CHURCH
AND
STATE
IN
TONGA

Sione Lātūkefu

This book was published by ANU Press between 1965–1991.

This republication is part of the digitisation project being carried out by Scholarly Information Services/Library and ANU Press.

This project aims to make past scholarly works published by The Australian National University available to a global audience under its open-access policy.

Church and State in Tonga

Church

*The Wesleyan Methodist Missionaries
and Political Development, 1822-1875*

CANBERRA 1974

and State in Tonga

SIONE LĀTŪKEFU

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY PRESS

First published in Australia 1974

Printed in New Zealand for the Australian National University Press,
Canberra

North, South, and Central America:

International Scholarly Book Services, Inc., Portland, Oregon

Southeast Asia: Angus & Robertson (S.E. Asia) Pty Ltd, Singapore

Japan: United Publishers Services Ltd, Tokyo

© Sione Lātūkefu 1974

This book is copyright. Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of private study, research, criticism, or review, as permitted under the Copyright Act, no part may be reproduced by any process without written permission. Inquiries should be made to the publisher.

ISBN 0 7081 0402 9

Library of Congress Catalog Card no. 73-85.582

DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY
OF HER MAJESTY
THE LATE QUEEN SĀLOTE TUPOU III
OF TONGA

Preface

POLITICALLY, Tonga, until 4 June 1970, was a constitutional monarchy under the protection of Great Britain. While the treaty which provided British protection was not entered into until the beginning of this century,¹ Tonga became a constitutional monarchy in 1875. Varying opinions have been expressed concerning the part played in the development of this monarchical system by the Wesleyan Methodist missionaries, since their influence dominated the affairs of Tonga during the first fifty years of their work in the group.

Regarding the constitutional development in Tonga as a disastrous error, Basil Thomson (1894:222-3), laid the blame at the Methodist missionaries' door. Louis B. Wright and Mary Isabel Fry (1936:259-60), taking their cue from Thomson, wrote:

From the first, they [the Methodist missionaries] itched to change the patriarchal feudal system to some form that comported with the democratic ideas that most of them had acquired in Australia, where the belief in universal suffrage had already taken root. The preachers longed to see pious Tongans voting blue laws to bring about the Methodist millennium that they envisaged. King George, devout Methodist that he was, had other views, however, and it was not until 1862, at the height of theocratic power, that the preachers persuaded him against his better judgment to give the people a magical instrument of government called a Constitution

For reasons diametrically opposed to those held by Thomson and his disciples, friends and supporters of missionary work claimed the same constitutional development as evidence of a remarkably successful missionary enterprise, and gave full credit to the missionaries for this outstanding achievement.² They be-

¹ The Treaty of Friendship and Protection between Great Britain and Tonga was signed in December 1900. It was revised in 1958 and ratified in 1959. On 4 June 1970 Tonga celebrated her full independence.

² Some of the missionary records were written for propaganda purposes, and were therefore as biased as those of their opponents.

lieved that 'civilisation' and 'law and order' were the spontaneous results of evangelisation and would not have developed except in ground prepared by the missionaries. The missionaries themselves subscribed to this view as the following remarks show:

A more hallowed and noble triumph, of Gospel truth, Tonga had never witnessed, than when the social and political advancement of its population was thus acknowledged, by king, chiefs, and commoners, to be the sole result of that enlightenment and saving grace, which the religion of Jesus Christ had imparted, and before which heathenism and tyranny had fallen to rise no more (West 1865:438).

Although these commentators were clearly convinced that all political changes in Tonga were to be directly attributed to the influence or interference of the Wesleyan missionaries, there is a need to re-examine this question from a less partisan viewpoint. It is the purpose of this book to try to assess critically and objectively the significance of the part played by the Methodist missionaries in the political development of Tonga from the re-establishment of their mission in 1826 to the promulgation of the Tongan Constitution in 1875. It attempts to demythologise the firmly established notions consciously or unconsciously developed and perpetuated either for purposes of religious propaganda by the supporters of the mission or for denigration by its opponents. It tries to assess the overall impact which the missionaries had upon the Tongan way of life at this time and to determine whether, in fact, they were solely responsible for the political changes in Tonga, as some writers have claimed.

I would like to express my gratitude to all those who, in one way or another, kindly assisted me both in my research and in the preparation of this work. I feel indebted to so many that it is impossible to acknowledge everyone by name, but I would ask those whose names do not appear on these pages to accept my very sincere thanks for their help.

My thanks go to the staff of the following libraries and archives for their valuable assistance in making my research easier and more enjoyable: the National Library of Australia, Canberra; the Mitchell Library, Sydney; the Turnbull Library and the New Zealand National Archives in Wellington, New Zealand;

to Ian Diamond, former archivist of the Fiji Archives, and many others in various institutions in Australia, New Zealand and Fiji.

I must acknowledge my indebtedness to the General Secretary of the Methodist Overseas Mission, the Reverend C. F. Gribble, O.B.E., and the Reverend E. V. Newman, who permitted the use of the Methodist Overseas Mission Archives; to Dr D. Williams of Trinity College, Auckland, for the use of the College archives; to the Reverend J. B. H. Robson, for the use of Methodist archives in Suva; to the Reverend G. Harris, then President of the Wesleyan Church in Tonga and to Bishop J. H. M. Rodgers, of the Roman Catholic Church, for the use of their respective archives at Nuku'alofa, and also to Father C. P. Butler and Father Mingam of the Marist Fathers' headquarters at Hunters Hill, Sydney, for the use of the monastery's archives, their useful criticisms of the sections on the Roman Catholic mission, and the translation of letters from the French.

My attention was initially drawn to the subject of this book by the late Reverend R. G. Page, who had been a missionary in Tonga for thirty-eight years. To this remarkable and unassuming man I owe a tremendous debt of gratitude for his sound advice, encouragement and personal interest in my work. The valuable historical books and records which he had wisely and carefully collected for many years, and which have been generously given to me by his son Roger and daughter-in-law Mary, have been of invaluable help to this work. It is my deep regret that he did not live to see the completion of this book, which he had always wished.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation of the valuable assistance given to me by Dr A. H. Wood and the late Dr E. E. V. Collocott, both ex-missionaries and authorities on the history of Tonga. Thanks are also due to Miss Gwenyth L. Davies, of Adelaide, Mrs Halliday of West Wyalong, Miss Oldmeadow of Melbourne, Miss Crosby of Sydney, the Reverend H. K. Moulton of London and other descendants of the Wesleyan missionaries, who gave me access to the journals and letters of their forebears who had served in Tonga during the period of this study; these documents proved to be invaluable sources of information.

This study has been enriched by the oral traditions collected

from various informants in Tonga during my field trip there from November 1964 to February 1965. I am deeply indebted to the Hon. Ve'ehala, Keeper of the Palace Records and Secretary of the Traditional Committee, for the wealth of information he kindly gave me in answer to my inquiries. Thanks are also due to the following informants: Tu'i'āfitu of Makave, Vava'u; the late Fe'iloakitau Kaho and the late Sione Filipe Tongilava of Kolofo'ou; the late Molitoni Finau of Nukunuku, 'Uhatafe of Mu'a, Siol'ā Soakai of Hihifo, Ha'apai, and many others, particularly my father, the late Siosua 'Alopi Lātūkefu of Kolovai, who so generously gave of their time.

To Dr W. N. Gunson of the Department of Pacific History, Australian National University, I owe an immeasurable debt, and it is impossible to convey fully the extent of his patient guidance and encouragement throughout the preparation of my thesis which formed the basis of this book. I also wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to the late Professor J. W. Davidson for the generous support given to me by his Department and for his invaluable criticisms of certain aspects of the manuscripts; to Mr Harry Maude, Dr Francis West, Dr Dorothy Shineberg and Dr Deryck Scarr, who at all times showed their readiness to discuss and criticise this work; to Dr Alaric Maude and Dr Noel Rutherford, both students of Tongan geography and history, who read portions of this manuscript and offered valuable suggestions. Thanks are also due to Professor D. J. N. Denoon of the History Department, University of Papua New Guinea, who has read the whole manuscript and made very useful comments.

I would also like to express my thanks to Mrs Coral Wong and Mrs Joan Stephenson of Port Moresby, who carried out the task of typing and preparing this manuscript; and to my wife Ruth for her devoted, untiring assistance and moral support during the preparation of this book. Thanks also to Lotte and 'Alopi who had to put up with their parents' preoccupation with this work.

Lastly, with deep gratitude and affection, I wish to express my great indebtedness to Her Majesty, the late Queen Sālote Tupou of Tonga, for her gracious interest and invaluable help in this work. I was deeply privileged and greatly honoured by an invitation, which she extended to me, to spend four weeks with her

in February and March 1965, at 'Atalanga' in Auckland, where she was receiving medical treatment. In spite of her serious illness, she was determined to impart to me her wealth of knowledge of the Tongan traditional past. I only hope that the outcome of this study is worthy of her patronage.

S. L.

Port Moresby

1973

Contents

Preface	vii	
Glossary	xv	
Abbreviations	xvii	
1 Traditional Polity in Tonga	1	
2 Confirmation and Frustration	25	<i>Confrontation</i>
3 The Breakthrough	50	
4 The Consolidation	68	
5 The Search for a Monarch	83	
6 The Religio-Political Wars and the Birth of a Kingdom	100	
7 The First Two Codes of Law: 1839 and 1850	118	
8 Renewed Resistance and the Last Civil War, 1852	133	
9 The Aftermath and the 1862 Code of Laws	156	
10 The Growing Separation	180	
11 The Constitution of 1875	204	
12 Conclusion	218	
Appendixes	221	
Bibliography	285	

Maps

Index	297
1 Tonga	6
2 Tongatapu	7
3 Vava'u	7

Maps drawn by the Cartographic Office of the Department of Human Geography, Australian National University.

Glossary

- fa'ahinga* extended family, a socio-political unit headed by an 'ulumotu'a; kind, class
- fahu* man's sister's daughter or son. One's *fahu* had almost unlimited liberties with one's belongings
- fakataha* meeting
- fatongia* traditional responsibility or obligation, enforced labour or *corvée*
- fono* a compulsory assemblage of people to be informed of what their chief wanted them to do
- ha'a* class, the largest socio-political unit in Tonga—a loose confederation of genealogically related chiefs and their peoples
- hau* temporal ruler
- hou'eiki* chiefs
- kainangaefonua* commoners (literally eaters of the soil)
- kāinga* the equivalence of the present-day village, the most important socio-political unit in Tonga, headed by a ruling titled chief
- kau* class
- kaukau* circumcision
- kau'inima* cutting off little fingers and offering them as sacrifice to the gods
- kau mu'a* children of unions between a chief and woman of the *matāpule* class
- kau papālangi* Europeans
- kau pōpūla* slaves, usually captives in wars
- kau tu'a* commoners, see *kainangaefonua*
- kava* traditional drink, mostly used in ceremonies. It is made from the dried root of the kava plant (*piper methysticum*)
- kolo* village
- kolotau* fortress
- le'o kava* guardian of the *kava* protocol
- mala'e* traditional meeting ground
- mana* supernatural power

- matāpule* chief's attendant
moheofo principal wife of the Tu'i Tonga, usually the daughter of the *hau* or secular ruler
ngatu tapa cloth
polopolo first fruits, presentation of first fruits to one's chief
Pulotu Tongan paradise
tapu taboo
tātatau tatoo
tofi'a inheritance, estate
tona yaws
tu'i ruler or king
tukufo a ceremony of presentation of gifts at the funeral of a chief
'api household
'eiki toputapu sacred chief
'inasi the annual tribute of first fruits to the Tu'i Tonga as representative of the god Hikule'o, the god of fertility and harvest
'ulumotu'a head of a *fa'ahinga* (extended family), he was either a chief, petty chief or a *matāpule* (chief's attendant)

Abbreviations

AA	<i>American Anthropologist</i>
ANU	Australian National University, Canberra
ATL	Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington
JPH	<i>The Journal of Pacific History</i>
JPS	<i>Journal of the Polynesian Society</i>
JRAI	<i>Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute</i>
JRGS	<i>Journal of the Royal Geographical Society</i>
KASP	<i>Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers</i>
ML	Mitchell Library, Sydney
MOM	Methodist Overseas Mission
NLA	National Library of Australia, Canberra
NZNA	New Zealand National Archives, Wellington
RAWMMS	<i>The Report of the Australasian Wesleyan-Methodist Missionary society</i>
TCL	Trinity College Library, Auckland
TML	Tonga Missionary Letters
TSL	Tonga Sundry Letters
WMH	Wesleyan Mission House, London
WML	Wesleyan Missionary Letters, ATL
WMM	War Memorial Museum, Auckland
WMMS	Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society
WMMSA	Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society of Australasia
W-M Mag.	<i>Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine</i>
WMN	<i>Wesleyan Missionary Notices</i>
WMSP	Wesleyan Missionary Society Papers, ATL

1 Traditional Polity in Tonga

Near the centre of the 70,000,000 square miles of the Pacific Ocean lies the smallest kingdom in the world, Tonga. Situated 1,100 miles north-east of New Zealand and 420 miles south-east of Fiji, it consists of more than 150 small islands which are scattered between 15° and 23° south latitude and 173° and 177° west longitude. The kingdom is divided into three main island groups, Tongatapu to the south, Ha'apai in the centre, and Vava'u to the north. The total area of the whole group is 269 square miles, though only thirty-six of the islands are inhabited by the population which numbered about 90,000 in 1972, 97.5 per cent of whom are native and belong to the Polynesian race. Using oral traditions, particularly genealogies, ethnohistorians have concluded that the ancestors of the present inhabitants of Tonga arrived at the group from Samoa in A.D.950 (Gifford 1929:50; Wood 1932:6). However, recent archaeological and linguistic evidence suggests that Tonga has been occupied for a much longer period and was settled probably from the north-west rather than from Samoa (see Green 1966:6-38; Groube 1971:278-316).

Long before the coming of the Wesleyan missionaries to Tonga there was a highly organised socio-political system somewhat similar to that found in other Polynesian societies, based on the rule of the chiefs. However, Tonga was unique in Polynesia, and in the Pacific as a whole, in that it had a traditional monarchical system under the headship of the Tu'i Tonga. In fact, the institution of Tu'i Tonga had developed through the years into something similar to the Dalai Lama of Tibet and the Mikado of Japan.

Originally, the whole of Tonga was under the sovereignty of the Tu'i Tonga. The first Tu'i Tonga, 'Aho'eitu, who began his rule in Tonga in about A.D.950, was believed to be the son of Tangaloa, the god of the sky, and an earthly mother (Gifford 1924:25, 38; Wood 1932:5) thereby encompassing in his person

supreme sanctity and giving his dynasty pre-eminence. Referring to the Tu'i Tonga, Williamson (1924, I:151) quoted Monfat, who used the records of the early Roman Catholic missionaries in Tonga, as saying:

In them the civil and political power is exalted and sanctified by the divine power; wherefore their authority is boundless. They dispose of the goods, the bodies, and the consciences of their subjects, without ceremony and without rendering account to anyone. *Tuitonga* appears, and all prostrate themselves and kiss his feet . . . The Tongans refuse him nothing, exceeding his desires. If he wishes to satisfy his anger or some cruel fancy, he sends a messenger to his victim who, far from fleeing, goes to meet death. You will see fathers tie the rope round the necks of their children, whose death is demanded to prolong the life of this divinity; more than once you will see the child smile as it is being killed.

Cook (1809, V:428) reported that if the Tu'i Tonga entered a house belonging to a subject it became *tapu* and could never be inhabited by its owners, so there were houses specially built for his reception when travelling. There was even a special 'language' to be used by those of lesser rank when they addressed or talked about the Tu'i Tonga, and similarly a language of respect was used in addressing or talking about other chiefs.

The Tu'i Tonga was both the temporal and spiritual ruler, at least until the fifteenth century. While Tonga was occupied by a fairly small population, the combining of spiritual and temporal authority in the office of Tu'i Tonga appears to have worked adequately for a time. However, a succession of murders of the Tu'i Tonga during the fifteenth century led the twenty-fourth Tu'i Tonga, Kau'ulufonua Fekai, to create the new office of *hau*¹ (temporal ruler) to take over secular responsibilities while the Tu'i Tonga became '*eiki Toputapu* (sacred ruler). The new position of *hau* was given to one of Kau'ulufonua Fekai's brothers, Mo'ungamotu'a, who founded a dynasty under the title, Tu'i Ha'ataka-

¹ The term *hau* is related to the Fijian terms *sau* meaning 'prosperity, high chief, king', and *sauturaga* or 'noble king'; Capell and Lester (1946:299) conclude that the title *sau* (or *hau*) 'is shared between Fiji, Rotuma, Samoa and Tonga, with possibly an earlier stratum in Tahiti and Hawaii'. The date 1470 for the first *hau* dynasty is cited by Gifford (1929:83), Collocott (1924:179) and Wood (1932:11).

laua. Later, the sixth Tu'i Ha'atakalaua, Mo'ungatonga, desiring to become like the Tu'i Tonga himself and be free of the responsibilities of the *hau*, created another dynasty, the Tu'i Kanokupolu, and appointed one of his sons, Ngata, to this position in order that the latter would take over the responsibilities of the *hau*. The establishment of this third dynasty took place about the beginning of the seventeenth century (Gifford 1929:86). The responsibilities of administering the affairs of the country were thus gradually transferred to the Tu'i Kanokupolu line.

Apart from his divine sanctity, the Tu'i Tonga's position was enhanced by a marriage arrangement between the Tu'i Tonga and the *hau* dynasties. The eldest daughter of the *hau* was usually given as a *moheofo* (principal wife) to the Tu'i Tonga. As a result the next Tu'i Tonga, who was the son of the *moheofo*, would be in a relationship of *fahu*² (unlimited authority) to the *hau* who would be his maternal uncle. For this reason, when the system was at its peak, the *hau* dynasty (first the Tu'i Ha'atakalaua and later the Tu'i Kanokupolu) felt privileged and honoured to support and maintain the position of the Tu'i Tonga.

The Tongan system of land tenure rested upon the assumption that, owing to his divine origin, all land in Tonga from the beginning belonged to the Tu'i Tonga, and that the rights possessed by other chiefs therefore derived from him. In recognition of this, and also of the fact that he was regarded as the repre-

² The term *fahu* was derived from the Fijian word *vasu* which is the commoner term for sister's son or daughter. In certain areas of Fiji, the sister's male children are *vasu* and this gives them the right to inherit all the portable property of their mother's brother. Capell and Lester (1946:241-2) suggest that the *vasu* right in its simpler form came into western Polynesia from Fiji, and that the more extended form of *vasu* right also developed in Fiji and 'from eastern Fiji the right will have passed direct to Tonga, and it did so because the existing Tongan social system provided it with a ready welcome'. Their contention is supported by Tongan traditions which say the *fahu* began with the marriage of the Fijian chief, Tapu'osi, with the Tu'i Tonga Fefine (Tu'i Tonga's sister). Their children became *fahu* over the Tu'i Tonga, and theoretically over the whole of Tonga (informant, Her Majesty, the late Queen Sālote). In actual practice, the privileges of the *fahu* among commoners were severely restricted by the more powerful rights of the chiefs over commoners' property. Hence the custom was only strictly enforced by the chiefly classes (Gifford 1929:22-6; Collocott 1923b:223).

sentative of Hikule'o, the god of harvest, an annual festival of 'inasi (offering of the first fruits to him) was held.³ It was believed that failure to carry out the 'inasi would result in calamity and the whole land would suffer from divine wrath.

The land was gradually divided among the principal chiefs as the population increased with the years and, in practice, they became the effective controllers of their respective land. Once a *tof'i'a* (hereditary estate) had been allocated to a chief, it remained associated with his title and neither the Tu'i Tonga nor the *hau* ever revoked it (Waldegrave 1834:185), though they could depose its existing title holder and choose another. The chiefs further acknowledged their indebtedness to the Tu'i Tonga for their land by paying him tributes and by performing the traditional *fatongia*⁴ (*corvée*).

Politics was closely interwoven with religion in Tonga. Every chiefly person possessed some degree of *mana* or supernatural power. However, the amount of *mana* a chief received was also thought to depend on the good will of the gods. Chiefs made offerings to obtain the favour of the gods and consulted them on important occasions, particularly before going to war or embarking on distant voyages. When any misfortune or natural disaster occurred it was attributed to the anger of the gods. Since the chiefs, who were the political leaders, relied upon priests as their mediators with the gods, a close alliance existed between them and the religious leaders in order to maintain their mutual interests. The powers of the priests were second only to those of the chiefs.

The Tongans were polytheistic and possessed a hierarchy of gods. Among the principal gods were the *kau* Tangaloa,⁵ who lived in the sky, the *kau* Maui, who lived in the underworld, and the deity Hikule'o, who held Pulumotu, or the Tongan paradise (Collocott 1921:152-3; Farmer 1855:133; Thomson 1894:23).

³ Because 'inasi was a religious festival, it was different from the ordinary offering of first fruits to the chiefs which was called *polopolo* (Gifford 1929:103; Martin 1827, I:201; Williamson 1924, III:347-8).

⁴ Vason stated, 'It was the custom of the inferior chiefs, to send men, two or three times a week, to "Fadongyeer", i.e. to dig plant and labour for Dugonagaboola' (Orange 1840:139).

⁵ *kau* is a plural sign. It comes before nouns denoting persons.

The *kau* Tangaloa were principally creator gods and there were no temples or priests dedicated to them (Gifford 1929:289) and the creator of some of the islands of Tonga and of the first people, Kohai, Koua and Momo (Thomas 1879: 12). The *kau* Maui were believed to have fished up most of the islands of the Tongan group. One Maui was also believed to carry the earth upon his shoulder, and an earthquake was supposed to be caused either by a Maui changing the earth from one shoulder to another, or falling asleep and nodding his head. Hikule'o was believed to control the weather and the fertility of the land. The Tu'i Tonga was regarded as her representative on earth and the annual '*inasi*' offerings to the Tu'i Tonga were actually offered to her.⁶

Although the principal deities were widely recognised, they were not as important in everyday affairs as the gods who were confined to particular localities. Thus each chief and his people had their own gods. These were usually the spirits of their dead chiefs. It was believed that when members of the chiefly class died they (or their spirits) went to Pulotu where Hikule'o resided. There they became gods of secondary order, and were thought to return to earth in the form of sharks, various animal species, and, in one case, an octopus, or were embodied in a whale tooth, a shell or a carved piece of wood (Gifford 1929:289-90; Wilson 1799:272; Te Rangi Hiroa 1935:12).

These secondary gods were consulted in the event of war or before embarking on long sea voyages, and sacrifices were offered to them in cases of illness (Collocott 1921:158). The offerings to the gods were made through a priest, and if he were dissatisfied he would ask 'Do you think I am going to take any notice of such paltry things as you have brought?' The poor people on hearing this would go to fetch more costly gifts and sometimes, if they received no assistance from the first deity to whom they had sacrificed, they would visit five or six gods in succession. If they obtained satisfaction, it was believed that the gods were pleased and were pleading on their behalf with the venerable

⁶ Some thought that Hikule'o was a male god (Lawry 1850:251); Collocott 1921:152).

Map 1 Tonga.

Map 2 Tongatapu. A. Hule, B. Ngele'ia, C. Poha.

Map 3 Vava'u.

deities in Pulotu. *Kau'inima* (the cutting off of fingers as a sacrifice) and even human sacrifices were often given to the gods in order to save the life of a chief. In April 1842 the Reverend John Thomas wrote to the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Committee in London:

January 10th, 1842, died Fatu, the chief of the Mua. His illness was of many weeks continuance . . . At length it was feared that he would not recover; and various means were used by Heathens, but to no purpose. On the 7th of January, a youth named Feheko, a Chief's son, about twelve years of age, was offered in sacrifice to the gods. His own father and another man strangled him; but all was in vain.
(*W-M Mag.* 1843:258)

So it was that natural disaster, disease, death and famine were attributed to the anger of the gods or the displeasure of the spirits of dead relatives.

Sacred houses were built in sacred places, mostly the burial places of the chiefly ancestors, where offerings and prayers were made to the gods through the medium of the priests. Because of their prestige and importance the priests received food and other gifts from the people (Watkin, *Journal*, 7 Feb. 1843). The sacred places were often used by wrongdoers, or those who were being pursued by a chief, as places of refuge. The most famous of these sanctuaries was that of the god Tāufa'itahi, whose priest was Kautai at Mu'a (Gifford 1929:300; Blacket 1914:121-3). The missionary, Walter Lawry, recorded in his diary (9 Dec. 1822) how Fatu, the chief with whom he stayed at Mu'a, became very angry when Lawry reported to him the danger to which he (Lawry) and his family had been exposed by 'the savage wantonness of several natives', and that 'the offenders took shelter in the Hoofanga, to beg pardon of the gods; this saved them from being killed at once'. In these sanctuaries the criminal was safe from attack, because any violation of these places was so serious a crime that a human life would have to be offered in atonement. (Martin 1827, I:190).

Pulotu was thought to be an island to the west of Tongatapu where anything mortal could not survive. The chiefs considered that the commoners had no place there. Hence commoners were

often called *kainangae fonua* (eaters of the soil) because it was believed by the chiefs and by most commoners that they turned into vermin after they died, though some commoners doubted this belief (Martin 1827, II:122-4).

There was no moral condition of any kind for the entry of souls to Pulotu. The sole condition appeared to be chiefly birth. Failure to comply with the laws of the community was punished during one's lifetime either by the chiefs who had absolute power over their subjects or, it was believed, by the gods and spirits of deceased relatives who could inflict disease or misfortunes upon transgressors.

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Tonga was politically stable. Abel Tasman, who visited the group in 1643, observed that the people of Tongatapu, the main island, carried no weapons, the country was peaceful, and the land was well cultivated (Kenihan 1964:50).

This stability was due to the reciprocal relations and balance of interests existing between the various classes of Tongan society. At the top of the social pyramid were the *ha'a tu'i* ('kings'). Immediately below this stratum was that of the *hou'eiki* (chiefs), then the *kau mu'a* (sons of a union between a chief and a *matāpule*), the *ha'a' matāpule* (chiefs' attendants), and *kau tu'a* (commoners) in that descending order. At the bottom of the scale were the *kau pōpula* (slaves) (Gifford 1929:111). The protection and jurisdiction offered by the chiefs ensured for the commoners security for both their lives and their property. It created and maintained peace and order, which ultimately resulted in prosperity and contentment. Partly from a deep sense of obligation, besides personal loyalty, gratitude and affection, the commoners were only too eager to carry out their responsibilities towards their chiefs. These included working for the chiefs, giving them the first fruits of their crops and the best of everything they possessed, and fighting for them when the chiefs decided to go to war. In addition, the absolute and arbitrary power of the chiefs, who usually dealt out rather severe punishments, together with fear of divine retribution for violations of the taboos, served as a deterrent

⁷ The word *ha'a* in this context means class.

which helped to maintain stability, peace and prosperity in the land.

With the expansion of population the local chiefs gradually consolidated their power over their own areas, and the authority of both Tu'i Tonga and the Tu'i Kanokupolu became nominal and ceremonial. Actual power rested with the chief of various localities or *kāinga* (the equivalent of the modern village in Tonga).⁸ Unlike the Samoan village where authority was vested in the village *fono*, at which the *matais* (titled heads of the families) discussed matters affecting the village before they were implemented, the powers of the village chief in Tonga were absolute and arbitrary. The Tongan *fono* was simply a compulsory assembly of the people to receive instructions from the chief. Offenders were not brought to public trial as was the case in Samoa. Any major offences were dealt with by the chief whose decisions were absolute, punishment frequently being meted out on the spot, either by the chief himself or by one of his powerful henchmen. This absolute power of the ruling chiefs, however, contained the seeds of the system's own destruction. As chiefly ambitions grew they fostered local autonomy, thus threatening the political unity of Tonga as a whole.

True, the country, during this period was economically prosperous, and life was easy and peaceful. Yet, at the same time, the vigorous and ambitious young warrior chiefs did not find enough excitement in such a life. The immense variety of newly found riches, and the stimulation which contact with the outside world brought to the Tongans, especially during the eighteenth century, whetted the appetites of the young chiefs for further power, wealth and excitement. It was when they began to misuse their power for purely selfish ends that corruption crept in followed by serious disturbances. There ensued a period of political turbulence and misery after the relatively peaceful, orderly, and prosperous years of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

⁸ Apart from the *'api* (household) there were three main socio-political units in Tonga. The smallest was the *fa'ahinga* (extended family), headed by an *'ulumotu'a* who was either a chief, petty chief or *matāpule* (chief's attendant). Next was the *kāinga*, headed by a ruling titled chief. The largest unit was the *ha'a*, a loose confederation of genealogically related, but autonomous, chiefs and their *kāinga*.

The growing contact with Fiji had quite a significant impact on the new developments in Tonga. The Tongans highly prized a variety of products which were either not available in their home islands or which were superior to anything of a similar kind which they had at home, such as spears, bowls, huge double canoes, pottery, sandalwood and the scarlet feathers of the Fijian parrots. So coveted were these articles that, in spite of the difficulties of sailing to Fiji, the voyages gradually became regular (Thomson 1894:320). Seemann (1862:240-1) wrote:

Up to this period the Tonganese had been peaceful traders . . . Gradually they adopted a different line of policy. Being men of athletic frames, of courage and daring, they were often asked to assist in the feuds in which chiefs friendly to them engaged, receiving canoes and other property in return for their services. From being mere mercenaries, they gradually began to act on their own responsibility, readily avenging every outrage from time to time committed against any of their countrymen on the smaller islands of the eastern group. . . .

Such exploits became extremely popular among young chiefs in Tonga who were thirsty for excitement and renown. They only had to join a party going to Fiji for canoes to place themselves in the way of gaining honour and fame enough to satisfy the most ambitious, for in Fiji 'there were alarums and excursions in plenty, war and rapine, easy living at the expense of their Fijian hosts, and freedom from the restraint of their elders' (Derrick 1963:122).

From these experiences, the young chiefs brought back to Tonga not only goods but also some cruel and revolting habits which were regarded by some of their fellow chiefs at home with great admiration. A list of these barbarities preserved in the old traditions were recorded by Thomson (1894:320):

The cold-blooded treachery that will betray a brother to gratify the thirst for blood; the brutal ferocity that spares neither sex nor age; the depraved lust that is gratified in outrage on the dead; the foul appetite of revenge that will eat the body of a slain enemy,—all these seemed to the young Tongan the badges of a manliness worthy of imitation. He regarded the comparative refinement of his own people as effeminacy, and vied with his fellows in imitating the accomplishments of his more travelled countrymen.

Gradually the excitement and the material gain of these expeditions, as well as the prestige and honour given to them, particularly by the younger generations of Tonga, made these exploits an integral part of the upbringing of young chiefs. Hence the rapid increase in the volume of traffic between Tonga and Fiji during the eighteenth century.

This intercourse had far-reaching effects on political affairs in Tonga. On their return home the young warriors did not hesitate to show off the new habits they had acquired in Fiji. Cannibalism and strangling of widows were introduced and became more and more common; 'Warriors who had blooded their clubs in Fiji fretted at the inglorious routine of peace. Intrigue, treachery, murder, and rebellion resulted' (Derrick 1963:122-3). When Captain Cook first visited Tonga in 1773 he reported that, although he saw arms, the people went about unarmed and appeared peaceful. On his third voyage, in 1777, he named Lifuka, the main island of the Ha'apai group, Friendly Island. He was entirely unaware that on the very same occasion there was a plot to assassinate him and his crew, and that they were only saved by a disagreement among their chiefly hosts as to whether to carry out the plot by day or by night (Martin 1827, II:71-2).

At the turn of the seventeenth century unrest began to appear, particularly in Vava'u. Vuna, a brother of the then Tu'i Kanokupolu, Mataele Ha'amea, went to Vava'u in order to quell the unrest and to restore allegiance to his brother. He was accompanied by one of his nephews, Tuituiohu, son of Mataele Ha'amea, who went as Vuna's *le'o kava* (guardian of *kava* protocol), and by some of the lesser chiefs of the *ha'a* Havea. However, after staying in Vava'u for a while, Vuna abandoned his original intentions and decided to extend his own powers, pronouncing himself Tu'i Vava'u (ruler of Vava'u) and establishing his own court at Pangaimotu, an island off Vava'u (informant, Her Majesty, the late Queen Sālote).

Meanwhile, the struggle for power continued on Tongatapu. One of Mataele Ha'amea's sons, Ma'afu'otuitonga, succeeded to the position of Tu'i Kanokupolu. He had three sons, Tupoulahi, Maealiuaki and Mumui, all of whom succeeded to the position. However, when Maealiuaki's son, Mulikiha'amea, decided to

vacate the position of Tu'i Kanokupolu, Tupoumohefo, a daughter of Tupoulahi, a very ambitious and strongwilled woman, decided to make herself Tu'i Kanokupolu in 1793.⁹

This action was unprecedented, for although women were superior to men in rank, no woman had ever before become head of any of the major socio-political units in the country, let alone succeeded to any of the three principal positions. Her extraordinary action could be explained by her unwillingness to see the position of Tu'i Kanokupolu go to her uncle, Mumui, and his descendants, for Mumui had a different mother from that of Tupoulahi and Maealiuaki, a woman of lower rank. For this reason Tupoumohefo resented Mumui or his sons taking precedence, and while she had not objected to the succession of Maealiuaki or his son, Mulikiha'amea, to the Tu'i Kanokupolu position, she was prepared to take this drastic step.

One of Mumui's sons, Tuku'aho, was infuriated by her action. He came from 'Eua where he was living, drove Tupoumohefo to Vava'u and deposed her. He made Mumui, his aged father, Tu'i Kanokupolu, while he himself retained the real power. Describing Tuku'aho, Captain Wilson of the *Duff* wrote (1799: 103):

He is a stout man, and may be about forty years of age; is of a sullen, morose countenance; speaks very little, but when angry, bellows forth with a voice like the roaring of a lion.

In his youth he had led other young Tongan chiefs and they had indulged themselves in a warring expedition to Fiji, returning with exciting tales of their victories.

Gradually Tuku'aho tried to exert his power throughout the whole of Tonga, and when he eventually succeeded his father as Tu'i Kanokupolu in 1797, he ruled with harshness, cruelty and terror. William Mariner, a young ship's clerk adopted by Finau 'Ulukālala, said:

⁹ Tupoumohefo was the principal wife of Pau, the Tu'i Tonga who met Cook in 1777. Pau left Tongatapu to reside in Vava'u because, according to tradition, he was upset by Tupoumohefo's insistence on conferring all the regalia of the office of Tu'i Tonga on her son and heir, Fatafehi Fuanunuiava, while he was still alive (informant, Her Majesty, the late Queen Sālote). Pau died in Vava'u in 1784.

THE TU'I KANOKUPOLU LINE

Toogoo Ahoo had succeeded to the throne; . . . He is reported to have been a man of vindictive and cruel turn of mind, taking every opportunity to exert his authority; and frequently in a manner not only cruel, but wanton; as an instance of which, he on one occasion gave orders, (which were instantly obeyed), that twelve of his cooks, who were always in waiting at his public ceremony of drinking cava, should undergo the amputation of their left arms, merely to distinguish them from other men, and for the vanity of rendering himself singular by this extraordinary exercise of his authority. (Martin 1827, I:80)

The tyrannical and cruel reign of Tuku'aho gave the young politically ambitious Fīnau 'Ulukālala Fangupō, who in 1797 had succeeded his father, Fīnau 'Ulukālala I, as Fīnau 'Ulukālala II, an excuse for furthering his own ambitions. For some time, Tupoumohefo, who was living in Vava'u, had been planning her revenge upon Tuku'aho, and she cleverly stirred up ill-feeling in the minds of the 'Ulukālala family, under whose protection she was living. These efforts were greatly assisted by Tuku'aho's own growing unpopularity.

Tupouniua, another son of Fīnau 'Ulukālala I, suggested that Tuku'aho should be assassinated. His half-brother, Fīnau 'Ulukālala II, hesitated for a while because Tuku'aho was the father of one of his other half-brothers (by the same mother), Tupouto'a. However, most of the other great chiefs, including the Tu'i Tonga, Tu'i Ha'atakalaua and Tamahā of Tongatapu were in favour of the assassination (Orange 1840:165). Finally Fīnau 'Ulukālala II gave his consent, and during the annual ceremony of *'inasi* at Mu'a, in 1799, Tuku'aho was murdered at night by Tupouniua while 'Ulukālala and his men stood guard outside. Almost all who were with Tuku'aho that night were slain. The murder of Tuku'aho threw Tonga into a long and bloody civil war, fought with unprecedented ferocity and treachery.

Until his death in 1809 Fīnau 'Ulukālala II proved to be the most powerful, treacherous and dangerous man in the country. He faced opposition first from the loyal supporters of the Tu'i Kanokupolu. Mulikiha'amea, the Tu'i Ha'atakalaua, allied himself and his people with Fīnau 'Ulukālala. He had hoped to become once again Tu'i Kanokupolu, but he was killed during one of the

battles.¹⁰ His death marked the end of the Tu'i Ha'atakalaua line.¹¹

In May 1799 'Ulukālala and his army attacked Hihifo. An eyewitness account by Vason, a renegade L.M.S. missionary living under Mulikiha'amea, reported that it was a tough and bloody battle in which the Hihifo army was forced to retreat, leaving many of their warriors behind, dead. Some took refuge at a sacred burial place in Pangai, believing that its sanctity would protect them from violence. Finau 'Ulukālala then appealed to Vason to set fire to the sanctuary and he complied, throwing a fire brand into the thatch of a house in the enclosure, which ignited and quickly spread. Many of those sheltering inside were burnt to death or killed by Finau 'Ulukālala's men as they tried to escape. 'Ulukālala's men dragged the bodies to the beach 'and after inflicting every brutal insult of savage cruelty, roasted and ate them—thinking it was just revenge on their enemies to devour them' (Orange 1840:175).

After he had defeated his opponents in Tongatapu in 1799, and as a gesture of contempt and ridicule for the defeated party, he and his half-brother, Tupouniua, set up a white pig in Hahake, as Tu'i Kanokupolu, and one of his chiefs, Veahahake, as the pig's representative (Blanc 1934:28) before proceeding to Ha'apai and Vava'u. In Ha'apai he crushed his opponents with utter ruthlessness and made himself ruler of Ha'apai. Describing what happened to his opponents in Ha'apai, Mariner recalled:

Some were sent on board old and useless canoes, which were then scuttled and immediately sunk; others were taken three or four leagues out to sea, and being put in old leaky ones, and tied hand and foot, were left gradually to meet their fate. Those against whom Finow entertained the greatest inveteracy were taken to the island of Lofanga,

¹⁰ Vason, who lived with Mulikiha'amea, revealed that an arrangement had previously been made, that upon Tuku'aho's death, Mulikiha'amea would become Tu'i Kanokupolu (Orange 1840:163).

¹¹ The L.M.S. missionaries gave a vivid description of the horrors of this war. They recorded how they saw a warrior being killed and, 'a fellow who had severed his head and body asunder was exhibiting them as a proof of his prowess; and even some of the women, as they passed him dipped their hands in his blood, and licked them' (*Missionary Transactions*, 10 May 1799:288).

and there tied naked to stakes driven in the ground, or to the trunks of trees and left to starve to death . . . Several of them bore their torments with the greatest fortitude, lingering till the eighth day, while others of weaker constitutions died in three or four days. (Martin 1827, I:85-6)

From Ha'apai, 'Ulukālala and his warriors proceeded to Vava'u where after two weeks of sporadic fighting, the resistance collapsed and the Tu'i Vava'u, Vuna III or Vuna Takitakimālohi, and his chiefs, including one of Fīnau 'Ulukālala's own sons, Moengāngongo, who had sided with him, fled to Samoa. Fīnau 'Ulukālala II had now become the ruler of both Ha'apai and Vava'u and from this time on the 'Ulukālala family assumed the title of Tu'i Vava'u. He made Tupouniua governor of Vava'u and Tupouto'a governor of Ha'apai. He then decided to move his residence to Ha'apai where he made preparation for further attacks on Tongatapu.

Meanwhile, in Tongatapu, the royalists determined to avenge what 'Ulukālala and his followers had done at Hihifo. In 1800 Vaha'i, one of the Ha'a Ngata Motu'a chiefs, and the strongest chief on Tongatapu at the time, led the men of Hihifo in a war which is known as the Tau Fakalelemoa (battle of chasing fowls) or Tau Langovaka (battle avenging defeat) (Collocott 1928:91). They marched from the west to the east of Tongatapu, defeating those who had supported Fīnau 'Ulukālala in 1799 everywhere they went. Vahe Loto, the centre of Tongatapu, was laid waste so that if ever Fīnau came back he would not be able to obtain provisions there. Houses were burnt down, and their inhabitants were driven into the sea to drown, or be slaughtered like chickens. At Poha, a mount between Hoi and Kolonga at Hahake, the royalists made a great heap of the bodies of their enemies, 'by being laid transversely upon each other, as a monumental trophy of the victory' (Orange 1840:186). They made it high enough for them to be able to look at the island of 'Eua from the top of it. Then they built a fire round a huge stone, called Pitoi Tangata (human cooking stone). When it was red hot, they cut the human bodies open, roasted them on it and ate them in revenge.

Some of 'Ulukālala's men went to Tongatapu with Vason for supplies, and arrived just in time to witness the horror of the destruction and massacre of their former allies. They had to flee

for their lives, without provisions. On one of the islands off Tongatapu they met Finau and his warriors. Joining him, they all sailed for Tongatapu and landed at Hahake. There they observed the shocking and sickening aftermath of the ravages perpetrated by the royalists. They left Hahake to attack the royalists at Hihifo and landed at Ma'ofanga, where they were joined by the people of that place, and then marched on to Hihifo.

Finau 'Ulukālala found the royalists well fortified and firmly entrenched, and, in the fierce battle which ensued, he was beaten and driven back from Hihifo. He was then compelled to return to Ha'apai, and for several years he made no further attempt to invade Tongatapu on a large scale, contenting himself with a series of surprise attacks, particularly at night. In these attacks, a few unsuspecting victims would be killed, property hurriedly destroyed, and the raiders would then quickly escape to their canoes, and sail back to Ha'apai. It was not until the capture of the *Port-au-Prince* in 1806, which brought an unexpected supply of guns as well as the services of some of the crew of the ill-fated vessel, that another major onslaught was made on Tongatapu.

Misery on Tongatapu was further intensified by the feuds between the chiefs of its various districts who struggled for power or tried to assert their independence. When Vaha'i died, two prominent figures emerged, Teukava of Kolovai and Tākai of Pea, both of whom had been closely associated with Vaha'i. The latter had appointed Teukava as his successor at Polonga, Hihifo, and ordered Tākai to build a fortress at Pea. Soon feuding broke out between Tākai and Teukava.

In the meantime, Tupoumālohi, Tuku'aho's younger brother, returned from Fiji where he had been for several years participating in the fighting of the Fijian chiefs. He built Nuku'alofa as his fortress and on the death of Ma'afu'olimuloa he succeeded to the position of Tu'i kanokupolu. He found, however, that he had very little influence among the chiefs, who wanted independence. The threat from Tākai and his followers in the nearby fortress of Pea compelled him to leave Nuku'alofa and join forces with Teukava. Teukava was, however, defeated, killed and eaten by a Fijian of Tākai's party at Te'ekiu. Tupoumālohi then left Tongatapu for Ha'apai where he stayed with his nephew, Tupouto'a, son of

Tuku'aho, and half-brother of 'Ulukālala. He remained there until his death, but before he died he voluntarily gave up the position of *hau* in favour of his nephew, Tupouto'a.

This period of political turbulence was aggravated by the contact with Europeans, which had an immense influence on the affairs of Tonga. European goods, especially those made of iron, were highly prized by the Tongans, particularly the chiefs, who would ultimately obtain anything bought or stolen by the commoners. The appearance of the huge European vessels with their powerful guns, the display of their deadly pistols and other weapons, arrested the imagination of the Tongans, making their traditional fighting weapons appear clumsy and inefficient. The chiefs were quick to realise the advantages which these superior weapons could give them in their struggle for power, while the possession of European goods such as beads for ornaments, clothing and steel tools, brought much social prestige. Consequently, the chiefs were prepared to use every available means to obtain them.

The more the Tongans obtained European goods the more they desired them and determined to use drastic measures to get them. In 1802, the Hihifo people of Tongatapu, with the help of some sailors living among them, captured the American vessel, *Duke of Portland*. Most of the crew were killed and a European woman named Eliza Mosey was taken by the chief Teukava of Kolovai as one of his wives. Later, in 1804, Eliza managed to escape by swimming to the *Union*, which had called at Tonga and whose captain and some of the crew had been killed when they went ashore. Eliza Mosey informed the mate of these happenings and the rest of the crew escaped (Martin 1827, I:282; Blanc 1934:30).

Two years later, the *Port-au-Prince* arrived at Lifuka and was captured by Fīnau 'Ulukālala II and his people. They murdered the captain and most of the crew, but some were spared to show Fīnau and his men how to use the guns, and the young ship's clerk, William Mariner, was adopted by Fīnau as his son. Even before this time there was a growing interest among the chiefs in having Europeans living with them, not only to assist in warfare but

because of their skills in making and repairing iron tools and, more importantly, as interpreters between the two cultures.

