should succeed King
George, the Tongans may boast a no unworthy ruler.

The “proud old chief” was still only in his early fifties. If the editor was
unaware of the provisions of the Tongan Constitution of 1875, Ma`afu certainly
knew where that document placed him in terms of the succession. With
`Unga’s descendants becoming more numerous, any prospect of the throne
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passing lawfully to Ma`afu was fast diminishing. If his visit to Tonga had been occasioned by any move to place him on the throne, the rumours noted by Miss Gordon Cumming and others might have had some substance. The British Vice Consul, Alfred Maudslay, visiting London when Ma`afu was in Tonga, expected a disputed succession on the King’s death. Since he held such a view despite the constitutional provisions for the succession, it is likely he was aware of some potential for trouble in the kingdom.\textsuperscript{120}

Whatever his immediate prospects were in Tonga, Ma`afu was neglecting his duties at home. When Le Hunte returned to Lomaloma in early November, he at once complained to Gordon about the “very complicated mess into which Lomaloma has got” in the absence of Ma`afu and Mafi. Many problems predated their departure: Ma`afu had, since Cession, been disposing of Fijian lands that had fallen vacant for any reason, and now Le Hunte wished to know by what right he did so. The Roko gave such lands to Tongans, a practice which served only to augment existing enmity between them and the Fijians on Vanuabalavu. Le Hunte was anxious for Ma`afu’s return, “as practically very little can be done until he comes. I never saw any place so deteriorated as Lomaloma has since I first came here. The town is dirty and badly kept. … The Tongans and Fijians are at enmity; the people complain of the burden that the Roko’s officers and prisoners are on them … Everything is adrift; and when I point this out the reply is, ‘Very true, when Tui Lau comes back it will be all right’ … Worst of all is the disagreement between the white officials and the natives”.\textsuperscript{121}

For all Le Hunte’s criticism, both Ma`afu and his home had earned praise from Miss Gordon Cumming during her stay just before Ma`afu left for Tonga. Having called to partake of a magiti with Elenoa, whom she described as “a very fine old lady” and from whom she parted as “excellent friends”, Gordon Cumming, like many other European women, did not stint her praise for Tui Lau:

Ma`afu himself had just started for Levuka. He is a splendid man, stalwart and stately; and whenever I have seen him he has always been dressed in native tapa, thrown around his waist in handsome heavy folds. He has the proud bearing of his race, for among the Tongans even the common people walk as if they scorn the ground they tread on.\textsuperscript{122}

Miss Gordon Cumming’s fleeting observation touched upon the heart of much future trouble in Lau.

Although Siale`ataongo was absent when Le Hunte returned to Lomaloma, it is not certain whether he accompanied his parents to Tonga. He appeared responsible
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for some of the Fijians’ lands being allocated to Tongans, since in October
John Thurston reported complaints from Tui Lomaloma, whose land Siale had
seized and given to Tongans, who had commenced planting and cutting down
breadfruit trees. Thurston believed that “there are good materials for brewing a
row at Lomaloma”, a town where neglect, corruption and malpractice reigned.
Ma’afu had levied an unauthorised tax of one shilling per acre on all European
landholders in Lau, “pending the settlement of their claims by the [forthcoming] Royal Commission”. As for unoccupied Fijian lands, the Governor believed
that while a Roko Tui has power concerning “the occupation of [Fijian] land
temporarily or permanently vacant”, he had no right to dispose of such land.
Gordon also suggested that Siale would likely be absent from Lomaloma for some
time, in view of the disquiet there over his activities. Isaac Rooney meanwhile,
about to leave Fiji, felt that his successor would have no difficulties dealing with
Ma’afu if he possessed “common sense” and “a little gumption”.

Despite the malpractice occurring on Vanuabalavu, the Fiji Times reminded its
readers that because of the leasehold tenure existing in Lau, planters there were
“regarded … with considerable justice, as being amongst the most wealthy in
the country”. Such a view reflected narrow settler interests only, ignoring
the province’s many problems. Ma’afu and Tui Bua, in their separate vessels,
reached Levuka from Tonga in late November and were expected to wait for
the approaching Bosevakaturaga at Rewa before proceeding to their provinces.
Ma’afu brought with him “a very handsome double canoe, a present from King
George to Cakobau”, with another to follow, destined for Tui Cakau. Gordon
believed that Ma’afu’s Tongan visit “must have had a useful effect in tranquillizing
the minds of those who have anticipated the probability of his contesting the
succession to the Crown of Tonga on the death of the old King”. Ma’afu reported
to the Governor that taxation was high in Tonga and that the people were “much
harassed by injudicious measures, which have been prompted partly by the
King’s eagerness overhastily to push on the adoption of European habits, and
partly at the interested suggestion of German and English traders”. Although
Leo Layard still anticipated trouble over the succession, Gordon refrained from
making any comment on that question to the Colonial Office.

Ma’afu still enjoyed his annual salary of £600, paid from general revenue, far
more than the salaries received by other rokos, which ranged from £100 to
£360. Taxes for Lau were assessed at £2,100 for 1878, an increase over the
1877 allocation of £1,900. At Lomaloma, still an official Port of Entry, customs revenue for 1877 would amount to £709, a significant increase over the £397 raised in 1876. These statistics would have been of little interest to Ma`afu as he prepared for the approaching Bosevakaturaga. Having received from Gordon an indirect “hint as to not bringing an unnecessary number of attendants with him to Rewa”, Ma`afu arrived late at the Council, which began on 5 December. After Gordon and Ma`afu “had yaqona and a long talk about many matters”, the Governor, in his opening address, praised Roko Tui Lau and three other rokos for their “energetic efforts” in tax collection. Such praise, while probably deserved, served to highlight the great and widening gap between convivial and leisurely discussion at the Bosevakaturaga and the harsh realities of life among the people.

Various aspects of Ma`afu’s rule in Lau came into the spotlight during the ensuing weeks, not always to his advantage. Tui Lomaloma, who spoke of imperative orders from Roko Tui Lau to raise money for the Vakamisinari, had himself been forced to borrow money from a settler to meet his contribution. Before leaving to attend the Bosevakaturaga, he instructed his people to make copra so the debt could be discharged. “This is the custom in Lomaloma”, the chief advised his fellows. “It is a case of rivalry between Roko Tui Lau and Mr Fison, the Missionary at Lakeba, as to which collection shall be the largest”. When discussion turned to the level of debt among the people, several chiefs stated that personal debts to white traders should be resolved between debtor and creditor, without chiefly involvement. Ma`afu evinced a note of despair:

It is good to have a preventative for this thing. The behaviour of the white man is incomprehensible. When we go to their stores, they give their goods, and say, ‘Take them, and pay when it suits you; pay in one or two years, or at any time it may be convenient to you.’ But when the goods are taken away, in a few days only he comes and asks, ‘Where is the payment for the things you took? Give me nuts or copra, or give me labourers in payment’.

Ma`afu was probably articulating his own frustration in the face of his everlasting debts to Hennings Brothers, as much as he was giving voice to another small tyranny for the people of Lau.

As always, taxation was debated at length, with Mafi reporting that the Lakeba people were obliged that year to collect 1,000 pounds of copra, 500 pounds for taxes and the balance to pay for a vessel (the Uluilakeba). He pointed out
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that Vanuabalavu could never have raised such an amount, since it was blessed with far fewer coconut palms than Lakeba. Tax requirements, Mafi believed, should be tailored to suit each community’s circumstances. The Bosevakaturaga adopted a Resolution to the effect that “for the future the procuring of produce for tax purposes may cease at the time of the yearly Council”, with all roko tuis obliged to furnish the Council with a detailed tax report for their respective provinces. The Governor duly approved this long-needed reform.

Taxation also featured in Ma`afu’s Lau Report. He advised that “while our taxes are completed at Lau”, there was not enough land at Vanuabalavu for sufficient coconut palms to be planted to meet the island’s quota. He was very circumspect about other problems there, seeking to absolve himself even of potential blame. “The roads were in good condition when I was at Lomaloma, but when I was away in Tonga I heard they had not been kept clean”. Ma`afu was at pains to deal with two matters that had been “misconstrued”: firstly, he often sent messengers to villages with orders to the turaga ni koro “to urge on” work in gardens, roads and house repair. The messengers were not themselves appointed as turaga ni koro, as rumour had it. Secondly, Ma`afu denied that no food was provided for people building houses for the Tongans on Vanuabalavu. Ma`afu also “took the lead” in a discussion concerning bulis and their exemption from tax. He and other speakers were unanimous that the exemption, seen as “the principal attraction” of the post of buli, should continue. He was also critical, probably with reason, of the bulis’ treatment at the hands of taxation officers and Europeans generally.

While the Native Taxation Ordinance met with approval, Gordon identified dissatisfaction with “the way in which it was worked” as the principal theme of the 1877 Bosevakaturaga. The Lau report was largely an exercise in dissimulation, since matters such as judicial incompetence and corruption, problems exacerbated by his long absence in Tonga, were not mentioned. Ensuing exchanges between Tui Lomaloma and Mafi reflected poor relations between Fijians and Tongans on Vanuabalavu, with the chief especially critical of the Tongans’ manners. In terms of addressing the state of Lau as it really was, the Roko Tui Lau’s report to his fellows was almost valueless. Apart from problems occasioned by Fijian-Tongan relations and by the island’s geography, the people of Vanuabalavu, like most other Fijians, continued to suffer the dual demands of taxation and lala. The picture at the end of 1877 was not rosy.

While Ma`afu probably returned home after the end of the Bosevakaturaga on 3 January 1878, the documentary record is silent concerning whatever steps he
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might have taken to deal with the malaise on his island. Vanuabalavu, and indeed
the whole of Lau, shared with the rest of Fiji continuing problems associated
with implementation of the tax laws, an area where disquiet had spread even
beyond the shores of the Colony. An “old colonist” who had moved to Australia
voiced a settler view:

Your system of native taxation is a disgrace … the Customs duties are the
highest in the world, and the system of taxing trades and professions
simply barbarous, and opposed to all correct principles of political
economy … help you will not get until you help yourselves.¹³⁷

On Vanuabalavu, four months after the Council, the Tongans were still causing
problems, with one settler complaining that up to 30 coconut palms were
destroyed for each Tongan house that was constructed, “a culpable destruction
of our principal article of export”. There was further loss of trees occasioned by
the need of many women, who had been fined £10 for unspecified reasons, to
pay the equivalent in produce. The problems did not stop even there:

The Fijians complain bitterly that they should still be forced to build or
thatch Tongan houses. Why they should be compelled [to do so] without
payment any more than the Governor should order them to build white
men’s houses for nothing is to them one of those mysteries than can
never … be explained.¹³⁸

Ma’afu could have provided some explanation, but for the first three months of
1878, the record is silent.

Sir Arthur Gordon, while remaining Governor of Fiji, was in 1877 appointed
as the first High Commissioner for the Western Pacific. Among his new duties
were the conduct of British relations with Tonga and the maintenance of law
and order among British subjects living there. Making an official visit to Tonga
as High Commissioner, Gordon instructed Ma’afu to accompany him.¹³⁹ The
Governor sailed from Levuka on 3 April and after calling at Lomaloma to take
Ma’afu on board, reached Tonga five days later. Gordon reported favourably
on his visit and on Ma’afu’s part in several “nocturnal conversations” with the
King, sometimes with Tungi Halatuitui’a present. He emphasised in his report
that Tupou “writhes under [Shirley Baker’s] tyranny” and “abhors the Bakerian
system”. Having been despondent about his kingdom’s future, Tupou came to
see “some light”:

as he said to Ma’afu after I had left the room: ‘I thought Tonga would
die: that when I died all would end. Now I see Tonga may live …’ In
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the presence of Ma`afu and Tugi, and with David Uga’s full agreement, he promised that in the forthcoming Parliament the ridiculous and oppressive laws now in force should be either wholly repealed or materially altered. Both Tugi and Ma`afu tell me that the King’s promise, thus made, may be absolutely relied on.  

After a two-day visit, Gordon and Ma`afu returned to Lomaloma, where the Governor remained for Easter: “It was pleasant enough sitting in front of Ma`afu’s door in the shade … the neat enclosure, the short grass, the ‘noko-noko’, sandalwood and other trees the pretty view of the bay, and the sweet evening sunlight”. Ma`afu’s thoughts about his visit to Tonga and the continuing parlous state of Lau are unknown.

Gordon favoured formal British recognition for Tonga and a treaty similar to that existing between the kingdom and Germany. Also, mindful of the many fugitives from justice living in Tonga, he advocated an extradition treaty. With the appointment of Alfred Maudslay as a resident Deputy Commissioner and Vice Consul to Tonga, the country’s links with both Great Britain and Fiji were strengthened. These matters of international relations were of no apparent concern to Ma`afu, who again fades from the record after his return from Tonga, except for his advice to the administration of the existence of an uncharted rock in the sea near Fiji, “very difficult to see in fine weather. It breaks only in gales”. The discovery was duly named “Ma`afu rock”. Shortly before the Governor left Fiji for a visit to Britain, he advised Ma`afu that Eroni Loganimoce was to be removed as Tui Nayau for an unstated offence, although permitted to remain as acting Buli Lakeba. There was to be further trouble in Lakeba later in the year.

Ma`afu’s biggest problems during 1878 continued to involve land: as David Wilkinson recorded, “under all kinds of pretences the lessees of his lands try to refuse to pay [their] rents regularly”. The leaseholders apparently feared that the government would soon take over all lands, forcing them to pay again. Ma`afu requested “a letter from the Colonial Secretary which he could show to them that he has full right and authority to receive such rents”. Rents were always of major concern to Ma`afu because of his perennial debts, reports of which had even reached Shirley Baker in Tonga. He also had to deal with Tongans stealing boats in Vanuabalavu in order to return to Tonga, as well as an unprecedented level of theft on both Vanuabalavu and Lakeba. The Governor
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Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

instructed Ma`afu to proceed to Lakeba, with Mafi, to assist the European magistrate there in court. The latter’s counterpart at Lomaloma, Charles Swayne, recorded that Tui Mavana, wishing to reduce the number of robberies, had sought permission to arrest people wandering in his village at night. Swayne saw this request as an example of a chief using the Colony’s laws as a means of maintaining their traditional authority, now somewhat diluted under British rule. In the event Swayne, who reportedly disliked Ma`afu, followed him to Lakeba to investigate the wave of thefts. Ma`afu disobeyed Gordon by leaving Mafi in charge at Lomaloma during his absence.

Swayne was given no immediate cause to alter his poor opinion of Ma`afu. While in Lakeba, he heard from several older men in Levuka village, near Tubou, “that Ma`afu had given a large tract of land belonging to them to a Tongan named Devi. On this land they said they depended to pay their taxes”. Although Devi had taken more land than his entitlement permitted, Ma`afu justified his action by saying that Devi held the land as guardian for a child. Swayne, having heard “no great report of … Devi from whites or natives”, urged Ma`afu to consult the Levuka elders again when he next visited Lakeba. While the truth of the matter cannot be determined, there is evidence from outside Lau of further unjust instances of lala involving Ma`afu. In October 1878, three of his vessels sailed to Natewa Bay in Cakaudrove, where a tabu had long been in place on most produce, in preparation for a chiefly feast. The vessels were

with their respective nobility ready to receive their gifts vakaviti. They were not disappointed, and the unfortunate natives were cleaned out … a Bau chief … received as his share 350 large nets, each of which would have been sold on the spot for ten shillings, while the Ului i Lakemba returned to Lomaloma with a full load of mats, tapa, and other things below, and pigs, turtle etc on deck, all of which were sent to Tonga.

The Uluilakeba continued to be the bane of the Lakeban people who, by October, had been subject to two further copra levies, one of 500 pounds per man to help pay for “a schooner Ma`afu has taken from the Lakeba people”, and another of 100 pounds per man “to pay some debts the late king left unpaid on taking his departure”. This was done despite Ma`afu’s advice to the Lakeba chiefs a year earlier that he would defray the cost of the schooner within three months.
None of these problems was to be aired at the 1878 *Bosevakaturaga*, which commenced at Bua in November. With Gordon still in Britain, the Lieutenant Governor, Sir William Des Voeux, opened proceedings, which included “a great distribution of presents” and a procession of delegates before Des Voeux. With Ma‘afu absent through illness, he “had sent his young daughter” according to Des Voeux, “and it was a sight not easily to be forgotten when this little lady, apparently not more than 11 years old, walked past me in the most stately fashion with her train of tapa carried by some 200 of her father’s retainers”. Since Ma‘afu and Elenoa had no daughter, the girl was possibly the child of a different mother or, more likely, a classificatory daughter. Later, Ma‘afu and the Lauan delegation, augmented by 60 or 70 Tongans who had sailed up from Lomaloma, participated in a spectacular display of meke and solevu from various parts of Fiji. Roko Tui Lau’s diplomacy was tested when, after the host Tui Bua presented solevu to Lau, Cakaudrove and Macuata, Tui Cakau “gave half his to Lau because of the extra Tongans”. Ma‘afu accepted the gift only because he did not want to risk offending Tui Cakau.

The chiefs’ major concern at this Council was, not unexpectedly, land:

> We fear for the age to come, and we say, ‘What shall become of the people when they have lost their lands?’ We do not seek or desire to take hold of or get back any land has been truly and righteously sold; but on the other hand, neither do we wish that one piece of land shall be lost that has simply been seized upon or sold wrongfully.

> Still our peace is incomplete as it is not yet clear what will be our position or status in reference to our lands in future, and the thing is crowded with rumours and apprehensions.

The chiefs’ concerns arose in part from the appointment in 1875 of a Lands Commission, which would bear fruit with the hearings of the Lands Claims Commission of 1880–1881. During this *Bosevakaturaga*, Roko Tui Lau proved reticent, announcing in his first address, “I have very little to say in reference to my Province. The general work is progressing favourably; the towns, houses and all our roads are in good condition, and the taxes for the Province are finished”. His failure, before an audience of his peers, to address the manifest problems of Lau brings into focus the notion of the *Bosevakaturaga* as theatre, where many chiefs, conscious of the eyes and ears of their little world, played a role increasingly divorced from the realities of life on the ground. Mafi, with

---
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details of some carefully chosen incidents, again referred to difficulties with European magistrates. Despite Mafi’s many shortcomings as a Native Stipendiary Magistrate, those difficulties were real enough and were articulated by Ma`afu:

... it was not so ... formerly, now the whites are coincided with and assisted. When the European Stipendiary Magistrate first arrived at Loma Loma we agreed very well on matters, until one day I sent Mafi to him saying I had received a letter for the three of us to proceed to Lakeba in order to hold a court; he said to Mafi, ‘It is not your and the Roko’s duty, and if you two proceed there you cannot hold any court’.157

If correctly reported, the magistrate was right in objecting to the presence of Ma`afu and his NSM. The Roko was doubtless anxious that his chiefly authority not be further eroded by the new hierarchy that had arisen on the foundation of the old. His speech about this matter was his longest at the Great Council, where even Lau’s continuing tax problems were not raised. While deliberations were still in progress, the province’s tax assessment for 1879 was announced: £2,100, equal highest, with Cakaudrove, among the 15 provinces. The figure did not bide well for Lau’s, or indeed Cakaudrove’s, long-suffering people.

The tax system operating in Lau continued to be onerous and inefficient. Each taxpayer was required to contribute 500 pounds of copra as his annual tax which, at the contracted selling price, raised a gross amount of £3–10–0 for the government. The cost of collection was such that the net return to the government was only £1 per head. While some of the discrepancy can be attributed to the geography of Lau, with its small, widely scattered islands, the rest of Fiji revealed, to a lesser extent, similar inefficiencies of collection. These difficulties, among others, prompted the British Colonial Secretary, Sir Michael Hicks Beach, to express his disapproval of the Native Taxation Scheme.158 Gordon, the Scheme’s chief protagonist, regarded as an “evil” the massive debts owed by many Fijians to traders, many of whom continued to pay for tax produce in kind rather than in cash, as had been intended.159 According to one settler activist, “dozens” of Fijians had been driven to suicide by the Scheme’s exactions.160 Settlers also encountered difficulties: faced with a collapsed cotton market, lack of capital and an uncertain labour supply, many quit Fiji during the late 1870s.161 In Lau, where settlers generally fared better than elsewhere in Fiji, the Fijian population continued to face the double burden of taxation and an unpredictable and equally onerous imposition of lala.
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Ma`afu, who kept his own counsel about these matters, pursued his efforts to improve living conditions in his own immediate environment of Sawana and Lomaloma. His idea to supply piped drinking water to these villages, to be conveyed from a spring at the back of Lomaloma by means of iron pipes and financed by a special levy on settlers, was considered feasible by Swayne and approved by the Colonial Secretary, John Thurston. Reported to be in a “very good humour” at dinner with Le Hunte in early March, Ma`afu was thought by David Wilkinson to be pleased with the population growth revealed in the Census of that month. His pleasure, Wilkinson asserted, was “greatly strengthening [his] attachment to the Government and its policy”. While Ma`afu was always adept at charming his European hosts, there remained some who would not be charmed. William Hennings, always Ma`afu’s creditor, warned him of the consequences of his “wrong-doing to tenants … ‘Remember Ma`afu, if Captain Swayne prosecutes you, it would not be a matanitu business. You will have to deal with Mr Gorrie [the Chief Justice of Fiji]’”. “‘Veitalia’” [do as you please], replied Ma`afu, who had been frustrated and disappointed so often during his 32 years living in Fiji. Was it possible that he did not care any more?

If Ma`afu sensed his isolation as “a subordinate administrator” in the Colony of Fiji, that perception might have been enhanced with the sudden death at Somosomo on 11 April of his longest-serving Fijian ally, Ratu Golea, Tui Cakau, whom Ma`afu had known for almost 40 years. It was Golea’s father Tuikilakila who had given Ma`afu the levying rights in Vanuabalavu that ultimately led to his residence there. The chief legacy of Golea as Tui Cakau was the alienation of numerous islands within his domain, which he sold to Europeans, largely in response to the failed Tongan campaign against him under Wainiqolo and which remain freehold land to this day. Ma`afu, in company with Cakobau, numerous other Fijian chiefs and Lieutenant-Governor Des Voeux, attended Golea’s funeral at Somosomo. The new Tui Cakau would be Golea’s son, Ratu Josefa Lalabalavu.

The death and funeral of Tui Cakau delayed Ma`afu in distributing that year’s tax surplus at Lakeba. Conditions in Lau, in so far as they were reflected in official correspondence, appeared to have improved, with Swayne reporting that “the prospects of food supply in all the islands is [sic] very good. Yams are plentiful [sic]”. What Swayne did not reveal was how much of this food would remain for the people, once the exactions of lala and taxation were met. Whatever
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pleasure Ma`afu might have taken in the superficially improved outlook was likely diluted by remaining problems at Lomaloma, where he again sought to assert chiefly rights now proscribed by his position as Roko Tui Lau. He “forcibly removed” from the gaol “a prisoner under sentence for misdemeanour” and assaulted a keeper who tried to prevent him. Des Voeux, seeking to deal with the matter discreetly, sent for Ma`afu, Le Hunte and “all concerned with the affair to come forthwith to Government House [where] a detachment of the armed Constabulary” was on standby. While police intervention was not required, “at interview … Ma`afu appeared excited, and he informed me with some warmth that the prisoner, who was a Tongan of his province, had complained to him more than once of ill-treatment, that he felt bound as his chief to see justice done to him and that he had therefore brought him to me”. Des Voeux decided that Ma`afu had acted on impulse and “had no idea of having done wrong”. The acting Governor nevertheless faced a dilemma, since owing to his position as one of the most influential chiefs in Fiji, and as the rightful heir and successor of the King of Tonga, any public punishment would be most humiliating, and might have very undesirable consequences, if resented as unjust. On the other hand to overlook such an offence committed in the public view … was of course impossible.

Des Voeux informed Ma`afu that he could not accept his plea of ignorance of the law and that he would have to answer for his offence before the Police Magistrate.

With a view however to lessen the humiliation, which he felt very keenly, the magistrate at my request took the case the same morning a few minutes before the ordinary time for beginning business; and as Ma`afu, by my advice, pleaded ‘Guilty’, he was fined £10 and had left the court before the public became aware of what was going on.

Dining with Des Voeux the next day, Ma`afu revealed no ill feeling, “though the occurrence was of course not mentioned”. Des Voeux was happy that the affair “had so happy a termination”, since it was “especially important … (that) cordial relations” should be maintained with “a most valuable public officer”. It was not worth the public humiliation of a great chief to place at risk the authority of the matanitu in Lau.

A few days later, Sir Arthur Gordon returned from his long visit home, with the Xarifa among many yachts sailing out to escort the Governor’s ship into harbour. When the Lieutenant-Governor departed the following week, he recorded that “Among the many who came to see us off was Ma`afu, who was
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crying as he wished us good-bye. However incongruous are tears with so huge a frame as that of this chief, we in this case could not but be touched by them, especially in view of the disagreeable scene which I had with him a few days before”. A moment of unguarded emotion was rare for Ma`afu, who was likely grateful to Des Voeux for allowing him to avoid a public humiliation. The Roko was about to make another visit to Tonga where, according to David Wilkinson, resident Germans had gained a greater influence over the King that that enjoyed by the British Vice-Consul, Alfred Maudslay, much to Ma`afu’s puzzlement. Maudslay had earlier advised Gordon that in the event of Ma`afu’s succession as King, Great Britain should seek to establish a protectorate over Tonga. “I think there is a way of making it acceptable to him”, Maudslay wrote, evidence perhaps that he had discussed the idea with Ma`afu. Although Tonga was unable to manage its international relations unaided, a protectorate at this time would have been most unlikely, even had the British been disposed to offer one. Two years earlier, according to the Fiji Times, “Tonga will never even be tendered to the British Crown”. The Tongans’ disposition would not have changed in 1879.

On the eve of Gordon’s return, the Foreign Office instructed him to ensure that relations with Tonga “should be of the most satisfactory description”. He was urged “to impress upon the King … that as his country is affected by the interests of Great Britain more largely and more intimately than by the interests of any other country, Her Majesty’s Government … considers that he should be prepared to listen to their wishes as expressed through you with especial favour”. The new High Commissioner accordingly advised the King of his intention to visit Tonga in October, so that “a lasting Treaty of Friendship” could be concluded. Ma`afu was to precede Gordon to Tonga aboard the Xarifa, carrying with him official despatches and armed with an official “Sailing Letter”, enjoining all to whom it might be presented to allow the Xarifa to proceed “without let or hinderance [sic]”.

Ma`afu’s ties with his homeland had earlier been reinforced in a manner not conducive to good government in either Lau or Cakaudrove. Reference has already been made to the produce extorted, in the guise of lala, at Natewa Bay in October 1878. Four months later, two of Ma`afu’s vessels visited the district again “to collect native produce, as Ma`afu’s presents to Tonga, to be sent by the Tongan government schooner, Mata ki Tonga”. Then in July 1879,
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the Arabian Girl, belonging to Ma’afu, “went to Tonga crammed to the hatch combings with tapa, sandalwood, sinnet, mats, fish nets etc, nearly all collected in Cakaudrove”. The Fiji Times, lamenting the loss of income to the people, articulated a fundamental social evil:

What use for them to labor if all the produce of their hands is to be seized for the glorification of their chiefs? This “lala” privilege was exercised far more mercifully in the old days of law when might was right. Now it has degenerated into simple robbery, and the chiefs’ hands are strengthened by the approval of an English Government.173

It is unfortunate that the voices of the Lauan people themselves on the matter of lala cannot now be heard. There remained much resentment in the province over land given to Tongans, as Thurston, writing in June 1879, made clear:

it is currently believed among natives that any Tongan arriving in Fiji is sure to get Fijian land allotted to him, and that domiciled Tongans fall in for the planting grounds of deceased Fijians to the exclusion of the proper successors.176

There is no evidence that Ma’afu, during his years as Roko Tui Lau, made any significant efforts to address either of these crucial and fundamental problems. This failure is scarcely surprising, since it was always his object to maintain the Tongan ascendancy in Lau. When he sailed to Tonga as envoy for Sir Arthur Gordon, Ma’afu was enacting a role divorced from his responsibilities as a “subordinate administrator” in the Province of Lau. During Gordon’s visit to Tonga in November, the Treaty of Friendship was signed, subject to ratification in both Tonga and Great Britain. The Treaty’s six articles provided, among other benefits, trading privileges for British subjects living there, who could also now be tried in certain cases by the British Consul. “Perpetual friendship” was guaranteed between Great Britain and Tonga, the latter a “nation” which did not yet enjoy international recognition.177 Ma’afu was not among the four signatories to the Treaty, which was not ratified until 1881.

Relations with Tonga would occupy much of the attention of both Gordon and Ma’afu, for different reasons, during the coming year. In the meantime, the Roko attended the 1879 Bosevakaturaga at Bau where, by way of contrast with the previous year’s Council, he presented a detailed report for Lau. He appeared somewhat vague on the matter of his province’s taxes whose amount he did not know, since some produce had been sent to Lomaloma and some direct to
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Levuka. This year, Ma`afu had the grace to admit that “some of our affairs … are not in [a] good … condition”. He mentioned communication difficulties in reporting births, deaths and marriages from the Yasayasa Moala, as well as “small matters of disagreement [which] are generally settled amicably. That is all I have to say in reference to our province”.\footnote{178} 

Roko Tui Ba, seemingly ready to confront Ma`afu, wanted to know why the “work” in Lau had suddenly become so difficult, suggesting that the province’s geography and lack of vessels might be the cause of the problems outlined by Ma`afu. “Formerly Lau was the head of all in the management of its affairs, but lately it has seemed to drop behind. What is the cause?” Some heated debate ensued, in which Ma`afu took no part but where Malakai Vakameitagake, the Tongan buli at Moala, bore the brunt of accusations of improper conduct. It was apparent that some chiefs resented the authority of a Tongan over the “taukeis of the land” at Moala.\footnote{179} Such resentment extended also to Malakai’s master, Roko Tui Lau, apparently absent following presentation of his report. Roko Tui Ba and Roko Tui Ra both referred to the fact that Ma`afu had left the Council: “Whatever we are discussing it is with the root of the matter absent. I do not know what it means”, observed Roko Tui Ra. Finally, Ma`afu was urged, in his absence, to ensure that the Bosevakayasana (the provincial councils) were held regularly and that “the whole of the province should be represented”.\footnote{180} 

Ma`afu’s absence from the Bosevakaturaga during discussion of the Lau report was more than a discourtesy to his fellow chiefs: it reinforced the impression that conditions in the province were unsatisfactory. The chiefs’ concerns appeared to be well founded since David Wilkinson shortly afterwards advised the Governor that “The work [in Lau] is all at sixes and sevens, and several things require to be put right or enquired into”.\footnote{181} At least the province had met its tax requirements, according to its Roko, and was again assessed equal highest among the 15 provinces for 1880, with a figure of £2,100 out of a total assessment of £20,000.\footnote{182} In March 1880, Gordon was able to advise the Colonial Office that in 1879, for the first time, taxation revenue had exceeded estimates, an advance which resulted from increased prices for copra as well as an expansion in other crops.\footnote{183} Although Lau had contributed its share, its Roko remained unwilling to devote his full attention to the province’s ills. He remained preoccupied both with his personal life and with the affairs of his homeland.

