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Synopsis

During the years of his adult life in Tonga and Fiji, before he became Tui Lau in 1869, Ma'afu remained an enigma to those of his acquaintance who were disposed to record their impressions of him. His character and career were the products of the turbulent times in which he lived in both groups of islands. The Tonga of his childhood and youth witnessed unprecedented social and political change, the consequence of continued civil war and of the introduction of an alien culture with the arrival and spread of Christianity. The advent of a unified Christian kingdom with centralised authority in the person of Tupou I. and the restraints imposed by the lotu as a force of social control, sent Ma'afu to Fiji in 1847. There, in a society characterised by minor wars and uneasy alliances, he was able to indulge his love of intrigue and pursue his ambitions.

Welcomed as kin by the Lakeban ruling house, Ma'afu established close links with Cakaudrove, and exercised a growing influence throughout Lau, where his path was smoothed by the generations of Tongans who had preceded him. Disruptions occasioned by the spread of Christianity enabled him to establish sovereignty, legitimate in Fijian custom, in the Yasayasa Moala and Vanuabalavu. By the late 1850s, when the question of the cession of Fiji to Britain was first mooted, Ma'afu’s influence had extended to Macuata and Bua as well. His power at its zenith, he was poised to achieve supremacy throughout Fiji.

Throughout the 1860s, as the British first considered and then declined the offer of cession, Ma'afu intrigued for ascendency. His contemporaries were never certain whether he was driven solely by his own ambition or whether he acted at the behest of his Ling. By 1863, with the future of the Tongan lands in Fiji in jeopardy, Tupou was indeed poised to intervene in their defence. He was foiled, and Ma'afu’s ambitions were stymied, by American greed. Ma'afu was faced with the Americans’ determination to extract some form of payment for the so-called American debt, while the increasing numbers of European settlers meant that the British government could not avoid closer involvement. These same pressures caused Tupou formally to withdraw from Fiji, leaving Ma'afu in effect as a Fijian chief. That new status achieved formal recognition with the creation of the title of Tui Lau, an innovation in the polity of Fiji and an acknowledgement of the power Ma'afu had achieved in the islands.
Ma'afu, although always able to use his opportunities to his best advantage, was ultimately defeated by forces beyond his control. If the contest in Fiji had been solely between him and the indigenous chiefs, with no British or American intervention, he would have become master at Bau, as he once admitted was his ambition. In Tonga, had Tupou died in the 1860s with no designated heir, Ma'afu would have been the first choice as king. In one sense, he was born a generation too late to achieve ultimate power in either group of islands. The paucity of scholarship dealing with the early years of his life has left unresolved questions such as his motives for coming to Fiji, his methods of acquiring the ultimate sovereignty of the chiefdom of Lau, and the nature and extent of his ambitions. Ma'afu influenced the history of mid nineteenth century Fiji more than any of his Fijian contemporaries, leaving in the chiefdom of Lau a model administration which would sit easily within the British administration after 1874.
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Glossary

(F = Fijian; T = Tongan)

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.

lotu (F): Christianity

lālā (F): the order of a chief, requiring work to be done.

magiti (F): food, esp. food prepared in large quantities for presentation to others; a feast presented to others.

mana (F): the spiritual force, sometimes considered as supernatural, which a chief was thought to possess and which enhanced his power. Mana could be prescribed (the consequence of high birth) or ascribed (the consequence of his own actions).

matanitu (F): a chiefdom; a political federation of vanua.

matapule (T): orator; ceremonial attendant of a chief.

solevu (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.

tābilai (F): a type of canoe end, or prow.
tabu (F): forbidden; sacred.
tapu (T): forbidden; sacred.
taukei (F): landowners.
tu’a (T): untitled man; commoner.
tikina (F): a district or subdivision of a province.
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 his uncle’s goods.
Viti (F): Fiji.
vono (F): a meeting of people of a village, to hear a report of a meeting with chiefs.
vavusa (F): the largest kinship and social division of Fijian society, consisting of the descendants of one originator.
Preface

The paths into history are many. My path into Fijian history began during a walk around Levuka on an overcast August morning in 1985. Reminders there of the nineteenth century European presence in Fiji awakened an interest in the events of those years, and particularly in the response of the Fijian people to the aliens in their midst. 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 denied as the chiefs and people of Fiji played out the dramas which would, eventually, lead to the unity of the *matanitu* under foreign rule. Yet so little was written about Ma'afu. Who was he, and whence did he come? What drove him never to leave centre stage in a country not his own? This work is a search for answers to many of the questions which arise concerning the enigmatic Tongan chief who, for more than thirty years in Fiji, engaged the attention of all who crossed his path. He was a figure who could not be ignored, and whose mark on the history of the islands of Fiji is greater than that of any of his contemporaries.

For reasons of length, this work deals with Ma'afu's life from his birth in Tonga c.1826 to his installation in 1869 as Tui Lau. It is worthy of note that any chronicle of the affairs of Lakeba, and more especially of the Tongan community there and elsewhere in Lau, during Ma'afu's early years in Fiji must inevitably 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 Tongans, and of what the writers believed to be the important issues of the day. They are also strongly influenced by the bourgeois, Christian and conservative values in which the missionaries themselves had been nurtured. The missionaries inevitably brought with them the ideology of their nation, religion and class. To quote Frank Welsh, 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.

Except in the cases of direct quotations from primary sources, I have followed standard modern orthography for Fijian, Tongan and other indigenous names.

Anyone who has written about the history of a society not his own owes so much to so many. In my case, the present work could never have been completed without the willing help of the following people:

In Tonga: Dr Mapa Puloka, the Hon. Veikune, the Hon. Fielakepa, all descendants of Ma'afu; Tu'ifu Tevake; the late Patricia Matheson.

In Fiji: (a) Viti Levu: Margaret Patel, former Government Archivist, Setareki Tale, present Government Archivist, and the staff of the National Archives of Fiji; Ratu Sela Rayawa, Librarian, Fiji Museum; Sairusi Ratulomai, of the Native Lands Trust Board; Tevita Nawadra; Rev. Tevita Baleiwaqa; Dr Doug Munro and Dr Morgan Tuimalaeali 'ifano, University of the South Pacific.

(b) Vanuaabalavu: Ratu Poasa Delailomaloma and Ratu William Fonolahi Keni of Lomaloma; Villame Veikune and Ratu Dennis Miller of Sawana; Metuisela Saimon of Aavea.

(c) Lakeba: Adi Tara Uluilakeba; Ratu Tevita Uluilakeba; Ratu James Rasolo, master, Ratu Finau Junior Secondary School, and the following students: Semti Bukiamasi, Jitoko Cika, Ilaisa Jikotani, Villame Logavatu, Semi Ranatawake, Lorima Sautu, Sam Sorby and Sekove Tulele.

In Australia and New Zealand: The librarians and staff, Mitchell and Dixson Libraries, State Library of New South Wales; Alan Davies, Curator of Photographs, Mitchell Library; the librarians, National Library of Australia; the following members of the Division of Pacific History, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University; Professor Donald Denoon, Professor Hank Nelson, Robert Langdon; Oanh Collins, Dorothy McIntosh, Jude Shanahan and Marion Weeks, also of the Division, for their cheerful and willing assistance above and beyond the call of duty; Ewan Maidment, Executive Officer, Pacific Manuscripts Bureau; Keith Mitchell, Cartography Unit, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies; Dr John Young (Franklin, Tasmania); Dr Elizabeth Wood-Ellem (Melbourne); Rev. Siupeli Taliai (Melbourne); Rev. Dr Geoff Cummins; Dr Deryck Scarr (Canberra), for kindly reading a draft of the thesis; Professor Peter Hempenstall and Associate Professor Ian Campbell, of the University of Canterbury, Christchurch; Emeritus Professor Ivan Barko, University of Sydney; Professor Alan Atkinson, University of New England, Armidale; Penny Williams
(Cambridge, Tasmania), Marion Diamond; Gareth Grainger; and Susan Woodburn of the Barr Smith Library, University of Adelaide.

Special thanks are due to Professor Stewart Firth, now Professor of Politics, University of the South Pacific, Suva, for his expert guidance and constant encouragement in all aspects of Pacific history, and to Dr Niel Gunson, Visiting Fellow, Division of Pacific and Asian History, Australian National University, for his special knowledge and insights into Tongan and missionary history and for putting up with me as a house guest.

Finally, I record my gratitude to my late father, Reg Spurway, whose support and encouragement over a lifetime meant so much.

To all of the above people, I owe a debt which can never be repaid.
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.)

I care not whether a man is good or evil; all
That I care
Is whether he is a wise man or a fool. Go! Put
Off holiness
And put on intellect.

- William Blake, Jerusalem

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
Prologue

Ma'afu, born in Tonga about 1826, was a son of Aleanotu'a, Tu’i Kanokupolu and a cousin of Tupou I, king of Tonga. When aged about 21, he came to live in Fiji and within fifteen 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 thirty years. Was Ma'afu the force for good he often claimed to be, and indeed often seemed, or did he don 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 earlier years have not received the attention from scholars which they merit. This neglect has left unresolved several questions concerning his life and career in his adopted home.

¹ [Unnamed] Wesleyan missionary to Stephen Rabone, 4 Jul 1865, WMN(J), No 38, Jan 1867, p 601.
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 endeavored to discredit this notion, there is need for a detailed consideration of the evidence to determine both the circumstances and the motive for his departure from Tonga. Similarly, the acquisition of sovereignty in the future chiefdom of Lau has never been shown as 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 as Roko Tui Lau in the British Crown Colony.

Ma'afu was sometimes seen, during his lifetime and since, as an agent of his king, Tupou I, in the latter's supposed ambitions to conquer all or part of Fiji. This question is one which has been addressed in detail by modern scholars, but which will not suffer from a reassessment in the wider context of Ma'afu's career from his childhood in Tonga until his formal accession to power in Lau. Finally, there is 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. Because Ma'afu rarely gave voice to his ambitions, they remain elusive. It is nevertheless possible to draw conclusions which can sometimes be definitive and which reveal a hunger for power which only the mastery of Fiji seemed likely to satisfy.

The enigma which Ma'afu posed his missionary visitor in 1865 was never to be satisfactorily resolved in his lifetime. A reassessment now of the years before he became Tui Lau can at least begin to determine whether Ma'afu 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.
Chapter One: Ma'afu'otu'itonga

To stand at the northwestern point of Tonga's main island, Tongatapu, at the site 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 the town of Nuku'alofa, Tonga's capital. A generation after the missionaries' advent in Tonga, Moala, then the principal wife of Aleamotu'a, scion of one of Tonga's highest-ranking families, gave birth to their first child. The baby's name, Ma'afu'otu'itonga, was that of his great-grandfather, the sixth Tu'i Kanokupolu. All his life, he was usually known simply as Ma'afu. Since his death, he has been known in Tonga as Ma'afu Fisi, or Ma'afu of Fiji, a designation which 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, also known by his family name of Tupou, was the principal chief of Tongatapu. His father, grandfather, and other relatives had ruled the island as Tu'i Kanokupolu 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 state offices of Tonga. The others were the Tu'i Tonga, still existing in the 1820s although with much reduced power, and the Tu'i Ha'atakalaua, 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. The Tu'i Tonga's person was tapu; very few people were allowed to associate with him. Despite the enshrined sanctity of this great office, it was never immune from the winds of political fortune. It is worth remembering, in the light of Ma'afu's future career in Fiji, that the islands which were 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.

The Tu'i Tonga was required to function 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’atakalaua, 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 to exercise functions
independent of the Tu’i Tonga, whose duties were both religious and ceremonial. In
practice, the country’s most powerful chief came to be 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. 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
Kanokupolu, could well owe more to myth than to history. A son of Mo’unga-o-tonga,
Ngata, whose mother was Samoan, was sent to govern the poor district of Hihifo in western
Tongatapu. The title of Tu’i Kanokupolu was probably not used until the time of Ngata’s
grandson, Mataeletu’apiko. Its meaning has been translated 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”. The title reflects a consolidation of power over at least three
generations which came to extend well beyond Hihifo. The role of the Tu’i Kanokupolu
can be considered as that of a secular king.

Despite an inferior status as a kind of lieutenant to the Tu’i Ha’atakalaua, the new
lineage gradually eclipsed both of its predecessors. Evidence for this crucial and
fundamental change in the Tongan polity can be 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 Kanokupolu came to be seen as the most suitable. Since, in
Tonga, the rank of a male ruler is inherited from his mother, this change of allegiance
indicated the growing prestige of the Tu’i Kanokupolu. From the eighteenth century, the

1 Phyllis Herda, The Transformation of the traditional Tongan polity: a Genealogical Consideration of Tonga’s Past, unpublished PhD thesis, Australian National University, 1988, p. 73. See also Campbell, Island Kingdom, p. 21
2 Gifford, p 35
Tu'i Kanokupolu 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 divorced from actual power. The name borne by Tupoulahi's immediate predecessor, Ma'afu'otu'itonanga, can be translated as "fire or weapon of the Tu'i Tonga", an indication of the perceived role of the holder of that 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 Kanokupolu titles no longer possessed the means to confer authority, as they had traditionally done. Force had become necessary to establish and maintain power. The previous Tu'i Kanokupolu, Aleamotua's nephew Tupoutoa, had died in 1820 and no-one had been appointed in his place. The absence of a Tu'i Kanokupolu 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*, was now 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 Aleamotua, whose elevation to the rank of Tu'i Kanokupolu 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

Aleamotua possessed rank, not only because of his close relationship to his predecessors as Tu'i Kanokupolu, but especially through his mother Kaufusi, a member of the Fale Fisi, or House of Fiji. 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.7 Authority derived from such august rank has been described as "the socially recognised right to rule".8 The essential difference between Aleamotua and most of his predecessors lay in his actual power, or capacity to rule, which was severely limited. His real authority 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.

---

4 Bott, "Power and Rank", p. 9
Aleamotu'a had yet to accommodate the demonstrated military power of his great-nephew Taufa'ahau, who after 1826 was the effective master of Ha'apai and Vava'u, the other principal island groups of Tonga. Taufa'ahau, the most powerful chief in the islands, was considered as hau, and could assume the role of kingmaker. In comparison, any "socially recognised right to rule" with which Aleamotu'a was endowed counted for little. Henceforth any power, and with it authority, which he could attain would be dependent on the good will and support of Taufa'ahau. While the prestige of the title of Tu'i Kanokupolu 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. 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. Membership of all classes, except occasionally some of the matapule, was ascribed: birth was the sole qualification. The later career of Ma'afu, in both Tonga and Fiji, cannot be properly understood unless his origins near the apex of this greatly stratified society are acknowledged.

During the decade of Ma'afu's birth Tonga, after some thirty 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 Kanokupolu were both revived in 1827, following the victory of Taufa'ahau over the forces of Laufili Tonga, the designated Tu'i Tonga, at the latter's stronghold, the fortress of Velata in Ha'apai. Restoration of the titles reflected a desire on Tongatapu to keep Taufa'ahau 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. Following his installation in 1827, the Tu'i Tonga relied on Taufa'ahau's support to remain in office. Taufa'ahau 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

---

7 Kaeppler, p. 174
without a people. Although Aleamotu'a was uninterested in war and diplomacy, his position was not greatly threatened, since Taufa'ahau, as hau, was likely to defer to rank within his own lineage.

Taufa'ahau, a son of Tupouto'a, complemented his great-uncle to the extent that while Aleamotu'a possessed high rank, the younger chief had accumulated both political and military power in Tonga. As for Aleamotu'a, many visitors to Tonga during the last years of his rule were dismissive of both the man and his authority. The American commodore Charles Wilkes, who called on the aged chief at his home 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..." 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". Aleamotu'a's apparent ineptitude was of little consequence since Taufa'ahau, 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 which he had not sought and to which he was elevated for political reasons. They tell us nothing of his involvement in one of the greatest catalysts 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: his wars were often seen as nothing more than attempts to expand his power, using whatever expedient was available. Yet Ma'afu was his father's son: Aleamotu'a, during his early years as Tu'i Kanokupolu, 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 some time in Tahiti in 1825, where he attended the LMS missionary 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. Two members of the Papara congregation, Hape and Tafeta, were chosen to travel to Fiji. In 1826, they accompanied Takai on board the 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, 11 Thomas, quoted in Campbell, Classical Tongan Kingship, p. 28
13 ibid., p 28.
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)".15 So the Tahitians
stayed, by invitation, not to say order, of Aleamotu'a, who was anxious for his people to
hear the Word.

The school opened by the Tahitians on Tongatapu was reported in 1827 as well
attended and “countenanced by the chief Tupou”16 During this time Thomas, who had
arrived in Tonga in June 1826, was still feeling his way at Hihifo. Three months after his
arrival, he recorded his puzzlement at the gift of five bunches of bananas from “the chief of
Nuguloffa... His name is Toobo”.17 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 anarchy, with no single chief able to assert authority over the island. Each chief was
“like a little king in his own village and among his own people. This is the consequence of
thirty years of unrest”.18 The absence of any central authority was the principal reason why
no Tu’i Kanokupolu 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 distroyed (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
prnying”19
Aleamotu’a’s position was nothing if not courageous; he remained 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. 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 spread of Christianity was always likely
to become part of the political process.

Because of his ardour for religion, Aleamotu’a faced many difficulties. After he
allowed the Tahitians to proceed to L...keba in November 1827, he faced an ultimatum from
most of his peers: he must renounce the lotu or prepare for war. Threats made by some
fellow chiefs quickly convinced Aleamotu’a that his personal safety was at risk. He
informed missionary Nathaniel Tumer “that, for the present, he had yielded to his enemies,
and that from this time the Lotu...was to be stopped".\(^{20}\) In return for his apparent capitulation, the other chiefs agreed to invest Aleamotu'a as Tu'i Kanokupolu, 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".\(^{21}\) The king did not abandon his principles. "I never heard," Turner wrote, "what has been stated by others, that [Aleamotu'a] promised to give up the lotu".\(^{22}\) Thomas correctly assessed the opposing chiefs' motives in noting: "...it is a political reason which drives them now".\(^{23}\) Over forty years later Ma'afu, at the zenith of his power as Tui Lau in Fiji, was to make public reference to the consequences of this very process, then incomplete, in his adopted country: "The sea is white with the sails of the white men's vessels...I only wish to remind you that this is a new age; work together for what is good and worthy of men".\(^{24}\) A new age also existed in Tonga in the 1820s, with the advent of the lotu. No-one, not even Aleamotu'a, could recognise its significance in the manner his son was to do in another time and place.

Articulate in the future manner of his son Aleamotu'a might not have been; quietly determined never to abandon the lotu he certainly was. On 1 December 1827 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."\(^{25}\) Concerning his appointment, Aleamotu'a "seemed to condemn it in his heart, while he yields to it in his actions".\(^{26}\) 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 three hundred 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 Kanokupolu".\(^{27}\) This was an attempt by the chiefs to set Aleamotu'a firmly, and permanently, against the new religion and all its implications. Aleamotu'a was confused and bewildered; "severely tried in his profession of Christianity".\(^{28}\) 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,
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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 twenty years later, was considerably more cynical than his colleagues in assessing Aleamotu'a's motives. He described the 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. Turner, Cross and Thomas, 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 Kanokupolu "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 what they saw as his devotion to Christianity, the wider political agenda cannot be ignored. Taufa'ahau, 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 Kanokupolu can be seen as recognition of the strength of Taufa'ahau. It had the potential to check any ambitions which Taufa'ahau might have had involving armed intervention on Tongatapu. Taufa'ahau did not possess the support which 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 heathen chiefs' reaction to the Tu'i Kanokupolu's unexpected move came from Hihifo, whose chief Ata, an unwavering opponent of the lotu, was "very angry that Tubo [has] 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
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pray for years”. This public identification with the *lotu* proved to be a political crossing of the Rubicon for Aleamotu’a.

One of the many consequences of that decision was 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, including Ma’afu, made arrangements for 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 Kanokupolu 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, 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 to-day, 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 which would more than once adorn his powerful shoulders, many years later, in Fiji.
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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. 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... 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..." 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. His choice of Christian name, doubtless inspired by the missionaries, indicated how anxious they were to use temporal authority to spread the Word and to reinforce its message.

Following Aleamotu'a's eventual death in 1845 Thomas, weary and disillusioned after almost twenty 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..." Perhaps little discredit should fall on Aleamotu'a for failing to achieve the harsh spiritual standards exacted 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. The three boys and one girl were named Hezekiah, Henry, David and Selina. The only one of them who can be identified with certainty is Henry, who was of course 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. The other children born to Ma'afu's parents were sons Fisi'ihoi, who was baptised as Samuel on 27 June 1830 and
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45 Ta'i and Hingano appear in Tongan genealogies as Taniele Ta'i and Simaima Hingano. They are likely to have been much older than the children of Aleamotu'a and Moala. I am grateful to Dr Neil Gunson for allowing me to examine copies of two Tongan genealogies in his possession: Tongan Genealogies Koe Tohu Hohoko 'A Eitueni Tupou and Tongan Genealogies Transcribed for E.W Gifford.
who died aged eight; Siaosi Niumeitolu, who reached adulthood and fathered four children; Lausi'i, who was born in 1837 and lived only four months; and Josiah, baptised on 2 July 1842 "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 fourteen. 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 the new faith on Tongatapu were linked to the political fortunes of Aleamotu'a which in turn depended on his continuing alliance with Taufa'ahau. Following the chief's baptism and marriage, those prospects 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. 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 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 did so because they saw in it opportunities to enhance their social position or political power. Others preferred their traditional society, a preference which meant that one pillar of that tradition, loyalty to the Tu'i Kanokupolu, could not be maintained. Aleamotu'a, invested as Tu'i Kanokupolu in a time-honoured ceremony, sought to govern within the bounds of the traditional Tongan hierarchy. But he was a Christian, and felt compelled to promote the faith among his fellow chiefs. In so doing, he was bound to rend asunder the polity of his divided island.

The new chapel, which opened in September 1830 with a congregation of about one thousand, including Aleamotu'a and his family, was undeniably a boost for Christianity on Tongatapu. Yet 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 had 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...51

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, despite life’s blows, 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. The question of how serious were the flaws in Aleamotu’a’s character cannot be satisfactorily resolved. For Ma’afu, living for most of his first twenty years in Aleamotu’a’s household, the influence of his father, for good and ill, 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”.52 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.53

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”54 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”.55 Yet it was to be a missionary who was the first to see moral weakness in Aleamotu’a. In 1832, John
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Thomas observed that Aleamotu'a lacked spiritual fortitude. "Since his baptism", wrote Thomas, [Aleamotu'a]

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. 56

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". 57 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 was to record in 1842. 58 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". 59

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' somewhat restrained comments on Aleamotu'a's unwillingness to assert his influence as he should are interspersed with more direct criticisms. The most serious of these concerned the sin of spiritual pride. At a Sunday service in March 1832, Thomas "corrected some errors into which our people are in danger of falling, such as calling Tubou
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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 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 sixty 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 just as 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. There seems little doubt that he received both encouragement and practical help from his 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. While attendance records would certainly have been kept, apparently none has survived. Thus we cannot say with certainty that young Ma’afu attended any of the schools. Yet it is impossible to imagine that he did not;
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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. Encouraged by the missionaries, Aleamotu'a and Moala must have ensured that their eldest son acquired some degree of literacy. 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. It is hard to imagine the son of Aleamotu'a anywhere but in the front row of the mission school in Nuku'alofa.

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, and the King of ... [Ha'apai] with 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...66

Ransome's reference to Aleamotu'a's family as "all daughters" could be explained by his mistaking the gender of the five-year old Ma'afu who, wearing a *tupenu* and seated on the ground among his sisters and other female relatives, might not have been recognisable as a boy. More likely, he was thought too young to begin his schooling, or was simply absent from the compound when Ransome visited. Aleamotu'a and Moala, having ensured the education of their daughters, were not likely to neglect that of their eldest son.

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 nature of 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".67 The Wesleyans' stated aim was "to teach both adults and children to read in their own language".68 They sought to establish their schools and churches firmly at village level, as a means both of promoting social 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 which would teach the Tongan
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people how to live a proper Christian life within, as far as possible, the existing framework of Tongan society. Church control of education was absolute; religion and literacy were indissolubly linked in Tonga, and were to remain so 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 in a position to appreciate the benefits which 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 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'alofa, 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. There were published in 1834 two small school books 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 two 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
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honour me, and I will treat with contempt those who despise me". The missionaries sought to inspire the people of Tongatapu and their ruler with the story of the evolution in ancient Israel of a monarchy inspired by the Lord and firmly under his sovereignty.

Although none of the missionaries is on record as saying so, they might well, in the 1830s, 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 far more than in Tonga, they likely considered Ma'afu as a possible future Tu'i Kanokupolu and as "king" of Tongatapu, if not eventually of the whole of Tonga. Yet Taufa'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 Kanokupolu. On his visit, Taufa'ahau impressed Nathaniel Turner with his intelligence and curiosity concerning Christianity, and asked Turner to send a missionary to Ha'apai. According to John Williams, Taufa'ahau, at the time of his visit to Aleamotu'a, "resolved at once to abandon the gods of his forefathers, and place himself under Christian instruction." 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.

By the early 1830s, although Taufa'ahau's military power was not yet extended to Tongatapu, the chief was regarded as hau by all of Tonga, except for the dissident chiefs on Tongatapu itself. Evidence of Taufa'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". Having begun to meet in class in 1830, Taufa'ahau did not long delay his conversion. In August 1831, he was baptised as "Joaji" in the presence of about 2,000 people. His three children, also baptised, were given the names of Salote, 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.'
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Another Biblical king had emerged, or so Thomas would have us believe. Almost twenty years later, Taufa'ahau's son Tevita 'Unga, the "Tafiut" 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. There was also an oral tradition that Taufa'ahau "confessed, many years afterwards, to a close friend and relative that the excellence of European arms and tools first attracted him to Christianity". Whatever his reasons, King George, as Europeans knew him, was to remain steadfast in the faith. The quest which had led him to accept Christianity was as much political as it was spiritual.

The missionaries' lavish praise for Taufa'ahau during the early 1830s reflects 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 Tongatapu, but as king of a united and Christian Tonga. But any possible accession to power by Taufa'ahau remained well in the future; Aleamotu'a continued to impress missionary visitors, even those with so discerning an eye as John Williams. Visiting 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". A fact which Williams did not appreciate, or to which he attached too little significance, was that Aleamotu'a continued to depend on the support of Taufa'ahau.

Aleamotu'a was aware 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 Kanokupolu, 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. Any decision about that future belonged not to Aleamotu'a but to Taufa'ahau.
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The civil strife which recommenced in January 1834 was another episode of the instability which bedevilled Tongatapu for over thirty years. On this occasion, however, Taufa'ahau emerged as a significant player in the drama. Until the previous year, his formal chieftainship had been confined to Ha'apai. His investiture as Tu'i Vava'u in 1833 meant that he was now master of central and northern Tonga. Taufa'ahau brought impeccable credentials with him when he arrived at Tongatapu in February 1834, with fifty double canoes filled with warriors. He has been accused of intervening in order to further his own ambitions, an assertion impossible to refute. Yet as hau, his intervention was entirely legitimate. Inevitably, the missionaries on Tongatapu saw his arrival as evidence of his total support for Aleamotu 'a against the anti-Christian forces. Before he landed, a number 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, [Taufa'ahau], though next in rank to himself, must sit amongst the common people. Like the children, Taufa'ahau remained content to play a subordinate role. Although rumours of war persisted, armed clashes were avoided. The role of Taufa'ahau in the avoidance of conflict was thought to be crucial: when the United States Exploring Expedition visited Tonga in 1840, Commodore Wilkes recorded that only the intervention of Taufa'ahau had saved the Tu'i Kanokupolu from being driven from his kingdom.

The missionaries were able to use the precarious situation of 1834 for their own purposes. Their school system continued to emphasise Christian virtues such as fellowship with all people, avoidance of hatred and the importance of love and forgiveness as part of the Christian ethic. While such a curriculum was to be expected in Christian schools, the tense religious and political circumstances then prevailing on Tongatapu posed a special challenge to the missionaries. They 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 is evidence of 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 which had arisen because of a 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 of the books enlarged on the theme that Jehovah will give strength to a righteous ruler who makes war on
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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 as yet 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. But he lived in a society which was only just embracing the uses of literacy, and in any case employed an amanuensis to deal with the demands of administrative correspondence. 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 could 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 must have realised that he could never become Tu'i Kanokupolu himself, even by force, so long as Taufa'ahau was alive.

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 ...  
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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 Kanokupolu 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".90 When in September 1835 a stockade was built around the hill in Nuku'alofa where the chapel stood, Aleamotu'a at last appeared determined to stand up to his disaffected fellow chiefs. "They have made a regular shuttlecock of [Aleamotu'a]", wrote James Watkin, "and he has endured their bad manners with great patience but is tired at length, and determined to resist their evil intentions".91 Desultory murmurings, sometimes of sufficient strength to be called plots, had surrounded Aleamotu'a ever since his investiture as Tu'i Kanokupolu in 1827. Taufa'ahau'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.92 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 school report could not be submitted.93 The following year, prejudice against Christianity reached new heights: opposition had "never been more violent than at the commencement of the present year".94 Many people left Tongatapu for fear of war and famine. During one of several visits to the island, Taufa'ahau "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".95 As if famine were not enough, in September 1835 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".96 Ma'afu was about ten and facing dangers more serious than those of his infancy.
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Shortly afterwards, Ma'afu accompanied his mother and four brothers and sisters to Vava'u, a visit which Thomas, then stationed in the northern archipelago, ascribed solely to Moala's Christian duty. "It says something of their love", Thomas wrote to his Society, "that they should have engaged in a voyage of upwards of 140 miles in order to visit us". It also says something of the dangers they faced at home, as well as Thomas' desire not to burden his superiors with unnecessary details of the vicissitudes of the faith in the "Friendly Islands". Moala and her party were refugees from famine and growing unrest on Tongatapu. Since Thomas chose to present her visit as something akin to a social call, he could hardly provide his Society 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]..." Missionary Stephen Rabone recorded the Tongatapu chiefs' desire to depose Aleamotu'a and "replace him with someone more favourable to their views and practices". In mid December, Taufa'ahau called at Vava'u on his way from Ha'apai 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 Vava'u "to consult with the great chiefs of this place". On Tongatapu, the Christian supporters of Aleamotu'a 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".

The events of 1837 need not be considered in any detail here. The arrival of Taufa'ahau with a fleet of canoes was undoubtedly seen as a hostile act by the heathen chiefs, who had long been anxious to provoke him to war. Fighting began one week after his arrival, its causes can best be ascribed to the polarisation of Tongan society. After hostilities commenced, the schools in Nuku'alofa quickly became overcrowded with refugees who had been driven from their villages by the anti-lotu chiefs. 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 Taufa'ahau had exercised the utmost Christian forbearance. "The Tu'i Kanokupolu 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 Taufa'ahau that he was to please himself ..."106 The chiefs' quarrel was not so much with Aleamotu'a as with Taufa'ahau, on whose power Aleamotu'a depended. Taufa'ahau's position as hau was under challenge.