With the guns of the *Port-au-Prince* and the services of the Englishmen, Finau 'Ulukālala decided to launch another major attack on Tongatapu. This new onslaught, in 1807, heralded a new phase in the history of warfare in Tonga, more dangerous and devastating than ever before. The fortress at Nuku'alofa was destroyed in record time. With the support of artillery and muskets, manned by Finau's white captives, the Tongans with their spears, clubs and fire-brands in hand, burnt down the fortress, slaying its men, women and children. Mariner recorded this destruction:

When Finow arrived upon the place, and saw several canoes, which had been hauled up on the garrison, shattered to pieces by the shot, and discovered a number of legs and arms lying around, and about three hundred and fifty dead bodies, he expressed his wonder and astonishment at the dreadful effect of the guns. He then thanked his men for their bravery, and Mr Mariner and his companions in particular, for the great assistance rendered by them. (Martin 1827, I:98)

On the advice of the priests, the victors rebuilt the fortress and, ignoring Mariner's advice to launch a full-scale invasion of Tongatapu, they engaged only in light skirmishes. As there was an acute shortage of food due to civil war, some proposed killing the prisoners and roasting them for food. 'The proposal was readily agreed to, by some, because they liked this sort of diet, and by others because they wanted to try it thinking it a manly and warlike habit' (Martin 1827, I:108).

Meanwhile, Tākai of Pea, a member of the Ha'a Havea, was the most powerful chief in Tongatapu at the time. He entered into an alliance with 'Ulukālala, pretending to acknowledge his rule, but immediately after the latter left for Ha'apai, Tākai and his men destroyed the fortress which 'Ulukālala had rebuilt at Nuku'alofa. This greatly angered 'Ulukālala, but further troubles in Ha'apai and Vava'u kept him occupied until his death in 1809.

The trouble in Vava'u and Ha'apai stemmed from a plot by Tupouto'a, 'Ulukālala's other half-brother, to avenge himself upon Tupouniua who had murdered his father, Tuku'aho. Tupouniua governed Vava'u on 'Ulukālala's behalf and was a popular and

able governor, Tupouto'a convinced 'Ulukālala that Tupouniua had ambitions to seize power for himself and thereby end 'Ulukālala's rule. He proposed a plot for Tupouniua's murder and was able, with 'Ulukālala's approval to implement it when Tupouniua visited Ha'apai for the occasion of the marriage of one of Fīnau's daughters to the Tu'i Tonga.

Realising that 'Ulukālala was implicated in the murder of their leader, the Vava'u people determined to avenge themselves and built a fortress at Feletoa to resist Fīnau's power. However, 'Ulukālala treacherously overthrew them by making false peace moves and then making a surprise attack upon the leading Vava'u warriors; some were clubbed to death while others were bound hand and foot and drowned in leaky canoes.

Not long after this 'Ulukālala himself died and Tupouto'a assumed the rulership of Ha'apai while 'Ulukālala's son, Moengāngongo, who had now returned from Samoa, became ruler of Vava'u. After a brief rule lasting only three years he died, and the struggle for power in Vava'u began again. This ended after further murders when Pāunga of the Tu'i Tonga family assumed the rulership of Vava'u.

Tupouto'a decided to go to Tongatapu in 1812 to assist the Hihifo people who were involved in a feud with Tākai. Tākai made peaceful overtures by offering his daughter, Pule, as a wife to Tupouto'a (Blanc 1934:33). The offer was accepted and while Tupouto'a was in Tongatapu he was made Tu'i Kanokupolu, after which he returned to Ha'apai.

He soon encountered opposition from Pāunga, the ruler of Vava'u, but with Tākai's assistance he subdued Pāunga and himself became ruler of Vava'u. Thus he was now ruler of both Vava'u and Ha'apai. He unsuccessfully made a bid for power in Tongatapu after Tākai's death in 1816 by trying to subue Fa'ē, Tākai's brother and successor. However, Tupouto'a himself died in 1820, and the rulership of Vava'u then passed to another son of Fīnau 'Ulukālala II, Tuapasi, who became Fīnau 'Ulukālala III. Tupouto'a's son, Tāufa'āhau, who was then twenty-three years old, assumed the rulership of Ha'apai, but no Tu'i Kanokupolu or *hau* was appointed until 1827. Later in the same year, Laufilitonga was installed in the position of Tu'i Tonga which

had been vacant since the death of his father, Tu'i Tonga Fuanu-nuiava, in 1810. When the Wesleyan missionaries started work in Tonga, therefore, first in 1822 and then in 1826, there was neither a Tu'i Tonga nor a Tu'i Kanokupolu.

There were several important developments from this political turbulence. One of these was the emergence of Vava'u and Ha'apai as unified regional political units with their own independent and central authorities vested in the Tu'i Vava'u and Tu'i Ha'apai respectively. On the other hand, Tongatapu was still fragmented and actual power rested with local chiefs.

The long-drawn-out civil war and the increasing impossibility of defending isolated hamlets against European guns and muskets gradually forced the people to move into fortified places called *kolotau*. Out of these sprang the modern villages of Tonga which are called *kolo*.

During this period also there was a marked change in the chiefs' treatment of the common people. It had become increasingly harsh, to the point of being intolerably cruel, inhuman and arbitrary. They came to regard the commoners as mere chattels to be used exclusively for their own benefit. The following incidents were typical:

Finow, observing one of the natives busily employed cutting out the iron fid from the maintop gallant-mast, and as he was a low fellow, whom he did not choose should take such a liberty, he was resolved to put a stop to his work. Calling to a Sandwich islander, who was amusing himself on deck by firing off his musket, he ordered him to bring that man down from aloft. Without the least hesitation, the Sandwicher levelled his piece, and instantly brought him down dead; upon which Finow laughed heartily, and seemed mightily pleased at the facility with which his order had been obeyed. The shot entered his body, and the fall broke both thighs and fractured his skull. Afterwards, when Mr Mariner understood the language, he asked the king how he could be so cruel as to kill the poor man for so trifling a fault. His majesty replied, that he was only a low, vulgar fellow (a cook); and that neither his life nor death was of any consequence to society. (Martin 1827, I:68)

Teukava of Kolovai, on the occasion of a festival, 'arranged in a circle a group of men suffering with elephantiasis of the testicles and went about with a hook, pulling their privates out into view'.

Using their personal power the chiefs would seize anything that might arrest their fancy. Referring to this situation Vason recalled:

They [the chiefs] exercise an arbitrary power over the lower orders, and have everything belonging to them in their power, which their sub-officers take from them, without ceremony, as the chief may need. Though the provision they have by them be ever so scanty, they are required to cook a part of it for the chief; so that they are frequently obliged to eat the root of the plantain-tree, for a wretched subsistence (Orange 1840:124)

More seriously, traditions were questioned, and the validity and effectiveness of the traditional religion were doubted by some. This was inevitable for usually a religion is required by people to explain how the universe works. The impact of the growing contact with Fiji, and with the Europeans—explorers, traders, whalers, beachcombers and L.M.S. missionaries—in particular, shook the foundations of the traditional cosmology. Many of the leading Tongans, therefore, were anxious to acquire a new cosmology to explain the new circumstances with which they were now confronted.

When the Tu'i Tonga ventured to advise Finau 'Ulukālala II on some matters of warfare, the latter replied, 'My Lord Tooitonga may return to his own part of the island, and content himself in peace and security; matters of war are my concern, and in which he has no right to interfere' (Martin 1827, II:126). He also terminated the traditional ceremony of *'inasi* at Ha'apai and Vava'u because he regarded it as useless and wasteful, and he thus deprived the Tu'i Tonga of the most important religious ceremony offered to him, as being representative of the deity Hikule'o. After Finau's death in 1809, it was revealed that he had planned to have the priest of the god Tupou Toutai strangled, because he had failed to secure the help of the gods in saving the life of his daughter who died from illness shortly before his own death (Martin 1827, I:307).

This was the situation into which the Wesleyan missionaries came. It was a period of political instability with several unsuccessful attempts to gain absolute power over the whole of Tonga, which were vigorously resisted, particularly on Tongatapu

by the Ha'a Havea chiefs who were afraid to lose their privileges and power among their subjects. It was not until after the coming of the Wesleyan missionaries that Tāufa'āhau, son of Tupouto'a and grandson of Tuku'aho, finally succeeded in becoming ruler of the whole of Tonga.

2 *Confrontation and Frustration*

The first attempt to convert the Tongans to Christianity was made by the London Missionary Society, a Protestant interdenominational body. The reports of the explorers, particularly those of Captain James Cook, together with accounts of atrocities committed by some unruly Europeans among the Pacific islanders, were widely read in England towards the end of the eighteenth century. In order to save the South Sea islanders from both heathenism and the lawlessness of certain Europeans, many people in England, particularly the evangelicals, believed that the best way was to Christianise and civilise them (Morrell 1960:28-31). For this purpose the missionary ship, *Duff*, under Captain James Wilson, was sent to the Pacific in 1796 by the L.M.S. with missionaries for Tahiti, Tonga and the Marquesas.

Captain Wilson landed ten missionaries in Tongatapu on 12 April 1797 (Wilson 1799:105-6). They were under the protection of Tuku'aho, the most powerful chief in Tonga at the time, and his aged father, Mumui, who was then the Tu'i Kanokupolu. This well-meaning effort was doomed to fail right from the beginning, for the missionaries were ill-equipped for this tremendous task, and the Tongans themselves were not ready for the new religion.¹

Initially cordial relationships were maintained between the missionaries and the leading Tongan chiefs, but the problem of communication proved a formidable barrier between the two parties. For months the missionaries were unable to communicate with the people about Christianity, let alone conduct any religious services for the people because of their ignorance of the language. Most of their time was spent in trying to establish a garden and

¹ There was no ordained minister among these missionaries. They were all artisans. For the names of the missionaries and their occupations before they left England, see Farmer 1855:78.

learn the language, and worrying about the safety of their diminishing trade goods.

It was soon apparent that the Tongan chiefs were only interested in the missionaries' trade goods and not their teachings. The early good relationship was due mainly to the missionaries' ability to satisfy the chiefs' demands for European goods. When the chiefs, at the instigation of three beachcombers, Ambler, Morgan and Connelly, demanded the expulsion of the missionaries from Tonga, Mulikiha'amea, the then Tu'i Ha'atakalaua replied:

If the men of the sky, discovered by any attempts of violence, or secret whisperings, that they meant to take our land, and kill us, we ought all to strike hands, and root them out from among us; but they have brought great riches, they have given them to us freely, we reap the good fruits of their living among us, their articles are of great use to us, they behave themselves well; and what could we wish for more? (Orange 1840:117)

However, as their supplies began to decrease, and the missionaries became less generous with their gifts, thefts occurred. One of the missionaries, Vason, was attacked one night and had his pistol stolen.

Added to the missionaries' problem were the hostile reactions of the beachcombers to their presence in Tonga. After the missionaries refused their unreasonable demands for trade goods, the three beachcombers told the Tongans that they themselves were men of high rank in England, but the missionaries were only commoners, and that in their prayer meetings they were praying to their gods to kill off the Tongan chiefs. Unfortunately for the missionaries, four leading chiefs died within three months of their arrival (Wilson 1799:257), and the Tongans took this as proof of the truth of the beachcombers' allegations. During the civil war in 1799, three of the missionaries were killed,² and the rest had to

² Vason explained these murders as the result of one of the Hihifo men's vengeance upon the missionaries from whom he had earlier requested some presents, but had been refused. Seeing the missionaries, he decided to revenge himself and was supported by his friends. Another possible explanation for the attack is that the missionaries were murdered because they were staying with the chief of Ha'ateiho, who with his people had joined Mulikiha'amea and 'Ulukālala, and was regarded as an enemy.

leave Tonga for New South Wales in 1800 after being stripped of their possessions, except Vason who 'went native'.³

Interest in missionary work in Tonga, however, did not disappear completely with its abandonment by the L.M.S. missionaries. One of those who escaped to New South Wales, Shelley, retained a lively interest in the people of the group. Several times he pleaded unsuccessfully with various mission bodies to reopen the mission work in Tonga. However, after his death his widow excited the interest of a young Methodist minister in Sydney, the Reverend Walter Lawry, with the tragic stories her late husband had told her about their few years in Tonga (Findlay and Holdsworth 1921:267). Eventually Lawry managed to persuade the British Wesleyan Methodist Conference (at this time the Methodist people in New South Wales were still under the British Methodist Conference) to appoint him with another minister to the mission field in Tonga.

Among the circumstances favouring his proposal was the news of the success of the L.M.S. in Tahiti, which had reached England and caused tremendous excitement among the evangelicals there, at the same time creating sympathy and sorrow for the forsaken people of the Friendly Islands. It was not difficult therefore to persuade the British Wesleyan Conference to send missionaries to Tonga, and Lawry was the first appointed.

Lawry decided to leave for Tonga without delay. Accompanied by his wife, their child, a carpenter, George Lilley, a blacksmith, Charles Tindall, and a young man from the Marquesas, Macanoe, to act as interpreter, Lawry arrived in Tonga on 16 August 1822 (Lawry, Diary, 16 Aug. 1822). He decided to reside at Mu'a, the then capital of Tonga, under the chief Fatu, son of the last Tu'i Ha'atakalaua, Mulikiha'amea. It was soon obvious, however, that their favourable reception was due more to his supply of goods than his teachings. Eventually, the opposition of the traditional priests and the people was so strong, and the constant threats to kill the missionary so affected Mrs Lawry's health, that Lawry

³ Vason deserted missionary work and lived among the Tongans for four years. The fascinating story of his experiences in Tonga is told in Orange 1840.

decided to abandon the mission. He and his family left Tonga on 3 October the following year, 1823, while Lilley and Tindall stayed behind. Macanoe, who apparently was not successful as an interpreter, died in Tonga from illness.

It was not until 28 June 1826 that Lawry's successors, the Reverend John Thomas and the Reverend John Hutchinson, arrived in Tonga (see Lātūkefu 1969). They had intended to go to Mu'a where Lawry had been stationed, but Tindall advised them against this, and recommended that they should go instead to Hihifo. Apparently Fatu had ill-treated Lilley and Tindall after the departure of Lawry. The chief of Hihifo, Ata, gave the new missionaries a piece of land at Kolovai, and was friendly to them, but he refused to accept the new religion personally and forbade his people to join the mission. Frustrated by their failure to win Ata and the people of Hihifo to Christianity, and because of the growing hostility of the people, Thomas and Hutchinson decided to abandon the work in Tonga altogether. The situation was aggravated by the failure of Hutchinson's health and also by the continuing petty quarrelling between the two missionaries. Accordingly, when a new assistant, I. V. M. Weiss, arrived with his wife in Tonga in 1827, Thomas sent them back in the same boat, a small whaler, with a request to the brethren in Sydney to send a bigger vessel to bring all of them back to Sydney with all the mission property (Findlay and Holdsworth 1921:283). After emergency meetings in Sydney the brethren rejected Thomas's request and decided instead that Nathaniel Turner, William Cross and Weiss should leave for Tonga immediately to prevent the mission from being abandoned again. The new arrivals saved the work in Tonga. They were stationed at Nuku'alofa while Thomas and Hutchinson carried on the work at Hihifo. The situation at Hihifo continued to deteriorate and, finally, in 1829, the brethren decided to close down the station there for the time being. It was not reopened until 1837.

This brief outline of what happened in the work of the Wesleyan missionaries in Tonga before 1830 clearly shows that, during the first few years of their attempts to convert and to civilise the Tongans, the Wesleyan pioneering missionaries encountered continual frustration. This was mainly because of the strong opposi-

tion they had to face, not only from the Tongans themselves but also from other Europeans who had found their way to these islands. In addition, the lack of proper preparation for their task, the absence of constructive imagination among some of the missionaries, and the rather unfortunate relationship between John Thomas and John Hutchinson further aggravated the situation.

Led by the traditional priests and many of the chiefs, the Tongans put up strong opposition to the work of the missionaries (see Lātūkefu 1966). Much of this opposition appeared to have been basically a conservative reaction against anything new. It sprang from a desire to preserve the *status quo*. They felt that the old standards and values ought to be safeguarded, not only because they were still more meaningful and were believed to be more relevant to their present needs, but also because of the chiefs' own deep loyalty and respect for their ancestors and their beliefs. This sentiment was at the heart of Ata's rejection of Christianity. He told Thomas bluntly 'that he would not pray but that he wished to end in the way he was in, it being the way his friends were in before him' (Thomas, Journal, 19 Jan. 1929). Asked later by Nathaniel Turner if he would change his mind about accepting Christianity, Ata replied, 'I will not attend to your religion. My mind is fixed . . . It is very good for you to attend to your God, and I will attend to mine . . .' (N. Turner, Journal, 16 July 1829). Obviously, the traditional leaders feared that Christianity as presented by the Wesleyan Methodist missionaries with its 'strange' scale of values and moral standards threatened to annihilate most of their treasured customs and traditions. Most of them coveted European goods, technical knowledge and firearms, but were not prepared to replace their traditional values and customs with those of the missionaries. John Thomas wrote:

Most of the chiefs upon this island [Tongatapu] will say, how glad they would be to have Missionaries; but the truth is they only want our property, and many of them cannot protect us from other chiefs; neither do they wish to change their religion; but whatever chief first receives a Missionary or an Englishman, all the property he has is considered as belonging to that chief . . . (Farmer 1855:165-6)

The commoners followed their chiefs as they had always done, for fear of immediate punishment and divine retribution.

For their own interest the priests, in particular, were anxious to keep the commoners' fear alive. Although the priestly class in Tonga did not have the same socio-political importance which the members of their order enjoyed in some other places in the Pacific, they were still treated by the Tongan people with considerable respect and fear. The veneration offered to a priest depended upon the rank of the god who inspired him. Although the power of the priests was second only to that of the chiefs, it was more religious in nature. Their power to curse (*talatuki*) was revered by all (West 1865:257). They were always consulted as to the will of the gods with regard to sickness, natural disaster, voyages, war and so on, and a very high fee was charged for the consultation (Watkin, Journal, 7 Feb. 1834).

It was obvious from the beginning that the intrusion of Christianity, with its strange and more sophisticated order of priesthood, meant the decline and in due course the disappearance of the traditional priesthood, together with all the power, honour and privileges its members had enjoyed for centuries. This was a significant loss and, as might be expected, the members of the old order were prepared to fight to retain their position.

Describing the state of affairs in his station Thomas (1879:57) wrote:

The priest and priestess now seeing that . . . the Tonga worship was being brought into great discredit, they gave utterances—while inspired by the gods, which roused some of the chiefs, who favoured them, to use means to put a stop to these disorderly proceedings. Some common persons, who had been bold enough to slight, or cast away the Tonga gods were beaten—and others were threatened—and all were termed foolish who had taken up at once with this new thing, which the *papalangi*—foreigners had brought.

After the death of a man at Hihifo, old Fai'ana, the priestess, told the people that she had a dream in which the deceased had told her that the missionaries had informed him that if he joined the *lotu* he would not die, intimating that the missionaries had lied (Thomas, Journal, 30 Jan. 1829). Again, after a severe storm one priest told the people that Pulu Kātoa (one of the most

revered gods) had been 'tired with the tardy movements of his faithful worshippers, the Tonguese heathens, in reference to making war upon the Christians [had] at length taken the matter into his own hands and his weapons of war [were] to be drought and storms . . . ' (Watkin, Journal, 21 Dec. 1826).

However, it is quite evident that the opposition raised by the priests was not in any way comparable with that offered by the chiefs. The honour and privileges that the priests had enjoyed in the old order were nothing compared with those which the chiefs, for instance, had enjoyed. But the fact that they threw their weight behind the opposition of the chiefs was quite significant.

It was the chiefs who had most to lose from the encroaching influence of the missionaries. Here lay the basis for their antagonism, and, because they had traditionally held all power in their hands, their opposition was formidable and was clearly understood by the missionaries.

The missionaries' teaching that all men were equal in the sight of God, their belief that everyone was a sinner by nature and that in order to get to heaven everyone, irrespective of rank, had to submit to certain moral discipline, and their preaching that no one, chief or otherwise, had any right to appropriate to himself any property belonging to another, were particularly unpopular with the chiefs, since these doctrines tended to undermine their status, privileges and authority. Since almost every heathen custom, which the missionaries regarded as contrary to Christianity and civilisation and were determined to eradicate, played some part in upholding the dignity and privileges of the chiefs, it was inevitable that the majority of the chiefs should clash with the missionaries over the maintenance of these traditional customs.

The missionaries, for one reason or another, appeared to have lacked the ability to differentiate between those customs which were incompatible with Christian principles and those which were contrary only to their own British middle-class moral standards. For this reason they failed to appreciate the psychological and social significance of some of the old customs and traditions to the Tongans themselves. An example may be seen in the perpetual conflict between the missionaries and the chiefs over the question of *tukufo*. This custom was performed at the funeral of any

member of a chiefly family. On such an occasion the people under the rule of the chief concerned, his friends and relatives in particular, would bring gifts of *ngatu* (tapa cloth), mats of various kinds, and articles of food and drink to him.

From the commoners' point of view, this was an expression of their love and respect for the deceased, sympathy for the bereaved, and also a manifestation of their regard and loyalty to their leader. For the relatives it provided an opportunity for an extended family gathering, where they learned to know each other personally, and also their various responsibilities to each other. The warmth of filial devotion and the strength of family ties were further kindled and strengthened on such occasions. The bereaved chiefs themselves were comforted. They also appreciated the fact that the commoners' (or rather their subjects') sorrow and devotion were being expressed in a practical way.

The chiefs were often reminded on such occasions of their responsibilities to their people and this helped to maintain good relationships between them and their people, all of which furthered the maintenance of stability and order in the community. The missionaries did not seem to understand, let alone to appreciate, these implications. The fact that some of the *ngatu* and mats were used to wrap up the deceased for burial, and that the food presented was prepared to feed the people present, caused the missionaries to view the *tukufofo*, rather mistakenly, as an offering to the dead.

Tukufofo was also regarded as a means used by the chiefs to accumulate wealth at the expense of the commoners. 'I wish to see the *tukufofo*—quite put down—' wrote John Thomas, 'but this is the craft by which many Tonga chiefs have their wealth. They would be glad to keep it up' (Thomas, Journal, 24 Dec. 1826). It may be pointed out that the chiefs did not demand the *tukufofo*. It came from the people quite spontaneously and freely and from a sense of responsibility.

Another point of conflict between the chiefs and the missionaries was the chiefs' jealousy towards the rival for their authority. The priests of the old order exercised power over the people only during their brief periods of inspiration. For the most part they were, like the rest of the population, under the power of the

chiefs. The missionaries held a different view of their own power. They regarded themselves as heads of their respective stations. Therefore all their converts, chiefs and people alike, had to obey them—their pastors—in all matters connected with the mission (Thomas 1825-35:153). For this reason and also because they were always convinced that they had a superior background, the missionaries often condescended to and even despised the chiefs, who were naturally antagonised by such an attitude. Ata complained that Thomas had been trying to make himself chief over his (Ata's) own people (Thomas, Journal, 18 Oct. 1828).

There is little doubt that the combined opposition of the Tongans led by the traditional priests and some of the chiefs during the first few years of the work of the Wesleyan missionaries in Tonga contributed significantly to the failures of Lawry at Mu'a in 1822-3 and of Thomas and Hutchinson at Hihifo in 1826-9.

The missionaries' frustration was further aggravated by the strong opposition to their work from their own fellow-countrymen—beachcombers, whalers and traders who were also important mediators of change in Tonga. The arrival of the First Fleet at Port Jackson on 26 January 1788, and the subsequent establishment of the first European settlement in the Pacific, had far-reaching consequences for the whole South Seas region. The impact of this penal settlement was soon felt in Tonga. Whether this was on account of Cook's reports concerning the friendly nature of the inhabitants of Tonga, or because Governor Phillip had been instructed to obtain women from the Friendly Islands as wives for convicts (Clark 1958:36), or for some other reasons, there were soon escaped convicts who found their way to Tonga and settled among the Tongans.

Ships from various European nations and the United States of America frequented the South Seas, attracted by the opportunities for trade in such diverse items as sandalwood, pork, bêche-de-mer, turtle shell, coconut oil and also by whaling. Others brought scientific expeditions for the exploration of the newly discovered islands. Many of these vessels visited Tonga and some were captured and their crews massacred (see Dillon 1829, I:274). Some mariners survived and, like the escaped convicts, remained

in the islands of Tonga. Ships' deserters as well as sailors abandoned on account of illness or misadventure also made their homes among the Tongans.

These men had in common the fact that none of them sought to interfere with the way of life of the inhabitants of Tonga (see H. E. Maude 1964:293). They were quite content to live among the Tongans and to accept their way of life. They had good reason to feel contented, for many of them were devoid of any social standing in their homeland. In Tonga, on the other hand, they lived among the chiefs, some of them being accepted as close friends and advisers, particularly in time of war, and they were accorded all the honours and respect normally shown to the nobility.

Most of these men possessed special skills, such as the working of metals, which were of great value to the chiefs, since iron tools were highly prized by the Tongans. Captain Peter Dillon, in 1827, found an American living with a chief in 'Eua. Dillon was told by him that he had been employed in repairing firearms, fish hooks and the like, and that he was kept amply supplied with produce of the country and was highly esteemed by the natives. The chief had shown him great kindness and had honoured him with his daughter for a wife (Dillon 1829, I:262-3).

Europeans were regarded as extremely valuable additions to a chief's household, and their mere presence became a source of social prestige. Consequently, they were keenly sought after and, at times, there were disastrous consequences, as can be seen in the following incident as told to Peter Dillon by John Singleton, one of the survivors of the *Port-au-Prince*:

the chiefs of these islands [he said] pride themselves much on having Europeans resident among them; a feeling that gave rise to the following unfortunate affray:— The morning on which the ship [*Astrolabe*] was about to sail, two of the crew, unperceived by the sentinels, had leaped from the side into a large canoe, where they were concealed by the natives. The canoe immediately pulled for the shore, and shortly after a boat, with eight or ten men and an officer, put off for Pangimodoo to procure sand; but the canoe reached the shore first. The chief of this canoe having acquainted those on shore that he had two Europeans with him, the other chiefs became jealous, and said, 'we must have some white men to live with us as well as you.'

The ship's boat had by this time reached the land, and the men on board being unarmed, were seized by the natives and taken on shore. (Dillon 1829, I:267)

Had Captain Dumont d'Urville been aware of the real reason for this seizure of his men, he might have been more lenient in his handling of this unfortunate affair. As it happened, two armed boats were sent from the ship to search for the men. The search party burnt down several houses and wounded two Tongans, who later died, and one of their men was killed, without finding any trace of the two men. Finally, the captain decided to keep the village of Ma'ofanga under fire for two days, with the result that, on the third day, the men re-embarked without having received any injury.

On the whole, relations between the beachcombers and the Tongans were harmonious and they lived quite amicably together before the arrival of the missionaries. The beachcombers helped to explain to the Tongans the various aspects of the white man's culture—his customs, economic system, technology, literacy and even religion (H. E. Maude 1968:163). Some were instrumental in paving the way for the work of the missionaries, and others helped the missionaries in their work. Lawry used Singleton of the *Port-au-Prince* as an interpreter. Before Thomas and Hutchinson arrived in 1826, Lolohea, one of the first converts in Tonga, and his brother who lived in Vava'u at the time 'were impressed by a few words about Jehovah, spoken to them by a sailor who lived in that island' (Farmer 1855:179). King George persuaded a sailor who lived under his protection in Ha'apai to show him and his people how to write and conduct prayers to the Christian God, and in 1827 'Ulukālala Tuapasi of Vava'u persuaded a sailor to write a letter for him to the missionaries in Tongatapu asking for a missionary of his own (Turner 1872:102-3).

The arrival and continued presence of the missionaries in Tonga was not, however, welcomed by many of these men. They feared that the missionaries would expose them to their chiefly hosts and thereby undermine their prestige and newly found privileges, and destroy the Polynesian way of life which they favoured and wanted to preserve. Consequently, some made every

effort to make life unpleasant for the missionaries. Nathaniel Turner wrote:

Today we have heard more serious reports concerning the intentions of our Enemies. They now say that they cannot hurt Tubo [King Siosaia Aleamotu'a] but they will put a stop to the Lotu by putting an end to us . . . Report says that two Frenchmen are at the bottom of this. These men are runaways from a French Discovery ship that was here some time ago. They are now residing with a powerful chief in the interior. They endeavour to persuade this chief and others with whom they have acquaintance that if they suffer us to remain and our religion is spread, by and by the English will come and take their country from them. (Turner to Committee, 4 Jan. 1828, WMMS 1818-36, item A2833)

John Thomas told of an Englishman by the name of James who had since been captured in Tonga by the captain of a British man-of-war for his part in stealing a vessel at Van Diemen's Land. According to Thomas, James, while in Ha'apai, planned to kill him and Tāufa'āhau, 'and the reason he assigned for so strange a conduct', wrote Thomas, 'was because I knew of his crime, he having confessed it to two Englishmen who made it their business to inform me of it' (Thomas, Journal, 29 April 1831). Woon, a later missionary, complaining about the conduct of these men, wrote, 'We have been much tried of late from the wicked conduct of some of our countrymen, who seem to defy the laws of God . . . Some have been so wicked as to say, that our religion is a lie' (Woon to Committee, 19 Jan. 1833, WMMS 1818-36, item A2838).

Although the escaped convicts, ships' deserters and castaways do not appear to have made any direct contribution to political development, their presence among the Tongans and their work in making and repairing tools for them, explaining the European culture, and advising them in warfare, stimulated the general desire for change. Their negative reactions to the missionaries, however, and to the emerging monarchical authority, and rule of law, which the latter had encouraged and assisted, met with disfavour from the British officials and, in some instances, they were deported. Indirectly, the prestige of the missionaries was enhanced as these men were discredited and their reputation among the Tongans badly damaged.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century and early in the nineteenth century the discovery of rich new whaling grounds in the western and central Pacific brought many whalers to the area. Tonga received its share of these visits and the whalers engaged in trade, exchanging beads, cloth, iron tools and muskets for fresh provisions of fruit, vegetables, pork, coconut oil and other native produce. The missionaries felt rather uneasy about the presence of the whalers. Nathaniel Turner wrote:

Tonga is now becoming a place of resort for shipping, especially whalers, and we may expect it will be much more so. This may in some respect be attended with advantages; but we have already cause to fear it will materially militate against our cause. (Turner to Committee, 24 April 1830, WMMS 1818-36, item A2836)

Later it became increasingly clear that the uneasiness of the missionaries mainly rested upon their fears that the whalers called at the islands not merely in search of provisions, but also to win the favours of the Tongan women. Yet in this respect the teachings of the missionaries had been readily accepted. Peter Turner reported that the captain and the supercargo of a vessel which left Tonga three days previously had done 'all they could to induce some of the females to go on board but all their efforts were futile' (P. Turner, Journal, 28 April 1832).

The whalers, for their part, felt antipathy towards the missionaries on account of this and tried to seize every opportunity to discredit them and undermine their work. They gained sufficient influence to delay the conversion of some of the remote islands of the group (Amos to Committee, 11 Sept. 1857, WMMSA 1852-79, item 170).

The attention of traders to Tonga was first aroused by Captain Cook's praise for the Tongans for their keen interest in trade. He claimed that 'Perhaps, no nation in the world traffic with more honesty and less distrust' (Cook and King 1784:384). Many years later, Peter Dillon (1829, I:277) added to this view when he wrote:

I may safely say that Tonga is the best island in the South Seas for ships to recruit their supplies at, provisions there are in such plenty.

These glowing reports soon made Tonga a popular port of call for shipping. Traders of all kinds called for provisions, both before and after the establishment of the Wesleyan mission.

In general, the traders and missionaries did not get on well, but there were a few traders who were convinced that the work of the missionaries was definitely advantageous to trade and commerce. Many of these were sons of missionaries who had been born or brought up in the islands. These men maintained good relations with both the missionaries and native leaders, particularly those who had accepted Christianity through the work of the Protestant missionaries, and mutual respect, friendship and help prevailed among them. They did their utmost to assist the work of missionaries, who naturally reciprocated.

Samuel Pinder Henry, a trader son of a missionary in Tahiti, was friendly with the Tu'i Kanokupolu Siosaia Aleamotu'a of Tonga. Arrangements were made with Aleamotu'a to obtain some Tongans to accompany Henry to the New Hebrides to cut sandalwood. Sickness prevented Henry from joining his vessel which called for the men. Unknown to him, his crew had brought some prostitutes in the ship from New Zealand. When the King, who had already become a convert, found this out, he decided to prevent the Tongans from boarding the vessel. However, Nathaniel Turner, who was acquainted with Henry and knew of his reputation for assisting missionaries throughout the islands, persuaded Aleamotu'a not to break his promise and thereby penalise Henry for the misconduct of his crew. He pleaded that it would have been a different matter if Henry himself had been aboard the vessel. The King was eventually persuaded to drop his objections and the Tongans were permitted to join the ship (N. Turner to Committee, 15 May 1829, WMMS 1818-36, item A2835).

Such dissensions as did take place between some of the traders and the missionaries may be attributed to a number of factors. Certain missionaries were worried about the effects of trade upon their converts:

The influence of trade is a source of serious apprehension to us. The people have a strong desire for our style of dress. Showy and expensive dress 'fakapapalagi' is the height of their highest aspirations. This is attended with many evils—the more they expend in dress the less

they have to give to God—this is one evil—the more their mind is engrossed in the idea of dress (fakasanisani) beautiful, the less it contemplates God and things divine. (Whewell to General Secretary, Aug. 1856, WMMSA 1852-79, item 170)

The traders were resentful of the fact that the missionaries were chiefly responsible for the growing sophistication of the people in the art of trade. In the early days they were able to fill their ships with provisions in exchange for a few guns, beads, nails, pieces of hoop iron and cheap calico and printed cloth. After the establishment of the mission and the introduction of schools, the people were taught the value of money and of articles of trade among the civilised countries. They soon refused to trade for cheaper goods and wanted either payment in money or more valuable articles. Peter Turner recorded on his way to Tonga by ship in 1831:

Many on board think with ungodly captains that missionaries do more hurt than good among heathens, because they cannot do with them as they did while their minds were held in darkness and error. They cannot now buy a fine hog for a large nail, or a piece of hoop iron. (P. Turner, Journal, 23 Feb. 1831)

Among the severest critics of the missionaries was the trader, Peter Dillon, and, in defending the mission against his accusations, the Reverend David Cargill (1842:29-30) wrote:

We are informed, (page 3,) that, in 1827, the Chevalier [Dillon] 'procured an abundant supply of hogs, poultry, etc., for a few glass beads,' and that 'on his last visit it was with the greatest difficulty he could procure sufficient for his own mess, for which he had to pay dollars.' For once, I believe, the truth of any of the statements in the work which I have been examining. In 1827 the people were ignorant and poor, and would exchange their commodities for almost any article of European manufacture. In 1837 they valued 'a few glass beads' no more than their disappointed and chagrined visitor valued such trifles.

Another source of conflict was over the question of the sale of liquor in Tonga. Selling 'grog' was a source of handsome profit for the traders. The missionaries, however, objected strongly to this form of trade. They were convinced that it was harmful to the people and would ruin their efforts. A later missionary wrote:

Some traders not satisfied with 2 or 3 hundred percent on their goods and the difference in the value of oil (here £12—in Sydney £30 or more) have introduced ardent spirits as article of trade. We expect commerce will follow in the wake of Christianity, but when it attempts to unchristianize an infant Christian people we deplore it. (Whewell to General Secretary, Aug. 1856, WMSA 1852-79, item 170)

Another major source of discord between the traders and the missionaries was over the question of women. John Thomas (Journal, 19 Mar. 1831) recorded the following episode:

The captain that was here last has left an ill savour behind him . . . He tried several persons in order to get a woman for his base purposes, but I am happy to know that he did not succeed. One chief viz Tuihaatuho told him he could not let him have one and when he (the Cap.) applied to Taufaahau he told him he could not do it, that he feared Jehovah and also he met in Society and wished to do as I taught him. These things would have a very bad tendency upon the infant cause here.

Another example of the clashes over women was reported by Rabone (Journal, 2 Aug. 1836) who commented upon certain incidents in his journal which 'made us ashamed of the name of Englishmen'. It appears that a Captain Brind of the trading vessel *Tower Castle* called at the island of Rotuma and, as several Rotumans wished to go to Tonga, he offered to take them. On leaving the island he took one female as his mistress, but after being at sea four days, in a fit of drunkenness he threw her overboard. His crew rescued the woman, without his knowledge, and stowed her away. Meanwhile he had taken another female, a young virgin, who was on her way to Tonga to marry a young chief. These actions grieved both the Rotumans and the Tongans very deeply. On a later voyage, he returned to Tonga and invited some Tongans and Rotumans on board, among whom was the young chief, who objected to his wife going. A fight broke out between one of Brind's men and the chief in which the young chief was killed. When this became known to the Tongans, a few hours later, they took the murderer and killed him.

The missionaries believed that the conduct of these captains was responsible for some of the 'evil doings' of the natives, of which they later complained when they returned to their home ports (P. Turner 1831-38:75).

For a variety of reasons the non-missionary Europeans who found their way to Tonga before and immediately after the establishment of the Methodist mission in the group viewed the missionaries and their work as a threat to their own interests. Hence the bitterness of their opposition to the work of the missionaries. Although they failed to destroy the influence of the missionaries as some of them determined to do, their opposition caused the missionaries anguish and frustration.

In actual fact the missionaries were responsible for some of the causes of the frustration they had to face. This was mainly due to personality problems, inadequate preparations for their task, and an unfortunate lack of imagination and tact. They were quite certain of the superiority of their culture, the infallibility of their cause, and the absolute peril of the heathen. Convinced of their being called by God to save the lost, they saw as their mission the conversion of the Tongans at all cost if necessary, even if it entailed martyrdom on the one hand and a complete destruction of the traditional culture on the other. They identified Christianity with their own middle-class moral values at home and regarded any deviations from them as heathen and therefore un-Christian and something that should be eradicated. Lawry's view of the moral deprivation of the Tongans was shared by his successors. He wrote:

The navigators first visited their islands, and the castaway mariners who have resided among them for several years, have attempted to wash these Ethiops white, by representing their morals as equal, if not superior, to those of any civilized nation; the fact however, is they follow their natural inclinations, and are earthly, sensual, devilish . . . Their whole lives are a scene of corruption. (Farmer 1855:159-60)

The traditional way of life in Tonga was then viewed as a means used by the devil to destroy the souls of the Tongans and to obstruct the cause of the Almighty, and since the missionaries believed that they were recruited to carry out Jehovah's war against the devil, they could make no compromise. This attitude of mind helped to explain their intolerance of many of the traditional practices of the Tongans and their consequential and almost fanatical determination to stamp out heathenism in all its forms. A later missionary wrote:

The character of the Tongan mind is such, that there must be a complete separation from, and abandonment of everything approaching the spirit of heathenism, customs innocent in themselves, lead to heart-burnings and wickedness . . . our experience is, that not only heathenism in its darkest character must be destroyed, but that our members must come out from its very spirit, and touch it not even in its mildest forms . . . A very superficial acquaintance with the Tongan character, is sufficient to convince any man, that that which appears innocent in itself, is often a fruitful source of crimes in the islands. (Minns to the Committee, 4 Nov. 1870, WMMSA 1852-79, item 170)

The kind of attitudes which the missionaries exhibited in Tonga reflected their own social and religious background. Writing for *Blackwood's Magazine* in 1890, the Reverend Coutts Trotter described the Wesleyan Methodist missionaries in Tonga as 'Men often of narrow culture and lacking in imagination' (Trotter 1890:142). This situation was not surprising since the majority of the parent body from which the Wesleyan missionaries were selected came from the lower middle and working classes of the British Isles. In a recent study of the politics of English dissent, R. G. Cowherd (1956:15) points out that 'More than other Dissenting denominations, the Methodists recruited their ministers and members from the lower classes'. These Methodists had certain attitudes towards the social life of their day. According to one authority:

Methodists defined rigidly the things that belonged to the world and the things that belonged to God. They felt they had been called out of an evil world into the new life of the spirit. The services on the Sunday and the class meetings in the week occupied their leisure hours. They looked with suspicion on all amusements and recreations. (Edwards 1948:127).

The theatre was regarded as a menace and a danger to morality. John Wesley called it 'the sink of all profaneness and debauchery' (*Works*, VII:34). His followers shared this view. In 1808, the *Edinburgh Review* censured the Methodists for their opposition to the theatre and to other amusements (Edwards 1948:127), and in 1818 another reviewer reported that when two theatres, Covent Garden and Drury Lane, were destroyed, many Methodists openly rejoiced and made it an occasion of thanksgiving (*Quarterly Review*, Nov. 1810, IV:491).

Concerning literature, the Methodists were only prepared to accept a very narrow and restricted range, most of which was produced by the Society itself. The *Methodist Magazine*, the only periodical produced by the Society for many years from Wesley's time, was occupied almost exclusively with sermons, articles on matters of faith, and letters and memoirs of devout Methodists. After the death of Wesley, the Methodist Book Room published almost entirely religious works or works connected with religion. Most Methodist authors in the early nineteenth century devoted themselves either to publishing sermons or to writing memoirs. A few, such as Coke, Clarke, Benson and Sutcliffe, published commentaries on the Bible or wrote philosophical treatises. These, together with religious pamphlets, were regularly read.

Dancing, snuff-taking and smoking were denounced by the Conference, and Wesley claimed that dancing made debauchery easy and might lead young women to numberless evils (*Works*, XII:39).

The Methodist leaders were particularly severe in their denunciation of spirituous liquors, except for medical purposes. Wesley strongly condemned the sale of spirits, and was deeply concerned with the ravages of gin and rum drinking on the nation. He demanded that distillation should be abolished, arguing that food was dear because of the immense quantity of corn consumed in distilling. He argued that spirituous liquors were deadly poison and that they destroyed not only the strength but the morals of those who consumed them. He therefore directed that Methodists undertake to taste no spirituous liquors unless prescribed by a physician. Those that followed him after his death maintained this attitude, and some went further and refused to drink wine, beer or even tea!

Gambling of any sort was bitterly opposed, on the grounds that it fostered covetousness, making men deprive their wives and families of money needed at home. Sports were frowned upon, for they were viewed as a waste of time which might have been spent in honest labour. They were also regarded as instruments used by the devil 'to fill the mind with earthly, sensual and devilish passions', making one 'a lover of pleasure more than a lover of God' (Wesley, *Sermons*, II:955-6).

The Methodists also followed Wesley's example in urging that Sunday be kept sacred. On this issue they joined that section of the English Dissent which held strong Sabbatarian views. The *Quarterly Review* (November 1810) complained that Methodists would not allow workers to work on a Sunday.

These attitudes were part and parcel of the lives of the missionaries. They believed them to point the way to the only way of life that true Christians should live, and that their converts in Tonga should follow them.

The narrowness of outlook and lack of imagination among some of the early missionaries were also caused by their lack of formal education and proper training for their task. The majority of them received only a very meagre formal education of the kind available to their social and economic classes at home at that time.⁴ The Reverend John Thomas, for example, was a village blacksmith in Worcestershire. According to the Society's historians, 'His upbringing was rustic, his education of the slenderest; he was taken straight from the village forge to be a Missionary at the ends of the earth' (Findlay and Holdsworth 1921:278). This was typical of many of the missionaries, most of whom received their only formal education from the Methodist Sunday School, where pupils were instructed in reading, spelling and writing. The Reverend Peter Turner began work at the age of seven or eight, when his father, a cotton spinner in Manchester, took him to help as a piecer at the local mill. He received his only formal education at a local Sunday School (P. Turner, *A brief account of myself*, I).

Thomas himself admitted a sense of insufficiency. He wrote:

What a raw, weak, uncultivated wretch was I when I left old England! And though I have, by study, sorrow, and deep distress, learned something, yet even now how little I know that I ought to know, and must know before I can be deserving of the name of a Preacher of the Gospel, much less of a Methodist Missionary! . . . It is a subject which very much humbles me when I see that through my inability . . . the salvation of souls is possibly delayed. O Lord, do Thou have mercy on me, and on these people! May they not perish through my weakness. (Findlay and Holdsworth 1921:282)

⁴ For detailed discussion of the education of the missionaries, see Gunson 1959:12.

This lack of proper training and adequate preparation was a great handicap to Thomas and Hutchinson, as it was to their predecessor, Lawry. Their inability to understand the Tongan language caused much frustration in their relationship with the people.

Their lack of elementary or basic medical skills was also detrimental to their work. One of Ata's sons, Mataele, took ill. His relatives took him to the god called Lātūfakahau, who was once a great chief in Tonga. Thomas went to Ata and told him and his people that they were foolish in doing so. He managed to persuade them to bring Mataele to his place. He bled him and gave him a little medicine but Mataele grew worse, so Mataele turned to the heathen gods and his relatives took him to another god's house. After a few days Thomas called to see Mataele and found him much better, and he thought it likely that Mataele would recover. Although he was happy for Mataele to recover he had reasons to be greatly concerned. Ata had stated that should his son Mataele die, this would furnish proof that the Tongan gods were a lie, and he would *lotu*, but should his son recover he would maintain faith in the old gods (Thomas, Journal, 8 June 1829).

Mataele recovered, and Ata took this as proof that the gods of his fathers were true after all. From that time on, nothing could shake his faith in the Tongan gods. He bluntly refused to have anything to do with the new god of the white missionary and did everything he could to prevent his people from joining the new religion, the god of which, according to his judgment, had been proved false. In deep distress, John Thomas (Journal, 31 Jan. 1829) wrote:

If we could cure the bodies of the people of their various diseases, it would be a great recommendation for us to the attention of the people . . . but we have neither skill nor means for this, and therefore in most cases, cannot undertake anything of the kind, lest we should do harm to the cause of Christ, by raising the expectation of the people, when we cannot satisfy them. We are obliged to therefore tell them that we did not come to cure their bodies but their souls, and our God saves not from pain and bodily afflictions but sin and hell, but as this latter subject is new to them and most of them care nothing about it, but wish to be made well here, they

are prevailed upon to cling to their own Otuas (gods) and follow the Tongan ways.