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \footnote{178} Published Proceedings of the Native Council or Council of Chiefs from September 1875, 1879 Council, 54.
  \item \footnote{179} Malakai was a son of Tu’ipelehake, a senior Tongan noble, and had been in Fiji since the 1850s. He was married to a daughter of Taliai Tupou. Malakai, NSM for Moala as well as buli, died in 1887. Swayne to Thurston, 11 Feb 1887, FC80.
  \item \footnote{180} ibid., 55.
  \item \footnote{181} Wilkinson to Gordon, 3 Jan 1880, Records…., 4, 157.
  \item \footnote{182} Published Proceedings…., 1879 Council.
  \item \footnote{183} Gordon to CO, 29 Mar 1880, CO 83/22.
\end{itemize}
For unknown reasons, a rift had developed between Ma`afu and his wife, probably before the end of 1879. Wilkinson, who delighted in writing to Gordon at great length during his journeys in both Fiji and Tonga, reported in February 1880 his “good hopes that a reconciliation has come about between Ma`afu and Elenoa. I left them together when I came away and it’s many years since I have seen Ma`afu so cheerful”. Wilkinson had spoken to Elenoa “as plainly ... as the delicacy of the position would allow”, with Elenoa replying “‘duty is truth’ and ‘duty is our Lord’”. During this time Ma`afu, visiting Levuka, earned a severe rebuke from Gordon, who had waited in vain for him to come and say goodbye before Gordon left for Moturiki:

Now such as this ... is not right and proper between us Chiefs ... I was pained, I was ashamed also, when I heard that you were intoxicated and going about so on the beach ... When I heard all about your unbecoming behaviour ... going about the streets and beach of Levuka, and ... that you were going about with a drunken white man, that your son was intoxicated and many of your own people that accompanied you – yes, when I heard all this, I refused to believe it possible of Ma`afu to follow such a course ... It will be of no use to me to name all you did ... Such habits are unbecoming and evil, and you know it well ... I pity you truly in my heart, but I must have regard to my duty and our joint work. But what shall I do? Shall I prohibit your coming to Levuka for a time? Or what else? ... I send my love to you.\(^\text{185}\)

Ma`afu had fallen further from grace than at any time since his youth in Tonga. If there was something on his mind, apart from the difficulties with Elenoa, no evidence has survived to enlighten us. His rampage in Levuka was no isolated event, since his reputation for insobriety would be mentioned at the 1880 Bosevakaturaga at Mualevu. Ma`afu’s angsta\(^\text{185}\), whatever its cause, persisted for months, with Wilkinson advising the Governor in July of further indiscretions. A large group of Tongans, with smaller numbers of Fijians, Europeans and Samoans, most of them intoxicated, had congregated on Hennings’ wharf in Levuka, near the Polynesian Hotel. Among them were Ma`afu and a visiting Englishman named Theodore Wood, nephew of a “lord” according to Gordon, with whom Ma`afu was staying, “both very much intoxicated with drink”. Siale`ataongo, also affected by alcohol, was of the party, most of whom boarded the \(Xarifa\), the \(Uluilakeba\) and a Tongan schooner and set sail for Lau.

Wilkinson did not provide details of the scenes that took place on the wharf, a spectacle he described as “simply disgraceful and disgusting”. He was concerned in part because of his efforts to effect a reconciliation between
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Ma`afu and Elenoa and to encourage Ma`afu to abjure alcohol. “The chief [was] degraded and disgraced before his people”, Wilkinson lamented. It seemed he placed some blame on Europeans who had supplied the “natives”, including Ma`afu, with liquor. Wilkinson discerned a motive for this largesse: “The chief has been followed feasted and flattered into the signing of documents and papers incurring debts and liabilities by impotent traders and designing men”. Ma`afu had left for Lau with Theodore Wood, the latter reported to have “some business or other with Ma`afu up there”. Further, while Ma`afu was in Levuka, he had, Wilkinson asserted, been induced “by carpenters and traders” to sign promissory notes, and although “it is quite uncertain to what extent it may have been led … and though the chief cannot be brought to court for debt his character and efficiency as a public officer must be prejudiced by such conduct”. Six months earlier, Wilkinson continued, Ma`afu had been “induced to take delivery of two boats from Drew the carpenter”. Although both men were informed that the purchase was irregular, Ma`afu “pestered Drew into accepting a promissory note, even though the carpenter knew that he could not sue Ma`afu for payment”. Since Ma`afu failed to honour the debt, Drew had been following him “day after day to sign a renewal or a new promissory note … and has probably succeeded. Neither is this a solitary case as they occur continuously giving endless trouble”.186

Wilkinson was concerned that Ma`afu had left Levuka in company with Wood, “a man known to be in needy circumstances and who has been making his boast that he can get the chief to do just as he likes and has certainly succeeded in some things”. Wilkinson appreciated the difficulties Gordon faced in dealing with a Roko who had so transgressed, “but it is not by any means the first act of indiscretion and misconduct he has been guilty of”. Much more than “an ordinary reprimand” was required. Wilkinson expected Ma`afu to submit to any punishment the Governor might decide on “and will do so chief like while that very docility may have its embarrassment as it will be humiliating to him in the sight of his fellow chiefs, but they already regard him as a very serious transgressor and his indecorous conduct has often called forth very sharp comments”.187

Although our glimpses of Ma`afu’s daily life during his years as Roko Tui Lau are too fragmentary for firm conclusions to be drawn, the episodes described by Wilkinson suggest that the Roko maintained his blatant disregard for his financial liabilities. Although Ma`afu bore, like all other residents of Fiji, a responsibility to obey the law, it would be a mistake to view his eternal financial troubles, extending over decades, as solely the actions of a man devoid of integrity in money matters. Ma`afu had been born a chief in a society where chiefs enjoyed the right to take possession of whatever property they pleased.
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Exposed to European ways since his childhood in Tonga, Ma`afu was sufficiently acculturated to understand the concept of personal debt and the legal purpose of promissory notes. He understood, but he did not care. He remained a Tongan chief of high rank; if a Tongan chief fancied acquiring two new boats, he acquired them. If signing a piece of paper was a necessary prerequisite, then sign it he would, but what were the odds? There were none, for a chief.

The matter of Ma`afu’s drunkenness is not so easily explained. An oral tradition painted a picture of Ma`afu in his final years: “An old fat man, sitting in the shade of a ‘nokonoko’ tree near the beach, distributing with a drunken smile bottled beer to a few hangers on”. It is easy to ascribe his alcoholism to his chagrin over his thwarted ambitions in Fiji, where he had bidden fair to become “chief at Bau”, or to his marital difficulties, or even perhaps to his uncertain prospects in Tonga, where there remained a real prospect of his succession, especially now that the designated heir, Tevita `Unga, had died. All this, though, is but speculation: we simply do not know what drove him towards public intoxication, to the destruction of his dignity as a chief, or to seek the company of dubious characters who possessed their own reasons for cultivating his favour. His fondness for “the bottle” had been noted by a visitor, Lord George Campbell, in July 1874, while according to an after-dinner anecdote by Sir Arthur Gordon, Ma`afu had begun to drink heavily soon after Cession and was encouraged by Gordon to sign the pledge. Ma`afu’s conduct on Hennings’ wharf was not that of a Roko, much less that of a king in waiting. Was he on the skids?

Tonga continued to claim much of his attention in 1880. We have noted how, during the previous two years, he had ruthlessly exploited the custom of lala to gather “gifts” to be sent to Tonga. Whether such “gifts” were designed to encourage his supporters in the kingdom remains unknown. At the 1879 Bosevakaturaga, it had been revealed that Ma`afu had told the bulis to issue orders for the preparation of tapa as gifts for Tupou. His contacts with Tonga, and his visits there every year, continued to cause some concern to British officials. Following Tevita `Unga’s death in Auckland in December 1879, the succession question assumed greater significance for Ma`afu. Although the Constitution provided for the succession to pass to `Unga’s descendants, with his son Wellington Ngū now the ostensible heir, speculation about Ma`afu’s intentions persisted. Henry Symonds, the acting British Consul in Tonga, believed that had `Unga survived his father, he “would never have become king
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without a struggle” owing to his unpopularity. Ngū, though, enjoyed increasing public favour and should succeed without objection, “unless such objection be originated from without”.  

Mention of an objection to Ngū “from without” was a reference to Ma`afu whom, according to Shirley Baker, Gordon wanted to succeed Tupou. “If [Gordon] could get Ma`afu appointed he would sign over Tonga”, Baker wrote in Auckland as he waited to accompany `Unga’s remains to Tonga for burial. If that was indeed Gordon’s view, he revealed nothing in his official correspondence. James Blyth, whom Gordon appointed Vice-Consul to Tonga during Maudslay’s leave of absence, was instructed that in his “intercourse” with the King and government of Tonga, he was to remember that Great Britain had “no selfish objects to obtain” in Tonga, whose independence must be respected. Blyth was urged to watch carefully any moves towards the assumption of power or influence in Tonga “by any other State”, since such a development would be against British interests, in view both of the proximity of Fiji to Tonga and of “the social connection between the two groups”.

These instructions, couched in the cautious tones of diplomacy, neatly outline contemporary British policy towards Tonga. Naturally, nothing was said concerning the succession, a topic that continued to occupy people’s minds. The veteran missionary in Fiji, Frederick Langham, supported British policy, telling Baker that “If [the Tongans] have a successor to King George like him, they will be much better without British influence and authority”. Wilkinson, writing from Tonga in February 1880, said that he would advise Ma`afu to attend `Unga’s funeral. Wilkinson, who believed that Ngū “would never hold his own against the people”, favoured Tungī to succeed as “he has the confidence of the king and the esteem of the people”. Wilkinson sought instructions from Gordon about how Ma`afu should be handled. The Governor remained displeased with Ma`afu, however, reporting that the Roko had gone to live with Theodore Wood, “a step I greatly deplore”. What was worse, at least for Ma`afu, was that he had been “awfully cheated” concerning the denture he had ordered from Sydney. Whether he had been overcharged, or whether the mail order teeth did not fit, has not been revealed to history.

Ma`afu, still in Fiji in June, was instructed to proceed to Levuka with Mafi for consultations with the Governor. Gordon wished to learn the full history of Rabe, the island in Cakaudrove which the former Tui Cakau had presented
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to Tupou in 1855 and which the King had sold in 1871.\(^{199}\) It was probably significant that Ma`afu did not attend the opening of the Tongan Parliament on 24 July, when the King announced that Shirley Baker was to be Premier of Tonga and that the treaty with Great Britain, if approved, would be ratified.\(^{200}\) When Parliament was prorogued one week later, the King made an announcement of considerable significance to Ma`afu: “The Constitution will be adhered to, and I hereby appoint my grandson, Wellington Tupoumalolo, as my successor and Crown Prince of Tonga”.\(^{201}\)

There was no reason to suppose that the constitutional provisions for succession would not be carried out on Tupou’s death. Gordon, as High Commissioner for the Western Pacific, was chiefly concerned to thwart German influence in Tonga, an influence he believed was promoted by Baker. He made his point to the Foreign Secretary, who minuted one of Gordon’s despatches, “I was not aware that the Fiji Islands were so mingled with the Tongan group, as to bring our own possessions into immediate and inconvenient contact with the latter”.\(^{202}\)

Gordon’s concerns were actuated by the extensive German trading interests in Fiji, where the proprietors of the long-established trading firm of Hennings Brothers had for years exercised a marked influence over Ma`afu.\(^{203}\)

Thurston, who shared Gordon’s fears about German intentions in Tonga, advised the High Commissioner that Tupou had received “valuable presents” from the German Emperor and Crown Prince. One positive development, Thurston reported from Tonga, was that the new Tongan Crown Prince appeared to oppose Baker’s policy of favouring German interests.\(^{204}\)

Gordon had sent Thurston, still Colonial Secretary of Fiji, to Tonga to “expostulate” with the King, who apparently did not intend now to ratify the treaty with Great Britain. Following pressure from Gordon and the Foreign Office, the King agreed that the deadline for ratification might be extended to December 1881.\(^{205}\)

Ma`afu appears to have dropped from official view for several months in 1880. When the new Tui Cakau, Ratu Josefa Lalabalavu, was installed at Wairiki in August, there was no mention in the press of Ma`afu’s presence, although it is likely that he attended.\(^{206}\) He re-emerged into the spotlight in November, when he played host to the Bosevakaturaga, held that year at Mualevu in northern Vanuabalavu. During the same month he gave evidence at a sitting of the Lands Claims Commission held in Lomaloma to investigate numerous European claims in Lau.

---

199 Gordon to Ma`afu, 14 Jun 1880, FCSO.
200 Blyth to Gordon, 30 Jul 1880, Records…, 4, 378 and 3 Aug 1880, FO 58/68.
201 FT, 23 Sep 1880.
202 Minute by Lord Kimberley, Gordon to FO, 31 Jul 1880, CO 83/22.
203 Gordon to SSFA, 31 Jul 1880 and 30 Dec 1880, FO 58/168.
204 Thurston to Gordon, 11 Nov 1880, FO 58/168.
205 Gordon to Thurston, 5 Nov 1880, Gordon to King of Tonga, 5 Nov 1880, Records…, 4, 490; CO to Under SSFA, 16 Oct 1880, FO 58/171; Gordon to SSFA, 29 Dec 1880, FO 58/168.
206 FT, 11 Aug 1880.
Missionary David Wylie had been prescient when he wrote in 1873, “The question of Land Titles is likely to become a serious one in Fiji”. Some land had been “sold” more than once, with several claims from both chiefs and settlers resulting. The Deed of Cession had recognised lands “in bona-fide [possession] … of Europeans or other foreigners”, but what constituted “bona-fide possession” under Fijian land tenure was far from clear. The Lands Claims Commission had been established following the chiefs’ adoption, after much debate, of the Lands Claims Ordinance of 1879 at that year’s Bosevakaturaga. The Commission’s chief concern was traditional indigenous rights to land in Fiji and “whether the vendors of each [foreign] claim were empowered, by their own custom, to alienate the land in question”. Europeans claiming land in Fiji were required to give evidence of the transactions with Fijians on which their claims were based, while chiefs and others representing the mataqali, the traditional owners of the land, were also questioned about the supposed alienation of the lands claimed by Europeans. The Commission set out, in principle, to ensure that where continuous Fijian occupation could be demonstrated, “sales” of such land to foreigners would not be recognised. The only “sales” deemed valid were to be those made by a chief who ruled in fact as well as in name and where there was clear evidence of consent from the taukei who lived on and planted the land in question. Since much land alienation had occurred because of Fijian cupidity, where people were anxious for a share of rents, and because of deception and often threats on the part of European “purchasers”, the enquiry would prove to be prolonged and extremely complex. By the time LCC investigations were completed in 1882, fewer than one third of claims had been recognised.

We have already noted examples of the many leases Ma’a’fu made to Europeans on Vanuabalavu in the 1870s and earlier. Over three days of hearings at Lomaloma, days when he had to be excused from attending the Bosevakaturaga, Ma’a’fu gave evidence to the Commission in relation to at least 19 separate claims. His depositions, seen in an attenuated form in the Commission Reports, demonstrate his thorough knowledge of the lands of Lau and those who worked them, as well as a prodigious, if sometimes selective, memory. It often seemed that he could account for every physical feature, every foot almost, of the land of Vanuabalavu and other islands in the province of Lau.
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Ma`afu was a busy man during the final weeks of 1880, since after the Commission hearings concluded, he resumed his role as host of the Bosevakaturaga. Following the Council’s official opening by Sir Arthur Gordon, Ma`afu, in Gordon’s presence, addressed the chiefs on the progress Fiji had made under British rule:

In former times, which I well remember, there were no such gatherings as these. In those days there was no unity and one-mindedness … From the time that the Vunivalu decided to give Fiji to Great Britain, we have been united … But now, Sir, you are about to leave us behind. One thing … let me urge. Do not forget us … We Fijians are not persevering. We are easily discouraged, and are very much so at your going away.\textsuperscript{213}

There was no dissent among the chiefs. Gordon also regretted his departure, for more than one reason, writing of Vanuabalavu as “the most enjoyable part of Fiji” with “an air of comfort … which is particularly attractive to me”.\textsuperscript{214} When Gordon sailed from Mualevu, on his final departure from Fiji, he was saddened at parting from so many “old friends” among the chiefs. One in particular would remain in his memory:

There were many touching incidents, but the one thing burnt into my memory for ever was the expression on Ma`afu’s face. He knew that in losing me he lost his strongest external help to the maintenance of his better nature. He spoke not a word, but held my hand with both his as though he could not let go his hold, and looked into my eyes, his face speaking – sorrow, affection, respect, and something of reproach at my deserting him were all mingled there. And the pitiless rain came down all the time in blinding torrents.\textsuperscript{215}

Ma`afu would need a friend during the Bosevakaturaga. During a discussion of Rewa, whose head, Roko Tui Dreketi, was a notorious alcoholic, Roko Tui Bua addressed the chiefs:

There are two amongst us whose habits of drinking are notorious. One is Roko Tui Dreketi, the other is Roko Tui Lau. Who are they, and what are they? Are they great and valiant men that their habits are thus? They are but men like ourselves …. Both these chiefs have been spoken to, counselled, and admonished, but they follow their ways, the fruit of which they do not eat alone – we are all sharers in their reproach and shame. It is unlawful to take … a person out of prison under sentence … Roko Tui Lau … did so in Levuka, and what was the result? None of us are devoid of sympathy and the desire to help his fellow, all of us have
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our failings and weaknesses, but if we are chiefs and are called upon to fill our positions in the government of our people, the faithful discharge of this duty surely ought to be our object…

The matter was dropped after further discussion. A few days later, Council deliberations again reflected badly on Ma`afu when Mafi referred to a major cause of disquiet in Vanuabalavu that the Roko had done nothing to address. Many children placed in the daily care of religious teachers had been made to work all day on the teachers’ plantations without being fed, contrary to Fijian custom. The problem was resolved only when the missionaries forbade the practice and ensured the children attended school. Ma`afu played no part in ending the children’s suffering.

Of greater concern to Ma`afu was the continuing resentment felt by other chiefs towards the Tongan ascendancy in Lau. When Mafi mentioned increasing thefts, Roko Tui Ba was quick to suggest a cause:

there are two mataqalis notorious for thieving in Fiji; one, strangers from another place, the second, Tongans newly arrived. We Fijians are naturally respectful and docile towards strangers, but you Tongans are a very different thing, and the fast youths amongst us have imitated the Tongan habits, and it is the picking up of these untoward habits of foreigners which has most to do with the creation of lazy and indolent people who become thieves and evil doers in the land. Formerly they were put down … by vakavanua usages. Now, they defy these…

Mafi, tongue in cheek, agreed with this description of a society under the stress of social change. He proceeded to remind Roko Tui Ba that the Fijians of Vanuabalavu were “notorious thieves” who were permitted “to defy … chief, law, policemen, Government and all”. “Yes”, replied Tui Ba. “That is because they have been well taught by you in your own land, before they came”.

Not surprisingly, Ma`afu was not forthcoming when he addressed the Council: “I have nothing much to report of our province”. He spoke of Mafi’s laxness in not travelling about Lau as he should, without acknowledging that it was his own responsibility as Roko to ensure that Mafi attended to his duties. Although able to recognise deficiencies and worse in his province, Ma`afu was not sufficiently motivated to set them to rights. Was that because the degree of social control he had established amply suited his purpose?

Siale`ataongo, whose unseemly conduct had been brought to Gordon’s notice, was the subject of another rebuke from Roko Tui Ba. Referring to Siale’s known
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illicit relations with various married women, two of whom he had struck, Roko Tui Ba suggested that he had not been brought before a court because he was the Roko’s son. Mafi demurred, citing a lack of any formal complaint as the reason. There followed a litany of further accusations against Siale, whom Mafi described as “a daring, bad young man. His father has lectured me twice for not bringing him to court, but the difficulty has been that no-one will lodge a complaint … He is a bitter fruit, indeed, to us Tongans, as well as to Lau as a whole. He is a chief, a high chief, amongst us”, Mafi added, coming to the heart of the matter, “and the fear he causes is great”. Sialeʻataongo who, at 16, had been described by a visiting missionary as an “Adonis”, was part of the Tongan oppression in Lau and would in fact be deported from Fiji within two years. His conduct emerges in the context of the Bosevakaturaga as further evidence of a lack of control from the top.

Many of Lau’s problems arose because the province was a society in transition. Aside from the repressive nature of Maʻafu’s rule, Lau was affected by the diminution of chiefly authority as the new colonial hierarchy became entrenched. The new rule of law, as Siale’s case exemplifies, blunted at the edges in the face of social attitudes surviving from the days when there was no statute law and neither gaols nor magistrates. At the Bosevakaturaga, Buli Lakeba complained “There are fornicators and adulterers in numbers, but no-one will charge them, and they are not brought to trial … there is disquiet everywhere”. The problem, at least for the buli, lay in the families of those involved in marital problems agreeing to settle the matter among themselves, often with compensation being paid, so that those guilty of breaches of a strict moral regime which the law sought to impose could never be brought to court.

Maʻafu appeared to address the problem:

It is true that the evil of Lakeba is great … What the Buli has stated I know well …. I have been told it is the age of law, of Courts, the road to which is straight. Though the evil of Lakeba be great, I believe the same evils on Vanua Balavu are greater. Here … all law is at an end. A man steals a fowl, and is brought to Court, but a man may violate his neighbour’s wife, or his neighbour’s daughter, and everybody says (raising his hand to suit the word), `Hush, hush, hush’ …. Such persons defy the elders of the land, and they easily defy the Courts and the laws.

When Maʻafu ordered that a notorious offender on Lakeba be flogged, he was “lectured” for having taken the law into his own hands. “I ask the Council, I ask the Commissioner, I ask the law, the Government, and the Governor, `How can you expect the land to be clean?’” One chief, Ratu Osea, could not resist
a rejoinder: “Lau formerly was not as it is now represented to be. These habits must have entered from Tonga”. In the days before the Vakapiritania, the chiefs were the law, and Ma’afu would never have been so constrained.

Aside from Ma’afu’s continuing dilemmas concerning application of the new laws, there remained much resentment on Vanuabalavu over Fijians being forced to provision Tongan residents for their visits home and to repair the Tongans’ houses. Ma’afu was supposed to have informed the new Governor, William Des Voeux, that the Fijians would not be evicted from the island as long as they continued to supply labour to the Tongans. If true, it seemed that Ma’afu and his Tongan cohorts, far from neglecting the social ills of their domain, had achieved just the right degree of social control necessary to maintain the Tongan ascendancy.

The Roko Tui Lau was, nevertheless, moved to complain when he saw both Fijians and Tongans as the victims of injustice. On islands in Lau leased to Europeans, voyaging Fijians who sought to shelter “during stress of weather” were usually refused, often being forced to remain on board their canoes, whatever the conditions, contrary to Fijian custom. They were also denied food. Ma’afu could not restrain his bitterness: “Doubtless it is [because] we are black and they are white, we are, in their eyes, filthy, and they are clean”. Was he accurate in his summation of settler attitudes, lingering from the days of the Cakobau Government and earlier, or were the resentments of a lifetime leading him to make common cause with the Fijians, whose rights in so many other areas he treated with contempt? Roko Tui Bua spoke in his support, at the same time giving voice to a malaise that was one more unintended consequence of the European intrusion into Fiji:

No one who sold land in those past days ever supposed he was selling all vakavanua rights and privileges with what he sold. Whoever thought he was selling his reefs, or the water? Yet all are prohibited by white men when they are not of good mind. We are prohibited from landing on their shores. Supposing that we prohibited them, what a noise there would be about it! … If this kind of thing is to continue, we shall indeed be in a pitiable condition.

In addressing the Bosevakaturaga on its final day, Ma’afu resumed the seemingly discarded cloak of statecraft:

With reference to our lands, formerly we were very much perplexed, and we have often discussed the matter, but never arrived at any satisfactory conclusion; but now we are thankful the law has been enacted which meets our case fully. It also certifies to us that the tales we have been told
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that the Government would take away our land, and we should be left in a pitiable condition, were not true … There is however one other matter which gives us concern, namely, our reefs … All reefs have ownership from the past down to the present time; that is clear to us … We beg of your Majesty that they may be registered with our lands … that the rights of owners may be fixed on a clear basis…

Ma’afu saw the Lands Claims Commission as a vehicle for reconciling traditional land tenure with the requirements of English law and European settlers. In view of the practices of many settlers in denying voyagers their traditional rights, similar protection was needed for the country’s reefs.

With the close of the Bosevakaturaga, the chiefs departed and Ma’afu returned to Lomaloma. The Fiji Times, four months later, cast aspersions on the Mualevu Council, addressing matters unlikely to have surfaced during the chiefs’ deliberations:

The dearest aspiration of Ma’afu’s heart was that in every respect the Lau Bose should outrival that held at Bau the previous year. In this he was so peculiarly successful … that has made it notorious even in the annals of Fijian licentiousness and debauchery. It is asserted that drunkenness and immorality were its distinguishing features; that the deliberative business … served as a cloak … for … the most degrading vice and lasciviousness…

The newspaper’s hyperbole renders its judgment suspect. There had certainly been problems, most notably the cutting of the Cakaudrove fishing nets during the Council, supposedly with Ma’afu’s knowledge. John Thurston, while careful not to accuse Ma’afu without evidence, advised Gordon, “it is hard to see how anyone dared do it except with the sanction or by the direction of the chief. The objects assigned have been numerous – one being that the Chief desired to snub Cakaudrove because they did not contribute more food. Another because Ratu Lala has put his foot down upon Tongan spoliation in Cakaudrove”. The Tongan raj, as Thurston referred to it, was coming under unprecedented pressure throughout eastern Fiji. With his various public humiliations, exemplified in his alcoholism, his personal ascendancy in Lau might well have appeared precarious.

Thurston, the wisest contemporary observer of the political scene in Fiji, addressed some fundamental aspects of Ma’afu’s rule, resolution of which would be needed in the future. The most important was his assumed right to lease Lauan lands without reference to the taukeis, a continuing cause of resentment for many years afterwards, as we saw in Chapter Nine. Secondly, Thurston asked
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by what right Ma`afu appropriated the whole income from such lands, leaving the taukeis without a penny in rent. Should the system be allowed to continue during Ma`afu’s life, and if so, what course should be adopted after his demise? Should the leases be allowed to run their course, up to 50 years, to the detriment of three generations of taukeis, or should the lands be returned to them, whose interests Ma`afu had so comprehensively ignored? The Tongan ascendancy on Vanuabalavu, and to a lesser extent elsewhere in Lau and beyond, had become characterised by discontent, injustice and incipient social breakdown under a chief whom Lady Gordon had described, not without reason, as “the cleverest of them all”.

13. “He is regarded with much bitterness and ill-will”
14. “He was a very dangerous man”

Following the conclusion of the *Bosevakaturaga* at Mualevu in January 1881, chiefs from that district and from Lomaloma assembled for the *Boseniyasana*, held as usual after a meeting of the Great Council. Almost no record has survived of the *Bose*, whose purpose, as always, was to acquaint the *turaga ni koro* and other lesser chiefs with the resolutions of the *Bosevakaturaga* and to consider matters of local concern. When the *Xarifa* reached Lomaloma on 11 January, having sailed up to Mualevu the previous day,¹ it probably returned Ma`afu to his home after some two months of prolonged chiefly deliberations, interspersed by several days of giving evidence at hearings of the Lands Claims Commission.

Almost one month later, SS *Ocean Queen* arrived at Levuka from Lomaloma with the news that Ma`afu was dead. He had become ill soon after the close of the *Bose* and since there was no medical practitioner on Vanuabalavu, urgent notification was sent to Levuka. According to John Thurston it was Siale`ataogo, conveying a load of copra which Thurston suspected was stolen, who brought news to the capital that his father was very ill and suffering from a greatly swollen leg. Since the *Ocean Queen* was about to sail from Levuka, the Governor instructed Thurston to change her course and convey to Lomaloma Dr Carmelo Ghio, a Maltese practitioner who had been in Fiji only two months. When the doctor arrived on 6 February, he found Ma`afu *in extremis*. The Roko Tui Lau died about two hours later.