Despite the Christian forces having no option but to lay siege, 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.107 When fighting ceased in early February, the rebels were confined to three of their other larger forts. Despite their setbacks, the heathen had remained "so infatuated...that they would not lay down their arms". They spurned peace offers from both Aleamotu'a and Taufa'ahau.108 In view of the nature of the propaganda which 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. Taufa'ahau had been followed to Tongatapu by Thomas' urgent admonition not to attack first: on 8 January Thomas, 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 Taufa'ahau immediately afterwards.109 Thomas was well aware of the political nature of the struggle on Tongatapu, and of the fact that some non-Christian chiefs lent their support to Aleamotu'a. It was the military supremacy of Taufa'ahau which 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".110 Two days before the Hule massacre, Thomas preached on Joshua 10, which deals with the successful Israelite invasion of Canaan:111 "Joshua conquered the whole land. He spared no-one; everyone was put to death".112 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
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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 which Huie 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”. Beecham severely condemned Taufa’ahau’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...” 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. The rebels, wrote Tucker, had formed a plan to murder Taufa’ahau 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. Taufa’ahau 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...”

With hindsight born of our knowledge of Taufa’ahau’s illustrious later career 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 great scepticism. For Taufa’ahau, the Christian-heathen contest possessed a complex political hue. Civil strife in Tonga had occurred throughout his lifetime; his position as hau, involving his inevitable succession as Tu’i Kanokupolu, 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 Taufa’ahau along the road to Hule. Nevertheless. “the teachings of the missionaries gave [Taufa’ahau] 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. Little Ma’afu, not present at Hule or even then on Tongatapu, was to 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 and outright deception. This divergence of approach and indeed of philosophy is a reflection of
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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 voyaged 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.

However determined many of the missionaries might have been to present teachings which highlighted themes of Christian brotherhood, mercy and forgiveness, their school curricula and their sermons inevitably came under the influence of the 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 remained nothing loath to extol the virtues of Taufa'ahau "whose very name almost strikes terror into the heathen". Eulogy was however tempered with a pragmatic note of caution: "...The Christians have not thought it prudent to remove out of the Fortresses lest their
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enemies should take advantage of it, and murder many of them". Only Taufa'ahau and his military strength stood between the survival of both Christianity and Aleamotu'a 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 Taufa'ahau. "The heathen are afraid", declared Rabone. One positive result of this further intervention by Taufa'ahau was the conversion of his grandfather, Ma'afu of Vaini, one of Tongatapu's most defiant rebels. His renunciation of the old gods is typical of much of Aleamotu'a's rule as Tu'i Kanokupolu: the lotu was used as an effective means of diffusing political opposition and avoiding war. Conversion of the recalcitrant chiefs helped to consolidate Aleamotu'a's precarious position while at the same time preparing a secure power base for his eventual successor, Taufa'ahau.

Ma'afu was about eleven at this time, and while we do not know whether he was among the 1067 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 maintenance of power, Ma'afu lived in his father's household, which lay inside the fortification at Nuku'alofa. The house and adjoining mission school lay on top of "a gentle acclivity". 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". The hill, site of the chapel built in 1831, is known in Tongan as Sia-ko-Veiongo, or the mound of Veiongo. It is the only elevated ground in the otherwise flat expanse of Nuku'alofa. From the summit of Veiongo, part of the view over coastline, lagoon and reef, familiar to Ma'afu as a child, can still be seen. Its position in the time of Aleamotu'a 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. "All the schools are conducted on strictly religious principles", the Society
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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". If we wish to sustain this image, we might picture eleven-year old 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:

Imagination, thou dost so abstract us
That we are not aware, not even when
A thousand trumpets sound about our ears.

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 an education with anything resembling a secular flavour.

There were even some missionaries prepared to advance reasons for this educational dead end which 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 which was 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 because they lacked proper training. 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.
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Amid the 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:

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.¹³¹

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 an indulged child of about twelve, 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 Taufa’ahau, 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.

¹³¹ Tucker, Journal. 14 Dec 1837, WMMS In Correspondence, Friendly Islands, 1836-1837
Chapter 2: The political wilderness

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 to receive a new code of laws, prepared by Taufa'ahau, known to missionaries as King George. The laws, already in operation on Vava'u for more than a year, were read to the gathering by Taufa'ahau, 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 as you may require them 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 a state of 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 a society vastly removed from such an ideal condition.

The renewal of hostilities in 1840 was in many respects a repeat of 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 Taufa'ahau 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

1 John Thomas. Journal, March 1839
3 Stephen Rabone, Journal, 31 Dec 1839
4 ibid, 20 Jan 1840
his family were visiting Fo'ui, a small, fortified Christian settlement in Hihifo. Four Christians from Fo'ui were murdered while working in their gardens outside the fort. Charles Tucker considered this atrocity to be "the greatest insult the heathen could offer [Aleamotu'a]", since it occurred while the chief and his family were inside the fort. 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 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 Taufa'ahau.6

Once again, the fortunes of Christianity were being placed firmly in Taufa'ahau's hands. The "confusion and uproar" on Tongatapu represented another challenge to his power as hau. He arrived from Vava'u, accompanied by thirty men, on 25 January,7 and was quickly followed by his "great war vessel" and other large canoes bringing more than 200 warriors.8 Taufa'ahau 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, Taufa'ahau 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".9 Tucker believed that only Taufa'ahau's actions had prevented an immediate heathen attack on Nuku'alofa.10

Taufa'ahau 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 fourteen, accompanied his parents on their visit to Fo'ui in January 1840, since "King Josiah and his family were on a visit there". Aleamotu'a's brother Abraham took a large party of men to Fo'ui to remove the family to the safety of the fortress at Nuku'alofa.11 We have no means of assessing the degree of political astuteness which 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 aging Aleamotu'a, would inevitably replace him.
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The partnership of rank and power had existed ever since Aleamotu' a was invested as Tu'i Kanokupolu. He and Taufa'ahau 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 round their waists ... They left the ship highly delighted with their presents and visit..." 12 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". 13 With fighting having again broken out 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 missionaries Tucker and Rabone, waited outside for Taufa'ahau to arrive. Wilkes afterwards praised that chief's demeanour and physical appearance; Taufa'ahau possessed the presence of one used to command. He nevertheless seated himself outside the hut because, as Tucker explained, Taufa'ahau was not yet considered a native chief of Tongatapu. Tradition demanded he be seated among the common people. Because Wilkes knew Taufa'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, Taufa'ahau sat himself "at a respectful distance from the king, to whom he showed great and marked respect". 14 Here, as at the investiture of Aleamotu' a as Tu'i Kanokupolu more than twelve years before, Taufa'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 Pangaimotu, in the Nuku'alofa lagoon, for the purpose of negotiating peace. In the event, only one supposedly heathen chief presented himself, and he decamped with his followers after only two days. 15 The American expedition 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" which were so painful to the missionaries. On his visit to the compound, Wilkes had noted "large numbers of warriors,

12 Charles Wilkes. United States Exploring Expedition ... Vol. 3. Fiji Museum Group Reprint. Suva. 1985. p. 21 "King George" had been given a "handsome fowling piece", while "King Josiah" received a red silk umbrella, "which highly delighted him"
14 Wilkes. p. 9
15 Rabone. Journal. 28 Apr 1840.
all grotesquely dressed and ready [to] ... fight, with clubs, spears and muskets". More pertinent to Tonga’s future was the “town” which Taufa‘ahau was building “just without the fortification of King Josiah”. The presence of the most powerful ruler 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 observed: “...the permanency and arrangement with which the town is laid out make Taufa‘ahau’s intention quite evident”. Construction of the “town” was a preparation for the day when Taufa‘ahau would assume in law the authority which for most practical purposes he already possessed.

Because of the assistance received from Taufa‘ahau, Aleamotu’a gave his nephew “land, and half the village of Nuku‘alofa”, including a broad sea front. “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”.

Despite such manifestations of power, Taufa‘ahau “did not consider [the] Nuku alofa people as belonging to him but rather to Josiah”. Taufa‘ahau’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 Mumui, a nephew of Aleamotu’a who was considered by some as a possible successor. During the following month Peter Turner, a Wesleyan missionary working on 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 Taufa‘ahau’s cause. “The heathens are determined on war and on their own destruction (sic)”. Turner declared. In Fiji, three canoes were being built: “when they shall be finished many Tonganese 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. 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. His father, "with other old chiefs ... slept outside [the mission's] gates" on the night of 17-18 June, so fearful were they of heathen incursions. Taufa'ahau, investing the heathen fortress at Vaini, returned before any harm could befall his uncle. Two days later both chiefs determined to apply for help to Commander Croker, commander of the visiting British sloop of war Favourite. The chiefs' application accompanied a written request for assistance from both Rabone and Tucker. The events of the next few days need no detailed consideration. On 24 June, Croker and about one hundred of his men, in an act of supreme folly, accompanied Taufa'ahau and his forces to the heathen stronghold at Pea. Croker was killed in the ensuing affray. One result of this affair, according to Peter Turner on Ha'apai, 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 Vava'u, arrived at Tongatapu on 21 July, he found the island at peace. The day before he returned to Vava'u in August, he received Aleamotu'a at the mission in Nuku'alofa. "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 Vava'u, 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 Fo'ui, the destruction of the heathen spirit houses by Taufa'ahau's forces, and the deliberate burning of the Fo'ui chapel by a Christian man, as
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immediate causes of the fighting, the events of the first half of 1840 must be considered in a much broader context. For Ma'afu, who rated no mention in any account of the wars, that broader context defined his political future, and was eventually to send him permanently beyond the shores of Tonga.

Ma'afu remained confined within his father's compound at Sia-ko-Veiongo. The surrounding fence and a deep trench symbolised the intense religious divide between Aleamotu'a and his heathen relatives. The Tu'i Kanokupolu quite properly fortified his home because he feared for the safety of himself and his family. The heathen, however, saw the defences as a declaration of war, a war which they were to begin. For them, it was another challenge to the power of the hau. The conflict's chief protagonist, Taufa'ahau, also saw it as a contest which would determine the fate of Christianity on Tongatapu, and was determined to avoid the bloodshed of the last serious clashes three years earlier. Before the attack on Fo'ui, Taufa'ahau 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". 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". We might wonder if this summation is entirely justified, in view of Taufa'ahau'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... Taufa'ahau, who is already master of Ha'apai and Vavao (sic), to possess himself of all the islands of the group". In view of his short stay in Tonga, Wilkes' analysis is remarkably pertinent. For him, "the missionaries and [Taufa'ahau] were mutually serving each other's cause". The inhabitants of Tongatapu, who had always been respected by other Tongans, 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".

Incisive though these comments are concerning the situation on Tongatapu as Wilkes found it, they fail to reflect the complex causes of the wars of the 1830s and 1840. The wars were occasioned by the power struggle which had been in progress for half a century. The same power struggle resulted in Ma'afu's father's elevation to the rank of
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Tu‘i Kanokupolu and would ultimately exclude Ma‘afu himself from any share in the evolving polity of his native land. Our knowledge of his life during this time of turbulence is inevitably limited by the almost complete lack of any documented reference to him in the decade following his baptism in January 1830, beyond references to the cosy domesticity of his family life.37 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 he meet Aleamotu‘a, Abraham, and Taufa‘ahau 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...”38 The subject of the men’s deliberation was presumably the forthcoming negotiations with the heathen. Neither on this day nor the next did Thomas make any mention of an event of major significance in Aleamotu‘a’s family which was to take place in the middle of 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 Elenoa 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”.

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 which 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 their number. 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”.40

Ma‘afu and Elenoa Gataialupe were distantly related by blood: both were descended from Mataeleha‘amea, fourth holder of the Tu‘i Kanokupolu title. He it was who first made the title one of significance outside Tongatapu. Of greater importance in 1840 was the fact that Elenoa was the sister of Lupepau‘u, known to Europeans as Queen Charlotte, the Christian wife of Taufa‘ahau. Ma‘afu, young as he was, thus gained as a brother-in-law the man in whose hands supreme power in Tonga effectively lay. Both men acquired status from their wives. Elenoa and Lupepau‘u were great-granddaughters,
through the female line, of the Tu'i Tonga Fefine Siufu'a'uta. The union of Ma'afu and Elenoa was political in nature. Although related by blood to Taufa'ahau, 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. That both Ma'afu and Taufa'ahau, men who already enjoyed relatively high status through birth, were considered to have gained rank through their respective marriages, is highly significant. Ma'afu was then aged only about fourteen or fifteen; although there is no contemporary evidence, it seems likely that the marriage was arranged by his father and Taufa'ahau, as a means of strengthening their own alliance amid the political turbulence of the times.

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 probable lengthy stay in Fiji. 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. It is likely that Ma'afu had 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 the neighbouring island of Nayau which, 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 Kisiiana, the daughter of a chief, Tui Naro. Ma'afu and Kisiiana had a son named Kateni, whose descendants are still to be found in Lau. 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 Nov 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 ... and given their dark incorrect notions of God and religion, that will end in their ruin. ... A canoe is now to be got ready to follow the runaways, to take
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them some property which will be useful to them at Fejees – thus many more will be leaving us, at least for some time, and others fear that as there is war at Fejees, some will not return again.\footnote{Thomas, Journal, 5 Nov 1841}

The departure of the pursuit canoe on 9 November was accompanied by "great crying" by those left behind.\footnote{Ibid., 9 Nov 1841.} 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 that Kisiana might have been a more immediate reason 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. Missionary Thomas Williams was in no doubt of the visitors' purpose. When he 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 the Tonga King, two chiefs with their canoes sent in pursuit of them".\footnote{Thomas Williams, The Journal of Thomas Williams, missionary in Fiji 1840-1853, ed. O. C. Henderson. Sydney 1931, Vol. I, p. 47 (18 Nov 1841).} We do not know when Ma'afu returned from this his second precipitate expedition to Fiji within a year, although he is not likely 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.\footnote{John E. Erskine, Journal of a Cruise among the Islands of the western Pacific, London, 1853, pp 143-144.

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 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 forty years later, Turner made reference to the sorry history of the sandalwood trade on the neighbouring island of Eromango. "About fifty years after the visit of Captain Cook [to the New Hebrides], it became known that sandalwood was plentiful on Eromango (sic)", Turner recorded. He mentioned the high prices paid for sandalwood in India and especially 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".\footnote{George Turner, Eromanga, [written 13 Nov 1885], LMS, South Seas Personal, Box 1, Folders 7-9.} 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". 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 1843. In June of that year, five months after his return from Tanna to Samoa, Turner wrote to John Thomas in Tonga. Turner was disturbed by reports of a second expedition which, 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". Thomas had become aware of the proposed voyage in late July 1842, when he returned to Tongatapu after attending 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. 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 sandalwood, 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 sixty 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
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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 forty years later. “[Aleamotu’a] did not want him to go but he went”.

Ma’afu almost certainly took a more active role in the recruitment than Tingea’s terse statement suggests. When Captain John Erskine, in command of HMS Havannah, visited Tonga in 1851, he interviewed a young chief named Methuselah Tae on the subject of the 1842 expedition. Tae, who had been warned by his superior Mumui, magistrate, local preacher and cousin 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 employed in building a large canoe when Captain Henry arrived on Tongatapu. He readily engaged with Henry to recruit sixty 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 who would have been well aware of any deviation from the truth.

It is likely that Thomas 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. Aleamotu’a, if he was aware of his son’s activities, and he could scarcely have been otherwise, made no mention of them when Thomas questioned him about the expedition. Before Thomas made any response 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”.58 Writing to his colleague almost three years after the events took place, Thomas clearly wished to lay stress on 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
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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 speak to 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 by return volleys from the vessels' guns. At 4 p.m., Thomas preached in the Nuku'alofa chapel on 2 Samuel 22, verse 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.59

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 Tonguense natives they had on board to serve as woodcutters".60 Williams recorded no disembarkation from the sandalwood ships, nor did he mention any augmentation in the woodcutters' numbers. Captain Henry, apparently considering the sixty or so men recruited at Tongatapu as insufficient for his purpose, had hopes of obtaining 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 by 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.61 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

60 Thomas Williams, The Journal of Thomas Williams... p. 93 (1 Aug 1842).
61 Berthold Seemann, Viti; an Account of a Government Mission to the Vitiian or Fijian Islands, London, 1862, pp 241-242 Seemann's source appears to have been not information from Ma'afu, but the account of Erskine's voyage in the Havannah, published in 1853.
sandle wood (sic)", recorded McLean. It is likely that the ten additional cutters were Tahitian, 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 Lakeba 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. So Henry and Malani were well acquainted, and 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.

Ma'afu's relationship to the Vuanirewa family of Lakeba:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delaivugalei, TN</th>
<th>Niumataiwatu = Tarau</th>
<th>Baleisasa, TN = Radike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rasolo, TN</td>
<td>1) Lauti = 2) Tuidravu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malani, TN</td>
<td>Taliai Tupou</td>
<td>Popua'uli'uli = Ma'afu'otu'itonga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d.1833)</td>
<td>TN (d.1874)</td>
<td>6th TK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Viliame) Vuetasau</td>
<td>(d.1856)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d.1856)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumi = Kaufusi</td>
<td>Alamotu'a = Moala</td>
<td>11th TK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d.1797)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d.1845)</td>
<td>16th TK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d.1845)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma'afu</td>
<td>(c.1826-1881)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1850, while on a visit to Bau, in 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 recruitment of cutters is true, Ma'afu must have been in the best
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position to know 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 seventy wood cutters landed and for three days worked harmoniously with the Erromangans, who helped the Tongans cut and carry the sandalwood. On the fourth day, there arose a dispute whose nature is not recorded by McLean. According to Erskine, a "disturbance" followed the theft of three axes by natives. One of the supposed thieves was shot by the Tongans. 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 fourteen 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 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.
In contrast with this first-hand and 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". 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.

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.

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 Moso, 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:

...they hid themselves in a cave, whether 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
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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 ....

Tae's account, detailed though it is concerning the sequence of events, says nothing of their cause. Fortunately, during the visit of HMS Havannah to Efate in September 1851, Erskine was able to interview two local men who vividly remembered the affray. The account of those men, whose names were Talipoa-ua and Tongalulu, 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 tabu, and sang songs meant to insult their hosts. Talipoa-ua and Tangaloa affirmed that the ensuing conflict resulted in the deaths of forty people from one side of what is now known as Havannah Harbour, and twenty on the other. 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.

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 which is 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".

We should finally consider the only other eyewitness account of the events on Efate, before making some attempt 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 which 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
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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."

McLean's account does much 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, it was Thomas on Tongatapu who led the charge. Because of his personal acquaintance with most of the principals of the affair, he was in the best position 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, 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. Each side, Tongan and European, clearly sought to endow the other with as great a share of the blame as possible. The Tongans would have been under orders from their leader Ma'afu. For Thomas, since the cutters were supposed to have acted on their masters' orders, it was those masters who bore ultimate responsibility.

According to Thomas, trouble arose on Efate on one occasion because a young Tongan named Atele 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
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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 was later to 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 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. Despite the censure Thomas heaped on the expedition’s leader, he did not forget to mention 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 Kanokupolu 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 tone of sandalwood”. Thomas did not need to know the full story in order to express his horror
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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 twenty-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. 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. Henry it was, 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 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, if any, 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 fifteen years Thomas and his colleagues had been instilling in their Tongan congregations a contempt for heathenism in all its manifestations. It could be argued that Thomas himself was partly responsible for the attitudes towards non-Christian people.
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which 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. 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 the ..., and she was tired of being cast off and taken no notice of by her husband.

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..." We do not know whether Ma'afu carried out even this token act of atonement. At seventeen, 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 Taufa'ahau, at Aleamotu'a's dictation, the letter was translated, with copies being made by missionary George Miller. One copy was
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despatched, through Walter Lawry, to the British government, while Thomas forwarded another to his Society in London.87

The letter emphasised that Tonga had hitherto been independent and free of interference from any 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 Hammond, “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...”. Those masters would have included Samuel Henry. 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 which continued to take place there. Hammond, who overestimated the extent of Aleamotu’a’s influence in Fiji, was prompted to write by his belief that those

87 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, p. 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 Colonial Office, whence it was sent to the Foreign Office. 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, FO58/44, both quoted in Angus Ross, New Zealand Aspirations in the Pacific in the Nineteenth Century, Oxford 1964, p. 28). Thomas enclosed a further copy with his letter to the Gen. Sec., WMMS, 2 May 1844 (WMMS Tonga Correspondence). See also The Report of the Wesleyan-Methodist Missionary Society for the Year Ending April 1846, p. 44.
who basked in the light of British “good will” were endowed with certain responsibilities to ensure they remained worthy of it.88

Neither Aleamotu’a nor Taufa’ahau was aware in February 1844 that the French had assumed control of both Tahiti and the Marquesas.89 Nevertheless, French activities in both places reinforced in the minds of Tonga’s rulers a sense of their islands’ vulnerability. Aleamotu’a’s insecurity, and that of the missionaries, was heightened by the presence of two French priests on Tongatapu. During the period when Taufa’ahau and Aleamotu’a were discussing with Thomas the proposed letter to Queen Victoria, Aleamotu’a was informed that the priests intended visiting Taufa’ahau. Acting with unaccustomed alacrity, and for reasons not entirely clear, Aleamotu’a sent a message ahead of the priests, urging Taufa’ahau to prepare kava for them. When the Frenchmen finally spoke to Taufa’ahau, they urged him to embrace Roman Catholicism, describing “Mr Wesley” as “a poor man”, and declared that all the remaining heathens in Tonga would soon be papists.90 In the event, France was never to show an interest in acquiring Tonga, while the sought-after British protection was not to eventuate for more than fifty 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”.91 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.92 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.93 As Ma’afu was to learn in Fiji, the rewards of Christianity were not always confined to the spiritual.
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Two months later, Ma'afu made himself useful to the captain of a visiting British ship. HMS *North Star*, a Royal Navy hydrographer commanded by Sir Everard Hume, 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 first manifested itself 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 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 Abraham, and John and Sarah Thomas. The only significant absentee was Taufa'ahau, who was in Vava'u. Aleamotu'a was buried in a vault near Sia-ko-Veiongo, "according to his own expressed wish". The death of his father bequeathed to Ma'afu a future in which nothing could be certain. The indulgences of the past were not 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". Commodore Wilkes' references to Aleamotu'a's desire for "peace and quietness" have already been noted. Among more formal missionary criticisms were the charges that Aleamotu'a took no note of crime on Tongatapu, encouraged rather than checked surviving heathenish customs, and was nothing
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less that "an enemy to civilisation". 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. Unjust as this last comment is, the fact remained that the uncertainties and dangers which marked much of Aleamotu'a's time as Tu'i Kanokupolu were only partly overcome when his successor sought to complete the unification of Tonga as a Christian kingdom.

When news reached Taufa'ahau in Vava'u of Aleamotu'a's serious illness, he proceeded at once to Tongatapu. 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 Kanokupolu". 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 Tongan tradition. Only with the explicit consent of Taufa'ahau could another relative of Aleamotu'a, such as his nephew Mumui or his brother Abraham, have been appointed to succeed him. In the circumstances of 1845, such an appointment would have been most unlikely.

A brief consideration of the circumstances of Taufa'ahau'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 Ma'afu, son of the previous Tu'i Kanokupolu, but still only about nineteen. On his deathbed, the Tu'i Kanokupolu 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 [Taufa'ahau] would undertake for us and give to God a righteous Governor".

Thomas need not have worried. Taufa'ahau was hau, and his succession was certain.

At a time when several leading Tongatapu chiefs were yet to embrace Christianity, Taufa'ahau enjoyed missionary support as an unequivocal champion of the faith. While approval from the traditional Tongan polity was less explicit, it was to Taufa'ahau and no other that most of the chiefs had looked to succeed as Tu'i Kanokupolu. Five years before, when Aleamotu'a had been dangerously ill with dysentery and thought unlikely to survive, urgent messages had been sent to Taufa'ahau at his home in Ha'apai, urging him to hasten to Tongatapu. The Wesleyan missionary at Ha'apai, Peter Turner, realised that none but Taufa'ahau could succeed: "he is the only next hei:"
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Tucker and Rabone, recognised that when Aleamotu'a had sent urgently to Taufa'ahau 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". Although Taufa'ahau's warriors were correctly auxiliaries to those of Aleamotu'a, it was Taufa'ahau 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 Taufa'ahau's *mana as hau*; their choice could have fallen on no-one else.

Although Taufa'ahau's family connections were largely irrelevant to his right to succeed as Tu'i Kanokupolu, they should not be overlooked, even though they alone could not have ensured his elevation. He was neither brother nor son of Aleamotu'a, but Aleamotu'a had succeeded as Tu'i Kanokupolu under extraordinary and unprecedented circumstances. Taufa'ahau was the son of Tupouto'a, Aleamotu'a's predecessor as Tu'i Kanokupolu, and grandson of Tuku'aho, Aleamotu'a's older 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 which had not existed in Tonga for more than fifty years.

Taufa'ahau's investiture ceremony took place at the village of Pangai in Hihifo. The "heathen" chiefs present did not oppose the new appointment. In his description of the ceremony, Thomas laid emphasis on the changed nature of the Tu'i Kanokupolu's august position. Not only was Taufa'ahau "the legitimate heir to the government", he was also "the first Tu'i-Kanokubolu Preacher and Class Leader that ever existed". In some circumstances, Taufa'ahau'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 Taufa'ahau's grandfather, who had died in 1842. It was this "new" Ma'afu, Thomas called him, along with the other most important chiefs of his ha'a, Lavaka, Pea and Vaea of Houma, who elected Taufa'ahau as Tu'i Kanokupolu.
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Taufa'ahau'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 Taufa'ahau is there any mention of Ma'afu.¹¹⁰ We are not even certain whether he witnessed the investiture ceremony, although there are indications that he did not. Only one person, then or later, was named even as a possible rival to Taufa'ahau. That person was Mumui, often called by his Christian name of Shadrach, or Setaleki, the son of Aleamotua'a's half-brother Tupoumalohi, the fourteenth Tu'i Kanokupolu. Taufa'ahau is supposed to have expressed a wish that preference be given to Mumui.¹¹¹ Bearing in mind the missionaries' unqualified support for Taufa'ahau, such a request is not likely to have been taken seriously. But, as *hau*, Taufa'ahau could have chosen the new Tu'i Kanokupolu, if he genuinely did not wish to accept office himself. Mumui outranked him, as did Abraham, who was apparently not considered by anyone. Mumui however had in the past been mentioned as a possible future Tu'i Kanokupolu.

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 Taufa'ahau, as a possible successor.¹¹² Proficient in English, Mumui was later described as “tall and handsome, but delicate-looking”, with “a mild and unambitious disposition”.¹¹³ 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 Kanokupolu, whatever some earlier expectations among resident Europeans might have been. Taufa'ahau 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.¹¹⁴ 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. We have some interesting, if very flimsy, evidence that Ma'afu might have been asked to intrigue against Taufa'ahau. On 5 December, Thomas, who never bore any love for Ma'afu, recorded: “Ma’afu the King’s son has rather disgraced himself ... his

¹¹⁰ See, for example, Thomas, Journal, 2 Dec 1845
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conduct was nearly the only thing I have heard of which gave pain." It took little to earn Thomas' ire, but what had Ma'afu done? Peter Turner in Ha'apai referred to what might be the same matter three weeks later, but is less severe on Ma'afu:

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.

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. It is just conceivable that Ma'afu was keeping his options open concerning a future challenge. It was either he or his brother Niuleitolu who had earlier been tattooed and undergone traditional rites, to the chagrin of their apparently pious mother. But Thomas, our chief informant on Tongatapu, vouchsafes no details. Ma'afu, in any case, must have faced the fact that Taufa'ahau, unlike Aleamotu'a and many of his other predecessors as Tu'i Kanokupolu, united that office with the substance of power. Ma'afu himself was left firmly in the political wilderness.
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On 3 May 1846 Matthew Wilson, a Wesleyan missionary stationed at Ha’apai, baptised the month-old son of “Henali and Eleona Ma’afu”. Since only the baby’s Christian name, Josiah, is recorded in the baptisms register, we do not know which of the children of Ma’afu and Eleona this was. 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. The mention of his mother Moala under her Christian name gives no hint of how the woman was to 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. Within a few days, Moala was suspended “for the present” from her position as class leader. 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”. 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 ...” The sorry tale culminated in February 1847, when Thomas married “poor fallen Mary” to the single man who had been enjoying her favours. 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.
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On 1 June 1847, Thomas borrowed a horse from his missionary colleague William Moore and rode to the villages of Maslamea 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 is does not matter. The Lord careth for me, and he has preserved both man and beast. 8

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”. 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 a fast ignorant vain young man,” Thomas deplored, “yet God can save him”: 10

Thomas became even more explicit in expressing his intolerance only days later, when

---

8 ibid. 1 Jun 1847
9 ibid. 21 Dec 1846
10 ibid. 1 Jan 1847
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".11

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".12 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 Taufa'ahau, 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 are the suggested reasons for Ma'afu's departure from Tonga which have appeared in published works. He was supposedly sent to Fiji by Taufa'ahau, who saw his cousin as a potential rival for the kingship, one around whom dissenting chiefs, with their followers, might rally.13 He was alleged to have incurred the king's displeasure through breach of trust and open rebellion,14 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"15 Taufa'ahau'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.16 It was even claimed that Ma'afu came from Tonga in charge of a hoard of
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brigands, for the sole purpose of imposing the Wesleyan doctrine on the Fijians by force of arms. Such a view is nothing more than the petulant response of an irresponsible Roman Catholic bishop to the triumph of Protestantism in Fiji, and 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.

Taufa'ahau spent a fortnight with the Tongan community in Fiji when in October 1842 his fleet of canoes had been blown off course and fetched up on the shores of Lakeba. During his stay, Taufa'ahau 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" Taufa'ahau, who had taken several Christian teachers to Samoa, was urged by missionary James Calvert to devote his pastoral energies to Fiji, whose needs were 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 Calvert's urging, Taufa'ahau 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. That task was one which Ma'afu was later to accomplish.

Five years later, Taufa'ahau was well aware of the continuing volatile nature of the Tongan community on Lakeba and elsewhere in Fiji, and of the potential threat which that community posed for the fragile peace established in Tonga. The accommodation which he achieved with Lasike and Tupou Toutai is especially significant in that their father, Tupou Nuau of Vava'u, had been murdered by Tupouto'a, Taufa'ahau's own father. While the potential for continued hostility was great, both sides were aware of the value of peace. Taufa'ahau, 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 both Bau and Cakaudrove at a distance. Their presence on Lakeba,

and that of their followers, meant that Bau, to whose rulers the Tongans were usually loyal, would have no reason to go to war against the Lakeba state. But Taufa‘ahau’s star, in 1842, was clearly on the ascendant in Tonga, and 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 Taufa‘ahau’s accession as Tu‘i Kanokupolu 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.” Such a description could convey the impression that the displaced Tongans gathered on Lakeba posed a potential threat to Tupou’s regime in Tonga. Despite active hostility to Taufa‘ahau among the chiefs of Vava‘u, there is no evidence that, in 1847, any of the “disaffection” on Lakeba manifested itself in open hostility to Tupou’s rule. There is similarly no suggestion that Ma’afu, 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 Ma‘afu then yearned for power in Tonga are not only unsustainable, they ignore the realities of the country’s power structure. Aleamotu‘a’s naming of Taufa‘ahau as his successor was a formality: Taufa‘ahau was hau, and had possessed absolute power for some eighteen 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. Ma‘afu would have been rash indeed to challenge him, even had he wished to do so. He appears to have rebuffed an overture from the Tu‘i Tonga, the one person who might have been able to pose a serious threat to the king. The notion that, during the years immediately following his father’s death, Ma‘afu harboured ambitions in Tonga and sought assistance from among the Tongans living in Fiji cannot be sustained.