In spite of working together in brotherly love in an all-out effort to remedy some of these deficiencies, Thomas and Hutchinson wasted much valuable time and energy in petty quarrelling, and writing lengthy letters to the authorities and friends accusing each other of improper conducts, disloyalty and lack of respect. The situation was aggravated by the failure of Hutchinson's health, which may have been partly caused by this unhappy personal relationship between the two families. Blinded by their hatred of each other the two missionaries made no effort to keep this unfortunate situation to themselves. Each tried to win the support of the chiefs by exposing the weaknesses and failures of the other. In so doing Thomas and Hutchinson unwittingly stripped themselves of much of the respect that Ata and many of his fellow chiefs at Hihifo might have had for them.

Not only did Thomas lack imagination, but, being young and inexperienced, he lacked tact. Had he been able to win Ata for the mission the whole of Hihifo would have turned with him to Christianity, as happened in other places where the chiefs were later won to Christianity. It would also have had significant impact on other chiefs in Tongatapu. Thomas himself wrote from Hihifo, 'I am perfectly satisfied that, as it respects the inhabitants generally, they are ready to receive our instruction; and if the Chief [Ata] were favourable, hundreds would sit at the feet of the messenger of the living God' (*W-M Mag.*, Sept. 1829:631). Ata's brother, Tōfua, told John Thomas that if Ata were to turn Christian, he would turn too. Tu'ivakanō, the chief of Nukunuku, said to Thomas that he would *lotu* if Ata *lotued*. Tāufa, chief of Pea, said the same:

He [Taufa] frankly told me his mind, [reported John Thomas] he asked if Ata our chief prayed to God. I told him no, he said when he turned him [sic] and his people should turn also, that Ata was older than him, and was his relation. . . . (Thomas, Journal, 12 June 1829)

Thomas was not unaware of the importance of winning Ata to the mission. However, he appeared to be so arrogant and tactless in his dealings with the people, including the chiefs, that he

inevitably antagonised many of them, and Ata in particular. One day Ata (who knew Thomas was a blacksmith by trade) sent a man with an axe to ask Thomas to sharpen it for him. Thomas sent the man back to Ata with the axe immediately with a message to say that he did not come to Tonga to sharpen axes. Ata on several occasions complained that Thomas tried to be chief among his people and Thomas, for some reason or other, kept telling the people that he was not afraid of Ata.

The last straw came when Ata's wife, Papa, took some friends on tour of Thomas's new house which was a novelty at the time. Being the wife of the chief of the area it was her prerogative to take her friends anywhere and to show them anything in the district. She did not have to consult anyone. For quite some time Thomas had built up a dislike for Papa whom he described as 'a very idle woman. She is either eating or drinking or lying about in different places or sleeping from morning to night' (Thomas, Journal, 24 July 1826). Thomas did not realise that, being a chiefly woman, Papa did not have to do any work. It was beneath the dignity of her office to work. Everything was done for her. However, in this case Thomas's patience ran out, and he decided to reprimand Papa in front of her guests for bringing people into his house without his permission. To the Hihifo people this was sacrilege and, in fact, Thomas was lucky not to have been clubbed to death on the spot. Ata reacted strongly to this humiliating treatment of his wife. He forbade any of his people to attend the school or worship, and bluntly told Thomas he could leave Hihifo and go to another place if he wanted to. With fierce indignation Thomas (Journal, 18 April 1829) wrote:

It is grief to me that the people are not allowed to attend. I cry to God for them that He would bend or breake the stubborn neck of our chief who seems to hinder the people here.

An understanding of the Tongan customs and traditions would have given Thomas and his colleagues some measure of the patience and tolerance which they needed for the success of their work, but they did not have this. Worse still there was little desire to make any sincere effort to understand the culture of the people since it was regarded as heathen, therefore unChristian and to be

destroyed. The half-hearted attempts to understand the customs of the people were more for personal security purposes than for their intrinsic or functional value to be exploited to the full for the purpose of winning the people to Christianity.

Like many other Tongan chiefs of his day, Ata wanted Europeans to live under him and to serve him but not as his masters or rival 'chiefs'. Hence his resentment of what he regarded as Thomas's attempts to make himself chief among his people. Again like many other Tongans, Ata and the people of Hihifo were more interested in the missionaries' trade goods than their teachings. Their hopes of gaining material goods were frustrated by the attitudes of the missionaries on these matters. The missionaries expected the Tongans to look after their material needs, since they had left their own homes to come to Tonga to save the Tongans from spiritual and intellectual degradation. This outlook of the missionaries led them at times to what the Tongans must have regarded as unfair bargaining and even meanness.

On the missionaries' request, Ata got his people to build a fence for them but when he 'was told what we should give [for the job] he would not look at the things, but went away . . .' Ata was greatly annoyed by the smallness of the payment. The missionaries used to buy six chickens for a plane iron, a pig for a hatchet (Thomas, *Journal*, 24 July 1826), or 180 lb. of yams or more for a shilling. Apparently some of the chiefs resented this so much that the people were forbidden to bring anything to sell to Thomas. Thomas explained the reason for the veto: 'this is through Tofooa the Chief's brother . . . He is displeased with us, and says we wanted to buy a large quantity of yams for a spade' (Thomas, *Calendar and Diary*, 4 May 1827).

Failing to get the material rewards they had expected from the missionaries, the people, with the full knowledge of many of the chiefs and probably their blessings, reverted to robbing the missionaries of their goods, threatening to burn down the mission premises and even to kill them. The situation had become so frustrating that Thomas was forced to arm himself day and night. He wrote:

This last few nights we have had to keep a sharp look out on our premises. I have kept a gun loaded and have walked about with a

sword in my hand and slept with it by my side. . . . (Thomas, Journal, 21 August 1826)

The missionaries were so disappointed by Ata's hardened attitudes to Thomas's work at Hihifo that Nathaniel Turner and John Thomas finally decided to interview Ata in July 1829 regarding the future of the mission work there, which had now been going for three years. Turner spoke to Ata about the purpose of their visit. He told Ata about Thomas's disappointment at not being able to carry out the work which God had sent him to Tonga to do, because Ata would not allow the people to come to school or to attend worship. He told Ata that unless he lifted his ban on the people attending the mission Thomas had to go to some other place where he would be at liberty to teach the people. He then asked Ata to tell them freely his mind on the matter. Turner recorded:

He listened to what was said very attentively, and commenced giving us his mind in a very firm, but not angry, manner. He observed, 'I have, and always have had, great love for Mr. Thomas, and should be glad for him to continue with me; but I will not attend to your religion. My mind is fixed. I have often told Mr. Thomas so, and I told you so when you were living here; and my mind is quite fixed. It is very good for you to attend to your God, and I will attend to mine; but I will not attend to yours. I am not angry with you or Mr. Thomas; but I will not turn for him, or any other, should another be sent from England. Mr. Thomas is quite at liberty to go to any other place where he thinks fit; and I shall not be angry' . . . We thanked him for the candid manner in which he told us his mind, and gave him to understand that Mr. Thomas would prepare for a removal immediately. (*W-M Mag.*, Oct. 1830:701-2)

Ata was a solid man, a great leader, and a true champion of the Tongan traditional ways of life. After weighing the pros and cons of the new religion, he unequivocally concluded that it was better for him to 'end in the way he was in, it being the way his friends were in before him'. He was certainly a man who would have been a gain to any party, but the Wesleyan mission missed out. Soon, however, Mr and Mrs Thomas moved to Nuku'alofa, and Ata himself took the missionaries to their destination in his own canoe. He died unconverted in 1833, four years before the mission at Hihifo was reopened in 1837.

3 *The Breakthrough*

The breakthrough in the work of the Wesleyan mission in Tonga was not an isolated dramatic occurrence but a slow process brought about by several factors. One was certainly the increasing impact of mission efforts on the minds of some Tongans. Before Lawry left Tonga in 1823 a number of Tongans had been attracted by his teaching. On the day of his departure many tears were shed and expressions of regret were voiced by a spokesman of the people who expressed the hope that he would return. One of those favourably disposed to Lawry's teaching was Tākai who came from 'Oneata in the Lau group of Fiji. On his return home, he told the chief of Lakemba, Tu'ineau, about the new religion and some of the things which Lawry had taught. Tu'ineau became interested and asked Tākai to try and get him a missionary. Tākai went back to Tonga, and he and another admirer of Lawry, named Langi, were taken to Sydney by Captain Peter Dillon in 1824 as his interpreters (Davidson 1970:16-17), though their intention was to search for a missionary for Tu'ineau. Dillon left them in Sydney where they were picked up by Samuel Henry, and taken to Tahiti. Impressed by their determination, one of the L.M.S. missionaries, J. Davis, sent two Tahitian teachers, Hape and Davida, with them for the Tu'i Lakemba. On their arrival in Tongatapu in 1826 Tākai told Aleamotu'a

that the Tahitians had found the true God and the word of life, and that the two Tahitians he saw were going with him to the Feegees to teach his countrymen the way to heaven. Tupou [Aleamotu'a] answered Takai and said. It must not be so. If the word he spoke of was really a good word it must not go (Williams and Barff, 1830:70)

Consequently the Tahitian teachers remained in Tonga at the hamlet of Nuku'alofa in order to teach Aleamotu'a and his people Christianity. Before the Wesleyan missionaries came to Nuku'alofa towards the end of 1827, a church had already been built

there by the Tahitian teachers and about 300 people from the area met regularly for worship. When Nathaniel Turner, Cross and Weiss decided to establish themselves at Nuku'alofa, they took over the little congregation, and it was here at Nuku'alofa that the Wesleyan mission began to flourish. Despite Ata's resistance at Hihifo certain chiefs of high rank from this area, such as Ulakai, son of Tuku'aho, joined the mission at Nuku'alofa.

Another important factor was the growing experience of the missionaries in dealing with the Tongans. This and the more tactful approach of some of the later missionaries contributed significantly to the breakthrough in the work of the mission. One of the outstanding personalities was the Reverend Nathaniel Turner. Unlike Lawry, Thomas and Hutchinson, Turner was a mature, well educated man with a progressive outlook. His experience with the Maoris of New Zealand, among whom he had worked for several years before he came to Tonga, seems to have given him many advantages. The experience helped him to develop a sympathetic understanding of the customs and traditions of the people, and gave him a crude familiarity with the fundamentals of the language, which enabled him to learn Tongan quickly and thoroughly. It was he who developed the Tongan alphabet which, with some modification by the present King of Tonga in the 1940s, is still being used in Tonga today.

Unlike Thomas, who did not hesitate to dictate to the Tongans, Nathaniel Turner was very cautious. When he was asked questions relative to politics, shortly after arrival, he answered that because he was a stranger to their country, and consequently to their ways, he would rather say nothing (N. Turner, Journal, 29 Nov. 1827, WMMS 1818-36, item A2833). Where there were disputes among the chiefs in connection with the affairs of the mission, Turner would sit down and discuss the questions at issue with them in a manner the chiefs could understand. Williams and Barff (1830:64), the two L.M.S. missionaries who visited Tonga in 1830, spoke very highly of the love and respect which the Tongans—both Christians and heathens—showed to Turner. He was reluctantly forced to leave Tonga in 1831, for a healthier climate. However, before his departure he had the satisfaction of seeing the new arrivals, Peter Turner (no relation), James

Watkin and the printer, William Woon, and his printing press, settling in to their various appointments, and above all he had the thrill of witnessing the breakthrough in the work of the mission. The official historians of the mission rightly point out that 'Nathaniel Turner's coming had changed the face of everything for the mission, and for the future of Tonga. He had snatched victory out of imminent defeat, . . .'. They continued, 'rarely has any man accomplished so much for a people in so short a time' (Findlay and Holdsworth 1921:266-7). Assisted by a very able colleague, the Reverend William Cross, his work soon showed very promising results. As early as November 1828, Turner reported that the chapel at Nuku'alofa had overflowed and many were outside for want of room.

Anxious to maintain the interest of their converts, and to prevent backsliding, Turner and Cross took measures to ensure that their new followers would retain their involvement. Accordingly, in addition to ordinary services, the converts were organised in classes, and class meetings became an integral part of the mission work. There were classes for those who had become church members, where individual members related their spiritual experiences. Here, under the leadership of a missionary or one of their more capable Tongan converts, the members strove to help each other with spiritual and moral admonitions. There were also classes organised for those who had embraced Christianity but not yet become church members. These were designed as a means whereby the new converts would be prepared for membership. After referring to the memorable day of the first baptism service held in Tonga, Turner (Journal, 4 Jan. 1829, WMMS 1818-36, item A2835) said of the candidates:

They have been under preparatory instruction for twelve weeks, and have given satisfactory evidence of work of God upon the minds—have chosen the new names for themselves. Mafileo—Noa; Takanoa—Moses; Lauola—Ilaia; Kavamoelolo—Banebasa; Vi—Bitā; Lavemai—Siosifa; Mo'ugaevalu—Ioane, John.

Nine months after this momentous occasion, Turner reported that the number that met in class was about 180. He went on to say:

Many of them evince a genuine work of God upon their minds. Their ardent desire for Instruction, their great progress in spiritual

knowledge, and their strict morality of conduct afford us the most satisfactory proof that they are indeed turned from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God. (N. Turner to Committee, 31 Oct. 1829, WMMS 1818-36, item A2835)

He also reported that there were about one hundred candidates who were under preparation for baptism.

In these classes, members were taught the basic Wesleyan doctrines, and to respect the authority of the Bible as the source of these doctrines. They were taught that there was only one God; His Son, Jesus Christ, was the Saviour; and the Holy Spirit the comforter. Man was a child of God. But the first parents were corrupted by the Devil, and being the offspring of the first parents everyone was a sinner. The only hope lay in the acceptance of Jesus Christ, the Saviour, through the work of the Holy Spirit. On the Judgment Day, those who had responded to the work of the Holy Spirit, had accepted Christianity and renounced heathenism, would go to Heaven where there would be everlasting peace and happiness, and those who had refused to do so would go to Hell, where they would be tortured with everlasting fire.

Although these concepts of God, Man and Morality were new to the Tongans, they were presented so simply by the missionaries that many Tongans did not find them incomprehensible. Trinity was viewed in the light of their traditional principal and secondary gods. The concept of future life was not new, only different. The new morality was not difficult to understand, the problems associated with it were practical and not theoretical. The effects of these teachings on the minds of the Tongans is clearly expressed in the following testimony given by one of the early converts:

I have been a very bad man, but I was ignorant. I knew nothing of Jehovah the great god, but since I have known him I have turned to him. He is my only King, my only God. I have no other. I shall soon die but I care nothing about my body . . . But my soul is what I think about, I am afraid of going to the great fire. I want to go to Heaven. (N. Turner, Journal, 17 Nov. 1828, WMMS 1818-36, item A2835)

Love feasts were also organised at which hymns were sung, prayers offered, and members of the congregation were encouraged to relate publicly their religious experiences. Turner recorded that

they had their first love feast after the afternoon service on 11 October 1829. One hundred and fifty members attended and 'those who spoke did so in a very pleasing and interesting manner indicating that the word and the spirit of the living God had been powerfully at work upon their minds' (N. Turner, Journal, 11 October 1829, WMMS 1818-36, item A2835). Sunday schools were started with the hope that they would be 'productive of much good' to the rising generation. Prayer meetings were organised and encouraged, and were conducted generally by Tongan exhorters and class leaders. Some of the Tongans conducted family prayer night and morning. Turner wrote how he heard Vi and Takanoa pray, and was both very pleased and edified by them, especially Takanoa. His prayer included 'the Creation, Fall and Redemption of man, and expressed in such a manner, as at once assured me that the understanding was clear respecting them, and the heart well affected with them'.

From the beginning, the translation of the Holy Bible into the Tongan language was regarded as a vitally important part of the work of the missionaries. As early as 1829, Turner wrote, 'I would just observe that if the conversion etc., of these islanders be our object, then we must have the Scriptures . . . brought into their language . . .' (N. Turner to Committee, 27 June 1829, WMMS 1818-36, item A2835). Four months later, he reported that he and his brethren had agreed to proceed in attempting a translation of some parts of the Scriptures. Each missionary was then allotted a portion of the Bible to translate.

The missionaries took with them to Tonga the attitudes of the parent Society at home towards education. The Society promoted elementary education among their followers with vigour and enthusiasm for it was necessary to be able to read and understand the Scriptures. Facilities for the formal training of Methodist ministers both for home and overseas missions were not forthcoming until the middle of the nineteenth century. As a result, many were thrust into the work of the ministry with very little or no training at all. However, many undoubtedly accepted and followed closely Wesley's advice when he said:

It is a shame for Christians not to improve on them, whatever he takes in hand. You should be continually learning from the experience

of others or from your own experience, reading and reflection to do everything today better than you did it yesterday . . . Make the best of all that is in your hands. (Wesley, *Sermons*, I:709)

With the help of Wesley's own works and directions to his 'helpers', many of the missionaries, like their colleagues at home, did their best to remedy the deficiencies of their education, and a number succeeded well. 'I and my colleagues', wrote one of the early pioneer missionaries in Tonga, 'have undertaken to do something in Latin-Greek-and Hebrew, Logic and Divinity every week' (P. Turner, *Journal*, 30 Nov. 1841). In addition to religious magazines and papers, some included on their reading lists works on politics, history (English, Greek, Roman), Pacific research, physics, astronomy, medicine and also biographical works (P. Turner, *Books read*: 12). Those who did not appear to make efforts at self-improvement were sharply rebuked.

The missionaries regarded the establishment of schools as a must, not only in order to enable their converts to read the Bible and to communicate with each other in writing, but also to help combat some of the superstitious beliefs of the people and facilitate the understanding of the new concepts they had to introduce. The first school to be established in Tonga was at Hihifo. It was opened by John Thomas and his wife, but it did not last long because of Ata's opposition. Before the mission at Hihifo was abandoned in 1829, several of the young men from there moved to Nuku'alofa in order to attend the school there.

It was at Nuku'alofa that schools really flourished under the leadership of Nathaniel Turner and William Cross. Their first school was opened on 17 March 1828 (Cross to Committee, 8 Sept. 1828, WMMS 1818-36, item A2834). In September of the same year attendance had risen to 150, Turner instructing the males and Cross the females. The main purpose of the schools was to teach both children and adults to read and write in the Tongan language. To begin with, the missionaries had to reduce the language into writing and then to write out everything they taught. Apparently some read as fast as the missionaries could produce these lessons for them. This was not surprising since many Tongans were eager to learn to read and write even before the arrival of the missionaries.

Commander J. M. Laws, of His Majesty's Sloop *Satellite*, described the situation as he saw it in 1829:

At Tongataboo I found the natives most amicably disposed and their intellectual superiority over those of the Society Islands is very remarkable, though they are seldom visited by Europeans . . . Most of the chiefs are young men who could make themselves understood in English, and when we asked them the names of the different islands, many of them would take a slate and write them down, some agreeing to a letter with Captain Cook's account, this they have learnt from the English missionaries, three of whom are settled here, and who to my astonishment, informed me they had begun to teach the natives writing only five months ago, and in that time they had completely exhausted their stock of Tonga literature, and were now learning English of their own. (Laws 1829)

Owing to the increased pressure on the missionaries' time and energy there was a real need for further teaching aids. Turner reported on 27 June 1829 that they were forwarding a work to the colony to be printed.¹ Meanwhile Cross prepared little books in the form of tracts. Children read them to their parents at home, and when some of the already literate people went to distant parts of the islands to visit their friends, they took great pleasure in taking their books to read to them, and some started to read and even write before they attended school. Thus the popularity of school work and the novelty of literacy spread.

The glamour of being able to read and write drew so many people to the schools—young and old alike—that the missionaries could not keep up with the demand. Turner wrote:

Never did I see and feel the importance of time so much as I do now, the wants of the people are great, and they are continually pressing upon us to furnish them with something to read. The ears of hundreds are opened to listen to the 'Word of the Book' but alas they have no book today—Oh! that we had but a press and some one that could manage it, then would these hungry souls soon feed as in green pasture. (N. Turner to Committee, 27 June 1829, WMMS 1818-36, item A2835)

¹ The work covered the alphabet and spelling lessons; first reading lessons; the history of Creation and the Fall and other Biblical topics; a catechism, Ten Commandments and twelve hymns (N. Turner to Committee, 27 June 1829, WMMS 1818-36, item A2835).

The rapidly increasing demand for books emphasised the need for a local press. This, together with many other growing demands of the mission was alleviated by the arrival of reinforcements in 1831. William Woon, the first printer in Tonga, set up his printing press on 4 April. The first book printed in Tonga was published on 14 April 1831. It was a school book containing four pages, and there were 3,000 copies printed (Woon to Committee, 25 April 1831, WMMS 1818-36, item A2837). Printing attracted great attention and people called from all parts of the island to witness the process. Woon claimed that, through the operations of the press, 'much light had been diffused, and the people were renouncing their superstitions, and turning to God with full purpose of heart' (*W-M Mag.*, March 1833:224).

In his memorable work, *The History of the London Missionary Society*, William Ellis put his finger on one of the very important factors which helped the work of the missionaries in the islands of the South Seas. He wrote:

It is generally and justly supposed that medical knowledge is one of the most valuable qualifications a missionary can possess; that its skilful and successful application is one of the best means of gaining influence among the people and predisposing them to regard with favour his endeavours to direct their minds to the heavenly Physician, and the means of healing and life to the soul. (Ellis 1844:59)

The contact with the Europeans introduced new diseases to the islands which the Tongans were unable to cure, and which subsequently claimed many lives. However, there were also diseases which had been with the Tongans before European contact, and which they had come to accept as a matter of course, knowing neither their causes nor any way of curing them. One of these diseases the Tongans called *tona* (yaws). Everyone was expected to suffer from it at one time or another, though it was preferable to get it at an early age. Peter Bays (1831:69) gave a graphic description of this disease in 1830 when he wrote:

In some cases which I saw, the sinews of the legs were drawn up, where the joints were affected; in others, two inches of bone were eaten entirely bare by the flies, hundreds of which were then feeding upon the corrupted flesh, while the *patient*, (a name so very appropriate in the present instance) who, either from superstition, or so callous

and accustomed to this plague, or pest of mankind, in these parts, either does not feel them, or is so unconcerned that he walks about as indifferent as though little or nothing ailed him.

Afflicted with their traditional ailments, as well as the newly introduced ones, and lacking knowledge of either their causes or cures, the Tongans attributed these misfortunes to the anger of the gods or the displeasure of the spirits of deceased kin. Accordingly, they believed that there was a direct connection between the efficacy of medicine and the power and truth of the god, whether the medicine was that provided by the missionary or by the heathen priest.

Fortunately for the cause of the mission, the missionaries at Nuku'alofa were more successful in combating disease than John Thomas had been at Hihifo. Nathaniel Turner wrote of their experience in this regard:

I must just observe in this place that our success in this respect has been the means of bringing many over to our cause from different parts of the Island. When a cure has been wrought, the individual has gone home to his friends, and they all beholding what has been done for him, the whole family, and, in some instances, families have come over to live at Nuku'alofa, and attend to religious instruction. (N. Turner to Committee, 6 May 1831, WMMS 1818-36, item A2832)

The importance of this aspect of the missionaries' work soon became apparent, and consequently dispensary hours had become part of their regular activities.

The missionaries' goods—articles of trade—were highly prized by the Tongan people, and these also helped to turn the interest of the people towards the missionaries and their work. 'If I had good trade', wrote John Thomas, 'it would not only be a saving of time, but tend to produce a good feeling upon the minds of the natives towards us and the good cause' (Thomas, *Journal*, 2 June 1826). Even John Thomas's dwelling house was something of great wonder to the people. It was the first European house built in Tonga, having two storeys with various apartments, with panel doors in front, and glass windows, and was something which they had never seen before. These things captured their imagination and became the chief topics of conversation not only

in Tongatapu but in the other islands as well. Many were initially attracted to the mission because they believed that through the mission they would get European goods.

The friendly relationship which existed between the missionaries and the captains of British men-of-war which occasionally visited the islands, and the respect the latter always displayed for the former, meant a lot to the missionaries and to their work. It enhanced their prestige in the eyes of the Tongans. It is easy to comprehend the reasoning of the unsophisticated mind, 'Surely', they would think to themselves, 'if the God of the white people could make these men-of-war and their guns and powder, it must be true that He is the only God.'

The commander of the H.M.S. *Seringapatam*, the Hon. William Waldegrave, removed five Europeans from Vava'u who had been troublesome to the work of the missionaries (*W-M Mag.*, 1831: 712), and later the British Consul in Samoa, George Pritchard, removed two Americans who had robbed the mission and made two others work on its behalf for ten weeks (*P. Turner, Journal*, 1 Nov. 1849).

While it was true that one of the main obstacles to the success of the mission was the objection of the chiefs, it is equally true to say that the breakthrough in the work of the missionaries was significantly due to the support given it by certain important chiefs in Tonga. Like the other chiefs during the initial period of European contact, they coveted European wealth, technological knowledge and power. However, the two groups differed significantly in their beliefs as to the best method of achieving their common ambitions.

The opponents of Christian mission on the one hand strongly believed that success would be achieved through the old gods and by means of the traditional religion. Significantly, most of these chiefs were more successful in the power-struggle which had been going on in the group at this time. They had no reason to doubt the validity of the old order, and they were eager to maintain the *status quo*. Others, on the other hand, became disillusioned by what they interpreted as the failure of their gods to achieve what they wanted, and they began to question the validity and effectiveness of the traditional religion. Some among them decided to

challenge some of the long-established traditions which hampered their ambitions. In doubting the old religion some began to believe, quite genuinely, that the only way to achieve their ambitions of acquiring the wealth, knowledge and power of the white man was to adopt his religion. They believed that the white man acquired all these from his superior and more powerful god.

It was initially for this reason that the Tu'i Kanokupolu family decided to accept and support the Wesleyan mission. Probably this was the most significant factor in the breakthrough which the mission enjoyed. As Ata's refusal to accept Christianity hampered the growth of the mission, its acceptance by Aleamotu'a and Tāufa'āhau (later to be known as King George) facilitated its breakthrough and accelerated its growth.

The original motive behind the conversion of these chiefs appears to have been political. After the death of Tupouto'a in 1820, a Tu'i Kanokupolu was not installed for almost eight years. The various sub-divisions of Tonga remained autonomous, each under its own paramount chief. In Tongatapu, the main island, power was at this time virtually in the hands of the Ha'a Havea. It was probably due to their powerful pressure that the 'electoral college' did not bother to appoint another Tu'i Kanokupolu for so long.

This state of affairs must have considerably influenced Aleamotu'a, his nephew, Ulakai, and the Tu'i Kanokupolu family in their decision to accept Christianity. The impotence of their own gods in the face of their present political plight no doubt predisposed them to accept more readily the idea of the Almighty Jehovah as the only true and omnipotent God, one who could offer them hope when their own traditional gods failed to do so. At this opportune time Tākai and Langi arrived at Nuku'alofa with the Tahitian teachers, Hape and Davida.

The Tahitian teachers knew neither Tongan nor English, but apparently old Aleamotu'a expressed a deep desire to learn the English language. For this reason he wanted to have European missionaries and he visited Hibifo several times for this purpose in 1826. In December, Thomas wrote, 'Toobo [Tupou Aleamotu'a] the chief of Noogaloff [Nuku'alofa] prefers English missionaries as he wants to learn the English language. He would be glad in

case Mr. Hutchinson leaves, for me to go to that place' (Thomas, *Journal*, 19 December 1826).

When Thomas decided to send Weiss back to Sydney for a bigger vessel so that they could all return to the colony in 1827, Aleamotu'a went to see him before the whaler left Tonga. He gave Weiss gifts and pleaded with him to ask his authorities to send him a missionary. It was not surprising then, when Weiss returned with Turner and Cross, that they decided to establish themselves at Nuku'alofa under Aleamotu'a.

Because of the strong opposition from the other chiefs, the Ha'a Havea members of the 'electoral college' in particular, Aleamotu'a ceased to attend worship and requested the missionaries not to conduct public worship in the chapel until his installation as Tu'i Kanokupolu was over. After his installation he rejoined the worshipping group. He was later baptised on 18 January 1830 as Siosaia (Josiah) Aleamotu'a by Nathaniel Turner.

Meanwhile, having accepted Christianity, Aleamotu'a sent one of his relatives, Tupoutoutai, to Fīnau 'Ulukālala, ruler of Vava'u, and his nephew, Ulakai, to Tāufa'āhau, ruler of Ha'apai to advise them, particularly Tāufa'āhau his grand-nephew, to become Christian. According to one account, the messengers 'explained that Tonga [Tongatapu] was ruled by the Ha'a Havea, and Ha'a Ngata . . . and the rest, and if they fight us on account of the Lotu, we will have the British to help us' (H. Moulton, *Notes on Tongan History*: 46b).

Whatever the true motives behind these conversions of the chiefs, clearly they had a significant influence in turning the people from heathenism to Christianity. Their own people turned with them. Those who resisted later turned, after the chiefs under whom they lived had been defeated by the Christians led by Tāufa'āhau.

If the missionaries needed the help of the chiefs to further their objectives, the chiefs of the Tu'i Kanokupolu family were equally in need of the missionaries at this time. Their mutual dependence on each other created a powerful union—a marriage of convenience—which determined the course of future political development in Tonga.

The decision of Tāufa'āhau to accept Christianity was the

greatest asset the missionaries gained in their struggle to establish Christianity in Tonga. Like several of his predecessors and contemporaries among the Tongan chiefs, Tāufa'āhau had become sceptical of the Tongan gods and the traditional religious practices. He had reason to doubt his family gods, for they had failed to come to his father's aid in his vain attempt to subdue the Ha'a Havea chiefs. Nor had they assisted him in his initial struggle against Laufilitonga at Velata. He had only been wounded once during his long career of fighting, and this occurred during the battle of Velata. In one of the skirmishes, Tāufa'āhau left his back to the protection of the gods and a chief named Faka'iloatonga speared him from behind. Though he was only slightly wounded on his left calf, the failure of the gods to protect him on this occasion only intensified his doubts. Increasing contact with Europeans and the superiority of their weapons also helped to undermine his beliefs in the traditional gods.

With the encouragement from his great-uncle Aleamotu'a he resolved to find out as much as he could about Christianity. After several trips to Tongatapu in 1827 and early in 1828, where he met the missionaries and some of his relatives, particularly his uncle, Ulakai, and great-uncle Aleamotu'a, who had adopted the new religion, he began to imitate some of the ways of the Christians. He also tried to make his people learn them. One of the early missionaries wrote:

from that time, he voluntarily abandoned various heathen amusements to which he had been addicted; and he began to observe, in some measure, the sanctity of the Sabbath day by ceasing from all his ordinary occupations. So anxious was he to make a beginning in the service of God, and to initiate the instruction of the people under him, after the example of the missionaries in Tongatabu, that he employed the services of a rough, ungodly sailor, then residing under his protection, to trace the letters of the alphabet upon the sands of the seashore, for the benefit of those who wished to learn; and he ordered the same man to conduct prayers to the God of the foreigners, in a house which he devoted to that purpose. (West 1865:357-8)

In October 1828, while in Tongatapu, on one of his trips, he told Nathaniel Turner about his desire to have a missionary sent to him at Ha'apai. Turner wrote that he was more encouraged

by Tāufa'āhau than by Fīnau 'Ulukālala Tuapasi of Vava'u, who had also spoken to Turner on the same subject (N. Turner to Committee, 27 Nov. 1828, WMMS 1818-36, item A2835). However, the missionaries had to be certain that Tāufa'āhau was not just interested in their trade goods, as were many of the other chiefs. Consequently, when Tāufa'āhau visited Tongatapu again in July 1829 in quest of a missionary, the Reverend John Thomas spoke to him freely on this matter. Tāufa'āhau replied that he did not want him for his property. He wanted only his person and he offered to clothe him and to build a house for him free of expense. He said he would build a chapel, and he and all his people would come to be taught by him, and if Thomas wished to go away he could take whatever he wanted. Thomas continued in his journal, 'From all I can see and hear respecting him he is a free honest open hearted man and that his request calls aloud' (Thomas, Journal, 8 July 1829).

The missionaries were not slow to recognise that the future of Tonga lay with Tāufa'āhau. Ata's consistent refusal to accept Christianity or allow his people to do so gave the missionaries the opportunity to comply with Tāufa'āhau's request. They decided to abandon the mission at Hihifo and sent Thomas to Tāufa'āhau in Ha'apai. However, because they had to get approval from the Committee in London for their decision, they resolved to send Pita Vī, one of the first to be baptised in Tonga, to teach Tāufa'āhau until Thomas himself was able to go.

Tāufa'āhau revisited Tongatapu in August and, when he was told of the missionaries' decision, he expressed deep disappointment that the missionaries saw fit to send him merely a Tongan teacher. He then refused to take Pita Vī with him to Ha'apai. On their way back he and his men ran into an exceptionally severe storm and with great difficulty they reached Ha'apai. Thinking that the storm was divine retribution for his refusal to take the teacher offered him by the missionaries, he presently returned to Tongatapu, apologised, and took Pita Vī with him.

With typical enthusiasm and determination, he applied himself to his new faith, attempting to further his knowledge of it as much as he could. Pita Vī reported that he led the way for his people in learning to read and write. Vī must have told him

stories from the Bible, including the stories of the Children of Israel and the Ten Commandments in particular.

As a man of action, Tāufa'āhau wanted to test the validity and power of the old gods and to discover by experience whether Jehovah was the only true God. He began by destroying a large canoe which had long been kept as sacred to their gods. Then one day he took Pita Vi and others with him to test the power of the god Haehaetahi. On their arrival at the house of the god's priestess, Tāufa'āhau asked her to let the god come so that they could have *kava* together.

Hereupon [narrated Pita Vi] the old priestess became inspired by Haehaetahi; and, in the meanwhile, Tāufa-ahau had prepared a great drinking-cup, . . . The cup was then filled and handed by Tāufa-ahau to the priestess; but, while her face was turned upwards, in the act of drinking off its contents, Tāufa-ahau struck her a great blow on the forehead, which sent the god (or priestess) rolling on the ground. He then gave her another blow, and, raising a shout of victory, cried out that the god was slain. (West 1865:364)

The chiefs of Ha'apai were already upset by Tāufa'āhau's commitment to the new religion, but after his treatment of Haehaetahi they were greatly alarmed. A plan was drawn up by their leaders, in which Tāufa'āhau was to be seized and bound, and the small band of followers of the new religion killed. Up to this time Tāufa'āhau had not yet joined the Christians in their religious meetings, but, on discovering the chiefs' plot, he decided to join them openly in their prayer meetings. Soon afterwards he and Vi went out to the bush and collected objects used for worship in the old religion, built a fire and burnt them all. Then they went to the sea. Tāufa'āhau swam out to the deep, calling the names of the gods, Haehaetahi (a shark), Tāufa'itahi, and others to come to him if they were really gods, but none came.

Tāufa'āhau did not confine his testing to the heathen gods alone. By way of testing the power of the Christian God, whilst on a canoe voyage, he cast his spear at a shark, which he suspected to be Haehaetahi, and, missing it, threw Pita Vi and another man overboard to fetch the spear and bring it to Hā'ano. He reasoned that if Jehovah were really God, he would save Pita Vi and his companion from the sharks. Fortunately for the mission,

Vī and his friend arrived safely on shore with the spear (Collocott n.d.:75).

Convinced by what he had learned and by the results of his tests that the Christian God was the only God, Tāufa'āhau became an ardent crusader for his new-found faith. He wasted no time in launching a full-scale campaign to eradicate heathenism in Ha'apai. He and his followers burned down god-houses and destroyed effigies on other islands, persuading and even forcing the people to give up their traditional beliefs and accept Christianity. When Thomas finally arrived in 1830, only three islands (Nomuka, Tungua and 'Uiha) out of the eighteen inhabited islands of the Ha'apai group had not yet accepted the *lotu* (Farmer 1855: 204-5).

Tāufa'āhau had at this time merely accepted the new God on the same terms as those on which he had accepted or served the traditional ones, and he had not fully grasped the meaning to Christians of such concepts as mercy and forbearance. He was the ruler of Ha'apai, desperately seeking what was best for himself and his people, and there was no other way to find this out than by applying drastic measures to prove whether his scepticism of the old gods was justified and his acceptance of the new faith was right. After becoming convinced himself, he went on to demonstrate to his people that infringements of the old religious taboos brought no penalties. His rank and position as ruler entitled him to do what he did. He was baptised on 7 August 1831, but before this he had chosen for himself the name King George. 'I would remark here', wrote Peter Turner (Journal, 13 June 1831), 'that the King of Haabai [Tāufa'āhau], tho' not yet baptized—was called King George—as he had chosen the name because of [sic] the late King of England was called George.'

In the same year he managed, with considerable difficulty, to persuade Fīnau 'Ulukālala Tuapasi, ruler of Vava'u, to become converted. Prior to this Fīnau had been bitter against the missionaries and the new religion, and had persecuted those who were sympathetic to Christianity, mainly because of the failure of the missionaries to comply with his request for a missionary. In response to Aleamotu'a's advice to accept Christianity in 1828 he had sent a letter to Nathaniel Turner, pleading with him to

send to Port Jackson for some missionaries to come to Vava'u to teach him and his people (Farmer 1855:171). Later in the same year while in Tongatapu he spoke to Nathaniel Turner on the subject, but because of the shortage of the missionaries Turner could do nothing about it at the time. However, Tāufa'āhau successfully persuaded him to drop this opposition to the mission work and accept Christianity. With 'Ulukālala's assistance, King George extended his crusade to Vava'u. 'Ulukālala ordered that all worshipping places and gods be burnt down throughout Vava'u.

The missionaries realised that traditionally King George and Fīnau 'Ulukālala were acting within the bounds of their authority, being rulers of Ha'apai and Vava'u respectively. Religiously, they regarded it as a triumph of Jehovah over Baal for 'Thou shalt have none other gods before me . . .' nor 'make unto thee a graven image, nor the likeness of any form . . .'. However, these actions sparked off a rebellion in Vava'u against 'Ulukālala, led by his half-brother Lualala. 'Ulukālala appealed to King George for help. The latter responded immediately, and he and his warriors from Ha'apai promptly put down the rebellion with a minimal loss of life. All of Vava'u then accepted Christianity.

The success of the union between the Tu'i Kanokupolu family and the Wesleyan missionaries both in putting down political rivals and turning the people to Christianity was regarded by both sides as the work of providence. When Fīnau 'Ulukālala and the people of Vava'u turned to Christianity, one of the missionaries excitedly declared, 'A king and his people waiting for God's laws! Satan's cause trembles and falls; at the name of Jesus idolatry bows down; it is crumbled into dust . . . This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes' (Thomas, Journal, 27 April 1831).

In 1833 'Ulukālala died after nominating King George his successor, and King George became ruler of both Ha'apai and Vava'u. Soon after, in the same year, he tricked Malupō and the warriors of 'Uiha, the last stronghold of heathenism in Ha'apai, into accepting the new religion, thus completing the 'Christianisation' of the whole of the northern groups of Ha'apai and Vava'u.

While the part played by the missionaries in the initial conversion of Tongans to the Wesleyan mission is undisputed, one

must also acknowledge the deep involvement of the Tongans themselves in the drive for success. For largely political and economic motives initially, certain chiefs decided to accept Christianity, but later, because of personal conviction through religious experience, some became ardent evangelists and religious leaders among their own people. Referring to King George, Dr R. B. Lyth (*Journal*, 6 Feb. 1838), one of the early missionaries to Tonga wrote:

One circumstance connected with our voyage—struck me with admiration. Our royal Captain towards evening summoned his men to the worship of God and again before sunrise—They sang a hymn together and they knelt down to prayer as the frail canoe urged its way thro' the deep the King himself—the Father of his people—acting as Priest.

In addition to the involvement of traditional leaders, the use of the vernacular as the medium of instruction helped to make the Bible and the teaching of the missionaries meaningful and attractive to the commoners, who had very little to lose by accepting Christianity, for the traditional religion had no place for them. Ultimately, the breakthrough in the work of the missionaries in Tonga came about because, at this stage, enough strong and influential numbers of chiefs and their supporters believed that Christianity fulfilled certain important needs of the society—both individually and collectively.

4 *The Consolidation*

The nominal acceptance of Christianity by whole communities in Ha'apai and Vava'u through the influence of King George and Finau 'Ulukālala Tuapasi confronted the missionaries with the enormous tasks of not only teaching the people Christian principles and ways of living, but also that of encouraging them to attain some sort of religious experience, a vitally important aspect of the Wesleyan approach to Christian conversion. Whether by deliberate policy or by the force of circumstances, the missionaries recognised the potential strength of involving the Tongans in the mission's activities and, to their credit, encouraged and utilised it in their efforts to consolidate their work. This involvement helped the Tongans to identify with the work of the mission and its achievements, and gave them a new sense of pride.

With their very limited training, many of the Tongan converts became local preachers, class leaders, teachers, and assistant missionaries. They greatly aided the missionaries in converting and educating the people. Most prominent among these was Pita Vi—one of the first seven baptised in Tonga, and of whom the missionaries had good reason to be proud. We have seen how Pita Vi was sent to Ha'apai to teach Tāufa'āhau and his people in 1829 before John Thomas was able to go there in 1830. When Finau 'Ulukālala and the people of Vava'u turned to Christianity, Paula Nau was sent there as a teacher, before any European missionary was available. In 1832, one of the missionaries in Ha'apai wrote:

The week past has been stormy, which occasioned me some anxiety for five of our Local Preachers who had gone to various islands for the purpose of making known the truth, and were wind bound. I was afraid it would prove a trial to them as it was the first enterprize of the kind, but my fears were dissipated upon the arrival of some of them, for they professed themselves delighted with the work and anxious to prosecute it. One of them had preached 8 times at 4 different islands, others of them 4 times, thus the seed is scattered

in places previously unvisited and light is springing up in darkness. (Watkin, Journal, 6 Aug. 1832)

Almost all of Lofanga accepted Christianity through the work of two native teachers who were local inhabitants. At Hā'ano 200 persons were added to the classes on 1 April 1832, also through the work of the Tongan teachers (P. Turner, Journal, 1 April 1847). Christianity was also spread to Niua Toputapu and Niua Fo'ou by the native teachers.

One of the most important phenomena in the consolidation of the mission work at the early stage of its development was what is generally referred to by Methodist historians as the 'religious revival' or 'the Pentecost of Tonga', which occurred in Tonga for the first time in 1834, and in which the Tongans themselves were deeply involved.

John Wesley emphasised the doctrine of Sanctification, Christian Perfection or Holiness. This was the task of keeping the newly justified life holy from day to day by faith. It meant that Christian perfection should lead to exemplariness in all things. Wesley practised his own precepts by becoming involved in the great public issues and problems of his day, and by working unceasingly to help the poor, the sick, and the distressed.

Unfortunately many of his successors, including most of the missionaries who went to Tonga, interpreted his teachings narrowly, and the notion of holiness often came to mean in their preaching little more than personal goodness, with little or no regard for the problems of the society. This transcendental emphasis drove them to dwell more on the life to come, in their preaching, than on the here and now, and laid great emphasis upon the eternal tortures of Hell and the everlasting bliss of Heaven, with the inevitable result of putting a tremendous stress on emotionalism.

The Reverend Peter Turner was a powerful man, of a kind entirely different from John Thomas and Nathaniel Turner. Unlike Nathaniel, Peter had no hesitation in involving himself in politics as 'an adviser', but what really distinguished him from the others was his fervent desire for religious revival. He had some experience of Methodist revivals at home, and for him the religious revival was absolutely essential. 'I prefer some move

among the people', he wrote, 'tho' there may be some few irregularities—I do not like irregularities—but almost anything is preferable to a deadness of feeling' (P. Turner, *Journal*, 9 April 1847).

Some of Peter Turner's colleagues did not share his enthusiasm for religious revival. The Reverend Stephen Rabone, for example, concluded a service at Hihifo, Ha'apai, because the people began to pray and cry to such an extent that his voice was not audible, and eight or ten adults were so overcome that they had to be carried out. He believed that the weak, well-meaning people needed instruction and direction (Rabone, *Journal*, 27 Nov. 1845). In a similar situation, Peter Turner applied an entirely different technique:

During the prayers [he wrote]—one or another continued to weep and cry out. At length my own mind could contain no longer and the weeping became general . . . I made many attempts to preach as I had proposed but could not speak a half a dozen words. So we turned the service into a prayer-meeting—and allowed some few to relate their Christian experience. It was a wonderful time to many, much weeping and melting of hearts. (P. Turner, *Journal*, 25 Mar., 1853)

The theological validity and psychological soundness of the revival movement in Tonga have been questioned, not only by outsiders, but by fellow mission workers as well, yet there is no doubt that the movement was a powerful factor in the conversion of many Tongans to Christianity.