There were conflicting reports concerning the cause of death. According to Thurston, seemingly on Siale’s information, a horse had trodden on Ma`afu’s foot “severing one toe, and I believe another nearly”, a report repeated in the press announcement of the death.² Another version, apparently unsupported by contemporary evidence, was that Ma`afu was visiting Mago when his boat grounded on a reef. In the act of assisting his men to push her off, Ma`afu cut his foot on some coral.³ Yet another oral tradition suggests that he cut his foot on a nail while at Mago. Thurston’s account is the most credible, written as it was only 12 days after Ma`afu died and apparently based on Siale’s account. Thurston also read Dr Ghio’s report, which indicated “that for carelessness and want of cleanliness gangrene … set in”, while Ma`afu seemingly also suffered from erysipelas, an acute streptococcal infectious disease of the skin, characterised by fever, headache and vomiting.⁴ Had medical advice been available, there is a good chance Ma`afu would have survived.
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Immediately following Maʻafu’s death, a delegation of local chiefs requested the Ocean Queen’s captain to return directly to Levuka to inform the Governor. The captain complied, reaching Levuka at 3 p.m. on 8 February and leaving again at 6.30 p.m. to convey the Native Commissioner, David Wilkinson and the Roko Tui Tailevu, Ratu Epeli Nailatikau, to Lomaloma, where they represented the Governor in paying respects to Maʻafu’s remains. Pending funeral arrangements, Maʻafu’s body was encased in sandalwood chips, which act as a preservative as long as the body is kept above ground. There existed an oral tradition, recorded in the early twentieth century, that the question arose of conveying Maʻafu’s body to Tonga for burial. Had that occurred, most Tongans resident in Vanuaabalavu were supposedly ready to return to Tonga as well. Again, contemporary evidence for this claim is lacking. The Governor, Sir William Des Voeux, wanted the body preserved until a message came from Tupou, although what that message was, if it ever came, is unknown. In any case, according to Buli Mavana from Vanuaabalavu, it was the wish of Elenoa and the chiefs of the island that Maʻafu should be buried in Lakeba, the customary seat of power in Lau. Accordingly, on 19 February Maʻafu’s body was conveyed thence on board the Thistle. “All the leading chiefs in the district and many white residents accompanied the remains”.

There was another oral tradition to the effect that Maʻafu, during a visit to Tonga, bemoaned the fact that he would likely leave his bones in exile. Tungī Halatuituiʻa corrected him: “Not so, if you leave your bones with Tui Nayau, he is one of us”. It would be as Tungī suggested. While preparations were made for the requisite Fijian and Tongan ceremonies attending the interment of a great chief, the Europeans too enacted the rituals of bereavement. Queen Victoria, having been informed of the death, sent the Governor a message asking that her appreciation of Maʻafu’s loyalty and “the services which he has rendered” be conveyed to his widow and relatives. In Tonga, the Premier, Shirley Baker, formally acknowledged on behalf of the King a message of condolence from the British Vice Consul, Henry Symonds. The funeral took place on 17 May 1881, with Des Voeux sailing down to Lakeba from Rotuma on board HMS Miranda. He was unable to attend the ceremony as planned, owing to seasickness and the affects of the heat of Rotuma. Remaining on board ship, Des Voeux sent his ADC, Captain Herbert, to represent him, in company with David Wilkinson and
the Commissioner for Lau, Charles Swayne. During the ceremony, the *Miranda* fired a salute of minute guns, after which Wilkinson, a fluent Fijian speaker, addressed the chiefs and people, before the usual exchange of presents.\textsuperscript{13} With no press reporter in attendance, it appears that no detailed report of the funeral ceremonies has survived.

Following the funeral, Siale`ataongo proceeded to Tonga with a letter from Tui Nayau for the King, who replied,

> I thank you Tuineau, your family and your people for arranging the burial of Ma`afu. Was this not fitting and right, when our people leave here to go to you, or when yours come to us here, that when misfortune occurs you and your people would do the same in similar circumstances? Has this not been the case from time immemorial?\textsuperscript{14}

Tupou had also conveyed to the British Vice Consul in Tonga his appreciation of the “respect” accorded Ma`afu’s remains and the “prompt medical attention” provided on news of his illness, and for furnishing a copy of the official medical report.\textsuperscript{15} In time, Ma`afu would be joined in his final rest by his grandson, Jone Vaubula, son of Siale`ataongo, by his two eventual successors as Tui Lau, Ratu Sir Lala Sukuna and Ratu Sir Kamisese Mara, and by holders of the Tui Nayau title. His tombstone, ordered from Auckland, was erected in 1935 in the presence of Queen Sůlote of Tonga, whose visit to Lakeba coincided with celebrations to mark the centenary of the arrival of the first European missionaries in Fiji.\textsuperscript{16}

Although Tupou had been right to remind Tui Nayau of the long-standing links between Tonga and Lakeba, those links had been under strain long before Ma`afu’s death. With their Tongan Roko no more, the Fijians’ dislike for the Tongans in Vanuabalavu and elsewhere in Lau soon manifested itself. Dr Reginald St Johnston, writing in the early twentieth century, quoted the draft of “a characteristic petition sent in by Fijian natives to the Government after Ma`afu’s death”:

> We want you to understand the true mind of all the towns. Ma`afu we liked, and he liked us. He was strong. We plotted against him, and failed. And Ma`afu is dead. If another Tongan is now to be made Roko, we will succeed to Bau or Cakaudrove. This is our true mind…\textsuperscript{17}
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Tupou intended writing to Des Voeux to request the return to Tonga of all expatriates in Fiji except those holding Government office “or who are married to Fijian women and settled in the Colony”.18 In November, the Governor chartered a vessel to convey to Tonga a group of 54 Tongans “living at Lau for some time past without any visible … means of support”, while any further Tongans found in a similar situation would be liable to be prosecuted for vagrancy.19 Officials in both Levuka and Lomaloma were adamant that the days of Tongan hegemony in Lau were over, as Swayne recorded almost three years after Ma`afu’s death:

It is perfectly well understood by the chiefs of Lau that the day has gone by when Tongans could be fed by daily magiti and encouraged to remain idle … The number of Tongans at Lomaloma has very largely decreased. Those who now remain here have with few exceptions been a long time in … Fiji. A number of them have never seen Tonga. That floating population of idle lazy bullies for which Lau was remarkable some years ago is no longer to be seen nor would they be endured by the people…

Thurston considered these changes “very satisfactory … the bouncing, lazy, bullying Tongan has disappeared from the province”.20 In 1885, none other than Semisi Fifita reappeared in Fiji “to make a list of all the Tongans … who can be got to return to Tonga”. With Fifita intending to meet Tongan taukeis at Lakeba, Swayne, who described Fifita as “an untrustworthy schemer sent to Fiji … to recruit tax payers for the King of Tonga”, was apprehensive “of the Colony losing many useful and loyal Tongan taukeis”. Fifita however informed Swayne that “he had received very few applications to leave Fiji”.21 Swayne’s concern that valuable Tongans were leaving Fiji is a measure of the changes to the Tongan community in Lau during the five years following Ma`afu’s death. By 1887, the acting Colonial Secretary was bemoaning “a great tendency to oust settled Tongan occupation and disallowance of [land] claims”, with resultant “wholesale disturbance of present possession”.22 SM Basil Thomson, at Lomaloma, wrote that the remaining Tongans felt themselves “unfairly treated in respect of lands granted to them by Ma`afu”, which he saw as “an outcome of a general tendency to bully the Tongans, whose prestige has been declining ever since Ma`afu’s death”.23 The wheel seemed to have turned full circle.

Ma`afu’s widow Elenoa Gataialupe remained at Lomaloma for more than four years after his death, on one occasion visiting Mago and staying with the family
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19 Thurston to Chief Secretary, Tonga, 9 Nov 1881, WPHC.
20 Swayne to Col. Sec., Suva, 28 Nov 1883, minute by Thurston, 20 Dec 1883, FC SO 83/3271.
21 Swayne to acting Col. Sec., 1 Apr 1885, Reports on the Province of Lau 1875–1906, FC SO.
22 Basil Thomson to Acting Col. Sec., 24 Mar 1888, minute by J.B. McGregor, 25 Jun 1887, FC SO.
23 Thomson NSM Lomaloma to Col. Sec., 24 May 1886, IC FC SO.
of James Borron, who had purchased the island from the Ryder brothers in 1881.\textsuperscript{24} Elenoa finally sailed to Tonga in June 1885, seeking to visit the grave of her son Siale`ataongo, who had died in Nuku`alofa in May 1883. Although she supposedly intended returning to Fiji, she apparently never did.\textsuperscript{25} While the date of her death seems not to have been recorded in Tonga, there is an oral tradition that she was interred at Lo`amanu burial ground on the island of Falevai, Vava`u.\textsuperscript{26} Siale`ataongo’s voyage to Tonga with Tui Nayau’s letter was unauthorised in that he sailed in the Uulilakeba, which he had requisitioned without its owners’ approval.\textsuperscript{27} After John Thurston observed that “Charley Ma`afu ought to be in gaol”,\textsuperscript{28} Siale was taken into custody when he returned to Fiji with the stolen cutter. Held for several weeks with his family at Draiba, Siale petitioned the Governor for permission to return to Tonga, claiming that the King had appointed him Governor of Vava`u. While David Wilkinson believed that Siale should be allowed to leave and not permitted to return to Fiji for at least two years, the Governor was less charitable: “Let the first opportunity be found for removing this man and his family to Tonga … and let them be forbidden to return here”. Thurston, having arranged for “the transport of the vagrant Tongan at Lomaloma”, agreed with Sir William Des Voeux: “[Siale] is a frightful liar … He will never leave Fiji as long as he can live in it”.\textsuperscript{29}

Having apparently remained in custody at Draiba, Siale wrote again to Des Voeux six months later, seeking permission to return to Lomaloma to visit his mother and collect his father’s property. Permission was denied, with Thurston commenting that this “sudden burst of filial affection” was prompted by Siale’s wish to sell his father’s possessions and to turn his mother out on to the rara.\textsuperscript{30} He was finally deported in July 1882, with a warning not to go ashore en route. He did seek to land at Moala, but was refused. Siale died less than a year later, on 28 May 1883, still aged under 40. Although the cause of death is not stated in the Tongatapu burial register, as was the custom,\textsuperscript{31} we are entitled to speculate that his alcoholism, lasting for many years, might have contributed to his demise. He was interred in Mala`e `Aloa in Kolomotu`a, near his grandfather Aleamotu`a. Although Siale had fathered several children with various women, none was eligible to succeed to the Tongan throne by reason of their illegitimacy. The King accordingly issued a proclamation in November 1885 to the effect that, if
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the line of Tevita `Unga also failed, the throne would pass, on the King’s death, to Tungi Halatuitui’a and his lineal descendants born in wedlock. Through an irony of history, the present King, Tāufa‘āhau Tupou VI, who succeeded in 2012, is, through his mother Queen Halaevalu Mata‘aho, a great-great-grandson of Siale‘ataongo.

Ma‘afu’s death was not unwelcome to Tonga’s Premier, Shirley Baker, who wrote that there would be consequences for the kingdom, since outsiders would no longer be able to use Ma‘afu “for political purposes and as a source of continual discord and annoyance”. Baker had seen Ma‘afu and his Tongan supporters as a potential threat to his plans for the throne to pass to descendants of Tevita `Unga. In Fiji, Sir William Des Voeux rather blandly observed that that the way in which Ma‘afu had performed his duties “has been warmly appreciated by Sir Arthur Gordon and myself”. More importantly, replacing the Roko Tui Lau would be “a matter of extreme difficulty”.

As so often, the most pertinent comment came from Thurston, for so long an unswerving opponent of Ma‘afu. He wrote to Gordon,

> As you know I was never particularly fond – politically speaking of Ma‘afu. I believe he was a very dangerous man – one who had missed his ‘coup’ and yet had come out better than he had any right to expect.

> I believe also … that he authorised – or shut his eyes to great oppression by Tongans in Lau – in fact the Fijian soul in Lau is now lifted up and asserting itself by talk as to the propriety of driving all the Tongans out of the country – This is of course mere ebullition of temper and will come to nothing.

> Still for all this – and for the sake of Tongan affairs I would gladly have seen Ma‘afu holding his place for another ten years. I am very sorry also that the poor fellow should have come – after an active and chief-like career to such a melancholy end…

Whether or not “the Fijian soul in Lau” was indeed “lifted up”, it was in Lau that Ma‘afu’s legacy has inevitably been most profound. Two American anthropologists working in Sawana in 1964/5 found that a Sawanan of that time would “usually admit that although his own ancestor came with Ma‘afu, the ancestor of other Sawanans came to Fiji under different circumstances”. Some other people in the village were suspicious of relatives’ claims that their common ancestor came with Ma‘afu, believing that the ancestor really came

---
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from Tonga at a later time. In Moala, a local man named Semiti, of Tongan descent, claimed to the distinguished anthropologist Marshall Sahlins that he was a direct descendant of Ma`afu. Later, the Tui Moala refuted the claim to Sahlins, referring to Semiti as “a great liar and `very ambitious’”. Many decades after Ma`afu’s death, with Tui Lau no longer within living memory, people still sought to associate themselves with his power and prestige.

The origins of that power and prestige lay in the special status Ma`afu had brought with him from Tonga in 1847. A kinsman of Tui Nayau and cousin of Tupou, Ma`afu was seen as a chief who, in addition to his own rank, shared some of the mana of his cousin. We have seen that Ma`afu was neither an agent for Tupou on a mission to conquer Fiji nor an exile excluded from the prospect of power at home. The treaty between Lakeba and Tonga in 1865, followed four years later by Tupou’s formal cession of power in Fiji to him, served to enhance his status as an envoy and confidant of the King. Tupou’s appointment of Ma`afu as joint governor of the Tongans in Fiji in 1853 revealed a confidence in his younger kinsman which was further articulated in his address to the Tongatapu chiefs at the fono of January 1856 and in his statement in 1875 that it had long been his wish to name Ma`afu as his successor. Ma`afu’s achievements in Lau rested on the foundation of his cousin’s patronage and approval.

Following Ma`afu’s death, Sir William Des Voeux observed that that his “loyalty” was all the more creditable in that with the advent of British power in Fiji, “Ma`afu’s ambition was thwarted just when it was on the point of gaining its object”. The truth was that the loyalty which Des Voeux saw, late in Ma`afu’s life, had come about precisely because of the thwarting of his ambition, which was indeed on the point of being realised. Yet his ambition, great as it was, would have counted for little without his talents for intrigue and statecraft. His intervention in defence of persecuted Christians, such as those in Dama and on Vanuabalavu, became a characteristic modus operandi, an integral part of his strategy to gain the ascendancy, not only in Lau, but in Cakaudrove, Bua and Macuata as well. He was able to present himself as protector of the weaker side in a conflict, intervening with superior military tactics so as to exploit the weakness to his advantage, with the consequence that both victors and vanquished usually came within his control. Another successful tactic, one which attracted contemporary comment, was his use of Tongan teachers throughout much of Fiji as sources of local intelligence and promoters of his cause. Because of his chiefly rank, and his status as Tupou’s envoy, the teachers were bound in custom to perform his bidding. Ma`afu was also adept in

using subordinates to achieve his ends by military means, while often himself remaining absent from the action. The ferocity of the Tongan campaign in Macuata in 1859 was widely condemned, and yet Ma`afu was able to distance himself, literally and metaphorically, far enough to evade undue censure. This policy proved to be an effective insurance in 1862, with the defeat and death of his lieutenant Wainiqolo at the hands of Tui Cakau’s forces at Wairiki, a defeat which was a major setback for Ma`afu’s long-term plans. When Ma`afu, absent in Tonga, claimed that Wainiqolo had acted without his authority, he could not be contradicted.

Much of Ma`afu’s military success arose from the Tongans’ practice of using Fijian allies, often from the last village taken, as frontal assault troops to bear the brunt of the fighting. In a wider context, the tightly-knit Tongans overcame Fijians often divided against themselves and with no tradition of unity of command. Ruthlessness and savagery also played their part, evidenced by the detailed if vague oral tradition of Ma`afu suffocating a number of Fijians in a cave near Lomaloma, an echo of the murders committed in a New Hebrides cave during Ma`afu’s youth.39 Although there is no contemporary reference to Ma`afu’s participation in the battle of Kaba, Berthold Seemann was informed in 1860 that Ma`afu and his countrymen “had prominently distinguished themselves” at Kaba five years earlier.40 While we lack a portrait of Ma`afu as a warrior in the thick of battle, his innovative military strategy, allied with the ferocity, when required, of his warriors, helped to promote his influence throughout eastern and northern Fiji.

When in 1870 Ma`afu reminded an audience of Europeans that “The sea is white with the sails of white men’s vessels”, he was speaking after more than four decades of exposure to European ways. Among all the chiefs of Fiji, Ma`afu best understood European culture and, more significantly, European thought processes. There was no better illustration of this understanding than the social ease apparent when he dined at the Governor’s table in Levuka, where his grace, intelligence, charisma and ease in conversation were often mentioned in the journals of his fellow guests. Although this acculturation process, begun so long before in the missionary school in Nuku`alofa, might have alienated him from Tongan ways, Ma`afu remained all his life a Tongan chief. While he valued his friendship with Europeans such as Robert Swanston and William Beddoes, he was never loath to berate the white community for “their everlasting talk and bluster” or, a theme he often adopted, their discrimination towards Tongans

40 Berthold Seemann, Viti; An Account of a Government Mission to the Vitian or Fijian Islands, London 1862, 244–245.
and Fijians because of the colour of their skins. When he raised the spectre of racism, he stood defiantly with his Fijian hosts, with whom he was often otherwise at odds, against the Europeans.

Ma`afu’s life on the fringes, and later within, a European milieu had predisposed him towards familiarity with the money economy. As John Young has observed, Ma`afu’s fondness for yachts and cutters hastened the end of the drua as a vessel for voyaging within Fiji and between those islands and Tonga. Yet for all his economic savvy, Ma`afu would remain a fellow traveller with the money economy, rather than a full participant. His perennial debts arose partly because of his fondness for European chattels and partly through his need to maintain the style and substance of a chief in an environment very different from those his chiefly forbears had known. For Ma`afu, as a great chief, matters of personal debt and monetary obligations to people outside the Tongan and Fijian hierarchy were beneath his notice. He entered into his various contracts, such as that with Frederick Hedemann for the rifles and ammunition, with no intention of honouring them. During his final years as Roko Tui Lau, many bulis deposited money with the Commissioner for Lau, Charles Swayne, for safekeeping, rather than entrusting it to the Roko. Ma`afu’s attitude to money was nicely stated, only three days after his death, by trader Christian Hennings in a letter to his brother William: “Ma`afu. I’m afraid there will be some difficulty about collecting his account”. Things had ever been thus.

Much of Ma`afu’s familiarity with European ways arose from his lifelong contact with missionaries. After his death, the Wesleyan missionaries in Lau praised their former chief: “He was always the friend of the missionary, and a liberal supporter of our church. We never asked him a favour which he did not cheerfully grant”. As we have seen, there is ample evidence from Lakeba and Vanuabalavu, during the second half of Ma`afu’s adult life, to show that this was indeed the case. Yet Ma`afu’s support for the mission and its cause poses a dilemma: did he, a baptised but apathetic Christian, possess a genuine wish to see the Christian ethic prevail among his people, or was he seeking to exploit the mission’s great influence over both the Fijians and Tongans in Lau as a means to sustain his own power? By the 1860s, missionary teachings had come to permeate all aspects of Lauan life and were to be enshrined in the law of the land under British rule. With missionary support, Ma`afu was able to use the Wesleyan church to effect a greater measure of social control over his people.

43 Christian Hennings to William Hennings, 9 Feb 1881, HP.
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

When he set a chiefly example through the generosity of his donations to the mission, he was helping to ensure that the Lauan people continued to render allegiance unto Caesar as well as unto God.

Ma`afu’s chief legacy to Lau was his land reforms, which bore fruit in the division of lands. They were never without controversy: as Roko Malani on Lakeba, speaking in the early twentieth century of the “notorious” disputes involving land on that island, recalled:

in the time of Ma`afu, before the days of the matanitu, it was not always so. When Ma`afu first ruled here there arose the origin of much land-quarrelling, and the Tongans always secured the best pieces … before that, in the times of Tui Nayau there were no incessant squabbles as to land.45

Ma`afu’s division of lands into magimagi and their careful allocation to men who could work them productively was done to ensure a regular income, in produce and cash, for himself and his administration, in place of traditional forms of tribute owing to a chief. In this way, the usages and benefits of a European money economy were grafted on to custom. The tenant, whether Tongan or Fijian, enjoyed greater security than under the customary system, so long as he continued to pay his taxes. Yet disputes arose, both during his rule and after his death, precisely because his division of lands involved the cessation of taukei rights. The lands involved, whether held as magimagi by Tongans or Fijians, or as leasehold by Europeans, denied customary rights to the mataqali. The European concept that land was vested in the Crown, which in the Lauan context effectively meant Ma`afu himself, was one which he was astute enough to realise would suit his purposes very well. Even though Ma`afu’s right to dispose of Lauan lands was always acknowledged, his innovations inevitably resulted in mataqali disaffection. Yet his wishes remained the final arbiter for disputes after his death: when, for example, the Lands Claims Commission disallowed a settler’s claim for the island of Munia in the Vanuabalavu lagoon, they did so on three grounds: the taukeis had not been consulted and were removed by force, the title of the first European “owner”, George Matthew Henry, was found to be “fraudulent and fictitious” and above all, “the acquiescence of Ma`afu in the claim was obtained by gross intimidation”.46 Residual Tongan claims survived, despite the departure of so many Tongans from Lau during the 1880s, until their formal recognition in 1939 by Ma`afu’s successor as Tui Lau, Ratu Sir Lala Sukuna, who was then also Commissioner for Lau. As an earlier Lau Provincial
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Council had resolved, at a meeting on Matuku in 1902, “It will be remembered that Ma`afu made a distribution of the land in Lau and it is a tribute to his ability how his work has stood the test of time among a conquered people”.47

Ma`afu, of course, moved on a bigger stage than Lau, a stage where his talent for statecraft would enjoy a freer rein. His creation of the Tovata ko Lau, a step along the road to Bau, was an attempt to create a second locus of power in Fiji, one which rested on a firmer foundation than did Cakobau’s precarious ascendancy. The Tovata’s intended metamorphosis into a matanitu encompassing all of Fiji was thwarted by the European settlers and their creation of the Kingdom of Fiji. As Viceroy of that dubious realm, Ma`afu claimed, often through his superb oratory, to be a loyal supporter of his nominal master, King Cakobau. Yet he was, in the words of John Thurston, “playing a double game all round”. When, in the face of an overweening ambition recognised by most of his contemporaries, he eventually agreed to Cession, he was making a virtue of necessity. Accused, with reason, of being “a renegade to his sworn fealty” and of displaying moral perfidy, Ma`afu had sought to use his vice-regal position as yet another buttress for his ambition to become “chief at Bau”. In a career marked by much disappointment and frustration, Ma`afu, in his angst-ridden submission to the inevitability of Cession, underwent the most severe humiliation of his life. As he observed to Commodore Goodenough, with uncharacteristic frankness, he could overcome Cakobau with ease, if the British did not interfere. When that interference came, Ma`afu’s chance to attain the mastery of Fiji was gone forever. He had to be content with the mastery of Lau, where the modern Lauan state, indisputably his creation, and despite the survival of some traditional links between Vanuabalavu and Cakaudrove, has lasted into the twenty-first century.48

The final stage of Ma`afu’s career, the bitter fruit of his humiliation at Bau, came with his appointment as Roko Tui Lau. Compensations for that humiliation included his inflated salary and his apparently free hand to manage the internal affairs of his matanitu. His administration effectively proscribed the place of lesser chiefs in the new province of Lau, in a sense reinventing chieftaincy by setting limits to its authority and curtailing the chiefs’ use of force. Ma`afu also used his authority to ensure the succession of his own men as bulis and turaga ni koro. His successful introduction of European methods of land management and tax collection resulted in better protection for his people, Tongan and Fijian, from settler exploitation, a protection that enabled him to exploit them in his own way. His practice of resuming land titles in default of rent or tribute, as well as his system of leasehold, caused much hardship for the taukeis. That

48 According to the TR, Lakeba yavusa, all of Lau became subservient to Tui Nayau after Ma`afu’s death, except for Vanuabalavu and Moala, although both those islands remained part of Lau.
hardship, the darker side of Ma`afu’s rule as Roko Tui Lau, was not reflected in his participation in the annual Bosevakaturaga. There, despite the power of his oratory, Ma`afu’s reticence and lack of frankness amounted at times to dissimulation and outright deception.

As he so often did in his public life, Ma`afu played to his audience at the Bosevakaturaga. To read the published accounts of his speeches, to observe, often between the lines, his manoeuvrings, his silences and his absences is to see nothing, but to suspect much, of the rotten state of Lau, where the double burden of onerous taxation and grasping Tongans ground down the taukeis. As he had always been in dealing with his European contemporaries, so he proved himself to be in his relations with his fellow chiefs: untrustworthy. Ma`afu’s charisma, his mien as “every inch a chief”, characteristics noticed by many almost to the end of his life, could not prevent his downward slide into alcoholism. Just as he circumscribed the powers of the lesser chiefs of Lau, so was the Roko Tui Lau restricted by the tightening rein of colonial bureaucracy. His unilateral action in freeing the prisoner at Lomaloma was a doomed attempt to break free, to reassert the chiefly privileges in which he had been nurtured. The inevitable ignominy of a fine in the Levuka magistrate’s court was but another humiliation.

Ma`afu’s life was, in many respects, the story of what might have been. Following the death of Tupou’s son Vuna in January 1862, Ma`afu appeared as the most likely successor to Tupou. The King had publicly expressed his confidence in his kinsman six years earlier at the fono of Tongatapu chiefs held following his long visit to Fiji. By 1862 Ma`afu, through his achievement of power in Fiji, had evinced sufficient statecraft and chiefly wisdom to be considered worthy to become Tu`i Kānokupolu in the fullness of time. His position as second in order of preference at the Tongan Parliament held a few months after Vuna’s death, second only to the august Tungī Halatuitui`a and two places in front of Tevita `Unga, reinforces the impression that if Tupou had then chosen a successor, it was likely to have been Ma`afu. The King said, in 1875, that had established Tongan custom not been supplanted by the European notion of primogeniture, Ma`afu would have been his choice to succeed him as King. Yet Ma`afu claimed not to want the throne, even stating to missionary James Calvert that he would much rather live in Fiji than in Tonga. For lack of evidence, his attitude to the apparent plot by the chiefs of Vava`u in 1877 remains unknown. The opportunity never arose, of course, because of Ma`afu’s early death and Tupou’s extraordinary longevity. There seems little doubt though, that had Tupou died in the early 1860s, following Vuna’s passing and before Shirley Baker could establish his dubious ascendancy, Ma`afu would have been chosen as Tu`i Kānokupolu and King of Tonga.
One key to Ma`afu’s career in Fiji lies in the fact that he was “a chief by ascription [and] also ... a big man by achievement”. While the first of these characteristics ensured his welcome at Lakeba in 1847 and indeed his future status as Viceroy and Roko Tui Lau, it was his achievements, above all else, which ensured for him a basis of power which could not be gainsaid. He was an opportunist, ever alert to the main chance, always willing, however reluctantly, to concede power when there was no alternative and nothing loath to demand concessions when they lay within his grasp. Ma`afu’s genius lay not in making war, but in statecraft. He successfully exploited his chiefly status and his profession of Christianity to attain a position which would have indeed seen him become “chief at Bau”, had not his rise to power in Fiji confronted the insurmountable barrier of European expansion. Yet for all his charisma, his chiefly presence, his undoubted intelligence, his skilful administrative abilities and, when he chose to exercise it, his immense personal charm, Ma`afu was a man essentially devoid of moral probity. He remained a great chief intent on playing those most fundamental of political games, such as he had known from his childhood: the acquisition and consolidation of power. To visit his grave on Lakeba, as I did in the company of his great-great-great-grandson, is to risk being lulled into a belief that all was well with this great chief, and his people. The peace of the remote Lauan island, and of the graveyard, tabu to all except chiefs and those who have gained their leave to visit, belies the turbulence, the anguish and indeed the triumphs of the extraordinary life of the first Tui Lau. Ma`afu achieved much, and might have achieved more, had he not faced the twin obstacles of an unfavourable moment in history and his own moral shortcomings. Because of the milieu in which he lived, and his own calculated reticence and reserve, we can only rarely see inside his mind. Yet he lives on, often in myth, in the minds of the Tongan and Fijian people, a chief unique in the history of the Pacific, a man who, for all that he was “a big man by achievement”, was never able to drape across his powerful shoulders that most desirable, and most elusive, of all garments that chiefs aspire to wear: the cloak of greatness.

---

Appendix A: Instrument signed by Ma`afu at Levuka, 14 December 1859

Know all men by these presents:

1. That I, Ma`afu, a chief of and in Tonga, do hereby expressly and definitely state that I am in Fiji by orders of George, King of Tonga, as his representative, and that I am here solely to manage and control the Tonguese in Fiji.

2. That I have, hold, exercise, and enjoy no position nor claim as a chief of or in Fiji.

3. That all Tonguese claims in or to Fiji are hereby renounced.

4. That no Tonguese in Fiji shall exact or demand anything whatever from any Fijian under any circumstances whatever, but they shall enjoy the privileges and rights accorded to other nations in Fiji.

5. That the lands and districts of Fiji which have been offered by various chiefs to me are not accepted and are not mine, nor are they Tonguese but wholly and solely Fijian.

6. That the cession of Fiji to England is hereby acknowledged.

In witness whereof I have hereto set my name, this fourteenth day of December, 1859.

Ma`afu

Appendix B: Précis of an agreement signed between George Tupou I, King of Tonga, and William Pritchard, HBM Consul to Fiji and Tonga, Nuku'alofa, 5 May 1862

1. Wainiqolo and Vatanitawaki are to be removed from Fiji and brought to Tonga.
2. Tongans in Fiji are not permitted forcefully to deprive Fijians of their property.
3. Tongans in Fiji are not to interfere in trading between Fijians and foreigners.
4. Tongans in Fiji are not to interfere in the sale of lands by Fijians to foreigners.
5. The forthcoming Tongan parliament will consider measures “to check the arrogance and bad conduct of the Tonguese in Fiji”. Any Tongans in Fiji who failed to comply are to be considered subject to Fijian law and “at the suit of the Consul”.
6. Parliament is to appoint a chief to proceed to Fiji to implement the above measures.
7. The Tongans are not to commence any war against Fijians until the decision of Queen Victoria concerning cession becomes known.

Source: GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga, Miscellaneous Papers.
Appendix C: Constitution of the Tovata Ko Natokalau Kei Viti, 13 February 1867

We, Tui Cakau, Tui Bua, and Ma’aifu, chieftains of Fiji ruling Thakaundrove, Bua and Lau in order to secure tranquillity to, and to promote the general welfare of our peoples, and to provide for the common defence, do bind ourselves mutually and severally to maintain to the utmost of our ability, this Constitution, which Constitution is hereby established this 13th day of February, 1867, under the title of the Tovata Ko Natokalau Ko Viti.