Questions of Realpolitik aside, the legal restraints on chiefs in Tonga following the succession of Taufa‘ahau as Tu‘i Kanokupolu were considerable. The first Tongan Code of Laws, adopted on Tongatapu after Taufa‘ahau’s accession, 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. While some might have seen Ma‘afu, who was a generation younger than Tupou, as a future Tu‘i Kanokupolu, the constraints upon him following his
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father's death were legal as well as ethical. To escape them, if such were indeed his intention, he could only sail away.

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 Taufo'ahau for help in controlling the Tongans in Lau, and in response the king sent over his young cousin.\(^2\) 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.\(^2\) 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 decision to undertake 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, undeniably a dialect of Fijian, contains many Tongan words in everyday use. The Tongan influence on Lakeba and Vanuabalavu, and on 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. European visitors to Tonga were informed that Fiji was a mountainous land inhabited by cannibals. On his second visit to Tonga in 1777, James Cook recorded that the many parrot feathers he saw there “all come from Fidgée, as also some of their finest striped and chequered [bark] cloth and a few other articles…” 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.” 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.” 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. 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, invariably the Tu‘i Ha‘atakalaua or, later, the Tu‘i Kanokupolu, the Tu‘i Tonga became “the quintessence and symbolic embodiment of the nation”. 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, Sinatakalua, the older sister of Fatafiahi, Tu‘i Tonga at the time, was accorded the special title of Tu‘i Tonga Fefsine. Her spouse was a Fijian, known in Tonga as Tapu‘ost, a chief from the village of Waciwaci on Lakeba. It has been estimated that this union occurred “about Tasman’s time”, that is during the first half of the seventeenth century. At about the same time, Fatafiahi took as his spouse Kaloafutonga, sister of Ngata, founder of the Tu‘i Kanokupolu line. More significantly, Kaloafutonga 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.
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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 sister 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 neutralization of the descendants of the Tu'i Tonga was clearly a political device", designed to ensure the survival of the Tu'i Tonga's paramount position.

A further dynastic affiliation came into being when the third Tu'i Kanokupolu, Mataeatu'apiko, gave his daughter Toafilimoe'unga to a Lakeban chief named Paleisasa, son of the Tui Nayau, Delavugalei. Popua'uli'uli, daughter of Toafilimoe'unga and Paleisasa, was a wife of Ma'afu'etu'itonga, sixth Tu'i Kanokupolu, who succeeded about 1730. Their son Mumui was father of Aleamotu'a and grandfather of Ma'afu.31
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In the wake of Tapu’osi’s emigration to Tonga, other Lakebans followed the chief’s example. Prominent among them was one Pupu, the 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 Kanokupolu.” Ever since Taufa’ahau was invested in this office in 1845, the reigning monarch has formally held the title of Tu’i Kanokupolu. When, in 1919, Queen Salote 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 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.33

---

Such profane behaviour from anyone else in the presence of the Tu' i Kanokupolu 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 to-day'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 the present king, Taufa'ahau Tupou IV, as Tu'i Kanokupolu. The then Tu'i Soso from Nukunuku in Lakeba was invited down to perform the same ceremonial function. Tonga's links with Lakeba are not forgotten.34

The islands of Lau, while part of Fiji, form a transitional zone between that country's heartland and the neighbouring archipelagoes of Tonga. The absorption over several centuries of thousands of Tongans, with their cultural and linguistic baggage, was aided 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 fifty 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".35 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 Vanuabalavu, the future home of Ma'afu, is the chief; in the west the Yasayasa Moala, comprising Moala itself, Totoya, Matuku and Vanuavatu, 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 the chief attractions of the Lauan islands was a heavy hardwood known in Fijian as vesi, which is unknown in Tonga. Vesi has always been the preferred wood for canoe construction in southern Lau; its strength and natural durability are augmented by low shrinkage and good seasoning properties. Because of its heaviness, vesi requires almost a year to dry out after cutting before its buoyancy is sufficient for the construction of canoe

34 Reid, p. 7, n. 26
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 which their fellow countrymen were to emulate elsewhere in Fiji. While vesti 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 incursions of the later eighteenth century. The Tongans began voyaging to Fiji in much greater numbers during the second half of the eighteenth century, and brought with them in the nineteenth a new technology. Their carpenters were able to utilise the adze and the chisel to exploit vesti 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 towards the end of the eighteenth century. The design of the hamatafua was probably developed by Tongan carpenters working in Lau, where the availability of vesti 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, had 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 kali'a, itself based on the Fijian dru'a. He compared the tongiaki to its Fijian counterpart in the same way as a "coal barge" might be compared to a "clippership". "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 kali'a had become the Tongans' principal means of voyaging to Fiji. The platform between the kali'a's two hulls featured a small "house" in its centre, for storage of cargo and shelter for some passengers during inclement weather. The largest kali'a could carry up to 150 people. It was in such vessels that uncounted thousands of Tongans voyaged between their islands and Fiji.
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 Fiji began in earnest during the final decades of the eighteenth century, a time 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. The Tongan presence in Lakeba, whose ruling house was of part-Tongan descent, became increasingly significant. 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 Taialai 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.\(^4\)

---


\(^4\) Hocart, p. 10. Only a few house mounds remain visible at the site of the former village.
At the time of Ma'afu's arrival, the Lakeban state included all the islands of central and southern Lau. Vanua-balavu and smaller nearby islands owed allegiance to Cakaudrove, the mataitu which 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 Vanua-balavu and elsewhere in Cakaudrove, while Tanoa, the chief 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 Taufa'ahau over the kava bowl, Lasike accompanied over one thousand Tongans who arrived in Lakeba in June 1845, when another large canoe was under construction. This one was intended for Taufa'ahau, who succeeded as Tu'i Kanokupolu only six months later. The canoe, built at Kabara, finally reached Lakeba in December 1845. The strategic alliance between Taufa'ahau and the Tongan power base in Lau, fostered in 1842, appeared to be working well. What remained unclear were the future relations between Bau, Lakeba and Tonga, the last now unified under Taufa'ahau. 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
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47 John E. Enlighten, Logbook of HMS Emerald, 18 Sep 1834. See also Wilkes, p. 55.
50 Lyth, Journal, 4 Jun 1845; Lyth, Day Book, 8 Dec 1845.
nevertheless be said to represent the many Tongan chiefs who sought either refuge or adventure in Fiji. Those chiefs and their followers were to play a crucial role, especially on Lakeba, in the spread of Christianity in Fiji. 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, Talia! Tupou. Vuetasau, pat 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, commenced in his house in February 1850. For a man who, before his conversion, boasted sixteen wives, his commitment to the lotu was certain to command 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 between which wars were frequent. Williams believed that Lakeba owed its prominence in central and southern Lau 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 degree of allegiance to Bau, Lau is not usually considered as an "independent" matanitu in the manner of Bau itself or of Cakaudrove, to which 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 Tanoa's domestic establishment) Radi Tagici, the king's favourite daughter". In addition, Cakobau's cousin
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Ratu Mara Kapaiwai, who was usually Bau’s emissary to Lakeba, possessed vasu rights on the island. Even without the complicating factors of the Tongans and the new faith which followed them, Tui Nayau had to tread warily indeed.

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 penetration of the islands. What no-one could predict in 1840, with the unity of Tonga and the supremacy of Taufa‘ahau still to be achieved, were the implications of this undeniable Tongan power. The unexpected meeting between Taufa‘ahau, Lualala, Lasike and Tupou Toutai on Lakeba in 1842 was of fundamental importance in determining the future direction of that power in Fiji. The reception given to the Tongans at Bau in 1840 was typical of the respect shown to loyal allies, and none was more loyal than Lasike and Tupou Toutai. In making Bau almost their second home, the Tongans had clearly allied themselves to power. But to what end?

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 which that power held for Bau’s somewhat precarious ascendency 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, which prompted Cakobau to complain to the visiting Taufa‘ahau “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 Taufa‘ahau. 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.

In preserving his seat of power in Lau, Tui Nayau could not afford to ignore Cakaudrove, especially as Bau’s supremacy was no longer assured. In 1839, Tui Nayau
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sent Lasike to Somosomo, the chiefly town of Cakaudrove, in order to ascertain what the intentions of Yavala, Tui Cakau then were 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 which never eventuated. Then, in 1846, two alarms occurred during the same month. On 8 January, a canoe arrived at Lakeba from Bau with the news that Bau intended to make war on the island. Tui Nayau ordered Tubou fortified yet again. On 31 January, another canoe arrived, this time from Vanuabalavu. Its occupants informed Tui Nayau that Tuikilakila, a son of Tui Cakau, was on the point of “visiting” Lakeba, “in search of property”. This time, an emissary was sent to Vanuabalavu 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 Lakeba, and on Tui Nayau and other Lauan chiefs in particular, 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 proved of sufficient attraction. By the late 1840s, it had become clear that any force seeking supremacy in Fiji would have to come to terms with the growing Tongan presence in the islands. At this time, unlike the late 1850s and most of the 1860s, the Tongans in Fiji can be said to represent only themselves, although their aggrandisement must even then have seemed to be a forerunner of future closer involvement of Tonga itself in Fiji’s power structure. For the moment, the reality of Tongan power in Lau 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.

It was during this political uncertainty of the 1840s that Christianity reached 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 felt himself unable to convert, and said as much to one of the ships’ captains who brought Takai and his Tahitian friends to Fiji in 1832. 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
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subject to Lakeba, possibly resulted from Malani's essentially political need to distance himself from the bearers of the *lotu*. After Malani's death in 1833, his younger brother Talai 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 whom were 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 was to take in extending his future power in Lau.

Like his predecessor, Talai 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, Talai 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".66 Although there was a growing Christian congregation on Lakeba, the bulk of them are likely to have been Tongan.67 Tui Nayau's prevarication probably owed much to his awareness of the political implications of conversion. When the United States Exploring Expedition was visiting Lakeba, Talai Tupou informed Lieutenant-Commander Ringgold that he would convert after Tanao's death.68 Six years later, Tui Nayau's daughter and her husband Lualala, chief of Waecvaci village, publicly urged him to embrace Christianity.69 Able as he was to articulate his dilemma, Talai 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 Joci Bulu, Jone Havea and Taufa'ahau's brother-in-law Julius Naulivou, had reached Lakeba from Vava'u in June 1838.70 The presence of these men, chosen in Tonga by missionary Dr Richard Lyth,71 doubtless helped to inspire the erection of a new chapel at Bucainabua, near Tubou, which was built by Tongans, with some Fijian assistance, and opened in October 1838.72 It was men such as these teachers and assistant missionaries who earned the praise 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-
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European ways, as harbingers of Christian civilisation in a savage land. 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 ..."

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”. 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”. 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”. Lyth, in common with many other missionaries, could not appreciate that Christianity operated according to the imperatives of Fijian culture and the exigencies of political 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 which would, in the fullness of time, convince him to latua, for the preservation of his power rather than for the salvation of his soul.
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The accommodation which Taufa'ahau had reached with the Tongan leaders on Lakeba during his visit 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 at that time 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 Taufa'ahau in Tonga, he wrote to Cakobau on the subject of 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 Vavau. Calvert believed that Taufa'ahau 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. I now that Finau is dead, George considers his way open to Bau".

Calvert recalled Taufa'ahau'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.40

As Calvert pointed out 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 Taufa'ahau. In that event, "a dreadful eruption" would likely ensue between Taufa'ahau and the Tongans on Lakeba. Only the good sense of both Tupou Toutai and Lausi'i prevented fighting between their respective followers. Calvert believed.
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From Taufa'ahau's letter, as recalled by Calvert, and from the missionary's comments to his colleague, it is not possible to determine what Taufa'ahau's intentions were towards both Bau and the Lakeba state in the mid 1840s. What is clear is 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, Taufa'ahau, was the true voice of Tonga. The "hes" and "deceit" spread by Finau should, Taufa'ahau believed, be buried with him. It is surely significant that his letter was written during the final months of Aleamotu'a's life, a time when Taufa'ahau must have known that his succession as Tu'i Kanokupolu, and the union of all Tonga under his own rule, could not be far distant. By coincidence, he was invested as Tu'i Kanokupolu only a few days before Calvert's letter to Hunt was written. Given Taufa'ahau'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 hostile actions 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 Taufa'ahau'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 Taufa'ahau, 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 pursuit 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 Tanoa, and thus a classificatory brother to Cakobau. Mara's mother, Adi Veisav'a, daughter of a former Tu'i Nayau, ensured for him
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vasu rights on Lakeba. The connection ran deeper still: Vuibureta's mother Ufia was also from Lakeba. Mara's vasu rights covered not only the island itself, but also the Lauan islands subject to Lakeba. Mara was, in effect, vasu to Lau, a position he was never loath to exploit.

Always a stormy petrel, and feared throughout Lau, Mara 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. Mara's uppermost thought appears to have been the aggrandisement of his personal power. He had long been thwarted by the Tongan community on Lakeba and in particular by their loyalty to Cakobau. In late 1845, after several years of voyaging between Fiji and Tonga, he arrived at Lakeba. His visits to the island were always seen to be 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 1845.83

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.84 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, and would have been acknowledged as kin 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".85 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 the tradition arising from his family links with the island. When the two young 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 on that basis that "he took possession of the present intended for the Fijian chief".86 The "present" was, of course, Christianity. LMS missionary John Williams referred to the "leadership role" accorded to Tongatatapu by the
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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 Kanokupolu 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 yagona, and acted as his envoy to convey commands to subject chiefs”. It appears that a clearly defined role awaited Ma’afu on Lakeba.

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 eighteen 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. “Fejeeans 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 Tugua, in Ha’apai, the residence of the Tamaha, the eldest daughter of the Tu’i Tonga Fefine. Because of an ancient association, or tava, between Tugua 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.

77 John Williams, Journal of 1832 Voyage to Samoa, July 1832, LMS South Seas Journals 101, Box 7.
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81 Calvert to Brethren, 10 Apr 1847, Personal Papers.
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 no e faliki, 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 Vanua'alava. 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; 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 solevu 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 Vanua'alava.

Cautionary though Tingea's account is, there is strong contemporary evidence that a canoe named Hiki no e faliki 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 Hike-noi-Falike. As it appeared to be the supreme object of his desire, so that by wishing the little girl to be called after the canoe he showed unusual regard for her". Ma'afu himself stated in 1864

---
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that the canoe which 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 which 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 more likely than not 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 1850 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 suffered the indignity of being 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 powerful *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. The report of the Wesleyan missionaries' district meeting, which concluded at Nuku'alofa on 14 July, made no mention of the departure. The conference was after all concerned with matters of spiritual or pastoral significance. In any case, 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. 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 at Bau". 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:

---
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...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 - Laujji - 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.101

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. There is little doubt that 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 in 1847, he brought with him several canoes to be refastened by Lauan experts.102 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 1847.103 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 thirty years later to the importance of canoe building and repair in his coming to Fiji. In September 1875 Ma'afu, by then Roko Tui Lau in the new British administration, 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, which has been defined as “a breastplate composed of plates split from the sperm whale teeth”.104 The baron had obtained the civitabua during an expedition in the mountains of Viti Levu the previous June. Because of their rarity, he suspected, correctly, that they were “not of Fijian origin”.105 The earliest civitabua known to Europeans were collected in Tonga by Captain Cook’s officers in the 1770s. They were thought to have evolved as armour in response to the need for protection against Fijian weapons.106 Ma'afu manifested great interest in the civitabua which von Hügel had collected, 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
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were "used in the same way as Tabua are... used... in Fiji. Ma'a'fu'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{107} The two men's host at the dinner, Governor Sir Arthur Gordon, made a similar reference, brief but intriguing, to the civitabua: "... a tabua first brought Ma'a'fu when a lad to Fiji".\textsuperscript{108} The "first visit" of which Ma'a'fu 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 civitabua really was, it is certain that the need to repair canoes was one among many reasons why Ma'a'fu came to Fiji in 1847.

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:

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 Fijian Islands, both European and native, to be brought under Great Britain, in the same manner that the New Zealand Islands have been.\textsuperscript{109}

Grey had requested Captain Maxwell of HMS 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{110}

Grey was well aware that he had no authority to negotiate with the Tongans on the subject of British protection. He did, however, urge Lord Grey, Secretary of State for the 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 Ma'a'fu had set sail for Fiji, it is of great significance in any consideration of the king's attitude towards Fiji at that time:
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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:

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.

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.

---
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In the event, the British declined to assume the protection of both Tonga and Fiji, owing to the expense involved.\textsuperscript{113} 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.\textsuperscript{114} When the Dido was in Tonga in January 1848, Captain Maxwell gave Tupou a present sent by Grey.\textsuperscript{115} 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.\textsuperscript{116} 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, of course, 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. Ma’afu found himself among his own kin in Lau, and was following a path along which 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 which would shake the fast-evolving polity of Fiji to its foundations.
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Chapter 4: A leader among his people

In the mid nineteenth century the Lavanate 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 which 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, was undergoing 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 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.

Family of Tui Nayau:

KUBUAVANUA = (wife from Tungua, Ha'apai, Tonga)
TN. of Moala

BUIVARORO
TN

KALOUYALEWA = Sivoki of Cekena
TN

POLINI, TN

QILAIISO, TN

Adi Vulase of Taveuni

DELAIVUGALEI
TN

Tarau, of Totoya

NIUMATEIWALU = Uma of Nukunuku  Paleisasa
TN

RASOLO = Lausiti of MATAWALU
TN  Vava'u (TN succeeded Rasolo)

MALANI  TALAI TUPOU
TN, d. 1833  TN, d. 1874

(Viliame) Vuetasau (d. 1856)  great-grandfather of Ma'afu

1 Richard Lyth, Day Book No. 7, 6 Mar 1851.
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 which visited Fiji in 1840, was not impressed by the 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". 2 Wilkes' second in command, Lieutenant-Commander Ringgold, described their chiefly host as possessing "a dull-looking countenance" and "mean and niggardly in his disposition". 3 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 mataniru, 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 a Christian before he died, at which he smiled, but made no reply". 4 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.

After Ma'afu's death in 1881, it quickly became an article of faith among the Tongan residents of Vanuaabalavu that, soon after his arrival in Fiji, Ma'afu assumed the role of "right-hand man" to Tui Nayau. 5 One tradition stated that when Ma'afu reached Fiji, "Taliai was advanced in years and greatly afflicted with elephantiasis, and it was not long before Ma'afu became practically his regent..." 6 Both of these claims are likely to owe something to the legends which grew up around Ma'afu's memory in Lau. Nevertheless Ma'afu 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.
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Unfortunately, for the period of almost two years between Ma’afu’s arrival in Lakeba and his departure in May 1849 for a residence of eighteen 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 Ma’afu 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 which knew neither unity nor peace.

By the time of Ma’afu’s arrival in Fiji, political power in the group’s most powerful mataitu, Bau, had shifted from the aged Tanoa to his son Cakobau. For upwards of thirty 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 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 he gave 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 repose confidence in England, but not in 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.”

Lawry’s words reveal the strong influence he and his colleagues sought to bring on Cakobau concerning Fiji’s dealings with the European powers present in the Pacific. The

---
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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 far less willing to heed his new friends. He continued to make war, aware that his political fortunes would suffer if he were to lotu. "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. Cakobau was certain 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 Tongans' presence in Lau. In February 1846, following the departure of a folau under the leadership of Lausi'i, Taufa'ahau's brother, few Tongans remained on Lakeba. Lyth described them as "running headlong to destruction", 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. In October 1847 the death occurred of Julius Naulivou, a Nauve Assistant Missionary, brother-in-law of Tupou and an adopted son of Malani, the previous Tui Nayau. 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. He was unwittingly exposing himself to an assassination plot. "concocted in Fiji, by a few disconcerted Tonguese chiefs then residing there, whose wicked project was ... abetted by others in Vava'u". After his return to Tonga, the king responded to this threat by replacing the governor and several judges in Vava'u. 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 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.

11 Lyth. Day Book, 23 Feb 1846
12 ibid., 25 Apr 1846.
14 Lyth to Williams, 29 Nov 1847.
Following the deaths of his two cousins, Lualala was the most senior in rank and influence among the Tongans on Lakeba. He was the son of Finau 'Ulukalalai-Ma'ofanga of Vava'u and his Fijian wife Vuturogo, a daughter of Niumataiwalu, a former Tui Nayau. He was also a great-uncle of Elenoa Gataialupe. Through his mother, Lualala was vaisu to Tahai Tupou, and had spent much of his early life in Lau.17 His half-brother, Finau 'Ulukalala Tuapasi, was ruler of Vava'u in 1831, the year Taufa'ahau, then Tu'i Ha'apai, converted to Christianity. Following a failed rebellion against Tuapasi, Lualala was exiled to Fiji.18 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...".19 Later, he achieved rehabilitation: in 1842, although still not baptised, Lualala earned lavish 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".20 More than a decade later, the ageing Lualala and the new chum Maʻafu would be appointed joint governors of the Tongans in Lau.

From about 1857 until his death in 1881, Maʻafu made his home on Vanuabalavu. The island then fell under the suzerainty of Cakaudrove, which 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. To-day, the last four islands, as well as Vanuabalavu and the small islands within its reef, are part of the province of Lau. Although Maʻafu might have visited Vanuabalavu earlier, he is known to have set foot there in 1849, in company with Tuikilakila, who had succeeded his father Yavala as Tui Cakau in 1845. Yavala had established his seat of power Somosomo on Taveuni's west coast.

Vanuabalavu underwent intermittent civil war during the 1840s, when the introduction of Christianity exacerbated existing social divisions on the island. There were then about 3,000 inhabitants divided between two vanua, or 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 missionari to Yaro served only to augment the instability of the troubled island.

Tui Cakau family:

RATOVO = Adi Manab (of Kioa)
TC 1

VAKAMINO = 1) Vaturogo (of Vuna) 2) Teyatoa (of Wainikeli)
TC 2

Leleivevono Adi Vulaono YAVALAVA = 1) Adi Cake (of Bouma) 2) Adi Levulevu
(wife of Tanoa) (of Bau)

Lalabalavu = Rogorogollagi Adi Talatoka Rabici
“TUI KILAKILA” (Valelevu) (wife of Tanoa)
TC5 (murdered)

Cakobau* Rakuro VAKALOLO RAIVALITA GOLEA = Adi Mila
TC6 TC7 TC8 (murdered)

*not to be confused with Cakobau, Vunivalu of Bau.

When renewed hostilities between Yaro and Lomaloma resulted in the deaths of five teachers, most Christians remaining at Lomaloma also removed to Munia, where most of them continued to stand aloof from the conflict. When news of the deaths reached Lakeba, some Tongan leaders there, including Lualala, sought to raise a folau to visit

21 Williams and Calvert, p 299. See also Calvert, Journal, 14 Oct 1841, Report of the Somosomo Station 1840, Fitee and Friendly Islands Minutes and Report, 23 May 1841, WMMS Fiji District Minutes and Reports 1835-1852
22 Williams and Calvert, Fiji and the Fijians ... 1884 edn., pp 300-301; Thomas Williams to his father, 23 May 1841
23 The Report of the Work of God in the Lakeba Circuit for ... the year ending June 1845, WMMS District Meeting Minutes. Fitee and Friendly Islands, 1827-1855 For a detailed account of these events, see Williams and Calvert, Fiji and the Fijians ... 1884 edn., pp 296-303
Vanuabalavu. They wished to make enquiries and to remove 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, with the Tongans not venturing 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. On 29 December twelve canoes sailed under the Lualala's leadership and visited Nayau, Mago and Cicia, as well as both districts of Vanuabalavu, everywhere exhorting people 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 loto, "believing that to be the only act that would prevent their being punished". When Lualala's expedition returned, he reported that many people had lotoed 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".

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, who was absent from the island at the time. If Ma'afu did accompany his fellows, he witnessed at close quarters the discord which the new faith could engender in a society already divided, a situation familiar to him since his turbulent childhood on Tongatapu. He was also exposed to the realities of Tongan power in eastern Fiji, where even the implicit threat of Tongan intervention was enough to cause the Lomaloma chiefs to loto. The deaths of Tupou Toutai and Nautilivou meant that the older Tongan leadership in Lakeba was passing away. Lualala was himself advancing in years; his restless countrymen would, before long, look to a new leader. We cannot know how they regarded Ma'afu in 1848, or even if they saw in him the seeds of future leadership. He was in any case a charismatic chief of high rank who needed no leave from the other Tongans to fill the shoes of the departed leaders. What we can say is that Ma'afu would take full advantage of opportunities which were, even during the first years of his residence in Lakeba, being revealed to him.

21 James Calvert, The Lakeba Note 5 June 1845 - 7 Dec 1847, 20 Nov 1847, Personal Papers, WMMS.
22 Williams and Calvert, Fiji and the Fijians ..., pp. 303-305.
23 Calvert to Gen. Secs, WMMS, 25 Aug 1848, WMMS Australasia Correspondence, Fiji, p. 2.
The *Matanitu* of BUA, MACUATA and CAKAUDROVE
The year 1846 was the first since Ma'afu’s arrival in Fiji when there is any significant supplement to missionary sources. Over thirty years later, at the hearings in Levuka of the Lands Claims Commission established to enquire into Fijian land tenure, Ma'afu was to relate a detailed version of the events which led to his assumption of sovereign rights in Vanuabalavu and, ultimately, to the creation for him of the title of Tui Lau. After Ma'afu reached Lakeba, the 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 Vanuabalavu Christians, Thomas Williams placed little trust in the 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 were to accept 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 *nand* appeared unchanged when he set sail to visit Lakeba in 1849, a visit when, to his surprise and apparent pleasure, he either made or renewed his acquaintance with Ma'afu.

In about May 1849, Ma'afu left Lakeba in Tuikilakila’s company to visit Vanuabalavu. During the voyage, Tuikilakila granted him levying rights to the island and several others in Cakaudrove. The grant was to lay the foundation for Ma'afu’s acquisition of sovereignty over Vanuabalavu, a matter of great controversy in the future. Ma'afu’s rights to the island, in accordance with both Fijian custom and English law, were not to be finally established until February 1865 when British Consul Henry Jones, after a judicial enquiry, found Ma'afu to be the lawful owner of Vanuabalavu. In 1849 and 1850, Ma'afu spent about eighteen 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

---

29 Richard Lyth to Thomas Williams, 16 Mar 1846, *Letters to Thomas Williams*.
31 Evidence given at the hearing relating to the question of sovereignty will be considered in detail in Chapter Seven.
32 Williams, *Somosomo Quarterly Letter*. 
proved hatred of God ... he should be left to discover sin and folly by the loss of his present advantages. The lotu is about the only thing he has left — but he despises it and trusts in broken reeds". 33 Ma'afu, a baptised but non-practising Christian, was apparently content to join Tui Cakau in an anti-Christian rampage o the Christian vessel going in Cakaudrove waters. James Watsford, a Wesleyan missionary stationed in Nukula, noted the departure of the two chiefs in Ma'afu's canoe and lamented that the Lomalalavu chiefs who had accepted the lotu during Lualala's visit in 1847 had now pronounced it. Ma'afu and Tuikilakila had "sadly insulted our cause at Lomaloma". Further, on being prevented from setting up house in the Christian chapel at Somosomo, the Tongans turned the local Christians out of their bure instead. The Tongans, apparently including Ma'afu, seemed "to have sold themselves to work iniquity". 34 Ma'afu was to remain in alliance with Tui Cakau, and living in Cakaudrove among conditions of disarray, for some eighteen months.

During Ma'afu's lengthy and obscure stay in Cakaudrove, events occurred in both Fiji and Tonga which would do much to determine 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 Lauca 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$3,006.12, advising the U.S. State Department that local chiefs be punished and compensation obtained. 35 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 of HMS Havannah, visiting Ha'apai during the final few days before the 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. 36 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 power in eastern Fiji to a position where the fortunes of Cakobau, and the independence of several Fijian matakiti, effectively lay in Tongan 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 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 but 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 offer. 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 had been the catalyst for conversion. That news had arrived the day before Tui Nayau announced his decision. One day after that event, on Saturday 20 October, Mara and his force of 300 men appeared off the beach at Tubou.

The Tongan leaders on Lakeba, Lavi'i and Tu'ipelehake, were quick to ally with Tui Nayau following his conversion. Not so Mara, who had long been resentful of the power of the Tongans at Lakeba, which he saw as infringing his legitimate va'au rights. His resentment turned to fury when Vuetnsau 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 Vanuabalavu in 1847. He had ordered the people of Mualevu to close their town against the

---
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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.

Mara's designs were thwarted in singular fashion. His *drua*, the *Ulullakeba*, and six others had arrived with him still ignorant of Tui Nayau's conversion. '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.43

"Lakeba is loyal to Tui Nayau and Tui Nayau and Lakeba are loyal to Bau", Lyth recorded. As if to underline his missionary friend's point, Tui Nayau made plans to send a *soro* to Cakobau, assuring him of his continued allegiance.44 The Tongans on Lakeba "commenced building a fence around their town" for fear that Mara might return.45 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 defensive fortification at Tubou continuing, more as a precaution than anything else,46 Tui Nayau was in no doubt concerning the delicate political circumstances of his realm. His letter to Tupou, conceived

---
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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 with no justification ... 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 visit us and 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. Their hearts were smitten with fear by the Lord ... I told Mara to return to Bau and preach about the Lord to the people of Bau.

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 which 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 ... 47

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 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. Yet Tallai Tupou’s letter had wider implications still. Whatever reservations he might have felt about asking for Tongan help were swept

47 The letter in the original Tongan is found in Richard Lyth, Day Book, 5 Nov 1849. I am indebted to Mr Villame Veikune of Sawana, Vanuabalavu, Fiji for an English translation.
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 the extent to which 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 was mightier than 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 conditioned 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 be master of Lau.

During the weeks that followed 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 had in mind before Mara’s invasion. Lyth expressed his satisfaction at the kindness which Tui Nayau had shown to Mara, and the respect shown to Bau. At the seaside near Tubou, fences were erected, “not for war but for defence”. Lyth 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”. 48 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”. 49

Lyth hoped for “a new era” in the mode of living of the Tongans resident in Fiji. He 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 consideration. I understand that Lakeba has met with a favourable reception and that ... Joeli Mafieio 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. 30

Four years later, Tupou was to acquiesce to the suggested appointment of a governor of the
Tongans in Fiji, when Lualala and Mat'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. 51 In the face of yet another
flowering of the *loup*, and of the reality of Tongan power in Lau, Cakobau could do nothing
more than make the best of the situation. The uneasy peace prevailing in Lakeba at the end
of 1849 was in effect a power vacuum in the making. Tui Nayau’s continued 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 that “the Tonguese are very bad
and under no restraint. What will become of them?” 52 Less than three weeks later, after
praising 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...”. 53 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.

Mat’afu might have provided such leadership had he been living on the island. In
May Captain Erskine of HMS *Havannah*, then in Australian waters, despatched Lieutenant
Walter Pollard, in command of HM Schooner *Bramble*, to Fiji. After spending some days
in Rewa, the *Bramble* proceeded to Ovalau, near which island it came across 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
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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”.54 Ma’afu had clearly established a position for himself at Somosomo, having had a draua built for him, and having been 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 documented mention of him since his arrival in Fiji three years earlier.55 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, Ma’afu’s thoughts might well have turned to the voyage “home” to Lakeba.