Deeply concerned with the superficiality with which many of the Tongans had professed Christianity, Peter Turner and his colleague in Vava'u, the Reverend David Cargill,¹ called the more spiritually-minded leaders among their followers to pray earnestly for a revival. The group decided to pray every day at

¹ For health reasons John Hutchinson returned to Australia in 1828 and Nathaniel Turner in 1831. In 1833 William Woon, the printer, left for New Zealand and John Hobbs from New Zealand replaced him. Towards the end of the same year, Charles Tucker and David Cargill arrived from England. The latter was the first trained scholar to be sent to Tonga. He was a Master of Arts of Aberdeen. By 1834 P. Turner and Cargill were in Vava'u, Watkin and Tucker in Ha'apai, and John Thomas (chairman), Cross and Hobbs in Tongatapu.

noon asking God for what they called 'the baptism of the Holy Spirit'. As a result, on Tuesday, 23 July 1834, in a service conducted by a Tongan local preacher at the village called 'Utui, the revival movement began. While he was giving a discourse on Christ's lament over Jerusalem:

there came upon the congregation an overwhelming spirit of contrition. Every soul was prostrate before God; many cried aloud in agony, some making open confession of past sins. Through the whole night weeping and prayers for pardon continued at Utui. The morning was greeted with shouts of joy over the assurance of God's forgiving love . . . on the next Sunday, at another village, the entire population of five hundred, attending the service, was seized by the same influence. From village to village, from island to island, the holy epidemic spread. (Findlay and Holdsworth 1921:305-6)

Normal activities ground to a halt, and schools were closed while five or six prayer meetings a day were organised.

The movement reached Ha'apai on 30 August, and Charles Tucker wrote:

Oh what a solemn, but joyful sight! One thousand or more individuals bowed before the Lord, weeping at the feet of Jesus and praying in an agony of soul. I never saw such distress, never heard such cries for mercy or such confessions of sin before. These things were universal, from the greatest chiefs in the land to the meanest of the people. (Findlay and Holdsworth 1921:307)

On 6 October, it reached Tongatapu, but its effect was limited to the existing congregations for the resistance to Christianity was still formidable there.

Undoubtedly, many were swept off their feet by the emotionalism of the mass conversion at these religious revival meetings, and before they really knew where they were, they found themselves enlisted as members of the mission. For many, such a decision could only have been made under the influence of hysteria. But when the accumulation of emotions and the excitement and glamour of mass enthusiasm wore off, when it had become clear that their hope of material gain through accepting Christianity was not to be realised and that by accepting the new religion they had to give up many of their heathen practices, dis-

contentment and tedium made their appearance. Many fell back to their old ways and Peter Turner himself lamented that 'these movements so soon die away' (P. Turner, Journal, 24 Nov. 1844).

However, Peter Turner pointed out that the revival had made many of the young men desire to work for God, and more than a hundred were brought forward who wished to be employed as exhorters or local preachers. Those who stood firm, chiefs and commoners alike, formed a very strong and militant team of evangelists who proved to be of great assistance to the work of the missionaries.

Foremost among these was King George himself. Before the revival movement there was an obvious want of depth in his acceptance of Christianity. When the chapel at Lifuka was constructed King George was grieved to find that the pulpit was the highest point within its walls. This was to him a violation of a taboo which maintained that no subject of his should sit or stand above him. To rectify this he had a platform built for himself on the opposite side higher than the pulpit. Later in 1833 when he took over the rulership of Vava'u he decided to inherit some of his predecessor's younger and more attractive wives as well. Peter Turner promptly disciplined him by terminating his membership of the Society.

In the following year King George repented, married Lupe Pau'u² in a Christian ceremony (Watkin, Journal, 27 Mar. 1834), and was readmitted to his former position in the mission. He and his wife were deeply involved in the revival movement. When he returned to Lifuka he had the tall platform in the chapel pulled down, and from that time on he sat at the same level on the floor in the chapel with his subjects. He became a local preacher, a very ardent evangelist and was instrumental in converting many of his people. Both he and his wife became class leaders assisting the development of the spiritual life of their people. Many of his fellow chiefs in Ha'apai and Vava'u followed his example.

As for the commoners, they had little to lose but rather much to gain by accepting Christianity. Now for the first time they

² Lupe Pau'u had been the principal wife of the Tu'i Tonga, Lauflitonga, before she eloped with Tāufa'āhau in 1833 and they were married by the missionaries in 1834.

were told that they had souls after all, and like the chiefs they had every right to life after death. Their enthusiasm may be illustrated by the testimony of Ilaiakimi Tāufa recorded by the Reverend R. Young (1854:246) during his visit to Tonga in 1853:

When the Gospel reached Tonga I heard, and was convinced of its truth, but not saved. I was converted at the great revival here. In reading the book of the Prophet Isaiah, I was powerfully impressed . . . one night it appeared to me as though a light shone within, and brought to my view my many sins . . . I saw that Christ alone could save, and that nothing else was sufficient for me. The Lord saved me; when I felt an immediate desire to praise him, and to show others the way to that good which I had obtained.

Many became very devout and sincere, and some were even prepared to give up everything they had for their faith.

It was reported that during an eruption at Niua Fo'ou friends offered to take away the native missionary, Semisi Fonua, who was looking after the work on the island, but he resolved to remain with his flock, even if he should perish with them. 'I did not come here to live only,' he replied, 'but [if necessary] to die. Just so, I am not [so much] afraid of this burning as I am afraid of meeting Jehovah in the end of time. Therefore I shall remain' (Dyson, Papers of . . ., VI:67). Such was the spirit and devotion of many of the Tongan converts who became a tremendous asset to the mission work.

The medical part of the missionaries' work continued to assume greater importance. It increasingly attracted people to the Society, who would not have gone a mile to hear a sermon, but who travelled many miles for a dose of medicine. Accordingly, dispensary hours became part of the regular routine. Some missionaries spent two hours every morning on clinical work. The success of the missionaries' medicine dealt a fatal blow to heathenism, for while it was more difficult for the Tongans to comprehend many of the abstract principles of Christianity, they could easily see the beneficial effects of medicine, especially when diseases were so prevalent and the death rate was so high. Many renounced their gods and still more began to doubt their long-established traditional beliefs.

In spite of the urgency placed on the translation of the Bible,

the task appeared to be dragging, to the great concern of some of the missionaries. 'I am ashamed for the District', wrote Rabone. 'we are not of one heart and mind, therefore we do not go on with our work [translating]' (Rabone, Journal, 12 Dec. 1846). However, in 1853, the Reverend Richard Amos was able to write concerning a revised edition of the New Testament:

As far as I have examined the book, I am persuaded that it is decidedly the best edition we have had, and greatly superior to any former one. If it had been printed with accented letters to mark the quantity of vowels, and the catches, or breaks, peculiar to the language, I think it might have been pronounced perfect. (*W-M Mag.*, Sept. 1854:871)

The Bible had a far-reaching effect on the lives of the people. It was not only regarded as the authority on Christian doctrine but also on day-to-day behaviour. King George called it 'a compass, a chart, telling us where we are and where to go' (Young 1854:443), and many people committed to memory long passages from it. A story is told of a sick man who, in two months, had committed to memory the books of Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and I Thessalonians and who used to repeat a book at a time. 'Mrs. Wilson [the missionary's wife] sometimes sent him his dinner; and on one occasion, when the girl took it to him, she said, "Have you had anything to eat today?" He replied in the affirmative. "What have you had?" enquired the girl. "Had?" said he, "I have eaten the whole of the Corinthians"' (Farmer 1855:398).

The missionaries, right from the beginning, gave education a high priority in their work. Accordingly, in their efforts to consolidate their gain, promotion of education was one of the most important tools. At the District Meeting in Vava'u in May 1850, the members were unanimous in their views with regard to education. 'We must have schools in every place,' they declared, '... thus elevating the rising race with the Bible in their hands, far above the darkness and baseness of heathenism, and the wicked intrigues of Popery' (*W-M Mag.*, 1851:823).

The Tongans responded to this call with great enthusiasm. King George himself took the lead and supported in every way possible the missionaries' efforts to build schools and training

institutions, convinced that the only thing that differentiated the white man from the others in ability and wisdom was their possession of superior knowledge. In a sermon preached from Hosea 4:6, 'My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge', King George declared:

See what knowledge has done for the white man! See what ignorance has done for the men of this land! Is it that white men are born more wise? Is it that they are naturally more capable than others? No: but they have obtained knowledge . . . This is the principal cause of the difference. (Young 1854:443)

Schools followed conversion throughout the islands of the group in order to meet the demands of the people. The more new schools were established, the heavier the demand for teachers became. Teachers were recruited from among the ranks of local preachers, and many were ill-suited for their task. So weekly teachers' meetings were organised in order to help teachers with their work, but it soon became obvious that the only remedy lay in the establishment of an institution for training teachers.

Accordingly, the first training institution was opened at Neiafu, the capital of Vava'u, on 13 July 1841 by the Reverend Francis Wilson, who had proved himself a very able educationist. Characteristically, King George took the lead. Without the knowledge of the missionaries he had organised the erection of a building for the institution free of cost to the mission, and while at Vava'u he himself attended the institution regularly. He also gave a large piece of land for the use of the students, who had to grow their own food. Some of the students were married men with families. The majority were trained as teachers while a few were trained to be assistant missionaries.

Unfortunately Wilson died after several months of sickness in March 1846. In the following year, 1847, the General Superintendent of the Wesleyan Missions in the South Seas, the Reverend W. Lawry, arrived in Tonga with four new missionaries, Thomas Adams, George Daniel, Walter J. Davis, and Richard Amos. Amos was trained as a teacher at the Normal Institution in Glasgow,³

³ The system, founded by David Stow, embodied the idea of educating 'the whole man' (Stow 1840:12).

and quite fittingly the educational work of the mission was entrusted to him. It was then decided to move the training institution to Nuku'alofa which King George, who was now King of the whole of Tonga, had decided to make his capital. In this new site, Amos was able to try out among his students the Glasgow training system. The missionaries believed that this system would suit the 'romantic and showy nature of the Tongans'. The King entrusted the education of his heir to Amos, and the trainees in the institution included both men and women, among whom were the Queen and the Chief Justice of Tonga, Setaleki Mumui, and his wife, who proved to be an extremely intelligent woman and an excellent teacher. A report on the visit of H.M.S. *Meander* to Tongatapu in June 1850 praised Amos's institution very highly (*W-M Mag.*, Jan. 1852:104). Later, circuit training schools were established.

The promotion of the educational work of the mission culminated in the establishment of Tupou College by Dr J. E. Moulton in 1866. Like the famous Malua College of the L.M.S. in Samoa, Tupou College was educating 'choice young men who would ultimately fill important positions both in the Church and the State' (Dyson, *Papers of . . .*, VI:76). With King George's approval, chiefs and commoners were treated alike in the school, and the only aristocracy recognised in it was that of educational achievement. In this way the Wesleyan missionaries, like their L.M.S. counterparts in Samoa, added to the Tongan social system a new élite of educated men and women (see Davidson 1967:37). The school produced not only outstanding ministers and teachers for the mission but also government officials and community leaders. Almost all the Premiers of Tonga since 1890 have been educated in this school. Families of commoner origin such as the Havea family⁴ and the Taumaepeau family, whose founders were

⁴ The first Tongan to be awarded a doctorate by any university was Dr John 'Amanaki Havea. He is at present (1972) the President of the Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga. Before this, he was the Principal of the Methodist Theological College in Tonga, the first Tongan to hold that position. His father, Sione Havea, was a student of Dr Moulton. Later, he became the Head Tutor of Tupou College for many years. One of his sons, Sālesi Mānoa Havea, a distinguished lawyer and a member of Parliament, later became Minister for Police.

trained at Tupou College, have produced outstanding church leaders, ministers of the Crown, doctors, leading public servants and teachers, whose impact on the religious, social, economic and political development of Tonga has been extremely significant.

The improvement in the training of teachers effected corresponding improvement in the number and standard of subjects taught in the schools, as well as the efficiency of teaching. In addition to religious subjects, history, geography, arithmetic and English were taught in day schools, and philosophy, astronomy, geometry, algebra and physics were added to the syllabus of the institutions (*W-M Mag.*, Dec. 1868:1144).

Referring to Mrs Tucker's lessons in astronomy Sarah Farmer (1855:332) wrote:

The evenings were spent in conveying to the natives, by familiar illustrations some idea of the first principles of astronomy. The lamp was made to represent the sun; a cocoa-nut the earth; some other object the moon; and as the cocoa-nut, suspended by a twisted thread, revolved round the lamp, they were taught the motions of the earth, with the cause of the change in its seasons. Lessons were also given on eclipses, gravitation, etc. Thus the views of the natives became corrected and enlarged.

Through the teaching of these subjects, the missionaries definitely went a long way towards undermining the traditional cosmology of the Tongans, by supplying scientific explanations of some of the natural phenomena which had been interpreted according to traditional beliefs. For example, the Tongans believed that earthquakes were caused by the deity Maui, who was supposed to be lying, feeble and sleepy, underneath the earth, and was at that time turning round. They immediately started their war-whoop in order to awaken him, 'lest he should get up, and in rising, overturn the world' (Farmer 1855:136-7).

The missionaries found that the majority of the Tongans did not have a flair for English. Consequently, subjects had to be taught in Tongan. This led to a proliferation of printed materials in Tongan. Books were translated, traditions and historical information collected, and many were published in the local press. When the old press went out of action, Dr Moulton managed by trial and error to set up one in the College, and trained his

students to operate it (Moulton 1921:53). Out of this press came scores of books, pamphlets and periodicals which he himself had written or, with the help of his students, translated into Tongan. Among those Moulton translated were two volumes of world history, two volumes of Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, Milton's *Paradise Lost*, *A Geography of the Holy Land*, and a *Life of Jesus Christ*. The College magazine published, among other things, world news and collections of outstanding Tongan poems. A complete translation of the Holy Bible was published by the Foreign Bible Society in 1862. A hymn book and catechism were also published.

Music was given special attention. Religious poems were written by Tongan poets and poetesses and set to traditional tunes. These songs really captivated the interest of the Tongans, for whom they made Christian teaching and Bible stories more alive and meaningful. Robert Young (1854:228) recorded a literal translation of one of these when he visited Tonga in 1853:

A guilty world stood exposed to wrath,
But Jesus beheld it in love.

(Chorus of response)

And we weep whilst we sing his dying love.

In Gethsemane's garden he sweat drops of blood,
That for us he might slay the last foe
And we weep whilst we sing his dying love.

Thou saidst to thy few disciples there,
That sorrow oppressed thy soul.
And we weep whilst we sing thy dying love.

He was judged to cruel death,
Yet he opened not his mouth
And we weep whilst we sing his dying love.

We look to thy wounded side, once pierced
By the Roman soldier's spear.
And we weep whilst we sing thy dying love.

We pray and not faint in Jesus's name,
And worship for evermore,
And we weep whilst we sing his dying love.

(Both words and tune were prepared by a poetess, Siokāpesi Fehi'a.)

Moulton ran into some difficulty when he tried to introduce formal music training in his college. He thought that the best way to teach music to the Tongans was to use tonic solfa. However, he soon found to his embarrassment that some of the common combinations of notes of the tonic solfa were obscene in Tongan. He then ingeniously devised a special notation, using numbers (Moulton 1921:54):

to	lu	fa	ma	ni	o	no	tu	fi	va	a	hi	to
3	♯	4	♯	5	6	♯	7	♯	8	♯	9	♯

The Tongans are very proud of this notation and it has really enhanced their interest in and enthusiasm for music. Hymns and classical masterpieces were transcribed into the new notation and sung by several hundred voices in each choir. The College itself, naturally, took the lead and its students spread its use to the villages throughout the country.

Charles Tucker and his wife introduced some improvement in teaching methods in Ha'apai as early as 1835 by grading students according to their progress. Matthew Wilson followed this up at Hihifo in Tongatapu in the early forties and found the method very popular among his students. Further attraction was also created by the introduction of the Glasgow method by Amos towards the end of the forties, proving the missionaries right in the belief that the method would suit the Tongans.

Meanwhile the infants' or children's school developed by Mrs Wilson at Vava'u proved so successful that it soon spread to the other islands. Young boys and girls now attended and it became very popular. Annual school feasts for the examination of the infant schools were organised at least at Vava'u and Ha'apai, and prizes were awarded for outstanding achievements. These school feasts captured the imagination and interest of the entire population of the two groups and became delightful annual events for the whole community.

In Tongatapu, school examination also became a big attraction. King George himself, the Queen and some of the chiefs became patrons of various schools. In his visit to Tonga in 1850 Lawry

was very impressed by a school from the small village of Tofoa, conducted by a young woman who was trained by Amos. Young, in 1853, spoke glowingly of the results of school examinations at Nuku'alofa and in particular the school for young women of which the wife of the Chief Justice was both patron and teacher.

The Methodists in England belonged to that section of the English Dissent which held strong Sabbatarian views, and in Tonga the sacredness of the Sabbath was an integral part of the missionaries' teaching. Tongan converts accepted this aspect of the missionaries' teaching with all seriousness. They regarded it in the same spirit as they observed the traditional taboos. Referring to this reverence for the Sabbath in Tonga, Young (1854:268) wrote:

Never had I previously observed such respect paid to the Sabbath of the Lord. The day appears to be exclusively devoted to religious services, and nothing meets the eye or ear infringing upon the sanctity of that blessed day, but everywhere incense and a pure offering seem to be presented to the Lord of Hosts. If the people are beheld coming from their habitations, it is that they may go up to the house of the Lord, and inquire in his holy temple. If a canoe is seen in the offing, it is conveying a Local Preacher to his appointment in some distant island, that he may preach unto the people Jesus. If noises occasionally fall upon the ear, they are not those of revelry and strife, but of holy praise and fervent prayer going up to heaven.

Observing the sacredness of the Sabbath later became a part of the constitution of Tonga.

Consistent with their puritanical attitudes to work, the missionaries seriously promoted industrious habits and commerce. People were encouraged to cultivate their land, build better dwelling places, and produce coconut oil for sale. Contribution to the mission was introduced and encouraged, as being part and parcel of the kind of life expected of converts to Christianity.

The many and diverse attractions of the mission activities led, among other things, to a redistribution of population in Tonga. Converts tended to move from their home areas to the centres where the missionaries resided, in order to attend the services and receive instruction in their new religion. Others moved into the

mission centres because it was more convenient to live close to the schools. Still others were attracted by the medical services which the missionaries provided. The missionaries claimed that one of the places thus created was Nuku'alofa, the present capital of Tonga, and were very proud of it. Amos wrote of its development:

The modern town of Nukualofa is purely a creation of Christianity; and . . . its present population has been gathered by the gospel alone . . . Nukualofa was ever an obscure village, with a small population of less than one hundred persons, (except when fortified in time of war as a place of refuge for other villages,) until the *lotu* collected from all parts of the island a population peculiarly its own, which now amounts to upwards of one thousand two hundred; and the reigning Tuikanokubolu has constituted it the metropolis of his ocean empire. Thus Christian Missions are founding cities, each of which, we hope, will become 'an eternal excellency, the joy of many generations'. (*W-M Mag.*, 1854:870)

Some new centres were established as a result of the persecution of Christian converts who were driven from their own villages. Some of these joined Christian villages or towns, but others started new settlements. The village of Fatai in Tongatapu was established by a man who had been driven out of Houma on account of his conversion. This redistribution of population in Tonga was a spontaneous response of the people to the new demands and challenges which confronted them, in marked contrast to what happened in Tahiti, for example, where the L.M.S. missionaries deliberately tried to move the people from their traditional habitats into new villages where mission activities were centred.

In the Christian towns and villages in Tonga the missionaries were able to exert considerable influence upon the growing Christian population, and as things began to settle, a new set of superstitious beliefs began to gather round Christianity itself. Natural disasters, sickness and misfortunes were now attributed by many to the anger of Jehovah, and prosperity and good health to His good will. As the missionaries were viewed as men of God, their property was regarded as sacred. The mission property and the Bible in particular were held in utmost reverence. The old

superstitious beliefs had now lost their former crude objects, but found new and more refined ones. There is no evidence to show that the missionaries either deliberately encouraged or discouraged these attitudes. Such beliefs became firmly entrenched in the minds of the Tongans and persisted for many decades. I can recall as a child how a neighbour, whenever her husband was away and she was left with her children in the house at night, used to place an open Bible by the doorway in order to prevent evil spirits from entering and harming the children. In 1952, an old Tongan minister confessed to the President of the Methodist Church from his sick bed that his sickness was caused by his using as firewood to cook his food old pieces of timber left under the local church after it had been renovated. He asked the President to pray for his recovery. The reverence and awe in which missionaries were held helped to consolidate their work and further enhanced their role as political advisers.

5 *The Search for a Monarch*

The missionaries who went to Tonga during the first half of the nineteenth century inherited the political views of Wesleyan Methodism in England at the time. Loyalty to monarchy, country and constitution was unquestioned and could thus be regarded as the basis of the Society's political views. It is not surprising that in the course of their work in Tonga they deliberately and persistently fostered the promotion of a central monarchical authority, the creation of a kingdom, and the establishment of constitutional rule in the country. The political disunity in Tonga, which made their task of converting the people to Christianity extremely difficult, also convinced them that it would be in the best interests of the people for the country to be united under a Christian government. Furthermore, they believed that their work would be accomplished more readily if a replica of the constitutional monarchy of their homeland were to be established in Tonga.

They discovered, within the indigenous political framework of the country, an institution which appeared to be potentially equivalent to the familiar model of constitutional monarchy. This was the *hau* or Tu'i Kanokupolu. Immediately they started to advocate that the Tu'i Kanokupolu was the central power in Tongatapu and they maintained that the whole Tongatapu group should submit to his authority,¹ in spite of the fact that it was largely nominal and ceremonial and that the real power rested with the chiefs of the various *kāinga*. Their decision to support the *hau* rather than the Tu'i Tonga showed that they clearly under-

¹ It was not until after 1845, when King George became Tu'i Kanokupolu, that the missionaries recognised this position as sovereign over the whole of Tonga. Before this, they appear to have believed that the power of the Tu'i Kanokupolu was confined to Tongatapu, for they recognised the supreme authority of Finau 'Ulukālala in Vava'u and Tāufa'āhau in Ha'apai. After Finau's death in 1833 they recognised Tāufa'āhau as supreme ruler of both Vava'u and Ha'apai.

stood the intricacies of the Tongan political system. For, while the Tu'i Tonga was higher in rank, he had very little power over the chiefs and the people because of his remoteness from them, and he had gradually become a mere figurehead. The Reverend S. Rabone (Journal, 10 Feb. 1838), wrote of the Tu'i Tonga:

This afternoon the Tui Toga arrived here on a visit this is the greatest personages in this Island but what a creature of imagination what a monstrous cypher he had a handful of people only, cannot speak a word in reference to the Government of the Island—nor anything that concerns it. It is not lawful to eat in his presence or at best not to face him eating or drinking—and there is language only applicable to this useless being—as much utility to the Island as a large mole to a man's face.

The *hau* or Tu'i Kanokupolu, who had been installed shortly after the establishment of the mission, was Siosaia Aleamotu'a, a comparatively weak old man who was quite inadequate for the task which the missionaries envisaged. Rabone (Journal, 24 Mar. 1838) wrote:

The King [Aleamotu'a] has paid us a visit from Nuku'alofa during the week. I begged him to speak to Ata on the subject of religion but he refused declaring it altogether useless but I do not think so, as Ata is known to have said that he waits for Tubou to tell him to lotu. And besides we have seen the influence that other kings and chiefs have in the lotu and the readiness of their people to obey them when they command, but Tubou is not the man.

Later in 1840, the same missionary (Journal, 21 Jan. 1840) asserted of the people of Tongatapu, that with regard to 'their own king they have no fear nor do they respect him', and on Aleamotu'a's death in 1845, he wrote that 'Of Josaia Tubou little can be said that is worth saying he lived an easy and comparatively a useless life' (Journal, 10 Dec. 1845).

It was King George who proved a much more likely candidate, and who appeared to have similar designs to their own, so that the missionaries placed their hopes in him, long before the death of Aleamotu'a. In a postscript in a letter to Nathaniel Turner (Watkin to N. Turner, 10 Oct. 1835, WML 1823-64) the Reverend James Watkin wrote:

You will learn that we have removed the press from Toga to Vavau as a place of greater safety and as being more central, it has given offence to the big boy [Aleamotu'a] we have as a chief at the former place, but his being offended is nothing marvellous . . . Taufahau [King George] is worth a thousand Tubous [Aleamotu'a].

Later, in 1838, Rabone (Journal, 20 Feb. 1838), wrote:

Perhaps no man ever obtained such influence in the Fry. Isles as he had nor is it likely anyone was ever half as much respected and beloved. The Xians love him. The Heathen fear him and all parties respect him—God be thanked for such a man such a Xian and such a king.

After Aleamotu'a's death in 1845, the missionaries exerted their influence upon the leading chiefs, particularly the members of the 'electoral college', to choose King George as the successor.² In giving the weight of their influence to King George they showed shrewd political foresight. Historians, in retrospect, have fittingly named him 'The Maker of Modern Tonga'. He succeeded in uniting the whole of Tonga into a kingdom, introduced the rule of law and gave the country a constitutional government (see Lātūkefu 1970).

King George was the son of Tupouto'a and the grandson of Tuku'aho, both of whom had been Tu'i Kanokupolu. His mother, Houmofaleono, was a daughter of Ma'afu of Vaini, the head of the Ha'a Havea, one of the main *ha'a* in the country and undoubtedly the most powerful group of chiefs in Tongatapu at the time. According to Tongan tradition then, King George was endowed by birth with the requisite *mana* for acquiring political supremacy.

When his father, Tupouto'a, died in 1820, the 'electoral college' delayed appointing a successor till 1827 when they decided upon Aleamotu'a, who was a brother of King George's

² 'I visited several families this morning . . . [wrote Thomas] I conversed with Tuitoga people—with Tuibelehake, Lauaki—and others. It is said that some persons here, rather wish that another and not Joaji [George] should be appointed to office. I have spoken my mind to a few about it—as King Tubou nominated George at his death bed—and as there is no person so suitable for the office. I have laid the matter many times before the Lord, that his will may be done in this affair and that Tonga may have a man to govern it who will seek its good' (Thomas, Journal, 25 Nov. 1845).

grandfather, Tuku'aho. It has been alleged that this delay was due to the anger of the chiefs of the Ha'a Ngatamotu'a members of the 'electoral college', at the fact that Tupouto'a was taken for burial at 'Uiha, Ha'apai, thereby preventing them from performing their traditional *fatongia* on such an important occasion. But a more plausible reason for the delay is to be found in the resentment against Tupouto'a of the other members of the 'electoral college'—the chiefs of the Ha'a Havea—who dominated Tongatapu, and who remembered his repeated attempts to break their hold. They did not wish to encounter the same opposition from his successor, and therefore, after six years of armed peace on Tongatapu, they eventually decided upon Aleamotu'a, realising that he was obviously weak and would have no ambition to interfere with any of them. Wilkes, after meeting Aleamotu'a in 1840, wrote:

He has the appearance of being about sixty years old; his figure is tall, though much bent with age; he has a fine dignified countenance, but is represented as a very imbecile old man, fit for any thing but to rule; as domestic and affectionate in his family, caring little about the affairs of government, provided he can have his children and grandchildren around him to play with, in which amusement he passes the most of his time (Wilkes 1845:180).

It is significant that King George's name was not even mentioned among the possible successors to the Tu'i Kanokupolu by members of the 'electoral college' in 1827, despite the fact that he was the son of the late Tu'i Kanokupolu, was then about 30 years of age, and had already shown himself to be an able leader by defeating Laufilitonga at Velata, thereby securing his position as ruler of Ha'apai.

King George was the *fahu* of the Ha'a Havea, because his mother was the daughter of its leading chief. Under normal circumstances the Ha'a Havea chiefs should have been his most loyal supporters. However, in this case, power politics far outweighed family ties, social customs and traditions.

Clearly his rank entitled him to the position of Tu'i Kanokupolu, but rank was not itself enough to ensure his appointment. After the death of Aleamotu'a in 1845, the 'electoral college' could no longer deny him the position, since he not only had the

rank but had proved himself, during the intervening years, to be a man of outstanding gifts of leadership. Wilkes, in 1840, observed:

He at once attracted all eyes; for, on approaching, every movement showed he was in the habit of commanding those about him. With unassuming dignity, he quietly took his seat without the hut, and as if rather preferred to be a listener than one who was to meet us in council. (Wilkes 1845:180)

Born in 1797 at a spot called Niu'ui³ at Lifuka, Ha'apai, the

³ According to the tradition held by Her Majesty the late Queen Sālote and the people of Tongatapu, King George was born at Lavaka's place, Kahoua, at Fualu, Tongatapu. It is said that when Houmofaleono became pregnant she developed a peculiar craving for human blood. This so alarmed her father, Ma'afu of Vaini, that he gave instructions to kill the infant at birth, if it were born a boy, for he would be a danger to Tonga. On learning of this, Lavaka (another member of the Ha'a Havea) took Houmofaleono to his 'api, Kahoua, where she gave birth to her child. The tradition among the Ha'apai people claims that Tupouto'a, on hearing about Ma'afu's decision, sent his chief navigator from Ha'apai to fetch Houmofaleono. But before the *kalia* (double canoe) reached Lifuka, Houmofaleono began to labour. Consequently they called at the little island of Ofolanga where she gave birth to a son. (This version was obtained from Fe'iloakita Kaho, who is a descendant of Tupouto'a's chief navigator.)

Another version, told by the 'Uiha people among whom Tupouto'a resided is that Houmofaleono was brought to 'Uiha. From there, she was taken first to one of the small neighbouring islands, where a certain plant grows called *ngahu* (*scaevola*), with a strong sickening smell. She soon complained that she felt sickened by this smell, and from that time on the island was called Luangahu, (*lua*—sick or vomit, hence 'sickened by *ngahu*'). Later they called at another small island, where she really became sick, and this island is still called Luahoko (actually vomiting). From Luahoko they went to another island where they spent the night, and during the night Houmofaleono awoke with pains. Hence the name of the island, Ofolanga (*ofo*—awake, *langa*—pain). They hurried back to 'Uiha, but could not reach there in time, so they landed on the western side of Lifuka, and there near the beach she gave birth. This spot is named Niu'ui (*niu*—coconut, *ui*—call) which is supposed to be due to the people calling out to each other for a coconut with which to prepare a *namoa* (baby food made from coconut cream). I recorded this version from the 'Uiha people at a *faikava* (kava party). It was supported by Siola'a Soakai, a very knowledgeable *matāpule* at Pangai, Lifuka. He recalled a speech, given by Tu'ipelehake, King George's grandson (and grandfather of the late Queen Sālote) which was delivered at the opening of the hospital, now

infant chief was called Nginingini ofolanga.⁴ He was very sick as a child, and during a serious illness he was taken to a deity named Tāufa'itahi at a place called 'Āhau at Lifuka.⁵ He recovered from his illness and the *taula* (priest) required that his name be changed from Nginingini ofolanga to Tāufa'āhau (Tāufa of 'Āhau).

As Tāufa'āhau grew, it became apparent that nature had endowed him generously in body, mind and disposition. Physically he was big, strong, handsome and athletic. Describing King George, West (1865:61) stated that he was 'Possessed of great prudence and undaunted courage, accompanied by a physical strength before which all his antagonists quailed'. Wilkes (1845:180) who met him in 1840 states that:

he is upwards of six feet in height, extremely well proportioned and athletic; his limbs are rounded and full; his features regular and manly, with a fine open countenance and sensible face . . .

Basil Thomson (1894:342) says of him: 'As he surpassed his fellows in stature and length of limb, so was he their superior in all sports that demand skill'.

Coupled with his magnificent physique was a mind which was alert and progressive, and was obviously ahead of its time. Another of his attributes was described by the Reverend J. Waterhouse who visited Tonga in 1841 when he wrote, 'I was greatly delighted at seeing this Christian King, . . . His words were few, but well chosen. He does not think aloud, but deliberates, and then speaks' (*W-M Mag.*, Feb. 1844:171).

His eagerness to learn and to adopt new and useful ideas later proved to his great advantage. He had a strong will which even

situated at Niu'ui, which referred to the appropriateness of a hospital being built upon the very spot where Tāufa'āhau's afterbirth was buried.

⁴ According to the 'Uiha tradition the first nourishment given to the baby was the *namoa* which they made from a *nginingini* (coconut shrivelled inside) which they found in the canoe which had been brought from Ofolanga.

⁵ The Tongatapu version claims that the baby Nginingini Ofolanga was taken to 'Āhau at Mu'a, Tongatapu. However, there were also places known as Mu'a and 'Āhau at Lifuka and these names are still recalled by the local inhabitants. Tāufa'itahi was also the name of the deity there (Lātūkefu 1968).

his opponents and severest critics could not help admiring. With physical prowess, resourceful mentality and strength of character far above the average, it is little wonder that he was almost worshipped by his people.

King George was very ambitious, but he nonetheless 'knew how to hold his ambition in check until the time was ripe'. As a consequence, 'he was more than a match for his enemies' (Morrell 1960:311). One of his great ambitions was to bring into effect what both his grandfather and father had failed to achieve, namely to make the Tu'i Kanokupolu supreme in authority throughout the whole of Tonga. His method was ingenious. He began by trying to eliminate potential powerful rivals, and in the process of doing so he established his own authority, first in Ha'apai in the 1820s, then in Vava'u in 1833, and finally in Tongatapu in the forties and fifties.

The Tu'i Tonga line was the first to receive his attention. It appeared from the actions of the chiefs of the Tu'i Tonga family that they wanted to restore to the position of Tu'i Tonga the temporal power it had lost for centuries. Hence the attempt of Pāunga to gain the rulership of Vava'u. When Finau 'Ulukālala made his half-brother, Tupouto'a, governor of Ha'apai, one of their other half-brothers, Tokemoana,⁶ who was elder to both of them, was apparently resentful about being superseded by his younger brother Tupouto'a. His resentment was even greater when, on the death of Tupouto'a, the latter's son, Tāufa'āhau, assumed the position of ruler of Ha'apai. He was awaiting an opportunity to settle his grievance against both Tupouto'a and his son. His chance came when the question of the old custom of *moheofo* (the giving of the eldest daughter of the *hau* as a *moheofo*, or principal wife to the Tu'i Tonga) arose.

⁶ The sixth Tu'i Kanokupolu, Ma'afu'otu'itonga, had a son called Ngalumotutulu who married a daughter of Malupō, chief of 'Uiha. They had a son and two daughters of whom the elder, 'Ulukilupetea, was an extremely attractive woman. She bore four sons, one to each of the four leading chiefs of Tonga at the time. The first was by chief Tokemoana (whose father was from the Tu'i Tonga family) and was named after him. The second son was called Vuna Takitakimālohi after his father, Vuna II. The third son was called 'Ulukālala Fangupō after his father, 'Ulukālala Ma'ofanga, and the fourth was Tupouto'a, the son of Tuku'aho, and the father of King George.

It must be remembered that the son of the *moheofo*, according to tradition, would have been the successor to the position of Tu'i Tonga. Tāufa'āhau's sister, Halaevalu Mata'aho,⁷ was to have been a *moheofo* to Laufileitonga, heir to the Tu'i Tonga. However, the elders of the family were persuaded by Tāufa'āhau to send her instead to the Tu'i Ha'ateiho. When Tokemoana learned of this, he sent a message to Laufileitonga, who lived in Vava'u, telling him that he did not like what Tāufa'āhau was doing, for it was obvious that his intention was to put an end to the Tu'i Tonga line by depriving it of an heir.⁸ He advised Laufileitonga that it was time to put a stop to Tāufa'āhau and invited him to Ha'apai, where he would have not only his support but also that of most of the other chiefs. Thus it was on the instigation of Tokemoana that Laufileitonga moved to Ha'apai and made his residence at Hihifo in Lifuka, close to Tokemoana and a few miles from where Tāufa'āhau lived. The Ha'apai chiefs set up their residences around that of Laufileitonga, where it was convenient for them to pay their respects and perform the traditional *fatongia* to him. Tokemoana appeared to have confidently expected that there would be a showdown between Tāufa'āhau and Laufileitonga, and that the former would be defeated, whereupon he himself would become ruler of Ha'apai.

Confrontation began with the building of a fort called Velata at Hihifo by Laufileitonga and the erection of another fort at Pangai by Tāufa'āhau. The chiefs of Ha'apai and the respective people were divided between the two opponents. Laufileitonga received more support, although some who pledged their loyalty remained inactive. In the skirmishes that followed, Laufileitonga's army, which was stronger and better equipped, for they had a few guns, defeated Tāufa'āhau's followers.

In spite of this defeat, Tāufa'āhau appeared never to have doubted his eventual victory. He decided to retreat to Tongatapu

⁷ Halaevalu Mata'aho later married Laufileitonga. They had a daughter named Lavinia Veiongo whose son, 'Asipeli Kupu, was the maternal grandfather of the late Queen Sālote.

⁸ Later Tāufa'āhau gave his own daughter, Sālote Pilolevu, by a former wife, who should have been *moheofo* to Laufileitonga, to the Tu'i Pelehake. Rabone (Journal, 14 May 1839) describes the wedding.

for two reasons: to obtain some guns from Kaufana, his relative in 'Eua; and to consult his grandfather's brother, Aleamotu'a, and his uncle, Ulakai, concerning the ultimate fate of Laufilitonga. As he was leaving Lifuka, he and his men sang the following *tau'a'alo* (chant):

Ha'apai e tefua ki Fanganonu
Kau 'alu ki Tonga 'o fakapatonu
Liu mai ke ta motuloutou.

[Ha'apai assemble at Fanganonu
While I go to Tonga for the final decision
Return to render asunder.]

Tāufa'āhau obtained the guns he wanted from Kaufana, who also sent his son, Puakatau, to assist and to instruct in the use of the weapons. Puakatau proved to be one of the most outstanding warriors of the last battle.⁹

The advice given to Tāufa'āhau by his great-uncle and uncle was to defeat Laufilitonga but to spare his life. On his return journey with a few men from Tongatapu, he recruited more warriors from the southern islands of Ha'apai, especially Nomuka, Ha'afeva and 'Uiha. With their support, particularly Tu'uhetoka of Ha'afeva and the two sons of Malupō from 'Uiha, his victory was ensured.

It was a tribute to Tāufa'āhau's leadership that he was able to win the support of these warriors, largely by his personal approach and great interest in people. When he arrived at Ha'afeva, Havealeta, the chief of the island, and his men were making preparations to go to Velata to assist Laufilitonga if there should be further trouble. After being told of this, Tāufa'āhau returned to his canoes, but he was stopped on the way by the sight of a little girl, the daughter of Havealeta's sister.

⁹ Tradition maintains that Puakatau was shot dead by the 'Uiha warriors as he tried to enter the fortress of Velata. Some claim that the 'Uiha warriors were jealous of his outstanding performances, while others believed that the 'Uiha warriors feared that Puakatau would have killed Laufilitonga had he been able to get into the fortress. It was not only that the 'Uiha warriors were closely related to the Tu'i Tonga, but Tāufa'āhau also gave instructions that Laufilitonga's life should not be harmed.

A few years before, he had named the little girl after his mother, Houmofaleono. When he lifted her up and kissed her goodbye, his gesture so moved the child's mother, who was watching, that she broke down and wept, and then sent a message to her brother Havealeta, saying that she had decided to accompany Tāufa'āhau to defend him. This impulsive action changed her brother's mind and he gave his allegiance to Tāufa'āhau and accompanied him, after persuading his sister to remain.¹⁰ The 'Uhia people were also planning to assist Laufiletonga, and it was no easy decision for Malupō and his two warrior sons to make, for they were close kin of both Laufiletonga and Tāufa'āhau. However, when the latter arrived in person at 'Uiha to plead for their support, they finally decided with much reluctance to join him.

The final battle took place in 1826.¹¹ After Laufiletonga had acknowledged defeat, he was permitted to remain, as long as he agreed to cause no more trouble. However, he decided to go back to Vava'u with Finau 'Ulukālala who came for him (Blanc 1934:34). Later in 1827 he attended the installation of Aleamotu'a as Tu'i Kanokupolu in Tongatapu, and, in the same year, he himself was made Tu'i Tonga, and settled at Lapaha (Mu'a) until his death in 1865.

¹⁰ Among the men of Ha'afeva there was a warrior of outstanding calibre. At the heat of one skirmish in which Tāufa'āhau and some of his men were being overpowered, he intervened, and with a rare display of skill and courage, he and Tāufa'āhau ploughed their way through Laufiletonga's men, felling scores of them with their clubs, while the rest fled. Watching this warrior's heroic performance, Tāufa'āhau remarked that he was like a gigantic fish chasing a shoal of small fish. After the final victory, Tāufa'āhau bestowed upon him the name of Tu'uhetoka (standing in the face of defeat), gave him a sizeable portion of land at Lifuka, just alongside his own, and called it Ikalahi (big fish) in memory of his gallantry. Later the name Tu'uhetoka became a noble title and was given Ha'afeva as his *tof'a* (inheritance).

¹¹ Wood (1932:43) states that 'there were two series of wars, in both of which Tāufa'āhau's chief opponent was Laufiletonga. The first series was before 1827 when Laufiletonga became Tu'i Toga, and the other consisted of fights after that date but particularly in 1832 and 1833.' The missionaries began their work in Ha'apai in 1830, and there is no evidence of any war in Ha'apai from their records since that date, except the destruction of the fortress of 'Uiha in 1833, although no fighting occurred there.

The defeat of Laufilitonga at Velata was of crucial importance, for it decided once and for all the political future of the Tu'i Tonga on the one hand, and the security of Tāufa'āhau's position, as ruler of Ha'apai, on the other. This victory eliminated one of his most formidable rivals and brought the ultimate objective of uniting the whole of Tonga one step nearer.¹²

Having consolidated his rule in Ha'apai, he now turned his attention to Vava'u which his father had ruled briefly. Circumstances were to favour him. His success in putting down the revolt against 'Ulukālala led by the latter's own half-brother, Lualala, and sending the ringleaders out of Vava'u, inevitably made him a favourite with the aged 'Ulukālala. With his half-brother, Lualala, out of the country, and his son, Matekitonga, still a minor, 'Ulukālala on his death bed in 1833 had no other choice but to nominate his cousin, Tāufa'āhau, ruler of Vava'u. This decision was doubtless influenced by gratitude for Tāufa'āhau's assistance and admiration for him as a leader, and almost certainly there was some pressure from the missionaries.¹³ As a result, Tāufa'āhau was now ruler of both Ha'apai and Vava'u.

During the latter half of the 1830s and the beginning of the forties, bitter conflicts flared up in Tongatapu between the Christians and the heathens. The leader of the Christian faction was the Tu'i Kanokupolu, Siosaia Aleamotu'a, who appealed to his grand-nephew, Tāufa'āhau, for help. The response was immediate, for there were ties of kinship as well as the bonds of common religious faith between the two. However, one cannot ignore the possibility that Tāufa'āhau saw this appeal as yet another opportunity to further his own ambitions. It gave him the chance, for the first time, not only to have a showdown with his father's formidable enemies, the Ha'a Havea chiefs,¹⁴ but also

¹² Tokemoana did not survive the war and, after the war, Tāufa'āhau told Laufilitonga that the title Tokemoana should not be conferred any more, thus ending this traditional title.

¹³ It would be surprising if the missionaries did not add the weight of their advice to make 'Ulukālala nominate Tāufa'āhau for the position of Tu'i Vava'u, for at this time they had already seen that the future of both Tonga and their mission work lay with Tāufa'āhau.

¹⁴ The last words of advice which the dying Tupouto'a gave to his son Tāufa'āhau in 1820 were, 'If you are to be successful, then destroy the Ha'a Havea' (informant, Her Majesty, the late Queen Sālote).

to pave his way to the position of Tu'i Kanokupolu, which was a necessary final step towards the ultimate unification of Tonga.

Tāufa'āhau's unrivalled skills as a leader and warrior were matched by an extraordinary political astuteness which enabled him to handle many complicated situations that arose, both before and after he eventually became Tu'i Kanokupolu. It was not easy to maintain a loyal following from all the people who came under his rule. The people of Ha'apai (except in the case of the 'Uiha people's resistance to Christianity) were always loyal and faithful to him from the moment that he had defeated Lauflitonga at Velata. However, things were different in other parts of Tonga.

Some of the Vava'u chiefs soon showed signs that they resented his rule, and to appease them he shifted his residence there until things had calmed down, eventually appointing one of the Ha'apai chiefs, Leonaitasi Lolohea, a close relative of his, as governor of Vava'u (Rabone, *Journal*, 12 Nov. 1836). But he soon realised the error of this move, and quickly returned the Ha'apai chief to his own people, and made 'Osaiasi Veikune, one of the leading chiefs of Vava'u, governor. He deliberately side-stepped Finau 'Ulukālala's son, Matekitonga, who was now of age, anticipating that he would try to restore himself as ruler of Vava'u if he were placed in such a position. Thus he forestalled a potential rival.

In Tongatapu in 1840, Aleamotu'a dispossessed the leaders of the heathen faction of Hihifo of their titles, Ata and Vaha'i, and conferred these on two other members of the respective families, who were loyal to the Christian faction. This move was taken at the instigation of Tāufa'āhau, and ensured the continuing loyalty of the Hihifo District to the Tu'i Kanokupolu and the Christian faction.¹⁵

Another shrewd step was to appoint Ma'afu, son of Aleamotu'a, to Fiji. This was after Tāufa'āhau had become Tu'i Kanokupolu in 1845, when he realised that Ma'afu could be a rallying point

¹⁵ Ata Tōfua, who was deposed in 1840 and sent to Ha'apai with his wife, returned to Tonga in November the same year (see Rabone, *Journal*, 30 Nov. 1840). In May 1841 his title was restored to him (*ibid.*, 17 May 1841).

for discontented elements in Tongatapu. When the plight of the Tongans in Fiji was exposed to him while he touched at the Lau group of islands on his way back from Samoa in 1847, he decided to send Ma'afu to Fiji to look after the Tongans and Tonga's interests there. This served the double purpose of caring for the well-being of the Tongans in Fiji, and disposing of yet another potential political opponent.