1. All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a General Assembly of the Chieftains, the consenting parties to this Constitution.

2. The General Assembly shall meet at least once a year, the time and place of said meetings to be fixed by the Assembly.

3. The executive powers shall be vested in a Chieftain Supreme who shall be one of, and shall be elected by, the General Assembly over which he shall preside, and which shall define his term of office; the Assembly shall also nominate one of its members as deputy to the Chieftain Supreme, which deputy shall be elected annually.

4. The Chieftain Supreme shall be Commander-in-chief of all the forces of the Confederation, and shall have the right to appoint his ministers and all civil and military officers necessary for the properly conducting the affairs of the Confederation.

5. In the case of death or inability of the Chieftain Supreme, it shall be the duty of the Deputy to act as head of the executive until the next meeting of the General Assembly, which meeting shall be called within two months of said decease or inability of the Chief Supreme occurring.

6. The salary of the Chief Supreme shall be 1,000 dollars per annum.

7. There shall be two Secretaries to the Confederation, who shall act as advisers and aiders to the Chieftain Supreme in all matters connected with the carrying out of this Constitution.

8. The supreme judicial powers shall be vested in the General Assembly, to which a right of appeal in all civil cases arising within the limits of this Confederation shall exist and the decision of which Assembly on such appeals shall be final. Criminal cases shall be finally adjudicated in the district where the crime shall have been committed.
9. The General Assembly shall have the power to fix the rate of, and to collect all such taxes, duties and imposts as may be deemed necessary, and otherwise to provide for the expenses of the General Government and to control the same, to pay the debts and secure the welfare of each Chiefdom as well as of the Confederation. To borrow money, to regulate commerce among the several Chiefdoms, to declare war, to make rules for regulating the forces of the Confederation, and to make all laws that shall be required for the furtherance of the objects of the Confederation.

10. The General Assembly shall have the right to investigate and bring under enquiry the official conduct of any individual Chieftain and to legislate in the matter.

11. The General Assembly shall decide upon the terms and conditions of admission to the Confederation of any independent Chiefdom hereafter applying for such admission.

12. The General Assembly shall guarantee to each and every Chiefdom the full liberty to regulate its own internal affairs, but without prejudice to the general interests of the Confederation, and shall protect each of them against invasion, and, on application from the Local Executive, from domestic violence and anarchy.

13. The General Assembly shall have the power to ratify or to disallow the appointment, and succession of a Chieftain who shall be nominated to the place of one deceased or removed.

14. No Chiefdom, being one of this Confederation, shall enter into any Treaty or Alliance with any foreign Powers, nor shall be permitted to withdraw from the Confederation, nor to contract any debt or debts that shall singly or jointly exceed 2500 dollars, without the consent of the General Assembly.

15. All aliens may hold real estate, and dispose of the same by will or otherwise as freely as though they were born or naturalized citizens or subjects of the Confederation.

16. No person shall ever, save in the case of order, be molested on account of his religious opinions, or of his mode of worship.

17. Additions to, alterations and amendments of, this Constitution, or of any clause thereof, may be made by a majority of the votes of the General Assembly being favourable thereto.

Appendix D: Resolutions relating to Fiji passed by the Tongan general Parliament, June 1868

I. The Government agrees to pay the sum of $6,000 (six thousand dollars), $2,000 in Tonga, $2,000 in Ha`apai and $2,000 in Vava`u, to complete the purchase of the schooner “Caroline”. And it is further agreed that the payment of this sum shall be completed before the end of July, 1869.

II. The Tongan flag which was hoisted at Lakemba without permission from this Government to be hoisted down immediately on the arrival of Ma`afu in Fiji.

III. The cession of their lands and people which the chiefs of Bua desired to make to this Government, and also their request to be allowed to hoist the Tongan flag in their territories is declined by this Government.

IV. Further, it is the desire of this Assembly and their command to Ma`afu that he shall not involve this Government in Fijian affairs; but should Ma`afu desire to enter into treaty with any of the ruling chiefs of Fiji for the purpose of their forming on conjunction with him a distinct Confederation, then, providing he first send to the Government of Tonga the written particulars of the Treaty into which they have entered, and the Constitution which they have agreed upon as the basis of their Union, and also the name of the Chief they have selected to act as head of the said Confederation, then should it appear from such documents that the union contemplated will be for the benefit of the people dwelling in the Tongan possessions in Fiji, and for the benefit of the Chiefs and people of the lands proposing to Confederate, the Tongan Government will recognize the same, and will give over the Tongan lands and people in Fiji to become part of the possessions of the said Confederation.

V. And it is lawful for Ma`afu to set and establish any laws and regulations which he may know to be for the good of the Fijian possessions of Tonga, even though such laws may not agree in all things with the laws of the Government of Tonga.

VI. Should there be portions of land in the Fijian possessions of the Tongan Government which the people are not able to cultivate, Ma`afu is at liberty to sell premises from the same to any foreigners wishing to obtain such from the Government. But in the case of an entire island, or a large district, he shall first report such intended sale of land to this Government for their approval.
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

I hereby certify that the within is a true copy of the Resolutions passed at this parliament and that I have truly translated the same from a copy of the document handed to Ma`afu and signed by His Majesty King George.

(SGD) TUBOU HAABAI

Secretary, Tongan Government

Tonga,

28th June, 1868.

True copy.

(SGD) ROBERT S. SWANSTON

Source: Robert Swanston to John Thurston, 8 August 1868, Enc. A, GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga Papers.
Appendix E: Law relating to Governors [Tonga 1868]

Clause 4:

And it shall not be lawful for any Governor or any other Chief, holding office under the Government of Tonga, to contract debts on account of the said Government unless permission be first obtained from the King and Government.

And should any party act contrary to this clause, it shall be with him and the people over whom he rules to pay the said debt, but in no case will this Government interfere or pay any portion of the said debt.

Passed in Tongan Parliament, 24th June, 1868.

(SGD) TUBOU HAAPAI,

Secretary

True copy,

(SGD) ROBERT S. SWANSTON

Source: Robert Swanston to John Thurston, 8 Aug 1868, GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga, Papers.
Appendix F: Statement by George Tupou I, King of Tonga, Nuku`alofa, 3 February 1869

Know all men by these presents that I, George Tubou, King of the Friendly Islands, being at present possessed of certain islands, and lands in Fiji, the principal of which are Vanua Balavu with its neighbouring islands, and Moala, and Matuku, and whereas it has been shown to me that it is for the true interests of my Government and people and also for the true interests of the Chiefs and people of the Eastern parts of Fiji, that I should alienate from myself and the Tongan government my said Fijian possessions, in order that the Chiefs and rulers of the neighbouring parts of Fiji may establish among themselves Fijian Confederation, which shall be for the mutual good of themselves and people.

Now be it therefore known to all men by these presents that I have this day with the full consent of all my Chiefs in Parliament assembled, given, presented, and made over to Henry Ma`afu, the late Governor of the Tongan possessions in Fiji, all the aforesaid lands and dominions now owned by Ma`afu and the Tongan Government in Fiji (save and except the island of Rabi which is at present offered for sale in Sydney) for his sole use and benefit, and for the benefit of his heirs and successors forever, in order that he may, should he so choose, become one of the beforementioned chiefs of Fiji.

And further know all men that this act is done by me and the Chiefs of the Government of Tonga in good faith, and for the purpose of benefiting Fiji, and releasing the Tongan Government from a source of embarrassment and difficulty, and that from this day forth the Tongan flag is withdrawn from Ma`afu and from all lands in Fiji, where heretofore it has been hoisted.

And I hereby declare that I have this day granted to the said Henry Ma`afu all my interest and authority, and all the interest and powers of the Tongan Government in the lands and people of the heretofore named dominions of Tonga in Fiji.

And in witness of the foregoing Cession and transfers, I have hereunto set my hand and the Seal of my Government at Nuku`alofa, Tongatapu, on this third day of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine (1869).

(sgd) George Tubou (sgd) Tubou Ha`apai, Secretary Tongan Government

Source: Robert Swanston to John Thurston, 25 Feb 1869, enc., GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga, Papers.
We, the Chiefs of Lau, are agreed to carry out all matters contained herein for the formation of a government of Lau.

1. The islands of the Province of Lau which formerly belonged to Tonga, and which now belong to Ma`afu, having been given to him by Tumbou, King of Tonga, and by authority from Tonga, together with the islands now controlled by Tuinayau will form one government and will be called the Chiefdom of Lau.

2. Ma`afu will be head of the Chiefdom of Lau, and will be known by the title of Tui Lau.

3. Vanua Mbalavu, and the islands near the reef, namely Tuvutha, Moala, Matuku and Totoya will pay taxes to Ma`afu which will become his own property to do with as he pleases.

4. The islands of Lau which are under the rule of Tuinayau will pay taxes to him which will become his own property to do with as he pleases.

5. From the taxes which he collects every year Tuinayau will pay to Tui Lau a tribute of 10 tons of produce from the sea. The first payment will be 5 tons, and will be paid up to the year 1870, and thereafter the annual tribute will be 10 tons.

6. Each year there will be a meeting of the Chiefs of Lau under the Chairmanship of the Tui Lau wherein laws will be enacted for the Confederacy. The chiefs of Lakemba will be responsible for the proper control of communal affairs in their provinces and villages.

7. A flag of the Confederacy will be made according to the design shown below.

8. This agreement will only apply to Enele Ma`afu.

9. This agreement will revoke the previous agreement which we entered into with Ma`afu.

Dated this 15th day of February 1869 at Vatuwanga, Lakemba, Lau.

Sgd.     Ma`afu Tui Lau

Tuinayau

Tevita Uluilakeba        Robert S. Swanston
Ma’afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

Koroi Vuke  his X mark  Louis Bigansole
Leonitasi  his X mark Isaac Rooney
Joni Wesele  his X mark
Tui Tumbou  his X mark
Vakavanua  his X mark
S. Sokotukioci  his X mark
Ilaitia  his X mark

Appendix H: Constitution of Tonga
1875: Paragraph 35

The Crown and Throne of this Kingdom is possessed by His Majesty, King George Tubou; and it is hereby confirmed that it shall be possessed by him, and to him who was begotten by him David Uga, and to him who was begotten by him Wellington Gu, and to them who shall be begotten by him in marriage; and if there shall be no heirs by marriage of Wellington Gu it shall descend according to the law of descent: – It is lawful only for those born in marriage to succeed. The succession shall be to the senior male child, and the heirs of his body: but if he should have no descendants, to the second male child and the heirs of his body, and so on until all the male line shall be ended. Should there be no male child it shall descend to the second female child and the heirs of her body until the female line is ended. And if there should be none of this line, lawful descendants, by marriage to succeed to the Crown of the King of Tonga, it shall descend to Henry Ma`afu and his lawful heirs, those that shall be begotten from his body by marriage, and to their heirs that shall be begotten by them: and if there shall be no lawful heir the King shall appoint his heir if the House of Nobles are agreeable to it. (The representatives of the people have no voice in the same)…..

Appendix I: Some Tongan descendants of Ma`afu and Elenoa Ngataialupe

Ma`afu and Elenoa had three sons: Siale`ataongo, Hopoatefua`atonga and Makakaufaki. Although their order of birth is not certain, they generally appear in the above order in genealogies. Siale`ataongo was the only son to survive childhood. He died in Kolomotu`a, Nuku`alofa on 28 May 1883, aged in his early forties.

Siale`ataongo is known to have had at least six children, whose names are listed below, not necessarily in order of birth. Five of them were apparently born in Tonga, while Jone Faupula was born in Fiji.

Vika Kaufusi (mother: Losaline Fatafehi)
Sione Te`ekosi (mother: Meleni Feuiaki)
Sione Panuve (mother: Mele Tonga)
Mele Vaohoi Kona `i he `ulu `o Aho`eitu (mother: Tupou Moheofo)
Tautua`a (mother, name unknown, from Ha`ano island, Ha`apai)
Jone Faupula (mother: Eka Radinikabara)

Vaohoi married Fotuafalefa Veikune (Hon. Veikune). Their children were:

1. Melenaite Tupou Veiongo (d. young)
2. Josateki Vuna Tu`ioetau
3. `Akanesi Tu`fua Latu Holeva (married Mervyn Stewart Carrick)
4. Sālote Maumautaimi Finau Heuifanga (married Tevita Manuopangai, Hon. `Ahome`e)
5. Samuela Fuatakifolaha
6. Sosefa Latū Lala Manumataongo (Hon. Veikune) (married `Ofa Kaho)
7. Mele Vaohoi (died young)
8. Tupou `Ahome`e Uangafa (died young)

The children and grandchildren of Heuifanga and Hon. `Ahome`e are:

1. Her Majesty Queen Halaevalu Mata`aho (married HM King George Tupou IV)
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1. His late Majesty King George Tupou V
   a. HRH Princess Sālote Pilolevu Tuita
   b. The late Hon. Maʻatu
   c. HM King George Tupou VI

2. Tupou Kolotolu (married Dr Tilitili Puloka)
   a. Sialeʻataongo
   b. Nalesoni Mapa Haʻano
   c. ʻElenoa Gataialupe
   d. Tevita Fatefehi

3. Kaufoʻou (married Holika Naufahu)
   a. Siaosi Tiutiuʻohu
   b. Kolōliana ʻOtūangū
   c. Sone Polo
   d. Penisimani

4. ʻElenoa ʻGataialupe (married Maheʻuliʻuli Tupouniua)
   a. Iesina
   b. Mafikaunanga
   c. Nikoleti Tupoumoheofo
   d. Mahe (Junior)
   e. Sela
   f. Olakaʻaina

5. Kalolaine Taukapa (married Kinikinilau (Hon. Fakafanua)
   a. ʻItafuaʻatonga (died young)
   b. Tuʻutoatasi
   c. Siatukimoana
   d. Kisione
   e. Pōlotu
   f. Paku
   g. Maʻata
   h. Mele
6. Vuna (Hon. `Ahome`e) (married 1st Lavinia Veiongo, 2nd Tu`imala Kaho)
   a. Tu`i`oetau (l)
7. Va`etapu Nopō
8. Manuopangai
9. `Otuangū (died young)
10. Latuniua (married Hon. Tu`a Taumoepeau Tupou)
    a. Kulisi
    b. `Ainise Tupoumoheofo
    c. Masela Tupou`ahome`e

The children of Lala, Hon Veikune (son of Vahoi and Hon. Veikune) and `Ofa Kaho are:

   a. Fuatakifolaha (Hon. Veikune)
   b. Mapafisi`avatonga
   c. Siselo Ma`afu`otu`itonga
   d. Akanesi Tu`ifua
   e. Fotuafalefā
   f. Vesili Siale `Ataongo
   g. Meveni
   h. Lala

The children of `Akanesi Tui`fua Moheofa Holeva and Mervyn Stewart Carrick are:

   a. Joan Ida Halaevalu Moheofa (married John Ramshaw)
   b. Diane Vahoi (married Martin John Daly)

Informants: Hon. Fielakepa, Dr Mapa Puloka, Mrs Jiutiti Vakaloloma `Uluikivaiola, Mrs Diane Daly.
Appendix J: Some Fijian descendants of Ma`afu and Elenoa Gataialupe

Jone Faupula, son of Siale`ataongo, married Eka Radinikabara. Their children and grandchildren were:

1. Siale`ataongo (married Melaia Lalaciwa)
   a. Elenoa Gataialupe
   b. Amelia Tawake
   c. Enele Ma`afu
   d. Basimaca Diuvosavosa

Siale`ataongo had two other children:
   a. Vika Kaufusi (mother Marieta)
   b. Siale`ataongo (mother Lutu Melaia)

2. Takete Hawea (married Taina Wati)
   a. Ane Tupoutoa
   b. Mele Kekekele
   c. Epeli Turaga
   d. Jiojifini Veatoki
   e. Jone Vaupula
   f. Jiutiti Vakaloloma
   g. Amelia Papa
   h. Ugatea Kafaloto
   i. Manutufaga
   j. Kaufusi Takayawa
   k. Siale`ataongo
   l. Eka Velavela

Takete Hawea had one other child:
   Jone Biu (mother: Fifita Sega)

3. Ratu Viliame Mataika (married Adi Mele Usavele)
   a. Hingano
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Ratu Viliame had one other child:

Vava (mother: Adi Liku)

Informant: Mrs Juititi Vakalolma `Uluikivaiola
Appendix K: Ko E Pulupaki

(Ko e tangi `a Elenoa Ngataialupe `ia Siale`ataongo)
Lament by Elenoa Ngataialupe for Siale`ataongo

Ke fanongo mai `a Tonga Lahi
Mo Vava`u pea mo Ha`apai
Ko si`eku talanoa ka fai
Ki he `otu matangi mei Fiji
Kuo ne `omai e pulupaki
`Oku ongo ki hoku `atamai.
Ko e talanoa ni ka fai atu
Ki he nofo fonua `i Tongatapu
`Oku kei sola he vaha palavu
Pea `oku faka`ofa ki a au
`A e tangi `a Anuanu – i – Lau,
Mo e fakatolonga `oku hanu
`Uma`a si`i maumi palavu
Mo e vai ko Tufu – mata – teau
Si`i pulupaki o taimani
Ko e tui `a e fine o taimi
Ko hono lolo ko e na`ati
`Oku `atu mo e fale hōsi
Pea `oku `atu he la afi
Ko e `atu ko e fungani tui
`O e tui mei `Eueiki.
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Ko e pulupaki ni kuo luva
Na`e tui `e he fine `o Leva (Rewa)
Pea lolo ki he ahi `o Pua (Bua)
Pea mo e vai Sagale`ula
Pea `oku `atu he tepa la
`Oku angi e vai liveliva.
Si`i pulupaki `o Vaipulu
Na`e tui `e he fine `o Bau
Na`e fio e Fusikalulu
Pea `oku `atu he tautau
Mo`o fungani e tui `a Vava`u
Ko e pulupaki ni o Kalauta
Ko e tui `a e fefine Levuka
Pea fio `e he Ponesitia
Pea `oku `atu he Paileka
Ke fungani mei Houmatala.
Si`i pulupaki ni `o Siale
Tui `ae fine Takaunove
Ko hono fio e lou lape
Kae lolo ki he sinamone
Pea `oku `atu he mavule
Mo`o fungani e tui `a Hahake
Ko e pulupaki ni `o Sailopa
Na`e tui `e he fefine `o Loma
Pea fio e Tangimausia
`Oku `atu he `u vai Lambasa
Mo`o fungani `o e tui `a Mu`a.
Ko e pulupaki ni `o `Ataongo
Na`e tui `i he `otu Fisi loto
Tapua tamata ko hono fio
`Oku `atu `e he matangi hako
Ke fungani e tui `a Hihifo;
Pea `oku faka`ofa ki a au
Si`i Pulupaki `o Siale Ma`afu
Na`e tui mei Vanua Balavu
Ko e funga Sawana te ne `oatu
Ki he funga – sia `i Tongatapu
Faletuipapai Makahokovalu.
Ko e toki me`a ne faka`ofa
Ko e pulupaki ni kuo hola
Tui `a e asaasa moala
Na`e fio ki he lou mavita
`Oku `atu `i he mali kulala
Mo`o fungani tui he Tukutonga
Ko e pulupaki ni ke `atu a
Ko e tui `a e fuanileva
Na`e fio ki he vunga – kinilā
Kae lolo ki he kaloni mapa
Pea `oku `atu he Fungaloa
Ke fungani e tui `a Houma.
Pulupaki `o Lea- `a e – vai
Tui `a e fine taka – i – Fiji
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Na`e fio e lou molimoli
Mo e lou pua papalangi
Pea `oku `atu he tokavoki
Mo`o fungani e tui `a Ha`apai.
Ko e pulupaki eni `o Tapu
Tui `ae fefine `Otu Lau
Mo hono koloa e salusalu
`Oku `atu `e he Labalavu
Ko e fungani ia `o `Ana efu
Ko e pulupaki ke folava
Ko e tui mei Ra mo Rewa
Ko hono fio e vungasina
Pea `oku `atu he Tangitina
Mo fungani e tui `a Niua.
Tala ki he fefine `o Tongalahi
Mou tui a ko e laloni
Kae tui fungani mei Fiji
Ka angi e tongotongo lalai
Pea ne `oatu hono fungani
`Avea mo hono pulupaki
Ke `ave ki Faletuipapai
`Ene ofo he vatu lingilingi
Mo e vai ko Moana Kauli.

Source: Courtesy of Her Majesty Queen Nanasipau‘u Tuku’aho
Glossary

( F = Fijian; T = Tongan)

balolo (F): a kind of sea-worm, considered a delicacy in Fiji.
buli (F): a salaried Fijian official, the head of a tikina.
bure (F): house.
civitabua (F): a breastplate composed of plates split from the teeth of sperm whales.
cuva (F): to bow the head, or stoop down.
drua (F): a double canoe.
`eiki (T): chief; title holder.
fale (T): house.
Fisi (T): Fiji.
folau (T): trip; journey; fleet of canoes.
fono (T): gathering of chiefs and orators.
ha`a (T): of the status or lineage of.
hau (T): conqueror; champion; most powerful chief.
i tokatoka (F): The extended family group, a subdivision of a mataqali.
kerekere (F): The practice of borrowing amongst kin, at the will of the borrower.
lala (F): the order of a chief, requiring work to be done.
loloma (F): love
lotu (F): (noun) Christianity; (verb) to convert to Christianity.
magiti (F): food, esp. food prepared in large quantities for presentation to others;
a feast presented to others.
matanitu (F): a chiefdom; a political federation of vanua.
matapule (T): orator; ceremonial attendant of a chief.
mataqali: (F): A division of the yavusa, a “clan”; the main land-owning group.
meke (F): a Fijian dance.
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*rara* (F): The central green of a Fijian village.

*sorevu* (F): a large gathering of people for the ceremonial exchange of food, with feasting on *magiti*; feasting generally.

*soro* (F): an offering; atonement; something offered to obtain pardon.

*sorovaka* (F): to present an offering to a chief in order to obtain a person’s life.

*tabilai* (F): a type of canoe end, or prow.

*tabu* (F): forbidden; sacred.

*tapu* (T): forbidden; sacred.

*taukei* (F): landowners.

*tikina* (F): a district or subdivision of a province.

*tu’a* (T): untitled man; commoner.

*turaga-ni-koro* (F): The administrative head of a village.

*vaka vanua* (F): “The way of the land”; according to Fijian custom.

*vakarorongo* (F): (noun): respect, reverence; (verb): to show respect, to revere; (adj): respectful, polite.

*valu* (F): war

*vanua* (F): land; a *yavusa* under a strong chief.

*vasu* (F): a man’s sister’s son, who has a right to take goods belonging to his mother’s brothers.

*Viti* (F): Fiji.

*vono* (F): a meeting of people of a village, to hear a report of a meeting with chiefs.

*yaqona* (F): The plant *Piper methysticum* and the drink made from its roots. Also called *kava*.

*yavusa* (F): the largest kinship and social division of Fijian society, consisting of the descendants of one originator.
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Set 24: Chief Secretary’s Office (Ministry of Foreign Relations), OC, general, 4 Sep – 7 Nov 1872.
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Set 34: Ministry of Lands and Works and Naval and Military Affairs, Copies of OC of George Austin Woods, Premier of Fiji, written during his visit to Australia addressed mainly to persons in Australia and Fiji, 5 Sep 1872 – 17 Jan 1873.
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Section 1: Miscellaneous Papers relating mainly to Fiji, 1871–1919.
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The German Land Claims in Fiji: Notes on the Statements and Evidence contained in two Volumes recording the proceedings of the Anglo-German Mixed Commission of 1884–1885.
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Lands Claims Commission 1880–1881: Reports on Claims

R3: Kanacea

R6: Mago

R9: Naitauba

R42: Vatu Vara

R45: Laucala

R118: Katafaga

R456: Bua

R783 and 783A: Nasarawaqa

R788: General report on Dreketi river, Vanua Levu

R822: Doloka, Dreketi river, Vanua Levu

R923: Vurevure, Taveuni

R926/7/8: Vanuabalavu

R929: Lovoni, Ovalau

R930: General report on Lau leases

R931: Raralevu

R932: Nasalia

R933: Dakui – Uruone

R934: Mua Mua

R935: Raradamu, Lau

R936: Na Yaca

R937: Na Vau Vau, Lau

R938: Mavana

R939: Doloca

R940: Buca Levu [Tota], Mavana, Vanuabalavu

R941: Bavatu, Lau
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R942: 2 town plots, Lomaloma
R943: Nabourua, Lomaloma
R944: Lomaloma Hotel
R945: Na Vao, Lomaloma
R946: Vanuabalavu
R948: Kauvula
R950: Navavua, Lomaloma, Vanuabalavu
R952: Na Yanuyanu, Vanuabalavu
R953: Vagariki and Na Rua Rua, Lau
R954/5/6: Navadugu, Nasigani and Navetau, Vanuabalavu
R957: Masomo, Lau
R958: Daliconi, Vanuabalavu
R959: Adavaci Island
R960: Munia
R961: Tabuta, Cicia
R962: Nasorio, Cicia
R963: Lomaji and Mata-ni-Siga, Cicia
R964: Tokalau, Cicia
R965: Sini Alewa, Cicia
R971: Nai Vaka, Totoya
R972: Matuku
R973: Yagasa Islands near Vulaga
R973A: Uruone, Vanuabalavu
R1065: Nanuya Lailai, Yasawas

Lau Provincial Council Meeting and Resolutions 1893–1908, NAF.
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Minutes of the Executive Council Sitting for the rehearing of claims to land, under the provisions of Ordinance XXV of 1879, entitled “An Ordinance to Provide for the Final Settlement of certain claims to Land”, 1881, NAF.

Monthly and Quarterly Reports on Lau Islands 1875–1882, NAF.

Native Lands Commission: Towards a report on the proceedings of the Native Lands Commission in the Province of Lau, 1913, NAF.

Official Correspondence: Translation of a letter from Commodore Goodenough, R.N., and Mr Consul Layard to the King and Chiefs of Fiji, John B. Thurston, Chief Secretary, 12 January 1874, NAF.

Records of HBM Consul for Fiji and Tonga, 1858–1876:

1. Copies of outwards letters, general:
   (a) 30 Jan 1863 – 30 Dec 1865
   (b) 4 Jan 1866 – 27 Aug 1869
   (c) 11 Mar 1872 – 13 Mar 1874

2. Copies of OC addressed to various Fijian chiefs and to King George of Tonga, 6 Sep 1865 – 27 Mar 1869.

3. Copies of letters addressed to persons other than officials, 15 Mar 1874 – 9 May 1876.

4. Copies of despatches transmitted to the Foreign Office:
   (a) 13 Jul 1872 – 23 Feb 1874
   (b) 15 Mar 1874 – 4 Apr 1876

5. Miscellaneous Papers, 1862–1870.


Report on the Proceedings of the Native Lands Commission in the Lau Province, NAF.

Registrar-General’s Dept: Report on the Census of the population of Fiji 1881, Central Archives of Fiji and the WPHC, 92/165, NLA.
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Tukutuku Raraba, Tikina ko Mualevu, Native Lands Commission, Suva.

**United Kingdom**

**Admiralty**

Adm.1/5606 and 6261: Secretary’s In Letters, 1840–1900: A Selection.


Adm.54/190: HMS *North Star* Ship’s Log 9 Sep 1841 – 10 Oct 1850.

**Colonial Office**

CO 83/1: Fiji: Correspondence, Original: Col. Smythe’s missing Despatches, Offices and Individuals 1860–63.

CO 83/4: Correspondence Original, 1873.

CO 83/5: Correspondence Original, Offices, Individuals 1874 Oct – Dec.

CO 83/7: Correspondence Original 1875 Nov – Dec Despatches.

CO 83/9: Correspondence Original 1876 Jan – Apr Despatches.


CO 83/13: Correspondence Original 1877 Jan – Jun Despatches.

CO 83/14: Correspondence Original 1877 Jul – Dec Despatches.

CO 83/16: Correspondence Original 1878 Jul – Dec Despatches.

CO 83/17: Correspondence Original 1878 Aug – Dec Despatches.

CO 83/19: Correspondence Original 1879 Jan – Sep Despatches.

CO 83/20: Correspondence Original 1879 Oct – Dec Despatches.
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Figure 23. Rev. Lorimer Fison.
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Figure 25. Left to right: unknown, Ma`afu (seated at back); Siale`ataongo; a British sailor; unknown; Ritova; Consul Pritchard aboard HMS Pelorus, in Macuata waters 1862.

Source: State Library of New South Wales
Figure 26. Lomaloma street scene.
Source: State Library of New South Wales

Figure 27. A cotton plantation near Lomaloma.
Source: State Library of New South Wales
Ma’afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

Figure 28. Tui Bua.

Source: State Library of New South Wales
Figure 29. Roko Tui Bua.

Source: State Library of New South Wales
Ma’afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

Figure 30. Robert Swanston.
Source: State Library of New South Wales
Figure 31. Tupou I, Lupepau’u and their son Vuna (composite photograph).

Source: Dr Adrienne Kaeppler, Curator, Tongan Cultural Centre, Nuku’alofa
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

Figure 32. Nuku`aloa 1870s.
Source: The Principal, Tupou College, Tonga

Figure 33. Nuku`aloa, late nineteenth century.
Source: State Library of New South Wales
Figure 34. The Palace, Nuku`alofa, late nineteenth century.

Source: State Library of New South Wales

Figure 35. “Mount Zion”, Sia-ko-Veiongo, Nuku`alofa.

Source: State Library of New South Wales
Ma’afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

Figure 36. Nuku’alofa, late nineteenth century.
Source: State Library of New South Wales

Figure 37. Tupou I.
Source: The Principal, Tupou College, Tonga
Figure 38. Tevita `Unga.
Source: The Principal, Tupou College, Tonga

Figure 39. Wellington Ngū.
Source: The Principal, Tupou College, Tonga
Ma’afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji
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Figure 42. British Commissioner Commodore James Goodenough.