Despite the representations made to him by 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 during a visit to Hihifo in June 1850 that “there was a great stir about so many [Tongans] going away to Fleejee, where they generally act as the English in Paris – cast off restraint and live as they list”.56 A familiar lament, but when Lawry’s party left Tongatapu for Fiji in July, it included, at the king’s request, Joeli Mafleo, the Tongan local preacher who resided at Lakeba. Mafleo, 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 Fleejee, 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 Fleejee”.57 Lawry endorsed this policy as a means of removing from Fiji those whose presence hindered the progress of Christianity. Curiously, a few days after his arrival in Lakeba, he was to express a much 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”.58 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,
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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, noted that the Tongans were very 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 which “was unanimously regarded as highly desirable”. Joeli Mafileo, the perennial go-between, was given the task of conveying 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?’” This incident throws into high relief the political implications of the lotu in Cakaudrove. The new faith, like the Tongans who professed it, was perceived to be alien. The murderer’s attitude might be taken as representing that of Tuikilakila who, like Cakobau, was well aware of the potential threat which the lotu posed to his authority. Unlike Cakobau, he would not tolerate a missionary presence in his
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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”. 63

Although Ma’afu was still living in Cakaudrove, and 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 on 25 November of the canoe Tafale, from Somosomo by way of Lomaloma. Its passengers brought word that “Tuipelehake, Banuvi, Maafu, with their respective canoes are at Vanuabalavu on their way from Somosomo to this place”. 64 Earlier in the month, a folau brought over 100 people from Tonga, including some described by Joeli Mafleo as “insubordinate and mischievous [and] of all people the most unfit to come into the presence of heathens”. Mafleo thought their arrival “the more injudicious as [the king] has sent a letter to Tui Viti desiring him to lotu”. 65 It must have been evident even then that the 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 who had returned from Lau and who were considered to have transgressed during their time away. Tevita ‘Unga informed Lyth that his father would not acknowledge his own sister Lavina 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”. 66 Other returning Tongans were judged and punished “without regard to rank”. These activities, while commendable in missionary eyes, must have been regarded as of little consequence by the Tongan community in Lau. It had long since assumed a permanent place in Lauan society, and any significant changes, whether or not in the nature of reform, 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. 68 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 eighteen months. Lakeba had changed during his absence: Christianity had, if not triumphed, certainly 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
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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 which greeted the returning exile.

Ma'afu's arrival, with the other Tongan chiefs, marks a subtle but significant change in his career. Henceforth, his movements would, in large part, be recorded by the missionaries, a distinction which 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” had 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.”69 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.

In November 1850, there was an outbreak of violence in the Christian village of Dama, near the former Wesleyan mission at Tiliva in Bua.70 Lyth saw the violence as a “war against Christianity... encouraged by Bau”.71 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.72 Calvert, at his mission on Viti, learned that Cakobau had intrigued to “destroy” Christianity in southwest Vanua Levu. The missionary's response was to take a large tabua to Bau as an offering to Cakobau. The Tui Viti, as the missionaries now usually referred to him, was “entreated” to stop the fighting. Cakobau was reminded that visiting ships of war were liable to seek revenge for destruction of Christian property, even though Cakobau, in giving permission for the attacks on Christian villages, had stipulated that no harm be done either to missionaries or to Tongans. 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 Joeli, Tu'i Ha'apai, brother of Tupou, Calvert asked the chief to take his accompanying force of 300 warriors to Bua in support of the Christian cause. Joeli agreed, only to find that Cakobau would not permit the three large Tongan canoes to depart. After several days' delay, the Vunivalu agreed that one canoe could proceed, with Calvert on board. While a full-scale
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war in the Dama district was avoided, several Tongans were killed and wounded in an engagement with a force from Nawaca.73

The hostilities in Bua were similar 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".74 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. The Vanivalu felt, correctly, that his tyrannical authority was undermined among those of his subjects who had converted. The missionaries themselves had refused to encourage the people to assist Cakobau in his various wars. Joseph Waterhouse 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".75 When besought by Calvert to end the fighting in V na Levu, and to protect the Christians there, Cakobau rebuked the missionary:

'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."76

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
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Calvert's idealism. It also expressed the Vunivalu's frustration with a doctrine which bade fair to diminish his authority and 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, Cakobau was as resigned to the inevitable as the missionary contends. Waterhouse was to allege that nothing less than the "extirpation" of the Christians of Fiji was planned. Whether or not the Vunivalu accepted the eventual 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. Their numbers would and did fluctuate; their conduct would and did continue 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 damaged. 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 instructions from Tupou, had commenced the work of "cleaning 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". Despite the missionary's apparent optimism, the numbers of Tongans in Lakeba would recover. Dama had demonstrated that Tongans were always likely to be involved in any conflict in eastern Fiji. Cakobau sought to maintain his authority against a people who respected that authority only when it suited them. He could dilute the threat.
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posed by Christianity by adopting the faith himself, as he was to do in 1854. It would never be possible to accommodate the Tongans so easily.

After Ma'afu's return, Tongan unrest on Lakeba continued. In January, some Tongan youths, in an act of "cruel and wicked oppression", took possession of a canoe which 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 Banuvii "with their people were occupied in setting four new posts in the Bethel chapel". The Tongans continued to act as they pleased and to co-operate with 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".81

While Ma'afu's thoughts about Dama were not recorded, Tui Nayau was "anything but comfortable on hearing of the real and threatened doings of persecution".82 On 7 March, he and Vuetasau asked Lyth to write on their behalf to Tupou. Tevita 'Unga, still on Lakeba, had himself visited Lyth's house the previous evening, "being desirous of hearing respecting passing events, as well as stating his own views".83 This was the time when Tui Nayau was looking "this way and that for help".84 He was evidently not the only Fijian "king" so placed: Cakobau was "trembling" following the visit to Fijian waters of an American ship of war sent to investigate various grievances. The news had been brought by the occupants of one of Tu'i Ha'apai's canoes recently returned from Bau. 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".85 The tables might have been turned, but the presence of American military power, brief as it was, served only to add another ingredient to the bubbling cauldron.
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In April 1851, there appeared hopes that Ma'afu might be encouraged to ponder his spiritual condition. Cakobau had advanced his 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 not long returned from a visit to Moala, where all was reported quiet. Two months earlier, on Mara's orders, the occupants of a Tongan canoe were murdered there. 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 had gone of his own accord, to investigate. The voyage to Moala was the first indication that his growing authority on Lakeba was accepted, not only by his fellow Tongans, but by the ruling chiefs and the Wesleyan missionaries as well.

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 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
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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, 
Tuiliala and Mara, to prosecute this new undertaking. Tui Viti 
taking Ra, Tuiliala Vatuabalavu, and Mara Moala and Lakeba.

Since Lyth’s sources of information are unknown, no conclusions about such a conspiracy 
can be drawn. It seems unlikely, since the three supposed conspirators were themselves at 
odd and had 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 eleven *drua* carrying hundreds of Tongans departed Lakeba for home. Among the 
notables leaving the island were Tevita ‘Unga, Semesi Fifita, Joeli Tu'i Ha'apai and 
Lausi’. Lualala and Ma’afu were the only community leaders remaining in the Tongan 
community on Lakeba. It would be up to them to direct any Tongan involvement in the 
troubles in Cakaudrove.

Unlike similar occasions in the past, no Tongan canoes sailed from Lakeba to 
Vatuabalavu 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 Vatuabalavu 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 was soon to 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 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, and wrote 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 Elena dined with 
the Lyths, and the missionary remarked 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 be 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, a vasu to Bau. His brother Qaraniqio, who succeeded him, ejected Bauan forces from Rewa, and the war entered a new phase. These events did not affect the Lauan Tongans for several more years, but 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 loto, while Tui Nayau, although now professing Christianity, still refused both to marry his principal wife and to relinquish the others. Ma'afu appears not to have been 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 Sefanaa [Lualala] of Waciwaci". This is the first known occasion when Ma'afu was employed in Lau on pastoral duties, a sure sign of the missionaries' continuing favour.

Ma'afu continued to enjoy the approval of Lyth, who nevertheless 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". 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". 107 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". 108 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. 109 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 had met Mara, who begged to be conveyed back to Lakeba, where he longed to exercise his vatu rights. Vuetasau vacillated, 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". 110

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, Vave arrived in Lakeba with news that Raivalita, a son of Tuikilakila, had visited Lomaloma and disrupted a Christian service, causing the local chief, Sefanaia Ravusia, 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". 111 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". 112 The expedition, under Vuetasau's command, spent only one night at Lomaloma, returning to Lakeba with Vave and other teachers and leaders. 113 There is no evidence that, on this brief visit and under the direction of Vuetasau, Ma'afu was able to 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 vest more than him". 114 Ma'afu meanwhile appeared to have undergone a spiritual reformation: in describing "an astonishing and pleasing change wrought in Ma'afu", Lyth recorded the
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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 cooperate 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".115

The reforms, personal and communal, instigated by Ma'afu 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 Wathiwathi and the reformation is exploded".116

Whether or not Ma'afu was aware, Mara was still scheming to regain his vassal rights on Lakeba. Having earlier stated that Lakeba "would be all right" if Vuetasau 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 commons. No doubt but he remembers their former plans together – whether against Lua Tui Nayau..."117 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 "had been speaking evil of Lakeba and the lotu to the Vunivalu and others, saying that Lakeba was bad because of it..."118 Tui Nayau, as delicately placed as ever he had been, 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."119 Ma'afu, if he were to pursue his leadership role on Lakeba, would have to confront Mara sooner rather than later.
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Another person likely to confound the ambitions of Ma‘afu and the peace of mind of Tui Nayau was 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”. 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 Cicia and against 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 Vaka Joto, 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, and later news arrived that their chief Ravunisa had “begun again to keep the Sabbath”, while other Christians continued steadfast. The threat to Lakeba, if there had ever been one, came to nothing.

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 in company with 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”. Lyth was reassured, but events were to reveal the extent to which he and his fellow missionaries had been deceived.

When Lyth returned 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
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intentions toward Lakeba are not so pacific as he had stated them to be".\textsuperscript{124} Lyth considered that 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.\textsuperscript{125} But the two were inextricably linked; for the Cakaudrove chiefs, the most important consideration was the threat posed by the lotu to their hegemony.

Following the breakdown of Ma'afu's reforms, missionary exasperation persisted. In August an American trader named William Ives, who had been living on Lakeba for several months, absconded with two girls who were employed as servants by Malvern. Ives sailed away with them in a whaleboat which 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. "[I]t 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.\textsuperscript{126}

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 Tuikulakila did not seem desirous of war - but had been urged to it by Ma'afu".\textsuperscript{127} Then, two days later, Mara returned from Cicia with news that Ma'afu had joined Ives and was proceeding with the American to Ovalau.\textsuperscript{128} 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, where the chief detained both them. They were freed only when Ma'afu visited Oneata, requisitioned the boat and sailed in it, with the men, to Lakeba.\textsuperscript{129}

It is impossible, on the available evidence, to determine what Ma'afu's motives were during this period of intense activity. Rees' secondhand account of Ma'afu's apparently bellicose attitude serves only to deepen our perplexity. It is nevertheless clear that Lyth's distrust of Ma'afu was increasing. The missionary had now been observing Ma'afu at close quarters for more than two years and his distrust was not solely the result of
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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 mid 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 down 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 Kanokupolu in 1845. At the very time 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. He emerged as "undisputed Sovereign of the Friendly Isles". The king's victory at Pea was aided by a timely visit from HMS Calliope, a British warship whose commander, Sir Everard Hume, successfully urged Tupou to accept the peaceful surrender of the Pea chiefs. Hume 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, Hume headed for Moala, where he heard Ma'afu had gone. Disappointed at missing him there, Hume 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". Hume expressed the wish to foster the spread of Christianity in Fiji, to follow its success in Tonga, and to do what he could to protect the Fijian people from unscrupulous Europeans. Lyth, perhaps after discussion with Hume, wrote that "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 missioner is likely to have heard from Hume that such was Tupou's intention. The king 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 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
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the paucity of sources and by the accretion of legend, it is possible to discern the foundations of power laid by him. In these early years, Ma'afu’s ambition had not yet asserted itself; he was not yet able 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 one of the least well-known periods of his life in Fiji. His rank alone would have ensured his place among the Somosomo chiefs bearing tribute to Bau in 1850. We can know almost nothing of his life at Somosomo, the nature and extent of his alliance with Tui Cakau, and 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.
Chapter 5: The basis of power

The islands of Moala, Totoya and Matuku, collectively known as the Yasayasa Moala, lie between 100 and 130 kilometres southeast of Viti Levu. They are approximately the same distance southwest of Lakeba. Owing some degree of allegiance to Bau, the three islands also enjoyed several family connections to Lakeba. The most prominent of the few practising Christians there was Donumailulu, or Donu, who, after lotuing while living on Lakeba, introduced 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 Moala group in October 1852. Despite the precarious state of Christianity on Moala itself, Lyth departed in optimistic mood, largely because of his faith 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 Hume, reached Levuka following a call at Moala. “The Fijies were never in a worse state than at the present time”, Hume lamented,7 a situation which he ascribed largely to the continuing hostilities between Bau and Rewa. He thought the end might be in sight now that Qaraniqio was gaining support at the expense of Cakobau. Qaraniqio, who claimed to have asked Cakobau for pardon and peace fourteen times in vain, declared he was anxious for the war to end and
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would lotu when it did. Hume assured the Vunivalu that if he too were to become a Christian, “all Feejee will follow your example”. At Bau, meanwhile, “all [was] dull and fearful”. 8

Hume had also visited James Calvert at Viwa, where he reported an atmosphere of “joy” in marked contrast to the gloom prevalent at Bau. It is likely that the views expressed in his letters to Cakobau and Qaraniqio owed much to Calvert, who believed that peace and unity would follow a conversion at Bau. Calvert asked Hume to intervene in a worsening dispute in Bua, which the commander was happy to do, arriving there with Calvert on 19 October. The mission station at Bua Bay, under the supervision of 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. Only three days after his arrival, Hume was able to preside over a meeting of the heathen and lotu chiefs of Bua, at which peace was agreed. 9

News from these conflicts caused little stir on Lakeba. There, Ma’afu appeared to be immersed in matters of local concern, building a new house for William Collis, the Wesleyan schoolmaster who had recently arrived. A new chapel was likewise under construction in Tubou, partly in expectation of a visit from Tupou I. The need for the chapel 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”. On the same day, trader William Ives returned to Lakeba with one of the girls he had earlier abducted. Ma’afu continued to deny any knowledge of the affair, naming a local preacher as implicated. 10 Ma’afu’s involvement with the minutiae of daily life meant that he was on hand to respond quickly to the news from Moala.

The response from Lakeba was rapid. Tui Nayau sent a 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 of three canoes on 7 December. A Lakeban complement under the command of Waqaimalani and Sokutukivei, both senior chiefs of the Vuanirewa, sailed in the Tabilai. Their spokesman was the Mata ki Bau, the Lakeban envoy to Bau, who carried a second large tabua for presentation to the Moalan chiefs. Both crews were under orders from Tui Nayau and Vuetasau to attempt a peaceful resolution of the conflict. 11 The choice of the
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Mata ki Bau as envoy for the delicate session was prompted by the allegiance, limited as it was, of the Yasayasa Moala to Bau.

When the Moalan chiefs refused to receive Tui Nayau’s envoy, the latter returned to Lakeba, leaving the rival villages, heathen Navucunimasi and lotu Vunuku, building war fences. On 13 December, a 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 set off with reinforcements on 14 December, 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 lotu party laying siege to Navucunimasi. Three days later, the combined force entered the village. The teachers and principal chiefs assembled in the temple for a cuva, or bowing of the knee, a symbolic submission, even if under duress, to the 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 lotu forces, both Tongan and Moalan, ransacked the village houses while the two principal chiefs, Baba and Koroltoa, were taken prisoner, bound with sinnet, and placed on board the lotu canoes, eventually to be conveyed to Lakeba. One of the Tongan preachers attempted to deny the destruction wrought by the lotu forces in his choice of a text for the sermon preached on 15 December among the foundations of the demolished “heathen” temple: “But we were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children”.

Upon his arrival in Moala on 19 December, Vuetasau was confronted with the victory of the lotu forces. Ma’afu had stolen his title; the task which Tui Nayau and Vuetasau had sought to accomplish was completed by the Tongans, whose armed intervention on the side of the lotu had brought about the speedy defeat of the heathens of Navucunimasi. Tui Nayau and his nephew had made the decision 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. The formal submission of Moala to the lotu occurred after Vuetasau’s arrival, and was followed by the conversion of the leading non-Christian community on Totoya on 26 December. On Matuku, only Tui Yaroi remained steadfast in opposition following the conversion of his entire village on 4 January 1853. Ma’afu, seeking perhaps to demonstrate his commitment to the lotu, sent Lyth a huge tanoa, six feet in diameter, pillaged from the temple at Navucunimasi.
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One immediate consequence for Moala was the installation of Baba as Tui Moala. He 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. 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. The changes wrought in the three islands under the banner of the *lotu* were essentially political in nature. While Ma'afu gained most from them, no firm conclusions can be drawn concerning the nature or extent of his ambitions in 1852. There are significant clues, however, in evidence he gave before the Lands Claims Commission in 1880, 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 letter came and 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 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.  

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 Koroita at Navucunimasi, Ma'afu had declared: “Moala will be under *LEWA vakatoga*” [Tongan law or jurisdiction]. Writing more than a year later, Lyth was
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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".19 Again, this time in a significantly wider context, Ma'afu's leadership role was acknowledged.

Giving evidence before the Lands Claims Commission 28 years later, 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 op, 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 P.e... and by the long-expected death of Tanoa on 8 December. Hume 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.20 For Ma'afu, the fortunes of Cakobau were to become increasingly important since, following the Tongan's success in the Moala group, further extension 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 Navucunimasl had lead to this general turning".21 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" 22 The voyage was meant to 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 bring about 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 act in open defiance of the missionary, proposed a compromise: “...The King should [first] send a canoe... to 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”. Ma’afu suggested that both 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.

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 such a course of action. 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”. But Ma'afu was not to 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”.32

The folau of eight large canoes set sail on the morning of 2 March, only to be driven back by contrary winds as soon as 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.33 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”.34 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 the minds of both Tongans and missionaries were preoccupied with plans for the delayed voyage, news continued to arrive from the Yasayasa Moala of 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 to lotu him”35 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.36 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 Tainawl 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 to prevent the departure of this folau.37 Ma’afu’s prestige in the eyes of Cakobau could only have been enhanced by this visit, since the Vunivalu had hitherto 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 but opposed by the other chiefs. “All are looking
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forward to Ma'afu's return as the event that will settle the question", Lyth recorded. 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 within the wider polity of Fiji. Vuetasau's opposition to Ma'afu's voyage might well 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.

It is uncertain how long Ma'afu remained in Bau, but by mid July he was again in Matuku, where hostilities had recommenced. On 21 July, news reached Lakeba "of the murder of two lotu men sent by Donu to the town of Yaroi". Vuetasau and Waqaimalani set off the same night 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, news reached Lakeba of the death of Kolilevu, Tui Yaroi's Christian son, and about twenty others. Ma'afu apparently underwent some "searchings of heart" following Kolilevu's death, seeing the hand of God in the series of reversals. When he and Matthias, the Tongan teacher living at Tubou, informed Vuetasau of their dilemma, the latter confessed that he had left Lakeba without the consent of Tui Nayau, so determined was he to respond to the appeal from Donu and Kolilevu for assistance against Tui Yaroi. "This disclosure surprised Ma'afu, who 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". Since Matthias was about to return to Lakeba, Ma'afu asked him to inform Tui Nayau of the real state of affairs.

A native teacher, probably Matthias, 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".
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Whatever Ma’afu professed to believe, he and Donu had voyaged to Matuku with a large complement of Tongans, Totoyans and Moalans, and had approached the shores of Matuku 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 towards the end of August, Lyth met with 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”.

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 lotuuing”. Both Tui Nayau and Lyth condemned this “Tongan method of making Christians”. Finally, news came on 27 September that the war on Matuku was over; Tui Yaroi had finally lotued. He had done 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”.

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 incompatible”. Seeking to ensure that Ma’afu 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, Ma’afu had evinced, if not regret, certainly awareness that his actions in Matuku were indeed ill-advised. Tevita ‘Unga had come to Lakeba with some of the spoils from Matuku, intending that they be returned to their rightful owners. Ma’afu, “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”.
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His fortunes at a temporary ebb during the weeks following Matuku, Ma‘afu 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, Ma‘afu expressed his approval, and said he would investigate the best means of having a chapel constructed in the village.\textsuperscript{47}

One day in late October Lyth, his new colleague John Polglase, Matthias Vave and others waited on Ma‘afu at his house, very likely in order to assert subtle pressure, this time in numbers.\textsuperscript{48} Whatever degree of rehabilitation Ma‘afu 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 Ma‘afu and Lualala. They were appointed 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.\textsuperscript{49} Lyth, though, must have experienced mixed feelings at seeing authority placed in the hands of Ma‘afu. 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.

It was to 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 \textit{vono}, or general meeting of the village, which was duly held six days later.\textsuperscript{50} Ma‘afu, Vuetasau and large numbers of people from Tubou and Uea attended. The purpose of the \textit{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, putting aside any reservations he might have felt, described the appointments as “the commencement of an era long desired, prayed and laboured for”.\textsuperscript{51} Although he had known of the decision for at least six days,\textsuperscript{52} neither he, Robert Young nor
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Nathaniel Turner, who were accompanying the king, seemed to have been aware of it during their visit. None mentioned it in their various documented accounts. 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 could have been in 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. Consideration must be given to how far Ma‘afu was the “agent” or representative of the king. His appointment was in part a response by Tupou to missionary pleas of long standing. The king had overcome the last resistance to his rule in Tonga less than eighteen 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.

It has been erroneously stated that Ma‘afu was expelled from church membership in 1853 for his part in the events on Matuku. Such a move would have lost 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.” 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
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expulsion of Vuetasau "for persisting in making war upon the people of Matuku that they might be compelled to lotu." It is impossible to think that, had Ma'afu been expelled, the two missionaries and Robert Young, all writing about Lakeba affairs during the final months of 1853, would have omitted any mention of it. The imaginary 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". Ma'afu, who had sailed to Matuku with hostile intent, was, although he did not commence hostilities, one of those who sought to fulfill "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 positions, which remained as far apart as ever. 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 "taking 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 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. Vuetasau, ever obdurate, had voiced his exasperation at the vono by demanding of Lyth: "Wherein are you caused pain - are you plundered of your property?" Ma'afu, who knew better than most the causes 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". The worst setback had come in August with an unsuccessful attack by Bauan forces on the
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Rewan village of Kaba, following a revolt by some of Cakobau’s personal slaves. Mara had 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, and Cakobau’s position in late 1853 allowed him no refusal when Calvert again urged him to take this step. Joseph Waterhouse landed at Bau on 30 October and, after exerting considerable pressure on a reluctant Cakobau, was allowed to remain.61

Cakobau welcomed Tupou’s unexpected arrival. During their first 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 pick up on 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”.62

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 the 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 between Bau and Tonga, either political or military. Cakobau was reassured by the promise of future help from the king, who hoped to see the Vunivalu accept the lotu, although how far he pressed that point during his visit is not clear. 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 for visits to Oneata and Kabara, returning on 4 January 1854.63 During the ensuing weeks, he basked in missionary approval by attending service regularly, seeking again to meet in class, and establishing a school in Uca. He declared to his fellow Tongans that “‘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
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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 assist in the completion of a new chapel in Uea. 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”. It remained only to see for how long Ma’afu would remain steadfast to the task.

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

The death of Tuikilakila did nothing to alleviate the reduced fortunes of Bau and its ruler. Cakobau had received a further 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 had gone 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:

---
64 Ibid., Jan – Feb 1854, passim.
65 Lyth to Mary Lyth, 27 Feb 1854, Letters home from Richard Bursdall Lyth and Mary Ann Lyth 1829-1856. See also Lyth to Gen Secs, WMMS, 3 March 1854.
66 Lyth, Day Book, 1 Dec 1853; Lyth, Journal, 6 Dec 1853. 18 Jan 1854.
67 Lyth to Gen Secs, WMMS, 3 Mar 1854, Lyth to Mary Lyth, 27 Feb 1854.
68 Lyth, Journal, 23 Feb 1854, Lyth to Gen. Secs, WMMS, 3 Mar 1854; Brewster Papers B5. Notes on pre-European history of Fiji 1796-1867 (E.J. Turpin), Roth Papers. It was generally believed that Cakobau had been behind the marau. For a discussion of theories concerning his involvement, see Shelley Sayes, Cakaudrove idea and reality in a Fijian confederation, unpublished PhD thesis, Australian National University 1982, pp 255-256
69 Waterhouse, pp 165-166. For an account of the second attempt to take Kaba, see ibid., pp. 161 et seq.
70 Lyth Journal, 20 Apr 1854
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.\textsuperscript{71}

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.\textsuperscript{72} 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.\textsuperscript{73} The letter of February 1854 was something more than a friendly suggestion to *lotu*. It intimated, Calvert said, “that evil might come to Bau”.\textsuperscript{74} 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.\textsuperscript{75}

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 those people and places which reject the Word.\textsuperscript{76} Tupou’s letter had arrived “at this crucial time”, following as it did Cakobau’s ominous reversal at Kaba.\textsuperscript{77} 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, which indeed it was. They also recognised the political nature of Cakobau’s decision: Christianity was a force which the Vunivalu could no longer resist. His enemies were preparing to hammer at his
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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. Even then, the *lotu* was far from guaranteeing 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 went on to scorn Waterhouse's suggested program of political reform, and faced the rejection of his own peace proposals from Qaraniqio. 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 Yarol and other Matuku captives and to convey them home. His mind was quickly diverted from these concerns when news arrived from Matthias Vave of a massacre of seventeen Christians in Lomaloma on Easter Sunday. The ringleader of the murderers was reported to be Tuilakeba, "chief of the turtle fishers". Vave's messenger, Mafa, 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 going to the relief of our teachers and friends at Susul". He sailed on 29 April in the *Tainawi*, accompanied, in another canoe, by Joeli Bulu and Jonah Tonga as missionary representatives.

There is conflicting evidence concerning the involvement of Ma'afu in the mission to Lomaloma. He was later to state that after reaching Lakeba, Mafa went first to Tui Nayau, who refused assistance. Then, following Mafa's subsequent appeal to Ma'afu, the latter set off for Susui with two large canoes. The traditional account on Vanaubalavu indicates that Vave's messenger brought to Ma'afu a letter reporting the murder of one Ratu Tomsa, who had been eating turtle meat without sharing it with a chief named Tui.
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Keba. 83 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”. 84 Ma'afu was disingenuous in his evidence at the 1865 Court of Arbitration, seeking 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”. 85

According to another missionary source, “the whole affair was more than sanctioned at Somosomo”. 86 If that was so, it does not belie the fact that the power of the Somosomo chiefs to become actively involved in Vanua Balavu 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 conveyed them back 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 700 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, “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. 87

At the Court of Arbitration in 1865, Samate and Lavaki corroborated Ma’afu’s evidence. Samate expressed his belief that Vanua Balavu belonged to Ma’afu, while Lavaki said that when Ma’afu’s message was conveyed to Raivalita, the Tui Cakau had said, “
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'Very good, if I ever want to go there, I will ask Ma'afu'\textsuperscript{88}. Despite this apparent unanimity, it is useful to consider the oral history recorded in the \textit{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 \textit{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 Boitucu village, from which Wainiqolo's men soon expelled them. The outcome of these and other skirmishes was that Ma'afu and his forces burned Mualevu village before returning to Lomaloma. Ma'afu gave the island of Cikobia to Wainiqolo as a reward, returned to Lomaloma to pay a final call on Matthias Vave, and 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 it was on that day he set sail 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 of Tupou and a large \textit{fotau} in Lakeba. 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 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 \textit{lotu} and "agreed to merge their ancient differences and live in peace". Ma'afu and his force returned to Lakeba on 3 June, with Tullakeba, the principal perpetrator of the April massacre, one of several prisoners.\textsuperscript{89} No wonder the Tongan was thought to have acted "excellently well".

By 1854, the bases for Ma'afu's claim to the sovereignty of Vanuabalavu were in place. They included the levying rights granted him by Tuikilakila and the gift of the soil by the Vanuabalavu chiefs following the Tongan conquest. Still nominally subject to Cakauvde, the island's people were expected to provide massive tribute to Tui Cakau and
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his entourage whenever they visited. Nevertheless from 1854, effective control of Vanuabalavu 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 in 1854 gave him effective sovereignty of the island. Raivalita accepted the situation because he had no choice. Subsequent judicial enquiry, firstly at the British Consul's Court of Arbitration in 1865 and secondly at the Lands Claims Commission hearings in 1880, confirmed Ma'afu in his possession. He claimed that his sovereign rights were bestowed entirely in accordance with Fijian custom, and 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 Fijian chief.

Only nine days after his return "home" to Lakeba, Ma'afu set sail yet again, this time for the Yasayasa Moala. While his immediate purpose is not known, the events of the previous two years meant that those islands, like Vanuabalavu, would henceforth count among his chief concerns. Lakeba was then said to be "the centre of political, religious and educational influence" in eastern Fiji. Lyth recognised that this situation 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". One consequence of this change occurred following the death in 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 which he had traditionally possessed. The several new appointees were well aware 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 so 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, that the Moala group constituted an independent state, while Vanuabalavu owed its allegiance to Cakaudrove. While there still existed channels of tribute and other
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traditional means of contact, 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 the hands of Ma‘afu. It was his conquests and their aftermath which brought these islands under the eventual suzerainty of Lau. Ma‘afu’s achievement raises the question of whether, and to what extent, he was acting in the interests of the government of Tonga. Although it can be argued that Ma‘afu was bent on securing for himself a kingdom in Lau, and possibly elsewhere in Fiji, there is no evidence that, in 1854, he was acting on behalf of Tonga or, more especially, 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. 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, might be said to have had a hand in its creation. For him, the withdrawal of Cakaudrove from Vanuabalavu, and the ending of Bauan infiltration of the Yasayasa Moala, did more to sustain the precarious independence of Lau than did 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 Ma‘afu assumed direct personal control of Vanuabalavu after the defeat of Mualevu. He is supposed to have “had a house built for himself at Lomaloma and appointed 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. These details are certainly wrong. Aside from the lack of any contemporary evidence for any Tongan settlement on Vanuabalavu in 1854, we know that Ma‘afu 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 so far as Ma‘afu is concerned, owing partly to the departure from Fiji in October of Lyth, whose journals and other writings are the most important sources for Ma‘afu’s movements during the early 1850s. The most that can be said about Ma‘afu during these months is that he had not yet moved his residence to Vanuabalavu.