Realising that the chiefs of the Ha'a Havea were unwilling to submit to his rule as Tu'i Kanokupolu, he decided, in 1847, to move his residence to Ha'apai, giving the administration of Tongatapu to their two leading chiefs, Ma'afu of Vaini and Lavaka of Pea. This was an ingenious design for he could see that it would either ensure their loyalty or draw them out in open revolt, in which case armed retaliation would be justified. Ma'afu and Lavaka chose to resist, and, in 1851, King George moved his residence back to Tongatapu, accompanied by a huge army from Vava'u and Ha'apai, and in the following year, 1852, the last armed resistance to his authority was put down and the last war in the history of Tonga successfully won.

There can be no doubt that Täufa'āhau's rank, strong personality and gifts of leadership played a significant part in his achievements. However, it is very doubtful whether he would have been successful if he had not received the whole-hearted backing of the Wesleyan missionaries, who became his strong allies and gave him valuable moral support. Besides the fact that King George was an ardent supporter of their work, the missionaries appeared to have been quite aware of his hereditary right to the position of Tu'i Kanokupolu, and also his remarkable gifts for leadership. Accordingly they gave him their full support in his efforts to achieve his ambitions.

These reasons were evident in the text of a laudatory address presented to King George by some of the former missionaries, during his visit to Sydney in December 1853. The address was presented at a missionary meeting held in the Centenary Chapel, York Street, Sydney, and read in Tongan by the Reverend S. Rabone. Part of the statement said:

Your high position by hereditary rank, and the respect which your energy and character and personal talents had already commanded,

all led us to expect much as a result of your personal decision and faithfulness. We have been gratified to hear of . . . your zealous labours in the cause of your own Redeemer, and your deep anxiety for the salvation and welfare of your people. We admire your self-sacrifice . . . to take this voyage, for the purpose of learning how you can best improve the temporal circumstances of your people (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 24 Dec. 1853:6)

Their clear acceptance of Tāufa'āhau's right to succeed is shown in Peter Turner's comment when Siosaia Aleamotu'a's health was failing in 1845, 'should Tubou be called hence—we expect King George will take his place. He is the only next heir' (P. Turner, *Journal*, 28 Nov. 1845).

The missionaries staunchly defended King George's right as legitimate successor when allegations were made by critics such as Peter Dillon, who called King George a 'blood-thirsty, usurping assassin' (Dillon to Thomas, 20 Nov. 1837). The Reverend Thomas West (1865:58), after citing the pedigree of King George and the circumstances which had led to his appointment as Tu'i Kanokupolu, declared:

The assertions, therefore, . . . that the present King is a usurper, and that he has ascended the throne of Tonga by fraud and sheer force of arms, and simply from motives of selfish ambition, have no foundation whatever in truth.

King George's close association with the missionaries obviously facilitated his growing sophistication. Their teachings helped him to develop and refine his character, particularly those humane traits such as clemency and benevolence which later became such marked characteristics. His association with them aided his intellectual development and gave him increasing insight into the ways and means of dealing with the complexities which he and his country now had to face. His visit to Sydney in 1853 at the instigation of the missionaries proved to be a tremendous experience for him. In reply to the address of appreciation read to him by the former missionaries from Tonga, he said:

When, in my own land, the missionaries used to tell me and my people of what God had done in England and elsewhere, we have listened with very great interest. Some of us believed, and some did

not; and I therefore resolved in my mind to come and see this land. I found on my arrival that all I had heard previously was but a little thing compared with what I have seen since. I found that everything I had heard was perfectly true, and, like the Queen of the South, I found that only one-half had been told to me . . . And when I am sitting alone in any place, or when I lie down on my bed at night, my most ardent wish is that the people of my land were here to see all the great things that you have done, and to participate in my acknowledgements of your great kindness towards both me and them. (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 24 Dec. 1853)

His conversion to Christianity undoubtedly assisted him not only to achieve his ambition of welding his people together under a new political system but it helped to sustain and improve it. After his conversion he never looked back to the old gods. There were occasions of backsliding, but they were due to self-indulgence rather than to a deliberate return to his old religion. His interest in the study of the Bible grew, his literacy continued to improve, and his general experience of the wider world continually expanded.

The impingement of the missionary teachings on the career of Tāufa'āhau may be discerned from some of his actions subsequent to his acceptance of Christianity, which show that he was deeply influenced by Christian ethics. When the rebellion in Vava'u was put down in 1831, 'Ulukālala Tuapasi was determined to kill all the ring-leaders, including his half-brother Lualala, who was their leader. Only the timely intervention on their behalf by Peter VI, who was acting on instructions from Tāufa'āhau, saved their lives, for he pleaded that they should not be killed, as this was contrary to Christian teachings, but should instead be expelled from the country.

Another occasion for clemency was when Matekitonga, son of Fīnau 'Ulukālala Tuapasi, being angered at King George's refusal to make him ruler of Vava'u, joined the rebels at Pea in 1852. After his eventual capture, the chiefs and warriors of Vava'u were so incensed by his treachery that they urged King George to kill him, but the King merely told them that Matekitonga had acted foolishly and granted him a pardon. He was allowed to return to Vava'u with the warning that he must cause no further trouble.

At the end of the war in 1852, all the rebel chiefs—the Ha'a

Havea—his father's formidable enemies, were forgiven and were permitted to return to their respective places. When they tried to thank him for this magnanimous gesture, he told them to express gratitude to God instead, for if it were not for Him they would all have been killed (Farmer 1855:408). Practically all of them were made nobles after the constitution was promulgated in 1875.

It may be argued that Tāufa'āhau saw political advantages in granting pardons to his opponents, and that his so-called clemency was merely a sham. If this were so, it would be difficult to understand his refusal to get rid of Matekitonga when the chiefs and warriors of Vava'u demanded it. There can be no doubt that the clemency he showed to his enemies proved politically advantageous, and probably he foresaw this, but the fact remains that he himself attributed his actions to his Christian faith.

Benevolence was another characteristic which owed much to missionary influence. Once his authority was secure he showed genuine care for the welfare of the people. Dr Lyth, the first medical missionary to Tonga, told him in 1838 about the need for a building to house the sick people brought in from various islands; he immediately promised his warm and full support for the project (Lyth, Journal, 2 April 1838). Convinced that Christianity was the best way of life for his people, he himself became not merely an evangelist, but also a crusader, in order to hasten conversion. He gave his full support for the promotion of education. He also led the campaign to emancipate the commoners from the absolute and arbitrary rule of the chiefs and promoted the notion of the equality of all men in the eyes of the law. Later he bequeathed the revenue from the lease of Crown lands to provide free medical treatment and free education for all his subjects.

At the same time, King George recognised that religious conviction and mere piety without hard labour would achieve little in the promotion of the general welfare of his people. Accordingly he exhorted them to work diligently. The following speech was reported to have been given by him at a *fono* at Neiafu, Vava'u, in 1833 when the people had moved there from their villages to be close to the missionaries for religious instruction and medical

care. He pointed out to them that there was a shortage of food due to a recent hurricane and that they could not afford to be idle.

Many of you are idle, and some are wasteful,—and others are thoughtless. We have not taken care of the abundance God gave us—in the time past. We eat to our fill, and then we threw much away. We should have made our bread, and should have had many stores of it, then we should have had food to eat in this time of want . . . God has been very good in giving us as good a land—but we must dig the soil, and plant or we shall not have much food. My mind is—that those who will not work should not eat, and you will do right to deny the idle young men—when they come to beg your food. There is another thing I wish to tell you about. That you must not all live at Neiafu; but you must go to your own places inland or to the islands; and you must build your houses—cultivate your fields and attend to your schools and to your chapels. And let the chiefs live with their people in their own places, and not remain altogether here. If you will do this you will have plenty of food and will have the blessing of the Lord upon all your labours . . . , there are some among us who make excuses when they are required to work more by saying they want to read the record of God, but such people cover their idleness by these excuses. It is very good to read God's Word, but you should not neglect your digging—nor your planting, nor your building by reading at improper times. You should do your work of this world, and read when your work is done. You have much time for reading if you will not sleep in the day,—and go about drinking your kava. (P. Turner, Journal, 30 April 1833)

In pursuing the difficult objectives of uniting the whole of Tonga under one ruler, and establishing Christian civilisation and the rule of law throughout the islands of the group, King George and his missionary supporters set themselves a formidable task. In the beginning they encountered only light resistance, but it was soon evident that the power-struggle could not be won easily, and that their ambitions and aspirations to establish a Christian kingdom could not be realised without bloodshed and war. The role played by the missionaries in this struggle, and their attitudes towards it, must now be critically examined, both as to the causes of the conflict and as to the manner in which the wars were fought.

6 *The Religio-Political Wars and the Birth of a Kingdom*

The missionaries who went to Tonga shared the attitudes of Methodists in England to the question of war; their abhorrence of warfare in general did not prevent them from loyally serving their king and country in time of war. John Wesley used his influence to avert the American War of Independence, but when it broke out he became one of the staunchest supporters of the British government (Edwards 1948:19). Their patriotism owed much to their belief in the Old Testament sense of kingship (Taylor 1935:25). They believed that a ruler was ordained by God and his authority was derived from Him.

Replying to Dillon's charges against the Wesleyan missionaries in Tonga that they were entirely responsible for the wars in 1837 and 1840, David Cargill (1842:7-9) wrote:

The Christians did not take up arms either to propagate their religion or abolish Heathenism. Their design was, to suppress rebellion, maintain the authority of their legal monarch, to defend their rights and privileges, and to preserve their lives

When they appeared in arms, loyalty to their Sovereign, love of their country, love to their wives and children, and the desire of self-preservation, not hatred to the Heathen, or love of war, were the principles by which they were influenced.

Besides being loyal to king and country, the Methodists felt justified in going to war to combat the threat of the forces of anti-Christ. This was one of the reasons why they wholeheartedly supported the British government in its stand during the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars. This view was reflected in the missionaries' attitudes towards war in Tonga.

The missionaries also felt justified in supporting the wars in Tonga because they were convinced that the heathens would never become loyal subjects of the Tongan monarch unless they accepted

the *lotu* (Rabone, Journal, 16 Feb. 1840). They feared that victory for the heathens would mean the end of monarchy, the rule of law and, above all, their work in Tonga. From the beginning of the mission the heathens were on the offensive. In Tongatapu they had the numbers and strength to become a serious danger to the Christian minority. Their aggressive behaviour was due in part to a deep-seated suspicion that the new religion would bring on disaster, by provoking the anger of the gods. Many of the chiefs and all the priests were also afraid that this *lotu* would undermine their prestige and deprive them of their privileges. As a result, Christian converts were persecuted and, when they showed no signs of surrendering their new faith, the chiefs felt compelled to drive these determined few from their localities. In doing so, they unwittingly helped to create a more closely knit and potentially powerful community of Christians, who were later able to overthrow their far from united oppressors. The gathering place of the exiled Christians on Tongatapu was the small hamlet of Nuku'alofa.

Under the leadership of King George, the Christians began to take the offensive, first in Ha'apai, where Tāufa'āhau systematically burned down the god-houses, destroyed effigies and turned the sacred places into gardens or homesites during 1829 and 1830. As James Watkin (Journal, 25 April 1831) wrote:

Part of one of these houses has been employed to erect a house which is appropriated to the good purpose of accommodating strangers and the ground that was devoted to the gods has been reclaimed for the use of man and is now covered with Banana and other trees bearing fruit to supply the wants of man. So that you see the Devil is losing ground.

Later, in 1833, when the fortress in 'Uiha had been demolished, and the god-houses and effigies destroyed, he also recorded that a residence for a teacher was built in the enclosure which had previously been regarded as sacred (Journal, 12 April 1833).

In 1831 King George extended his campaign to Vava'u, where he was assisted by Fīnau 'Ulukālala Tuapasi. Sarah Farmer described how Fīnau put the gods to test and then burnt them:

the king [Fīnau 'U. Tuapasi] gave orders, that seven of the principal idols should be placed in a row. He then addressed them in language

like this: 'I have brought you here to prove you; and I tell you beforehand what I am about to do, that you may be without excuse.' Then, commencing with the first, he said, 'If you are a god, run away, or you shall be burned in the fire which I have prepared!' The god made no attempt to escape. He then spoke to the next in the same way, and so on till he came to the last. As none of them ran, the king gave orders that the sacred houses should be set on fire. His commands were promptly obeyed. Eighteen temples, with their gods, were burned down. (Farmer 1855:211)

Peter Turner relates how King George and some of his warriors went to the god-house at Makave, a village near Neiafu, the capital of Vava'u. When the priest saw them he thought they had come to consult the gods, and he entered the house of the god and proceeded to pray for inspiration. The sight of this so exasperated King George that:

He rose, went into the god's house, dragged out the Priest, and annointed him plentifully with mud from the gutter—and threw him on one side telling him as an old deceiver 'to have done with his foolishness'. He then went into the house, brought out the god, wrapped in a bundle of native cloth and fine mats; and to the astonishment and dread of some, began to disrobe the god, fold after fold was taken off until the great god was seen in the form of a small spotted shell, which fell to the ground, to the surprise—of some,—the shame of others, to see how they had been deceived, and some laughed out right. Fire was set to the house, and its glory ascended in flame and smoke. (P. Turner, Missionary papers:49-50)

Many were alarmed and took up arms to avenge this sacrilege but, when they saw that it was King George and his men, they became afraid and could not carry out their intentions. As a result, King George and his men systematically went on with this destruction throughout Vava'u.

The missionaries realised that traditionally King George and Finau 'Ulukālala were acting within the bounds of their authority, being rulers of Ha'apai and Vava'u. Religiously, they regarded it as a triumph of Jehovah over Baal. They were so excited about the success of this campaign that one of them declared, 'This tide of glorious intelligence that Vavau had become Christian spread northward and southward like a swelling tide' (P. Turner, Missionary papers:51).

The actions of 'Ulukālala and King George, however, sparked off the first armed conflict in Tonga since the establishment of the Wesleyan mission in 1826. Lualala, 'Ulukālala's half-brother, led the rebellion against 'Ulukālala. The destruction of the places of worship was given as the pretext for this uprising. While there was genuine provocation in these acts, the rebellion cannot be viewed in isolation, for it was an extension of the general power struggle which had gone on for quite some time in Tonga. Lualala had his eyes on the rulership of Vava'u, for 'Ulukālala was ageing and his son, Matekitonga, was still very much a junior. The missionaries regarded the uprising as a rebellion against the legitimate authority in Vava'u and consequently they gave at least their moral support to 'Ulukālala and King George. However, through their influence, clemency was shown towards Lualala, and he and his followers were saved from being killed and banished from Vava'u.

When King George became ruler of both Ha'apai and Vava'u in 1833 the whole of Ha'apai, except 'Uiha, had accepted Christianity, chiefly because King George wished them to do so. There were a few objectors, such as Malupō of 'Uiha and his sons, whose refusal was due largely to their attachment to the old religion, but they remained politically loyal to King George. Some of the other chiefs of Ha'apai were also still attached to their old gods, but they dared not disobey the wishes of King George and so became Christians, at least nominally. Malupō and his sons were able to resist, on account of close kinship and political affiliation with King George. It will be recalled that the King's paternal grandmother was a Malupō, and both he and his father, Tupouto'a, were brought up at 'Uiha by Malupō and the 'Uiha people. Furthermore, Malupō and his sons had supported King George in his previous struggle against Laufiletonga at the war of Velata.

King George for his part was not seriously disturbed by 'Uiha's resistance. He sought no armed reprisal, but treated the whole matter in a rather humorous way. At the time that he became ruler of Vava'u, it was well known that there was some dissatisfaction among a few of the chiefs in Vava'u, particularly the former supporters of Lualala, concerning the issues of religion and

the rulership of Vava'u. King George used this situation as a means of tricking Malupō.

Before leaving on one of his visits to Vava'u he sent a message to Malupō, saying that he had heard it rumoured that there was a plot to assassinate him in Vava'u and he pleaded with Malupō to send the warriors of 'Uiha to Vava'u for his protection. After he reached Vava'u, he secretly arranged for the people of a village called Masilamea, well known for their gentleness and lack of fighting prowess, to lie in wait for the 'Uiha warriors near the spot where his large white pig was kept in an enclosure. When the 'Uiha canoe full of warriors arrived, King George informed them that the rumoured plot against his life was false. He then suggested that they should fetch his pig to kill it as provision for their return voyage. Two or three warriors remained in the canoe, while the rest set forth, unarmed, to fetch the pig. As soon as they had departed the canoe was seized. The others approached the pig enclosure, only to encounter the gentle Masilamea people who ambushed and of course outnumbered them, bound their hands behind their backs and led them to Neiafu, the capital. When King George saw his famous warrior cousins as captives of the most un-warlike Masilameans, he burst into laughter, saying, 'Toki taha a Masilamea' ('Masilamea's first')—a great humiliation for the 'Uiha warriors. He then spoke to them very strongly on the falsehood of heathenism and exhorted them to become Christians. The warriors were kept in Vava'u until he and his men sailed to 'Uiha, levelled its fortress and burnt down the god-houses and all the effigies. The warriors became converts in Vava'u, and when they returned to 'Uiha they proceeded to build the largest and most beautiful chapel in all Ha'apai (Lātūkefu 1968:142). Thus the last resistance in Ha'apai was settled without war or bloodshed.

Meanwhile the heathen chiefs on Tongatapu were enraged by the news of the desecration and destruction of the sacred places of Ha'apai and Vava'u, for it was clear that they feared the political implications of King George's success in this campaign. It increased their determination to resist, at all cost, any similar onslaught which he might be planning to make on Tongatapu. When he visited his great-uncle, Aleamotu'a, in Tongatapu later

the same year, he learned that the heathen chiefs of Tongatapu were plotting to attack his canoes. He took his great-uncle's advice to return to Ha'apai, realising the gravity of the situation which could easily erupt into open conflict (P. Turner 1831-8:52). However, this move did not appease the heathens, who continued to prepare for an offensive. 'All Tonga', wrote Watkin (Journal, 11 April 1835), 'with the exception of this place [Nuku'alofa] are building strongholds, sharpening their spears, and fabricating clubs with which to take away each others lives.'

After the rebellion in Vava'u was quashed in 1831, Lualala had gone to Tongatapu and allied himself with the Ha'a Havea chiefs, the traditional enemies of King George's father. This was a politically significant move. Assisted by the chiefs of Pea, Lualala built the fortress of Ngele'ia¹ (Blanc 1935:37), which became a formidable threat to the Christians at Nuku'alofa.

The Ha'a Havea chiefs were extremely upset when one among them, William Tu'ivakanō, became converted to Christianity. They applied so much pressure on him to give up the *lotu* that he eventually agreed to renounce his newly found faith in April 1835. The missionaries, however, persisted in their efforts to regain him, and, in September, Watkin was able to write: 'Tu'ivakano who apostatized some time ago resumed his profession of Christianity which he certainly did not renounce heartily but allowed political consideration to influence him to take that step' (Watkin, Journal, 19 Sept. 1835).

The Ha'a Havea chiefs reacted violently to Tu'ivakanō's re-conversion. They deposed him and drove him and his followers out of his fortress of Hule and they appointed another member of the family to the title. William and his people fled to Nuku'alofa, where other Christian refugees had gathered under Aleamotu'a, the then Tu'i Kanokupolu.

The renewed intensity of opposition forced the Christians to fortify Nuku'alofa. They surrounded the hill where their chapel stood with a stockade and ditch, so that the place might be used as a citadel in case of war. Watkin (Journal, 25 Sept. 1835)

¹ P. Turner (1831-8:58) stated that after remaining in Tongatapu for a while, Lualala went to Fiji and settled at Lakemba where he became 'zealous in the cause of Christ and ended well'.

wrote, 'I hope the mere erection of the fortress will deter the heathens from farther hostilities and serve to check the disloyal spirit which has animated them.' Watkin's statement reveals the missionary view of the conflict, indicating that they regarded the Tu'i Kanokupolu as the supreme and legitimate ruler of Tonga; that hostilities against him and his followers were therefore rebellious; and that they were hoping that the erection of the fortress at Nuku'alofa might terminate these hostilities and thereby save the country from going to war. Subsequent events, however, proved these hopes to be futile.

At Hihifo, one of the late Ata's sons, Setaleki Ve'ehala, and his friends, who had been converted, were driven from their homes at Kolovai early in 1836. They established a little settlement on Setaleki's land at Masilamea, two miles from Kolovai. Many other Christians had to leave Tongatapu for Ha'apai and Vava'u in order to practise their religion unmolested. The missionaries were disturbed by the way things had developed in Tongatapu. One of them wrote:

The heathens continue to rage and imagine vain things against the Lord and against his anointed and cause us some trouble and apprehension which require a strong faith to quell them knowing the bloody character and purpose of the heathen who compose the majority in this island. (Watkin, Journal, 26 Feb. 1836)

Aleamotu'a and King George valued the advice and the moral support of the missionaries, which they were constantly seeking, especially in times of crises. The Reverend Stephen Rabone (Journal, Aug. 1836) wrote:

King George is indeed a fine man body and soul he is now preparing to leave for Haabai in the morning, not to return till after our District Meeting when King Josiah of Tonga will meet us and very much is expected as the result of their visit it is hoped it will prove a death blow to the remaining cause of Heathenism in Tonga.

This District Meeting was held at Lifuka, Ha'apai, in October and was attended by both Aleamotu'a and King George. There can be little doubt that the question of the offensive of the heathen chiefs at Tongatapu was one of the main issues discussed. This meeting of the *hau*, Aleamotu'a, and his deputy,

King George, only added to the antagonism of their opponents, who openly showed their resentment when King George accompanied Aleamotu'a back to Tongatapu in November, as reported by Rabone. 'The reception', he wrote, 'was not attended with any particular marks of kindness the Heathen had prepared for war foolishly supposing King George was bringing his people to fight . . .' (Rabone, Journal, 12 Nov. 1836).

King George returned to Ha'apai, but the situation in Tongatapu grew worse. Rumours were spreading that the heathen chiefs, members of the 'electoral college' in particular, were planning to depose Aleamotu'a and replace him with someone more loyal to their cause. Aleamotu'a wrote to King George, informing him of the seriousness of the situation in Tongatapu. The latter immediately departed for Vava'u to discuss the matter with the chiefs there. He then left for Tongatapu, accompanied by his uncle Ulakai and others in several canoes. They arrived on 1 January 1837 and on the sixth Rabone received news that the island was considered to be in a state of war and King George had ordered:

the strong healthy men of these islands to go to Tonga that in case the Heathen should be foolish enough to fight they may have a force to meet them and in the name of the Lord to put them to flight Many are going in the morning. May they have a fair wind. (Rabone, Journal, 6 Jan. 1837)

The determination of the heathen chiefs to put an end to the spread of Christianity was fostered by both religious and political considerations. The scepticism regarding the traditional gods which the Tu'i Kanokupolu family had developed, partly on account of the failure of the gods to ensure their success in their endeavour to make the Tu'i Kanokupolu the supreme ruler of the whole of Tonga, was not shared by the other chiefs. The others had no reasons for doubting the power of their gods, for they had been quite successful, so far, in maintaining their independence. The Ha'a Havea, in particular, had won their wars against the Tu'i Kanokupolu family, and at this time were the most powerful and influential chiefs in Tongatapu.

The political considerations which influenced the heathen chiefs in their rejection of Christianity were bound up with their realisa-

tion that a victory for the Tu'i Kanokupolu and King George and their new religion would mean an end to their arbitrary powers over their subjects and deprive them of their privileges. They were probably confident of their own strength, remembering how both Finau 'Ulukālala and Tupouto'a, with their warriors from the northern groups, had failed to defeat them at the beginning of the century. The heathen chiefs were thus firmly resolved to halt the spread of Christianity, and, if need be, to fight, in order to protect both their religion and their political independence.

It has been alleged that the war between the heathens and Christians, which broke out in 1837, was a purely religious conflict. Basil Thomson (1894:350-1), who took this view, stated:

It was a missionary war—a crusade in which the club and the Bible were linked against the powers of darkness; and no knight-errant ever went against the Crescent with greater zest than the new converts showed in their quarrel with their heathen countrymen.

This over-simplified view of a complex situation completely fails to take into account the underlying power struggle, which was much older and more basic than the religious issues which appeared on the surface to have precipitated this war.

The war began on 8 January 1837. The heathens chose the Sabbath day on which to attack, thinking the Christians would not defend themselves, but they were proved mistaken. According to Watkin, who was an eye witness, the Christian fortress was well guarded, and the attackers were easily driven off, although two of the Christians were wounded. Watkin (*Journal*, 11 Jan. 1837) wrote, 'They [the heathens] have therefore actually commenced the war, and God will I trust vindicate his own cause'. King George waited till the following day, then led his men to attack the nearest heathen fortress of Ngele'ia which had been built by Lualala with the assistance of the chiefs of Pea. When they came in sight of the fortress, he called his men around him to give them their orders, and before they launched their attack, they prayed together 'and felt (according to their own expression) just as when the revival of religion broke out' (Rabone, *Journal*, 17 Jan. 1837). In the surprise attack that followed all twenty-six warriors in the fortress were killed, 'among whom were some of the greatest

persecutors in Tonga, and many of the relatives of Lavaka [one of the leading chiefs of the Ha'a Havea] who is chief promoter of the present war' (Watkin, *Journal*, 11 Jan. 1837).

News of this victory reached the mission headquarters in Vava'u, but it was also learned that in spite of this set-back the heathens were determined to continue their resistance and gave no signs of easy surrender. Thomas, who received news of the encounter, wrote in February 1837:

Tonga has stood out against God for many years. They prefer darkness to light, because their deeds are evil. The obstinate unbelief of the Jews was the cause of their being destroyed by tens of thousands if not hundreds of thousands. It is very painful to see our dear people taken away from their peaceable dwellings—from their wives and families and parents to go to war, and yet so satisfied are the people of the goodness of their cause. They are most willing to leave all and to go both to suffer and to die if God requires them in his good cause. We have heard nothing for the last three weeks, but hope all is well, and God will continue to interfere in behalf of his cause. (Thomas to Committee, 2 Feb. 1835, WMMS 1822-55)

The missionaries were anxiously awaiting news of a settlement of the war, for they wanted an early peace, though not a peace at any price. Rabone (*Journal*, 21 Jan. 1837) wrote, 'we begin to feel anxious to hear again from Tonga . . . they are at war if so some will fall on both sides. O may the Lord speedily interpose and give the victory in favour of our Israel.'

On Sunday, 15 January, a week later, the heathens decided to destroy the Christians' plantations thinking that they would not guard their gardens on the Sabbath. Again they were proved wrong for, while they were busily engaged in this destruction, the Christian warriors rushed upon them and pursued them right to the gates of Pea itself, killing nine and wounding many others. The Christians suffered the loss of one man and another was seriously wounded and died later. The next day, the Christians burned a sacred canoe and took the small fortress of Te'ekiu (Watkin, *Journal*, 12 Feb. 1837).

King George's next attack was centred upon the fortress of Hule which was Tu'ivakanō's fortress, from which he had been forced to flee. Tu'ivakanō had appealed to King George to destroy

the fortress and wipe out his opponents. The King offered the leaders of Hule terms of surrender, but they refused and the fortress was stormed on 25 January. About three hundred men, women and children were killed, Tu'ivakanō himself and his followers playing a leading part in this massacre.

It is interesting to note the more ruthless and aggressive stand taken by King George during this war. In these two encounters the power struggle was approaching its peak. Lualala had left Vava'u and allied himself with the Ha'a Havea chiefs. The apparent intentions of this dangerous alliance must have awakened in him the old savagery and fighting spirit which had lain dormant for several years to such an extent that they momentarily overshadowed the Christian influence on his actions and life. Later in the 1840 war when he and his warriors besieged Kolovai, King George told his men:

Our late war with the heathen, three years ago, was by the mercy of God, a victorious one. But, though we got the victory, in some things we went astray. We fought not as Christians should fight. Our object then was not to save, but to destroy. But you all now present, hear from me, that we do not so fight again. If, as may be expected, the enemy should come out of their fortress to-morrow morning, let every man endeavour to seize and save his man, and not one to shoot or strike, but in case of life and death. (Farmer 1855:317)

However, the serious threat which the heathen opposition posed not only to his own future, but to the future of monarchical authority and the rule of law, and also to his newly adopted religion, must all have spurred him on to crush the rebellion with ruthless vigour.

The missionaries did not condemn the indiscriminate slaughter of the inhabitants of Hule. They regarded it as a divine judgment—an inevitable consequence of the sinfulness of the heathens. When the news of the massacre reached Vava'u, Rabone (Journal, 14 Feb. 1837) wrote, 'It does indeed appear that the Tonga heathen are given up to a reprobate mind and are bent upon their own destruction, for they have positively refused to "Lotu", and madly prefer dying in their sins'. While the missionaries boasted about the willingness of their converts to die for their faith they

saw no merits whatsoever in the determination of the heathens to die for theirs.

Several months later, when Rabone himself passed through Hule on a trip from Hihifo to Nuku'alofa, he wrote:

Hule is the place in which so many lost their lives when King George with his people attacked and destroyed their fortress this took place early in February last, and yet the bones of many are to be seen dried under the sun. I counted 12 skulls in a circumference of 3 square yards. Scores have been buried but many remain as visible mark of God's displeasure against sin—this was an awfully wicked fortress, but judgement has overtaken them and there scarcely remains one that escaped. (Rabone, Journal, 27 Sept. 1837)

Further skirmishes occurred and on 8 February Pea was again attacked, with the loss of thirteen heathens and three Christians. Meanwhile King George sent for reinforcements from Vava'u. Referring to this new call up, Rabone (Journal, 16 Feb. 1837) wrote that if he understood it correctly, the intention was to make 'a desperate attack upon the Heathen who positively refuse to "lotu" or to turn to God without they do this there is no ground of hope for their being better subjects or in any respect'. At any rate, 200 or more men left Vava'u in four canoes in February with Rabone's prayer, 'O Lord do thou undertake for thy people and speedily bring the war to an end' (Rabone, Journal, 18 Feb. 1837).

Indeed, the war was speedily brought to an end, for with the 200 or more men as reinforcements, the heathens lost heart and ceased their offensive. King George was then able to extract from them a promise to desist from further persecution of Christians as a condition for peace. Although Aleamotu'a and King George were in a winning position, they did not wish to continue the war, thus supporting the missionaries' contention that the war was largely fostered by the heathen chiefs.

In April the warriors from the north returned to their respective places. Rabone (Journal, 12 April 1837) gave an account of the welcome back to Vava'u:

We went down to welcome them back the sight was to me very affecting & interesting, . . . We indeed were glad to see them, and more especially when as soon as they spoke they attributed their

salvation to God & our prayers for them, some say why what are they? They wonder they are alive but it must be because their friends have prayed much for them.

The fears of the heathen chiefs of Tongatapu that King George might extend his campaign of destruction of the sacred places and effigies proved justified. Everywhere King George and his warriors went during the war they burnt down and destroyed god-houses, objects of worship, and sacred places. The *vao tapu* (sacred wood) of the famous sanctuary of Ma'ofanga, which had been so sacrosanct that no one could approach it, on pain of death, was cut down and sold to the sailors for firewood. Many of the warriors from the north took back with them, as souvenirs, pieces of wood made into staffs from this sacred place. Later in June, when peace had been restored, Rabone (Journal, 23 June 1837) wrote:

Last night we walked out to the Mafanga of all others the most sacred place in these islands . . . King George . . . burnt down the spirit houses and now all appears desolation he has planted bananas on the most sacred ground and I was glad to see that the Gods & Devils had not prevented their growth they look well and promise abundant fruit in their season.

It was soon clear that, in spite of the return to peace, the heathens had not abandoned their resolve to stop the spread of Christianity. Unfortunately, the Christians themselves furnished some provocation which gave the heathens a pretext for further hostilities.

The first incident occurred on 25 July 1837. Describing what happened, Rabone (Journal, 25 July 1837) wrote, 'I fired a loaded gun as a chief who was near the premises at the time rushed in and seized me attempting dragging me about vociferating in the most devilish manner . . .'. Rabone did not say what he was firing at, but Commodore Wilkes (1845:181) said that it was a sacred pigeon which was revered by the people. It is very likely that Rabone acted in ignorance. At Kolovai where he was stationed it was flying foxes and not pigeons which were regarded as sacred. In fact one of the most popular sports among the chiefs was catching pigeons. However, there was a *fa'ahinga* (clan) at Kolovai known as Matapā whose land was adjacent to

the mission house. These people had originally belonged to Ve'ehala of Fāhefa, but had been invited by Ata to settle at Kolovai. It so happened that Ve'ehala's god was a pigeon. What appears to have caused the upset was that Rabone was seen shooting a pigeon by the head of the Matapā clan, and he of course would still revere the bird.

However, the rough treatment which the heathen chief gave Rabone over the shooting incident grieved the Christians very much. Referring to this, Rabone (Journal, 25 July 1837) recorded:

Almost all our friends from the Foui [the centre of the Christians at Hihifo] had arrived both female & male and all weeping. Ulakai and Setaleki [the two leading Christian chiefs at Hihifo] went to the vagabond and gave him a smart telling too . . .

Another source of annoyance to the heathen chiefs was the policy of persuading, and in some cases forcing, influential chiefs from Tongatapu to go to Vava'u and Ha'apai, so that they would become converted there. 'Ahome'e, a great chief from Hihifo, went to Vava'u in 1837, and when he returned he told Ata that he had become a Christian, much to the discomfort of the heathens. King George visited Tongatapu in December 1837 and tried to influence Ata to accept Christianity, but was refused. When King George returned to Ha'apai in February of the following year, Rabone (Journal, 24 Feb. 1838) wrote:

We rejoice that Fatu's son Finau is gone with him and also Mahe-'uli'uli . . . It is in this way that we expect the enemy must be weakened in Tonga at least this is one way viz the removing of certain influential characters to Haabai and Vavau where they will embrace religion return to this their own land and instruct their heathen relatives and people.

It was when Ulakai decided to seize five apostates from the fortress of Kolovai, in May 1838, and send them to Ha'apai that the already strained relations between the two factions deteriorated to a dangerous degree. The heathens closed their fortress 'for the preacher' and made preparations for war.

When the situation at Hihifo became too precarious, Rabone decided it was advisable to abandon the mission after he had

been there for one year. His relationship with the heathens grew worse and in December 1839, just before war broke out, Peter Turner (Journal, 11 Dec. 1839) mentioned in his journal that he had been 'informed that as Bro' R. was going to preach a heathen called him to return & eat his [own] dirt'. This was of course regarded as a serious insult by the Christians. Unfortunately, the missionaries were not in a position to bring about any reconciliation between the disputing factions, because they had already committed themselves wholeheartedly to supporting King George and the Tu'i Kanokupolu even though they were acting contrary to the expressed policy of the Society. In August 1837 Ata and his followers removed by force an old man from his own people on the little island of 'Atatā, and sent him to the Christian settlement of Fo'ui, after he had decided to accept Christianity. This was an infringement of the agreement between the two parties. However, the Christians were infuriated by Ata's action, and Aleamotu'a conducted a *fono* at Kolovai on 17 August, at which he said to Ata and his people:

Before the late war I told Lavaka and others that if they did not mind and resist they would be overtaken—they were and now . . . their bones are dry in scorching sun. I tell you the same. (Rabone, Journal, 17 Aug. 1837)

Rabone, who reported the *fono*, added, 'I pray God this event may be sanctified to the good of all'.

Soon after this, the chiefs of Pea applied pressure on one of their number, Moeaki, to give up Christianity. After hearing this, Aleamotu'a and Ulakai went to Pea and warned the Pea people 'that they might do as they would—but that the day they began to persecute the Xians the term of peace would be broken and they would again fight' (Rabone, Journal, 24 Aug. 1837).

The cause of the heathens was favoured by the fact that King George and his warriors from the north were no longer stationed in Tongatapu. It was further encouraged, in 1839, by the death of two very able Christian leaders; one was Uiliami Ulakai, son of Tuku'aho and brother of King George's father Tupouto'a; the other was Setaleki Ve'ehala, son of the late Ata and a nephew of the existing Ata. Because of their rank, traditional *mana* and

personal prowess as warriors they were revered by both Christians and heathens. They had, on several previous occasions, managed to exert their influence to avert armed clashes between the two factions of the Hihifo community.

War broke out in January 1840. The incident which triggered it was the removal of some sticks from one of the heathen god-houses by the Christians. Why they did so is not known, but the heathens were greatly angered, and were probably awaiting an opportunity such as this to make trouble. They attacked and killed four Christians, and war began. Aleamotu'a went to Hihifo, to try to make peace, but failed. Several other attempts at a settlement were made, but they also failed. Eventually Aleamotu'a sent for King George who arrived shortly after with his warriors from the north. Kolovai was besieged and surrendered after a short time, but Pea, Houma and Vaini continued to resist.

Commodore Wilkes arrived in Tonga on 24 April and offered to act as conciliator.² He was unsuccessful in his attempt and he blamed the missionaries for his failure. However, one of the missionaries wrote:

An ill-arranged and fruitless attempt was made by Commodore Wilkes to bring the contending forces to peaceful terms. He seems to have acted upon the supposition that the heathen were the aggrieved and injured individuals; and when he found that these both duped him and robbed him, notwithstanding his good opinion of them, instead of manfully acknowledging that the representations made by the Missionaries were true, he left the islands in anger; and in evident chagrin at being outwitted and laughed at by the heathen, he

² Most writers state that the missionaries requested Wilkes to intercede, but Rabone (Journal, 24 April 1840), who was present, recorded: Commander Wilkes arrived—several gentlemen immediately came on shore and invited Bro T & myself on board—we went and have had a long conversation—principally in reference to the heathen & the present state of Tonga—he expressed his earnest desire to make peace between the contending parties and for the arrangement of this affair has requested a meeting of the Chiefs tomorrow morning. May the blessedness of peace making be his portion.

Wilkes (1845:179) states, 'Believing that I might exert an influence to reconcile the parties, and through my instrumentality restore the blessings of peace, I proffered my services to that effect, which were warmly accepted by the Reverend Mr. Tucker'.

published opinions concerning the Missionaries of a damaging character, which had no foundation in justice or truth.³ (West 1865:283)

It seems very likely too that the missionaries and their followers were hopeful that after the fall of Kolovai, the others would also surrender, but they were mistaken. They found that the resistance was much stronger and more determined than had been expected. As a result, they appealed to Captain Croker, who arrived on 21 June on the British sloop *Favourite*, to make peace (Thomson 1894:353-5). They regarded Croker's arrival as an act of providence; of it Rabone wrote (Journal, 21 June 1840), 'we view it as an interposition of our Heavenly Father and so hope his visit will be made a blessing'. Two days later he again wrote, 'we hope the coming of this vessel of the Lord—and that the interference of Capt. Croker may be owned of God and sanctioned by his Government tomorrow is the time fixed for the expedition' (Rabone, Journal, 23 June 1840). However, the expedition brought no immediate relief, for Croker was shot dead at Pea. When news of his death reached the missionaries they were confounded. Rabone (Journal, 24 June 1840) wrote:

O what have we felt this day! Cap. C. dead—2 of the men likely to die to-night 17 or 18 men wounded . . . Guns etc left in the hands of the heathen. O my God! We stand confused and confounded! What shall we say or do? that ever a Cap C shd come here—a worthy—kind, good gentleman but no more!! Oh his poor wife and 5 or 6 children!! Lord, Lord pardon our sins and deliver us not unto the evil of our enemies. Great is the rejoicing of Satan and his host. A servant of God and England fallen

Although the death of Croker appeared to be a triumph for the heathens, it actually caused them great alarm, for they feared

³ Farmer (1855:320), claimed that the chiefs whom Commodore Wilkes saw were neutral and he did not contact the heathen chiefs who were directly involved in the war:

Yet on the strength of his conversations with a neutral party, Commodore Wilkes concluded, to his own satisfaction, that the heathen party was desirous of peace, and that it was the fault of King George, and of the Missionaries, that the war continued to rage. Men who spend only eight days in a place ought to be careful how they express an opinion regarding the causes of the things that meet their eye.

that more ships would be sent from Britain to revenge the Captain's death. They also grew tired of living within the confines of their fortress. For these reasons they were easily persuaded to accept peace. Fighting ceased after 26 June, an armed peace was restored, and Tonga enjoyed this condition for more than a decade. It looked as though Captain Croker's blood had not been shed in vain after all, and that the missionaries' belief that he had come by Divine Providence was somewhat vindicated, although the peace which they desired had been accomplished in a more tragic way than had been expected. Thomas, who was stationed in Vava'u at this time, went to Tongatapu in August and discussed peace terms with the heathen chiefs. King George stayed on in Tongatapu with some of his men till the latter half of the following year when they finally returned to their homes in the northern groups.

Although these wars were triggered off by religious disputes, they were endemic to the power struggle which had been going on in Tonga for many years, since the quarrel between Tuku'aho and Tupoumohefo in the 1790s. Religion and politics were so intricately interwoven in the causes of the wars and in the determination of both sides to be victorious, that they may be more accurately termed religio-political wars than merely missionary wars or crusades, as Basil Thomson arbitrarily claimed them to be.

7 *The First Two Codes of Law: 1839 and 1850*

As Tonga gradually emerged from a fragmented society into a centralised political system it had to acquire legal machinery adequate to its changing requirements. The Tongan leaders had no need to consult the missionaries for advice on matters relating to pedigree or the succession to the various titles, but when it came to questions of law in a Christian society, they were quite aware of their own ignorance of jurisprudence and felt tremendously dependent upon the missionaries for advice. The missionaries in Tonga were well aware of this need and they regarded it as an integral part of their work. This has been well expressed by the Reverend John Williams (1839:119), in reference to the work of the L.M.S. missionaries in the South Seas:

it would be criminal were he [the missionary], while seeking to elevate the moral character of a community, and to promote among it the habits and usages of civilized life, to withhold any advice or assistance which might advance these designs . . . The Missionary goes among them [the heathens], . . . Subsequently they become acquainted with new principles; are taught to read portions of the word of God, which are translated and put into their hands; and soon perceive that these ancient usages are so incompatible with Christian precepts, that such a superstructure cannot stand on a Christian foundation. To whom then, in this dilemma, can they apply for advice, but to the persons from whom they have derived their knowledge? And what less can the Missionary do than give it freely and fully?

The important implication of this statement is that the very nature of missionary endeavours will inevitably bring about an involvement in the politics of the society in which the missionary works. This situation is brought about by the nature of man himself, as Dr Philip (1828, I:vii), an early mission director, vividly pointed out. 'Man', he wrote, 'in his individual and collective capacity, is so constituted, that no improvement can take place in any part

of one or the other without diffusing its influence over the whole man, and over the whole frame of society.'

The traditional Tongan society with its social, economic and political institutions had been closely integrated with the traditional religious system. When the influential chiefs and their people accepted Christianity, the equilibrium of the old social system was undermined and changes and adjustments became inevitable. A deliberate effort was made to reconstruct Tongan society upon the new Christian beliefs and values. It was to be based only upon those old customs and traditions which the missionaries and their chiefly converts thought suitable for the new design, and it was to incorporate many new and imported elements.

The immense task of social reconstruction proved to be too formidable for the chiefly builders, who were often at a loss as to the nature of the new design. During the first two or three decades, they were forced to rely heavily upon the advice of the missionaries. These converted chiefs were already the political leaders of their various *kāinga*, and their continued reliance on the missionaries ensured that the missionaries had almost as much to do with political matters as they had with religious guidance.

There was a precedent for this, in the close alliance between the priests and chiefs in pre-missionary Tongan society. It was therefore not surprising to find the converted chiefs, who wished to pursue their politics according to Christian principles, as early as 1827, consulting the missionaries on political matters (N. Turner, Journal, 29 Nov. 1827, WMMS 1818-36, item A2833).

The result was a fusion of church and state matters. Residences for the missionaries, school buildings and churches were built and maintained by the people, often not on their own initiative, but rather 'in obedience to the command (*fekau*) of the King. Their conversion was a "mea Fakafetogia"—(a matter imposed upon them by the government)' (Whewell to Eggleston, 4 Aug. 1856, WMSA 1852-79; item 170). Peter Turner (Journal, 24 May 1841) wrote, 'I must say that the people have done much for us since we came. They have thatched our house—and the house of Bro' Kevern. And they are about to put up a house for Bro' Wilson and a house for an academy.'

The fusion of church and state matters caused some confusion

as to the leadership of the church. In 1834 John Thomas reported of King Josiah Aleamotu'a that, 'In the course of two years I have spent with him he has interfered with me on several occasions, he has got an idea that it is his duty to govern in the Church of Christ, his place to appoint teachers or displace them—his place to take into the Society and put out etc.' (Thomas, *Diary and letter book*:153).