Source: Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Cambridge
Figure 43. British Commissioner Leo Layard.

Source: The Principal, Tupou College, Tonga
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Figure 68. Cakobau.

Source: Alexander Turnbull Library
Figure 69. Ratu Epeli Nailatikau, a son of Cakobau.

Source: Alexander Turnbull Library
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

Figure 70. Ratu Tevita Uluilakeba.
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Figure 74. Vaohoi, a daughter of Siale`ataongo, and her husband Fotu `a falefā (Hon. Veikune).
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Source: Dr Christine Weir
Figure 76. View of Lomaloma, 1994.

Source: Author's photo

Figure 77. Site of Ma’afu’s house, Sawana.

Source: Author’s photo
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji
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Figure 80. Henelē Ma`afu `o Tu`itonga Hiki-mo-falike Puloka, a descendant of Ma`afu.
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complaint against Semisi Fifita, 191
claims French man-of-war about to visit Fiji, 233

British Subjects' Mutual Protection Society, self-appointed opposition to government, 329
'manifesto' sent to CO, 329-330
threat of armed force against government, 338
requests King to annul constitution, 338-339

Britton, Henry, Australian newspaper correspondent,
description of M, 278-279
praises M's management of Lau, 279, 294, 300

Brooks, Rev. Samuel, Wesleyan missionary,
expresses views of planter community, 369

Brower, Dr Isaac Mills, US Vice-Consul in Fiji,
says M sought US recognition as king of Fiji, 162
acknowledges M's power in Lau, 163-164
claims Tupou is partly responsible for...
American ‘debt’, 164
appointed as Vice-Consul, 183
‘probability’ that Tongans will overrun Fiji, 207
claims that Wainiqolo had M’s consent to wage war in 1862, 212
belligerence towards Tupou, 218
encourages Cakobau to organise armed resistance to Tongans, 223
false account of meetings with Jones and Tupou, 231
rapacious attitude towards Tongans, 232
favours British protectorate for Fiji, 269
M ‘a disturbing element’ and a ‘tool of faction’, 292-293
Bulu, Joeli, (c.1810-1877), Tongan teacher arrives in Lakeba (1838), 73
accompanies M to relieve Lomaloma Christians (1854), 131
appeals to Golea to stop fighting (1862), 206
requests M ‘to help in the war’, 207
accompanies M to conference at Wairiki, 219
Burnes, William, Viti Levu planter, murdered with wife and children, 344
Burt, George Rodney, planter in Nadroga, invites M to ‘clear out the mountains and reign there’, 272, 410
instigates meeting of Europeans at Levuka (1871), 305
‘nucleus’ of Cakobau government formed, 305
Burt, Sydney, commercial agent to Cakobau, Chief Secretary of Fiji
sails yacht Xarifa to Fiji and sells it to M, 287-288
Premier of Kingdom of Fiji, 313
Buzacott, Rev. Aaron, (1800-1864), LMS missionary, sees divine judgment of Samuel Henry, 46
Cakobau, Vunivalu of Bau, (c.1815-1883), complains about Lakeban vassals, 71
depends on support of Lauan Tongans, 76
assumes power at Bau, 87
erroneously called King of Fiji, 87
intends to lotu eventually, 87-88, 98
approves conversions on Lakeba, 97
sends gifts to Tui Nayau, 98
foments violence against Bua Christians, 102-103
planned wholesale ‘extirpation’ of Christians, 103-104
aware of menace posed by resident Tongans, 104-105
wants to remove Lakeba Tongans, 105
fears intentions of visiting US warship, 105-106
declares ‘freedom of conscience’ at Bau, 106
remains wary of Mara, 106
urges Moala chiefs to rebel against M, 118
formal installation as Vunivalu, 127
allows resident missionary at Bau, 127
presents Ra Marama to Tupou, 127
decides to lotu, 129-130
receives submission of Rewan chiefs, 142-143
approves mooted cession of Ovalau (1855), 146
acknowledges American ‘debt’ ‘through fear’, 149
sends fleet to relieve Buan villages, 159
asks Tui Bua not to appeal to M for help, 159-160, 165
seeks Tupou’s help against Mara and his Buan allies, 160
again seeks help from Lakeba, 163
under intense pressure over rebellion and ‘debt’, 164
formal offer of cession to Great Britain, 164
prestige weakened by American ‘debt’, 165
visits Bua to pressure ‘heathen’ chiefs, 167
apprehends M’s involvement in Bua and Macuata, 170
appeals to Pritchard to check M’s ‘intrigues’, 175
deprecated cession of Beqa to Tongans, 176-177
enhanced prestige following first cession offer, 181
Tupou ‘dead with crying’ over proposed cession of Fiji, 184
detained as hostage on board Cornélie, 191
refuses to sell Wakaya to Pritchard, 192-193
confirms foreign ownership of lands in Fiji, 198
apprehensive about Tongan intentions, 215
plans for code of laws similar to Tonga’s, 215-216
Ma’afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

tells Tongan Commissioners he desires peace, 227
says Tupou is ‘at rest’, 228
under pressure from many sides, 233
dilemma posed by limits to his power, 233
would never relinquish Lau, 233
refuses to give up land to Tongans, 233-234
proposes joint expedition to Macuata with M, 234
pressed by Europeans to resist Tongans, 236
protests about Tongan occupation of Matuku and Moala, 237
contemplates the chimera of power, 244
first president of the Fijian Confederation (1865), 246
desires to form government like that of Sandwich Is, 251
‘coronation’ at Levuka (1867), 251
chiefs’ oath of allegiance, 252
writes to U.S president, 253
agreement with Polynesian Land Company, 258-259
repudiates P.L.C. agreement under pressure, 259
dreads M’s power, 262-263
invites ‘foreign military settlers’ to Fiji, 271
‘evil will come upon Fiji through ... M’, 293
obtains support from Taveuni planters, 295
support from Nadroga and Rewa chiefs, 302
M’s ‘treachery’, 302
attitude to land alienation, 307
recognises M’s rule in Lau, 311
gives consent to Fiji’s constitution, 313
apparent unity of purpose with M, 313-314
outward trappings of office, 315
oath to respect constitution, 315
seeks to interfere in Bauan dispute, 318-319
formally opens Privy Council, 322-323
signs BSMPS petition, 330
refuses to accept ministers’ resignations, 347
receives Levuka traders’ spokesman, 362
hostile to any intervention by Captain Simpson, 363
formal installation as Tui Viti (1873), 367
resents Goodenough’s attitude, 369-370
misrepresents M’s career in Fiji to Goodenough, 370-371, 372-373
seeks to influence Commissioners against M, 32
desperation to have M removed from Fiji, 378
reluctantly tells M he can remain in Fiji, 383
annoyance with M, 383
formal refusal of Cession, 387
requests Thurston to carry on government, 387
recognises Thurston as head of new government, 391
offer of Cession, 396
fears Fijians’ loss of land and chiefly authority, 396
formally presents Cession letter to Commissioners, 396
reasons for reversing his decision, 397, 398
supposed jealousy of M, 39
offered a yacht if he agrees to Cession, 398
‘Fiji will become like ... drift wood in the sea’, 420
‘The whites ... are mere stalkers on the beach’, 420
M ‘is trying to foment discords’, 420
agreement among chiefs at Nasova meeting, 420-421
anxious about land tenure after Cession, 421-422
submits Deed of Cession to Robinson, 422
accepts gifts from M and Tui Cakau, 425
friendly reception of M and Tui Cakau on board Pearl, 426
presents war club to Robinson at Cession ceremony, 428
‘Sa oti, Ma’afu’, 428
Tui Viti title bestowed at Cession ceremony, 429
reminds chiefs of their subordination to British Crown, 431
returns from visit to Sydney with measles, 438
recovered, 438
formally receives Gordon at Bau, 450
Calvert, Rev. James, (1813-1892), Wesleyan missionary,
urges Tāufaʻāhau to promote Christianity in Fiji, 60
on Tongan menace in Lakeba, 74
believes Tupou seeks to challenge Bau, 75
report’s Tupou’s approaches to Tanoa and
Cakobau, 75–76
aware of Mara’s imminent return to Fiji, 78
entreats Cakobau to end mistreatment of
Christians, 102
solicits Tongan help to defend Bau
Christians, 103
believes all is quiet in Lau and
Cakaudrove, 108
optimistic about peace prospects, 116
preaches at Cakobau’s conversion, 130
accompanies Cakobau and Tupou to Rewa,
143
supportive of Tupou’s mission in Fiji, 145
returns to Fiji and admonishes M, 189–190
on reasons for Cakobau’s detention by
French, 192
skilled diplomacy prevents war (1861), 194
the ‘wild Tongans’ are ‘tamed down’, 195
would blame Pritchard for any ‘war’
(1861), 195
favoured cession of Fiji, 196
believes Tupou ‘covets’ Fiji, 197
Tongans indignant about being ‘shut out’
of Macuata, 204
optimistic about keeping ‘Tongans and
Bau united’, 208
believes Wainiqolo’s death would
‘constrain’ M, 208
apprehensive about Tupou’s plans for
Tongan lands in Fiji, 210
ignorant of M’s plans after Wairiki, 210
‘assumed predominance’ of Tongans in
Fiji, 210
dilemma posed by Tongan presence in
Fiji, 210
renewed war between Ritova and Tui Bua,
211
Tongans ‘cannot look on’ in Fiji, 211
urges M to assure Cakobau of peace, 211
‘one-sided’ nature of Tupou’s letter to
Cakobau, 214
alarm over reinforcements requested by
M, 214
Europeans’ anxiety about Tongan plans in
Fiji, 217
attempts to reconcile M and Golea, 218
believes M satisfied with Waikava
agreement, 220
derides ‘idleness and oppression’ of M
and his people, 222
seeks British protection against Tongans,
224
blames Tongans for failure of agreement
with Consul Owen, 226
utopian vision of resident Tongans, 228
Europeans in Fiji would support Fijians
against Tongans, 228
says Vanuabalavu not rightfully M’s, 229
pleasure at peace agreement between M
and Golea, 230
urges Cakobau to accept Tupou’s proffered
friendship, 236
seeks alliance of matanitu against
Tongans, 244
Carey, Rev. Jesse, (1832–1914), Wesleyan
missionary,
  on outcome of Macuata ‘civil war’, 191
  ‘nasty little breezes’ emanating from M’s
  fleet, 297
Cargill, Rev. David, (1809–1843), Wesleyan
missionary,
  opinion of A, 13
  dependent on Lauan Tongans, 69
despairs of Lakeban Tongans, 70
Carnarvon, Lord, (Henry Howard Molyneux
Herbert, 1831–1890), Secretary of State for
the Colonies 1866–1867, 1874–1878,
favours acceptance of Cession offer, 398
War Office advice that M is ‘anxious for
British rule’, 415
reassures Queen Victoria of M’s
‘concurrence’ after Cession, 432
Chapman, William, commander of HMS Dido,
intervenes against rebellious Viti Levu
settlers, 344
promises to protect M from government, 349
Clark, Bouverie, L.t, commander of HMS Esk,
praises Tongans in Rewa, 248
Clarkson, Howard, Minister of Finance in
Kingdom of Fiji,
attempts to increase taxation revenue, 335
M’s ‘misunderstanding’ over ‘Deposition
of taxes’, 342–343
Cocker, Joshua, (1824–1880), British Vice-
Consul in Tonga,
appointed Vice-Consul, 199
instructed to refer all matters to Consul
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

Pritchard in Fiji, 199
appointment as Vice-Consul confirmed (1864), 231
Cokonauto, Roko Tui Dreketi, paramount chief of Rewa,
death (1851), 108
Collis, William, Wesleyan schoolmaster on Lakeba,
interpreter at cession meeting (1859), 179
Colonial Office, Great Britain,
lack of interest in cession of Fiji, 165-166, 180 n.127
appoints Commission to investigate Pritchard, 203
hearings and findings of Commission, 203-204
remains uninterested in cession (1870), 289
recommends against acceptance of Cession offer, 398
approves 'confidential advance' to M, 437
Commission of Enquiry (1863), Commissioners, 222
meeting with M, 223
visits to Bua, Kadavu, Beqa et al, 223
meet Consul Owen, 224-225
agreement with Owen impossible to enforce, 226
Confederation of 1865, resolutions, 245-246
weaknesses, 246-247
causes of failure, 250, 251
Cook, Captain James, (1728-1779), visit to Tonga (1777), 63
Court of Arbitration (1865), evidence of Vunaabalavu chiefs' submission to M, 131-132
Croker, Walter, RN, (c1784-1840), commander of Favourite,
killed at siege of Pea, 33
Cross, Rev. William, (1797-1842), Wesleyan missionary,
witnesses A's inauguration as TK (1827), 7-8
dependent on Lauan Tongans, 69
Crown Colony of Fiji, structure of government, 449
Cruikshank, James, Taveuni planter, sought settlers' protection from Commodore Stirling, 360
address of grievances to Cakobau, 360
Dama, village in Bua, outbreak of anti-Christian violence, 102-103
Denham, Henry Mangles RN, (1800-1887), commander of HMS Herald,
offered cession of Ovalau, 145-146 convenes conference of Cakobau, Tupou and Ovalau chiefs, 146-147
unable to accept offer of cession, 147
Denison, Sir William, (1804-1871), Governor of New South Wales 1855-1861,
advised that Fijians sought cession to Great Britain, 163
believes French presence in Pacific poses potential danger, 165
Dennison, Samuel, captain of O.C. Raymond, participates in 1842 sandalwood expedition, 38
De Robeck, George, secretary to Sir Hercules Robinson,
describes M's compound, 423-425
Des Voeux, Sir William, (1834-1909), Governor of Fiji,
chairs 1878 Bosevakaturaga as Lieutenant-Governor, 485-486
orders M to appear before Police Magistrate, 488
valued cordial relations with M, 488
temporary departure from Fiji, 488-489
represented by ADC at M's funeral, 506
arranges deportation of Lauan Tongans 'without ...visible means of support', 508
orders Siale ataongo's permanent deportation, 509
faint praise for M after his death, 510
M's ambition thwarted, 511
Donumailulu (Donu), first Moalan Christian, brought lotu to Moala, 115
requests help from Lakeba, 116
'expelled the Society', 123
Drew William, private secretary to Cakobau, persuades George Burt to withdraw petition to M, 272, 410
Drury, Charles, Special Commissioner for Lau, Ratu Tevita's filial relationship to M, 406
puzzled about ultimate fate of Lauan taxes, 410
deprecates Bayley's influence over M, 410
plans to appoint Fijian magistrates in place of Tongans in Lau, 411
raises with M the fate of Beqan labourers, 411
Lau tax collection ‘has gone on smoothly’, 413
expects M, Tui Cakau and Tui Macuata to fight against Bau, 415-416
concerned about hundreds of people ‘held in servitude’ in Lau, 433
Du Bouzet, Josephe, (1805-1867), Governor of Tahiti,
concludes treaty with Tupou I, 135
Dunn, Thomas, American trader on Ovalau,
convenes abortive peace conference at Bau, 143
Efate, New Hebrides,
visited by 1842 sandalwood expedition, 42
Egglestone, Rev. John, (1813-1879), Wesleyan minister,
protests to M about Tongan savagery in Macuata, 171
*eiki*,
definition, 4
Emberson, Horace, Vanuabalavu planter,
appointed a magistrate for Lau, 433
asks Layard’s advice about M’s contract with Hedemann, 436
‘death, desolation and woe’ at Lomaloma following measles outbreak, 438-439
shortcomings of tax collection in Lau, 440
satisfied with arrangements for Tongans’ repatriation, 441
orders shrubs and trees from Sydney for Lomaloma botanical gardens, 442
Erromango, New Hebrides,
visited by 1842 sandalwood expedition, 41-42
Erskine, John Elphinstone, (1806-1887), commander of HMS Havannah,
interviews Methuselah Tae (1851), 38-39
interviews two New Hebridean men, 43
informs Tupou that Britain will not protect Tonga, 93
Executive Council, Fiji,
appointed as part of Ad-Interim Government, 399

Fale Fisi,
origins, 3, 64
sacred nature of, in Tongan polity, 64
Fangalua, Pita, Tongan resident of Bau,
says Pritchard encouraged M to enforce Tongan claims in Fiji, 193
Tupou did not approve of war against Bau, 193
Fatafehi, Tu’i Tonga in 17th century, 63
Fifita, Semisi, brother of Lausi’i,
orders seizure of Tongan canoe 105
leaves Lakeba for Tonga, 107
second in command to Wainiqolo in Macuata, 171
responsible for floggings in Yasawas, 191-192
attempted to force Yasawas’ cession to Tonga, 191
‘trial’ on board French corvette, 192
taken to New Caledonia as a prisoner, 192
prays with M at Fawn Harbour, 216
arranges repatriation of Tongans from Fiji (1885), 508
‘an untrustworthy schemer sent ...to recruit tax payers for [Tupou]’, 508
few Tongans wished to leave with Fifita, 508

*Fiji Argus*, newspaper,
M is ‘perfectly effete’, 416
attributes benign intent to M, 421

*Fiji Gazette*, newspaper,
government has ‘cleared all misunderstandings’ with M, 351
claims M did not secede, 353, 354
‘utopia of rampant Anglo-Saxons’, 368
favours Cession, 392

*Fiji Times*, newspaper,
endorses M’s administration of Lau, 300
on M’s ‘armed neutrality’, 303
necessity for ‘some kind of union’ in Fiji, 306
Europeans should pull the strings in any ‘native’ government, 307
praises constitutional model of Lau federation, 310
sees pragmatism behind the Kingdom of Fiji, 314
M and Cakobau support government (1871), 325
presence of Tongan troops in Levuka, 328
settlers favour Cession, 339
queries M’s failure to provide taxes or arms, 345
notion of Anglo-Saxon pre-eminence, 345
‘immense importance’ of M and Tui Cakau
Ma’afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

to Fiji, 345-346
M and Tui Cakau intent on a separate
government, 351
confirms secession of M, 354
‘M is a very ambitious man’, 359
annexation ‘only a matter of time’, 367
detrimental effects of secession of M and
Tui Cakau, 371
Thurston did predict dire consequences
for chiefs after Cession, 385
M’s deposition at Bau, 392
M and Tui Cakau have ‘a mutual
understanding’, 398
‘the long-winded and expensive farce’, 397
war between Cakobau and M ‘out of the
question’, 402
M ‘ready to swoop down on Cakobau’, 402
Thurston’s demand for Lauan taxes
‘preposterous’, 404, 405
Ad-Interim Government should ‘leave M
alone’, 405
Cakobau and Thurston’s hatred for M,
405-406
Government ministers must consider M
’an utter fool’, 407-408
Lau neglected by ‘unscrupulous settler
regime’, 408
M and Tui Cakau have ‘aggressive
movements in contemplation’ 416
‘a flagrant piece of barbarity on the part
of M’, 430-431
‘petty tyranny’ of tax system for Fijian
people, 440
final departure of Tongan ‘predatory
picnic’, 441
M’s ‘delight’ in beautifying Lomaloma,
442
M’s court house and botanical gardens
‘handsome additions’ to village, 465
M ‘somewhat the worse for wear’, 475
Lauan planters ‘among the most wealthy
in the country’, 479
‘system of native taxation is a disgrace’,
482
lala ‘has degenerated into simple
robbery’, 490
Finau ‘Ulukālala Tuapasi, chief of Vava’u, 6
Tupou accuses of deception, 75
Fisi’ihoi, brother of M, 10
Fison, Rev. Lorimer, (1832-1907), Wesleyan
missionary and ethnologist,
predicts Tongan domination of Fiji, 251
on the absurdity of Cakobau as Tui Viti,
274
wants M to head F, 274
‘Cakobau is no more king of Fiji than
I am’, 325
M’s concept of the oath of allegiance,
325-326
Hennings Bros profiteering from copra,
454
M but one of several legitimate successors
in Tonga, 456
Wesleyan Mission’s expertise in fund
raising, 463
accompanies M to deal with Matuku
‘angels’, 466-468
‘angels’ were ‘hopelessly stupid’, 467
praises M’s intervention at Matuku, 468
Fonomanu,
first Tu’i Lakepa, 64
Fordham, John Smith, (1828-1904), Wesleyan
missionary,
mediates between Cakobau and Pritchard,
194
on Tongan ambitions in Fiji, 194-195
disagreement with Pritchard, 195
on continued Tongan menace to Bau, 195
Foreign Office (Great Britain),
preferred a U.S. protectorate over Fiji, 271
recognises need for a decision about Fiji,
289
still uninterested in annexation, 307
accords only de facto recognition to Fijian
government, 325, 329
Fo’ui, Tongatapu,
murders at, 29
Friend, Rev. Percival, Wesleyan missionary
and schoolmaster,
to ‘keep track of M’, 270
disagrees with M over ‘laws of the
Kingdom’, 375
Fremantle, Stephen, (1810-1860), officer at
Royal Navy Australian Squadron,
accuses Commander Boutwell of
extortion, 148
states that British government must
decide on cession of Ovalau, 148-149
urges British annexation of Fiji and
Tonga, 152
gratuitous advice to Tupou, 152
visits Tonga, 157
Gataialupe, Elenoa,
marriage to M (1840), 35
family and ancestry, 35
separated from M, 47-48
adultery with Semisi Banuvi, 100
visit with M to Ratu Golea, 230
‘severe illness’, 368
’a nice fat old lady’, 400
’a very fine old lady’ 478
rift with M, 492
remains in Lomaloma until 1885, 508
departure from Fiji (1885), 509
interment at Falevai, Vava’u, 509
Giblin, John,
apPOINTed as Secretary for Lau against M’s wishes, 341
comPLAINS of tax irregularities in Lau, 347
Goleanavanua, Ratu, (Golea), (d.1879),
Tui Cakau
bent on exterminating Christians at Fawn Harbour, 205
convert to Catholicism, 207
wounded at Wairiki (1862), 208
reconciles with M, 213
sells Vanuabalavu to George Henry, 214, 236
sold lands partly to defy M, 213, 214, 235
mistrust of M, 217
sold two islands ‘for ammunition’, 218
opposes Tongan Commissioners’ agreement with Consul Owen, 226
sells Mago, Kanacea and Kafafaga, 226
defiance of Tongan Commissioners, 227
receives M and Elenoa at home, 230
still exercising arbitrary rule in Vanuabalavu, 236
evidence at Court of Arbitration (1865), 238, 240
acknowledges his father’s gift to M, 238
acquiescence at M’s control of Vanuabalavu, 240, 241
deployes to remove Rabe inhabitants without M’s permission, 275
created Tui Vanua Levu, 290
co-operation with settlers, 295
refuses to recognise Kingdom of Fiji, 314
reluctantly swears ‘allegiance’ to Cakobau, 315
takes oath of office as Privy Councillor,
323-324
secedes from Fiji government, 349
150 Tongan ‘visitors’ at Somosomo, 349
maintained separate identity of Cakaudrove, 351-352
repudiates all connection with ‘Cakobau’s white government’, 352
his goals in seceding, 354
changes mind over secession, 356
signs letter declining Cession, 384
astonished at M’s volte-face, 386
joins M at Lomaloma to await Cession decision, 415
formal meeting with Robinson and Goodenough at Lomaloma, 425
signs Deed of Cession, 426
death (1879) and legacy, 487
Goodenough, James Graham,
(1830–1875), Commander-in-Chief of Royal Navy Australia Station,
appointed as a Commissioner to investigate state of Fiji, 348
on influence brought to bear on M, 355-356
Nasova a ‘test’ of Fijian government’s resolution, 364
impossibility of tax collection, 364
arrival in Fiji, 367-368
represents white interests only, 369
denigrates both Cakobau and the European community, 369
antipathy towards Thurston, 369-370
need to respect ‘rights and powers ... in existence’, 373
sense of confidence and moral rectitude, 374
M ‘a man of the world’, 374
advice to CO that both M and Cakobau support Cession, 376
‘general indebtedness of the country’ a matter of concern, 376
willing to misrepresent Fijian situation to CO, 378
advised chiefs their privileges would be preserved after Cession, 379
asks M why he now favours Cession, 380
personal liking for M, 380
insists that M’s position be respected, 381-382
chiefs ‘spit out their venom’ against M, 382-383
Ma’afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

confrontation with Cakobau at Cession meeting, 383
would not interfere in any Fijian civil war, 385-386
disapproves chiefs’ rejection of Cession, 387
willing to assist M against Bau, 388-389
persuades M to return to Vanuabalavu, 389
opposed to Thurston’s plans for a new government, 390
principal chiefs’ hatred for M, 392
party to M’s plans, 393
supports William Hennings in his riposte to Thurston, 395
attempts to bully Cakobau and leading chiefs, 396
visit to M at Vanuabalavu, 399-401
growing rapport with M, 400-401
enjoys Tongans’ hospitality, 400
Commissioners’ Report, 403-405
fair and objective assessment of M, 403
recommends M continue as Tui Lau, 403
M ‘a Tongan and a stranger’, 403
praises M’s ‘personal government’ in Lau, 404
Report’s recommendations for Fiji after Cession, 418-419
M ‘always truthful and straightforward’, 426

Gordon, Sir Arthur, Baron Stanmore, (1829-1912), first resident Governor of Fiji, M’s interest in a civitabua, 82
arrives in Fiji, 447
determined to preserve Fiji’s existing hierarchy, 448
real aims of Cakobau Government’s taxation policies, 448
takes oath of office at Nasova, 449
entertains M, Tui Bua, von Hügel and Wilkinson to dinner, 449-450
impressed by order and progress of Lomaloma, 453, 469
M not Tupou’s legitimate successor, 456
confusion over M’s renunciation of rights, 457
deplores ‘waste’ of Fiji’s taxation system (1875), 462
new tax system to be community-based, 462-463
partial success of Taxation Ordinance (1876), 463
displeased about ‘copra business’ in Lau, 463
M’s successor should have only half M’s salary, 465-466
impressed by M’s troops, 466
compares Tongan and Fijian yaqona ceremonies, 469
M showing ‘no signs of life’, 474
fears secret timber contract between M and Hennings Bros, 474
arranges to meet M at Bua, 474
Code of Regulations, 474
urges M to meet him before visiting Tonga, 476
values relations with Tupou, 476-477
disquiet in Lomaloma over Siale ataongo’s actions, 479
appointed High Commissioner for the Western Pacific, 482
instructs M to accompany him to Tonga, 482
pleasure in visit to Lomaloma, 483
advocates treaties between Great Britain and Tonga, 483
Fijians’ massive debts to traders ‘evil’, 486
returns home for visit, 488
wants ‘a lasting Treaty of Friendship’ with Tonga, 489
Treaty signed during his visit to Tonga (1879), 490
advises CO that Fiji’s taxation revenue exceeded estimates, 491
rebukes M for public intoxication in Levuka, 492
saddened by M’s conduct, 492
deplored M’s residence with Theodore Wood, 495
wished to learn full history of Rabe, 495-496
wished to thwart German influence in Tonga, 496
final parting from M, 498

Gordon, Lady, née Rachel Shaw-Lefevre, (d. 1912)
favourably impressed by M, 453, 466
also impressed by Lomaloma, 466
Gordon Cumming, Constance, English travel writer and artist, (1837-1924)
Vava’u chiefs ‘plotting against King George’, 477
M ‘splendid ... stalwart and stately’, 478
‘...the Tongans walk ... as if they scorn the ground they tread on’, 478
Grey, Sir George, (1812-1898), Governor of New Zealand 1845-1854,
believes Tongan and Fiji people wish to be under British rule, 82
assures Tupou I of his friendship, 84
Grey, Henry George, 3rd Earl Grey, (1802-1891), Secretary of State for War and the Colonies 1846-1852,
urged to reply to A’s letter of 1844, 83
Hamond, Andrew S., Commander and Senior Officer at the Society Islands,
writes to Aleamotu a, 49
Hape, Tahitian teacher, 5
Harris, Charles Coffin, (1822-1881), Minister for Foreign Affairs of Hawai’i,
suggests M and Cakobau visit Hawai’i, 302
prescient views of Kingdom of Fiji, 315
hau, definition, 1-2
Havea, Jone, Tongan teacher,
arrives at Lakeba (1838), 73
Hazlewood, Rev. David, (1820-1855), Wesleyan missionary,
on Mara’s humiliation at Lakeba (1849), 95
Hedemann, Frederick, German trader in Levuka,
accepts M’s order for rifles and ammunition, 349-350, 414-415
denied access to his warehouse, 361
second agreement with M, 414
refuses to release M from contract, 435-437
threatens legal proceedings against M, 443
summons M, 443
under cross-examination, 444
allowed to become non-suited with costs, 444
Hennings, Christian, German trader,
difficulties collecting M’s debts after his death, 513
Hennings, Frederick (Friedrich Wilhelm), b. 1837
appointed German Consul in Fiji (1869), 270
Hennings, Gustav, German Consul in Fiji,
protects William Hedemann and his clerk, 362
Hennings, Gustav Mara, (b. 1868), grandson of Ratu Mara,
on his grandfather Ratu Mara’s exile in Tonga, 78
inaccurate account of Mara’s exile, 174
Hennings, Adi Mere, daughter of Ratu Mara Kapaiwai and wife of Frederick Hennings,
account of M’s part in Mara’s death, 174
Hennings, William, German trader in Fiji,
advised Great Britain would not accept cession (1862), 203
purchases Mago from Golea (1863), 214
sells Mago to Thomas Ryder (1864), 235
extent of Hennings Bros’ operations on Vanuabalavu, 294
persuades M to accept office as Viceroy, 311
welcomes M’s appointment as Viceroy, 318
appointed Warden of the Eastern Group, 328
authorised to collect all Lauan taxes, 342
to pay salaries of M and Ratu Tevita from tax revenue, 342
attempts to have M’s debts to him settled, 342
all Lauan taxes paid into M’s account at Hennings’ store (1847), 347
caught unawares by M’s secession, 356
co-operates with M in arms procurement, 391
reproves Thurston for his dismissal of M, 394
heavily in debt to Rabone, Feez and Co, 405
reasoned defence of M’s record in government, 408-409
warns M about his ‘wrong-doing to tenants’, 487
Henry, George Matthew, (1817-?),
Tahitian-born settler in Fiji,
‘purchase’ of Adavaci, 183
complaint of assault against M, 189
purchases Vanuabalavu from Golea, 213
purchase of Adavaci (1860), 217
persuades Cakobau to endorse purchase of Vanuabalavu, 228
sells Vanuabalavu to George Winter, 228
evidence at Court of Arbitration (1865), 239
threatened with deportation over attempts to sell Vanuabalavu, 256
renews claim to Vanuabalavu (1875), 462
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