---
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Towards the close of 1854 there was unease in both Fiji and Tonga concerning 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, British naval commander Stephen Fremantle noted that Tupou had concluded a treaty with France. Both Tongans and Europeans, Fremantle believed, were wary of France’s ulterior motives. He was apprehensive that the French priests 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 he concluded with Governor Joseph 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. The treaty’s implementation 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 accepting the lotu. Early in 1855, preparing for his promised second visit, Tupou proposed to bring a folau of more than thirty 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 with Tupou, acknowledging the debt owed to the Tongans, whose presence fostered the spread of Christianity and the safety of both missionaries and teachers. 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.” Several months later, West saw the need to correct some false impressions concerning Tupou’s motives:
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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, which had been 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 Tongese 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.105

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 would 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 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

105 West to Gen. Secs. WMMS, 1 Nov 1855, WMMS Letters from Fiji.
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.\(^{106}\)

There 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 possessed his own reasons for continuing to defy Cakobau.\(^{107}\) 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.\(^{108}\)

Ma’aafu, still living on Lakeba, made a hurried departure on 10 February, supposedly heading for Tonga by way of Kabara.\(^{109}\) 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.\(^{110}\) 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.”\(^{111}\) The fleet had touched at Kabara and Moce en route.\(^{112}\) It was later reported that the king’s purpose in coming to Fiji was to “bring Tonguese property” to Cakobau in return for the Ra Marama, and to congratulate the Vunivalu on his renunciation of heathenism.\(^{113}\) 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.
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At Lakeba, Tupou’s *folaau* was augmented by “a considerable force well supplied with firearms”, a force probably commanded by Mal’afu. It seems likely that he and his followers were part of the fleet when it reached Moturiki, an island southwest 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 twenty persons on board, across to Ovalau to deliver letters to the French priests there. He also sent a *tabua* and a bundle of kava to Tui Levuka, who had recently *lotuaed*. 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. 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. The canoe stood out to sea to avoid Mara’s approaching canoe, and made its way back to Moturiki.

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 opponents, both Fijian and European, on Ovalau by posing as an enemy of the Tongans. Mara 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 Tongans at Lakeba. He had also [requested] the people of Ovalau, that they would fire upon, and destroy ... any ... Tongan 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 project 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.
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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". 118 On the day of his arrival, 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". 119 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 Rewa towns who were at his command. 120 A clash was inevitable, and as Calvert wrote, "its results for good or evil will be immense". 121

Cakobau had for long been urged to give up the war against Rewa, as much for its deleterious effect on Christian evangelisation as for its inherent evils. 122 But the time for peace was long past. Tupou attended an immense prayer meeting on 2 April, and later promised to prevent loss of life as far as possible. 123 On the same day, the Tongan fleet proceeded from Bau to Kiuva, a village on the east coast of Rewa, drawing fire from Kaba as it sailed past. 124 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. 125
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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. But, 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 to a Wesleyan teacher which 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".126

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 only fourteen, with about thirty 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.127

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".128 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 definition 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.
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There exists no contemporary reference to Ma’afu’s participation in the battle of Kaba. A twentieth century writer has 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. 129 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, 130 while another tradition places Ma’afu at the head of a contingent of his own called the Kailoma. 131 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 days and 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. 132 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 1855, Tupou received a letter from David Whippy, a respected American who had been living in Fiji for more than thirty years. Whippy, on behalf of himself and other Europeans resident at Levuka, expressed regret that any quarrel should have arisen between them and the king. A fortnight later, further letters arrived from the whites of Ovalau, requesting the king to keep any future war away from their island. 133 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. Mara, the king believed, was the cause of their being fired upon at Ovalau and of the bad feeling against the Tongans in Fiji. For the future safety of the resident Tongans, he felt he had to act against Mara. For the same reason, he intended, as did Cakobau, to show mercy to the vanquished Kabans and their numerous allies. 134 This avowal of reluctance to be involved in war and of determination to temper his power with both justice and mercy were certainly worthy of a Christian king, and must have been music to missionary ears. It remained to be
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seen whether, in the light of events over the next fourteen 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 clear that only the village of Kumi, on the coast of Verata, whence Mara had made his escape 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 owed his survival to Tupou, and in gratitude presented the king with an 86-ton schooner called the *Cakobau*. 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 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 thirty 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.
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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: support for the *lou*. 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 an American ship, the *Dragon*, Captain Dunn, arrived at Levuka. 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 said, 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 all of them to proceed to Bau within a few days to make peace offerings. Dunn requested Waterhouse to urge the speedy return of Tupou and the Vunivalu as soon as practicable, so that a formal peace might be concluded.\(^{138}\)

Because of the *Dragon*’s sailing schedule, the meeting at Bau took place on 18 June, four days before Cakobau’s return.\(^{139}\) Nothing conclusive resulted.\(^ {140}\) With Mara’s fangs not yet drawn, the ascendancy of Cakobau was far from assured.

Meanwhile, the Tongan *folau*, because of 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 Beqa chief, Tui Sawau, seized the opportunity to complain to Cakobau about some villages in isolated parts of the island, which had prepared 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

---
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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”. Upwards of 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 constitution of the 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. For the Tongans, such an arrangement was in accordance with 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 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, sometimes gratuitous but always 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”.

This question was not to be properly addressed until the promulgation of the first Tongan constitution twenty years later. In 1855, when the principle of primogeniture was by no means established in Tonga, any consideration of Tupou’s
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possible successor could not have excluded Ma'afu. The son of Tupou's predecessor as Tu'i Kanokupolu, 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. 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." Doing "all he could" meant continued practical support for Cakobau and active promotion of the lotu. Religious could not be separated from political considerations, now almost inevitably involving outsiders. 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. He took pains to outline to the chiefs the conditions implied in any act of cession and agreed to hoist the British flag at Levuka a few days later. The proposal had the support of prominent European residents of Lau and was accompanied by the despatch to Denham of several baskets of earth. 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. Since there were six towns on Ovalau which, although subject to Bau, were in open rebellion, much would depend on the attitude of Cakobau towards any notion of cession.

When apprised of the move to cede Ovalau to Great Britain, Cakobau expressed approval, provided his differences with the island's chiefs were settled and the six recalcitrant towns were reconciled with Bau. His enthusiasm was such that he announced to Denham his desire to "lead" Ovalau's annexation, as an example to the rest of Fiji.

---
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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.\(^{149}\)

The attitude of Tupou towards the question of some form of cession is unclear. In respect of his own country, he had objected to the governors of New Zealand or New South Wales declaring a protectorate on behalf of their respective governments. Now the king might 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.\(^{150}\) His immediate concern, as he prepared to visit Ovalau in company with Cakobau, was to settle his differences with those who had shot Tawaki four months earlier.\(^{151}\) On 25 July, when the two men arrived at Ovalau with a fleet of eleven canoes, a conference of all contending parties took place on board HMS 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 request to his commanding officer, Captain Fremantle, whose vessel, HMS Juno, was expected in Fijian waters later in the year.\(^{152}\) 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."\(^{153}\)

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.\(^{154}\) With all effective opposition to him 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 the northern matanitu. The king regretted that so many lives had been lost at Kaba, but was still

---
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\(^{150}\) Calvert to Hoole, 24 Jul 1855

\(^{151}\) ibid

\(^{152}\) Calvert, Journal, 19 Jul 1855

\(^{153}\) ibid See also the remarks of Francis Hixson, Acting Second Master aboard HMS Herald, 13-29 Jul 1855. Francis Hixson Papers 1848-1860

\(^{154}\) Calvert, Journal, 25 Jul 1855
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. 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. In response to a request from Raivalita, Tupou sailed to the island of Rabe, subject to Cakaudrove. Some inhabitants of Rabe had killed and eaten twenty Tongans whose canoe had drifted to the island on a voyage from Lakeba to Tonga. Rabe people had also killed two Somosomo chiefs, one of them a half-brother of Raivalita. 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 who had earlier gone ashore from the king's vessel were themselves murdered. The king immediately made sail back to Somosomo.

Raivalita regarded these new atrocities at Rabe as the last straw. He 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 sixty drowned while attempting to escape. The destruction was complete, and Rabe continued to be regarded by the king as his own property, separate from Ma'afu's acquisitions in eastern Fiji. 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 which Cakobau enjoyed. On 28 September, the USS John Adams, Captain Boutwell, arrived at Bau further to investigate the claims arising from the destruction of Consul Williams' house by fire six years earlier. 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.

15 Great Council of Chiefs, 1879, Published Proceedings of the Native Councils, or Council of Chiefs, from September 1875, Suva, n.d.
116 Berthold Seemann, Viti, an Account of a Government Mission to the Viti or Fijian Islands, London 1962, p. 245
15 Calvert, Journal, 29 Sep 1855, Calvert to Hoole 20 Oct 1855.
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..."\(^{159}\)

Boutwell finally raised the indemnity to US$43,686. Fremantle later accused the American of "supercilious hauteur" and even "extortion". He noted that the alarm raised in the minds of many Fijians by Boutwell's "peremptory proceedings" caused them to look to Great Britain for protection. The British commander received from Tui Levuka a renewal of the offer to cede Ovalau. As far as Fremantle could determine, Tui Levuka and the other chiefs "were afraid of King George, of the French, of the Americans, and in fact of each other." He informed Tui Levuka that discussions with the British government would be necessary before any decision could be made.\(^{160}\)

Cakobau, returned from Taveuni and summoned aboard the John Adams, signed an acknowledgement of the debt "through fear".\(^{161}\) He was given two years to pay. For the Vunivalu, the situation was rich in an irony which he would not have appreciated. His authority, limited as it was, had been underwritten by the military successes of Tupou and his forces. Cakobau's 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 have offered 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 folau left Wairiki on 18 September, apparently "for home".\(^{162}\) Within a month of this departure, Ma'afu formally handed over to his king all the land he had acquired in Fiji. While there is no contemporary account of the occasion, it seems to have taken place on Vanuabalavu. In his 1864 statement to the then British Consul, Ma'afu recalled the circumstances:

\(^{159}\) Commander Boutwell to National Intelligencer, 30 Mar 1859, quoted in Williams and Calvert, p. 579
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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...  

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, and the only connection I have now with the same am (sic) that I am governor of the people and Lands belonging to the Government of Tonga and situate in Fiji.  

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 I himself. In handing over his lands to his king, Ma'afu was doing nothing more than 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 Feejeees, 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.  

Tupou's confidence in Ma'afu meant that he would have been quite content to leave the Tongan lands in Lau, nominally his own, in the capable hands of his young 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 likely believed that the British Consul, and

---
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the government he represented, would readily understand and accept a sovereignty deriv:11~
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 very pretty sight" as
they sailed into the Tubou roadstead.166 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 one
thousand 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".167 On a more practical level, the Tongans' Lakeban
hosts felt the strain of feeding such a great number of people.168 The visit was prolonged,
since the king had time to visit Ono, in southern Lau, whence he returned to Lakeba on 10
November.169 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.170

One immediate consequence of the tumultuous events of 1855 was the assured
predominance of Christianity in all parts of the group, with the exception of central and
western Viti Levu. While West ascribed the triumph of his faith to "the religious examµle
of the Tonguese",171 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.172 The eventual triumph of the faith could not be gainsaid. It could be
argued that given the various outside pressures being felt by Fiji, the lotu was bound to be
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successful in any case. 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 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 ascendancy. 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 Maʻafu, 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, in a lengthy report to the British Admiralty at the conclusion of the visit of HMS Juno to Fiji and Tonga, called into question Tupou's motives and intentions 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 "cruise", 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. In any case, Tongan military involvement beyond the shores of Tonga had traditionally been undertaken to support allies or clients, and 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 latu. West, who knew Tupou well, was aware of such views even before the Tongan fleet returned home.

"Fremantle to Osborne, 12 Dec 1855"
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.\textsuperscript{174}

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.\textsuperscript{175} 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,\textsuperscript{176} there is no evidence for any arrangement between the two men beyond that detailed by Ma'afu in his statements considered above. It should be remembered that Ma'afu's successes in the Yasayasa Moala and in Vanuabalavu had occurred without any assistance from Tupou. Ma'afu's personal ambition was unquestionably great, as was his ability to seize any opportunity which 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.

\textsuperscript{174} West to Gen Secs. WMMS. 12 Nov 1855. See also West, \textit{Ten Years} ..., p. 403.
\textsuperscript{175} West to Gen Secs. WMMS. 1 Nov 1855. It is impossible to believe that such an offer, if it occurred, was made in earnest.
\textsuperscript{176} See, for example, R.A. Derrick, \textit{A History of Fiji}, Suva 1950, p. 117; Basil Thomson, \textit{The Diversions of a Prime Minister} Edinburgh and London 1894, p. 364; Reid, p. 90.
Chapter 6: The brink of power

For more than a year following the tumult of 1855, Fiji experienced relative tranquillity. Evidence for Ma'afu's activities during the months after Tupou I's departure is fragmentary, offering only occasional glimpses into the life of the man in whose hands Tongan power in Fiji now lay. Ma'afu had been entrusted with the care of the Tongan lands in Fiji, and the measure of the king's confidence in his kinsman can be seen in the address he made to the assembled chiefs of Tongatapu one week after his return. The king's accolade suggests that he saw Ma'afu as a possible successor, both as Tu'i Kanokupolu and as king. Ma'afu, 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 which he could scarcely have foreseen when he quit Tonga nine years earlier.

The king's only surviving son born in wedlock, Vuna, died in January 1862, and for more than thirteen 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 that line fail, the succession would pass to Ma'afu, who was then Roko Tui Lau in the British administration of Fiji. The king's mind was revealed in an address to the Tongan Parliament in 1875. 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 Ma'afu 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 ... Ma'afu you are aware holds office in Fiji under the English government and moreover I think ... that Ma'afu 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.

Ma'afu's official position in Fiji was seen in 1875 as an effective bar to his succession in Tonga. However, circumstances were very different eighteen years earlier. Although Vuna was still alive in 1857, the possibility that the position of Tu'i Kanokupolu might return to

---
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the senior branch of the family, in the person of Ma'afu, is likely to have been present in the king's mind when he addressed the fono of Tongatapu chiefs.

Ma'afu 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. The reasons why the captains were seeking him are not known, although 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".

While Ma'afu's activities on Ovalau are unknown, he was certainly back in Lakeba by 26 May. On that date, Mary Polglase noted that he had "settled" the "disgraceful affair" of a woman named Neomai. Then, just three days later, Thomas in Nuku'alofa wrote a note "to accompany a copy of the Scriptures to Fejees — for ... Maafu called the son of the king". Ma'afu's favour in the eyes of Tupou appeared undiminished. 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, despite Vuetasau's impulsive temperament. Now that he was gone, the reliance of Tui Nayau on Ma'afu could only have increased.

The authority vested in Ma'afu by Tupou and acknowledged by the Lauan chiefs appears to have remained unchallenged during this period. Nevertheless, 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. He assured the Queen 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". The king’s letter was not forwarded.
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from Sydney for more than two years; in the meantime he gained the support of Captain Stephen Fremantle, who visited Tonga in command of HMS Juno later in the year. Fremantle noted the existence there of disaffected "malcontents . . .betted by the French missionaries", as well as the frequent visits of French men of war sailing between New Caledonia and Tahiti. 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" there was nothing new; nor did it 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 Feejeees. 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.

In March 1857, Ma'afu returned to Lakeba from a "long sail" which likely included his stay in Tonga. He quickly readjusted to life in Lau: after a long 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 which included upwards of eighty turtles. When Polglase and his wife 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 mostly a diversion for Ma'afu. Less than a week 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". 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

---
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clarification before involving himself in any hostilities. In a surprising move, he set off for Somosomo, telling the missionary that he was intent on helping free an English ship which had run aground on a reef. It is likely that he made straight for Bua, if only for a short time. South of Bua lay the vanua of Solevu, a district which owed its first allegiance to Bau and whose people were traditional enemies of the neighbouring Buan village of Nadi. 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, along with "some Tonguese". Whether Ma'afu was yet involved is not clear. In a move which revealed 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 akin to the valu ni lotu earlier in the decade. The intervention of Cakobau turned the tables against the heathen forces, to the discomfiture of local French priests, who threatened to send to New Caledonia for a French worship. According to John Binner, the Vanua Levu "heathens" were calling themselves lotu popi or lotu kataki ka, demonstrating not a commitment to Roman Catholic dogma but rather a determination to confront the lotu weseli which bade fair to change forever the world they knew. To the inherent instability of this matanitu was added a veneer of sectarian confrontation which was scarcely understood and which carried with it the faint but sinister threat of imperialist force ready to be summoned when required. That such 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 southwestern Vanua Levu provided ideal opportunities for intervention by Ma'afu.

Tui Bua was later to state that notwithstanding Cakobau's expressed wish, he did make a direct appeal to Ma'afu. Another Buan chief, Tui Wainunu, "a Papist and a perfect devil", joined forces with Ritova, Tui Macuata, as well as Tui Levuka and Ratu Mara, the ubiquitous stormy petrel of mid nineteenth century Fiji. Missionary James Royce believed, with justification, that each of these men 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
of Levuka. Ma'afu had not yet intervened, since Mary Polglase on Lakeba recorded his presence there in mid July.

Ma'afu’s involvement became increasingly likely as the situation in Bau deteriorated. In August came the news that the forces of Mara and Tui Levuka had murdered the Christian chief of Nadi village, well as a local preacher. Other Buan chiefs allied with Mara were sending “property” to villages on Vitawa and in Rewa, villages allied with Bau, many of which “accepted the property, thereby pledging themselves to cooperate 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.”

At this time of uncertainty in Fiji, the unique position of Ma’afu in Lau came under some scrutiny in Australia. Charles St Julian, the Sydney law reporter who had corresponded with Tupou, published a monograph which attempted to assess 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. 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. 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 honorable position at a distance a chieftain who might, one day, have proved troublesome at home”. 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. 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. The use of such legal terms as “sovereignties” and “right of conquest” owed more to St Julian’s legal turn of
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mind and vivid imagination than they did 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 is further evidence of the king's confidence in his kinsman, whose power in Lau he had earlier recognised with the appointment as governor. To write in terms of "sovereignty" is to ascribe to Tonga a status as a sovereign state which it did not possess. The very concept was still alien to the nineteenth century Pacific. Sovereignty then 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 one year following the early hostilities on Vanua Levu is one of the most obscure of Ma'afu's adult life. It is possible that during this time he moved his main residence from Lakeba to Vanuabalavu, although evidence is lacking. It was later stated that he "divided his time between Lomaloma and Lakeba", 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". 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". If Brower's claim is accurate, it reveals the full extent of Ma'afu's ambition at a time still 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 clear to all. 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 Williams made no mention of any such request from Ma'afu in lengthy and detailed despatches to the U.S. State Department at the time.

More pertinent are Williams' reports wherein he writes of the "Tonguese exotick" who control Lau and

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. Notwithstanding the Tonguese are not a
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very industrious race of men themselves, but for them the Fijians at Lau ... would have been comatose to this day.\textsuperscript{34}

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.

In the same week that 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.\textsuperscript{35} Cakobau was also faced with the rebellion of one of his own Bauan chiefs, his half-brother Dranibako, who had joined the heathen forces on Vanua Levu. 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{36} In the midst of this renewal of war, fourteen 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{37} Although Ma'afu was not among the fourteen chiefs to sign the protest, 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 was to dominate Fiji for more than four 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{38} 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".\textsuperscript{39} His 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
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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.40 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 the 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, Captain 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.41 The formal offer of cession signed by Cakobau on 12 October was a document equally remarkable for its frankness and for its falsehoods. The frankness arose from 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, understanding little and fearing much, had no choice but to comply. In return, the British government was to pay $45,000 to the US 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 fulfill.42
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The nature of Fiji’s polity meant that Cakobau was always destined to be on the back foot when dealing with any foreign power, British, Tongan or any other, which sought to meddle in the islands. The divisions entailed by the importance of the mataqali and its 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 was the most powerful chief in Fiji, but was far from enjoying any kind of paramountcy. Such power as he did possess was seriously weakened by the American claim which, as he knew for certain by 1858, would not go away. Disputes were rife even within his own family, and after his conversion to Christianity, 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 accepted Whitehall’s reluctance to annex Fiji as a challenge. 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” 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 which 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
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Pritchard to unseat them and appoint others in their place if they refused. Pritchard went on to threaten the deposition of Tui Nayau as well. At this point, 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”, left the meeting, leaving Ma‘afu to urge the reluctant chiefs to sign. In the event, all the chiefs present signed 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.

Tui Nayau, who had earlier observed that one end of his land joined to Tonga while the other pointed towards Fiji, is likely to have felt himself to be under the protection, and to some extent the authority, of Ma‘afu. He was thus emboldened to resist the Consul’s threats. Ma‘afu’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.

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. Pritchard was insistent, and 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. For the moment though, Ma‘afu dominated play. Following Pritchard’s departure for London in November, the ink barely
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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, visiting Rewa in December, had doubts about his intentions. If the report were true, his efforts were not directed towards Bau. In mid December, five young Christian men were murdered near the Wesleyan mission at Tiliva, 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 druua 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".

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 some 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 him. 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

---

61 Polglase, 21 Dec 1858
62 William Wilson, Journal, 17, 20 & 27 Dec 1858, quoted in Wilson to John Eggleston, Feb 1859, WMN(A), No. 11, Jan 1860, p. 169
64 John B. Williams to Lewis Cass, Secretary of State Washington, 31 Mar 1859, USC Lautala 3. Williams estimated the number of men accompanying Ma'afu as "about 500", while John Smith Fordham, Wesleyan missionary stationed at Bau, estimated there were "about 1,000 including the women and children".
65 Fordham to Binner, 15 Jan 1859, quoted in Binner to Eggleston, 24 Jan 1859, MOM 98.
"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 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 could be said to have 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 most 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 Williams and Robert Swanston, acting British Consul in the absence of Pritchard. 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.
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57 Williams to Cass, 31 Mar 1859.
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:

[In Fiji] 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.59

Williams used his intimate knowledge of Fiji to place Ma’afu’s actions in a context which few others would have recognised at the time. History would bear out the Consul’s judgment.

War, meanwhile, continued in Vanua Levu in the form of further Buan raids against Macuata.60 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.61

Ma’afu stated to 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.62 Missionary and chief seemed united in their determination to keep Ma’afu out of the renewed hostilities.

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. The two had long been contending for supremacy. The situation was 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
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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 writing in 1862, Swanston indicates that the nature and extent of Ma‘afu’s motives were understood three years earlier.63

With the renewal of hostilities, Tui Bua quickly applied for help to Raivalita and Cakobau, in both cases without success. He then wrote both to Ma‘afu and to Wainiqolo, the latter his kinsman through his Tongan mother and Ma‘afu’s principal lieutenant. Four separate messages were sent to Ma‘afu, who repaired to Lakeba and set out from there in a fleet of drua, himself sailing in the Ra Marana. 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, Ma‘afu sailed 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.64 According to Pritchard’s later account, Ma‘afu had also promised his support to Ritova. 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. Rumours of missionary support for the violence led John Eggleston, secretary of the Australasian Wesleyan Missionary Society in Sydney, to write to Ma‘afu, protesting against a number of outrages and urging him to reveal himself as the true inspiration of his lieutenants’ work.65 Not for the first time, Ma‘afu’s absence from the action permitted him some degree of dissociation from events which, 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 from the aftermath.

After protracted fighting, Ritova had surrendered by October to the combined forces of Cakobau, Tui Cakau, Tui Nayau, Tui Macuata, Tui Dreketi and Ma‘afu66. He was conveyed as a prisoner to Taveuni and placed under Tui Cakau’s authority.67 Tui Bua retained his office, while Macuata was divided into two separate districts, with Bete being made chief of the western district, while the eastern district was placed under the authority of his half-brother Bonaveldogo. Both brothers were to pay tribute to Ma‘afu, as was his
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long-standing ally, Tui Bua. Finally, the district 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 were expected to return to Tonga. As if to place his final 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 which probably arose from Ma'afu's claims to be identified with the mission cause. Raivalita was lotu, and his appointment as "king" while his "heathen" brother 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 the vanua of Solevu symbolised the damage done to Cakobau's power and prestige throughout the region, damage rendered the more significant by the fact that there had never been open hostility between the Vunivalu 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. Pritchard was later to 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, paying with coconut oil, and visited Cakobau, supposedly seeking his approval for aid to Tui Bua and Bete. While Pritchard's intimate involvement in Fijian politics over several years merits a serious assessment of his views, his account is far from telling the whole story. The interpretation which 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 Bréheret, head of the Catholic mission, expressed the view 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.

---
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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. Ma'afu repudiated Williams' complaints, declaring that he was "fighting for the chief of Bau and for the mission". He showed Swanston the letter from Cakobau, which he said was 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. 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. Once again Ma'afu was able to head off his critics. His achievements in Fiji, properly described as "breathtaking", 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. That is not to say that there was no tacit support from the king. At the time, Joseph Waterhouse wrote that "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". The dilemma is scarcely easier of resolution to-day 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, 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

---
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missionaries. For Ma'afu, the end of Mara, in whose company he had voyaged to Fiji twelve years earlier, was welcome. 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.

Ma'afu's anger, real or apparent, 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. 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. In these accounts, however, the authority of Mara's daughter and grandson must 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 pardon if he would present himself at Bau. Upon arrival, 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 at Levuka in September owed something to 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 be interfered with. 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 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:

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.

Despite his gains in northern Fiji 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.

---
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Following Pritchard's return, Ma'afu did not cease attempts to extend his influence whenever opportunity arose. On 25 November two Tongan canoes arrived at 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 *lotu* in those Kadavu villages still unconverted, but quickly acknowledged his error. Pritchard arrived on board HMS *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 *lotu* and under the authority of chiefs appointed by the Tongans. The chiefs had also expressed their support for cession. 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.

Ma'afu also despatched a *folau* to Beqa, an island indirectly subject to Bau through Rewa. When Williams heard reports that the Beqa chiefs had ceded their island to Ma'afu, he wrote immediately to Cakobau, seeking clarification. In reply, John Fordham wrote to Williams on Cakobau's behalf, confirming 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 without a messenger from either Bau or Rewa". Cakobau went on 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. Ma'afu was later accused by Pritchard 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. His control, in various forms, included 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.
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Before the meeting took place, Pritchard engaged in intense lobbying of several of the more important chiefs. Visiting Wairiki, he interviewed Tui Cakau in the presence of Joseph Waterhouse, acting 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 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 to be seen.93

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 work towards a proper settlement. This astonishing change of heart on Cakobau's part was reported to the State Department.96 The details of V'illiams' 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.97 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.

---
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Despite his improved negotiating position, Ma'afu attempted to head off the meeting by urging Pritchard to agree to a division of Fiji. He first offered 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. 98 Williams was apparently convinced "that the British intended" to divide Fiji in the manner suggested by Ma'afu. 99 He need not have worried; Pritchard was determined both to maintain the existing balance of power and, as far as possible, to stop the Tongans in their tracks. 100

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 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. Cakobau was then acknowledged as supreme by all the chiefs present, who were from Rewa, Viwa, Bau, Ra and Nadroga. Tui Levuka was also in attendance. All of these men 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-maneouvred. 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
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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.101

The document was witnessed by Pritchard and by Commander Campion.102 Interpreters William Collis and Edward Martin in their turn certified that Ma'afu had understood its content.103 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. The 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 ways of thinking and, more especially, European military strength. He harboured no illusions concerning 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 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 necessarily mean agreement on the ground. For the moment, 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 informed 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".104 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

101 This account is based on Collis to Polglase (see n. 98). Collis acted as an interpreter at the meeting. See also the evidence of the other interpreter, Edward Martin, in *Report of the Commission* ..., p. 15.
102 For the full text of the Instrument, see Appendix A.
measures he may deem necessary, proper and expedient”. When Williams, who was 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 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 beche de mer or sandalwood.

Pritchard’s dictatorial powers, a natural consequence of the “overbearing” attitude noted by Martin, were later to attract adverse comment from Whitehall. In the immediate aftermath of the chiefs’ offer, Colonel William Smythe was directed by Whitehall to lead a Commission of Enquiry in Fiji, with the object of determining the views of as many leading chiefs as possible, and submitting a report to the Colonial Office, before a final decision could be made. Following the renewed offer of cession and Ma‘afu’s apparent capitulation, the prestige of Cakobau received a much-needed boost. He had secured at least grudging support from all the principal chiefs, which meant that his “title” of Tui Viti possessed greater authority than hitherto. Berthold Seemann, the 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. As soon as 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.
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103 Pritchard to FO, 31 Dec 1859, CO83/1.  
104 Williams to State Dept, 2 Jan 1860, USC Lauca la 4; Evidence of Edward Martin, Report of a Commission...  
106 For the detailed instructions to Colonel Smythe, see Henderson, ed., The Evolution of Government in Fiji, pp 9-15; Sarah Smythe, Appendix, pp. 191-196.  
107 Seemann, p. 226. See also n. 104, above.  
108 Binner to Eggleston, 14 Dec 1859, MOM 165.
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. 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 awarded himself, he would possess an ascendancy in Fiji hitherto denied anyone else.