The consummation of this alliance between church and state occurs in the remarkable career of King George. In a letter to the Committee in London, the Reverend Charles Tucker wrote of him:

You have heard, I suppose, that our excellent King is a class-leader and a Local Preacher. He is a fine fellow, a genuine Christian, a man of noble mind . . . We have the very flower of the people on the Local Preachers' plan, so far as rank, piety and talent are concerned . . . The King is as obedient as any of them to our directions. (*W-M Mag.*, April 1836:304)

While the progress of the church and state alliance was hindered on Tongatapu by bitter opposition from a strong and influential band of heathen chiefs, it sailed before the wind in Ha'apai and Vava'u where Tāufa'āhau's rule was uncontested. King George was convinced that, in general, the ways of the *kau papālangi* (Europeans) were superior to those of the Tongans, for he was quick to see that they possessed superior wealth, knowledge and, above all, power. He was responsive to innovations and was prepared to learn all he could from Europeans and put what he had learned into practice, whether it was in the field of culture, economics, religion or politics.

Unlike Hawaii, Fiji, Samoa and many other Pacific islands, which had quite large numbers of white settlers, Tonga, in the first half of the nineteenth century, had only a small number of Europeans and, apart from the missionaries, they were mostly escaped convicts and runaway sailors. They did not own land or establish businesses, but lived with various chiefs who had befriended them (Dillon 1829, II:260), so they could not be classed as settlers. The absence of a settler class to whom to turn made the chiefs, especially Tāufa'āhau in the early days of his political career, rely almost exclusively upon the Wesleyan missionaries for

advice. In 1831 Peter Turner (Journal, 26 Dec. 1831) recorded that, 'The king came up this morning and wished to have some laws for the regulation of his servants . . .'.

The missionaries, for their part, were not only willing to give their advice, but they expected to be consulted on almost every important matter, so much so that when their advice was not sought by the chiefs they were deeply disappointed. Thomas noted in his journal, in February 1831, that in things of small importance he had been consulted by the chief, Tāufa'āhau, but it was a long time since Tāufa'āhau had taken much notice of him. Later, in the same year, Thomas was furious when Tāufa'āhau decided of his own accord to accept an invitation from Fīnau 'Ulukālala of Vava'u, who was then heathen, to a canoe race. He referred to Tāufa'āhau as 'headstrong', because he had not consulted him on the matter, 'but sent word to 'Ulukālala that at such a time he could come' (Thomas, Journal, 13 April 1831).

It is quite obvious that Tāufa'āhau's first venture into legislation was strongly influenced by mission teaching. He had great admiration for the prominent figures of the Bible and wanted to follow their examples. He told one of the missionaries, in the course of a conversation on political matters, that, 'he wanted to imitate Abraham and those of whom the scriptures speak' (P. Turner, Journal, 26 Dec. 1831).

Although there is no documentary evidence, it seems fairly certain that the missionaries told King George about the system of government in their homeland and that the King of England and his Parliament ruled the people according to a written code of law. It would also be surprising if the King had not heard from the missionaries and visiting sea captains about the laws and port regulations already existing in other Pacific islands such as Hawaii and Tahiti.

It is not possible to document the degree of Tāufa'āhau's familiarity with the British system of law, but it was under his rule that the first written law in Tonga—the Vava'u Code (for the full Code see Appendix A)—was officially promulgated in a *fono* at Pouono, a *mala'e* at Neiafu, the capital of Vava'u, on 20 November 1839. According to Thomas (Journal, 20 Nov. 1839), these laws had, with a few exceptions, been acted upon in Vava'u

for more than twelve months before the Code's official promulgation. They were printed on 16 May 1838.

Authorities have pointed out that this simple but remarkable Code was largely Tāufa'āhau's own composition. However, the influence of the missionaries is quite apparent in the Code itself, which has a long preamble written in Biblical language.

Perhaps the most striking feature of the Code is the bold step it made towards limiting the power of the chiefs. This was undoubtedly due, to a large extent, to the advice of the missionaries.¹ They believed that all men were equal in the sight of God, and they had long been disturbed by the arbitrary power of the chiefs and the inhuman way they often treated the commoners. The attitudes of the missionaries on the question may be illustrated by the following instances. Tāufa'āhau decided to bury without any ceremony an old woman who died at Lifuka, Ha'apai, where John Thomas was working at the time. 'I told him [Tāufa'āhau]', wrote the missionary after hearing what happened, 'I wished to do towards a poor old woman as I would towards the rich, and that God was no respecter of persons' (Thomas, Journal, 26 Mar. 1831). Again, a charge was brought against a chief of one of the islands of Ha'apai, in a Quarterly Meeting, for appropriating to himself yams belonging to other people, and forcing them to cultivate his land for him without receiving any wages, and also tabooing for the King certain pigs belonging to the people. The missionaries' reaction against this action was firm and decisive. One of them reported:

We strongly expressed our disapprobation of such arbitrary methods of obtaining supplies either for the King or Chiefs as well as pronounce our views of the inconsistency of the same with the office of a Local Preacher amongst us and our resolution to retain no such persons as preachers from the time to come. (Rabone, Journal, 11 Sept. 1838)

This attitude of the missionaries is reflected in Section 4 of the Code which reads:

It is my mind that my people should live in great peace, no quarrelling . . . but to serve the God of peace in sincerity . . . ; they

¹ Obviously Tāufa'āhau's own ambitions had a lot to do with this move.

[the commoners] will work for you [chiefs] as you may require them . . . ; but I make known to you it is no longer lawful, for you to *hunuki*, or mark their bananas for your use, or to take by force any article from them, but let their things be at their disposal.

The setting up of a court of four magistrates in Vava'u to sit once a month and to have jurisdiction over chiefs and commoners alike was deliberately designed to put an end to the use of the despotic club of the chiefs as the supreme arbiter in any serious dispute or quarrel, which had hitherto been the custom of the land. Murder and theft in former days had been regarded with indifference unless the person murdered was equal to or of higher rank than the murderer or unless the property stolen was a consecrated article. The prohibition of these crimes again reflects the attitude of the missionaries towards the importance of the individual and the value of personal property. Part of Section 1 states that it is the King's prerogative to command the death sentence and if anyone attempts to injure or kill another he shall be brought before a judge for sentence.

In the words of one of the missionaries, 'neither chiefs nor peoples were hereafter to take the law into their own hands. The rights of the parties in criminal or disputed matters, were to be decided and maintained by the appointed and responsible courts of law, after a fair and open trial' (West 1865:164).

The prohibition of adultery and fornication sprang from the emphasis which the missionaries placed on the sacredness of sex—'a belief that man and women could only excusably share the joys of love after a ceremony in which with the sanction of church and state, they pledged themselves to one another in life-long fidelity' (Collocott, n.d.:199). To do otherwise was, in the eyes of the missionaries, a serious sin. One of them reported in his journal, 'In the course of the day, a case was brought before him (Leonaitasi—the King's representative)—of fornication . . . the couple were publicly flogged. May these chastisements be sanctified to the good of all' (Rabone, Journal, 22 Sept. 1836).

Fidelity in marriage and the sanctity of family life were always very important features in the teaching of the missionaries. After visiting a young man who had been assaulted by the husband of his mistress, Thomas (Journal, 20 April 1828) wrote, 'If each

man had his own wife at Tonga many evils would be avoided and many sins destroyed'. In order to safeguard marriage Section 8 decreed that a deserted wife might claim her husband's plantations and property while a woman who deserted her husband should be brought back to him; if she refused to remain she could not lawfully remarry during her husband's lifetime.

It should be pointed out that marriages in Tonga were frequently arranged, by one's parents or by a chief, without reference to the wishes of the couple who were betrothed. A marriage was entered simply by the woman cohabiting with a man under his roof and protection. She was expected to remain with her husband until such time as he might choose to divorce her. Mariner estimated that about two-thirds of the married women in Tonga had been divorced and married again several times. The missionaries condemned this custom, not only because they regarded it as immoral and sinful, but also because it had led to several murders, when men of lower rank had married the former wives of superior chiefs.

The great emphasis which was placed on the holiness of the Sabbath and of church services by the missionaries is clearly and unequivocally reflected in Section 2, which exhorts people to abstain from work on the Sabbath day and to attend places of worship, and which makes it an offence for anyone to disturb the service or insult the minister of the congregation.

Another distinct feature of the Code is the importance given to industrious habits and the cultivation of the land. Many missionaries complained bitterly because the Tongans appeared to them incredibly indolent. In a letter to the General Secretary of the mission, the Reverend John Whewell asserted that the Tongans were naturally indolent. 'Only the old and married people', he wrote, 'profess to work. The young people spend their time up to manhood in supreme indolence or in what is worse—voyaging from group to group' (Whewell to Eggleston, 4 Aug. 1856, WMMSA 1852-79, item 170). A few, on the other hand, argued that the people were not entirely an idle race. Their aversion to work was mainly due to the abundance of natural resources from which their simple wants were supplied. Hence, there was no strong incentive for them to work, but when it appeared necessary

they were capable of intensive labour to supply their needs. To the missionaries, however, all idleness was a breeding ground for sin and crime, and they determined to put an end to it. A reflection of this sentiment may be seen in Section 3 which exhorts the chiefs to show love to the people under them but to require them to be industrious and perform their duties to the government and to the chiefs. It also states that the chief should apportion land to the people, sufficient to enable them to procure the necessities of life and support a family. And in order to safeguard the gardens, provision was made to that effect in Section 5 which prohibited anyone to allow his pigs to run loose and damage other people's gardens.

Sale of rum and other spirits to the Tongans was a cause of constant worry to the missionaries. One of the later missionaries wrote to the General Secretary of the mission on the subject. 'What will be said when a Tonga man drinks 3 bottles of strong spirit in one day and laughs at it and says he did not take enough to make himself drunk, and yet this is the case. Will not the curse of the Holy one be upon those Europeans who thus bring the cup of death to this (sic) . . . islanders' (Baker to Eggleston, 18 Dec. 1861, Baker 1860-79). Some years later, when one of King George's sons died, the missionaries did not hesitate to attribute his death to excessive drinking. The prohibition of the sale of hard liquor by the new laws and its being punishable by 'a fine to the King of Twenty Five Dollars'² and a liability 'to have the spirits taken from him', was obviously a reflection of the missionaries' sentiment.

The missionaries' attitude to heathen customs and traditions (especially those which had any religious connection) was one of uncompromising intolerance. They identified Christianity with 'civilisation' and the latter with the habits and customs of an English town or village, and anything contrary to them, such as Tongan customs and traditions, was uncivilised or unchristian, and therefore ought to be destroyed. Bishop Blanc (1934:38) asserts that 'It seemed to be the aim and object of the former [Wesleyan missionaries] to instill into the minds of the people the idea that all pleasures were sinful. To this end they prohibited,

² This was a Spanish dollar and it was worth four shillings sterling.

through Taufa'ahau, all the early dances and songs and many of the ancient customs; . . . Through the suppression of the ancient songs, much valuable information regarding the early history of Tonga has been for ever lost.' Section 8 of the new law, consistent with the teaching of the missionaries, specifically mentions traditional customs such as tattooing, circumcision and 'any other idolatrous ceremonies' which are punishable by fines.

Except for liquor retailing and drunkenness, for inducing seamen to leave their ships with the intention of staying in Tonga, and for allowing pigs to run loose and damage gardens, the laws did not stipulate any fixed punishments. Consequently, punishments for various crimes were left to the discernment of the magistrates.

Desiring to inflict penalties in accordance with Christian principles, King George and his magistrates naturally consulted the missionaries on the matter:

The King [wrote one missionary] came up to ask our opinion about punishing those who violate the laws of the land. They have punished them of late by beating them in the face with the fist. We told the King that we did not like the manner of punishing culprits, but that like himself we were at a loss to give any new mode which would be useful as almost every kind had been tried and had failed . . . We recommend hard labour and to appoint officers to look after those appointed to work. (P. Turner, *Journal*, 28 Feb. 1842)

The consultation of the missionaries on this matter gave rise to resentment, and mission houses at Neiafu were burnt down and Peter Turner (*Journal*, 18 Aug. 1845) told King George that the missionaries no longer wished to be consulted on the subject of punishment, since 'the most abandoned of our people might think that we influenced the judges to inflict certain punishments upon them'.

Thomas recorded in his journal on 20 November 1839 that the Vava'u Code would be put in force at Ha'apai too, which group was also under Tāufa'āhau's rule from 1820. It appears, however, that these laws had been acted upon in Ha'apai long before this date, for Dr Lyth (*Journal*, 12 Dec. 1838), who was working at Ha'apai at the time, reported in December 1838 that 'The King [Tāufa'āhau] assembled the people from all the islands [of

Ha'apai] and gave them new laws. The meeting commenced by daylight and was ended in about two hours.'

When Tāufa'āhau became Tu'i Kanokupolu on 4 December 1845, it appeared that the same Code—or at least the principles of the same Code—was applied to Tongatapu as well, and to the rest of Tonga, until the new Code was promulgated in 1850.

Knowing that the King would hold a *fono* with his people at Nuku'alofa on the morning of 9 January 1846, Thomas wrote to the King the night before, hoping it would assist him in preparing for his meeting with his people in the morning. On the day of the *fono*, Thomas (Journal, 9 Jan. 1846) recorded:

After prayer, I heard the people were assembled with their King—I went down and sat in a private place, in order to hear his address without his seeing me so that I may not be any hindrance to him.

I think he spoke for half an hour. It was as good as a sermon to them . . . he spoke against the sins so common here—as Sabbath breaking—drinking to excess—adultery—fornication—stealing, etc., and instructed them to avoid such things, as being attended with much fatal consequences upon all . . .

He exhorted them to many things and amongst others—that of contributing of oil towards the support of the cause of God—I hope much good will result from the truly Christian address.

Being conscious of the rapid advance of the general sophistication of his people, King George felt that there was a need for another more comprehensive code of laws with which to govern his country more efficiently. He frequently and earnestly consulted the missionaries on the subject and at the end 'applied for their official help in framing them' (West 1865:212).

The matter was brought up in the annual meeting of the missionaries in July 1847, at Nuku'alofa. Lawry, the then General Secretary of the Wesleyan Mission in the South Seas, who visited Tonga and Fiji that year, presided over the meeting. After a careful discussion of the whole question, the missionaries suggested that the King should seek the advice and opinion of 'the highest English legal authority in New Zealand' on the matter. The King then wrote a letter on the subject and Lawry conveyed it to the appropriate quarter. In due course, the reply came advising the

King that the best he could do was to adopt a code of laws similar to the Society Islands laws published by William Ellis (1831: 176-92), making any modification necessary to suit the local situation.

The missionaries immediately prepared a translation of this Code of Laws which had been drawn up for Huahine in 1823, and placed it in the hands of the King and his chiefs for their consideration. The King and his chiefs held several meetings to discuss the laws. In these meetings they made many alterations and amendments as well as additions to the laws, and a rough draft was drawn up.

In June 1850, the King and some of his chiefs attended the annual meeting of the missionaries which was held at Neiafu, Vava'u, to seek the advice and opinion of the missionaries on the rough draft they submitted to the meeting. One missionary wrote:

Upon carefully and unitedly examining and discussing the whole, we suggested several important alterations, which he [the King] and his native advisers were to consider for themselves, and to either adopt or reject as they might deem proper. We were very careful to impress them with the conviction, that these laws must be adopted and promulgated as their own and not as the laws of the missionaries. (*W-M Mag.*, 1851:511)

One of the things advocated by the missionaries was some standard of appeal, so that the people would not be subject to the whim or caprice of any 'upstart native Judge, who may be as unfit for his office as a want of common sense can make him, but who may have got into office by mere favour or rank'. However, the missionaries found that the King's mind was not fully made up on the question, and he wanted to postpone it till he consulted with the chiefs of Tongatapu.

Accordingly the King and some of his chiefs from the northern groups sailed for Tongatapu in the mission vessel, *John Wesley*, to meet the chiefs there. Thus, in the first week of July 1850, King George held his court at Nuku'alofa during which 'the Code was finally completed and made law by public and regal authority' (West 1865:213).

In effect, the Code of 1850 (see Appendix B) turned out to be a revision and enlargement of the Vava'u Code of 1839 with

only a few additional provisions from the Huahine Code. The missionaries were a little disappointed with the outcome, since several things they would have liked to have seen included were absent; at the same time, they found in it much that was contrary to their views. The sentiment of the missionaries was expressed by Lawry who again visited Tonga at this time. On 5 July 1850, he recorded in his journal:

The King is holding his court, and they have now fully agreed upon a Code of Laws, which are to be published forthwith. They are not all that we could wish them to be; and this I told the King and Chiefs; remarking especially on the mode of paying the Judges out of the fines levied on the offenders, which is sure to corrupt the seat of justice; but the King's apology was, 'we must do things little by little'.

In spite of their disappointment, the missionaries believed that, on the whole, the Code of 1850—with all its defects—was much in advance of the 1839 Code, and that it would, 'no doubt, prepare the way for something better still' (West 1865:213).

As in the 1839 Code, the influence of the missionaries was apparent. Emphasis on industrious habits was again a feature. Article XXXVI declared that men must work and persevere in labouring to support themselves and their families and to contribute to the cause of God and the Chief of the land. Anyone who refused to work was to be denied food or other assistance.

Quoting the above article as evidence, Thomson (1894:221) claimed that the missionaries designed the Code mainly for their own profit. 'Their hand', he wrote, 'is detected in the following excellent provision, designed to check the growing indolence of the people, and turn their labour into a channel of profit to the reverend legislators.'

On the other hand, the missionaries felt that they were only doing their duty in trying to inculcate in the minds of the Tongans that it was 'the duty incumbent upon professed converts to the Christian faith, and especially upon all members of the church, of personally contributing to the support and extension of missionary agencies' (West, 1865:141).

In the Law referring to Women (Article XXXVII) the duties of women included labouring to clothe their husbands and children.

It was forbidden for any women to remain indolent, and they were not to be assisted or fed since 'Our assisting the indolent is supporting that which is an evil'.³

Sanctity of marriage was again an important feature of the 1850 Code in which Article VII declared marriage to be a covenant which could not be broken during the lifetime of either spouse.

The missionaries made no compromise regarding polygamy. Giving up all but one wife was made one of the conditions of acceptance into membership of the Church. 'I told the people', wrote Thomas (Journal, 30 Mar. 1831), 'of many of their sins particularly of the sin of Polegemy. I exhorted them to put away their wives and keep one only and the Lord will then receive them into his family'. This attitude is reflected in Article VII: 3 which made it unlawful for anyone to have more than one spouse.

Dancing was a popular entertainment among Tongans. It was mainly held at night time, and usually went on until the small hours of the morning. The excitement naturally whetted the sexual appetite, and couples would melt into the darkness. This was, of course, horrifying to the eyes of the missionaries who, like all Evangelicals, viewed dancing with disgust, as a great enticement to sin. Another reason for the missionaries' disapproval of dancing was the fact that it was often performed in association with the old religious ceremonies. Their views were expressed in Clause XI which forbade dancing and heathen customs with a penalty of one month's hard labour for the first offence and two months for further offences.

The puritanical views on modesty, which the Wesleyan missionaries held, made it imperative for adequate and proper clothing to be worn in public by the new converts. 'To dress otherwise, leaving the body healthy and glad in the sunshine and fresh air

³ Knowing the privileged position women occupied in Tongan society, Neill could not understand this seemingly extraordinary law. 'It is the husband', he wrote, 'who was, and still is, the working partner and breadwinner in the Tongan home' (Neill 1955:98). It may be pointed out, however, that women had the responsibility of making the *ngatu* (tapa cloth) mats and so on, which were needed in the home, and this was the work to which the clause referred.

was uncivilised, or worse' (Collocott, n.d. (a):199). Blanc (1934: 43) has claimed that the European style of clothing was detrimental to the health of the Tongans:

Being used to anointing their bodies with coconut oil when leaving their houses, and if caught in the rain receiving no hurt therefrom, they neglected to change into dry clothes after a wetting, and so developed colds and chest troubles which later turned to the dread scourge of consumption.

The missionaries' view on this matter can be seen in Article XLI which stated that everyone had to be clothed.

The missionaries, however, cannot be blamed completely for clothing the people. The Tongans themselves were eager to imitate, though imperfectly, the way the Europeans dressed, for they, particularly the leading chiefs, believed that it was part of progress.

The General Secretary of the Wesleyan Mission was very disappointed that the promulgation of the 1850 Code had not been brought about earlier, since he could see no reason for the long delay, and he implied that the missionaries, being the advisers, were to be blamed for it. However, Peter Turner explained that the Tongans were very jealous of any foreign interference, and sometimes even questioned the motives of their missionaries, whether they might not wish to bring them under some foreign government. This was the reason why they had not done more to promote a code of laws like those of the Society Islands and Hawaii. He wrote in June 1850, a month before the promulgation of the second Code of Laws in Tonga, 'We have left them to feel their own wants, and we hope now they will make some move towards improvement in civilization and political economy' (*W-M Mag.*, 1851:511-12).

Among other reasons, the two Codes are important for the fact that they formed the basis of the future constitution of Tonga. They took two very important steps. Firstly, they limited the power of the chiefs, and thereby raised, to some extent, the social, economic, religious as well as political status of the commoners. Secondly, by limiting the power of the chiefs they consolidated the new and powerful position of the *hau*.

The *Law referring to the King* (1850 Code) proclaimed that the King was the root of all government and that it was for him to appoint those who should govern. He had power to command the assembly of his chiefs to consult with him on whatever he might wish to have done. He was the Chief Judge and the ultimate judicial authority in disputes. Finally, he had powers to impose whatever taxes seemed proper.

The analysis of the two Codes and the evidence available indicate that although their influence was quite apparent in the Codes, the missionaries could not, and did not, dictate the laws to Tāufa'āhau and his chiefs. That they did not do so can be attributed to the strong personality of Tāufa'āhau, and the chiefs' suspicion of any foreign interference in the affairs of their country. Having accepted Christianity, Tāufa'āhau and his chiefs sought the advice of the missionaries, that they might govern the country in accordance with Christian or 'civilised' principles. The missionaries offered their advice, but it was left to the King and his chiefs to decide what laws were most suitable for their people. It is quite obvious that the decisions the King and his chiefs had made were made by means of the new 'light'—dim though it might have been—which they had now received through the teaching of the missionaries. The eventual success of these laws can be attributed to the fact that it was the Tongan leaders who decided the final content of the codes of laws they wanted, and it was to the credit of the missionaries that they promoted and encouraged such a policy. This was in direct contrast to the situation in Tahiti where the L.M.S. missionaries, on their own initiative, drew up a code of laws and then invited the chiefs to ratify it.

8 *Renewed Resistance and the last Civil War, 1852*

Upon his succession to the position of Tu'i Kanokupolu in 1845, King George immediately assumed supreme authority throughout the whole of Tonga. The laws he had promulgated in Vava'u in 1839, and which were later revised in 1850, were now applied to the whole kingdom. The heathen chiefs did not find it easy to observe many of the laws, which were influenced by the missionary teaching they did not accept: prohibition of Sabbath breaking, fornication, and the exercise of the chief's traditional rights over the commoners' property. Moreover, they resented the loss of their independence and power. These underlying elements of discontent were in due course brought to the surface by the sympathetic support of the Roman Catholic French priests who made no secret of their determination to undermine both the Protestant and British influence in Tonga.

In 1842, the first Roman Catholic mission was established in Tonga and became an effective counter-influence to the Methodist missionaries in the affairs of the group. The decision to send Roman Catholic missionaries to the South Seas can be traced directly to the influence of the Irish adventurer Peter Dillon. At his instigation, Bishop de Solages, who had been interested in sending missionaries to the South Seas, submitted a scheme for carrying the Gospel there.¹

Dillon had outlined his plans for sending French Roman Catholic missionaries to the South Pacific in a letter to the Bishop in 1829. There he proposed that a party be sent via South America on board the yearly French government cargo ship which could

¹ Bishop de Solages contacted the Cardinal Prince de Croy, the first president and patron of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, requesting him to submit a proposal for sending French missionaries to the South Seas to the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda at Rome. The Cardinal complied and wrote to the Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation in September 1829 (see Keys 1957:41).

land them at various islands in the Pacific. He envisaged himself as the leader of such an expedition and stressed his own connections with the Polynesian chiefs, saying he could persuade them to accept the missionaries. Although Dillon's letter was forwarded to the Prince de Polignac, Chief Minister of the French Government, to secure support for the scheme, Dillon was not in fact chosen to lead the expedition (Davidson, n.d., chapters 19, 20, 21).

This scheme was approved in Rome on 22 December 1829, when the Sacred Congregation, at the direction of Pope Gregory XVI, divided the prefecture of the South Seas into two portions. Eastern Oceania was confided to the Picpus Fathers, the first Vicar Apostolic of Eastern Oceania being the Right Reverend Monsigneur Rouchouze, who had been working in Hawaii since 1827. His jurisdiction covered the Hawaiian Islands, Tahiti, the Marquesas and other eastern Pacific Islands. Western Oceania, comprising the area between the Cook Islands and New Zealand, was confided to Bishop de Solages. The Bishop died in 1833 and the project had to be postponed for another two years. In 1835 Pope Gregory XVI established the Apostolic Vicariate of Western Oceania and the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda sought a Vicar Apostolic for the Vicariate, and a body of priests to assist him. Eventually this important task was entrusted to the young chaplain of a boarding school for boys in the Diocese of Lyons, Jean-Baptiste François Pompallier.

On the advice of the Archbishop de Pins of Lyons, who had been working with the Marists, Pompallier turned to the Society of Mary for his priests. Several Marists offered themselves for this new venture and the Archbishop sent their names and that of Pompallier to Rome, with the recommendation that the latter be made the Vicar Apostolic of Western Oceania. Archbishop de Pins also recommended the Marist society to undertake the work of that region, urging that approbation be given to the society in order to encourage and strengthen it. These recommendations were approved in Rome by Pope Gregory XVI in April 1836.

One of the factors which assisted the success of the Roman Catholic mission was the high calibre of its priests. Pembroke and Kingsley (1872:251) have accurately observed that the

Roman Catholic priests who were sent out to the South Seas were 'more highly educated and cultivated than the greater part of those sent out by the various Dissenting bodies'. Bishop Pompallier was himself a scholar and a man of piety and zeal. Father Chevron who, with Brother Attale, was entrusted by Bishop Pompallier with the task of establishing the Catholic mission in Tonga was also highly educated. He had entered the Ecclesiastical College at Belley at the age of 15 in 1826, studied philosophy in a seminary for three years before becoming a teacher, and in 1831, at the age of 24, he was ordained priest. Most of these Marist priests, in addition to being well trained, were dedicated men, sincere in their beliefs, unequivocal in their sense of vocation, and faithful to their calling. Perhaps their spirit of dedication may best be shown in a letter written by their leader, Bishop Pompallier, to the members of the Council of the Propagation of the Faith at Lyons:

As for us privations and death are a gain, . . . Ah, the more we survey this distant mission, the more we find their difficulties insurmountable to human prudence left to itself alone. But we are full of confidence; nothing is impossible to Jesus Christ. It is He who sends us by His august Vicar, our Holy Father the Pope, who has blessed us. Besides, there are the promises of the Divine Master; . . .

We congratulate ourselves as being poor instruments in the Hands of God. We congratulate you, gentlemen, with gratitude, with respect and with affection . . .

We cannot forget you in the lands that we must water with our sweat and perhaps, happily, with our blood . . . (Keys 1957:51-2)

One of the Protestant missionaries claimed that it was 'unreasonable, ungentlemanly, and unchristianlike for a body of Roman Catholics to come to these shores and enter into other men's labours' (quoted in Brookes 1941:78). While it is difficult to dispute the truth of this accusation, it is fair to remember that these men, like the Protestant missionaries, were only following the sincere belief of their church. At this particular time the Roman Catholic church was preoccupied with 'heresy' as much as with heathenism. On 12 March 1832, de Solages wrote to Pope Gregory XVI and also to the new French King, Louis Philippe,

'begging for facilities to offset the progress of Protestant missionaries in Oceania' (Keys 1957:42).

The accepted Catholic view as expressed by Bishop Blanc, a later historian, writing in the Tongan Catholic paper, *Taumua Lelei*, is as follows:

The reason for the decision made by Pope Gregory XVI [to send the Roman Catholic priests to Tonga] was his carrying out the commandment given to the Catholic Church by Jesus Christ, saying that it [the Church] should spread and continue to spread His Will and His Commandments to all people of the Earth, so that they should know the one True Church and follow it

There is no other Church which Jesus Christ gave that command but the Catholic Church. Consequently the servants of the Church had to go out to all parts of the world where there are people, irrespective of whether they were still pagan or belonged to any other Church or religion.

In Tonga there were people who were still pagan and others had joined the Protestant Church, but they had not yet known the true Religion and this was the purpose of sending Bishop Pompallier by the Pope and for the same reason, the Roman Catholic priests sailed to Tonga.

They came in order to lead into the Catholic Church, both Pagans and Protestants and this is the real task of the True Servants of Jesus Christ throughout the world, because they hold fast to the Commandment which was given by the Lord to the Catholic Church, to teach all peoples of the world. And there was no such commandment to any other Church. (4 July 1931—translation)

It was with such a conviction that the Roman Catholic priests went to Tonga and, because of this uncompromising attitude, which matched that of their Wesleyan counterparts towards them, the clash between the two parties became inevitable.

Like the marriage of convenience between the Methodist missionaries and the Tu'i Kanokupolu family in Tonga, the Roman Catholic mission in Oceania was wedded to the French government. The Catholic missionaries appreciated the advantages of having the protection and assistance of the French government, and, being Frenchmen themselves, they naturally relished the possibility of their work promoting the interests of France.² Bishop

² It appears that from the time of Napoleon I the anti-church sentiment in the French government forced the church to emphasise its patriotism in its seminaries (Keys 1957:25).

de Solages, for instance, had emphasised the military value to France of Pacific outposts in his proposals for the South Seas mission.

After his return from Rome, Bishop Pompallier paid two visits to the French royal family. On the first occasion he saw only Queen Amélie, who promised him a gift for the mission. On his second visit he managed to see both the King and Queen, and also the King's sister, Madame Adelaide, who was notably devout and is said to have had much influence on her brother. The Bishop received from Louis Philippe an order for 1,500 francs and letters of introduction addressed to 'The Commanders of the French Squadron, stationed in the Southern Ocean, Valparaiso', dated 24 September 1836, and signed by the then Minister of the Navy and Colonies. The letter reads:

This letter will be handed to you by His Lordship François Pompallier, Bishop of Maronea, Vicar Apostolic of the Western Islands of the Pacific who, in the course of his august mission, may often perhaps require the support and good services of the ships of state. I request you to receive this prelate with the honours and the attention due his office and his person, and I most particularly desire you to seize every opportunity of giving him the assistance which his situation may require and which yours will enable you to afford. You will give similar instructions to the commanders of ships under your orders. I shall witness with pleasure all that they and yourself may do to be useful to his Lordship the Bishop of Maronea. (Keys 1957:48-9)

Bishop Pompallier (1888:12) later stated that he had reason to attribute his 'deliverance from civil intolerance and the annoyance of the English Protestant ministers in Oceania' to this 'powerful and efficacious protection' that the King accorded him.

The furthering of nationalism appeared to be the prime motive in the French government's enthusiastic and unrestrained support of mission work. The resurgence of nationalism which followed France's defeat at Waterloo led to an intense rivalry and desire to outdo Great Britain. French nationalism was closely linked to Roman Catholicism and it was the ambition of the French government to revive French prestige and restore France's position as a world power and enlightened nation, by such means as spreading the state religion, particularly in those parts of the world where

English Protestantism was gaining ground. After the fall of Napoleon, the French government was often dominated by anti-clericals who sought to curtail the church at home, but at the same time gave unqualified support to Catholic missions abroad (Oliver 1961:98), because they served a national purpose.

Laplace, in the narrative of his cruise around the world in the late 1830s, commented upon Great Britain's extensive influence in Oceania and how her influence might at any moment be converted into political rights. He also pointed out that 'the foundation of Britain's position was religion, therefore it might be undermined by a technique similar to that which the English had used to build it' (quoted in Brookes 1941:92). Louis Philippe had the reputation of being an opportunist who was prepared to be friendly to the church if such a policy was advantageous, and who favoured the missionary effort because he believed it would advance his colonial ambitions. However, political motives were not the sole basis for the French government's support, if one considers the comments made by Father Colin, founder of the Society of Mary, on the attitude of the French officials. Writing to Bishop Pompallier he said:

They all ask for French establishments in the most important islands of Oceania; and they look for success out of missionaries' influence. They say if these islands are made Catholic they will be made French . . . I do not think that in these new projects the French Government is inspired solely by politics. It is also intent upon protecting religion and people. There is general indignation at the behaviour of Englishmen who are said ruthlessly to destroy savage peoples. (Keys 1957:148)

All the evidence indicates that the Roman Catholic priests went to the Pacific with the full blessing of both the church and the French government, and with the double purpose of winning the islanders, heathens and heretics alike, to the 'one true Catholic Church' and at the same time promoting French national interests in those islands, particularly where British interests might be undermined.

Pompallier and the members of his team left France on Christmas Eve 1836 and they finally reached Valparaiso in June 1837, where they were received by the Picpus missionaries. They re-

mained there, stranded, for two months awaiting a vessel that could take them to their destination. In August 1837 they departed on board the *Europa* on a course to the Gambier Islands and Tahiti, where they chartered a small schooner called the *Raiatea*, which belonged to the American Consul, Moerenhout (later French Consul at Tahiti). With the aid of this schooner they were able to reach their destination with greater freedom and speed and at less expense.

When they finally reached Vava'u, which was the first port of call, Bishop Pompallier managed to obtain two interpreters, one a Frenchman and Catholic, the other an American and Protestant. Through these two interpreters, according to the Bishop's own account, he established social communication with King George, who, in the absence of the two Wesleyan missionaries, John Thomas and William A. Brooks, showed him cordiality and kindness and agreed that two of his company could remain on the island. However, when Thomas and Brooks returned two or three days later, the Bishop learned from one of the interpreters that the missionaries 'had done nothing but beset the mind of the King in order to constrain him not to receive any member from my company on his island'. Being unable to speak the language, the Bishop raised no objection and bade the King farewell, promising him that when he had learned the language he would return to see him again and then 'he [the King] would understand all things better according to my wishes and hopes for the happiness of himself and his country'. According to the Bishop, all he wanted to do was to leave two of his company in Vava'u to guard the mission stores and to correspond with the mission stations they expected to establish elsewhere (Pompallier 1888:17). His real intention in wanting to do this, however, is not clear. According to his biographer, 'The King at first agreed . . . that the Bishop should leave two of his company at Tonga to study and teach there' (Keys 1957:62).

However, the Wesleyan missionaries who had been working there since 1831 were not convinced that the Bishop's plan to leave two of his company in Vava'u was as simple as he tried to make it appear. Consequently, they voiced their objections to the Bishop. According to John Thomas's account of the incident, the

Bishop honoured them with a visit the day he and Brooks arrived back from Ha'apai after attending their District Meeting. After offering to give them any supplies they might want from his vessel, the Bishop told them that he wanted two of his company 'merely to remain' in Vava'u. The missionaries replied that it should be the King's decision. The Bishop then informed them that the King had led him to believe that it was a matter for the Wesleyan missionaries to decide.

I then requested his Lordship to let us know his object as we understood he had Missionaries on board, and if he wished to know whether or not we wished him to leave Missionaries here to act as teachers of religion, we begged most respectfully to assure (sic) his Lordship that we did not wish him to do so as our people were all Christians, and under our care and to have Missionaries of another creed and discipline would not be for the good but evil of our people, but that if his Lordship merely wished to leave two persons on shore here, we begged to say again, it was for the King to decide and not us

His Lordship regretted that we should object to his leaving Missionaries here and said that were he in our case he should not do so . . . I told him it was the good of the people I sought and I was sure, it would not lead to edification but confusion, if there were other Missions here, as the people were one, under one King and as one family also we had come to them in their heathen state had sought them and brought them to the path of truth and goodness, and it was only just that we should wish to keep them as they were our children, the fruit of our labour in the Lord. (Thomas, Journal, 27 Oct. 1837)

The Bishop then assured the missionaries that he did not want his men to act as teachers or interfere in any way with religious matters.

We informed his Lordship [continued Thomas] that as they were Missionaries it was not to be expected but that they would interfere with religious subjects. We thought that was a duty they owed to the Society which had sent them but, on that ground only it was we objected to their being here, but if it was merely to remain here I stated again it was for the King to determine.

The Bishop, however, persisted in his belief that John Thomas had it in his power to decide the matter. Thomas then offered to accompany him to the King and hear what he had to say

on the subject. The Bishop accepted the offer, and they all set off to the King's house. Thomas described this encounter:

We found the King sitting on his mat. I took my seat by him, as in the Tongan fashion, but his Lordship did not *Nofo ki lalo* [sit down]. He then proposed to the King by means of the Frenchman whether or not he would allow two men to remain at the islands. The King asked for what purpose? His Lordship replied that he merely wished them to remain to learn the language. The King asked for what purpose? He said he wished them to know it. The King said he had told him before he did not wish them to remain here. The Bishop pressed the King to allow it saying they should not interfere with his people and that he could send them away anytime, say in two or three months, if a vessel called, and moreover he expected a vessel to call here. The king said it was not true that they would not interfere with religion that the Bishop had already interfered by telling him before we came home that his the Bishop's was the old religion and consequently the true one, that what we taught was new and lately sprung up, and the King said they must not remain but go away for he did not need them here, and as they had now a vessel they must go away in it.

Despite the numerous discrepancies between the two accounts of the incident,³ several facts appear certain. The Bishop's account shows an unfortunate lack of knowledge, or appreciation, of the real character of the King. He clearly underrated the degree of conviction with which King George had accepted Christianity through Methodism. During the past three years he had been deeply involved in the religious revival which began in Vava'u and then spread throughout Tonga. He identified himself with the Methodist mission and was instrumental in gaining new members. Obviously, he watched with pride and satisfaction the growth of the mission, and for the Bishop to tell him that the Catholic church was the old, and therefore true, church, implying that the King's own church was not, must have been a great insult to him, arousing in him (if he had not had them before this incident) some feelings against both the Bishop and the Roman Catholic

³ Several factors may explain these discrepancies. There were the obvious difficulty of direct communication, the use of unreliable interpreters, the fact that the Bishop wrote his little book several years after the event, and also the understandable bias on both sides.

church. The Bishop's allegation that the Wesleyan missionaries decided the matter for the King, implying that the King was a puppet of the missionaries, was based on an underestimation of both the intelligence and character of King George. It was quite natural for him to seek the advice of his missionaries in cases such as this one, for he was well aware of the limitation of his knowledge of the white man's laws and way of life, let alone religion, but in the end he always made his own decisions. John Thomas himself often complained that the King did not take any notice of him. Another missionary wrote of him:

He happens to have a mind of his own, and like the Hero of Waterloo ignores any Second in Command. (Amos to Eggleston, 26 Oct. 1857, WMMSA 1852-79, item 170)

The Wesleyan missionaries felt justified in their objection to the establishment of a Catholic mission in Tonga where their own mission had already been established. They feared that this would only confuse the people and bring difficulties to their work as well as to the country as a whole. Events which followed in the forties and fifties proved them right. They also had good reason to doubt the real motives of the Bishop in his attempt to leave two of his men in Vava'u. The missionaries were well aware of the train of events associated with the landing of Catholic priests in Tahiti in 1836.

However, one cannot overlook the fact that there was a decidedly anti-Roman Catholic bias among the Wesleyan missionaries. They had inherited this outlook from the parent body at home, and in Tonga they made no secret of their hostility to the expanding work of the Catholic priests. Their letters during the 1840s and for the next two or three decades after the establishment of the Roman Catholic mission in Tonga were full of these anti-Catholic sentiments.

The Wesleyan missionaries had, however, underestimated the calibre of the man with whom they were dealing. Bishop Pompallier had tremendous determination and strength of character, and he had no intention of giving up easily. He kept his word to the King that he would come back, but before that he decided to strike his first blow at the Methodists by establishing mission

stations in 'Uvea and Futuna. With regard to this unexpected move the Bishop afterwards wrote:

I at once gave the captain orders to set sail for the islands of Wallis ['Uvea] and Futuna . . . I had learned during my stay at Vavau that the Protestant missionaries intended establishing their mission in these two islands, whither I myself was going before them and without their knowledge. They thought I was going to Ascension Island . . . Such, indeed, was my intention . . . It was only at Vavau, that intolerant and first-inhabited island I visited within the bounds of my jurisdiction, that God caused me to conceive the resolution of carrying the work of salvation to Wallis and Futuna, in order to save these two islands from Protestantism and the intolerance which it had established at Vavau, and finally to bring to the true fold this interesting people, who as yet had not exchanged paganism for heresy. (Pompallier 1888:18)

Meanwhile, Dillon, after his return from the Pacific at the end of 1838, continued to maintain his contact with France and the French missionaries. In a letter to Father Colin, in February 1841, he alleged that, after Captain Croker's death in 1840, the Tongans had banished their cruel oppressors, the British missionaries, from Tongatapu, and were now asking for French missionaries and for the protection of the French Crown:

if his Majesty Louis Philippe [he declared] would now come forward I could procure for him the sovereignty of Tonga and all the Friendly Islands at the trifling expense of a few thousand francs. (Dillon to Colin, 10 June 1841, cited by Davidson, n.d., ch. 28:32)

Dillon also suggested that perhaps a French colonising company could be formed to buy land in Tonga under his guidance, and that the mission should begin work in Fiji. He informed Colin that he had written to friends in Tonga telling them to advise the chiefs not to let the Wesleyans return and to expect Roman Catholic missionaries soon. He made a further suggestion that 'perhaps the Marists should abandon New Zealand now that it had become British and concentrate on Tonga and Fiji, where they could benefit France as well as the Catholic religion'.

After carefully considering Dillon's proposals, Father Colin rejected some of them but approved of Dillon's suggestion that missionaries should be sent to Tonga and Fiji. He decided to support this idea by sending missionaries to Tonga.

In 1841, when news reached Pompallier of the murder of Father Chanel at Futuna, he wrote to the captain of the French corvette *L'Aube*, M. Lavaud, on 6 November 1841, expressing his indignation at what he believed to be the apathy of Captain d'Urville of the *Astrolabe* in not visiting the missions at 'Uvea and Futuna while he was in those waters, but instead taking as a passenger to a neighbouring island the 'intolerant' John Thomas, at whose instigation the King had banished him and his missionaries from Vava'u four years before. The Bishop complained that he could not understand why no ship had visited 'Uvea and Futuna, despite the letters he had sent to the French stations and consuls at Valparaiso, Tahiti and to the ministers of foreign affairs and of the admiralty.

Lavaud immediately placed the corvette *L'Allier* and her commander, Captain du Bousset, at the Bishop's service. With this protection Pompallier fulfilled his promise to return to Vava'u. According to his own account:

We left Akaroa with the *Sancta Maria* and the corvette the *Allier* towards the end of November. The first stoppage we made was at the harbour of refuge in the Island of Vavau. It was Christmas time, and I celebrated the Holy Offices with great solemnity on board the *Allier*, which was anchored off the shore. The Commander, M. Bousset, rendered the Catholic Bishop military honours off this island, firing a salvo of artillery; then he called together all the chiefs of the tribes to a great meeting on shore, where, with dignity, loyalty, and firmness, he read them a well-deserved lesson on civilisation. He reproached them with the civil intolerance (imposed by the Methodist missionaries) they had shown me nearly four years before, in refusing to allow me to stay on their island. He exacted from them that, for the future, they should not behave in a like manner to any French subject, whosoever he might be. All the chiefs received the advice of the noble commander with docility.⁴ (Pompallier 1888:78)

Referring to this incident, the Reverend Stephen Rabone (Journal, 1 Jan. 1842) wrote that the chiefs of Vava'u were

⁴ Brookes (1941:84) claimed that, 'The French government and the French commanders consistently confused the issue in Oceania by insisting that the expulsion of French missionaries was a deliberate insult against their nationality, when the crux of the situation was obviously only the question of freedom to proselytize'.

asked whether they had heard what the French had done at Tahiti and other places. He claimed the Tongans were aware of their intention to 'force Popery' upon them and that they could often be heard praying earnestly and sincerely to the Lord to steer the French vessels in any direction but to their islands. In his opinion, the conduct of the Roman Catholic priests only served to affirm the common notion 'that it is a work of great mercy with them to convert us hereticks tho' by fire and sword to their system—than to enlighten the minds of dark and untaught heathen'. He claimed that there were many other heathen islands where the Roman Catholics could expand 'all the resources of their charity', but they would not go there because 'agitation' was one of their watch words. He deplored the use of a man-of-war to threaten a few quiet, unarmed natives, adding that in such an unequal contest they might indeed gain something:

but He, whom they profess to follow has left directions enforced by his own example diametrically opposed to such doings. Such conduct can therefore never receive his sanction and blessing. May the Lord consume this and every other deadly error with the breath of his mouth and save these poor Islanders from the curse of Popery. Amen & Amen.

Bishop Pompallier and the two vessels left for 'Uvea and Futuna, where he stayed for the following five months, to smooth out some of the difficulties in the work of his mission stations there. On 9 June he finally left Futuna, taking with him Father Chevron and a catechist, Brother Attale. They departed aboard the *Sancta Maria* which was accompanied by a large canoe in which were more than thirty Tongans from Tongatapu who had been living in 'Uvea for some years and had been converted to Catholicism. They now wished to return to Tonga to help convert their people and they had asked the Bishop for at least a priest and a catechist, 'to sustain them in the practice of salvation and to endeavour to obtain the conversion of all their island' (Pompallier 1888:79).