Henry, Samuel Pinder, (1800-1852), Tahitian-born ship's captain, conveys Tahitian teachers to Lakeba, 5 supposed inspiration for M's Christian name, 11 1829 sandalwood expedition to New Hebrides, 37 1842 sandalwood expedition, 37-47 calls at Lakeba, 40-41 arrives at Tanna, 41 bitterly denounced by John Thomas, 45 Hicks Beach, Sir Michael, Bt, (1837-1916), Secretary of State for the Colonies 1878-1880, disapproves Fiji's Native Taxation Scheme, 486 hiki mo e falike, name of M's canoe, 79 presented to Tui Cakau, 78, 79-80 Hill, John, Irish-born Australian businessman, intends to purchase Rabe, 275 completes purchase, 324 Home, Sir (James) Everard, (1798-1853), British naval officer, engages M as pilot, 50 visits Tonga in command of HMS Calliope (1852), 113 writes letter to M, 113 visits Moala, 115 urges Cakobau to lotu, 115-116 finds atmosphere of 'joy' at Viwa, 116 accompanies Calvert to Bua, 116 presides at meeting of Buans chiefs, 116 urges Cakobau to forbid strangulation of widows, 119 Hope, Charles Webley, (1829-1880), captain of HMS Brisk, conveys M and Thurston to Niuafo‘ou, 255 describes M as 'a gentleman', 255 believes Fiji should be two separate kingdoms under Cakobau and M, 256 British annexation 'only a matter of time', 270 impossible to coerce M to support constitution, 341 House of Commons, vote on annexation of Fiji (1872), 330 motion for annexation of Fiji again defeated (1873), 367 House of Lords, queries whether M will be bound by terms of Cession, 413 Hule, fortress on Tongatapu, siege, 19-21 Hunt, Rev. John, (1812-1848), Wesleyan missionary, A's motives in becoming TK, 7-8 alerted by Calvert to Tupou I's ambitions, 75 Ives, William, American trader on Lakeba, abducts two girls from Lakeba, 112 returns to Lakeba with one girl, 116 seeks to recover abducted girl, 122 Jaggar, Rev. Thomas, (1814-1882), Wesleyan missionary, disapproval of Taliai Tupou, 73 Jenkins, Robert, RN, (1825-1894), commander of HMS Miranda, conveys official delegation to Fiji, 203-204 Miranda's tour of Fiji, 204-205 Jones, Henry Mitchell (Michael), VC, (1831-1916), British Consul in Fiji, appointed as Consul (1864), 230 approves Tupou's Tongan code of laws, 231 'no sovereign chief' in Fiji, 231 seeks to recognise Cakobau only among Fijian chiefs, 232 recognises Tonga's inalienable links with Fiji, 233 sees justice in Tongan land claims in Fiji, 234 acquiesces in Tongan control of Matuku and Moala, 234-235 declines to countenance Tongan control of Vanuabalavu, 235 orders Moss to lower Tongan flag at Vanuabalavu, 235 will not approve commercial treaty between Tonga and Great Britain, 235 adjudicates in ownership disputes on Vanuabalavu, 235 convenes Court of Arbitration to resolve Vanuabalavu ownership dispute, 237 judgment that Vanuabalavu was rightfully M's, 240-242 endorses peacemaking by M and Tui Cakau, 243 'instructions' to M, 244-245 convenes meeting of Fijian chiefs, 245-246 arrogant letter to Cakobau, 247 on Tongan rapacity and 'cupidity', 248 aware of realities of power in Fiji, 248
seeks formal statement from Tupou on Tongan land claims in Fiji, 249
admonishes M for his debts, 250
endorses Tovata, 251
Josiah, brother of M, 11
baptism, 57
Josiah Tubou, ‘King’, see Aleamotu’a
Kaba, village in Rewa,
attacked by Bauan forces, 127
unsuccessful Bauan campaign (1854), 129
destruction by Tongan and Bauan forces, 140
consequences of battle, 140-141
Kaloafūtonga,
sister of Ngata and wife of Fatafehi, 63-64
Kamehameha V, (1830-1872), King of Hawai‘i,
invites M and Cakobau to visit Hawai‘i, 302, 317
Katonivere, Macuata chief,
appointed Governor of Macuata, 290
signs Deed of Cession and taken to Nasova, 427
Kaufusi,
paternal grandmother of M, 3
Kimberley, Lord (John Wodehouse),
(1826-1902), Secretary of State for the Colonies 1870-1874, 1880-1882,
favours annexation of Fiji, 348
Kingdom of Fiji,
hardening of Europeans’ racial attitudes, 306, 312-313
constitutional convention meets (1871), 308
chiefs paid salaries to ensure their loyalty, 310-311
inauguration meeting, 311
adhesion of M and Cakobau, 311-312
details of constitution, 312-315
bureaucracy, 321
chieflly discontent with apparatus of government, 332
ministry unable to continue in office, 364
Kuila, Cakaudrove chief, cousin of Raivalita,
wants to kill Golea, 206
ambitious to become Tui Cakau, 206-207
solicits Wainiqolo’s aid against Catholics, 207
invites Wainiqolo, Kuila and Joeli Bulu to meet him, 207
invited instead to meeting with them, 207
Lakeba,
expected attacks from Cakaudrove, 71-72
continuing threat from Bau, 72, 77
reality of Tongan power in, 72
first chapel opens (1838), 73
fortunes of lotu on, 74
traditional links with Tongatapu, 77-78
security dependent on resident Tongans, 95-97
Tongan community ‘a volatile wayward element’, 98
departure of hundreds of Tongans (1851), 107
centre of political and religious influence in eastern Fiji, 133
taxation burdens imposed by M, 272-273
deaths from measles, 439
settlers complain to M about Ratu Tevita, 443
people’s intense suffering from unjust lala, 484
Lala,
chiefs urge its retention under British rule, 451
reasons for planters opposition, 451
source of gross chiefly exploitation in Lau, 454, 484, 486
Land tenure in Fiji,
contrasting Fijian and European concepts, 306-307
proposed Crown Lands Bill intolerable to chiefs, 324-325
land dealt with on makeshift basis, 326-327
provisions in Deed of Cession, 429
Native Affairs Ordinance (1875), 447-448
problems over land ‘sold’ to foreigners, 497
M’s legacy in Lau, 514-515
Lands Claims Commission,
established (1880), 496
M gives evidence, 496
aim to examine all ‘sales’ to foreigners, 497
Langham, Frederick, (1833-1903), Wesleyan missionary at Bau,
claims Cakobau sought French protection, 227
M’s warlike intent, 296
wants Jesse Carey as missionary at Lomaloma, 304
predicts chiefly support for M’s secession, 350-351
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

possibility of M's being taken into custody, 351
reports M has changed his mind over Cession, 375, 377, 393
Thurston's threat to dismiss M, 388-389
seeks to have Cession question re-opened, 391
predicts M's secession and subsequent war, 393

Lasike (Abraham), brother of A, removes A and family to safety (1840), 30
at Lakeba in 1838, 77

Lasike, brother of Tupou Toutai and leader of Tongans on Lakeba,
meets Tāufaʻāhau at Lakeba and convenes vono, 60, 71
first arrival in Fiji (1833), 69
sent as envoy to Somosomo, 71
death (1844), 75

Lau,
Tongan influence in, 62-68
ingo to Tonga, 64
twentieth century links with Tonga, 65-69
economic importance of Tongan community in, 67-68
political situation in 1840s, 70-71
traditional links with Bau and Cakaudrove, 70-72, 134
inclusion of Yasayasa Moala and Vanuabalavu, 134
joins Tovata to form Chiefdom of Lau, 264-265
M installed as Tui Lau, 265
constitution and code of laws, 265
M's leasehold policy in, 265
taxes raised to be M's property, 265
taxation under M's rule, 273
legal opinion of M's land practices, 279-280
under efficient administration (1872), 332
disposal of tax revenue, 347-348
divisions after Cession, 430
hierarchy intact, 430
people exploited in tax collection, 440-441
burden of tax in copra, 453-454
tax assessment for 1876, 462
tax assessment for 1877, 473
maladministration of justice under M's rule, 475-476
tax assessment for 1878, 479-480
increasing theft in both Vanuabalavu and Lakeba, 483
tax assessment for 1879, 486
onerous and inefficient tax system, 486
people's double burden of taxation and lala, 486
'there is disquiet everywhere', 500
Tongan ascendancy under M's rule, 502-503
dislike of Tongans manifest after M's death, 507
remaining Tongans welcome to stay in Lau, 508
contemporary Lau seen as M's creation, 515
Laufilitonga, Tu'i Tonga, (c.1798-1865), defeated at Velāta (1826), 4
evidence of plot against Tāufaʻāhau, 54-55, 61
Laufitu, wife of Ratu Rasolo, TN
promotes Tongan settlement in Lau, 63
Lausii, brother of M,
birth, 10
death & funeral, 27
Lausii, brother of Tāufaʻāhau,
brings Tupou's letter to Cakobau (1845), 75
prevents fighting between Tongans and Fijians on Lakeba, 76
accompanies M to Fiji (1848), 80-81
leads folau of Tongans home from Lakeba, 88
continued visits to Bau during late 1840s, 89
quick to ally with Tui Nayau following latter's conversion, 94
meets Mara on the beach at Lakeba, 95
helps to build 'Bethel' chapel on Lakeba, 105
leaves Lakeba for Tonga (1851), 107
heads Commission of Enquiry to Fiji (1863), 223
Lavaki, supporter of M,
at Vanuabalavu with M (1854), 132
Lawry, Rev. Walter, (1793-1859), Wesleyan missionary,
forwards A's letter to Queen Victoria, 48
praises Tongan Christians on Lakeba, 73-74
urges Cakobau to lotu, 87-88
on 'godless' Tongans at Lakeba, 88
notes disquiet in Tonga over Tongans
resident in Fiji, 99
believes Lakeba Tongans to be law-abiding, 99-100
dubious about Tui Nayau's conversion, 108

Layard, Edgar Leopold (Leo), (1824-1900),
British Consul and Commissioner,
appointed as a Commissioner to investigate state of Fiji, 348
arrival in Fiji as a Commissioner, 371
warns against constitutional change, 271
widespread anger among Europeans over rejection of Cession, 389-390
‘pride and vagaries of ... upstart and dishonest British subjects’, 397
urges patience on M, 404
knowledge of M’s ‘plot’ against Ad-Interim Government, 432-433
authorises payment of part of M’s salary to William Hennings, 437
misinterpretation of Tongan succession laws, 455
influence of Wesleyan missionaries on Tongan succession, 455-456
avers wrongly that M did not swear allegiance to Gordon, 456
M would enjoy wide support if he sought Tongan succession, 456

Leggoe, Rev. John, Wesleyan missionary,
‘red-letter day’ in Lomaloma, 304

Le Hunte, Sir George, (1852-1925, SM in Lau and private secretary to Sir Arthur Gordon,
food scarcity and influenza epidemic in Lau, 460
concern about labourers employed in Vanuabalavu, 460
Xarifa one of only three seaworthy vessels in Lau, 460
complaints to Gordon about M’s and Hennings’ corruption, 464
second copra impost from Ratu Tevita, 464-465
Hennings has ‘done’ M into timber contract, 474
‘very complicated mess’ at Lomaloma, 478

Loganimoce, Ratu Eroni, Tui Nayau, son of Taliai Tupou,
chosen by M as Tui Nayau (1876), 470, 472
removed as Tui Nayau by Gordon (1878), 483

Loganimoce, Lote, Lakeban chief,
attends Tongan parliament (1868), 259

Lomaloma village,
exiled teachers return, 128
massacre of Christians (1854), 130
settlers’ meeting formulates Lau constitution, (1869), 298-299
second meeting (1870), 308-309
settlers’ committee to consider constitution, 318
neglect, malpractice and corruption, 479
decrease in resident Tongans after M’s death, 508

Lovoni people, central Ovalau,
order attack on Tongan missionaries, 138
‘Lovoni war’, 298
insurrection, trial and banishment of fighters, 303

Lualala, Sefanaia, leader of Lakeba Tongans & uncle of Tupou L,
cousin of Taliai Tupou, 58
and Tāufaʻahau’s visit to Lakeba, 60-61
exiled to Fiji (c1831), 89
arrives at Lakeba (1837), 89
most senior-ranking Tongan on Lakeba (1848), 89
praised by John Calvert, 89
family relationships, 89
leads fōlau to Vanuaabalavu (1847/48), 90
baptised (1851), 108
anxious to restore peace on Matuku, 123
appointed joint governor of Tongans in Fiji, 124

Luisa Tupou, sister of M, 11

Lupuʻapuaʻu (Queen Charlotte), wife of Tāufaʻahau,
half-sister of Elenoa Gataialupe, 35

Lyth, Rev. Dr Richard Burdsall, (1810-1877), Wesleyan missionary,
on Tāufaʻahau’s baptism, 17
chooses Tongan teachers for Lakeba (1838), 73
fails to appreciate political dimensions of lotu, 74-75
records M’s arrival in Fiji (1847), 80-81
on Tuikilakila’s opposition to lotu, 92
on reasons for chiefly conversions at Lakeba, 94
on Lakeba’s loyalty to Bau, 95
approves Tui Nayau’s treatment of Mara, 97
favoured appointment of Governor of Tongans in Lau, 97-98
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

complains of Lakeba Tongans, 98
despairs of more Tongans ‘flocking’ to Fiji, 104
rejoices at departure of hundreds of Tongans, 105
complains about remaining Tongans, 105
pleased at Cakobau’s discomfiture, 106
speaks to M ‘about his soul’, 106
alleges conspiracy between Tuikilakila, Cakobau and Mara, 107
praises M’s spiritual state, 108
apprehends Tongans returning to Lakeba, 109
lavish praise for M, 100
laments M’s fall from grace, 110
fearful of ‘large army’ at Vanuabalavu, 111
entreats Tui Cakau to permit Christian worship in Cakaudrove, 111
on threat posed by Tuikilakila’s sons, 112
growing distrust of M, 113
expects Tupou to visit Fiji, 113
pastoral visit to Moala (1852), 115
account of M’s actions in Moala, 119
understands true reasons for conversions in Yasayasa Moala, 120
rebukes Joeli Bulu over ‘Lakeba physic’, 120
understands M’s motives in sailing to Vanuabalavu, 120-121
regrets M’s absence from Lakeba, 122
expulsions from church meeting over Matuku ‘war’, 123
disapproves M’s conduct in Moala and Matuku, 123-124
approves appointment of two Tongan governors, 124-125
Matuku war ‘a political dispute’, 126
astonished by M’s reforms of Lakeba Tongans, 128
sends M to help Christians at Lomaloma, 130-131
praises M’s intervention, 131
departure from Fiji (1854), 135

unrest in Tonga during his adolescence, 27
at Fo’ui (1840), 30
marriage to Elenoa Gataialupe (1840), 35
two visits to Fiji in 1841, 36
defies his father to join Samuel Henry’s expedition, 38
interviewed by Lt Pollard, 42
suffocation of Efate people in cave, 42-43
degree of blame for NH slaughter, 46-47
separation from Elenoa, 47-48
acts as pilot for North Star, 50
father’s death, 51
not considered as TK in 1845, 54
rebuffed approach to oppose Tāufa`ahau, 54-55
exacts retribution on John Thomas, 58
speculation about his reasons for leaving Tonga, 59-62
relationship to Vuanirewa family of Lakeba, 64-65, 77
reasons for coming to Fiji (1847), 77-80
preparations for voyage, 80
arrival in Fiji (July 1847), 80
dines at Government House, Suva (1875), 81
great interest in civitabua, 81-82
supports Taliai Tupou in Lakeba, 87
first visit to Vanuabalavu (1849), 89
emerges as leader of Lakeba Tongans, 87, 91
accompanies Tui Cakau to Cakaudrove (1849), 92
receives levying rights from Tui Cakau, 92
aids Tuikilakila in persecution of Christians in Cakaudrove, 92-93
ceremonial visit to Bau with Cakaudrove chiefs (1850), 99
returns to Lakeba after ‘exile’ in Cakaudrove, 101
investigates attack on Lyth, 102
helps with construction of ‘Bethel’ chapel on Lakeba, 108
authority over Lakeba Tongans acknowledged by chiefs and missionaries, 106, 109
visits Oneata, 107-108
‘subject of serious religious impressions’, 108
helps build canoe on Kabara, 108
engaged by Lyth on pastoral duties, 108-109

Ma`afu, Tui Lau (c1825-1881),

birth, 1
ancestry, 1-3
flees Tongatapu as a child, 6
baptism, 9-10
known as Henry or Enele, 11
education, 14-19, 26
aids removal of some Christians from Lomaloma, 109-110
asks Lualala to help keep Lakeba Tongans ‘in order’, 110
apparent spiritual reformation, 110
recalled from Kabara to defend Lakeba, 111 and William Ives’ abduction of two girls from Lakeba, 112, 116
leaves Lakeba with Mara, 112
requisitions boat on Oneata, 112
leaves for Ovalau with William Ives, 112
returns to Lakeba, 113
growing network of contacts throughout Fiji, 114
building house for schoolmaster on Lakeba, 115
responds to appeal for help from Donu, 116
joins siege of Navucunimasi, 117
ransacks Navucunimasi and captures chiefs, 117
sends ‘heathen’ tanoa to Lyth, 118
cautions Moala chiefs against resistance, 118
his account of conquest of Yasayasa Moala, 118-119
quick to seize opportunity in Moala, 119
leads abortive folau to Vanuabalavu, 120-121
formal visit to Bau, 122
‘searchings of heart’ over Matuku reversals, 122
professed ignorance of ‘real root of [Matuku] war’, 122-123
knows his actions in Matuku were ‘ill-advised’, 124
appointed joint governor of Tongans in Fiji, 124
convenes vono on Lakeba, 124-125
not an ‘agent’ of Tupou, 125
myth of supposed expulsion from church, 125-126
denies guilt over Matuku, 126
urges Lakeba Tongans to behave like Christians, 128
plans to liberate Matuku captives, 130
offered submission by Yaro and Mualevu chiefs, 131-133
gives Cikobia to Wainiqolo, 132
confirmed as owner of Vanuabalavu, 133
rumoured intrigues against Tupou, 136-137
joins Tupou’s folau at Lakeba, 138
probable involvement in battle of Kaba, 141
aids Tevita ‘Unga to subdue Beqan village, 144
formally hands his Fijian lands to Tupou, 149-150, 239-240
short visit to Kabara, 151
prospects of succession to Tongan throne, 155
living on Lakeba in 1857, 156
disciplines Lakeba Tongans, 156-157
visits Tonga, 158
provides turtles and taro for the Polglases, 158
visits Bua, 158-159
his forces attack parts of Bua and Macuata, 160
takes Tui Wainunu prisoner, 160
takes up abode in Lomaloma c.1857, 162
again acknowledged by Lomaloma chiefs, 163
manipulated into signing cession offer, 166
reasons for supporting cession (1858), 167
aids Cakobau to sentence ‘rebel’ chiefs at Bau, 168
arrives off Ovalau with 200 men, 168-169
pretence of being Cakobau’s ally, 169
joins hostilities in Macuata, 171
appoints Tui Cakau as ‘King’ of Vanua Levu and Lau, 172
ostensible ally of Cakobau and the missionaries, 172-173
reassures Consul Williams over free flow of commerce, 175
claims to wish to rule Fiji for England, 176
tries to extend his rule over Kadavu, 176
his power in Fiji at its zenith (1859), 177
deceives US Consul over American ‘debt’, 178
proposes division of Fiji, 178
out-maneouvred at cession conference, 178-179
signs cession offer under duress, 179
reasons for his acquiescence over cession, 179-180
pressure placed on chiefs over cession, 180
in debt to Isaac Brower, 181
regrets agreeing to cession offer, 181-182
involvement in revolt at Rakiraki, 182
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

brings his allies to meet Consul Pritchard, 182
seeks Consul Williams’ support, 182
acknowledged by Vanua Levu chiefs, 182
seeks to influence chiefs against cession, 184
advised not to interfere in Macuata, 186
told to remove Wainiqolo from Macuata, 186
attends Tongan parliament (1861), 187
enmity between him and George Henry, 189
unhappy with 1861 agreements, 191
‘system’ of enforcement in Fiji, 192
still feels humiliation over 1859 cession offer, 193
ready to attack Bau (1861), 193-194
‘I shall be chief at Bau’, 193
claim against Bau referred to Tupou, 194
agrees not to attack Bau, 194
seeks to exploit rift between Cakobau and Pritchard, 194
returns to Lau, 196
actions in Fiji independent of Tupou, 197
second in order of precedence at Tongan parliament, 200
in Tonga during visit of Young’s delegation to Fiji, 204
Tukutuku Raraba account of his instructions to Wainiqolo, 206
absent when Wainiqolo’s forces defeated at Wairiki, 208
expected return from Tonga (1862), 208-209
still in Tonga (Sep 1862), 210
returns to Fiji with 200 kegs of gunpowder, 211
at Waikava with ‘document’ from Tupou, 211
probable prior consent for Wainiqolo’s actions, 212
angry with Wainiqolo’s men, 213
reconciliation with Golea, 213
asks Tupou to come to Fiji with 1,000 warriors, 214
accompanied Tu’i Ha’apai to enquire about Wairiki, 216
adamant that he does not want war, 216
seeks again to meet in class, 216
mutual distrust between M and Golea, 217
asks Consul Owen not to register sale of Vanuabalavu to George Henry, 217
confers with Cakobau at Waikava, 218-219
accompanies Cakobau to Wairiki, 216
spiritual ‘earnestness’ noted by three missionaries, 219
proposed treaty with Golea and Cakaudrove chiefs, 220
lays claim to large parts of Fiji, 220
marginalised by Tongan chiefs, 222
reasons for not remaining in Tonga, 222
meets Tongan Commissioners, 223
accompanies Commissioners to Bau, 227
laments loss of Munia and removal of its inhabitants, 229
surprise meeting with Golea at Kioa, 229
nine quiet months on Lakeba, 230
still owes allegiance to Tupou, 231
responsible for collecting Tupou’s taxes in Fiji, 232
‘all appeared to be settled’ between M and Cakobau, 234
seen as heir to the Tongan throne, 235
removes Mago people to Lomaloma, 236
formal statement about his acquisition of Vanuabalavu, 237
Petitioner’s Plea in Court of Arbitration, 237
dual basis of his claim to Vanuabalavu, 238
formal presentation of Vanuabalavu to Tupou, 239-240
his rights on Vanuabalavu as defined by LCC, 241
considered a de facto chief of Fiji, 242
bound to Tui Nayau by treaty, 243
non-participant in chiefs’ conference (1865), 246
conduct praised by missionary, 247
possible murder plot, 249
first Chieftain Supreme of Tovata ko Lau, 250-251
renounces claims to Munia and Yanuyanu, 253
tactical withdrawal from Fijian politics, 254, 257
deferential treatment during visit to Niuafo’ou, 255
cultivates cotton on Wakaya, 256
meets Cakobau on Moturiki, 257
handles Fijians better than Europeans can, 257-258
attends Tongan parliament (1868), 260
involved in renewed Solevu hostilities, 262
refuses to give up Beqa to Cakobau, 262
prevented by British and US influence from taking control of Fiji, 263
secures agreement of Lakeba, Cakaudrove, Bua and Macuata chiefs to remain in Fiji, 263
all Tongan lands in Fiji except Rabe formally ceded to M, 263
resenting giving land to Swanston, 264
leasehold land system in Lau, 264
Vanuabalavu and Yasayasa Moala formally Vakarorongo to M, 265
formal installation as Tui Lau, 265
absolute powers over leases and taxation, 265
formally acknowledged as ‘a fellow chieftain of Fiji’, 266
acknowledged by chiefs to control Tongan lands in Fiji, 266
supports resolution for British protectorate, 269
visits Nadroga (1869), 271-272
Tonga not responsible for M’s actions in Fiji, 272
mortgages three islands to Hennings Bros, 272
exchanges schooners with merchant Charles Mcfarland, 272
signs petition to Queen Victoria seeking annexation, 273
asserts ownership of Beqa, 274
‘the one man’ preventing Cakobau becoming King of Fiji, 274
advocates British annexation, 276, 288
German settlers wanted ‘to have M as king’, 276
support expressed by Lomaloma Europeans, 278
addresses Lauan chiefs on progress in Lau (1870), 278
absolute authority over sale of Vanuabalavu land, 281
estabishes magimagi allotments on Vanuabalavu, 281-282
leasehold land practices in Lau, 282-287
disregards interests of taukei, 283-284
taxation policies, 287
purchase of yacht Xarifa, 287-288
at Wairiki for Tovata ‘parliament’, 289-291
on Europeans in Fiji, 291
letter to Consul March on Solevu troubles, 291
veiled threats to Cakobau over Solevu, 292
effective control over settlers in Vanua Levu and Taveuni, 295
voyages around Fiji to gather support, 296
takes 230 prisoners on Beqa, 296
‘[a] Tongese gentleman dressed in a black coat and a large gun’, 297
threatens Europeans in Lau, 297,298
approves constitution of Lau, 299
instigates Lovoni insurrection, 303
preaches on ‘love and endurance’ at Lomaloma, 304
heavily in debt, 305
called to account by Lomaloma Europeans, 307-308
address to his Tongan and Fijian subjects, 309-310
settles differences with Cakobau and appointed Viceroy, 310
member of Privy Council, 310
views on formation of constitution, 312
disparate support for M as Viceroy, 313-314
reasons for accepting role as Viceroy, 314-315
‘will always prefer the substance to the shadow’, 316
false promises to St Julian, 317
presides over Privy Council meeting, 318
concerned over high taxation, 323
persuades Tui Cakau to adhere to new regime, 324
conditional nature of his oath of allegiance, 326
asserts rights over Vanuabalavu and Moala, 327
appointed Governor of Lau (1872), 328
signs B.S.M.P. petition, 330
seeks appointment for Siale ‘ataongo, 331
President of Privy Council, 331
Maʻafu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

harassment by Europeans in Levuka, 332-333
expresses support for Cakobau's government, 333
joins Queen's Birthday celebrations, 333-334
delivers King's speech and gives Royal Assent to 20 Bills, 335-336
speech condemns dissension among Europeans, 336
ordered to build himself a house, 342
Laun taxes not passed on to the government, 342
perennial problem of debts, 342-342
misappropriation of Lauan taxes, 343
views on payment of tax, 343
other sources of income, 343
offers to help military expedition to Ba, 343
delays involvement in 'Viti Levu wars', 344, 346
reports of coercion, 344-345
supports dissident Vanuabalavu planters, 346
secedes from Fijian government, 349
consults Captain Chapman, 349
orders rifles and ammunition, 350
'a man who knows the meaning of borrowing', 350
public debate over his secession, 351
attempts to manipulate Captain Chapman, 349
'playing false' after secession, 353-354
letters to Chapman, 355
alleged threats from ministers, 356
renounces secession, 356-357
'papalangis' everlasting talk and bluster', 356
supports King's expression of confidence in ministers, 360-361
calls on Commodore Stirling, 361
heads armed force to confront Levuka traders, 362
actions at Nasova cost him 'much sympathy' among Europeans, 363
firm ally of Cakobau at Nasova, 363-364
reasons for opposing traders and settlers, 364
succession provisions in new constitution, 365
thanks Europeans who helped in Ba campaign, 365
a signatory for establishment of bank, 365-366
awarded annual salary of $4,000 by Privy Council, 366
sends three tons of copra in lieu of tax, 366
proclamation 'favourable to the cause of religion and morality', 367
unable to meet Goodenough, 368
arrives at Levuka to meet Commissioners, 372
only Tovata laws should be recognised in Lau, 375
unfettered power over Lakeba chiefs, 375
Cabinet's ultimatum to submit unpaid Lauan taxes, 375-376
secretly orders Lauan taxes to be retained at Lomaloma, 377
assured he would retain authority in Lau after Cession, 377
'cold and sulky' during dinner with Goodenough and Thurston, 379
'detestable by the Fijian chiefs', 380
undaunted by Fijian chiefs' hostility, 380-381
dismissed as Governor of Lau, 382
twice consults Swanston over Cession, 383-384
consults Goodenough over rejection of Cession, 384-385
claims that chiefs would be 'shot like pigs' if Cession occurred, 384-385
Commissioners' warning of consequences of Cession, 385
'the source of all the trouble in Fiji', 385
severe loss of face at Cession conference, 385
suddenly favours Cession, 386
left meeting 'silently angry', 386
reasons for changing his mind, 386, 392
blames Thurston for rejection of Cession, 387
named Lieutenant-Governor of Lau, 387
advises Commissioners that he favours Cession, 388, 391
receives death threat from Ratu Savenaca, 389
ready to send Mafi to Tonga to fetch 'an army', 389
member of Thurston's Council of Advice, 390
pressure from German traders to reject Cession, 391