Ma'afu appears to have carried on life as usual. Early in 1860 Williams sought to prevent him 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. Ma'afu already regretted his actions of December, since in January he was reported to be "galled" and anxious to fight Bau, claiming that Cakobau had deceived him. He was also indirectly fomenting trouble in Rakiraki where a rebel chief had erected a defensive fortification supposedly on orders from Tui Bua "in the interests of Ma'afu". Pritchard disbelieved the assurances of Ma'afu's envoy, Semisi Fifita, that Ma'afu was not involved. On 15 January, Ma'afu arrived off Levuka aboard the Elenoa, accompanied by six drau and a force of about 1200 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 called on Williams to ask him which chief would be the best to rule in Lau and Vanua balavu, 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, 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
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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”.\footnote{Royce to Gen Secs, WMMS, 27 Mar 1860, WMMS Letters from Fiji. See also William Wilson to Gen Secs, WMMS, 9 Apr 1860, WMMS Letters from Fiji.} 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”.\footnote{Lakeba Circuit Report, p. xxvii. The Report of the Australasian Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society for the year ending April 1860, Sydney 1860.} Ma‘afu’s absence from the record during these months suggests that he might have visited Tonga in the wake of the agreement of December 1859. In eastern Fiji, one of the first land sales which would cause so much debate in the future occurred on 30 May. Kuli Kavaci, owner of Adavaci, a small island within the Vanuabalavu reef, sold it to George Henry for $100.\footnote{Deed 192, Consular Register of Deeds 1858-1872, GB FO HM Consul for Fiji and Tonga Papers.} It is probable that the sale enjoyed the approval of Tui Cakau, within whose 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.\footnote{FO to Sir Fredenc Rogers, 20 Jul 1860, with encls. CO83/1} Colonel Smythe, armed with his instructions which were weighted against cession, reached Levuka on 5 July to begin his investigations.\footnote{Newcastle to Sir William Smythe, 23 Dec 1859, PP 1862, xxxvi (1895), pp. 24-27. See also Smythe’s formal instructions (n. 106, above).} A few days later, Smythe and his wife met Ma‘afu in Levuka, 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.\footnote{Sarah Smythe, Ten Months in Fiji, Oxford 1864, pp. 126-127.} Her husband 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 urged his followers to remain quiet and to refrain from fomenting discord.\footnote{Seemann, p. 256.} He certainly appears to have remained quiet himself, because his meeting with the Smythes resulted in the first documented reference to him since the previous January.
Smythe, Seemann and their entourage left Levuka on 19 July aboard HMS *Pegasus* to commence their tour of Fiji. There was then "no slight excitement" among many Fijians, who now realised that even though their commitments to the British Consul had been made in writing. Pritchard's promises to them were merely verbal. Smythe began his round of consultations at Bau, where several meetings with Cakobau and other chiefs took place. 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. More significantly, he 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 informed 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 on 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
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Commissioners and Pritchard reached neighbouring Bua later in the month, Tui Bua asked Joseph Waterhouse, who was acting as an interpreter, where was the "British uprightness" of which the missionary had spoken? Tui Bua was in a moral dilemma, since he announced to Smythe that he now put 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.\(^\text{130}\)

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".\(^\text{131}\) Proceeding with his enquiry, Smythe reached Lakeba on 5 October. Here, he and his party felt the Tongan presence as never before. Wishing to determine Tui Nayau's "real sentiments" concerning cession, Smythe 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. In a difficult meeting which followed, Tui Nayau appeared at a loss without Tongan support, and would only vouchsafe his approval of cession. He 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. The control which Ma'afu had exercised among these islands for several years was not yet accepted as customary, at least by Tui Nayau.\(^\text{132}\)

One of Smythe's most important meetings was the last, at Fawn Harbour on 22 October. He first enquired into Ritova's recent depredations along the Macuata coast, and 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 that Bete, installed as Tui Macuata in the presence of Ma'afu and Cakobau, should be left in that office.\(^\text{133}\) After the meeting, Pritchard informed missionaries Jesse Carey and Thomas Baker that he wished to return Ritova to Macuata.\(^\text{134}\) 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 Taveuni, as a prisoner to Tonga. He also wanted to consign all Ritova's lands to Bonaveidogo, the chief to whom
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he had given eastern Macuata. On 27 October, an "arrangement" between the parties restored Ritova’s lands, including his home island of Nukubati. 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, staying 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, home of Bete. 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 been destroyed, with more than forty 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 him, reminding him of the powers “granted” to him (the Consul) by the chiefs and also recalling that the Tongans had no political status in Fiji. He demanded that Wainiqolo be withdrawn and Rataqa and his fellow chiefs be released; Ma’afu complied. Pritchard wrote of “positive evidence that all these disorders 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 any 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”.
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Ma'afu, at the end of 1860, was blamed by Pritchard for the renewed violence in Macuata. The Consul's own peremptory conduct had aroused complaint from London and from missionaries resident in Fiji, most particularly Waterhouse, who accused him of lying.\textsuperscript{140} 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 the Vunivalu had been acknowledged in that role by various officials of the British, American and French governments.\textsuperscript{141} 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",\textsuperscript{142} 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 which, as he must have known, Cakobau could never pay. Tupou might have been preparing the ground for future intervention, fixing an eighteen-month period so as to allow Whitehall time to make a decision. It is conceivable that the letter was Ma'afu's idea and the king was not involved at all. 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 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".\textsuperscript{143}

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 Elena, which was probably conveying Ma'afu back to Fiji. Attention in Fiji was then 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 forty
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"independent tribes", among which were 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".145

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.146 Smythe favoured a minimal British presence in Fiji consistent with the development of cotton cultivation and the continued Christian evangelisation of the "natives".147 London's later decision not to annex came as no surprise, given its predisposition before Smythe began his enquiry. It was some time before that decision became known in Fiji, and in the meantime hostilities recommenced in Macuata.148 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 landed at Nuduri 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.149 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".150
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Ma'afu, not for the first time, had 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 the whites of 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 Seymour to Macuata, which "after a little diplomatic shuffling they agreed to do". The Pelorus duly anchored off Naduri on 19 July. 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 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".

On arrival off Naduri, Seymour learned that Wainiqolo's Tongan force and their Fijian allies had forced Ritova and his party to take refuge on Kia, an island sixteen kilometres offshore. The Tongans had wrought destruction on the plantations and drua
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belonging to Ritova's followers, several of whom had been murdered. Seymour sent for Ritova who, once he came on board, 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 fourteen 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 drau "with a ... fair wind for Lakeba, ...beating their drums and cheering most lustily".158

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 signed159 Yet, in circumstances similar to those prevailing at Levuka seven months earlier, Ma'afu signed because he had no choice. On this occasion, there was no need for Pritchard to out-maneuvre the Tongan. Seated with Wainiqolo, Cakobau and the other chiefs on the

159 Evidence of Wainiqolo and Bonaveidogo, Report of the Commission...
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 ...”\(^{160}\) Nevertheless, ten days after the warship’s departure, Ritova’s forces recommenced hostilities against many villages whose inhabitants had been allies of the Tongans. After one of his chiefs successfully sought help from Tui Cakau and his brother Ratu G·lea at Somosomo, many atrocities followed, part of a “reign of terror” which had not ceased one year later.\(^{161}\) Ma’afu, who apparently accompanied Cakobau to Bau after the meeting on board *Pelorus*, was at Rewa in August, on his way back to Beqa and Kadavu.\(^{162}\)

During this period Tongan forces, denied further intervention in Macuata, wrought destruction in the Yasawas, a group of islands in northwestern Fiji subject to Bua. One of the Yasawas had reportedly been ceded to the Tongans. During a visit to the islands 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. 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.\(^{163}\) 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 the Levuka trader Hicks, who happened to be visiting, intervened, Fifita threatened to ask Ma’afu to send Wainiqolo 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”.\(^{164}\) 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
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acknowledged that Fifita had flogged the men, but not because of their religion. Bréhéret thought otherwise, and his view prevailed. On 10 October the *Comelie* sailed for New Caledonia, with Fifita confined on board, supposedly "to be employed for two years on the public roads". 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. Pressure was also exerted on Tupou, with the despatch of a French warship to Tonga to "punish" him.

The events on board the *Comelie* 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, who was 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 ...." A week later a British warship, HMS *Harrier*, Commander Sir Malcolm MacGregor, anchored in Laucala Bay. It had been sent from Sydney by Commodore Seymour following complaints by Pritchard of mistreatment of Europeans in Vanua Levu and Kadavu. MacGregor's intervention was instrumental in securing Cakobau's release from the *Comelie*. 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 Tu'i Dreketi: "I have shielded Cakobau, but to-day I abandon him, and give him up to the Tongans to do their own pleasure with him". 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 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
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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 likely, 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, reported a 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”.

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 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
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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, his ambitions must still have included the conquest of Bau. Pritchard, grateful to the missionary or 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, were under no illusions about the threat which 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
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180 Calvert to Rowe, 19 Nov 1861.
181 Evidence of Calvert, Report of a Commission...; Calvert to Gen Sees, WMMS, 19 Nov 1861, Calvert to Rowe, 19 Nov 1861, Pritchard to Calvert, 9 Nov 1861, FO 58/108
182 Pritchard to Calvert, n.d. [c. 11 Nov 1861], quoted in Calvert to Rowe, 19 Nov 1861.
183 Pritchard to Cakobau, 11 Nov 1861, FO 58/108.
still in Rewa. Fordham’s eloquence in a letter to his Society articulated the peril which had so recently confronted Bau and which might re-emerge at any moment.\textsuperscript{184}

Ma’afu, no longer intent on fighting Bau, quit Rewa and arrived at Levuka with seven canoes on 15 November.\textsuperscript{185} 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.\textsuperscript{186} In Levuka on the same day, Ma’afu and his entourage attended the two services which Calvert took. “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”:\textsuperscript{187} Ma’afu and about 300 followers, including women and children, soon left to return 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”.\textsuperscript{188} Ma’afu had returned to his lair, but might re-emerge, and 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 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”.\textsuperscript{189} Like other missionaries, he strongly favoured cession,\textsuperscript{190} while expressing anxiety should it be refused. 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 which they knew could never be collected. The Tongan claim Calvert considered to be “an after consideration”, made in an attempt to extort as much as possible from Fiji before the expected cession. Pritchard “discard[ed] the idea of paying”, despite his petulant remarks 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

\textsuperscript{184} Fordham to Gen. Secs. WMMS. 12 Nov 1861.
\textsuperscript{185} Calvert. Journal. 15 Nov 1861.
\textsuperscript{186} Fordham to Gen. Secs. WMMS. 16 Nov 1861, WMMS In Letters. Tonga and Fiji.
\textsuperscript{187} Calvert to Rowe. 19 Nov 1861. See also Calvert, Journal. 16 Nov 1861.
\textsuperscript{188} Fordham to Gen. Secs. 16 Nov 1861.
\textsuperscript{189} Calvert to Gen. Secs. WMMS. 19 Nov 1861, WMMS In Letters. Tonga and Fiji
\textsuperscript{190} See, for example, Binner to Eggleston, 19 Nov 1861, MOM 165.
Harrier to enquire into the claim. 191. The course of conduct for both Tupou and Ma'afu seemed to depend on the eventual British decision concerning cession.

The rapid succession of events which culminated in Ma'afu's return to Lomaloma caused others beside 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 Tongue from Bau". For Waterhouse, the Tongue 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. 192 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 ..." 193 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 from the Tongan grasp". 194 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. 195 In the middle of these various alarms, Cakobau sought in April 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. 196 Much was feared of Tupou at this time, but very little known of his intentions.

191 Calvert to Rowe, 19 Nov 1861.
192 Joseph Waterhouse to Gen. Secs., WMMS, 16 Dec 1861. WMMS In Letters, Tonga and Fiji.
193 James Murray to Sir Frederick Rogers, FO, 31 Dec 1861, quoted in de Ricci, p. 233.
194 Calvert to Rowe, 13 Jan 1862, WMMS In Letters, Tonga and Fiji. Three months later, LMS missionary Martin Dyson, stationed in Samoa, expressed fears of an imminent Tongan invasion. See Martin Dyson to Eggleston, 17 Apr 1862. MOM 166; Dyson to Eggleston, 30 Jun 1862, MOM 166.
195 Seymour to Adm., 16 May 1862, CO 83/1.
196 Pritchard, Polynesian Reminiscences, p. 289. See also Roth Papers, AJCP M2792.
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.” Ma'afu’s earlier appeal to the Consul to let him become chief of Fiji demonstrates the degree 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. He sought advice from Consul Brower and Père Bréheret, who both urged him to make the voyage. Before his departure he wrote to the Foreign Office, assuring his masters 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 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’”.

Pritchard duly reached Nuku'alofa on 23 April, and over the next thirteen 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 which were 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 had come in order to mature plans for war, although further evidence for such an admission is lacking. Pritchard had always considered Ma'afu to...
pose 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".205 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 clearly not enough.

An agreement signed by Tupou on 5 May provided for the removal of Wainiqolo from Fiji. It also sought to forbid Tongan interference in commerce and in the sale of land to Europeans.206 The treaty 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 as the most significant. It forbade Tongans from commencing any war in Fiji until the decision concerning cession was known. Pritchard in fact described this provision as "the main object of my visit [to Tonga]."207 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 as he had always been: the wild card.

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 to the British, should cession be approved.208 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 and Samoans as well as Tongans, placed Ma'afu second in order of precedence, following Viliame Tugi, great-uncle of the king.209 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

206 For a précis of the treaty, see Appendix B. For the full text, see GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga, Miscellaneous Papers. See also Pritchard to FO (enc), 15 May 1862. FO58/96. For missionary opinions of the treaty, see Walter Davis to Eggleston, 10 Jun 1862, MOM 170: Calvert to Gen Secs, WMMS, 27 May 1862, WMMS In Letters, Tonga and Fiji.
207 Pritchard to FO, 15 May 1862.
208 Ibid.
209 Viliame Tugi would have been Tu'i Ha'atakalaua, had that title still been conferred. For the full list of chiefs in attendance, see WMMS(A), No. 25, Jun 1863, p. 343.
was expressly forbidden.\textsuperscript{210} The provision for security of tenure in return for payment of taxes was to 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{211} Since then, a fundamental change had occurred: Vuna, Tupou's only surviving legitimate son, had died on 2 January 1862.\textsuperscript{212} Although a system of primogeniture was not to be established in Tonga until 1875, Vuna must have loomed large 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, Tevita was placed only fourth among the assembled chiefs in 1862, two places behind Ma'afu. As the son of Aleamotu'a, Ma'afu must have been seen as the most likely successor, in view of established Tongan custom. In Fiji meanwhile, following the treaty wrested from Tupou, all depended on the British government's decision regarding cession. Ma'afu was to return to Fiji with his prospects uncertain, but fraught with possibilities, in both groups of islands.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[211] See above, n 1.
\item[212] Frank Firth to Dr Osborn, 20 Nov 1862, WMMS In Letters, Tonga and Fiji, Calvert to Rowe, 4 Feb 1862, Personal Papers According to Firth, a Wesleyan missionary stationed in Tonga, Vuna died of "strong drink".
\end{footnotes}
Chapter 7: A chief of Fiji

News of the British government's decision concerning Fiji, so eagerly awaited by so many in those islands 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 Mervina, Captain 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 a 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 twelve
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1 James Calvert to Gen. Secs, WMMS, 25 Jul 1862, WMMS In Letters Tonga and Fiji; Calvert to John Eggleston, 25 Jul 1862, MOM 99.
2 Sir Frederic Rogers to E. Hammond, 7 Sep 1861, CO83/1.
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, p. 39. See also Lord Clarendon to Sir Edward March, 20 May 1862, GB PP 1869, xiii [4222], p. 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, p. 4). See also "W H," to the Editor, The Argus, 17 Apr 1862, p. 4.
4 William Pritchard to Isaac Brower, 28 Jul 1862, GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga. See also Brower to Pritchard, 28 Jul 1862, ibid.
5 William Smythe to Newcastle, 9 Nov 1860, CO83/1.
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

The hearings, which accorded Pritchard unjust treatment and resulted in his dismissal from office, are not of immediate concern here.7 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.”8 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”.9 The most notable absentee from the gathering was Ma’afu, 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 greed 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.10 James Calvert wrote of Tongan indignation because “the Consul has shut them out for twelve months from their friends on the Macuata coast...”11 The imminent withdrawal of Prichard, 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”. The “Tongan elements” were needed, he wrote.
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6 FO to Rogers at CO, 15 Mar 1862; Sir John Young to Newcastle, 21 May 1862, CO 83/1.
7 See Memorandum for the guidance of the commission appointed to enquire into the conduct of Consul Pritchard at the Fiji Islands, 15 Mar 1862, FO 58/108. The full transcript of the hearings appears in Report of the Commission Appointed to Enquire into the Conduct of Her Majesty’s Consul at Fiji, with Minutes of Evidence. Sydney 1862, FO 58/108. For the views of a modern scholar who argues that Pritchard was the victim of a miscarriage of justice, see Andrew Robson, “The Trial of Consul Pritchard”, *JPH*, Vol. XXX, No 2, Dec 1995, pp 173-193
8 Captain Robert Jenkins HMS *Miranda* to Pritchard 7 Jul 1862, FO 58/108.
9 Sir John Young, Message to the Chiefs, HMS *Miranda*, Levuka 11 Jul 1862. Young had also written to Cakobau advising him of the decision: Letter from the Governor of New South Wales to the chiefs of Fiji, as commanded from Britain ..., quoted in Togainvalu, “Ratu Cakobau”, *TFS*, 1912-1913, no pagination.
10 Jenkins to Commodore William Burnett, 30 Aug 1862, quoted in de Ricci, pp. 41-43.
11 Calvert to George Stringer Rowe, 31 Jul 1861, Personal Papers.
“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”.12

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 petulant remarks in the face of what he saw as Cakobau’s obduracy. 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”.13 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. When Golea was expected at Fawn Harbour in July, bent on “exterminating” the local Christians, a canoe was sent “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”.14 His comment neatly captured 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 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 Laucaula and Qamea. Wainiqolo was bent on capturing Golea. Not surprisingly, in view of the people’s

12 Edward Martin to William Collis, 3 Jul 1862, Letters to William Collis 1855-1876, MOM 129.
13 Evidence of Joseph Waterhouse and Edward Martin, Report of a Commission of Enquiry ...
apparent disposition, the Christian party were augmenting their numbers hourly, while the enemy, seeing the size of their opposition, fled and suffered pursuit.\textsuperscript{15}

Joeli Bulu, the Tongan assistant missionary who had worked in Fiji for over twenty years, has left an account of this renewal of Tongan armed intervention in his autobiography. According to Bulu, Ritova had sent a \textit{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. When that assistance was refused, Golea threatened to raid the town after his return from Macuata. Alarmed, the \textit{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 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 \textit{lotu}, but because he wanted to kill Golea, who stood in his way.”\textsuperscript{16}

Another indigenous aspect to these events is found in the account of the Toga \textit{vavusa} in Lomaloma recorded in the \textit{Tukutuku Raraba}.\textsuperscript{17} This 1923 narration, likely to have been modified during the sixty years which had passed since the events it described, holds that when Ma’afu departed for Tonga, he left instructions with 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 \textit{Tukutuku Raraba} contends, heard of

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{16} Joeli Bulu, \textit{Joel Bulu; the Autobiography of a Native Minister in the South Seas}, translated by a missionary, second edition. London 1864, p. 99 Bulu’s account of the hostilities is found on pp. 90-99

\textsuperscript{17} See above, Ch. 6
Ritova’s renewed campaign in Macuata and wanted to participate. Lacking a force of sufficient strength, he actively sought fighting men throughout Cakaudrove until he amassed a force of suitable size. 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 sought to take advantage of Golea’s absence in Macuata. Wainiqolo 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.

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. Tui Cakau had shifted his support to the faction in Macuata which Ma’afu had defeated. 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 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”.

Despite Thomas Baker’s awareness of the secondary place of Christianity in the chiefs’ rivalries, he and other missionaries regarded 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. Baker made no mention of Golea’s supposed conversion to Catholicism, 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
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19 The agreement signed on board HMS Pelorus in Sep 1861 had expressly forbidden Wainiqolo from visiting Macuata again. See Ch. 6, n. 158.
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25 Calvert to Rowe, 3 Mar 1863, Personal Papers.
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. Not surprisingly, the three declined to walk into the trap. Instead, they 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 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. Tui Cakau was “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 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”.29 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 1500 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 sixty 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 Tu: 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 received its most severe check in the fifteen 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 prove to be a check on 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 orises, rumour ran ahead of knowledge: there was a report that several Tongan chiefs were at Lomaloma, "on their way towards Waikava", 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.

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: "Do a hair grow on the soles of your feet? Come quickly, lest the hairs grow too long for you to run". 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. More than twenty 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". 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. Tupou indicated he would wait to learn the decision concerning cession before deciding on his 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

---

18 Pritchard, *Polynesian Reminiscences*, p. 346
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missionary mentors in Nuku’alofa, the king 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.

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 himself 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.99 Despite these precautions, Calvert and his colleagues remained in ignorance of the intentions of both Tupou and Ma’afu for more than two months after Wairiki. 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”.40 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.41

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”.42 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

99 Tupou I to Cakobau, 7 Aug 1862, cited in Calvert to Frederick Langham, 1 Dec 1862, Personal Papers; Calvert to Gen Secs, WMMS, 27 Aug 1862, WMMS In Letters, Tonga and Fiji; Calvert to Eggleston, 20 Aug 1862
40 White to Gen Secs, WMMS, 18 Oct 1862.
41 George Lee, Journal, 16-17 Sep 1862. Ma’afu’s former sloop, the Elenoa, was plying Tongan waters, apparently having been given to Tupou by Ma’afu. On 11 Oct, the Elenoa, commanded by the king, arrived at Nuku’alofa with Semisi Fifita as a passenger. (Lee, 11 Oct 1862)
42 Calvert to [?Rowe], 20 Sep 1862, Personal Papers.
be resolved in the short term. In October, Calvert recorded that "the Somosomo party", 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 hard-pressed not 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".43

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".44 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 insisted that Tupou "was on the eve of a visit to Fiji, with a fleet of sixty double canoes".45

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.46 The missionary learned from the captain a vessel newly arrived in Levuka that 200 kilograms of gunpowder had been purchased in Tonga, in case enquiries made by Ma'afu and Tu'i Ha'apai indicated that further Tongan "interference" was required.47 Calvert remained convinced that Tupou was designing "something" in relation to the Tongan lands in Fiji, although he was "persuaded that [the

43Calvert to Eggleston, 13 Oct 1862, MOM 99. See also Calvert to Rowe, 14 Oct 1852, Personal Papers.
44Calvert to Rowe, 31 Oct 1862. Personal Papers.
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47Calvert to Gen Secs, WMMS, 12 Dec 1862, WMMS In Letters, Tonga and Fiji.
king] will not be allowed to accomplish all his wishes.""48 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 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 peaceful. He was "under strict injunctions from King George not to engage in war".49

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".50 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, the document represented an attempt 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. But such a report is hearsay at best, and from a "witness" who was disbelieved in other matters at hearings of the Lands Claims Commission. Bulu's letter to Ma'afu in Tonga51 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.52

48 Calvert to Rowe, c20 Dec 1862. WMMS In Letters, Tonga and Fiji
49 Calvert to Gen. Secs, WMMS, 20 Dec 1862. WMMS In Letters, Tonga and Fiji.
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51 See above, n 22.
52 Evidence of Ma'afu, LCC R930.
Since Ma’afu had a history of denying intent, his evidence cannot be accepted without question. Brower pointed out 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 by word of mouth, very likely away from prying ears.

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 in whose household Ma’afu had lived for about eighteen 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 subject to Cakaudrove and its paramount chief. It was within Golea’s power to do far more to put a spoke in the wheel of Ma’afu than Cakobau could hope to do.

---
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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 ... 'That 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 Matthew Henry for $400, a sale which included most of the islands within the Vanuabalavu reef. One exception was Munia, sold separately to Macomber. Laucala, Mago and other islands were also sold. 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 Thakaundrov? 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?
Given that, 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 rapaciousness over many years.\(^1\) 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.\(^2\) Whether or not he had been manipulated by Ma'afu, Tupou was clearly prepared to act 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. Viliame Tugi, 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".\(^3\) 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 disinterested in the plans of Tupou. The king was influenced, although to what extent cannot be determined, by a message from a group of settlers:

\(^{1}\) ibid
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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".  

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 made its contribution to the fears and temptations playing in Tupou's mind as he waited for the results of Ma'afu's mission to Cakaudrove.  

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 and his warriors had been his saviours at Kaba. The chiefs were urged to do nothing to provoke the Tongans now. 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 would last for ten years and cost thousands of lives.  

Ma'afu called on Calvert soon after the missionary reached Fawn Harbour on 4 January. He said 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, news arrived of the events at Wairiki. Ma'afu and Tu'i Ha'apai were instead sent directly to Walkava 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
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negotiate peace if Cakobau and Tui Cakau were willing. He appeared genuinely desirous of peace:

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.

Calvert did not forbear to add that Ma'afu had "abandoned the drinking of spirituous 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". Great also was their capacity to deceive, and great the naivete of James Calvert.

The degree of reconciliation Ma'afu had achieved with Golea, recounted in the Tukutuku Raraba, can be called into question. He had apparently sent three messages to Golea requesting a meeting. Tui Cakau refused to cross to Waikava, insisting instead that if Ma'afu desired a meeting, he should come to Waririki, which Ma'afu 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. The signatories urged 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.
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Ma'afu meanwhile continued to impress Calvert both with his humility at prayer and his ardent desire for peace. On 20 January the missionary and Joseph White were at Wairiki, where Calvert 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”. Such men would acknowledge that Vanuabalavu belonged to Ma'afu according to Fijian custom. Golea purported to believe that the i soro rights which Ma'afu had received on Vanuabalavu were now inoperative, following Wainiqolo's defeat. Similarly, Laucala was sold despite its having been given Ma'afu after the first offer of cession. Calvert, who seemed to enjoy Golea’s confidence, also noted that Tui Calcau had “sold two good and large islands for ammunition”. The missionary 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

---
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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". White wrote the next day that Tupou "was daily expected in Fiji with a large
army". Despite the efforts for peace then under way, defensive preparations for war were
being made. 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 decided to call on Ma'afu,
accompanied by Calvert, 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.

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

---
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conclusion”. He spoke the next day on board Cakobau’s schooner, where, in an apparent indication that relations were amicable, Cakobau presented Ma’afu 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.

That negotiations remained extremely delicate was apparent 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. Cakobau agreed, but Calvert was apprehensive that the substitution of “inferior persons” would offend Golea and prevent peace. The missionary threatened to return to Ovalau immediately unless Ma’afu agreed to accompany Cakobau. So anxious was Ma’afu for Calvert’s continued involvement in the peace negotiations that he acquiesced. 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 the...

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 which 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 which as yet showed no signs of flagging. In his defence, it
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should be remembered that White was convinced of his sincerity, and remained so eighteen months later.\textsuperscript{90}

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. Cakobau also favoured regular meetings of chiefs at Bau.\textsuperscript{91} Ma’afu later appeared “manifestly delighted” at the prospects both of the treaty and the chiefly conclaves.

Following these various arrangements, Ma’afu asked that one of the schooners be sent to Tonga to convey news of the proposed treaty to Tupou. He professed himself anxious to dissuade the king from coming to Fiji with a large force. Even with peace having been agreed, the potential dangers from such a force were great. Cakobau meanwhile urged Calvert to visit Tonga to discuss the Tongan ir\textsuperscript{e}minity 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”.\textsuperscript{92} Because of the possible implications of such a visit, however, Calvert decided to remain in Fiji.\textsuperscript{93} 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; 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 parts of Kadavu, all parts of Fiji which had ever possessed some connection with Tonga.\textsuperscript{94} Ma’afu was later to write formally on two occasions to Owen on the same subject. His second letter specified “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”. The first letter, written three days earlier, protested
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specifically against Golea's sale of Vanuabalavu to George Henry. He was to claim in 1864 that he intended the letter principally as a protest against this sale.

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 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 archipelagoes "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. George Lee was not impressed, lamenting, "It all seems a force".

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 : younger since he gave up the affair". 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

---

44 Ma'afu to British Consul. 4 May 1863 and 30 Apr 1863. GB FO HBM Consul, Fiji and Tonga. See also Dutton Papers. Vol 1. Deeds 357, 358 & 359. Consular Register of Deeds Owen in reply reminded Ma'afu that the deed of sale to Henry had been registered by Pritchard, but promised to investigate any appearance of injustice (Owen to Ma'afu. 2 May 1863. GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga)
45 Statement of Ma'afu regarding the Tongan claim to Vanuabalavu and adjoining islands. Nov 1864. GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga
46 William Moore to Eggleston. 23 Mar 1863. MOM 165.
47 Calvert to Eggleston. 28 Mar 1863. MOM 99
48 Lee. 30 Jan & 14 Feb 1863. See also Frank Firth to Eggleston. 3 Feb 1863. MOM 166. Walter Davis to Calvert. 4 Mar 1863. quoted in Calvert to Eggleston, 28 Mar 1863
49 Calvert to Eggleston. 28 Mar 1863
50 Whewell to Calvert. 4 Mar 1863. quoted in ibid
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 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.

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. Ma‘afu’s absence from the deliberations on Vava‘u, and especially his exclusion from the planned consultations in Fiji, suggests a degree of marginalisation. Calvert expressed “grave doubts” about Ma‘afu:

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?

Although acknowledging that there was “much good” about Ma‘afu”, 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. But Ma‘afu had opposed those laws even in Tonga. Tupou had appointed him as a judge, at a salary of £80 per year, woefully inadequate for a chief of Ma‘afu’s reckless ways with money. To remain in Tonga under the new regime, a public servant on a salary, would have been anathema to
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Ma'afu, 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". His letters to Owen seeking that the sale of Vanuabalavu not be recorded were preceded by a similar request from Tupou. The king informed the Consul that he was "pained" about the sale to foreigners of Tongan lands in Fiji. Owen was asked to curtail the practice and to nullify earlier sales.

Tupou had not forgotten the insulting letter he had received from Brower warning him against any form of Tongan intervention. He replied in May, forcibly reminding the Consul that Tonga's 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. 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.

Tupou's letter to Brower was conveyed by the Tongan Commissioners. The king's defiance augmented the apprehension already felt by many Fijian chiefs and many missionaries. The Commissioners, Viliame Tugi and Josaia Lausi'i, first visited Ma'afu at Waikava, bringing with them some land deeds given them by the king. Ma'afu added to the collection with 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 and from which the Commissioners declined to depart. Both Tugi and Lausi'i wrote lovingly to Bau before proceeding to Bau, Kadavu, Beqa and elsewhere, all areas containing land claimed by the king.

---

103 ibid
104 See above, n. 94
105 George Tupou to Owen, 22 Apr 1863, GB FO HBM Consul, Fiji and Tonga, Miscellaneous Papers
106 See above, n. 82
107 King George Tupou 1 to Dr Brower, 6 May 1863. Archives of the Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga, Nuku'alofa Quoted in H.G. Cummins (compiler), Sources of Tongan History. A Collection of Documents. Extracts and Opinions in Tongan Political History 1616-1900, pp. 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 Boobool, Vol. 11, No. 6, 1875. The King's speech at the opening of Parliament in 1875).
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. 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 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
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was inevitable. 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". 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. Such a statement would be sufficient; "all would then be quiet".

The crucial meeting between the Tongan Commissioners and Owen took place at the British Consulate on 11 and 12 August 1863. Tugi informed Owen that 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 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.

Tugi 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. Tugi 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
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lands in question would rule itself, under a Fijian chief, but would be vakarorogo (subject to Tonga).  

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. Owen declared that he feared a famine in the group unless the Tongans ceased their “numerous arrivals”. He said 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.  

An agreement signed between Owen and Tugi 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. Any decisions made by the conference had to be unanimous and were to be binding on all parties. These provisions, ostensibly 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, which meant 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 Tugi and Owen, the Commissioner refused to sign. A second document was then drawn up, but Owen refused
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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... GB FO HBM Consul, Fiji and Tonga, Miscellaneous Papers.
to sign it on the grounds that it did not reflect the agreements which he had made with Tugi 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 Tugi 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 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
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warship be sent to protect him if the Tongans came in force. Cakobau took the step through fear, since he was increasingly suspicious of the motives of the Commissioners during their tour. When he finally had the Commissioners’ 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, expressing 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. 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 Tugi’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”.

Despite Cakobau’s request, Tugi and his party proceeded to Wairiki, their next scheduled stop. There, the Commissioners 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.
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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 vision of utopia was contrasted with the present situation where Tongans were “sailing about” Fiji, producing nothing, wreaking havoc and accepting lands which rightfully belonged to others.133 On a more practical level, Calvert sailed to Wairiki to consult Golea. Finding the chief absent, he could only attempt to dissuade the Tongan teachers not to abandon their posts.134 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”.135 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”.136

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.137 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.138 Golea had originally sold through resentment over Ma’afu’s control or 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...
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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 being". 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 Henry when he agreed to Golea's first sale of Vanuabalavu. Now it was fear of the Tongans which 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. The issue was decidedly murky, however. The missionary was possibly unaware of the 1849 grant to Ma'afu by Tuikilikila of levying rights, a grant which should have rendered unnecessary the consent of Tuikilikila'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 Waiqava and Tui Cakau across the Somosomo Strait at Wairiki continued to represent the danger confronting Fiji, unless some accommodation were reached quickly. 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
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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 matanivamina, Mai Kavula, to invite Ma’afu to Wairiki. The Tongans at Waikava, apprehensive about Golea’s intentions, sent Mai Kavula back without their leader. During the ensuing night Ma’afu secretly left Waikava “in a small paddling canoe”. The next morning, Elenoa joined a large group of Tongans which set out in search of her husband. The following day, Calvert and other missionaries also set off in their schooner, and were alarmed on hearing noise of musket fire early in the morning, coming from the direction of Wairiki. Later, they heard news that Ma’afu and Elenoa had been honorably 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 Ritovn. 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 in the face of Golea’s continuing sales 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 Vanuabalavu seemed to have evaporated during the ensuing months. In January 1864 the island appeared in “abject subjection” to Cakaudrove. Tui Cakau, after “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 Vanuabalavu people who their master really was, nevertheless kept the peace with Ma’afu, while Tupou was apparently still favourably disposed towards Fiji. Ma’afu removed from Waikava to Lakeba following the 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
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Lakeba which were denied him on Vanuabalavu. The divisions within Fiji were seen as “potential prey to Tongans, half-castes and whites”, while Bau and Lakeba remained “distant with each other”.\(^{148}\)

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 ...”\(^{149}\) After spending some time in Tonga,\(^{150}\) Jones reached Fiji on 2 October 1864. He had noted 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 undiminished by real experience of Fiji, that a centralised authority and a code of laws might be established.\(^{151}\) 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 his promise. 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
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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.152

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 Kanokupolu. 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.153 Brower, speaking sixteen 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 which culminated in the creation for Ma'afu of the title of Tui Lau in 1869.