After four days, they arrived at Lakemba (Fiji) and were met by another party of Tongans, one of whom was Fifita'ila, son of the celebrated Fa'ē of Pea. At this stage there had been no firm

decision as to where the mission station should be established, for the Tongans from 'Uvea did not agree among themselves. However, Fifita'ila advised them that their only hope would be with Moeaki of Pea. The Bishop inquired who Moeaki was, and was informed that he was a chief of high rank whose paternal uncles, Tākai and Fa'ē, and grandfather Lavaka, were responsible for making the present *hau*, Aleamotu'a, the Tu'i Kanokupolu. This information pleased the Bishop (*Taumua Lelei*, June 1931:4).

On 30 June 1842 they arrived at Pangaimotu and the Bishop sent two messengers to inform Moeaki of the new mission and of the proposal to establish it under him in Pea. Moeaki and Lavaka welcomed the Bishop's proposal and invited him to Pea. On 2 July the Bishop and Father Chevron conducted the first mass held in Tonga under a tree at Pangaimotu. Next day, the Bishop's party landed on the main island. They first called on Aleamotu'a, but he would not accept the new mission, saying that they already had one. He directed them to Moeaki. That day, the Bishop and Father Chevron held the first mass on Tongatapu, in the house of Moeaki. His wife Fie'ota and their three children, and two others, joined the church that day.

Aleamotu'a had not expected that Moeaki would accept the Catholic Mission, since he was at that time a Methodist and, when he found out that Moeaki had accepted the new mission, he became very angry and repeatedly sent messengers to urge him not to do so. Meanwhile, Fie'ota pleaded with Moeaki to turn Catholic, and Lavaka added his weight in support of her, so that finally Moeaki was converted to Catholicism on 7 July 1842. Bishop Pompallier then left Father Chevron in charge of the mission with Brother Attale as his assistant.

On his return to New Zealand Pompallier wrote to Lavaud, on 19 October 1842, and gave an account of the work he had done:

From Fiji I went to Tongatabu where I passed ten days. The Wesleyan party by its missionaries and the chiefs protested furiously against me, but I opposed it calmly by word and authority. I have been told that this island has ten or twelve thousand souls. About nine or eleven thousand are in favour of me.⁵ The great chiefs of

⁵ The Bishop was either misinformed or misled to believe this. Farmer (1855:368) claimed that the number of people who joined the Roman Catholic mission had never been more than 300 at any one time.

Bea have received one of my priests whom I offered them with a catechist. The principal chief of Bea has already turned to the Faith with several others of his celebrated fort, where I said the first Mass on 2nd July . . . We touched at Vavau, the intolerant island which takes upon itself to yield nothing of its intolerance for the French, in spite of the letter and threats of M. du Bouzet. (Keys 1957:189)

The founding of the Catholic mission in Tonga was a staggering blow to the Wesleyan missionaries, for obviously Bishop Pompallier had scored a victory over them at this stage. They were absent, attending a District Meeting, when the Bishop and his followers arrived at Tongatapu. Expressing deep disappointment and indignation, John Thomas reported to the Committee in London that upon returning to Tongatapu he found:

to my great grief, that, during our absence, the Roman Catholic Bishop had succeeded in placing a priest at the Bea where the Chief Moeaki, a man who professed Xty, but who was not a member, or even baptized, has embraced the heresy; and as the Bishop has brought a number of Tonga men from Wallis's Island, who have embraced their dogma, he will have the means of greatly annoying us. It is thought that had Tupou [Aleamotu'a] exerted himself, he might have prevented this evil from taking place. (*W-M Mag.*, Mar. 1843:261)

Apart from Pea, two other Catholic centres existed on Tongatapu, one at Holonga and the other at Kotongo (Kolonga). Both were formed from the people who came from 'Uvea with Bishop Pompallier in 1842, and who had returned to their own places of origin.

Having now established their roots in Tonga, the priests proceeded with vigour and enthusiasm to pursue the task which they firmly and sincerely believed God had called upon them to perform: namely, the conversion of all Tongans, Protestant and heathen alike, to the 'true faith'.

According to Methodist accounts, the priests travelled for a time to the various places where the Wesleyan missionaries were already well established, 'endeavouring to subvert the faith of the native converts', and 'in the prosecution of this object, they resorted to every species of calumnious misrepresentation' (West 1865:290). They alleged that at Hihifo the priests told the people

the Methodists were misleading them, for they were of Mr Wesley's religion, which only began one hundred years ago 'and Mr Wesley was no better than Jovili [Siovili] (an imposter, who was in the Navigator Islands a few years since, and who deceived many)' and, also, that their Bible was full of error (Farmer 1855:365).

Later, Peter Turner (Journal, 1 Dec. 1848) recorded that, while at Mu'a, he 'procured a small book belonging to the Romish party' which the priests had given to a heathen there. An extract from it reads:

It is three hundred years since Luther was separated from the Church of Jesus Christ and commenced his religion of mere men and that Wesley has only lately been separated from Luther and begun his religion himself—just according to his own mind.

That the curse of Luther and Wesley are the same and also the curse of Lucifer: for Lucifer was separated from God, because of his refusing to attend his majesty; and Luther and Wesley were separated from the Church, and for their refusing to listen to the Church were driven away that they might be like him (viz the devil).

Realising the importance of the Tongan language to their work, the priests applied themselves to learning it, having been greatly assisted by the fact that it had already been reduced to writing by the Methodist missionaries, and aided by their earlier contacts with Tongan speakers at 'Uvea. A few years later, one of the Wesleyan missionaries admitted how greatly he admired the way in which the priests had mastered the language. Their command of the language enabled them to establish schools by the late 1840s. Like the Wesleyan missionaries, they trained and sent more gifted members as teachers in the various places where they had converts. Peter Turner (Journal, 5 Nov. 1848) wrote:

It is very evident that the priests are following our example in some things.

1. In sending some—to act as teachers in the various places in wh.^h they have a few.
2. They are now commencing schools.
3. And in going out among the people.

In spite of their untiring efforts, the priests were not very successful in converting the masses to their faith as they had

hoped to do. The Reverend George Miller reported in 1845: 'Popery, hitherto, thanks be to God, has not made much progress in Tonga. Many of the heathen see that it is the old thing in a new garb' (*W-M Mag.*, 1846:158). Later, in 1850, another Wesleyan missionary wrote, 'there are now 4 Romish Priests on Tonga, but they are losing their influence among the people, and with all their seeming compliances, and "pious" fraud, they are cast into the background. The reason for this is, we have God and truth on our side' (*W-M Mag.*, 1851:510). As will presently be shown, the Wesleyan missionaries succeeded in convincing their converts that 'Popery' was a system of lies and that the French missionaries were agents of France, whose real intentions were to create disturbances which could be used by their country as an excuse to annex Tonga.

Since the priests failed to make much impact upon established Methodist areas, they abandoned the itinerant system and concentrated their efforts upon the few centres in which they had established themselves. In addition to Pea, Holonga and Kotongo, these now included Ma'ofanga and Houma.⁶

The priests were as aware as the Wesleyan missionaries of the importance of converting the influential chiefs to their work. Once they had learned that the highest chief in all Tonga was the Tu'i Tonga, Laufilitonga, who lived at Mu'a and who was still a heathen, they concentrated all their efforts upon trying to win him. Father Chevron first visited him in 1842, but Laufilitonga rejected his overtures. In 1843 Bishop M. Douarre arrived from France on his way to New Caledonia. He and the other priests paid Laufilitonga a visit. The Tu'i Tonga showed them sympathy and promised that he would accept Catholicism. However, when the new Vicar of Central Oceania, Bishop Bataillon, first visited Tonga in 1844 Laufilitonga still refused to be converted.

The Wesleyan missionaries were equally unsuccessful. Peter Turner (Journal, 6 Mar. 1843) alleged that when he and John

⁶ After the 1840 war a few of the Ma'ofanga people continued to live at Pea. Some of these people were converted to Catholicism after its establishment there in 1842. They returned to Ma'ofanga and started the Catholic mission there. Father Chevron, after repeated failure, finally managed to obtain a few converts at Houma, which had recently become a Methodist area (see *Taumua Lelei*, July 1931:3).

Thomas went to Mu'a to see the Tu'i Tonga, he ran away to the bush and refused to see them. It seems that political issues were involved. Bishop Blanc points out that the main reason for Laufiletonga's not accepting either Catholicism or Protestantism was that King George, who had defeated him in war many years ago, had accepted a foreign religion, and the missionaries supported him. When the Catholic mission, another foreign religion, arrived, Laufiletonga could not understand that there was a vast difference between the two, and so he preferred to remain heathen (*Taumua Lelei*, July 1931:3-4).

However, Father Chevron persisted and finally Laufiletonga recognised that the two missions were not the same and permitted Father Chevron to reside at Mu'a in 1847. In the following year, 1848, he decided to accept Catholicism and attended the mass on Sunday, 24 September. He was baptised by Bishop Bataillon on 30 September 1851.

The Wesleyan missionaries claimed that the conversion of the Tu'i Tonga was an integral part of the priests' general plans to destroy their influence on the people of Tonga. They alleged that the priests were secretly encouraging the 'spirit of disaffection, which the termination of the war of 1840 had not removed from the minds of several important heathen chiefs' (West 1865:291). They claimed that after King George was appointed Tu'i Kanokupolu in 1845, the priests began, at first secretly and then openly, to try to undermine his authority. The Reverend Thomas West (1865:291) wrote that the priests:

first of all attempted to advance the claims of their principal convert, the Tuitoga, to the supreme government. They asserted his right not only among the natives, but to captains of merchantmen, and ships of war, belonging both to England and France; whilst they denounced King George as an ambitious usurper.⁷

At an encounter with two of the priests from Mu'a, who were on board the *Mary Jane* anchored at Nuku'alofa, Peter Turner (Journal, 5 Nov. 1848) accused them of trying to make the Tu'i

⁷ From a traditional viewpoint, the Tu'i Tonga would have been an equally legitimate claimant as was King George, but the former, Laufiletonga, was not as gifted for leadership, nor nearly as powerful, as his rival.

Tonga King of Tonga, among other things. 'These things', he wrote, 'I told to the priests and showed them how unbecoming it was for them to meddle so much with the chiefs and the Government of the Islands.'

Turner then wrote two long letters to King George, 'giving an account of the state of affairs in Europe and of France in particular'. In the same letters he urged King George to come to Tongatapu, noting that 'A word from him goes a long way with many of the heathens'.

King George reacted promptly, as West (1865:291) recorded:

No sooner, however, did the latter become acquainted with these facts, than he manned a few canoes, and sailed direct to Mua, where he publicly charged the priests with the offence, and where he also confronted the Tuitoga. The latter denied all participation in any attempt to advance himself to civil power; and declared further that he had no right to it, nor did he wish it.

The effect of this meeting was quite significant, as West points out that the Tu'i Tonga's 'public disavowal of all claims, as opposed to those of the lawful sovereign, effectually prevented any further open attempts on the part of the priests, to be his advocates'.

Again, according to the Wesleyan missionaries, when the priests failed in their bid to undermine King George's power by making Laufilitonga King of Tonga, they adopted another method. This was to claim that the chiefs of Pea, Mu'a and Houma had every right to rule their people quite independently of King George and his laws.

Although the Ha'a Havea chiefs had agreed to support King George and to accept his authority, at the *fono* which he held after his installation as Tu'i Kanokupolu they still remained uncooperative. It was claimed that their reason for resisting King George's laws resulted from the priests telling them that to submit to these laws, which King George had promulgated with the guidance of the English missionaries, meant submitting to the King of England and not to King George. The priests also promised the chiefs their support and the support of French men-of-war (P. Turner, Journal, 5 Nov. 1848).

King George then decided to move his court to Lifuka, Ha'apai, leaving the administration of Tongatapu to Ma'afu and Lavaka, two of the leading chiefs of the Ha'a Havea. It seems very probable that King George did this in order to test their loyalty. If they faithfully carried out their responsibilities and maintained peace and order on Tongatapu, he would be satisfied, for that would prove that there was no further hostility or resentment towards his authority and the law of the country. But if, on the other hand, they seized upon this opportunity to rebel and undermine his authority, then with his solid following in the rest of Tongatapu, Vava'u and Ha'apai, he could easily crush any rebellion.

Ma'afu and Lavaka chose to rebel. They started to rebuild the fortress at Pea. When news of this reached King George, he sailed for Tongatapu to investigate the matter, but Ma'afu and Lavaka denied the rumours and King George returned to Ha'apai, after the promulgation of the 1850 Code of Laws. However, the truth could no longer be contained, and, when an appeal came from the Governor, Sūnia Haumono, and his friends in Tongatapu, King George decided to move his residence to Nuku'alofa in 1851. At this stage Ma'afu and Lavaka openly defied his authority and gave asylum to any fugitive from the laws promulgated by the King. Vaea and Fohe, two other Ha'a Havea chiefs, fortified Houma, ready to support Pea in the event of war.

In spite of repeated efforts on the part of the Wesleyan missionaries,⁸ the Ha'a Havea chiefs had determined to defy the

⁸ West paid a visit to Vaea, chief of Houma, and during their interview a conversation occurred, which West (1865:310-11) later recorded:

Vaea, in the course of our interview, said, 'You see us armed, not that we are at war, or wish to fight, but because Tubou' (the hereditary name of the Tongan kings) 'is angry with us, and because he is preparing to attack us. He wants to force us to become Christians; but sooner than that shall be, we will fight and die.' To this assertion I thought it my duty to make the following reply:— 'It is no business of mine to meddle with your political affairs; but I will say this, that King George does not, and never did, wish to compel you to become Christians: he leaves that to your own free choice. He only asks you to keep the general laws of the land, and to abide truthfully by your voluntary oaths of allegiance to his person and government. As the proof of what I say, you may go

authority of King George and, if attacked, to fight. Basil Thomson (1894:355) who was a particularly severe critic of the Wesleyan missionaries, had this to say: 'The priests had set their followers on the road that leads to civil war, and for the misfortunes that overtook them they have only themselves to thank.'

King George declared war on Pea and Houma on 1 March 1852. He asked the French priests to leave Pea in case harm might come to them, but they replied that it was not the way of Catholic priests to desert their followers in their time of distress.

Meanwhile, M. Nallier, the commander of a French vessel from Tahiti, the *Henri*, arrived in Tonga on 13 April with Bishop Bataillon on board. Nallier informed the King that he had orders from the French Governor at Tahiti to remove the French priests to Tahiti if he found them in danger, and if they so desired. However, after being told the cause of the war and the steps the King had taken with regard to the personal safety of the priests, the Commander replied:

'If they wish to go away, I can remove them to Tahiti; but if they choose to remain, the consequences are with themselves. You, as King, have done your duty in offering them protection; and if they get shot by accident, they will nobly fall in the performance of their duty, and no Government in the world will complain of either you or of them.' (West 1865:323)

Bishop Bataillon, however, addressed a letter to the King asking him whether it was true that the purpose of the war was to destroy the remainder of the heathens and the adherents of the Roman Catholic mission. The King replied:

The report you heard . . . was a lying report. This is not a religious war, but a civil war . . . The object of the present war is to subject the rebels to the government of their country. There is one thing however, I must make known to you. It appears evil in my eyes that your converts in general have joined the heathens in opposing my rule. (Farmer 1855:405)

to the Christian towns all over the country, and you will not find one place fortified for war, or a single man carrying musket or club. Go and visit the king, as is your duty, submit to the laws, and desist from your warlike preparations and conduct, and I pledge my word that all will be well with you.'

Skirmishes occurred between both sides, with the loss of several lives on both sides. On 21 April, the King, 'not wishing to sacrifice human life unnecessarily' by storming the heathen fortresses, resolved to besiege them, in order to starve the rebels into submission. Pea was besieged by four divisions from Nuku'alofa, Mu'a, Ha'apai and Vava'u, and Houma was entrusted to Ata and the Hihifo warriors. Apparently there was a hope among the rebels that the Bishop would return with a French man-of-war by the end of April. After a while, however, the priests decided that one of them should go to Tahiti to inform the officer commanding the French men-of-war of their danger. Consequently Father Calinon left for Tahiti on the *Atalina* on 27 June. Undoubtedly Father Calinon's trip raised considerable hope among the rebels for French intervention to settle the war in their favour. But after a month of expectation, Houma could not hold out any longer, and on 11 July, Vaea and Fohe surrendered. Commenting on this, West (1865:329) wrote:

It was known that only one thing had . . . sustained their courage and hopes. They had heard that one of the Romish priests at Bea had sailed in a ship bound for Tahiti, with the avowed purpose of obtaining the interference and assistance of a French ship of war, on behalf of the heathen and Roman Catholic rebels, under the cloak, of course, of rendering protection to the French priests and their property.

Meanwhile, Pea held out a little longer, believing that a French man-of-war might arrive on any day to assist, and at the same time the King instructed his army to attack Pea immediately if a French man-of-war were sighted. On 9 August a ship appeared and everyone waited anxiously to ascertain if it were the long-expected French ship. However, it turned out to be the H.M.S. *Calliope*, commanded by Captain Sir Everard Home, a personal friend of King George. Sir Everard offered protection to the priests of Pea in his ship, but the priests declined the offer saying that they were in the fort for the sole reason of administering to their people and that they were prepared to lay down their lives, if necessary, for the sake of their calling.

However, on 17 August 1852 Pea surrendered and on the following day its fortifications were levelled and Sir Everard Home

witnessed the way in which King George did everything he could to save the lives and property of the French priests. Before leaving Tonga, Sir Everard wrote to King George verifying his actions on these matters.

Meanwhile, Father Calinon returned in a small vessel, 'and when he found the war ended, declared that he would have ample reparation in due time. He subsequently departed for Tahiti, where he lodged certain charges and claims, against the Tonguese, before the French Governor' (West 1865:337). Eventually the long awaited man-of-war, *La Moselle*, arrived on 12 November, with Calinon on board. Its commander, Captain Belland, made inquiries regarding the complaints lodged in Tahiti by Father Calinon. Apparently the captain was quite satisfied with the King's account. West (1865:338-9), who was present at the inquiry, wrote:

On every point Captain Belland seemed satisfied. The king was armed with abundant documentary evidence, and proved himself a capital diplomatist . . . At the conclusion of the enquiry, Captain Belland desired me to say to the king that he was perfectly satisfied with his entire conduct. 'Tell him,' said he, 'that I have seen and conversed with many chiefs, in the South Sea Islands, but I have never met his equal. The French have acknowledged his authority by directing me to him as supreme ruler in Tonga. He must, however, employ his authority in protecting all foreigners from insult, and must allow his subjects to choose what religion they please; but all must submit to the law of the land. Tell him also that, should any Frenchman be guilty, in future, of such intermeddling with his government as has been proved orally in this case, he has only to procure proper documentary evidence of the fact, and the French Government will not fail promptly to punish the offender by his removal from the country, or otherwise, whether he be a priest or merely a layman.

Belland then decided not to submit to the King the 'documentary claim for heavy pecuniary compensation, on behalf of the Roman Catholic missionaries for damages to their property'. He also decided to take Father Calinon back with him to Tahiti.

9 *The Aftermath and the 1862 Code of Laws*

With the favourable resolution of Tonga's internal political struggles by the end of the 1852 civil war, King George focused his attention on establishing and maintaining Tonga's independence by trying to secure its recognition by the major powers. This objective now became his main ambition, for his own political position by this time appeared quite secure. One of the things that concerned him most during the next decade was to improve the country's legal system. Both he and the missionaries were well aware of the inadequacy of the 1850 Code for good government. The Reverend Robert Young, who was sent by the Wesleyan Missionary Committee on deputation to the South Seas in 1852-3, stated (Young 1854:442) that King George was aware of the defects of the Code, and he himself had reason to believe that before long the King and his chiefs would revise it. The missionaries entertained the same hope, but it was not in fact fulfilled until some twelve years later.

A new and more comprehensive Code, revising and enlarging previous laws, was drawn up and promulgated by the King and his chiefs in 1862. Basil Thomson (1894:223) called it a constitution, because the Code included provisions which were 'constitutional' in nature, in that they furnished a framework of government. Clauses I, III and V, for instance, were concerned with the powers and duties of the King and his assembly, the judges and governors, respectively (see Appendix C).

The promulgation of the Code produced great excitement among some of the friends and supporters of the mission who regarded it as a remarkable achievement on the part of the missionaries. With obviously deep feelings, the Reverend W. M. Punshon, a prominent member of the Missionary Committee in London, declared:

The Friendly Islands demand a little notice at our hands. A very remarkable instance of the collateral results of Missions has been

there furnished us during the year: I allude to the code of laws enacted by King George and the chiefs of Tonga. This extraordinary code is a model of jurisprudence . . . in plain straight-forward speech, it announces its meaning, which nobody can misunderstand. It is not faultless, of course. You do not expect the first Code of Laws of any nation to be absolutely without blemish. That is not very common, even in British legislation . . . I claim for Christianity first and foremost, a tribute of recognition and of thankfulness; and I claim for your earnest, loving, and unostentatious pioneering Missionaries of the Friendly Islands the tribute that is due to heroes, and the recognition of that sublime greatness which shall outlive the lapse of time. (*W-M Mag.*, 1863:750-1)

However, these sentiments were not shared by the enemies of the mission, who viewed this Code of Laws with utter contempt. They regarded it as a political blunder instigated by men who were unqualified for such a highly specialised venture. Thomson (1894:222-3) afterwards wrote:

King George—to his credit be it said—long resisted the importunities of the missionaries to grant his people a Constitution, and ape the form of government evolved in Europe from centuries of civilisation . . . In 1862 he yielded, and signed a bran-new Constitution, drawn up by the missionaries, after a model devised for the King of Hawaii by a Mr. St. Julian.

Both Punshon and Thomson, though diametrically opposed in their attitudes towards the mission, shared the view that the missionaries were largely responsible for this Code. However, it is necessary to question the correctness of their assertions. What part did the missionaries in fact play in this historic event? Did they participate in the drawing up of this Code upon the official request of the King and his chiefs, as they had done in the case of the 1850 Code of Laws?

The second half of the 1850s and the first half of the sixties witnessed a steadily widening rift in the 'marriage of convenience' between the state and church in Tonga. This rift prevented the missionaries as a body from giving King George and his chiefs the kind of assistance they had previously offered, in their role as political advisers to the King. Many causes contributed to the rift.

Many chiefs and their peoples had accepted Christianity, not on

the grounds of personal conviction but for reasons of loyalty to, or fear of, powerful King George and his Christian followers. They met in classes and performed religious obligations largely because the King wanted them to do as he and his supporters did. For a time, the emotional fervour of the religious revivals, which spread with such intensity in the second half of the 1830s and also in the 1840s, affected even these nominal Christians, so that scarcely anyone remained untouched by revivalism in one way or another. But the effects were not lasting, and gradually the excitement and enthusiasm wore off, particularly amongst the chiefs. Some began to realise that they had a heavy price to pay for their conversion, for they were required to surrender many of the privileges which for centuries had been regarded as the exclusive birthright of their socio-political class. They began to wonder if they had made a sound choice, and some began to react against the missionaries.

Some of the novelty attached to the work of the missionaries had worn off. Literacy, early the prerogative of the missionaries, had become common to most Tongans by the latter half of the 1850s, when many could read and write and teach others to do the same. Nor were the operations of the printing press any longer regarded with awe and wonder, and its exciting effect upon the minds of the people was fast disappearing.

The monopoly of the Wesleyan missionaries in the use of medicine, which for two decades had won them admiration, affection and respect, was now seriously challenged by the Roman Catholic mission. Owing to the great demand for medicine and its short supply, since the Committee provided an insufficient amount, the Wesleyan missionaries were forced to buy extra supplies of medicine and also to charge a small fee for its distribution. The Roman Catholic priests had meanwhile decided to distribute their medicine free among their members.

John Thomas (Journal, 6 May 1856) wrote:

The priests, it seems spare no pains in order to make converts, or rather to prevent the people from the right way of the Lord. In case of anyone taking medicine from them that is understood to be a sign of their turning—and some one is sent at once to perform worship in the house, and thus introduce popery into that family. And then,

while we require a small remuneration for our medicine—they give it, and give it at any time. But we had to fix a time to give it, and to require our people to come at that time—or go back, in some cases, without it, as we have other duty to attend to, besides preparing and serving out medicine.

The missionaries' monopoly of trade, because of their possession of ample supplies of articles for barter, was similarly affected. The challenge this time came not only from the Roman Catholic priests but also from traders who had by now established themselves in the various islands of Tonga.

The absence of respectable settlers in the islands before the fifties had made it inevitable that King George and his chiefs relied almost completely on the missionaries for advice concerning the previous two Codes of Laws and also Tonga's foreign relations. However, this situation was altered by the presence of other European settlers in Tonga, from the mid-fifties onwards, who seriously challenged the missionaries' role as unofficial political advisers.

Another factor threatening to undermine both the prestige and popularity of the missionaries was the pride of the chiefs. Conscientious of the fact that the chiefs had been their protégés in religious and educational matters, the missionaries tended at times to adopt a patronising attitude which the chiefs resented. One missionary wrote:

The missionaries or some of them are not one with the King and the chiefs. The old missionaries know what they were, remember how they have taught them and that all they are they owe to them; on the other hand, the chiefs are beginning to be ashamed of being reminded what they were, and wish people to remember what they are—and are only—this is certainly one cause, that the missionaries are at a distance with the King or rather he with them
(Baker to Eggleston, 21 April 1863, Baker 1860-79)

All these things contributed in one way or another to the gradual decline of the prestige of the missionaries in the eyes of the chiefs and helped to widen the gulf between them. Even King George, himself the hero and protector of the Wesleyan cause, was no exception.

As early as 1850 there was obviously some strain in the relationship between the King and John Thomas, then chairman of the Wesleyan mission in Tonga. On the day he left Tonga for England for the first time after almost twenty-four years of continual service in Tonga, Thomas (Journal, 21 Feb. 1850) painfully recorded, 'many natives now come to take leave . . . but the King and I leave in not a good state of mind . . . I regret he should have so far yielded to the enemy.' Apparently one of the reasons for these strained relations was due to his suspicion that Thomas had used cunning in order to try to obtain Tonga for Great Britain 'merely because [he] advised the King at a time when they feared they should have become the slaves of the French, to apply to the English Government for protection—to offer themselves to be the friends—or subjects of the English (for England has no slaves)' (Thomas, Journal, 19 Nov. 1849). When Thomas finally left Tonga in 1859 he wrote with obviously heavy heart:

The King is not coming, so I shall not have the privilege of bidding him farewell. He is busy, it seems, building his house . . . One of his sons, as he is called, expresses his great surprise at this part of the King's conduct—That any house building should have been so important as to detain him from seeing me before I left. (Thomas, Journal, 15 Dec. 1859)

While the decrease in missionary influence was obvious in the framing of the 1862 Code, non-missionary influence was quite marked. This was partly brought about by a revival of interest in some of the old Tongan customs and forms of entertainment, which may account for the disappearance of the provisions prohibiting dancing and all heathen customs, and partly by the growing contact of the Tongan leaders, especially King George, with non-missionary Europeans.

The chiefs in Tonga valued the skills and services of Europeans. It had been, at one time, a matter of prestige among the chiefs to have a European resident. King George himself had employed a few Europeans in the palace as early as the 1840s, including an ex-convict from Australia, to the utter disgust of the missionaries. The King established close associations with the new Euro-

pean settlers in Tonga, met and received advice from friendly sea captains and British Consuls.

The missionaries told Lawry that:

The King has learned from the captain of the 'Meander' that he ought to hoist his flag, and the ships of war would salute the same. The King has come to us and said, 'I will fix the flagstaff in the ground, and you will please to prepare the flag'. (Lawry 1851:95)

Thomas (Journal, 27 Oct. 1849) reported:

The Consul Pritchard has interested himself greatly in behalf of this place—he has proposed to the King a few alterations as to the Port Regulations—also will write and advise him, as to some better mode of employing persons who have to work for the government.

An intimate friendship developed between himself and Sir George Grey, Governor of New Zealand, who exhibited much interest in the affairs of Tonga. In one of his letters to the King, Sir George wrote:

This subject of the Education of your son, and of the children of some of your principal chiefs should constantly occupy your mind. The best mode of accomplishing it would be to send your son accompanied by some other children to New Zealand. I have myself no children my only little boy having died, and Lady Grey and myself would take every care of your son whilst he continued here. He could live with us whilst the other children could be sent to the Educational Establishment of the Wesleyan Missionaries. (Grey to George Tupou, 30 April 1849)

These wider ranging contacts must have had some influence on the King's political thinking. They certainly coloured his estimation of missionaries of the 'Thomas school' with their paternalistic attitudes, and he was further driven to seek help and advice from non-missionary sources.

By far the most penetrating non-missionary influence on the Code came as a result of the King's visit to Sydney, and his subsequent political correspondence with Charles St Julian, law reporter of the *Sydney Morning Herald*, and later Hawaiian Consul in Sydney.

King George embarked on the mission vessel *John Wesley* for a trip to Sydney in 1853. The idea was originally suggested by Rabone. The missionaries believed that it was a good idea for

King George to visit New South Wales to see how the people of civilised countries lived and managed their affairs. The King eagerly accepted the idea and was ready to leave Tonga on a man-of-war, 'but the Missionaries, fearing that influences unfriendly to his spirituality might possibly act upon him in such a vessel' (Young 1854:213) persuaded him to wait for their own vessel, the *John Wesley*.

The extent of the impact of this new experience on the King's mind remains a matter for conjecture, but one wonders whether he may not have received a similar impression to the one expressed by his son, Tēvita 'Unga, when he visited Sydney in 1872. When 'Unga returned to Tonga, he told the people that he had discovered on his trip that 'rulers' in Sydney were not all ministers of religion but businessmen (W. T. Rabone to his father, 5 July 1872, WMMSA 1852-79). There was one experience, however, which left a marked impression on King George, and which was later reflected in the 1862 Code of Laws. In Sydney he encountered poverty. It has been said that he saw many poorly dressed people, obviously ill-fed, sleeping in the parks. He asked about these people, and was told they were homeless people who had no place to go. This state of affairs was greatly surprising to King George, who could not understand how there could be homeless and poverty-stricken people in a land as large and obviously rich as Australia. His heart was so full of pity for the plight of these people that he determined that such an appalling situation should never be allowed to arise in Tonga (informant, Her Majesty the late Queen Sālote). The King was also very impressed with the leasehold system of land tenure which he saw in Sydney, and he made up his mind that the land in Tonga should be distributed among his own people along similar lines.

This appears to have been the origin of King George's idea of legislating for the individual ownership of land—a revolutionary change in the system of land tenure in Tonga. The prohibition of the sale of land which appeared in Clause II of the 1862 Code was only a legislation of customary land tenure, but the notion of individual ownership of land by leasehold was something quite new.

One can observe the influence of his overseas experience in

the provision of the Code which compels the chiefs to allot portions of land to the people and as long as they pay their tribute and rent to the chief they cannot be dispossessed (see Appendix C, Clause XXXIV:6 and 7).

Although documentary evidence is lacking, it seems highly probable that King George met Charles St Julian in Sydney towards the end of 1853 or just before his return to Tonga in early 1854. At any rate, St Julian wrote several letters to King George in 1854 and 1855.

The missionary, Thomas West, reported that he had received an official document from St Julian towards the end of 1854, which the latter had asked him to translate for King George. According to West this document contained three main suggestions: that Hawaii and Tonga would enter into political and commercial relationships; that the King would take steps to secure a formal recognition of his independence by foreign powers; and that he should establish a constitutional government. This document, together with a copy of the constitution adopted by Hawaii at this time, was accordingly translated and presented to the King.

He appears to have given the submission careful consideration, but he thought that 'the introduction of such a movement would be inopportune' (West 1865:393). In a letter addressed to St Julian on 24 November 1854, thanking him for his letter and for his desire to help him and his people to elevate his kingdom, King George stated:

My Kingdom is established in these days. It has its laws and the people obey them . . . I greatly desire in these days to raise my people and my land that they may become civilised like the various Kingdoms of the world . . . and this is the Book of our Laws that I send you. Do you look into it, and if there be anything that seems strange or wrong you make it known to me and I will consider respecting it. (Tupou to St Julian, 24 Nov. 1854)

St Julian followed this up with another three letters in 1855. In the first, dated 25 April, he stated the objects of his correspondence:

I have not the slightest desire to dictate. I tender advice because Your Majesty has requested me so to do: because it is my earnest desire . . . that your Kingdom should be permanently independent;

and because it is only by the establishment of a good and efficient government that this permanent independence can be secured. (St Julian to Tupou, 26 June 1855)

His other letters outlined the system of government which he suggested might be adopted by King George (St Julian to Tupou, 15 Oct. 1855), and also advice on matters relating to foreign relations, military defence and public revenue.

To improve the economy of the country he suggested that Tonga could develop a cotton industry. He pointed out that the fertility and suitability of the soil for cotton growing would attract planters, who would find excuses for seizing the land, and the only way to prevent this would be to have a well organised and well administered government.

The King's apparent lack of enthusiasm or slowness to adopt the reforms which St Julian believed were needed in Tonga led the latter to publish an article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on 9 January 1858, alleging that King George had imperialist ambitions towards Samoa and Fiji, which were likely to create dangerous friction between the great maritime powers who had subjects living on these islands. He alleged further that King George's 'government of his own islands is totally inefficient except for the wants of the merest savages, and, with the true feeling of a semi-barbaric chief, he obstinately resists all improvement'.

When this letter was challenged in a strongly worded reply from Eggleston, the General Secretary of the Methodist Overseas Mission, St Julian wrote, defending his stand and claiming that his statement concerning the inefficiency of King George's government was fully justified:

I am unable to deny its truth, [he wrote] when I remember that the Tonguese laws, imperfect as they are, are administered by chiefs who divide among themselves, by way of remuneration for their trouble, the fines and labour of those whom they convict and when I remember too that they have proved powerless for the enforcement of some of the simplest contracts known to civilised men—That King George having brought his governmental system to its present condition and hitherto expressed the strongest disinclination to make such further improvements as would fit his state for the duties imposed on civilised governments and justify its admission within the pale of internationality . . . I should be glad, as you well know, to see

King George not only recognised by all the maritime powers and invested with an extended role if the conditions precedent of qualifying his government to fulfill international obligations were complied with. But ere this be, he must give up his canoe progress, feasting and cava parties, must have an organised government, and an effective code of Laws impartially administered, must relieve the lower orders from the exactions of chieftdom, must encourage industrial improvement, must give up his local preachership and stand neutral between all sects and classes of his subjects. (St Julian to Eggleston, 13 Jan. 1858)

In general his arguments were valid and sound. However, he failed to appreciate the fact that there were problems peculiar to each region which would inevitably influence not only the kind and degree of change to be made, but also the appropriate time for such action.

St Julian was a Roman Catholic and he was also, at this time, seeking a government appointment in the South Pacific islands. His attempt to offer advice to King George was resented by the missionaries, for they viewed it as an encroachment upon what they regarded as their sphere of influence. Their resentment was intensified by St Julian's attack on the credibility of King George, the avowed champion of their cause. Not surprisingly, when St Julian sought an exequatur from the British government to act as British Consul in Tonga, a letter was addressed on their behalf to the Colonial Office, 'offering reasons against the appointment of Charles St Julian Esq. to the Office of the Consul of the British Government in Tonga, or the Friendly Islands' (Hoole to Lythton, 27 July 1858, WMSA 1852-79).

The missionaries saw the advantage to Tonga of adopting a constitutional government and of being recognised as equal by all the great nations of the world; yet despite their belief 'that the Tonguese [had] better capabilities, and greater facilities for becoming an important people, than even the Hawaiians' (West 1865:393), who, in fact, had achieved international recognition for their independence, they felt that such sweeping reforms and alterations in the political condition as those proposed by St Julian ought to be brought about gradually. King George appeared to have shared their opinion for a time, but events of the following years reveal that he was forced by circumstances to adopt many of the measures suggested by St Julian.

Evidently the Roman Catholic priests were dissatisfied with Captain Belland's decision in 1852, which exonerated King George's conduct during the civil war, and they determined to continue the fight. Three years later Father Calinon succeeded in having the case reopened, and in January 1855 he returned to Nuku'alofa with the French Governor of Tahiti. The Governor believed that King George had been treated too leniently by Captain Belland. The King was then 'required to sign on 9 January a treaty of peace and friendship reminiscent of those dictated by French Naval Officers in Tahiti and Hawaii in earlier years' (Morrell 1960:314). The treaty had already been prepared in advance for him to sign. It stated that there was to be perpetual peace and friendship between Tupou and Napoleon III; the Catholic church was declared free in all the islands of Tonga and its members were to have all the privileges accorded to Protestants; those who had been exiled or deprived of their property on account of religion were to be allowed to return to their homes and have their property restored; French subjects residing in Tonga and visiting ships and crews were to be protected in their persons and property by the King; French ships were to enjoy the most-favoured-nation privileges in regard to anchorage pilot dues and other charges; and King George's subjects were to have a right to the advantages accorded to the French in Tonga in all French possessions (West 1865:388-90).

Wood has rightly pointed out that the treaty was important as the first official recognition, by a foreign nation, of King George's sovereignty and Tonga's independence. It showed that he was regarded 'as fit to rule his country and to prevent trouble happening to Europeans resident in Tonga' (Wood 1932:56). Although this was quite true, the treaty was evidently designed as a means of promoting the interests of the Roman Catholic church and consequently of French imperialism. It gave the Catholic priests renewed determination, after the humiliating setbacks they had suffered in both their failure to achieve the conversion of the masses to their faith and in their political manoeuvring which had led to the civil war of 1852. The fall of Pea removed the last obstacle to King George's rule throughout the kingdom, and was at the same time a tremendous blow to the Catholic cause which had associated

itself with the rebel elements. However, equipped with the rights now sanctioned by the treaty, they wasted no time in pursuing the restoration of their lost prestige and the fulfilment of their objectives. On a wide variety of fronts they launched their assaults with vigour, beginning with political agitation.

Soon after the departure of the Governor the priests began to visit various districts, including some such as Hihifo where they had not a single adherent, in order to establish a permanent residence. Later, in July 1858, Father Calinon and another priest arrived at Lifuka, Ha'apai, intent upon establishing a Catholic mission there. The Governor of Ha'apai, Siosaia Lausi'i, tried to temporise, saying that he had to obtain permission from the King, who was at Vava'u at that time, before allowing them to land. This refusal gave Father Calinon an excuse to appeal to the French frigate *La Bayonnaise*, which had arrived in Tonga. Its captain immediately sent for King George and Siosaia, the Governor. King George tried to explain that the Governor had acted in accordance with the laws of the land, and that he did not realise that he had broken the treaty in doing so. He appealed to the captain to have the matter judged by a third party and failing this he offered to pay compensation for any inconvenience that might have been caused to the priests by the Governor's action. This offer was refused and the captain demanded that King George should 'depose the Governor, Josiah; . . . convey the French priests, their servants and their baggage to Ha'apai; and . . . grant them a piece of land and build them two houses equal in every respect to those occupied by the Wesleyan Missionaries' (*Wesleyan Missionary Notices*, Jan. 1859:17).

The only concession, made at the suggestion of Father Chevron, was to give the Governor of Ha'apai three months in which to carry out these undertakings. 'The King had no alternative,' wrote Thomas, 'and in [a] few days, his own vessel had to take the Priests on board with their things and remove them to Lifuka—where the Protestant chiefs and people are working almost night and day in order to get these houses built' (Thomas to Eggleston, 19 Aug. 1858, WMSA 1852-79).

Referring to this incident Whewell wrote (to Eggleston, 16 Feb. 1859, WMSA 1852-79), 'I fully understood "The Treaty"

a copy of which I sent you, two years ago, to give them a legal right to go anywhere in the dominions of King George of Tonga. That was its plain verbal meaning to my mind, though that never was the King's idea of it.'

In 1860, Father Calinon wanted to conduct a Catholic burial in the Wesleyan cemetery. Governor Siosaia was approached and, after consultation with the Wesleyan missionaries, he sent a message to the priest to say that he could bury his dead at any other burial place but the Wesleyan. Father Calinon regarded this as an insult, for 'he sought a piece of ground only four feet by four to inter in for the time being, which was refused and this being the case, he considered himself persecuted by the natives, and that the treaty had been broken which granted equal privileges to Catholics and Protestants—therefore considered himself justified in bringing the matter to a man of war' (Stephinson, *Journal*, 7 Aug. 1860). He then sent his complaints to the priests in Tonga-tapu, who were to present them to the commander of a man-of-war. As a result the captain of a French warship, which called at Tonga in March 1860, demanded that Siosaia be deposed, threatening that otherwise he would 'carry off King George to New Caledonia' (Morrell 1960:315). His demands were carried out, and Siosaia was deposed.

Eventually, however, the priests became aware of the fact that their involvement with the power of the French Navy did more harm than good to their cause. Father Chevron wrote (to Father Poupinel, 11 Nov. 1861):

We find that this visit [man-of-war] . . . has been a lesson for us not to rely too much on the assistance for our Missions from the French Government. We would have given a better account of ourselves had we settled matters with the chiefs ourselves. We thank the good God for the lesson and we propose to go ahead in the knowledge that the only thing we can expect from the French Government is unpleasantness, even if it seems to be anxious to defend our rights

The Roman Catholic priests appeared to show more understanding and sympathy towards the customs and traditions of the Tongans than did the Wesleyans. Their open encouragement of some traditional practices was a direct challenge to the intolerance

of the Protestant mission and it flouted some of the laws formulated by King George under Wesleyan influence. The priests deplored the blanket prohibition of all heathen customs in the 1850 Code of Laws.

It remains true that the Roman Catholic priests showed greater tolerance towards Tongan traditional culture, but their motives for doing so were not clear. It is difficult to decide whether they were prompted by a genuine understanding and appreciation of Tongan traditions or were more tolerant on account of their Gallic Catholic background, which was relatively free of puritanical austerity, or whether they were primarily motivated by a desire to undermine the work of the Methodist missionaries. The last may well have been the case, since in other groups where Roman Catholics were predominant their priests did not show the same tolerance as was shown in Tonga. The Roman Catholic mission at the Gambier Islands was an example of this.

The Wesleyans, however, had only one interpretation and viewed the priests' attitude on these matters as a deliberate attempt to entice away their followers. One missionary wrote in 1863:

Of late Popery has been making desperate efforts in this part of the Circuit. They have been practising the old heathen games, thinking that, although they could not bring over the people by persuasion, or buy them with presents, they might attract them with these games. The Gospel, however, still triumphs. The games had not the effect expected. The people say, 'if this is religion, what need had we of the Gospel? Did not we do these things when we were yet heathen?' (*W-M Mag.*, 1864:270)

A year later another missionary wrote that the French priests had been breaking the Sabbath by assembling the people to sing songs and play different games on the Catholic mission premises 'as part of the religion, to keep them [the people] out of mischief' (*W-M Mag.*, 1865:175).

The continuing opposition of the priests and their attempts to involve French men-of-war in their political agitation only strengthened anti-Catholic and anti-French sentiments, particularly among the chiefs, who were jealous of any foreign interference in their country. These experiences helped to deepen King George's conviction that there was a tremendous need to establish a govern-

ment which would be recognised and whose laws would be respected by the civilised nations of the world, if the independence of Tonga was to be assured.

It is clear that at the time of the preparation of the 1862 Code, relations between the missionaries of the 'Thomas School' and the King were so strained that they were all, collectively and individually, out of favour with the King. They were therefore not in any position to be asked by the King and the chiefs to offer advice on the drawing up of the Code.

When John Thomas left in 1859 the Reverend Thomas Adams became the chairman of the mission. Adams was a very able man and was on very good terms with King George. Unfortunately Adams's wife died in 1860 and he had to return to England. The Reverend W. J. Davis, who had served in Tonga from 1848 to 1856, was sent back to Tonga from Australia and was to be the chairman of the mission from 1861 to 1866.

Within a year of the start of his chairmanship, Davis became involved in a head-on clash with the King and his chiefs over the funeral of King George's son, Vuna, who died on 2 January 1862. The chiefs and relatives of the King had decided to revive the old custom of *tukufo* (presentation of gifts at funerals), which was still prohibited by the Society, but had been made legal by the state the previous year. Davis, standing firm by the rules of the Society, decided to dismiss all the chiefs and people who were involved in this matter from membership of the Society. The King took it as a personal insult and decided to resign all his positions in the church, and the Queen did likewise (Stephinson, *Journal*, 5 Mar. 1862).

The members of the Methodist Overseas Mission Committee in Sydney were obviously disturbed by this dramatic development, for they knew only too well how much their work in Tonga depended on King George and his support. The chairman, however, defending his stand in the dispute, wrote to the Committee declaring, 'We must be prepared to do battle with the enemy in high places' (Davis to Eggleston, 18 Mar. 1862, WMSA 1852-79). To which Eggleston, the secretary of the Committee, replied:

If this means 'do battle with those who speak evil of dignities and bring the discipline of the church to bear upon slanderers and back-

biters' I think you have the word of God on your side . . . But if 'doing battle' is opposing George and his chiefs in their political measures, or giving countenance to their slanderers and defamers neither God nor man ought to wish prosperity to such conduct. (Eggleston to Davis, n.d., WMMSA 1852-79)

Among the younger missionaries, there was one who had arrived in Tonga in 1860 and who had a rather different outlook. He was not highly educated, but was gifted, vigorous, full of enthusiasm and very ambitious. He appeared to be more liberal than the senior missionaries. This young man was Shirley Waldemar Baker, who was destined to make a name for himself in the history of Tonga.¹ Apparently King George felt that this young missionary was the very one they needed, for it was to him that the King turned for advice. Baker wrote in 1863:

With regard to the new laws, the King asked me my advice and opinion etc. I replied I was a junior minister, it would be better for him to ask one of the Senior Brethren, he said he would not ask me to do or say anything which grieve another—he asked me not as a minister but as a friend. I said on those conditions I would give him any advice or anything he wanted, the result is that most of the new laws are the result of my conversations with the King. I wrote them and they were printed almost exactly—I told his Majesty not to take my advice but to use his own judgment upon them—that I would bear no responsibility, he replied he should get all the advice he could and use his own judgement. (Baker to Eggleston, 21 April 1863, Baker 1860-79)

There have been some doubts raised as to the part Baker claimed to have played in drawing up the Code. Because Baker had only been in Tonga for two years, some argued that his knowledge of the language was barely sufficient for such a difficult job. It has also been alleged that Baker did not have the necessary training for this kind of specialised task. 'It may be supposed', argued Consul Layard, 'that this gentleman, from his antecedents, is not especially qualified for making the part of a legislator, and yet he manufactures new Constitutions and Laws, which are accepted.' Baker answered:

¹ For a fuller account of Shirley Baker, see Rutherford 1971.