does not appear on Thurston’s list of chiefly appointments, 392

M, Tui Cakau and Tui Macuata ‘ready for revolt’, 393

dismissed by chiefs as Governor of Lau, 394

‘M’s men’ drilling on the beach at Lomaloma, 400

determined to defend his rights if British do not accept Cession offer, 402

his power and influence acknowledged in Commissioners’ Report, 403

no government in Lau but himself, 404

continues tax and rent arrangements in Lau, 405

support from Europeans, 405-406, 407

apparent acquiescence in Drury’s suggested reforms, 408

praised by Isaac Rooney, 413-414

continued exploitation of Beqan labourers, 414

150 Tongans ‘over on a visit’, 415

has kept a ‘Tongan mob’ at Lomaloma for over a year, 416

tells Lakeba chiefs there is no government in Fiji, 418

‘taken aback’ by chiefs’ ‘concurrence’ over Cession, 421

‘a man of stately presence’, 424

preoccupied and apathetic, 424-425

‘of one mind’ with Cakobau over Cession, 425

formal reception on board Pearl, 425-426

signs Deed of Cession, 426

private meeting with Cakobau and Tui Cakau on board Pearl, 426

‘M’s manner ... undignified ... uncivil ... vulgar’, 427

gazetted as Roko Tui Lau, 430

‘intends giving up his peculiar ways now’, 431

claims he is forbidden to take delivery of rifles, 431, 435-436

welcomes Fiji’s newly-acquired unity, 431-432

‘a subordinate administrator’, 432

‘let the people know I am Ma’afu’, 433

has not freed hundreds ‘in servitude’, 433

legal checks on his power to free prisoners, 433-434

presents court house and gaol to Provisional Government, 435

precise instructions for tax collection, 435

‘very grateful’ for financial assistance, 437

instructed Lakeba ‘natives’ to prepare copra to pay for rifles, 437-438

cruises Vanua Levu coast, 438

recovery from measles, 439

speaks at Hennings’ celebration dinner, 439

‘zealous’ in tax collection and census, 439-440

satisfied with arrangements for Tongan teachers’ repatriation, 442

gives land for ‘People’s Park’ in Lomaloma, 442

relieves starvation in Ono-i-Lau, 442

fails to persuade Ono people to move, 442-443

again advises Hedemann that he cannot honour contract, 443

summoned for debt by Hedemann, 443

court proceedings, 443-444

ruling in his favour, 444

instructed to attend Gordon’s installation, 447

consultation with Gordon, 447-448

witnesses Gordon take oath of office as Governor of Fiji, 449

swears allegiance, as Roko Tui Lau, to Governor, 450

statesmanlike speech to Bosevakaturaga, 451-452

views on Vakapiritania, 451

urges retention of lala, 451

views on punishment for disobedience, 452

part of ‘a co-opted indigenous hierarchy’, 452

‘he is regarded with much bitterness and ill-will’, 452

‘the handsomest of them all’, 453

‘high-handed manner’ in enforcing new regulations in Lau, 454

prospects of succession under Tonga’s new constitution, 454-459

allegiance to Great Britain no impediment to succession in Tonga, 457
Ma’afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

claims to support Tevita ‘Unga as Tupou’s successor, 457
opposition to Tungi Halatuitui’a’s succession in Tonga, 457–458
consistently declined Tupou’s invitation to chiefs’ meetings in Tonga, 458
sails Xarifa to escort HMS Barracouta, 459–460
legal restrictions on his powers under British rule, 460
house praised by English visitor, 461
in debt to George Bayley, 462
fails to submit monthly reports to Gordon, 462
quells civil disturbance at Ono, 464
secret agreement with Hennings over construction of a schooner, 464–465
seizes schooner Ululakeba, 465
‘being done horribly’ over schooner, 465
allowed to choose penalty for incestuous couple, 465
objects to David Wylie’s appointment as missionary at Lomaloma, 465
sends troops to help in Kai Colo wars, 466
affair of the Matuku ‘angels’, 466–468
takes ‘angels’ into custody on Matuku, 467
shrewd and humorous interrogation of female ‘angel’, 467–468
sentences two male ‘angels’ to one year’s imprisonment, 468
humorous treatment of ‘angels’ en route to Lomaloma, 468
receives Governor’s permission to live at Lakeba to build church, 469
people in Tonga ‘sorely harassed’ by Shirley Baker, 469
apoologies to Bosevakaturaga for Lau’s shortcomings in food, 469
recounts story of Matuku ‘angels’, 469–470
secures adoption of new prison regulations, 470
content with division of lands in Lau, 470–471
limitations to lala on Lakeba, 471
planting regulations ‘too onerous’ for parts of Lau, 471
joins other chiefs in letter to Queen Victoria, 471
recommends dismissal of Ratu Tevita as Buli Lakeba, 472
instructed that rent should be paid to leaseholders, 473
illness (1877), 473
dines with Gordon at Levuka, 473
told to ‘get on with’ 1877 tax collection, 473
ordered to regulate hours people work on tax produce, 473
told to cease unnecessary logging, 473
rumours of Vava’u chiefs’ plot to make him king of Tonga, 474
determined to visit Tonga, 476
‘cutting a great dash’ in Tonga, 476
gives Tupou letter from Gordon, 477
press speculation about succession prospects in Tonga, 477–478
‘he is a splendid man’, 478
consequences of his neglect at Lomaloma, 478–479
levies unauthorised tax in Lau, 479
brings canoe from Tonga as gift for Cakobau, 479
people in Tonga ‘much harassed by injudicious measures’, 479
advised to bring few attendants to Bosevakaturaga, 480
‘the behaviour of the white man is incomprehensible’, 480
circumspect about problems in Lau, 481
continuing difficulties collecting rent in Vanuabalavu, 483
ordered to assist European magistrate in Lakeba, 483–484
reallocates taukei land in Lakeba to a Tongan, 484
some Cakaudrove people ‘cleaned out’ by M’s men, 484
late arrival at 1878 Bosevakaturaga because of illness, 485
fails to address Lau’s problems at Bosevakaturaga, 485
speaks about differences with European magistrates, 486
plans for piped drinking water for Sawana and Lomaloma, 487
in ‘very good humour’ at dinner with Le Hunte, 487
attends funeral of Golea, Tui Cakau at Somosomo, 487
forcibly removes prisoner from gaol, 488
fined £10 in police court, 488
tearful farewell to Des Voeux, 488-489
puzzled about Germans’ influence
in Tonga, 489
to precede Gordon on official Tongan
visit, 489
M’s vessels again extort lala in
Cakaudrove destined for Tonga, 489-490
failure to redress problems of lala and
land alienation, 490
intent on maintaining Tongan ascendancy
in Lau, 490
presents vague details of Lauan ascendancy
to 1879 Bosevakaturaga, 490-491
‘some of our affairs are not in good
...condition’, 491
Lau had not met its 1879 tax
requirements, 491
rift with Elenoa, followed by
reconciliation, 492
rebuked by Gordon for ‘habits
...unbecoming and evil’, 492
intoxicated in public in Levuka, 492
cajoled into signing promissory notes and
pursued by creditors, 493
conduct castigated by David Wilkinson,
493
blatant disregard for financial liabilities,
493-494
puzzle over his public intoxication, 494
orders tapa prepared as gifts for Tupou,
494
staying with Theodore Wood, 493,494
‘awfully cheated’ over mail order teeth,
495
ordered to bring Mafi for conference with
Gordon, 495
host for 1880 Bosevakaturaga at Mualevu,
496-502
three days’ evidence at Lands Claims
Commission, 497
Fijians ‘discouraged’ at Gordon’s
departure, 498
farewell to Gordon, 498
not forthcoming in address to 1880
Bosevakaturaga, 499
criticises Mafi’s ‘laxness’, 499
wanted Siale’ataongo brought to court,
500
the ‘evils’ of Lakeba and Vanuabalavu, 500
‘how can you expect the land to be
clean?’, 500
legal constraints on his authority in Lau,
500-501
complains of Europeans refusing
sustenance to distressed Fijians, 501
concern over ownership of reefs, 501-502
return home following Mualevu
Bosevakaturaga, 505
final illness and death, 505
his body conveyed to Lakeba, 506
condolence messages, 506
funeral, 506-507
his legacy in myth, 510-511
assessment of his life, 511-517
Ma’afu of Vaini, grandfather of Tāufa’āhau,
conversion to Christianity, 25
death, 53
Ma’afu otu ‘itonga, 6th TK,
great-grandfather of M, 1
meaning of name, 2
MacGregor, Sir Malcolm, (1834-1879),
commander of HMS Harrier,
secures Cakobau’s release from French
detention, 192
Macomber, John, American settler in Fiji,
reported conversation with Wainiqolo, 212
purchases Munia from Golea, 213-214
complains M refuses to relinquish Munia,
273
renews appeal to M to remove Munia
‘natives’, 305
Mafi, Sione, matapule of M, Native
Stipendiary Magistrate,
Consul Jones’ recognition of M as owner
of Vanuabalavu (1885), 242
appointed Assistant Native Judge
in Supreme Court, 337
M opposes Cession in early 1874, 372
signs, on M’s behalf, letter
rejecting Cession, 384
support for M in his confrontation
with Thurston, 385
appointed NSM for Lau, 430
formally receives Sir Arthur and
Lady Gordon at Lomaloma, 453
complains about being forbidden to hold
court, 470
criticism of his actions as magistrate at
Lomaloma, 475
uses justice system to exploit Fijians on
Vanuabalavu, 475-476
both incompetent and corrupt, 476
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

tax obligations of Lakeba people, 480-481
critical of Tongans' manners on Vanuabalavu, 481
at 1880 Bosevakaturaga refers to children suffering on Vanuabalavu, 481
joins castigation of Siale`ataongo at Bosevakaturaga, 500
Mafileo, Joeli, Tongan local preacher, acts as intermediary between Tupou and Fijian chiefs, 99-103
Mafoa, messenger of Mataiase Vave, appeals to Lakeba for help, 130, 237
evidence at Court of Arbitration (1865), 239
Mago island, part of Cakaudrove, 89
many inhabitants lotu, 90
Christians harassed by raiders from Somosomo, 107
sold to William Hennings, 214
sold to Thomas Ryder, 235
awarded to Ryder brothers by Consul Jones, 235
M removes inhabitants to Lomaloma, 236
some inhabitants return, 248-249
Malani, Tui Nayau, welcomes Tahitian teachers, 5
visited by Samuel Henry (1829), 40
visited by M (1841), 36
unable to lotu (1832), 72
Malvern, Rev. John, (1818-1901), Wesleyan missionary, praises Taliai Tupou, 85
complains of Tongans at Lakeba, 88-89
political impetus for Taliai Tupou’s conversion, 94
Mara Kapaiwai, Ratu, (c.1817-1859), possesses vasa rights on Lakeba, 70
determined to claim vasa rights, 76-77
arrives at Lakeba (1845), 77
exiled in Tonga (1846-1847), 78
to make his peace with Bau, 78
arrival in force at Lakeba (1849), 94-95
hostile intentions thwarted, 95
makes peace with Tui Nayau, 95
removal to Moala, 97
still harbours ill will towards Lakeba, 106
prevented from returning to Lakeba (1851), 109
scheming to exercise vasa rights on Lakeba, 110
allies himself with Rewan chiefs, 110
arrives at Lakeba (1852), 112
appears at Moala and Matuku, 121-122
in command of Rewan forces, 127
boasts that Kaba can never be taken, 137
orchestrated attack on Tupou’s emissaries, 138-139
defiance of Tupou and Cakobau at Lakeba, 139
escape to Ovalau following battle of Kaba, 140
plotting against Cakobau (1857), 156
murders chief of Nadi village, Bua, 160
foments rebellion in Bua and Kadavu (1858), 163
still a force for instability (1858), 167
tricked into coming to Bau, 174-175
hanged at Bau (1859), 174
March, Edward, British Consul in Fiji, submits annexation petitions to Foreign Office, 276-276
detailed report to Foreign Office on state of Fiji, 276
offended by letter from M, 291-292
‘impending war between ... Cakobau and M’, 294, 298
summons M to interview over Beqa visit, 297
confrontation with M at Levuka, 297-298
growing despair over Fiji situation, 300-301
unpopularity, 301
requests ammunition from NSW Governor, 303, n.165.
Cakobau the dupe of scheming Europeans, 307
Kingdom of Fiji ‘an impertinence and an absurdity’, 311
a ‘burlesque constitutional government’, 312
accepts reality of new government, 313
new ‘bearing’ of Cakobau and M, 314
on Fijian chiefs’ support for new regime, 314
denigrates Cakobau’s ‘mental capacity’, 325
great discontent among settlers (1872), 329
advocates return to status quo in Fiji, 340
Martin, Edward, interpreter at cession meeting (1858), 179
Pritchard’s ‘overbearing’ conduct towards chiefs, 180
at Commission hearing (1862), 205
M’s power and influence in Fiji, 205
Martin, Sir James, Attorney-General of New South Wales 1856,
advises NSW Governor on impossibility of assuming control of Fiji, 308
expects foreign intervention in Fiji, 329
Mataeleha’amea, 4th TK, 35
Mataeletu ‘apiko, TK, 2
Mata ki Bau, Lakeban envoy to Bau,
leads mission to resolve Moalan conflict, 116-117
matapule,
definition, 4
Matuku island,
al all villages but one are lotu, 115
war over (1853), 123
seven chiefs acknowledge that Matuku belongs to Tonga, 234
poverty prevailing (1875), 460
M and the Matuku ‘angels’, 466-468
Maudslay, Alfred, (1850-1931), British Vice-Consul in Tonga,
no Tongan understands 1875 Constitution, 459
favours M as successor to Tongan throne, 459
blames Baker for M’s exclusion from direct succession, 459
anticipates disputed succession after Tupou’s death, 478
Deputy High Commissioner of Western Pacific, 483
suggests British protectorate for Tonga if M succeeds, 498
Maxwell, John, captain of HMS Dido,
visit to Tonga (1848), 82, 84
McConnell, James, Taveuni planter,
articulates planters’ fear and distrust of M, 354
McLean, George, mate on Sophia,
account of 1842 sandalwood expedition, 40-47
Miller, Rev. George, (1806-1854), Wesleyan missionary,
borrowed horse from M, 50
Miller, Henry, interpreter to M,
claimed Wainiqolo acted without M’s consent at Wairiki, 209
leased land at Vanuabalavu from M, 294
visit from Commodore Goodenough, 401
Moala, (Mele Moala), mother of M,
baptism & marriage, 9
esteemed by missionaries, 14
takes refuge in Vava’u with her children, 21
returns to Tongatapu, 24
son ‘gone to the heathen’, 50
castigated by John Thomas, 57
apparent remarriage, 57
Moala island,
people fearful of Mara, 106
murder of a local preacher, 116
formal submission to lotu, 117
under M’s control, 118
tukutuku Raraba account of Tongan conquest, 119
chiefs’ written acknowledgement of Tongan sovereignty, 234
‘purchase’ by Reece brothers, 327
M’s laws ‘opposed’ to those given out by Stipendiary Magistrate, 460
Moore, Rev. William, (1821-1893), Wesleyan missionary,
accuses Cakobau of fomenting anti-Christian violence, 102
Fiji’s more ‘cheerful’ aspect, 182
Moso island, NH, massacre, 43-44
Moss, David Jebson, (Tupou Ha’a’apai), private secretary to Tupou,
sent by Tupou to consult Consul Jones, 232
instructed to take possession of Fijian lands gained through conquest, 232
brings Tongan bureaucracy to Fiji, 232
threatened enforcement of Tongan rights ‘by power’, 233
visits Bua accompanied by Ma’afu, 235-236
enquires about ammunition prices, 236
asks Thurston to regard Tongans in Fiji as M’s subjects, 265-266
Mo’unga-o-tonga, 6th TK, 2
Moturiki island,
visit of Tupou’s folau (1855), 138
Mumui, Setaleki, nephew of A,
plot to murder, 32
warning to Methuselah Tae, 38-39
prospects of succeeding as TK, 53-54
Ma'afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

Nailatikau, Ratu Epeli, Cakobau’s eldest son, aids M in defence of law and order at Nasova, 363
joins M in Council of Advice, 390
member of Ad-Interim Government, 399
accompanies Goodenough to Lomaloma, 422

Nanovo, Tui Nadroga, declares Nadroga ‘part of Tongan dominions’, 223-224

Naulivo, Suliasi (Julius), Tongan teacher, arrival at Lakeba (1838), 73
death (1841), 88

Navucunimasi village, under siege from lotu force, 117
chiefs captured by M, 117
ransacked by M’s party, 117

Newcastle, Duke of, (Henry Pelham-Clinton, 1811-1864), Secretary of State for the Colonies 1859-1864,
advises NSW Governor that Great Britain will not assume sovereignty of Fiji, 203

New Hebrides (now Vanuatu), 1842 sandalwood expedition, 38-47

Ngata, first TK, sent from Samoa to Hihifo, 2

Ngū, Wellington, son of Tevita ‘Unga, appointed as Tupou’s successor (1880), 496

Nisbet, Rev. Henry, (1818-1876), LMS missionary, meets Samuel Henry in NH (1842), 41

Niuemoji, brother of M, 10

Nukubati island, restored to Ritova, 186
houses and gardens destroyed by Tongans, 186

Ovalau island, attack on Tongan emissaries (1855), 138
many chiefs owe no allegiance to Cakobau, 145-146
visit by Tupou and Cakobau, 145-146

Owen, William, Acting British Consul in Fiji, urges Tupou to maintain ‘friendly relations’ with Fiji, 218
confers with M at Waikava, 218
describes Fiji’s ‘insecurity’ because of Tongan threat, 224
response to Tongan Commissioners, 225
refuses to sign written agreement with Commissioners, 226
distances himself from both Tongan and Fijian chiefs, 227

Paleisasa, Vuanirewa chief, marries into family of TK (18th century), 64
grandfather of Mumui, 64

Pangai island, abortive meeting of chiefs (1840), 31

Parsons, Henry, Warden for Taveuni, surprised at Tui Cakau’s secession, 349

Perroquet, French armed transport, calls at Levuka (1855), 149

Philp, Richard, planter, need to bring M and Tui Cakau under Cakobau’s actual authority, 337-338

Polglase, Rev. John, (1823-1860), Wesleyan missionary, visits M at home in Lakeba, 124
unaware of momentous political changes of 1855, 151
praises M for disciplining Lakeba Tongans, 157

Pollard, Lt Walter, commander of HMS Bramble, interviews M (1850), 41-42
visits Fiji (1850), 95

Pritchard, William Thomas, (1829-1907), first British Consul in Fiji, Bau’s pursuit of vasu rights, 76
appointed British Consul (1858), 93
arrives in Fiji as Consul, 163
advocates cession to Great Britain, 163, 164, 165-166
on Tongan teachers as political agents of Tupou and M, 163-164
decentration over Cakobau's alleged sovereignty of Fiji, 164, 166
draft of cession offer, 164-166
threatens chiefs unwilling to endorse cession, 166
leaves for London with cession offer, 167
returns from London, 175
secures Kadavu chiefs’ support for cession, 176
accuses M of fomenting trouble in Rewa and Rakiraki, 177
lobby chiefs ahead of cession meeting, 177
determined to ‘stop...Tongans in their tracks’, 178
succeeds in gaining chiefs’ support for cession, 178-179

‘Act of Cession’ (1858), 180

claims he did not condone depredations in Macuata, 185

blames M for Macuata violence, 186-187

asks Tupou to restrain M, 187

enquires whether Tupou wants British protection for Tonga, 187

sees M and Wainiqolo as responsible for Macuata killings, 189

accuses M of enforcing a ‘common system’, 191

petulance towards Cakobau, 192-193

reassures Cakobau that Tongans will not attack, 194

visit to Tonga, 197-199

claims Tupou admitted his ‘designs’ on Fiji, 198

acknowledges M’s strategic skill, 198

claims M is ‘dreaded’ in both Tonga and Fiji, 198

agreement with Tupou forbidding Tongan aggression in Fiji, 199

Commission of Enquiry and dismissal from office, 203-204

rift with Col. Smythe, 207-208

Pritchette, Kintzing, (1800-1869), Acting US Consul, approves Thurston’s views of M (1867), 257

Provisional Government of Fiji (1874), five-man Executive Council established, 429

administrative structure, 429-430

taxation system, 440

Qaraniqio, brother of Cokonauto, succeeds as Roko Tui Dreketi and expels Bauans from Rewa, 108

says he will $lotu$ when war ends, 115

anticipates destruction of Bau, 137

anticipates ingestion of Cakobau, 137 death, 137

Rabe island, atrocities against Tongans, 147-148 hundreds killed by Tupou’s forces, 148 island given to Tupou, 148, 260 sale to John Hill, 324

Rabone, Rev. Stephen, (1811-1872), Wesleyan missionary, Tongatapu chiefs’ hostility to A, 21

preaches on mercy and love, 24

describes heathen chiefs as ‘afraid’, 25

meeting with A and Tucker, 30 opinion of A, 51

Raivalita, Tui Cakau, (D. 1862), son of Tuikilakila, disrupts service at Lomaloma, 109

forced to leave Vanuabalavu, 111

resumes keeping Sabbath, 111

succeeds at Tui Cakau, 131

informed of Vanuabalavu chiefs’ submission to M, 132, 239

installed as Tui Cakau in Tupou’s presence, 147

appointed by M as ‘king’ of Vanua Levu and Lau, 172

shifted support to defeated Macuata faction, 206

a prisoner of war, 207

Ransome, Henry, captain of Elizabeth, approval of A, 12

describes A’s compound, 15

Rasolo, Ratu, TN, 63

Ravunisa, Sefanaia, Vanuabalavu chief, expels Tongans from Lomaloma, 109

seeks Christian teachers from Lakeba, 120

Rees (Reece), Joseph, resident of Viti Levu, reports that M urged Tuikilakila to make war on Lakeba, 112

with M at Ono, 116

Rewa, conclusion of peace with Bau, 137

remaining disaffected chiefs united under Mara, 137

end of resistance to Cakobau, 142

visit of Tupou and Cakobau, 142-143

Tongan residents ready to attack Bau, 193

Ringgold, Cadwalader, (1802-1867), member of US Exploring Expedition, visits Lakeba, 73

Ritova, Tui Macuata, taken prisoner by M, 160-161

orders murder of Christians at Tiliva, 167

surrenders to forces of M and Cakobau, and deposed, 172

threatens war, 184

his lands restored, 186

forced to take refuge on Kia, 190
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

his forces begin ‘reign of terror’ in Macuata, 191
seeks Golea’s help against Wainiqolo’s Tongans, 205
absent from Tovata ‘parliament’, 290
oath of allegiance to Cakobau, 322
hoists Tongan flag in Macuata, 417
berated by Cakobau, 427
signs Deed of Cession and taken to Nasova, 427
death (1875), 444

Robinson, Sir Hercules, (1824-1897), Governor of New South Wales 1872-1879, Fiji bureaucracy ‘preposterously large’, 341
government of Fiji is ‘a charade’, 367-368
sent to Fiji to investigate chiefs’ offer of Cession, 425
precise instructions from CO concerning Cession, 419
advises Cakobau that transfer of sovereignty must be unconditional, 420
Cakobau’s alleged sovereignty over Fiji ‘simply ludicrous’, 422
official visit to Vanuabalavu, 423-427
signs Deed of Cession after M, 426
convenes meeting of chiefs at Draiba, 431
told M he should not possess rifles but should honour his contract, 436

Roko Tui Ba,
attacks Lau administration at 1879
*Bosevakaturaga*, 491
criticises M’s absence from debate, 491
blames resident Tongans for increasing thefts in Fiji, 499
angrily rebukes Siale’ataongo for criminal conduct, 499-500

Roko Tui Bua,
castigates M and Roko Tui Dreketi for alcoholism, 498-499
supports M in condemnation of European attitudes, 501

Rooney, Rev. Isaac, Wesleyan missionary praises hospitality and generosity of M and Elenoa, 275
financial support from M, 344
lavishes praise on M’s rule in Lau, 413-414
commends M’s support for the church, 414
foresees no threat from M and Tui Cakau, 417
again praises M’s financial contributions, 445
tax obligations prevents people from supporting Mission, 464
agrees to remain at Lomaloma at M’s behest, 465
Roulleaux, Joseph-Francois, (1805-1871), Marist missionary in Fiji, chagrin over Wesleyan triumph in Moala, 119

Royce, Rev. James, (1829-1907), Wesleyan missionary,
praises M’s intervention in Bua, 170
on M’s campaign against ‘rebels’, 174

Ryder, George, (1844-1927), Australian settler in Fiji,
arrives in Fiji (1864), 235
admiration of M, 235
Ryder, Rupert, planter of Mago,
chairs settlers’ meeting at Lomaloma, 277
Ryder Bros own ‘finest cotton plantation in Fiji’, 294
Ryder, Thomas, Australian settler in Fiji,
purchase of Mago from William Hennings (1864), 235

Sahl, Carl Ludwig, Commercial Agent for Fiji in Sydney,
interviews Foreign and Colonial Secretaries in London, 339
advises Thurston of requirements for Cession, 339
William Hennings’ account books ‘excellent’, 347
much of Lauan tax revenue paid directly to Hennings, 347
helps audit government finances, 365

Sāltoe Tupou III, Queen of Tonga, (1900-1965), installed as Tui Kānokupolu, 65
unveils M’s headstone (1935), 507

Samate, supporter of M,
at Vanuabalavu with M’s forces (1854), 132
evidence at Court of Arbitration (1865), 238-239, 241

Samuel, brother of M,
birth & death (1837) 10, 11-12

Savenaca, Ratu, brother of Cakobau,
death threat to M, 389
joins M in Council of Advice, 390
member of Ad-Interim Government, 399
accompanies Goodenough to Lomaloma, 422
Scott, -, captain of Sultan, participates in 1842 sandalwood expedition, 54

Seed, William, acting SM at Lomaloma, Siale`ataongo’s actions as acting magistrate ‘highly injudicious’, 474-475 Mahi’s corrupt conduct as magistrate, 475

Seemann, Dr Berthold, (1825-1871), German botanist, M’s role in NH, 40

1853 agreement between Cakobau and Tupou, 127 reasons for chiefs’ support of cession (1858), 181 Tongan teachers as M’s spies, 183

Seymour, J. Beauchamp, (1821-1895), commander of HMS Pelorus, proposes that M and Cakobau accompany him to Macuata, 189 convenes conference on board Pelorus, 190 presides over two agreements between Macuata chiefs and M, 190-191

Sia-ko- Veiongo, Tongatapu, site of Wesleyan chapel, 11 erection of stockade, 20

Siale ataongo, (Charley Ma’afu), (c.1841-1883), M’s son, hearsay account of 1842 expedition, 43-44 drills ‘a standing army’ at Lakeba, 303 overstepping his duties, 331 gains commission as captain, 331 responds to toast for his absent father, 334 escorts Goodenough on visit to Lomaloma, 401 takes armed force from Lomaloma to Lakeba, 406 ‘a veritable scamp’, 407 sent to Lakeba with 250 men, 418 ‘his weakness is said to be for gin’, 424 ‘highly injudicious’ conduct as acting magistrate, 474-475 seizes Tui Lomaloma’s land and gives it to Tongans, 478-479 publicly intoxicated at Levuka, 492 ‘a daring, bad young man’, 500 account of father’s illness, 505 conveys letter from Tui Nayau to Tupou, 507 taken into custody after theft of a cutter, 509 claims he had been appointed governor of Vava’u, 509 denied permission to return to Fiji, 509 ‘the vagrant Tongan’ deported from Fiji, 510 ‘Charley Ma’afu ought to be in gaol’, 509 ‘Siale is a frightful liar’, 509 death in Nuku alofa (1883), 509 his children ineligible to succeed in Tonga, 509 ancestor of Tonga’s present King, 510

Simpson, Cortland, commander of HMS Blanche, invited to intervene in Levuka traders’ protest, 362 advises British subjects at Levuka not to arm themselves, 362 ‘Convention’ to limit his intervention in Fiji, 363

Sinaitakala, first Tu’i Tonga Fefine, Fijian spouse, 63

Sinclair, Arthur, commander of USS Vandalia, fixes American ‘debt’ at US$45,000, 164 Siumafua’uta, Tu’i Tonga Fefine, ancestor of M and Elenoa Gataialupe, 35

Smythe, Sarah, Mrs, approves of M’s influence in Fiji, 183

Smythe, Col. William, head of British Commission of Enquiry, visit to Lakeba (1860), 134 appointed head of Commission of Enquiry, 181 arrives in Fiji and meets M (1860), 183 anticipates Tongan conquest of Fiji, 183 consults Cakobau at Bau, 184 on limits to Cakobau’s authority, 184 visits Rewa, Kadavu and Beqa, 184 meetings at Bua and Macuata, 184-185 advises CO of Fijian disunity, 185 visit to Lakeba, 185 meeting in Cakaudrove, 185-186 his Report submitted to CO, 187-188 his views on M’s power in Fiji, 188 Report recommends against cession, 188, 203 recommends dismissal of Pritchard, 203 changes his mind about cession, 340

Sokutukivei, senior Vuanirewa chief, accompanies M to Moala, 116

Solevu village, Bua, chief intends to destroy Christian villages, 159
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

destroyed by Christian forces, 159
surrenders to M and Tui Bua, 160
placed under suzerainty of Tui Bua, 172

Stanley, Fabius, (1815-1882), captain of USS Tuscarora,
arrives in Fiji to press for payment of 'debt', 253
urges Tupou not to interfere with 'debt', 253, 261
meets M at Lomaloma, 254

Stephen, Sir Alfred, (1802-1894), Chief Justice of New South Wales 1844-1873,
believes Cakobau is 'acknowledged ... King' of Fiji, 333

Stirling, Frederick, commander of HMS Clio, supports Cession, 361
St John, Samuel Avery, (1826-1904), private secretary to Cakobau,
calls meeting of planters (1867), 252

St Julian, Charles, (1819-1874), law reporter, consul and Chief Justice of Fiji,
advises Tupou on Tongan constitution, 145
considers M as a potential threat to Tonga, 161
claims M was appointed as Tupou's 'chief judge' in Lau, 161
suggests Hawaiian protectorate over Fiji, 302
astute analysis of M's position as Viceroy, 316-317
expects M to be 'actual ruler of Fiji', 317
alert to M's sophistry, 317
aware that Kingdom of Fiji is unsustainable, 317-318
pessimistic about new government's prospects, 325
presides over Parliament as Chief Justice of Fiji, 334
consultation process over cession 'essential', 340
announces constitutional amendments, 346

Suckling, Lieut. Thomas, (1844-1922), HMS Renard,
Cakobau jealous of M's yacht, 398
Ratu Tevita's visit to Lomaloma, 406
description of M at home, 407
Sukuna, Ratu Sir Lala, (1888-1958), second Tui Lau, Commissioner for Lau,
confirms M's magimagi (1939), 284-285
Sullivan, T.R., captain of HBM Favourite,
participates in 1842 sandalwood expedition, 38