Jones' plans, soon after his arrival in Fiji, were the reverse of those later alleged by Brower. When he called at Vanuabalavu 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".154 In the same month, Francis Tait on Lakeba noted a new Tongan incursion:

Two schooners are here from Tonga. Tubou has sent instructions to Ma'afu to collect taxes at Vanuabalavu 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.155

David Jebson Moss, actually the king's 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

---

152 Evidence of Brower. LCC930, 6 Jul 1880
153 Minute by John Bates Thurston, 4 Dec 1880, Evidence of Brower. LCC 930. See also in Thurn Papers, p. 3.
154 Tait to Moore, 14 Oct 1864, WN/NA). No. 30, Jan 1865, pp 473-474
155 ibid. David Jebson Moss, from Huddersfield, Yorkshire, was Tupou's secretary. The king later gave him the name Tupou Ha'apai. He signed his correspondence as Tupou Ha'apai, S S K G, which initials Consul Jones suggested stood for Soapy Secretary to King George (Calvert to Rowe, 1 Nov 1864, Personal Papers). Moss had been in Fiji in 1852, and later moved to Tonga. A fluent Tongan speaker, he married a Tongan woman.
rested on Ma'afu's shoulders. Tupou possibly wished to assert Ma'afu's existing status as governor in the light of circumstances prevailing in 1864, when Tongan control of Vanua Balavu 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 Vanua Balavu 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 announced 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 made clear.

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". According to a disgruntled European settler at Levuka, Moss caused the Tongan flag to be raised on some Tongan lands which had been "purchased" by settlers from their Fijian owners, and had caused damage to property. Père Bréheret told Swanston that a French man of war would soon visit the group. Bréheret suggested that either Swanston or Brower should advise Cakobau to request the French captain to drive the Tongans away. Brower would have been nothing loath to provide such advice, given his statement to Jones that their only purpose in Fiji as Consuls was to facilitate the acquisition by their countrymen of
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"large tracts of country, as cheap[ly] as they can ... and the Tongans always prevent that". 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; 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". 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". 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". 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'afu 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 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".

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
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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 district. 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. 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. Jones expressed his annoyance with Cakobau, who 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". They lost no time in doing so: on 3 December, Tui Yaro 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. 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 cases of Matuku and Moala, but would not permit 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 entreatimg him to protect the island against the Tongese". Moss was instructed to have the
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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". 168

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 eleven of the other fourteen 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". 169 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 had remained aloof from the various disputes which, since late 1862, had involved Ma'afu, Tui Cakau, the European Consuls and the Tongan commissioners. He had accompanied Ma'afu to Tonga in 1862 when the parliament passed the new Code of Laws.
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Now, when Ma'afu and Moss paid their formal visit to Bua in January 1865, they and Tui Bua concluded a treaty of "perpetual 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. 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". The day before witnessing the treaty with Bua, Moss had written to the Foreign Office seeking "price lists of cannon, shot and other ammunition".

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, five large canoes suddenly appeared at Mago, and 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 ..."

Ryder was later to give evidence 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.

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, Cakobau still refrained from showing his hand. Calvert believed that the best option for Cakobau 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
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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. The repudiation by Jones of the "treaty" between nine Vanuabalavu chiefs and Moss cast further doubt on the island's legal and customary ownership. In January, Ma'afu went to Rewa, avowedly to seek a willingness for an approaching investigation by Jones 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.

The long-running dispute concerning ownership of Vanuabalavu was finally resolved by a Court of Arbitration, presided over by Consul Jones and 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.

The controversy lies 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
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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 eighteen 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, Maafoa, to Tui Nayau with a request for help. When Tui Nayau refused, Maafoa 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.

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 had reminded Golea of Ma’afu’s renunciation of all Tongan land claims in Fiji. When Golea later received from Henry guns and percussion caps in payment for the island, he returned them 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 proved 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 twelve 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.
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... 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.180

The chiefs' apparent unanimity probably owed much to pressure brought to bear on them by 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 district'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".181

Ma'afu's ownership of Vanuabalavu was clearly considered as legitimate by the island's chiefs, principally as a consequence of the gifts of tabua and baskets of earth. Samate, a matanianuva 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 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 Vanuabalavu to Ma'afu.182 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'".183 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. Maafu 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.184 Finally, an unnamed chief from Muallevu declared that the gifts to Ma'afu were "a request for our lives".185
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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".186 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".187 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 statement on his own behalf:

Be it known to all men that Vanuabalavu 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.188

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 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 Tulkilakila and by recognition from the chiefs and people of the islands. The only exceptions were any islands which had since been alienated by lawful deeds of sale.189

---
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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'". 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 which must have passed almost unnoticed at the time, but which 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. 191

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.

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

190 Calvert to Rowe, undated fragment [c. Dec 1864], Personal Papers.
not come to Charley [Ma'afu’s son Sialeata’ogo]”. Golea assented, telling Ma’afu “Vanuabalavu and all the islands within the reef belong to you but all outside still belong to me”.

On the basis of this evidence, the 1880 Lands Claims’ Commissioner, Victor Williamson, was to 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)”. That distinction was far from clear in 1865, however. Ma’afu had managed to control proceedings to the extent where he was able successfully to enlarge the terms of the original gift as a more secure basis for the Vanuabalavu chiefs’ later customary s’-t mission 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 which reflected realities on the ground.

Consul Jones’ finding was itself to become 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 eighty 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 than 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.

---

191 Evidence of Samate, LCC R960.
192 LCC R960, Supplement. See also Victor Williamson to John Bates Thurston, 9 Dec 1880, ibid.
Recognition of Tongan control of Vanuabalavu and the Yasayasa Moala in 1865 by the British Consul and by most of the leading chiefs meant that Ma'afu could now be considered as a *de facto* chief of Fiji.
Chapter 8: Tui Lau

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 was to effect a further significant consolidation of Tongan power in Fiji. 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 signed 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. 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

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, QB FO HBM Consul, Fiji and Tonga
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..." Jones was attempting to organize 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 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. But 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 degree of naïvete, 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.
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4 Calvert to Gen Secs, WMMS, 13 Mar 1865, WMMS In Letters, Tonga and Fiji. See also Calvert to Rowe, 13 Mar 1865, Calvert, Journal. 13 Mar 1865; Calvert to Nisbet, 18 Mar 1865, Nisbet Papers. Lee, Journal. 24-25 Mar 1865
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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;

2. Cotton should be planted on an extensive scale;

3. Profits should be divided with the people, not retained by the chiefs, Fijian style. Cultivation of coffee should also begin as soon as practicable;

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

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

---

*ibid. See also Calvert to Gen. Secs. WMMS, 5 Apr 1865, WMMS In Letters Tonga and Fiji*
6. Ma’afu should administer strict justice. He was admonished for fining thieves £25 for stealing two bottles of gin, which Jones described as “tyranny”.

7. Ma’afu was to avoid meddalling 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. The meeting adopted eight resolutions:

1. The seven head chiefs would meet annually;

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

Jones to Ma’afu Governor of the Tongans. 12 Apr 1865, GB FO HBM Consul, Fiji and Tonga.
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;

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 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

---
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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. 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 or not with their rivals as best suited their interests. The Confederation established no permanent organization, beyond the envisaged annual assembly, 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...

---

10 Calvert to Rabone, 9 Aug 1865.
11 So much was acknowledged by Consul Jones. See Jones to FO, 24 Nov 1865, FO 58/124.
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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 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 Naitau to a European, even though Naitau 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 mooted. He noted that resident Europeans were opposed to the Tongans because they were aware that Tongan rule would render land purchases immeasurably more difficult. He also mentioned the "superior intelligence and courage" of the Tongans, qualities which made them eagerly sought after. Repeating the laments of the missionaries over three decades, Jones observed that chiefs who engaged Tongan help usually regretted their actions, since their

---
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"rapacious allies seldom leave any district so long as it contains anything to excite their insatiable cupidity". Fiji appears to have entered a quiet period following Confederation, with Ma'afu apparently dutiful to his spiritual needs at Lomaloma and the great dilemma posed by the islands' disunity 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 beche de mer along the Macuata coast was assuming 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.

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
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19 Jones to Ma'afu, 5 Oct 1865, and Jones to Tui Cakau, 5 Oct 1865, GB FO HBM Consul, Fiji and Tonga.
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 ...”20 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 fifty men to deport them once again.21

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 Vanuaabalavu, Jones looked to David Moss for help. He suggested to Tupou’s secretary “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”.22 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 to be absent from Lomaloma for at least three months. His canoe was seen in Nuku’alofa in May, although there was no mention of him.23 He was certainly back in Fiji by 12 September, when he faced growing antagonism from Fijian and European alike.

As was usually 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

---
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been sinister undertones to his apparently quiet existence in the form of a plot against his life. An English traveller, Herbert Meade, visited Nuku'alofa in October 1866. He 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.¹⁴ No evidence survives concerning the origin of the supposed conspiracy or the identity of the plotters. When Meade, continuing his voyage, reached Lomaloma in November, he described the village, under the dominion of Ma'afu, as 'dirty and uninteresting'. ²⁵ 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". ²⁶ The year closed with something of a mystery: 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.²⁷ 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.²² 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,
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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 Vatuabalu, the division could not but grow stronger. 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 Supreme.  

Many of the changes embodied in this 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”. This view was 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. His cession in 1855 of his Fijian lands to Tupou had been largely, though never formally, superseded by events since then. By 1867, the acknowledged Tongan rule over those Fijian lands claimed by right of conquest had become focused 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

---
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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, Lorimer Fison, a sepulchral voice of doom, “[did] hereby prophesy ... [the] day is not far distant where ... all Fiji [will fall] under Tongan sway”.

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'afu’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. 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. His designation as “King of Bau and its Dependencies” reflected the limits of his personal control. The US 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.

11 Brower to U S State Dept. 31 Mar 1867, USC Lauca 4
12 Lorimer Fison to his sisters [fragment]. Lakeba. Feb 1867. Miscellaneous Papers of Lorimer Fison 1865-1868
13 Thurston to FO. 31 Dec 1867. FO 58/111
14 For a detailed eyewitness account of the ceremony, see Frederick J Moss, A Planter’s Experience in Fiji, Auckland 1870, pp 26-27. See also Henry Britton, Fiji in 1870 ... Melbourne 1870. pp 32 – 34. Colman Wall, “Cakobau’s Flag”. TFS, 1910 (no pagination). For Swanson’s reaction, see Swanson to Jones. 7 Jun 1867, GB FO HBM Consul, Fiji and Tonga.
15 The “dependencies” which Cakobau claimed to rule were Viti Levu, Kadavu, Ovalau, Koro, Gau, Batiki, Narau and nearby smaller islands (Jones to FO. 15 Jul 1867). Over much of Viti Levu, he possessed no authority whatever
The proposed assembly of the new kingdom's chiefs never met, nor did the expected taxation revenue eventuate. 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. While echoes of the “kingdom” were to reverberate for a few more years, genuine political strength in mid 1867 lay with the Tovata. Its head, Ma’afu, 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’afu 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”. Ma’afu was strongly opposed to any use of the flag, since it was to be his influence, not his country’s, which should prevail.

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 that he could not ally himself with northern Fiji and with Tonga both. A choice had to be made, and 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

---

38 For the text of the Bau constitution, see enclosure in March to Clarendon, 18 Jul 1870, FO 58/118.
39 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, pp. 300-301.
40 Edward Tui Nayau, Lote Loganimoce [and] John Wesley to Swanston, 28 May 1867. Minute by Swanston 1 Jun 1867, GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga.
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 he 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 urging 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.
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41 Carey to Thomas Williams, 25 Jun 1867. Carey Letterbook 1867-1874
42 The islands were Narrai, Batiki and Moturiki
43 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
44 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, Soui islets, Avea, Qilaqila, Adavac and Yanucaaloa.
45 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 p. 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. 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. 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.

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 bloodshed apparently occurred with the slaughter of numerous Lakeban pigs. 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:

... 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...  50

So Ma'afu could not have his way and, as was his wont, he 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. 51 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". 52 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.

---

50 Ma'afu to Thurston, 15 Sep 1867, GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga.
51 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).
52 Swanston to Thurston, 25 Sep 1867, GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga.
For the moment, the man led a settled existence. In October HMS Brisk, Captain Charles Hope, visited Fiji. Hope wished to call at the island of Niuafou'ou, in northern Tonga, "to call the natives to account for the ill-treatment of the crew of an English vessel". Hope 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 Niuafou'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.33

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 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.34

33 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.
34 Charles W Hope. Memorandum on the Fiji Islands, 21 Nov 1867.
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.55

George 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. Ma'afu himself cultivated cotton on Vanuabalavu in partnership with Swanston.56 In an
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55 Thurston to Henry, 2 Dec 1867, Thurston to Ma'afu, 5 Dec 1867, Henry to Thurston, 6 Dec & 19 Dec 1867, GB FO HBM Consul, Fiji and Tonga. Henry valued the losses to his livestock, occasioned by Ma'afu's people, at $850.
editorial based more on hearsay than on 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.\footnote{The Argus. 15 Jan 1868, p 5}

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.\footnote{Thurston to “King George of Bua”. 7 Jan 1868. Thurston to Swanston. 14 Jan 1868. GB FO HBM Consul. Fiji and Tonga} 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 a 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 can manage them, put us in the middle and let us work together and Fiji will be at rest; try and handle these people yourselves and you will have endless trouble'.

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.59

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.

59 Swanston to Thurston, 29 Feb 1868, GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga.
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". 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 return, the company agreed to pay the "debt" in full. 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, issued an injunction against the Company's men "to stay further action". 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. 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.
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60 Swanston to Kinsington Pritchette, 13 Apr 1868, GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga.
61 Care Rowley Lambert to Sir J H T Manners Sutton [Governor of Victoria], 14 July 1868, Copies of Extracts of Correspondence relating to the Fijian 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
62 Thurston to Lambert, 1 Jun 1868, GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga. See also Thurston to Stanley, 12 May 1868. ibid. Thurston's fears were not unfounded. The Argus of 4 Dec 1868 would quote an editorial in the San Francisco 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".
63 Thurston to FO, 1 Jun 1868, FO55/113
Cakobau's authority was further weakened by the failure of a military expedition in Navosa in April, a fact which Thurston brought to Whitehall's notice. 64

Following Thurston's injunction, Cakobau repudiated the May agreement. Further action concerning the Polynesian Land Company was deferred pending the expected arrival of Lambert in July. 65 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. 66

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 Logainimoce, two leading Lakeba 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 states with the closest links to Tonga. 67 The only one of the Tongan lands in Fiji to remain unsold was Rabe, since 1855 the private property of Tupou. 68 Parliament passed a series of "resolutions relating to Fiji" which were designed to define future relations between the two countries. Chief among them were:

64 Thurston to FO, 23 May 1868, FO 55/113
65 Thurston to FO, 27 May 1868, FO58/113
67 Swanston to Thurston, 5 Jun 1868, GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga.
68 Rabe was eventually sold to a Sydney man, John Hill, in 1870, for £1,300. See LCC R1, Fiji Times 30 Jul 1870.
1. The Tongan flag hoisted at Lakeba in June was to be lowered when Ma'afu returned to Fiji. 69

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 which the people were unable to cultivate. 70

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. 71 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. 72

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. 73 At the same time, and in a very

69 See above, n. 40
70 For the full text of the resolutions, see Appendix D. See also Swanston to Thurston, 8 Aug 1868, enc. A. GB FO HMB Consul, Fiji and Tonga. For an account of the meeting of Parliament, see The Fijian Weekly News and Planter's Journal, 21 Oct 1868.
71 Swanston to Thurston, 8 Aug 1868, enc. B. For the text of the Law relating to Governors, see Appendix B.
72 Tupou Ha'apai to Thurston, 2 Apr 1869. GB FO HMB Consul Fiji and Tonga.
73 William Owen to George Tupou, 31 Jan, 1863. See Ch. 7, n. 81.
different tone, Isaac Brewer had sent a belligerent message to Tupou, advising that the king 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.74 Although Tupou had informed Martin Dyson in July 1867 that he was still prepared to use force to protect Tongan interests in Fiji,75 the visit of USS Tuscarora during the same month, with further warnings from Captain Stanley against “interference”, left its impression on the king.76 Following the resolutions of June 1868, the Tongan lands previously considered to be under the rule of Tupou were permanently relinquished 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 was to remain in Tonga for at least a month and, following his return, he 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. 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.77 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.78 Neither investors nor 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.79 Ma’afu became involved when Cakobau wrote to him in August concerning Beqa, which formed part of the
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74 Isaac Brewer to George Tupou, 31 Dec 1862. See Ch. 7, n. 82.
75 See above, n 45
76 See above, n 44
77 Thurston to Governors of New South Wales and Victoria, 23 Jul 1868, GB FO HBM Consul, Fiji and Tonga.
78 Charter signed by King Cakobau, granted to the Polynesian Land Company, July 23, 1868. Henderson, pp. 22–23
79 Thurston to FO, 8 Sep 1868, GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga.
lands “granted” to the Company by Cakobau. Since the island owed allegiance to Ma’afu, Cakobau asked him “if Beqa is really yours, give it to me so that I may give it to the Europeans.”

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. The king’s reply, six months later, reflected the Tongan parliament’s resolutions relating to Fiji. The king’s secretary Tupou Ha’apai wrote

... 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
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84 Thurston to Ma’afu. 2 Oct 1868. GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga.
85 *The Fijian Weekly News and Planters Journal*, 3 October 1868
Cakobau had lost to Bua six years before, and also Macuata. While both Maʻafu 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 Maʻafu had owed a deceased settler. Maʻafu 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 Maʻafu as his friend and partner in the land. Maʻafu’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 Maʻafu’s control. Cakobau, the Levuka newspaper contended, “has reason to dread the power [of Maʻafu], for his known connection with the King of Tonga”. If such were indeed Cakobau’s view, he appeared to place 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 Maʻafu to come to their assistance. Thurston correctly advised the Governor that only British and American influence had prevented Maʻafu, “a man of great energy and ambition”, from subjugating Fiji. Having

---

86 Evidence of Fr Favre, LCC R586, Evidence of David Wilkinson, LCC R788, “Dreketi and Macuata”, Im Thurn Papers, Doc 15, FM
87 Swanston to Thurston, 9 Nov 1868, GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga
88 Maʻafu to Cakobau, 10 Nov 1868, GB FO HBM Consul, Fiji and Tonga, Emosi Tui Beqa to Cakobau, 16 Nov 1868, ibid. The controversy over Beqa would continue. In June 1869, Cakobau wrote to the British Consul, insisting that Beqa was the property of himself and Tui Dreketi. Maʻafu similarly lost no time in telling the Consul that Beqa was his by virtue of a gift from Tui Dreketi. Cakobau to Consul, 11 Jun 1869, GB FO HBM Consul, Fiji and Tonga, Maʻafu to Consul, 30 Nov 1869, ibid.
89 The Fijian Weekly News and Planters Journal, 21 Nov 1868
90 The Argus, 20 Jan 1869
waited for years for “a plausible pretext” to enter Fiji. Ma’afu had now been offered one, or so Thurston believed.91 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.92 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”.93 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 was both definitive and final.94

The 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 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

91 Thurston to Earl of Belmore, 2 Feb 1868, and enclosure A. Petition to Ma’afu, ‘King of the Windward Isles’, GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga. See also James Calvert to Admiral Erskine, MP, 25 May 1869, FO51 116.
92 Statement of George Tupou, 3 Feb 1869, enclosed with Swanston to Thurston, 25 Feb 1869, GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga. For the full text of the statement, see Appendix F
93 Tupou Ha’apai to Thurston, 4 Feb 1869, GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga.
succession had been put in the hands of Parliament in 1865, and when the chiefs has failed to agree, they had sworn an oath to support anyone chosen by the king.\(^9\)

Part of the process of disengagement involved the formal termination on 1 March of the treaties between Tonga and both Bua and Lakeba.\(^9\) The demise of these treaties, following his alienation from Tonga, gave Ma'afu unprecedented freedom to pursue his political fortunes in Fiji. 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 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".\(^9\) Most of the principal Lakeban chiefs were Ma'afu's kin. Ma'afu was formally installed as Tui Lau in a ceremony at Lakeba, the name Lau being officially applied to the united chiefdoms of Lakeba and Vanuabalavu. Two flags were chosen by the assembled chiefs.\(^9\)

At the time of Ma'afu's installation as Tui Lau, "a sort of constitution and Code of Laws" was drawn up for the new Chiefdom of Lau.\(^9\) Included among the chiefly signatories to the constitution were Tui Nayau and also Tevita Ululakeba, son of the late Vuetasau and designated successor of Taifai Tupou. The constitution included the provision that the Tui Lau possessed the right to lease all unoccupied public lands with a limit of 500 acres for any one lessee. While a full consideration of Ma'afu's land policies as Tui Lau is beyond the scope of this work, it is useful to make brief reference to them. Among the reasons for their eventual success was Ma'afu's determination not to deprive the taufetie of lands which were, or could be, under cultivation. Only unoccupied lands could be leased, and that with a view "to introduce white capital and energy into the country". To encourage

---

\(^{91}\) David Moss to Thurston, 2 Apr 1869. NAF

\(^{92}\) Tupou Ha'apai to Thurston (2 letters), 4 Feb 1869. GB FO HBM Consul, Fiji and Tonga.

\(^{93}\) LCC R952 See also LCC R920 The term vakarorogo indicated that the specified islands were under the authority of Ma'afu and owed obedience to him.

\(^{94}\) Swanston to Thurston, 25 Feb 1869. GB FO HBM Consul Fiji and Tonga.

\(^{95}\) For the constitution, see Appendix G See also Henderson, pp 26 - 27
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. The size and resources of the allotments determined the amount of tax to be paid. Such a system had been in operation on Vunuabalavu 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. The Lands Claims Commissioners of 1880 were to recommend that these absolute powers over leases and taxation should not be extended to Ma'afu's successors

Tupou Ha'apai 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 to their home country. 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, Cakaudrove 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...

---

100 Evidence of Swanston LCC R930
101 Victor Williamson to Thurston, 25 Nov 1880, LCC R930 (General Report on Lau Leases) See also LCC R90
102 Moss to Thurston, 2 Apr 1868 (second, "non-official" letter)
103 Swanston to Thurston, 5 Jun 1869
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.\(^{64}\)

If Tui Cakau harboured any regrets over the loss to Cakaudrove of Vavuabalavu and other islands, he kept his own counsel. One administrative measure which revealed the chiefs’, or Ma’afu’s, foresight was the appointment of Tevita Ulilakeba 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 reorganization 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 34 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 from his canoe and wade ashore at Lakeba in 1847.

\(^{64}\) Book of Council of Chiefs, June 1869, unpublished MS (no pagination). NAP
Epilogue

In 1874 Commissioners James Goodenough and Leo Layard prepared a report for the British Government recommending the annexation of Fiji as a Crown Colony. In the report, the Commissioners wrote: "It is true that Ma'afu is a Tongan and a stranger..."¹ A Tongan he certainly was; a stranger he could never be, although many of the indigenous chiefs of Fiji continued to regard him as an interloper in their midst. Such was their dislike of the Tui Lau that on 2 March 1874, at one of their meetings to discuss the cession proposal, the assembled chiefs "had not gone into [annexation] at all and ... had only spit out their venom against Ma'afu".² After 27 years in Fiji and five as a recognised chief in the islands, Ma'afu had not gained acceptance from his fellows.

Ma'afu's installation as Tui Lau and subsequent formal recognition from leading indigenous chiefs had given him an authority which could not be challenged from within Fiji. His sovereignty, legitimate in Fijian custom and English law, enabled him to create, in the Chiefdom of Lau, a model of administration significantly in advance of those operating in the traditional Fijian mata11iru. From this position of strength and stability, he was able to assume the position of Viceroy in the short-lived planter oligarchy subsequently known as the Cakobau Government. Later, his position as Roko Tui Lau in the British administration confirmed him as master of Lau, his own creation, while effectively excluding him from the core of the Colony's administration.

The paucity of published works dealing with Ma'afu's life before he became Tui Lau has left unresolved several fundamental questions from these years. My attempt to address these questions, while to a certain extent frustrated by the limitations of the sources, has enabled some conclusions to be drawn in respect of hitherto obscure aspects of Ma'afu's life. Both indigenous and European sources indicate that Ma'afu's acquisition of sovereignty in the future Chiefdom of Lau accorded with Fijian custom and was accepted under English law. Although not a Fijian, Ma'afu gained recognition as a chief of Fiji, despite reservations felt then and later about his character and ultimate ambitions. Concerning the question of why he came to Fiji in 1847, the sources, while less informative than might be wished, enable us to eschew the earlier view that Tupou I exiled Ma'afu as a

² Robert Swanston. undated note, c. 3 Mar 1874, Journal II.
dangerous rival for power. There exists no contemporary evidence for this now largely discredited view, while Tupou’s later public endorsement of Ma’afu in Tongatapu in 1856 indicates a confidence unclouded by suspicion or mistrust. In similar vein, on a matter of lesser importance, a proper assessment of documented sources enables us to discard the belief that Ma’afu was expelled from Wesleyan society on Lakeba for his actions avowedly in defence of the *lotu* on Matuku. On these three important issues, the present work has attempted to draw conclusions which, if not in all three cases definitive, are the best which the available sources permit.

A question which several published works ask, but few have answered satisfactorily, is whether Ma’afu acted as an “agent” for Tupou I in any plans the king possessed for the conquest of all or part of Fiji. Because of the nature of the society in which Ma’afu lived, in both Fiji and Tonga, and because his consultations with Tupou were always verbal, the records preclude any definitive answer. Existing evidence however strongly suggests that until Cakobau’s first offer of cession, Tupou possessed no aggressive intent towards Fiji. He had been content to entrust the so-called Tongan lands in Fiji into Ma’afu’s care after his military intervention of 1855. It was only when prompted by the cession offer, and especially by Ma’afu’s forced renunciation of the Tongan lands in 1859, that Tupou’s concern would ripen into active plans for invasion. The events of 1863 prevented him from taking the plunge, while his awareness of likely British and American reaction eventually propelled him towards disengagement from Fiji. Ma’afu was left with a formal recognition from Tupou of a status he had always possessed: that of a chief operating independently of the king to whom he owed customary allegiance but whose active agent and political tool he never was.

While Ma’afu’s ambitions were undoubtedly great, their lack of definition renders their nature and extent forever enigmatic. Ma’afu hankered always for madder music and stronger wine: when he saw opportunities to enhance his power, he was seldom slow to take advantage. His acquisition of sovereignty in the Yasayasa Moala and Vanuabalavu would not have occurred had he not possessed an ambition for power supplemented by adroit diplomacy, military prowess and unrivalled cunning. Simply stated, Ma’afu was hungry for power, which he sought in whatever direction it could be found. As he once confided to Consul Pritchard, he saw the path to Bau open to him, a path which, if he could follow it to its end, would lead him to supremacy in Fiji. His ambition eludes definition
because it changed to meet the opportunities and exigencies of the moment. If he aspired to the throne of Tonga, to which his birth certainly entitled him, the longevity of Tupou I and especially the king's formal withdrawal from Fiji contributed to Ma'afu's yielding place to Tupou's direct descendants. In Fiji, the involvement of the British and Americans in the islands' political evolution denied him a supremacy which otherwise was certainly within his grasp.

To recall the views of his missionary visitor of 1865, Ma'afu was “a most finished hypocrite”. He was a force for good in so far as it suited his purpose in his constant quest either to acquire or consolidate power. Circumstances in both Fiji and Tonga meant that his quest would never attain its full potential. Ma'afu would end his days as ruler of a remote chiefdom which was his own creation and where his legacy endures to this day.
Appendix A

Instrument signed by Ma’aatu at Levuka, 14 December 1859

Know all men by these presents:

1. That I, Ma’aatu, 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’aatu

Appendix B

Precis 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 forcibly 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 Natakolau Kei Viti, 13 February 1867

We, Tui Cakau, Tui Bua, and Ma'afu, chieftains of Fiji ruling Thakaundrove, Bua and Lau in order to secure tranquility 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 Chieftom, 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.

Source: George C. Henderson ed., *Fijian Documents, Political and Constitutional 1858-1875*,
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 intention of land to this Government for their approval.

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

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.
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 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 "O HBM Consul Fiji and
Tonga. Papers."
Appendix G

Formation of the Chiefdom of Lau, Lakemba, February 15th 1869

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. Yanua 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

Koroi Vuke his X mark

Leonitasi his X mark

Witness to signatures:-

Robert S. Swanston

Louis Bigansole

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
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COLLOCOTT, E.E.V. (Compiler), Royal and Chiefly Genealogies, in Papers on Tonga, ML.

COLLOCOTT, E.E.V., Taufa’ahau: A King and his Kingdom. A short history of Tonga in the nineteenth century. TS, 1941, ML.

CROSS, William. Extracts from Letters and Diary 1838 – 1842, ML.

CROWE, Frederick. Letter to his father written on board HMS Brisk 1867, ML.

CUMMINS, H. Geoffrey (Compiler), Sources of Tongan History: A collection of Documents, Extracts and Contemporary Opinions in Tongan Political History 1616-1900. TS, Nuku’alofa 1972. Division of Pacific and Asian History, RSPAS.
DORRANCE, John C., Yankee consul and cannibal king: John Brown Williams and the American Claims in Fiji (A study), PMB 27.

DRUS, Ethel, compiler, Papers, Division of Pacific and Asian History, RSPAS.

DUTTON, S.W., compiler, Historical Records of Fiji c1862 – 1910, Vol 1, ML.

DYSON, Martin, Papers, Vol. 6. ML

EGGLESTON, John, Letters received 1851 – 1866, ML.

FISON, Lorimer, Letterbooks Vols 1 – 7, 1867 – 1883, NLA.

FISON, Lorimer, Miscellaneous Papers 1865 – 1868, PMB.

FISON, Lorimer, Papers 1869 – 1907, NLA.

FISON, Lorimer, Press Copy Book: Sermons, articles and letters 1867 – 1873, ML.

FREE WESLEYAN CHURCH OF TONGA, Baptismal Registers, Tongatapu 1838 – 1890, PMB 992.

FREE WESLEYAN CHURCH OF TONGA, Marriage Registers, Tongatapu Circuit 1840 – 1872, PMB 987.

Genealogy of the Family of Tu'ifu Tevakei, Nuku’alofa, Tonga (MS in possession of Tu'ifu Tevakei, Tonga).

GOLDFINCH, Henry, Papers 1873 – 1876, ML.

(GOODENOUGH, James), Correspondence with (mainly from) Commodore James G. Goodenough of HMS Pearl, FM.

GOODENOUGH, James G., Journals and Notebooks 1854 – 1875, 11 vols, ML.

Great Britain and Ireland: Copies of Memorials Letters etc, from the Colonial and Foreign Offices, ML.


GORDON, Arthur H., compiler, Fiji Newspaper Cuttings, ML.


HARVEY, William H., 7 Letters from William Henry Harvey to Dr George Bennett, 26 May 1855 – 12 May 1860, and one from Dr Moore to W.H. Harvey, 7 Jul 1860, ML.

Hennings Papers, NAF:
1. James O’Neill Diary 1880 [1881]
3. IC, General, 1864 – 1881.
HMS Havannah, Log Books Jan 1848 – Feb 1852, ML.

HAZLEWOOD, David, Day Book, 5 Sep 1844 – 30 Nov 1846, ML.

HAZLEWOOD, David, Journal, ML.

HMS Herald, Remark Book, Sydney to Fiji May 1855 – Aug 1860, NLA.

HIXS, N, Francis, Remarks HMS Herald from Sydney to Feejee Islands, May 1855 – Aug 1860, ML.

HOARE, Henry John, Journal of Her Majesty’s Ships Dido, Clio and Pearl off the West Coast of Africa, Australia, New Zealand and the Fiji Islands, 20 April 1871 – 16 June 1874, 2 vols.

HOPE, Charles Webley, Letter-Journals (of HMS Brisk 1865 – 1868), ATL.

HMS Hyacinth, Ship’s Log, ML.

KING, Phillip Parker, Correspondence received 1824 – 1855, ML.

LANG, John Dunmore, Papers, Vol 7, Correspondence 1855 – 1977; Vol 9, Personal and Miscellaneous 1838 – 1873, ML.

LEE, George, Journal 1862 – 1866, TS in the possession of Dr Niel Gunson.

Letters to the Rev. Thomas Williams, 4 vols, ML.

LMS records, ML:
Papers of South Seas Missionaries 1800 – 1879.
Samoa District Minutes 1836 – 1851.
South Seas Letters, Boxes 6 – 8, 1827 – 1832.
South Seas Letters, Boxes 16-17, 1843 – 1844.
South Seas Letters, Box 18, Society Is, Hervey Is, Samoa, New Hebrides 1845.
Outgoing Letters – South Seas, Box 3, Aug 1843 – Jun 1846.

LONNBERG, E.W.G., Diary, Bureta, Fiji 1862 – 1869, ML.

LYTH, Mary Ann, Papers 1838 – 1853, ML.

LYTH, Richard, Circuit Returns 1850 – 1853, ML.

LYTH, Richard, Day Book Jun 1842 – Apr 1855, ML.

LYTH, Richard, Day Book and Journal Aug 1850 – Dec 1851, ML.

LYTH, Richard, Day Book 26 Nov 1852 – 26 Apr 1854, ML.

LYTH, Richard, General Index to Journals, Quarterlies and Miscellaneous Manuscripts, ML.

LYTH, Richard, Journal 1842 – Oct 1854, ML.
LYTH, Richard, *Miscellaneous Pocket Book*, ML.

LYTH, Richard, *Newspaper Cuttings and Fijian Vocabulary*, ML.

LYTH, Richard, *Personal Papers*, Box 6, ML.

LYTH, Richard, *Scrapbook 1883 – 1887*, ML.

LYTH, Richard, *Tongan and Fijian Reminiscences*, Vols 1 and 2, ML.


LYTH, Richard Burdsall and Mary Ann, *Letters Home from Richard Burdsall Lyth and Mary Ann Lyth*, TS, NLA.

MA’AFU, Elenoa, Letter to J.M. Borron of Mago, Fiji, 12 Jun 1884, FM.

McARTHUR, William, Letter to G.L. Griffith (of Fiji), 1 June 1875, ML.

METHODOIST CHURCH – FIJI: *Letters from Mary Ann Lyth, James Calvert and Richard Burdsall Lyth*, ML.

MOM Series, ML:
32: Letterbook (Mission Office), 1856 – 1859.
33: Rev. John Eggleston Letters Jul 1862 – Apr 1864;
   Rev. Stephen Rabone Letters 20 May 1864 – May 1872;
98: Letters received from Fiji: Rotuma, Rewa, Ovalau, Bau and miscellaneous 1855 – 1879.
100: Waterhouse, Rev Joseph: Correspondence 1855 – 1878.
102: Correspondence of Rev. George Brown 1862 – 1878.
103: Correspondence of Rev. Frederick Langham 1862 – 1879.
104: Correspondence of Rev. Lorimer Fison 1873 – 1878.
128: Baker, Rev. Thomas: Diary, Aug 1850 – Jul 1866
129: Letters to William Collis 1855 – 1876.
138: Polglase, Mrs John [Mary], Diary Aug 1850 – Jan 1859.
166: Miscellaneous Correspondence 1856 – 1903.
324: [Baker, Rev. Thomas], Journal kept in Fiji 1859 – 1873.
579: Copy of Diary (Robert Swanston).
589: Lyth, R.B. [attrib.], Notebook.

MILLER, George R.H.: *Tongan Diaries 1843 – 1849*, ML.
MOORE, Charles, Journal on board the ship *Medway* from London to Sydney, 1847 and cruise in HMS *Havannah* 1850, ML.

NISBET, Henry, Papers, Vols 6 & 7, ML.

HMS *North Star*, Captain’s Log 1841 – 1846, AJT ‘P.

HMS *North Star*, Remark Book 18 Dec 1841 – 5 Sep 1846, NLA.

ORTON, Joseph (attrib), Four notebooks, WMMS, ML.


PARKES, Henry, Correspondence, Vol. 57, ML.

HMS *Pearl*, Logbook Sep - Dec 1874, ML.

PHILP, Richard, Diary, NLA.

RABONE, Stephen, Journal 1835 – 1849, ML.

RANSOME, Henry, Journal on board the barque *Elizabeth*, 4 Apr 1831 – 4 Jun 1834, ML.

ROBERTS, J.H., Tongan Papers, ML.

ROTH, G.K.. Papers, AJCP.

RYDER, George L., Pioneering in the South Seas, being Reminiscences of G.L. Ryder, of Mango Island, ML.

SMALL. Arthur J., Memoirs of Reverend A. J. Small, ed. by Winifred McHugh, NAF.

Stanmore Papers 1855 – 1912, AJCP, NLA.

SWAINSON, Henry Gabriel: Journal 1850 – 1851, ATL.

SWANSTON, Robert S., Journal 1857 – 1866; 1874 – 1885, 6 vols, FM.

SWANSTON, Robert S., Diary 14 Feb 1874 – Sep 1875, FM.

SWANSTON, Robert S., Letters, 1857 – 1866; 1870 – 1875. FM


TAUFA’AHAU TUPOU I, Letter to Tui Nayau, 13 July 1881, (contemporary copy of the original), in the possession of Dr Elizabeth Wood-Ellem.

THURSTON, John B., Diaries and biographical papers 1854 – 1897, NLA.

THURSTON, John B., Diary Feb - Apr 1874, NLA.
THURSTON, John B., Papers, NLA.

THOMAS, John, Collection of Holograph Letters, ML.

THOMAS, John, Diary and Letter Book 1825 – 1839, ML.

THOMAS, John, History of the Friendly Islands, ML.

THOMAS, John, History of Tonga and of missionary work there, ML.

THOMAS, John, Journal, 1827 – 1852, ML.

THOMAS, John, Letters of the Reverend John Thomas and his wife to parents and friends 1834 – 1850, and letters received by them 1836 – 1844, ML.

THOMAS, John, Papers 1821 – 1875, ML.

THOMAS, John, Papers 1825 – 1835, ML.

THOMAS, John, Private Journal, ML.

THOMAS, John and Sarah, Correspondence 1834 – 1850, ML.

THOMAS, Sarah, Journal, ML.

Tongan genealogies, translated for E.W. Gifford, in the possession of Dr Niel Gunson.

HMS Torch, Remark Book, Sydney to Fiji Apr 1854 – Feb 1855, ML.

TUPOU. Etueni, ed., Tongan genealogies, in the possession of Dr Niel Gunson.

TURNER, George, Eromanga, ML.

TURNER, Nathaniel, Journal to New Zealand, Tonga and Fiji Aug – Nov 1833, ML.

TURNER, Nathaniel, Personal Narrative 1793 – 1846, 2 Vols, ML.

TURNER, Peter, Journal 1831 – 1840, ML.

TURNER, Peter, Missionary Papers 1831 – 1838, ML.

TURNER, Peter, Private Journal, ML.

TURPIN, Edwin J., Diary and Narrative of Edwin J. Turpin, NAF.

VIGORS. P.D., Private Journal of a four months cruise through some of the “South Sea Islands” and New Zealand on HMS Havannah, NLA.

Waterhouse family papers, ML.

WATERHOUSE, John, Australian and Polynesian Journal 1840 – 1844, ML.
WATERHOUSE, Joseph, Papers 1826 – 1876, ML.

WATKIN, James, Journal 1830 – 1882, ML.

WATKIN, James, Papers 1830 – 1839, ML.

WATKIN, James, Papers 1832 – 1833, ML.

WEBB, Arthur J., Journal 1881, ML.

WMMS Records:

Australasia Correspondence: Tonga 1835 – 1846; Fiji 1835 – 1860, NLA.

Circuit Returns [Fiji] 1850 – 1853, ML.

Committee Minutes 1820 – 1865, ML.

District Despatch Book 1826 – 1835, ML.

District Letterbook 1826 – 1835, ML.

District Meeting Minutes, Fiji and Friendly Islands 1827 – 1855, ML.

Fiji District Minutes and Reports, ML.

Fiji District Returns 1854, ML.

In Correspondence Fiji 1835 – 1884.

In Correspondence Friendly Islands 1822 – 1875, ML.

In Letters Australia and South Seas May 1828 – May 1834, ML.

Letters from Fiji 1835 – 1852, ML.

Letters from Fiji 1853 – 1857 and Miscellaneous Items, ML.

Letters to the Reverend Thomas Williams, 4 vols, ML.

Methodist Church Papers, Boxes 4 –5, ML.

Notices of Fijian and Tongan Missions 1837 – 1859, ML.

Out Correspondence 1820 – 1854, ML.

Tonga District Minutes 15 Feb 1827 – 9 May 1849, ML.

[WILKINSON, David], Letter from David Wilkinson to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, 21 Dec 1905, FM.

WILLIAMS, John, Narrative of a Voyage performed in the Missionary Schooner “Olive Branch” by John Williams 1832, ML.

WILLIAMS, John and BARFF, Charles, Journal of a Voyage by Williams and Barff, ML.

WILLIAMS, Thomas, Articles used for food by the natives of Feejee, ML.


WILLIAMS, Thomas, Letters to his father 1839 – 1843, ML.

WILLIAMS, Thomas, Miscellaneous Notes chiefly concerning Feejee and Feejeeans, 3 vols, ML.

WILLIAMS, Thomas, Rough Sketches of Places, Persons and Things for the most part Fijian, ML.
WILLIAMS, Thomas, Somosomo Quarterly Letter Aug 1845 – Sep 1847, ML.

YOUNG, John, Message to Fijian Chiefs, 11 Jul 1862, ML.

(a) Published works

ARTHUR, William, What is Fiji, the Sovereignty of which is offered to Her Majesty? London 1859.

BAYS, Peter, A Narrative of the Wreck of the Minerva, Cambridge 1831.

BELCHER, Edward, Narrative of the Voyage around the World performed in Her Majesty's Ship Sulphur during the years 1836 – 1842..., 2 vols, London 1843.

BODDAM-WHETHAM, J.W., Pearls of the Pacific, London 1876.

BRENCHEL, Julius L., Jottings during the Cruise of HMS Curacao among the South Sea Islands in 1865, London 1873.

BRITTON, Henry, Fiji in 1870: being the Letters of The Argus Special Correspondent, with a Complete Map and a Gazetteer of the Fijian Archipelago, Melbourne 1870.

BULU, Joel: Joel Bulu: the Autobiography of a Native Minister in the South Seas, ed. by George S. Rowe, London 1884.

CALVERT, James et al, Events in Fiji 1855, London 1856.

CAMPBELL, George, Log Letters from the Challenger, London 1876.

CARGILL, David, The Diaries and Correspondence of David Cargill, ed. by Albert J. Schütz, Canberra 1977.

CARGILL, David, Memoirs of Mrs Margaret Cargill, London 1841.


CHESSGN, Frederick W., The Past and Present of Fiji, London 1875.


*Fiji in 1877. The First Three Years since Annexation under Governor Sir Arthur Gordon KCMG; or, A Crown Colony of a very Severe Type*, nd (c1878).


FISON, Lorimer, *Tales from old Fiji*, London 1907.

FORBES, Litton, *Two Years in Fiji*, London 1875.


GOODENOUGH, James, *Journal of Commodore Goodenough, with a Memoir by his Widow*, London 1876.


LAWRY, Walter, *Friendly and Feejee Islands: A missionary visit to various stations in the South Seas in the Year 1847*, London 1850.

LAWRY, Walter, *A second missionary visit to the Friendly and Feejee Islands*, London 1851.


MEADE, Herbert, *A Ride through the Disturbed Districts of New Zealand, together with some account of the South Sea Islands*, London 1870.

Memorandum (dated 6 April 1874) upon The Native Ownership of Land in Fiji, Suva 1886.

[MOSS, Frederick J.], *A Month in Fiji. by a Recent Visitor*, Melbourne 1868.


MOSS, Frederick J., *Through Atolls and Islands in the Great South Sea*, London 1889.


Ordinances of the Colony of Fiji, from the 1st September 1875, the date of the Proclamation of the Royal Charter erecting the Fiji Islands into a British Colony on the 31st December 1878, Sydney 1880.


Published Proceedings of the Native Councils, or Council of Chiefs, from September, 1875, nd.

Report of the Commission Appointed to Inquire into the Conduct of Her Majesty's Consul at Fiji, with Minutes of Evidence, Sydney 1864.

RUSSELL, M., Polynesia, Edinburgh 1842.

SEEMANN, Berthold, Viti; an Account of a Government Mission to the Vitian or Fijian Islands, London 1862.


TURNER, Nathaniel, First Lessons in the Language of Tongataboo, one of the Friendly Islands; to which are added a Prayer and several Hymns, Sydney 1928.


WATERHOUSE, John, Journal of a Second Voyage from Hobart Town, Van Diemen's Land to New Zealand, the Friendly Islands and Feejee commenced Wednesday October 28th, 1840..., London 1844.

WATERHOUSE, John, Journal of ... a voyage to the Polynesian Islands and return to Hobart Town, London 1841.


WATERHOUSE, Joseph, Memoir of Vah-ta-ah, the Feejeean Princess, with occasional allusions to Feejeean life, London 1857.

WEST, Thomas. Ten Years in South-Central Polynesia, London 1865.


WILLIAMS, John. A Narrative of Missionary Enterprises in the South Sea Islands, London 1837.


WILLIAMS, Thomas and CALVERT, James, *Fiji and the Fijians*, ed. by George Stringer Rowe, London 1870.


(c) Official Records

(1) Fiji

Administrative Officers Lau 1875 – 1959, FM.


Cakobau, Ad-Interim and Provisional Governments, Fiji.

(NB: In some cases, Set numbers vary between the original records, held in the National Archives of Fiji, and microfilm copies of those records. I have adhered to the numbers on microfilm, which I have examined at the Dixson Library, Sydney and the NLA, Canberra.)

Set 1: Executive Council (King’s Cabinet), IC, general, Jan – Dec 1873.
Set 2: Executive Council (King’s Cabinet), OC, general, 21 Jan 1873 - 20 Aug 1874.
Set 3: Executive Council (King’s Cabinet), Minutes of Meetings of the Council and Papers relating to the Ba War 1872 – 1874.
Set 9: Chief Secretary’s Office: Name Index of IC, general, Jun 1871 – c. Mar 1873.
Set 10: Chief Secretary’s Office and Colonial Secretary’s Office: IC, general, 30 May 1871 – 31 Aug 1875.
Set 11: Chief Secretary’s Office: Naval and Consular Correspondence, Inwards Feb 1872 – Sep 1874.
Set 12: Chief Secretary’s Office: register of OC, general, 8 May – 3 Jul 1872; 3 Jan – 29 Dec 1873.
Set 13: Chief Secretary’s Office and Colonial Secretary’s Office: Copies of OC, general, of the Chief Secretary and Chief Clerk 9 Sep 1871 – 2 Sep 1875.
Set 14: Chief Secretary’s Office. Copies of correspondence between HBM Consul and the Fijian Government, 2 Jun 1871 – 16 Feb 1872.
Set 17: Chief Secretary’s Office. Correspondence received from the Attorney-General Apr – Dec 1873.
Set 20: Chief Secretary’s Office – Colonial Secretary’s Office (Audit Dept): Miscellaneous IC addressed mainly to Auditor-General, Apr – Dec 1873.
Set 21: Chief Secretary’s Office: Resolutions of the Representatives of Natives and foreign residents carrying on the Government of Fiji pending annexation by Great Britain, 23 Nov 1874.
Set 22: Chief Secretary's Office: Copies of despatches from the Administration and the Colonial Secretary to the Secretary of State, the Governors of New South Wales and Fiji, the officer commanding the Australia Station and other government officials abroad, 15 Oct 1874 - 15 Jun 1875.
Set 23: Chief Secretary's Office (Ministry of Foreign Relations). Copies of OC, general, of the Chief Secretary and Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 8 Jun 1871 - 6 Oct 1874.
Set 24: Chief Secretary's Office (Ministry of Foreign Relations): OC, general, 4 Sep - 7 Nov 1872.
Set 25: Colonial Secretary's Office (Ministry of Foreign Relations). Copy of a Letter from the Chief Secretary to the British Consul 31 Jan 1872.
Set 26: Ministry of Finance: register of IC, general, Jan - Dec 1873.
Set 27: Ministry of Finance: IC, general, Aug 1871 - Dec 1873.
Set 28: Ministry of Finance: copies of OC, general, of the Minister and Chief Clerk, 2 Jan 1872 - 20 Sep 1873.
Set 31: Ministry of Interior Affairs, Ministry of Lands and Works and Naval and Military Affairs, IC, general, Jun 1871 - Dec 1873.
Set 32: Ministry of Interior Affairs: Ministry of Lands and Works and Naval and Military Affairs: Copies of OC, general, of the Minister, 9 Jun 1871 - Jul 1871.
Set 33: Ministry of Interior Affairs, Ministry of Lands and Works and Naval and Military Affairs: copies of OC, general, of the Minister and Chief Clerk, 15 Apr 1873 - 24 Dec 1873, 2 Vols.
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.
Set 36: Ministry of Lands and Works and Naval and Military Affairs: Copies of IC, general: (a) Chief Surveyor, Lands and Works, Oct 1873 - Jan 1874; (b) Auditor-General 27 Oct 1873 - c Sep 1875.
Set 37: Ministry of Lands and Works and Naval and Military Affairs: Despatches from the King's Private Secretary to the Premier and Chief Secretary Jun 1873 - Feb 1874.
Set 40: Ministry of Native Affairs, Register of IC, general, Jun 1871 - Apr 1873.
Set 41: Ministry of Native Affairs, IC, general, Jun 1871 - Aug 1873.
Set 42: Ministry of Native Affairs, Copies of OC, general, of the Minister for Native Affairs and of the Chief Clerk, 28 Jun 1872 - Apr 1873.
Set 43: Ministry of Native Affairs: Secretariat for Native Affairs. Copies of OC, general, of the Minister for Native Affairs (afterwards Secretary) and the Chief Clerk, 8 Apr 1872 - 24 Aug 1875.
Set 44: Ministry of Native Affairs: Copies of Outwards Memoranda and Minutes of the Minister and Chief Clerk, 3 Aug 1872 - 18 Jan 1873.
Set 45: Ministry of Native Affairs: Copies of Outwards Memoranda and Minutes of the Minister and Chief Clerk, 3 Aug 1872 - 30 Sep 1873.
Temp 1: Registrar, Chief Secretary's Office: Registrar of Miscellaneous Deeds, 1 Feb 1872 - 9 Oct 1874.
Temp. 13: Royal Commission to Quiet Land Titles, Claims Files 1872 - 1873.
Temp. 19: Despatches from the Governor of New South Wales and Fiji to the Administrator of the Provisional Government of Fiji 1874 - 1875.
Temp. 18: Government House Miscellaneous Papers 1873 - 1875.
Colonial Secretary's Office:
Circular Despatches from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the Officer Administering the Government of Fiji, Vols 1 - 16, 1861 - 1899.
Circulars, Vol. 1 (3 Nov 1875 - 12 Dec 1907).
Colonial Office Circulars, 3 Jan 1869 - 28 Dec 1901.
Despatches from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the Governor of Fiji Jan 1875 - Dec 1882.
Despatches to the Secretary of State for the Colonies from the Governor of Fiji, Vols 1-3, 3 Oct 1874 - 10 Nov 1882.
Government House: Copies of Letters other than to the Secretary of State, Vol. 1 (12 Jun 1876 - Feb 1883).
Governor’s Letter Book 1876 - 1883.
List of IC, Vols 1 - 6, Sep 1875 - Oct 1876.
Notes of Enquiry 1885 - 1887.
Outward Letters 2 Sep 1875 - 31 Jan 1882.
Outwards Letters of the Officer Administering the Government of Fiji, 2 Jan 1877 - 31 Dec 1883.
Register of Commission 1875 - 1914.
Register of IC Dec 1877 - Oct 1878.
Register of IC Sep 1879 - Aug 1880.
Register of IC Aug 1880 - Aug 1881.
Register of IC Jul 1881 - Apr 1882.
Register of IC May 1882 - Feb 1883.

Correspondence relative to Land Claims in Fiji presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.

Executive Council Minutes 1881, Vol. 2.

Further Correspondence relative to the Colony of Fiji 1876.

Further Correspondence relative to Land Claims in Fiji in August 1883.

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 1884-5.

Im Thurn Papers:

Section 1: Miscellaneous Papers relating mainly to Fiji, 1871 - 1919.

Section 2, part 1: Mainly Papers culled from the records of the British Consulate in Fiji 1870 - 1875.
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.


Land Claims Commission 1880 – 1881: Reports on Claims:
  R3: Kanacea
  R6: Mago
  R9: Naitauba
  R42: Vatu Vara
  R45: Laucaala
  R118: Katafaga
  R456: Bua
  R783 and 783A: Nasarawaqa
  R788: General report on Dreketi river, Vanua Levu.
  R822: Doloka, Dreketi river, Vanua L:vu.
  R923: Vurevure, Taveuni
  R926/7/8: Vanuabalavu
  R929: Ovalau
  R930: General report on Lau leases
  R950: Navavua, Lomaloma, Vanuabalavu
  R952: Na Yanuyanu, Vanuabalavu
  R953: Vagariki and Na Rua Rua, Lau.
  R954/5/6: Navadugu, Nasigani and Navetau, Vanuabalavu
  R960: Munia
  R961: Tabuta, Cicia
  R962: Nasorio, Cicia
  R964: Tokalau, Cicia
  R971: Nai Vaka, Totoya
  R972: Matuku
  R973: Yagasa Islands near Vulaga
  R973A: Uruone, Vanuabalavu
  R1065: Nanuya Laila!, Yasawas

Lau Provincial Council Meeting and Resolutions 1893 – 1908. NAF

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 claim: to Land”, 1881.

Monthly and Quarterly Reports on Lau Islands 1875 – 1882.


Records of HBM Consul for Fiji and Tonga, 1863 – 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 QC 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.


Registrar-General’s Dept: Report on the Census of the population of Fiji 1881, Central Archives of Fiji and the Western Pacific High Commission 92/165; NLA mfm G6718.

Towards a report on the proceedings of the Native Lands Commission in the Province of Lau, 11 August 1913.

Tukutuku Raraba, Tikina ko Lomaloma, Koro ko Sawana, Yavusa ko Tonga, Native Lands Commission, Suva.

(2) Great Britain

(a) Admiralty:

Adm 1/5606 and G. 31: Secretary’s In Letters, 1840 – 1900: A Selection.
Adm 1/5617: Capt. Sir E. Hume, Calliope in South Seas.
Adm 1/5672: Capt. Fremantle, Juno, Pacific Islands.
Adm 51/3229: HMS Hyacinth, Captain’s Logs 1833 – 1835.
Adm 54/190: HMS North Star Ship’s Log 9 Sep 1841 – 10 Oct 1850.

(b) 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 83/11: Despatches Oct - Dec 1876.
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.
CO 83/22: Correspondence Original 1880 Jan - Jul Despatches.

CO 83/11: Despatches Oct - Dec 1876.
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.

CO 83/11: Despatches Oct - Dec 1876.
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.

CO 83/11: Despatches Oct - Dec 1876.
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.

CO 83/11: Despatches Oct - Dec 1876.
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.

CO 83/11: Despatches Oct - Dec 1876.
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.

CO 83/11: Despatches Oct - Dec 1876.
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.

CO 83/11: Despatches Oct - Dec 1876.
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.

CO 83/11: Despatches Oct - Dec 1876.
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.

CO 83/11: Despatches Oct - Dec 1876.
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.

CO 83/11: Despatches Oct - Dec 1876.
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.
FO 58/90. Consuls at Society, Navigator and Fiji Is: Miller, Gibson and various 1859.
FO 58/91: Consuls General at Sandwich Is: Miller, Nicolson and others. Foreign various, Consular Domestic 1859.
FO 58/92: Consuls at Tahiti, Raiatea, Honolulu and Fiji Is: Miller, Gibson and others 1860.
FO 58/93: Consul Williams, Foreign Various, Consular and Domestic 1860.
FO 58/95: Consul at Honolulu; Green, Foreign Various, Consular Domestic 1861.
FO 58/96: Consuls at Fiji, Tahiti, Samoa: Pritchard, Miller, Williams 1862.
FO 58/98: Consuls at Fiji, Honolulu: Owen, Jones, Pritchard, Synge 1863.
FO 58/100: Consular Domestic 1863.
FO 58/102: Consuls at Samoa, Fiji: Williams, Owen, Jones 1863.
FO 58/105: Consuls at Fiji, Samoa: Jones, Owen, Williams 1865
FO 58/106: Consuls at Honolulu: Synge, Green, Consular Domestic 1865.
FO 58/108: Conduct of Mr Pritchard 1861 – 1865.
FO 58/109: Consuls at Tahiti, Fiji, Samoa: Miller, Jones, Williams 1866.
FO 58/111: Consuls at Tahiti, Fiji, Samoa: Miller, Jones, Williams 1867.
FO 58/113: Consuls at Tahiti, Fiji, Samoa: Miller, Thurston, March 1868.
FO 58/115: Consuls at Tahiti, Fiji, Samoa: Miller, Thurston, March, Williams 1869.
FO 58/116: Consul at Honolulu, Wodehouse: Consular Domestic 1869.
FO 58/118: Consuls at Tahiti, Fiji, Samoa: Miller, March, Thurston, Williams 1870.
FO 58/119: Consul at Honolulu, Wodehouse: Consular Domestic 1870.
FO 58/120: Consuls at Tahiti, Fiji, Samoa: Miller, March, Williams; Consul-General at Honolulu: Wodehouse 1871.
FO 58/124: Consular Jurisdiction in Fiji Islands with reference to Pacific Islands kidnapping 1863 – 1871.
FO 58/131: Consul at Fiji: March, Consular and Commercial 1872.
FO 58/135: Consuls at Fiji: March, Layard, Nettleton 1873.
FO 58/142: Consuls at Fiji: Layard, Nettleton; Political Consular and Commercial 1874.
FO 58/144: 1874 Jan – Apr Consular Domestic.
FO 58/147: 1875 Consuls at Fiji, Tahiti, Samoa: Layard, Woodhouse, Miller, Williams; Vice-Consul at Honolulu; Davies, Commercial Domestic, various, Political Consular and Commercial.
FO 58/150: 1876 Consuls at Fiji, Samoa: Layard, Williams, Liardet; Political, Consular and Commercial.
FO 58/159: Consuls General and Commissioners: Sir A. Gordon, Mr Maudslay.
FO 58/163: Consul General Maudslay, Sir A. Gordon; Treaties of Friendship with Samoa and Tonga.
(d) Parliamentary Papers

Report on the Social Conditions of Fiji and Tonga, 1866 (Consul Jones) 1866, LXIX, 603.

Correspondence and Documents relating to the Fiji 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, 1871. 1871, (No 435), XLVII, 777.

Further Correspondence relating to the Fiji Islands (in continuation of PP, House of Commons, 435. 8 Aug 1871, and House of Lords 6 Feb 1872). 1872 (C.509), XLIII, 469.

Correspondence relative to the Fiji Islands, 1862. 1962, XXXVI, 701.

Report of Commodore Goodenough and Mr Consul Layard on the offer of cession of the Fiji Islands to the British Crown. 1874 (C.1011), XLV, 323.

Correspondence respecting the Cession of Fiji and the Provisional Arrangements made for Administering the Government. (In continuation of C.1011 of 1874), 1875 (C.1114), LII, 153.

Correspondence respecting the Colony of Fiji, 1875 C. 1331), LII, 227.

Further correspondence respecting the Colony of Fiji. (In continuation of C.1337 of 1875). 1876, (C1401), LIV, 13.

Further correspondence relative to the Colony of Fiji. (In continuation of C.1624 of 1876). 1876 (C.1624), LIV, 65.

Further correspondence relative to the Colony of Fiji. (In continuation of C.1624 of 1876). 1877 (C.1826), LXI, 161.

Correspondence relative to Land Claims in Fiji. 1883 (C.3584), XLVI, 339.

Fiji Correspondence relating to the native population of Fiji, part 1: Native Labour Ordinances [C.-4434]; part 2: Native Population of Fiji [C.-5039].

Fiji Correspondence in connection with the Native Produce Taxes [C.-1880].

Proposed Annexation of the Fiji Islands, printed for the use of the Cabinet, 13 May 1873.

Memo by Consul E. March respecting affairs in Fiji, 7 May 1873.

Minutes of Proceedings at a Meeting between Sir Hercules Robinson, Cakobau, Ma'afu and Tui Cakau, held on board HMS Pearl, at Lomaloma on 2 Oct 1874.

Instrument of Cession.

(e) Miscellaneous

Western Pacific High Commission, Report of Her Britannic Majesty's High Commissioner for the Western Pacific relating to Tongan Affairs, 1874 - 1911.

Great Britain Hydrographic Office: HMS Pearl Logbook Sep – Dec 1874.

(3) Australia


(4) United States

Despatches from United States Consuls in Lauthala, Fiji. 1844 – 1890.

(5) Tonga

Tonga Ministry of Justice, Tongatapu Register of births and deaths, 1867 – 1907.
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