Susui island,
Christians harassed by Cakaudrove raiders, 107

Swainson, Henry Gabriel, (1830-1892), crew member of HMS Bramble,
notes strength of Tongan community on Lakeba, 100

Swanston, Robert Sherson, (1825-?), acting British Consul, secretary to M,
accuses M of wishing to 'aggrandise' himself, 169
on M's ambition, 170
urges M to defend himself to Consul Williams, 173
mollifies Consul Williams and Père Bréheret, 173
dilemma posed by M's ambitions, 173-174
becomes M's secretary, 244
secretary of Tovata ko Lau, 251
predicts Tovata's fall, 252
tells Thurston that Tovata is 'broken up', 254
M 'represents Tongan interests solely', 255
M's succession hopes in Tonga, 257-158
M's impregnable power in Fiji, 258
Fijians could never establish their own government, 270-271
advocates working in union with chiefs, 277
evidence of M's care with leases, 283-284
public support for M and the Tovata chiefs, 293
appointed Minister for Native Affairs, 334-335
approached by M's creditors, 335
appeals to M over problems in Bua and Macuata, 337
Cakaudrove people 'crying out in despair', 375
Macuata 'utterly disorganised', 375
M should not be considered in Cession negotiations, 378
instructed to tell Cakobau that M's position must be respected, 382
warns M against confrontation with Bau, 386-387
'M's word is in the hills', 394-395
refuses to act as Warden for Lau, 395
Minister for Native Affairs in Provisional Government, 434
instructions to M as Roko Tui Lau, 434
advises Emberson that M can ignore Hedemann contract, 436
suspended from office as Minister, 437
clerk in Colonial Secretary’s Department, 439
no allowance for M’s use of his own vessels, 439
Swayne, Charles, Lau SM, 1887 opinion of M’s ownership of Vanuabalavu, 241
various findings on M’s leases in Lau, 279-281
visit from Commodore Goodenough, 401
distrust of M, 484
pre-tax food supply in Lau, 487
distrust of Semisi Fifita, 508
Sydney Morning Herald, The, Australian newspaper,
collision between M and Cakobau ‘far from improbable’, 346
Commissioners would not support M in a ‘war’, 407
M’s house had ‘a vulgar public-house sort of air’, 427
Fijians will be bound by Cession only if convenient, 428
Symonds, Henry, British Vice-Consul in Tonga, Tongans ‘always looked on M as the rightful ...successor’, 459
believes Tevita ‘Unga would never have succeeded as king, 494-495
Tae, Methuselah,
account of sandalwood expedition, 38-41, 42-43
Tafeta, Tahitian teacher, 5
Tagici, daughter of Tanoa, taken to Bau and ill-treatment there, 70-71
Tahara’a, Tahitian teacher, arrives at Lakeba (1830), 41
Tait, Francis, Wesleyan missionary, ‘political tendencies’ of Tongan teachers in Fiji, 224
on collection of Tongan taxes in Fiji, 232
Takai, Lakeban chief, stay in Tahiti (1825), 5
Talai Tupou, Tui Nayau, (d. 1875) visited by Samuel Henry (1842), 40
cousin of Lualala, 58
son of Ratu Rasolo, 61
uncle of Vuetasau, 67
sends Lasike to Cakaudrove, 68
orders Tubou fortified, 68
sends emissary to Vanuabalavu, 69
described by Thomas Jaggar as ‘persecutor’, 69
regarded by missionaries as a tyrant, 73
political reasons for failure to lotu, 73
moral character impugned by Lyth, 74
fails to impress Commodore Wilkes, 85
good reputation noted by Erskine, 85-86
genealogical table, 86
seeks Tupou’s help against Bau, 93-94, 95-96
accepts lotu (1849), 94
prepares soro for Bau, 95, 97
looking ‘this way and that’ for help, 85, 105
refuses to renounce wives, 108
dismayed by arrival of Tongan canoe builders, 110
reassures Cakobau that he will resist Mara, 111
suspicious of Tuikilakila, 112
sends tabua to Moalan chief, 117
sends military assistance to Moala Christians, 117
moral dilemma over conversions, 120
orders M not to sail to Somosomo, 121
assures Cakobau of loyalty, 122
condemns violence on Matuku, 124
refuses help to Mafoa, 130
aids Lomaloma chiefs, 130
condones M’s campaigns, 134
refuses to sign Pritchard’s offer of cession, 166-167
stated by Smythe to be ‘under Tongan influence’, 185
claims that Lakeba and Yasayasa Moala are independent, 185
treaty with Tupou, 243
declines to join Tovata, 252-253
death, 445
Tanna, New Hebrides, arrival of sandalwood expedition (1842), 41
Tanoa Visawaqa, Ratu, Vunivalu of Bau, father of Cakobau, returns from exile with Tongan help, 69, 70
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji
dead (1852), 119
Tapu `osí,
Fijian husband of first TTF, 63
Taufa`ahau, TK (c1797-1893), later King
Tupou I, (for references after 1845 see Tupou
I),
master of Vava`u and Ha`apai, 3-4
praised by missionaries, 16-18
acknowledged as hau, 17
baptism (1833), 17
becomes Tu`i Vava`u, 18
saves A in Tongatapu (1834), 18
calls at Vava`u (1836), 21
position as hau challenged by civil war,
22-23
religious justification for his actions at
Hule, 24
sole guarantor of peace on Tongatapu
(1837), 25
promulgates code of laws (1839), 29
arrival in force on Tongatapu (1840), 30
confers with Commodore Wilkes, 30-31
fortifies Nuku`alofa, 31-32
respectful towards A, 31-32
visited by French priests, 49-50
appointed TK, 51-53
stay at Lakeba (1842), 60
rapprochement with Tongan leaders on
Lakeba, 60-61
Tavaki, Vanuabalavu chief,
evidence at Court of Arbitration (1865),
239
Tawaki, Tupou's emissary,
killed at Ovalau, 135
Taxation Ordinance (Fiji), 1876
details of implementation, 463
teething problems, 463
Tevita, Vanuabalavu chief,
evidence at Court of Arbitration (1865),
239
Thomas, Rev. John, 1796-1881, Wesleyan
missionary,
views of A, 4, 6, 10, 12-14,
on A's renunciation of lotu, 7
praises Moala, 21,
urges forbearance on Taufa`ahau, 22
supports Christian chiefs in Tongatapu
war, 22-23
finds Tongatapu at peace, 33
meets principal chiefs on Tongatapu
(1840), 34
Castigates M for unauthorised visits to
Fiji, 36
opposes 1842 sandalwood expedition,
38-40
investigates 1842 expedition, 44-46
endorses Taufa`ahau as TK, 52-53
condemns Moala's moral character, 57
thrown from his horse, 58
condemns M's conduct, 58-59
intolerance, 59
Thomas, Mrs Sarah, née Hartshorn, (d.1867)
records arrival of two canoes from Fiji
(1841), 36
Thomson, Sir Basil Home, (1861-1939),
describes M's land practices, 282, 285
Tongans at Lomaloma unfairly treated
after M's death, 508
Thurston, John Bates, (1836-1897), acting
British Consul,
Wainiqolo `a cruel treacherous marauder',
209
notes rapprochement between M and Tui
Cakau, 247
supports M's authority over Europeans on
Vanuabalavu, 257
opposition to Polynesian Land Company,
259, 261
urges M to pay his debts, 262
reluctant to request protectorate, 269
'Fiji is ... almost the birthright of the
Australian colonies', 270
deplores chiefs' European secretaries, 271
submits annexation petitions to Consul
March, 275
notes M's and Tui Cakau's perks of office,
295-296
decides to join new government, 315
poor relations with Consul March, 332
'recongrous elements' in Fiji
government, 332
protests to CO over de facto recognition
of Fiji, 338
need for constitutional reform, 338-339
ready to take M and Ratu Epeli to London
for cession talks, 339
consults Cakobau, M and Tui Cakau about
annexation, 339-340
requests FO to consider cession, 340-341
advises Sir Hercules Robinson of parlous
state of Fiji, 341
rumours of disaffection in Lau, 345-346
‘grasping and rapacity’ of Europeans in Fiji, 348
blames M for his and Tui Cakau’s secession, 352, 353
attempts to reverse secession, 353
persuades M and Tui Cakau to consult Cakobau, 353
chiefs’ disillusionment with government, 356
urges new constitution or annexation, 357
threats to depose King and Viceroy, 362
M ‘very staunch’ resisting armed Europeans at Nasova, 362-363
Cakobau, M and Tui Cakau resentful towards Europeans, 364
many whites wished ‘to clear the niggers out’, 364
proposes new constitution, 365
deplores Goodenough’s overbearing attitude to Cakobau, 370
terse correspondence with Goodenough, 371
M ‘playing a double game all round’, 378
informed M he was to be deposed as Viceroy, 381
offended by Commissioners’ ‘specious promises’, 385
calls M a liar to his face, 385
bore M a grudge ever after Cession conference, 385
warns Tui Cakau not to heed M, 388
prepared to use armed force against opponents, 389
‘a triple-eyed villain and traitor’, 389
preparations to form a government, 390
calls Council of Chiefs at Levuka, 390
accused of lies and deceit by Goodenough, 390
supported by M and Tui Cakau, 390-391
breach with Goodenough beyond repair, 391
determined on M’s permanent expulsion from Fiji, 392, 394
on M’s emissaries in Bau, 393
asked by chiefs to hold office, 393-394
M has ‘wilfully and wholly broken’ his agreement with government, 394
to send mercenaries to Lau to undermine M’s authority, 395
warned not to attempt M’s expulsion from Fiji, 395
antipathy towards settler interests, 397
displeased with letter from Goodenough, 401
pleased with Cession offer and with M’s dismissal, 401-402
warns King of Tonga not to deal with M, 402
warns Layard not to recognise M, 402
demands Lauan taxes from M, 404
judgment clouded by ‘spite’, 406
detailed riposte to Hennings on M’s record in government, 409
M ‘a dangerous, dissembling man’, 410
justice of many of his charges against M, 410-411
urges Layard not to visit Lomaloma, 417
instructs Ratu Tevita to meet Robinson at Bau, 418
false representations to Robinson concerning Cakobau, 422
denies M deed of transfer over Lomaloma court house and gaol, 435
warns M over Lauan tax collections, 439
M requires permission before removing people from their homes, 443
‘there are good reasons for brewing a row at Lomaloma’, 479
great resentment in Fiji over land given to Tongans, 490
Tupou received ‘valuable presents’ from German Emperor and Crown Prince, 496
sent to Tonga to ‘expostulate’ with Tupou, 496
deprecates ‘Tongan raj’ in Fiji, 502
queries M’s leasing and rent practices, 502-503
‘the bouncing, lazy, bullying Tongan has disappeared from Lau’, 508
‘Charley Ma’afu ought to be in gaol’, 509
‘Siale is a frightful liar’, 509
regret for the manner of M’s passing, 510
The Times (London), opposes annexation, 359
Tingea, matapule to M,
on 1842 sandalwood expedition, 37 n. 49, 38
on M’s reasons for voyage to Fiji in 1847, 79, 81
To Kivea, Sakiusa, Lakeban chief, attends Tongan parliament and impressed by code of laws, 211
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

wants to adopt similar code in Lau, 211
Tongatapu,
unsettled state in 1820s, 6
Wesleyan mission schools, 14-16, 21
hostility to Christianity, 6-8, 20-27
famine, 21
civil war (1837), 22
Tovata ko Lau,
formation (1867), 250-251
new locus of power centred on M, 251-252
Tupou not consulted, 253
adhesion of Lakeba, 264
resolutions of 1870 ‘parliament’, 290-291
Truxton, William, commander of USS
Jamestown,
recommends refund to Cakobau if ‘debt’ paid, 273
threatens force against M, 273
Tu`a,
definition, 4
Tucker, Rev. Charles, (1808-1881), Wesleyan missionary,
condones slaughter at Hule, 23
funeral of M’s brother Lausi’i, 27
confers with A and Rabone, 30
sees Mumui as future TK, 54
Tucker, Mrs Jane, née Hall, (1806-1875)
in charge of Mission school, 16
funeral of M’s brother Lausi’i, 27
Tu`i Ha`apai, brother of Tupou I,
his Tongan forces intervene in Bua, 103
begins ‘clearing out’ Tongans from Fiji, 104-105
leaves Lakeba for Tonga (1851), 107
sent to Fiji to enquire about M’s claim against Cakobau, 194, 197
accompanies M to enquire about Wainiqolo’s defeat, 216
Tu`i Ha`atakala, title,
creation, 1-2
extinction, 2
Tu`i Kanokupolu, title,
creation, 2
growth of power, 2-3
revival, 4
Tuikilakila, Tui Cakau, (d. 1854),
determined to acquire M’s canoe, 79-80
succeeded (1845), 89
opposed to lotu, 90, 92, 101
genealogical table, 91
visits Lakeba and conveys M to Cakaudrove, 92
grants M levying rights for some islands in Cakaudrove, 92
seeks to explain raids on Mago and Susui, 107
continued campaign against Christianity (1852), 111
deceives delegation of missionaries at Bau, 111-112
murdered (1854), 128
Tuilakeba, chief,
ringleader of massacre of Christians on Vanuabalavu, 130
prisoner of M, 133
Tui Levuka, Ovalau chief,
accepts lotu, 138
seeks cession of Ovalau to Great Britain, 143, 146
secret approach to French bishop, 146
Tui Lomaloma, Vanuabalavu chief,
lands requisitioned by Siale`ataongo, 478-479
rivalry between M and Fison over Mission collections, 480
Tui Nadroga,
asserts his rights against Cakobau, 324
Tu`ipelehake, Tongan leader on Lakeba,
allies with Tui Nayau, 94
Tu`i Tonga, title
creation, 1, 63
revival, 4
Tui Waimunu of Solevu,
viewed as outlaw by missionaries, 160
taken prisoner, 160
Tui Yaroi, Matuku chief,
steadfast opponent of lotu, 117-118
awaiting lotu, 121
accepts lotu, 123
death in custody on Lakeba, 133-134
Tungi Halatuitui’a, (d.1900)
visits Bua and converts Tui Bua, 159-160
first in order of precedence at Tongan parliament, 162
heads Tongan Commission to Fiji, 223
tells Owen some Tongan claims in Fiji must be referred to Tupou, 224
says M was ‘compelled’ to sign 1859 cession offer, 224
Tupou disapproves M’s conduct, 224
verbal agreement with Owen over Tongan lands, 225-226
refuses to sign written agreement, 226
Tupou I, (King George, c.1797-1893), King of Tonga 1845-1893, (for references before 1845, see Tāufa‘āhau), seeks to enhance Tongan influence in Fiji, 75-76
approves M's voyage to Fiji (1847), 77-84
seeks British protection for Tonga, 83-84
fears French interest in Tonga, 84
assists Bau (1847), 88
assassination plot, 88
seeks to recall Tongans from Fiji, 99-100
urges Cakobau to lotu, 101, 127, 129
punishes Tongans who transgressed in Lau, 101
emerges as undisputed ruler of Tonga, 113
calls at Lakeba en route to Sydney, 124
appoints M and Lualala joint governors of Tongans in Fiji, 124
visits Cakobau at Bau, 127-128
proffers help in war against Rewa, 127
concludes treaty with France, 135
prepares large folau for Fijian visit (1855), 135-136
determined to discipline Tongans in Fiji, 135-136
arrives at Lakeba with force of 3,000, 137
murder of his emissary Tawaki at Ovalau, 138-139
Tongan chiefs united against Mara, 140
merciful to defeated Fijians, 142
visit to Rewa, 142-143
visit to Beqa, 144
constitutional position, 144-145
mass conversions at Beqa, Kadavu and Vatulele, 145
again at Bau, 145
leaves Cakaudrove ‘for home’, 149
praises M at fono on Tongatapu (1855), 150
arrives at Lakeba on way home, 150
presents his war club to Thomas West, 151
farewell service on Lakeba, 151
list of events
political and religious consequences of long visit to Fiji, 151-152
signs agreement to remove Wainiqolo from Fiji, 198
reluctant to acknowledge Tongan danger to Fiji, 199
convenes Tongan parliament (1862), 200
expanded Code of Laws (1862), 200
awaits decision on cession (1862), 209-210
arrives in Fiji with Semisi Fifita (1862), 210, n.42
orders Tongans in Fiji not to ‘meddle’ in Fijian troubles, 211
wants Fijian chiefs to confirm status quo of Tongan lands, 211-212
enjoins M not to engage in war in Fiji, 212
seeks authority over sales of Tongan lands to foreigners, 212
writes provocatively to Cakobau, 214
active plans for invasion of Fiji, 215
reasons for displeasure with Cakobau, 215
‘pained’ by M’s renunciation of Tongan rights, 215
invited by group of settlers to invade Fiji, 215
lays up ammunition in Tonga as preparation for war, 216
had planned peacemaking visit to Bau, 216
appraisal in Fiji over his proposed visit (1863), 221
Tongan chiefs resolve to send 1,000 warriors to Lakeba, 221
proposed visit to Fiji ‘given up’, 221
dissuaded from visit by letters from two Consuls in Fiji, 221
to send a commission of enquiry to Fiji, 221-222
‘pained’ at land sales to foreigners in Fiji, 222
claims Tongan lands in Fiji ‘held by right’, 222-223
has ‘six tons of powder’ ready for use in Fiji, 236
seeks formal disengagement of Tonga from Fiji, 260
rejects Cakobau’s request for help, 261-262
reasons why he relinquished Tongan lands in Fiji, 263
his successor not chosen by 1865, 264
formal termination of treaties with Bua and Lakeba, 264
sends food aid to Lau, 275
sends ship to Fiji to fetch home Tongans willing to leave, 438
orders M not to hinder Tongans wishing
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

to leave Fiji, 438
succeeded by his great-grandson, 459
rejoices in Tonga’s independence, 472
signs Treaty of Friendship with Germany, 472
rumours of Vava’u chiefs’ plot to overthrow him, 474
requests M to visit him (1877), 476
friendly letter to Sir Arthur Gordon, 477
‘writhes under [Shirley Baker’s] tyranny’, 482
promises Tungi and M that repressive laws will be repealed, 482-483
extends deadline for ratification of treaty with Great Britain, 496
writes to Tui Nayau of ‘long-standing links’ between Tonga and Lakeba, 507
Proclamation on succession in 1885, 509-510

Tupoulahi, TK, 2
Tupouto’a, TK, death (1820), 3
Tupou Toutai, leader of Tongans on Lakeba, and Taula’ahau’s visit, 60, 71
arrival in Fiji (1833), 69
death (1848), 89

Turner, Rev. Dr George, (1818-1891), LMS missionary,
account of 1829 sandalwood expedition, 37-38
meets Samuel Henry on Tanna, 41

Turner, Rev. Nathaniel, (1793-1864), Wesleyan missionary,
As renunciation of lotu, 7
witnesses As inauguration as TK (1827), 7-8
produces Tonga’s first school book and opens missionary school, 9
praises Taula’ahau, 16-17
accompanies Tupou on Lakeba visit (1853), 125

Turner, Rev. Peter, (1802-1873), Wesleyan missionary,
on Tongatapu civil war (1840), 32-33
endorses Taula’ahau as TK, 52

Twynings, John, sailor,
describes Tongans resident on Lakeba, 67-68

Ululakeba, Ratu Tevita, (d. 1876), Tui Nayau, son of Vuetasau,
chosen successor as Tui Nayau, 265
appointed as Governor of Lakeba division of Lau, 267
M’s personal representative in Lakeba and Ono, 278
appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Lau, 328
ordered to Tonga by M, 377
appointed an executive officer of Lau by Ad-Interim Government, 399
again sent to Tonga, 402
subservience to M, 403
decides appointment as Governor of Lau, 406
possible attempt to accept appointment, 406
‘offside’ with M, 418
resigns as Governor of Lau, 418
appointed a NSM and buli for Lakeba, 430
supports M on retention of lala, 451
imposes tax burdens on Lakebans, 464-465
death (1876), 465, 470, 472
sau ni vanua, 472
regarded as tyrant by Lakeban people, 472
reprimanded by Governor, 472

`Unga, Tevita, son of Taula’ahau,
(c.1824-1879),
on his father’s baptism, 17
accompanies M to Fiji (1847), 79
precedes Ratu Mara to Lakeba (1849), 95
leaves Lakeba for Tonga (1851), 107
helps M subdue Naceva village, Beqa, 144
prospects for succession to Tongan throne, 155, 200
fourth in order of precedence at Tongan parliament, 200
prospects of succession to Tongan throne, 456-457
named as Tupou’s heir in 1875
Constitution, 458
death (1879), 494

Vakaloto, son of Tuikilakila,
leads raid on Cicia, 111

Vakawaletabua, Tui Bua, (d. 1874)
seeks M’s help against ‘heathen’, 158
defeat of Solevu, 159-161
wary of M’s wider ambitions, 161
signs offer of cession (1858), 167
again seeks M’s help, 170
visits Yasawas with Semisi Fifita, 191
concludes treaty of ‘perpetual peace’
between Bua and Tonga, 236
attends Tongan parliament (1868), 259
seeks closer ties with eastern Fiji, 262
determined to seek help from M and
Golea against Cakobau, 278
appointed Governor of Bua, 290
ready to use force to resist tax collection, 379
sent by M to consult Swanston, 384
taken on board Pearl to Nasova for
Cession ceremony, 427

Vanuabalavu,
civil war during 1840s, 89-90
fear of Tongan intervention, 90-91
murder of Fijian teacher (1850), 100-101
massacre of Christians (1854), 130-133
chiefs’ formal submission to M, 131-133,
still subject to Cakaudrove, 133, 228
Tongan rights on island under
Fijian custom, 229
in ‘abject subjection’ to Cakaudrove, 230
chiefs state that only M has right to sell
their land, 234
chiefs’ statement to Court of Arbitration,
M’s ignominious leasehold practices,
settlers’ security of tenure, 299-300
deaths from measles, 439
people suffering under tax and lala
demands, 481
Fijians forced to build houses for Tongans,
Tongan ascendancy maintained under M,
Vatu, see New Hebrides
Vava’u,
religious revival, 20-21
Vave, Mataiate, Tongan teacher,
reports raids on Christians on
Vanuabalavu, 106-107
seeks help from Lakeba, 109-110
working at Lakeba, 122
Vecsey, Gideon, Hungarian settler in Fiji,
leases land on Vanuabalavu, 286
failure as planter, 287

Vesti,
Fijian hardwood used for canoe
construction, 66-67
prevalence on Vulaga and Kabara, 66-67
Vi, Pita, Tongan teacher,
on siege of Hule, 22
death from measles, 438
Vika Kaufusi, sister of M, 11
von Hügel, Baron Anatole, (1854-1928),
naturalist and museum curator,
dines with M at Government House, Suva
(1875), 81-82
‘Ma’afu is a splendid specimen of
humanity’, 448
‘those deep hazel eyes speak for
themselves’, 448
Vuesasau (Viliame), (d. 1856), nephew of Talai
Tupou,
materially aids lotu at Lakeba (1840s),
69-70
close associate of M, 87
seen as leader of Fijians on Lakeba, 109
commands relief expedition to Lomaloma,
arrives too late for Navucunimasi siege,
seeks to prevent M’s mission to Bau, 122
campaign in Matuku, 122
fear of M and the Tongans, 123
‘expelled the Society’, 123, 126
queries his expulsion, 126-127
difference of opinion with Lyth, 126
lost at sea (1856), 87, 157
Vuna, son of Tupou I,
death (1862), 155, 200
Vunuku village, Moala,
lotu introduced, 115
attacked and burnt, 115
Wainiolo, (d. 1862), Tongan chief and M’s
lieutenant,
accompanies M to Moala, 117
battle against Mualevu forces, 132
receives Cikobia as gift from Tupou, 132
sent by M to enquire into affairs at Bua,
his forces’ depredations in Macuata, 171,
again intervenes in renewed hostilities,
his forces wreak destruction on those of
Ritova, 190
forced ‘retirement’ from Fiji, 190
intent on capturing Golea, 205
appeal for help to Waikava, 205
takes Golea prisoner at Somosomo, 206
agrees to help Kuila destroy Golea, 208
death at Wairiki, 208
defiance of Golea at Wairiki, 209
‘a cruel, treacherous marauder’, 209
his defeat a ‘pyrrhic victory’ for his
chiefs, 209
Waqaimalani, senior Vuanirewa chief,
accompanies M to Moala, 116
accompanies Vuetasau to Matuku, 122
attends Tongan parliament (1868), 259

Waterhouse, Rev. James, Wesleyan missionary,
retirement of many Tongan teachers,
441-442
Waterhouse, Rev. Joseph, (1828-1881),
Wesleyan missionary,
misunderstands Tongan power structure,
33
on Cakobau’s reluctance to letu, 88
becomes resident missionary at Bau, 127
and Cakobau’s conversion, 129-130
concerned about disaffection on Ovalau,
144
approves M’s actions in Bua and Macuata
(1862), 172
urges M to help Pritchard or leave Fiji, 177
favour ‘Tongan-Fijian government’, 204
confirms that Pritchard urged Tongans to
attack Bau, 204
claims that M would never recognise any
treaty made by Cakobau, 205
Watkin, Rev. James, (1805-1886), Wesleyan
missionary,
opinion of A, 20
Watsford, Rev. James, (1820-1907),
on Vanuabalavu chiefs' renunciation of
letu, 93
accuses M and Tuikilakila of ‘iniquity’, 93
Wesleyan Methodist Mission Society,
lobbies British government over cession of
Fiji (1858-1859), 180
Wesleyan Mission in Tonga,
schools, 14-16, 26
theories of kingship, 16
Tongan publications, 16, 19, 24
schools’ curriculum, 24-25, 26
on ‘holy war’ on Tongatapu, 25
West, Rev. Thomas, (1824-1890), Wesleyan
missionary,
urges Tupou to reduce size of his folau, 135
on Tupou’s motives in visiting Fiji (1855),
136
on unsettled state of Lakeba Tongans, 136
describes M as once ‘a chief opponent’ of
Tupou, 136
decides to acknowledge M as a champion
of the letu, 136
pleased at outcome of Tupou’s long visit
to Fiji, 151
defends Tupou against accusations of
imperialist ambition, 152
Whippy, David, (1802-1871), US Vice Consul
on Ovalau,
urges Tupou to keep war away from
Ovalau, 142
White, Rev. Joseph, Wesleyan missionary,
M ‘daily expected with a large army’
(1862), 210
still expects M ‘with a large army’ (1863),
218
convinced of M’s sincerity in religion,
219
Wilkes, Commodore Charles, (1798-1877),
Commander of U.S. Exploring Expedition,
call at Tongatapu and opinion of A, 4-5
praises Tongan Mission school, 16
finds Sia-ko-VEiongo in uproar, 31
seeks to mediate in Tongatapu disputes,
30-31
on religious and political aspects of
Tongan civil war, 34
Wilkinson, David, secretary to Tui Bua,
witnesses treaty between Bua and Tonga,
236
Secretary of Tovata ko Lau, 251
praised by Sir Arthur Gordon, 251, n.34,
interprets for M during Robinson’s visit,
425
advises Gordon of plethora of problems in
Lau, 491
‘disgraceful and disgusting’ conduct by
M, Siale’aataongo and others, 492-493
M has been cajoled into signing
promissory notes, 493
M pursued by creditors, 493
M guilty of much ‘indiscretion and
misconduct’, 493
advises M to attend Tevita ‘Unga’s
funeral, 495
favors Tungī to succeed, 495
addresses chiefs at M’s funeral, 507
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Williams, Rev. John, (1796-1839), Wesleyan missionary,
visits Tongatapu, 5, 12
praises Tāufa’ahau, 17
praises A and Moala, 18
on Tongatapu’s ‘leadership role’ over Lakeba, 77-78
Williams, John Brown, (1810-1860),
appointed U.S. Commercial Agent in Fiji (1846), 93
destruction of his house by fire and subsequent damages claim, 93
views of Tongans in Lau, 162-163
asked to intervene between Cakobau and rebel chiefs, 168
his intervention prevented by M, 169
astute appraisal of sources of M’s power, 169
commends M for making peace at Solevu, 175
urges M to respect ‘peace and commerce’, 175
death (1860), 183
Williams, Rev. Thomas, (1815-1891), Wesleyan missionary,
reports Tongan ‘fugitives’ at Lakeba (1841), 36-37
records visit of Triton to Lakeba (1842), 40
describes innovation in canoe construction, 67
Lakeban tribute to Bau, 70
importance of va’ulu rights, 76
Tuikilakila’s opposition to lotu, 92
M as ‘the Tongan Hengist’, 228
Williamson, Henry, Lands Claims Commissioner,
Golea not justified in selling Vanuabalavu, 229

intoxicated in public with M, 492
apparent hold over M, 493

Woods, George Austin, (b. 1828), Premier of Fiji,
wary of M, 308
seeks a loan in Sydney, 326
appointed Premier (1872), 334
proclamation of order for planting of cotton trees, 335
asks M to lead ‘Western Contingent’ through Viti Levu mountains, 343
borrows money for ministers’ salaries, 348
likely consequences of Nasova ‘affray’, 363
proposes new constitution, 365
M ‘tamata vuku’, 383

Yasayasa Moala,
description, 115
traditional links with Bau and Lakeba, 115, 116-117
political nature of islands’ conversion, 118
new chiefly appointments under M’s aegis, 133-134
effectively under M’s control, 134
M’s appointee as chief deposed, 443
Young, Sir John, (1807-1876), Governor of New South Wales 1861-1867,
leads official delegation to Fiji, 203-204
formal advice that Great Britain will not accept cession, 204
Young, Rev. Robert, (1796-1865), Wesleyan missionary,
accompanies Tupou on Lakeba visit, 125

Wilson, Rev. Matthew, (1808-1876), Wesleyan missionary,
baptises M’s son, 57
Winter, George, Australian settler in Fiji,
M’s friendly overtures to Bete, 171, n.83
advises Cakobau to seek French assistance, 229, notes 129 and 138
applies for Crown Grant of Vanuabalavu, 327, n.28
claims title to Vanuabalavu, 462
Wood, Theodore, English visitor to Fiji,