I was not aware it was the part of the instructions of Consuls to investigate the antecedents of the missionaries. Before entering the ministry I was studying the profession of my choice; that of the law, and under one who afterwards proved himself to be amongst the first of the profession: hence I have perhaps as good an idea as some others. (L. and B. Baker, 1951:12)

When one examines the 1850 and 1862 Codes of Laws closely one finds that about 75 per cent of the main clauses of the 1862 Code were taken out of the 1850 Code with changes of wording and alterations in the arrangement of clauses. In the 1850 Code, for example, the law concerning land is found in Clause XXIX which reads:

The Law referring to the Soil

It shall not be lawful for any Chief or people in Tonga, Haabai, or Vava'u, to sell a portion of land to strangers (i.e. foreigners); it is forbidden; and any one who may break this law shall be severely punished.

Whereas in the 1862 Code it is found in the second clause and reads:

The Law concerning the Land

It shall in no wise be lawful for a chief or people in this Kingdom of Tonga to sell a piece of land to a foreign people—it is verily, verily forbidden for ever and ever; and should any one break this law he shall work as a convict all the days of his life until he die, and his progeny shall be expelled from the land.

The fact that a considerable proportion of the 1862 Code of Laws was a reproduction of the earlier 1850 Code shows that even if Baker's knowledge of the Tongan language was imperfect at the time and the story of his law studies a fabrication, he could still have managed to play the part he claimed to have played in drawing up the Code. Baker had nothing essentially new to contribute to the Code, for most of the provisions which appeared to be new were merely the results of the logical development in King George's own political thinking. Even the laws concerning the emancipation of the people, the credit for which Baker had claimed for himself, seem to stem from King George, who, as early as 1839, had legislated against the old custom of *hunuki*, that is, marking or

tabooing for the chiefs things belonging to the commoners, particularly food crops. A section of the 1850 Code pertained to the taking of anything forcibly (1850 Code, XIII).

This provision certainly went much further than the first one in 1839, although other provisions in the Code still allowed the chiefs to order their people to work for them.

In order to make the necessary reforms, King George called a meeting of his chiefs in 1859, at Nuku'alofa, which was followed by one in 1860 in Ha'apai and another in Vava'u in 1861. The King found it very difficult to obtain the chief's agreement to the reforms which he himself wanted to make in the laws. The chiefs were unwilling to part with their remaining privileges. In the famous meeting at Pouono, the ceremonial ground at Neiafu, Vava'u, in 1861, many chiefs opposed the Emancipation Edict, complaining that the King had already deprived them of their power and consequently of much of their prestige, and now he was going to deprive them of the only remaining privilege upon which they were dependent for their living—the *fatongia* (enforced labour). 'What would happen to us?' asked Tungī, one of the leading chiefs, 'we cannot fish, we cannot till the land, we cannot do anything for our living. Why don't you just take the *ngia* and leave us the *fato*?' (informant, Siola'ā Soakai).²

The King, however, saw the answer to the chiefs' complaint in the rent which was to be paid to them by the land-holders for their tax allotments.

The 1862 Code with its forthright declaration of emancipation for all the people and their chiefs marked a culmination of the earlier developments when it enacted that:

All chiefs and people are to all intents and purposes set at liberty from serfdom, and all vassalage, from the institution of this law; and it shall not be lawful for any chief or person, to seize, or take by force, or beg authoritatively, in Tonga fashion, any thing from any one. (Clause XXXIV:2)

It should now be apparent that Baker's part in this Code was limited to discussing it with the King and to committing these

² *Ngia* for *ngeia* meaning prestige derived from power; *fato* for *fatongia*, enforced labour. It is a play on words.

laws to writing at the request of the King himself. These were important functions, of course, for the King and his chiefs were neither capable of deciding whether the laws which they wished to enact were in accord with the legal requirements of civilised countries (a thing which the King especially wanted to achieve) nor of setting the Code down in written form.

The rift between the King and the missionaries did not affect his acceptance of the Christian principles which they had taught him. He appeared to be absolutely convinced that the way of life that Christian civilisation had to offer was the best way of life for his people. Even when he decided to give up his positions in the Society as local preacher and class leader, he never ceased to be grateful for the work done by the Wesleyan missionaries for Tonga. In a speech which he delivered on a school examination day at Nuku'alofa in 1863, King George said:

I wish to express publicly my thanks on behalf of myself and the Government to you the Wesleyan Missionaries, and through you to your Conference, for the strenuous, and generous efforts you make to instruct and elevate the people of this Kingdom. I feel that it is just and right for me to do this. I do not do it by way of flattery . . . I state now what is the true feeling of my heart. I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that whatever of good we have among us; civil or social, domestic or national, temporal or spiritual . . . we owe it all under God to that noble Christian Institution 'The Wesleyan Missionary Society', and you its indefatigable agents . . . (Whewell to Eggleston, 27 Oct. 1863, WMMSA 1852-79)

He went on to say that thanks should be expressed by deeds as well as words and promised to replace the old chapel with one as good as he and his people could possibly build free of charge to the Society. He then donated 2,000 dollars towards the cost of the proposed new chapel. King George always supported the actual work of the mission, what he resented was the paternalism of the missionaries. Together with this was his suspicion that the missionaries were plotting against the much treasured independence of Tonga by trying to get the island kingdom for Great Britain.

The King still valued the missionaries' opinions on certain matters. One of the things which worried them, for instance, was the method used for payment of the judges. It consisted of the

distribution of convicted persons among them, as labourers. The missionaries believed that this kind of payment by convict labour would easily corrupt the seat of justice. They feared that the judges' decisions could easily be influenced by the knowledge that they would be paid for their work by having the prisoners who were about to be sentenced to work for them. In response to this a section of the 1862 Code requires that judges and the public officials should be paid salaries and that criminals should work for the state (Clause XXXVI:2 and 3).

The missionaries were not happy with leaving the punishment of offenders to the discretion of the judges. A spokesman for the missionaries discussed this with the King in 1850 after the promulgation of the Code of Laws of that year, but the King's reply was that he and his chiefs wanted to do things step by step (Lawry 1851:81). However, the experiences of the intervening years appear to have convinced King George that the view of the missionaries on this question was correct. In the 1862 Code there are specific penalties mentioned for infringements of the law and it is no longer left to the discretion of the judges.

Another matter which had caused some concern to the missionaries was the absolute power of the King, which they believed was far too great. While they were satisfied that King George exercised this power with great prudence and equity, they feared that such power would probably be quite unsafe in the hands of his successors. A response to this may be seen in the provision concerning the King which makes him subject to the laws in the same way as the people (Clause I:3).

From the start, the missionaries had recognised the importance of education in lifting the general standards of the people. One missionary wrote: 'a great work remains to be done. There are multitudes of young persons growing up, who, if not blessed with a proper *training*,—physical, intellectual, moral, and religious—will be the pests of society, and worse than heathen, if possible' (*Wesleyan Missionary Notices*, Jan. 1859:10).

At first the Tongans showed great interest and enthusiasm for education but by the fifties many had become apathetic and the majority had ceased to attend school. One missionary wrote in 1857:

We stand by our schools, and are trying to prosecute this department of the work with vigour. It is very arduous and often discouraging, through the indolence and indifference of the people. Civilization and commerce are not yet sufficiently advanced to make them feel so deeply the importance of secular knowledge, as to impel them onward in its pursuit as ardently as to conquer the natural indifference of a tropical constitution; hence we are often discouraged; but 'though faint we yet pursue'. (*Wesleyan Missionary Notices*, April 1858:53)

The missionaries were very concerned about this situation. They discussed the matter with the King and his governors and the results can be seen in the provisions of the Code which make education compulsory (Clause XXXII).

Naturally, they were pleased about this, for it must be remembered that the only schools which existed at this time were mission schools. One missionary wrote of this law:

I am thankful to entertain the hope that the King, in conjunction with his chiefs, has enlarged our field of usefulness, by compelling parents to educate their children . . . many of the parents took their children away from the school, or allowed them to neglect it; but this will not be the case in future. The people have been set at liberty by a good King, and one of their best interests has evidently not been overlooked in the enactment of such a law. Wisdom is the hand-maid of Religion, and we hope that our labours to extend the Gospel, by religiously educating the rising generation, will produce much fruit. (*Wesleyan Missionary Notices*, April 1863:355)

King George seems to have been convinced of the wisdom of establishing a public revenue, as St Julian had emphasised in his letters. Customs duties were levied on wines and spirits, arms and ammunition. A licence of 100 dollars per annum was required for the sale of spirits, and every male over 16 was to pay a poll tax. Finally the new Code gave powers to the government to resume uncultivated lands which were not used by the people as a further incentive for the productive utilisation of land, thereby indirectly promoting the growth of the economy (Clause XL).

The missionaries gave the promulgation of the 1862 Code a mixed reception. Baker praised the event very highly, while another missionary, Whewell, wrote critically:

The doings of this parliament will affect our work in its most fundamental organizations and institutions . . . in a way you little

anticipate . . . Our Native Agencies have heretofore been free from all Government work and all taxes—for their work's sake—They are now to be on a level with others in everything—many will leave the work unless we can pay them a small salary. Without this they cannot pay their taxes. It would be easy to pay this if it were likely that contributions would now be equal to years gone by, but this is not probable, because the amount of direct taxation—12/- per man annually—besides ground rent is more than they can do . . . And if the people be so heavily taxed we shall have little oil to send up to the committee year by year . . . The meaning of all this is easily explained. Many of our head chiefs are worldly as the New Zealanders. They have long looked with an anxious eye on the shipments of Mission oil and Europeans have not been wanting to tell them what a fine revenue for them this oil will make. They are now trying it. The result on your balance sheet will be anything but agreeable I fear. (Whewell to Eggleston, 28 June 1862, WMSA 1852-79)

There were other missionaries who feared that the emancipation of the people might encourage the commoners to revive the old heathen customs and ways which were unacceptable to Christianity. In the mission report of 1866 it was stated that:

The many and great changes introduced by the operation of the new code of laws, and the state of unrestrained freedom now enjoyed by the people, have not in all cases been wisely used. One complaint is, that some of the young men, taking advantage of the liberty the law gives, are attempting the revival of customs and practices which, since the prevalence of Christianity in the Islands, have not been allowed. (*W-M Mag.*, Jan. 1866:926)

However, they were more optimistic about the long-term effects of the change stating that 'we doubt not it will prove a blessing in the end' (*RAWMMS*, 1866:22).

Three decades later, Basil Thomson (1894:222-3), blaming the missionaries for the Emancipation Edict, wrote:

The missionaries had perhaps read of Peter the Great and Wilberforce, and they too panted to win the grateful admiration of posterity. To their heated fancy the people appeared as slaves, because they yielded service without fixed wages, and nothing would content them but a formal liberation. They did not stop to reflect that these 'serfs' were fed and clothed by their chief, and that as members of his household they enjoyed privileges which men of their low rank could not hope for in other societies.

Thomson was quite wrong here. The emancipation laws did not have the mere object of freeing slaves. Tonga's emancipation was the freeing of the people from the bondage of an institutional system akin to feudalism. Wood rightly points out that 'though the serfdom that had existed in Tonga was not comparable to a condition of slavery under masters of another race, as in America, yet the ancient absolute power of Tongan chiefs over the lives and property of their people was out of keeping with the position of the country even in 1862' (Wood 1932:56-7).

The favourable reactions to the Code, from both Australia and England, were heartening to King George, who wished to obtain the recognition of the world at large for his government. The Tongans, apart from the chiefs who resented the infringement of their privileges, welcomed the Code with enthusiasm. For many of the commoners, in particular, the new codes brought opportunities for greater prosperity, through the distribution of tax allotments and the abolition of the chiefs' rights over their people's property, though later some felt the burden of taxation just as heavily if not heavier than the traditional *fatongia*.

The beneficial effects were reported by the British Vice-Consul, A. P. Maudslay, in 1879 when he wrote to the Marquis of Salisbury:

In 1862 . . . every taxpayer was, under the most solemn oaths taken by the King and chiefs, guaranteed a good title to his town plot and country land, with liberty to bequeath his title to his heirs and successors. This plan was . . . a great success. Feeling secure of their lands the people set to work to plant coconuts with so much industry that in a few years the exports of the country were increased enormously. (Maudslay to Salisbury, 23 Jan. 1879, Britain 1876-1880)

The Code of Laws of 1862 was mainly due to King George's own progressive thinking and matured political judgment. Certainly, it was not forced upon him by the missionaries, nor did it come as a result of their importunities, as Basil Thomson would have us believe. The relationship between King George and the senior missionaries had become so awkward at this time that he did not ask the missionaries, as a body, for their advice in preparing this Code. However, he had maintained friendly relations

with some of the younger missionaries, such as Thomas West, Thomas Adams, Richard Amos, and especially Shirley Baker, and he had consulted with them. In addition, he had turned to non-missionaries, such as St Julian, for advice. He had also discussed the reforms which he wanted to make with his chiefs in their meetings before the Code was finally drawn up and promulgated.

Nonetheless, the missionary influence in the Code was quite marked, for several reasons. Firstly, there was the King's continuing religious conviction. Secondly, there was the contact with the younger missionaries, mentioned above, particularly with Baker who was responsible for drawing up the Code in written form. Finally, the 1862 Code drew heavily upon the earlier 1850 Code which the missionaries had helped to formulate.

10 *The Growing Separation*

The deterioration in the relations between the Wesleyan missionaries and King George and his chiefs, which was already evident during the latter part of the 1850s, became increasingly apparent during the following decade. During this decline in the political influence of the missionaries generally, only one of them, Shirley Baker, began to emerge as a significant political figure. He was to play a leading part in bringing about the Constitution of 1875.

The King's social ties with the mission had been restored by 1863 when he resumed his normal relationships with the Society and personally supervised the construction of a new chapel at Nuku'alofa which was to become the biggest and most beautiful chapel hitherto built in Tonga. However, he did not restore the senior missionaries to their former place as his political advisers and confidants and the gulf between church and state, evident at the time of the 1862 Code of Laws, was to become ever wider. One of the reasons for this was the missionaries' change of attitude with regard to the independent sovereignty of Tonga. While the country was secure from external threats the missionaries appeared to be reasonably satisfied with the internal management of the kingdom by King George and his chiefs. However, after the decisive actions of the French in Tahiti during the 1840s, which proved beyond doubt that the European powers had entered the Pacific and were bound to disturb the politically vulnerable islands of the region, they felt some concern. They realised that the weak indigenous governments were no match for any major power, backed by warships and guns, and that Tonga was no exception.

It was natural for the Wesleyan missionaries to look to Britain, their homeland, for protection. When Thomas advised King George and his chiefs to give their country to the British, he was expressing a genuine conviction that the interests of both the mission and Tonga would best be served by placing the country under British rule. However, this well-meant advice met with vehement opposi-

tion and bitter resentment from the King and his chiefs. They regarded it as a deliberate imperialist design on the part of the missionaries to enable the government of their home country to annex Tonga (Thomas, *Journal*, 19 Nov. 1849).

The newer missionaries, however, were more cautious than their predecessors, and were very careful not to express their opinions on this extremely delicate subject. The rebuff suffered by John Thomas was sufficient warning to them to avoid advocating such action. Although their real attitudes might not have been different, the only expressed view on record concerning this touchy subject came from the Reverend James Thomas, who was, with Moulton and the other missionaries, bitterly opposed to Shirley Baker's involvement in Tongan politics. In a fit of anger he declared that if Baker's political motto was 'Tonga for the Tongans', his was 'Tonga for the British'. Needless to say, King George and his chiefs reacted violently to this declaration. When James Thomas left Tonga in January 1877, he was warned that if ever he came back he would be charged with treason.

Relations were not improved when the missionaries gave very little support to what they believed were futile and dangerous overseas campaigns. In 1863 King George contemplated sending troops to Fiji to settle the disputes there between the Tongans and Fijians, particularly over land questions, and he also demanded £12,000 compensation from Cakobau for the damages and losses the Tongans suffered in 1855 when they assisted Cakobau in his fights in Fiji. The Reverend Frank Firth wrote (to Calvert, 2 Feb. 1863, Calvert 1855-79), from Vava'u saying that the chiefs and people there were thoroughly opposed to the war.¹ They felt that Tonga had nothing to gain in Fiji; also two of their chiefs were going to Tongatapu to try to persuade King George to negotiate and not involve the country in war. When the King eventually decided to abandon his scheme, Whewell jubilantly wrote (to Calvert, 4 Mar. 1863, Calvert 1855-79), 'the projected visit of King George and his warriors is quite given up. The letters of the

¹ King George was driven to demand this huge sum by his annoyance after hearing that Cakobau had prepared to cede the whole of Fiji, including the Lau group, to Great Britain (Calvert to Eggleston, 28 Mar. 1863, Calvert 1855:79).

two consuls have led to the happy result. The good and wise among the Tongans are in raptures of joy.'

The missionaries opposed these schemes not out of disloyalty to King George and his government, but out of a conviction that they were exceedingly dangerous not only to the King and his people but ultimately to the work of the mission which was their main concern in Tonga. They were convinced that King George had been ill-advised by ruthless Europeans, intent on profit-making and adventure. One missionary claimed that the King was misled by Europeans, who urged him to invade Fiji by saying to him, 'now is your time, Tubou. England will not accept Fiji: if you go we, the Europeans and half-castes will to a man join you, and, you will walk through Fiji without any difficulty' (Calvert to Rowe, 19 Nov. 1861, Calvert 1861, 1866). It was also said that the King's demand for £12,000 was 'advised . . . by Mr St Julian, a papist, who is said to have lately paid his debt in Sydney without money' (Calvert to Eggleston, 5 Mar. 1868, Calvert 1855-79). The missionaries were grieved by the loss of time, money and property spent on the preparation for the intended invasion of Fiji. They also believed that the excitement it caused was extremely harmful to the moral and religious beliefs of the people. On the other hand, King George was deeply hurt by the failure of the missionaries to give him any moral support or even sympathy in what was for him an extremely important affair. It was not an easy matter for him to lose what he claimed to be his by right (Dyson, *Papers of . . .*, VI:72). The disagreement over his plans for the Fijian invasion obviously further widened the rift between himself and the missionaries.

The King's suspicion of the missionaries was further aggravated by their hospitable and friendly reception to the British Consul, William T. Pritchard. 'H. Majesty's Consul from Fiji is here', wrote one missionary, 'just leaving for Fiji again. I hope his visit will do good here. It will be the means of better understanding between King George and the British Authorities in Fiji' (Whewell to Eggleston, 7 May 1862, WMSA 1852-79). This was a rather naive belief, on the missionary's part, for it was well known in Tonga that Pritchard was very much against the Tongans in Fiji, and that he had been working hard to invalidate King George's

claims to land there. In 1859 he had drawn up a document to the effect that the Tongans had no land rights in Fiji and had compelled Ma'afu, King George's representative in Fiji, to sign it. Ma'afu later explained to King George that he had signed the document under duress (Derrick 1963:143).

On 20 April 1862, three days before his arrival in Tonga, Consul Pritchard had written a report on 'The Claim of Tonga against Fiji' (Britain, Consul, Miscellaneous Papers . . .). He stated in its conclusion:

Viewing the question from the various points raised, I cannot admit that King George has substantiated a case against Thakombau, which can authorize a departure from the settlement contained in the declaration signed on the 14th Dec., 1859, by Maafu, as King George's representative, in which are these words (Article II) 'All Tonguese claims in or to Fiji are hereby renounced'.

While in Tonga he wrote:

Every day from 23rd April to the 5th May, the matter [the intended invasion of Fiji] was discussed, but . . . I could not obtain any satisfactory result. I therefore felt it my duty to state plainly, through the able interpretation of the Wesleyan missionaries, on the island, that whatever consequences injurious or even prejudicial to the interests of property of British Subjects, which might result from an invasion of Fiji by Tonga, King George alone would be held responsible and Thakombau fully exonerated. (Pritchard to Colonial Office, 15 May 1862, Britain 1862)

In the end, he succeeded in obtaining a solemn pledge from King George that he would not make war in Fiji.

Under normal circumstances the extension of hospitality and friendship to the British Consul by the missionaries would not have caused concern to anyone, but in this particular situation it was different. It was well known that Pritchard had been doing everything in his power, though unsuccessfully, to get the British to annex Fiji. In so doing it was necessary to invalidate Tongan claims to land in Fiji and destroy Tongan interests there, and he certainly did so very effectively. The open and enthusiastic welcome which the missionaries, who were already under suspicion, extended to Pritchard was looked upon with considerable disfavour by King George and his chiefs.

Another cause of much displeasure to the King and his chiefs was the growing friendship between the missionaries and the traders who, during the 1870s, persistently and arrogantly opposed the Tongan government. There had been a steady increase in the numbers of traders settling in Tonga since the latter half of the 1850s. They disliked the restrictions placed by the government on various features of their trading ventures. Sale of land, for example, was strictly prohibited under any circumstances, making it impossible for them to secure complete ownership of land, and sale of spirituous liquors was severely restricted. At first the traders blamed the missionaries for these prohibitions, but later they realised that the missionaries had become increasingly isolated from politics. They regarded it as unthinkable that they, who belonged to the 'Anglo-Australian' civilised race, should be governed by laws produced by a half-civilised King and his chiefs. One of them wrote:

They will find their efforts to stay the tide of immigration useless . . . and England, being aware of the justice and importance of protecting, if not actually governing her subjects in these seas, the Anglo-Australian race will settle and find a living in the Friendly Islands, in spite of all the laws passed by Kings and chiefs. (*Fiji Times*, 22 Oct. 1870)

The belief that the British government would eventually annex Tonga was also shared by some visitors who went to Tonga. A traveller named Holt, who went there on a trading vessel in 1865, suggested in an article which appeared in one of the New Zealand papers that more people with small capital should take up business ventures in Tonga, for in a few years they would make a fortune. With regard to the question of security, he said that Britain would certainly take Tonga in the very near future (*New Zealand Advertiser*, 19 June 1865).

A few years later the principal traders sent a petition to the Governor of New South Wales complaining of the manner in which Europeans were treated, and what they were subjected to in Tonga. They requested the Governor to 'define a limit to the arbitrary authority of a government which to say the least, is and only can be semi-civilised' (Rutherford 1971:50).

This disrespect for the laws and government of Tonga led some traders to defy the decisions of the law courts with contempt and arrogance. Philip Payne, one of the leading traders in Tonga, refused to comply with the court's order to pay eight shillings damages to the owner of a piece of tapa cloth damaged by his horse, arguing that he did not order his horse to do the damage! He also insisted that his case should be tried by a captain of a British man-of-war.

In the main, traders and missionaries, with a few notable exceptions, viewed each other with hostility and treated each other with disrespect. But an entirely different relationship developed between these traditionally hostile factions of the European community towards the latter part of the 1860s and during the following two decades. Miss Eliza Ann Palmer of Sydney, who went to Tonga as a guest of the Reverend and Mrs William Stephinson from 1869 to 1871, recorded in her diary that she and Miss Payne, daughter of the aforementioned trader in Tonga, joined a missionary party which went to 'Eua one night. On the following morning Stephinson sent for a sheep farmer on the island named Parker, a hostile opponent of the government, who arrived with his horses and cart and took the party to his property (see Rutherford 1971:104). Later on in her account of the trip she wrote of another European settler: 'Mr. Young spent the evening with us, and brought his native wife. He is a well educated gentleman and belongs to one of the best families in England and yet he is content to bury himself in 'Eua with his Tongan wife' (Palmer, *Diary*, 1869:32-6).

The sharing of similar political sentiments seems to have been a strong factor in bringing the missionaries and European traders and settlers closer together. They had in common a distrust of the direction in which the Tongan government was heading. They also had no faith in its ability to withstand the test of strength of international power politics in the Pacific. Consequently they looked to their home government for protection, and later they were in accord in their united stand against one of their countrymen, Shirley Baker, who decided to align himself with King George and his chiefs in their struggle to maintain Tongan independence,

and who was therefore accused of being a traitor to both his church and his country.

Although the missionaries and traders shared a common political objective, they differed widely both in their motives and in their approach. The former were paternal and benevolent in their motives, restrained and tactful in their approach; the latter were generally selfish and vindictive in their motives, forthright and arrogant in their approach. Unfortunately for the missionaries, the King and his chiefs were not in a position to understand the subtleties of the situation. The very fact that the missionaries had social relations with men who were openly in opposition to and defiance of the legitimate government of the land, and who made no secret of their desire for Britain to take Tonga, and who also boasted of the certainty of Britain's doing so, must have been very galling to the King and his chiefs. It was little wonder that the gulf between the missionaries and the Tongan leaders in the field of politics grew increasingly wide.

The missionaries were not unmindful of their changed position with regard to local politics. They realised that they had been relegated to the background. They openly expressed their disapproval and criticism of some of the measures adopted by the King and his chiefs for the political development of Tonga. They favoured a slow, more gradual pace for the political progress which would coincide with the people's understanding of civilised ways. Just a month before the promulgation of the 1862 Code of Laws the Reverend George Lee wrote to the General Secretary of the Mission in Sydney:

The restless love of change and the Athenian desire for something new so prevalent among the Tonganese seems to be encouraged or have means for gratification in connection with them. And as the King and Chiefs seem inclined in many things to relax the severity of punishments for crime or suspend or abolish them in favour of a more free and as they call it Sydney-like policy—though in many things their laws are far too lenient now—Many of the bad characters are in hopes of such a change in the constitution of the Islands government as will leave them to face no act as their depraved natures suggest unpunished, uncensured by those in power and unrestrained. (Lee to Eggleston, 16 May 1862, WMMSA 1852-79)

When the 1862 Code was promulgated the missionaries received it with rather mixed feelings. On the one hand they claimed it to be the direct result of the work of the mission.

The year 1862 [said the Tonga Circuit Report], is to be immortalized in the annals of Tonga, and the 4th day of June is to be kept for ever as a day of public rejoicing being the date of the signing of the Magna Charta of Tonga. King George has long been known and styled 'the Alfred' of the Friendly Islands; and truly his great desire seems to be to give his people a code of just Laws, and establish among them a wise and popular administration. This is one glorious consequence of a faithful acceptance of Christianity. (*Wesleyan Missionary Reports*, 1863:35)

One missionary wrote enthusiastically, 'New life and thoughts are arising . . . —liberty is proclaimed—on the 1st of January [1863] the Tongan flag will not wave over a slave that day—Such is the glorious success of the Gospel . . .' (Baker to Eggleston, 19 Dec. 1862, Baker 1860-79).

On the other hand, there were misgivings felt by the missionaries about certain aspects of the Code and their probable consequences. They were fearful of a general resurgence of heathen customs and traditions, which for decades they had laboured unceasingly to eradicate, as a result of the emancipation of the people from the power of the chiefs, and also the dropping of the clauses making these customs and practices illegal. In the years that followed directly after the promulgation of the new Code, they claimed that the unfortunate effects which they had predicted were in fact taking place. They accused the government of yielding to the pressure of English precedent in allowing matters such as fornication to go unpunished. They claimed that there were many who at first interpreted this move as a legalisation of sin and a public expression of the will of the King and chiefs regarding indulgence in vice. 'Many of the heathen games', they lamented, 'though given up [were] not positively prohibited by law, and the natural tendency of the unconverted [was] to revive long gone usages' (*RAWMMS* 1866:25). The obnoxiousness of the situation for the missionaries may be seen in the following passage from the annual report of the mission for the year ending April 1863:

This year will be memorable in the *Church History* of Tonga, as the year of sifting and testing the principles and piety of the church . . . We have to report a very serious decrease, as our schedule will show. The occasion of this decrease, is principally the 'Great Fakataha' . . . The designs of this great national movement were good and laudable, but its influence has been destructive to the piety and spirituality of many of our people. The Tonga people are impulsive, and as human nature is not more immaculate here, and the restraints of education and example are not so strong as in civilized society—the moral influence of this Parliament has been a *great* evil to the *Lotu* people—a temporary one we hope—but an evil, and one which we cannot but deeply deplore. (*RAWMMS* 1863:35)

The note of pessimism contained in this report was repeatedly echoed throughout the following years. The releasing of the people from a state of semi-barbarian servitude to one of almost unrestrained liberty was seen by the missionaries to have brought about a variety of deleterious results. The Ha'apai Circuit Report of 1865 stated:

The circumstances attending the sudden introduction of liberty to a community of Tonguese are far from being favourable to the cultivation of the religious element. Their ideas of liberty are associated with what is hostile to the advancement of their best interests. Hence the abounding licentiousness among the young, the impatience felt towards everything that would tend to restrain bad habits and lead to virtue. Profligacy, theft, and bad conduct were never so prevalent as at the present time. We not only have to lament over the ungodliness of those who are without the pale of the Church but also because of many who did run well, but whom Satan hath hindered. (*RAWMMS* 1865:31)

Another feature of the Code that caused the missionaries much concern was its taxation provisions. They argued that the marked decline in support of the church was caused by heavy taxation. The *Report of the Australasian Methodist Missionary Society* (1866:22) stated:

The chief reason, however, which we believe has operated to the exclusion of many from the Church, is to be found in the extreme poverty of the people, in consequence of the new Governmental regulations: by which the tax has been increased by one third, thus rendering the Quarterly contribution to God's cause a formidable difficulty. And though this is enforced with all christian affection and

love, yet such is the apathy of some, that they prefer quietly to retire or remain aloof from the Society, rather than make the required effort, and so maintain their position in the Church. On account of this we have lost not a few

The missionaries had reason for alarm, for in addition to the decrease in attendance there was a sharp drop in the amount of money they sent from Tonga to the Committee in Sydney. In 1862 the mission sent the Committee £2,330 5s 6d, partly in cash and partly in coconut oil, but the amount had decreased to only £1,232 13s 1d in 1864, a drop of about 47 per cent, and £532 7s 6d in 1865, a drop of about 75 per cent. This was indeed a grave matter for the missionaries, particularly when they knew that the Committee in Sydney had a tendency to measure the efficacy of their work in terms of pounds, shillings and pence.

The 1862 Code was also blamed for the young people's growing indifference to education. 'Our Institution', said the Ha'apai Circuit Report, 'has also received our attention, but we do not number so many at present as in former years, arising from various causes, one being that the new political changes have exercised a worldly influence upon the minds of our youth' (*RAWMMS* 1864:33). This was a worry to the missionaries, particularly when it was so obvious to them that education played a vitally important part in the success of the mission's work.

Faced with all these difficulties and disappointments, the missionaries applied themselves vigorously and enthusiastically to the task of revitalising every facet of their work. Effective attempts were made to gain new converts and to reconvert the apostates, and the annual subscription to the mission fund was successfully raised to £3,770 in 1866 (*RAWMMS* 1867:110). Education received considerable attention and it certainly showed a marked sign of reviving. In fact the missionaries achieved their purpose to a remarkable degree. But their preoccupation with the revitalisation of the mission's activities led them consciously or unconsciously to restrict their sphere of influence. By so doing, they unwittingly strengthened the inherent narrowness of outlook which had already become a formidably negative factor in the church-state relationship.

This outlook, which discouraged vision and imagination and bred intolerance, was due in part to the policies of the mission, in its particular emphasis on the life to come rather than the here and now, and the prohibition of its members to meddle in politics.² It was partly due also to the calibre of the men who carried out the work of the mission. Most of them appeared to be of average intelligence but without proper training and the result was that their energy and drive were not matched by their vision or imagination. For them, the mission was an end in itself rather than a means to an end, and they considered that everything should revolve around it. Their maxim seemed to be 'Tonga for the mission' rather than 'the mission for Tonga'. Hence they objected to 'excessive' spending of money by individuals or groups on anything but the mission collection.

There were, of course, a few exceptions. The Reverend Egan Moulton was one of these. He came from a scholarly family, and although he had not received any university training, he was well educated and intelligent. He held a broader and more liberal view of the work of the mission. When he founded Tupou College in 1866, he decided that the college should become an institution upon which 'Church and State, in their many divergent channels of departmental usefulness, were to centre their hopes and expectations . . .' He planned that 'from it the Church would draw its supply of ministers, stewards, officials, and teachers . . . While from it also the Government could seek its clerks, magistrates, and other officials' (J. E. Moulton 1921:47). He permitted students nominated by the government to enter the college.

² Part of the instructions given by the Committee of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society to the Rev. Samuel Leigh and other missionaries in 1821 read:

Should you acquire influence and consideration with the natives of the places of your destination, as we trust by the blessing of God you will, you may be placed in circumstances of some difficulty arising from the quarrels and different views of the various chiefs. Your plain line of duty is to take no part in their civil affairs, and to make it understood that interference in these matters is no part of your object, and that you are sent to do good to all men. This, however, will not prevent you giving them such advice as may be beneficial to all parties when it is desired. (Loose printed enclosure in Thomas, Draft letter book)

Moulton's fresh approach and wider and more liberal outlook met with severe opposition from his colleagues. Most of his opponents objected simply on the grounds that Moulton had indulged himself in an expensive project which would be of little benefit to the mission. Some of them argued that the sole purpose of the college should be to train young men for the work of the mission, and the Training Institution, conducted by Amos in the fifties, was cited as the model to be followed (Greenwood to Rabone, 10 Aug. 1872, WMMSA 1852-79).

King George's greatest ambition was to preserve the independence of Tonga, and he realised that one way of achieving this was to gain international recognition of his government. Accordingly there was a need to establish an efficient system of government which would be acceptable to the civilised countries of the world. The mission, although quite effective at the local level, was not equal to assisting in these ambitions towards international politics.

In his description of the functions of a legislative council in a letter written to King George, St Julian wrote:

Such fundamental principles should be laid down as would form what is termed a constitution and all subsequent Legislation should be in strict accordance with these principles. In the first instance not much Legislation would be needed. But little probably beyond the Code of Laws which Your Majesty has already promulgated . . . But with the rise of the Kingdom will arise an absolute need of Legislation upon many points with which it is now unnecessary to deal. (St Julian to Tupou, 26 June 1855)

The question of acquiring a written constitution for Tonga had been occupying the King's mind for some time. A number of significant events had made him realise, more than ever before, the urgency of the need for Tonga to become recognised by the main powers. First there had been Consul Pritchard's serious attempts to get Britain to annex Fiji in the late fifties; then the increasing involvement of the powers in Samoa and elsewhere in the Pacific in the seventies; and finally the actual annexation of Fiji by Britain in 1874. King George fully appreciated the value of having a constitution as the basis of the laws of the country,

but he had to find someone who was capable of drawing up the much needed document.

As the affairs of government became increasingly complicated, particularly its external affairs, the King recognised the need for the services of a European adviser in the government, as pointed out by St Julian in his letter of 26 June 1855. He therefore adopted an Englishman named David Jebson Moss as his son, gave him the name of Tupou Ha'apai, and made him his secretary in 1864. The Reverend James Calvert of Fiji referred to him as King George's 'soapy secretary' (Calvert to Rowe, 1 Nov. 1866, Calvert 1861, 1866).

Moss went to Tonga from Fiji during the 1850s. He was very proud of his Tongan name, and went to considerable trouble to identify himself with his new country and its people.³ He appears to have been enthusiastic and hard-working, but lacking ability and common sense.⁴ Although Moss gave King George and his

³ In 1864 Moss was deputed by King George to settle disputes between the Tongans and Fijians concerning certain islands in Fiji, to which the Tongans had laid a claim. Referring to Moss, a newspaper correspondent wrote:

This delegate has become a naturalised subject of Tonga, and has discarded his proper name, and has received the Tongan name and title of Tubou Haabai, by which he prefers to be known and addressed. He signs his new name when writing, and it gives no small offence to his dignity to address him by his baptismal cognomen . . . But the delegate does not rest contented with mere adoption of the Tongan name; on all state occasions he acts the character of dispensing with his European civilised garments, and appearing in the garb of a Tongan—to wit, a massy tappa, or native cloth, round his waist, and with a plentiful unction of sandalwood-scented coconut oil on his bare breast, arms and legs.

The correspondent, William Graburn (Levuka, Fiji, 14 January) stated that Moss's attire and demeanour brought derision from the Fijian chiefs and met with contempt from the European settlers and helped to prejudice his mission from the outset (from a newspaper clipping, no source or date, in A. R. Tippet's scrap book).

⁴ The same writer tells that Moss hoisted the Tongan flag over certain Fijian islands which had been purchased by Europeans from their Fijian owners and caused damage to some property, causing the traders to protest to the British consul about his actions. Graburn continues:

It is much to be regretted that the settlement of the long-existing disputes between Fijians and Tongans should ever have been entrusted to one so unfortunately incompetent to adjust them as Tubou Haabai, as the matter is a grave one, involving perhaps peace or war between the two nations.

government several years of useful service, it was evident that he was definitely not the man to be entrusted with the highly specialised task of drawing up a constitution—a task for which the Reverend Shirley W. Baker was destined.

Baker, like many of his missionary colleagues, had received little formal education, but he was quite gifted, highly intelligent and full of imagination and drive. He was, on the one hand, a great and enthusiastic worker, more liberal than most of his colleagues, and also an ambitious and daring opportunist. On the other hand, he had a passion for fame and a lust for power, and possessed an unlimited capacity for making enemies. The conglomeration of these qualities which formed the idiosyncrasy of the man also formed the basis for both his achievements and his later downfall.

Physically, Baker was short but stout, very healthy and strong, and impressive rather than attractive. He was born in London in 1836 and there are conflicting accounts of his early youth (see Rutherford 1971:1-5). One version states that at the age of sixteen 'he found the alluring gold fever so strong that he ran away from them in the old land, hid himself as a stowaway on board a ship for Australia' (Roberts 1924:12), and tried his hand at gold mining in Victoria. In 1855 he had become a teacher at a Wesleyan school on the goldfields in the Castlemaine district. He was ordained a Wesleyan minister in 1860, and was sent to Tonga as a missionary, arriving there on 14 August 1860.

Soon after Baker's arrival in Tonga, a very firm friendship developed between him and King George. This friendship, according to Baker's daughters, became a source of annoyance to the senior ministers. Besides requesting Baker to draft the 1862 Code of Laws, the King sought his advice on the design for a Tongan flag, and in 1864 Baker made a formal presentation of a flag to the King and his chiefs (L. and B. Baker 1951:8). In 1866 he was forced to return to Australia on account of his wife's ill health.

In his letters to the Committee in Sydney during his first term in Tonga, Baker rightly pointed out that the root of most of the troubles in the mission could be traced to the paternal and somewhat out-of-date attitudes of the older missionaries. He claimed

that what they needed in Tonga was new blood, new ideas, and a fresh approach. He argued that a little prudence on their part would fix the trouble. At the same time he casually referred to his own popularity with the King and his chiefs. 'I would not wish', he wrote, 'to be thought to speak unkindly of any of my Brethren. I believe that they have one and all done what they have conscientiously thought to be right (whether it is turned out so is a different thing)' (Baker to Eggleston, 21 April 1863, Baker 1860-79). Later, in another letter, he wrote:

I am thankful to-day the Lord has given me favour in the sight of the King and chiefs . . . I believe that more can be done by kindness than by strife— . . . Our Fathers who so nobly bore the heat of burden of the day cannot realize the noble tree that has grown up the fruit of their toil—They see Tonga under the old regime . . . New life and thoughts are arising. The Tongans are no longer children. They are just rising into manhood and must have a reason for everything. (Baker to Eggleston, 19 Dec. 1863, Baker 1860-79)

Reaching Sydney in 1866, Baker wrote a long letter to the Committee in which he gave a glowing account of the farewell speeches made by the Tongans in a valedictory service held for him and his family in his circuit before they left Tonga. He told how the people had wept as they spoke, and how the Governor had spoken on behalf of the King and his fellow chiefs, praying that God would so order it that they might return to them:

I can only say that I wept, [wrote Baker] and felt as much in parting from my Haabai flock, dark though their skin may be, as though I was parting from a people of my own nation, and my own tongue.

Many have endeavoured to cast a slur upon their love, and to doubt the genuineness of their attachment; let those do so who will. I believe in it, for in my greatest trial, in the hour of my deep affliction, in the day of need, they rallied round me, my grief was their grief, my sorrow their sorrow, and ever shall I remember their little acts of kindness with heart felt gratitude . . .

. . . despite all the dangers in voyaging—debilitating and depressing as is its climate, tropical as is its heat, coarse as its fare, and strange and rough as may be its customs. Yet, nevertheless, I love Tonga . . . I love its prayer meetings, its love feasts, its simplicity, and above all, its love to the Gospel and to Methodism. (*Wesleyan Missionary Notices*, Oct. 1866:583)

It would be difficult to question the sincerity of Baker's motives for criticising the work of the mission, or the genuineness of his deep affection for Tonga; but when his remarks are viewed in relation to the later course of his career, one wonders whether these seemingly innocent remarks were not also part of a clever design to further his own ambitions. His remarks implied that the failure of the other missionaries to get on with the chiefs disqualified them for the task in hand, while he himself, with a more up to date approach, had gained the confidence and deep affection of the King and his people. When the Reverend George Lee returned to Australia in 1868 and the chairmanship in Tonga fell vacant Baker was back in the following year as the new Chairman of the District in spite of the fact that Stephinsson had been in the District for about twelve years continuously.

Baker's obsessive desire to make a name for himself and to achieve power inevitably coloured his later activities. It was probably at the root of the somewhat doubtful stories which he told of his own origin and educational achievements.⁵ It certainly made him fanatically intolerant of any rival to his fame, or any opposition to his power and authority. It also made him bitterly resentful if his work received no praise or recognition from the mission authorities in Sydney. In their report to the Committee, the members of a deputation which was sent to Tonga with Baker in 1869, praised Moulton's work in the College very highly.⁶ This was far too much for Baker to take. He saw Moulton and his

⁵ Baker claimed that he was the son of an Anglican clergyman who was the headmaster of the Oxford Home Grammar School, London, and that he was educated 'for the ministry, but had a greater desire to become a lawyer, and pending his decision he went out to Australia to visit his uncle Parker, who was Crown Protector of the Aborigines'. This is the version told by his daughters (L. and B. Baker 1951:5), and part of it is told by Roberts (1924:12). However, neither of these claims has been satisfactorily proved. Rutherford, after an exhaustive search, could find no trace of Baker's alleged father in any records nor was the existence of the school substantiated (Rutherford 1971:2). Even the relationship between Baker and his alleged uncle Parker is in doubt, and no one seems to have any knowledge of the origins of his doctorates.

⁶ The deputation's report claimed that Tupou College was 'a positive wonder', and Moulton 'a cyclopedia of accomplishment' (*Wesleyan Missionary Notices*, July and October 1869:148).

work as a threat to his own prestige and honour. So he decided to do all he could to crush both Moulton and the College. He started a campaign against the College, which eventually developed into a bitter dispute.

Baker charged Moulton with creating a false impression to the world, of things taught and accomplished in the College. He alleged that the College was a nuisance and hindrance to the work of the mission, and was only causing unpleasantness. However, the Committee gave their support to Moulton, and Baker, resentful and disappointed, wrote to the General Secretary in Sydney:

I feel tempted to resign . . . You say you hope that God in his mercy will defend the College and make it a great blessing—I can only say Amen. I have done more for the College than any other man . . . yet the Committee and the Conference are not satisfied. (Baker to Rabone, 5 July 1872, Baker 1860-79)

In an attempt to win the favour of the Committee, Baker turned all his energies and gifts to the task of fund-raising, knowing full well that the Committee was badly in need of money. He certainly had a flair for collecting funds. At his first missionary meeting in December 1869, the contributions came to £5,480,—£4,558 in cash and £922 in oil—and this amount was nearly £3,000 in excess of local expenses and was equal to the combined contributions of all the Methodists in Australia. Baker duly received the praise he had worked for when the January 1870 issue of *Missionary Notices* gave the full details of this 'noble sum . . . contributed in one year by this earnest and devoted Christian Community'. However, Baker did not enjoy this praise for long, for the dubious and ruthless methods he employed in raising funds antagonised the traders, who were in friendly relationship with the other missionaries, brought unfavourable comment from contemporaries, such as the Earl of Pembroke and Dr Kingsley, on the work of the Committee, and also provoked severe criticisms from his own colleagues. 'The Earl and Doctor' (Pembroke 1872:251) described the missionaries in Tonga as 'canting sharks'. Moulton wrote (to Rabone, 10 Sep. 1872, Moulton 1855-79), 'It's a great mercy the Earl and the Doctor did not come to Tonga or they would have made statements more astounding than they did', and George Minns wrote:

I cannot report such improvements in the general condition of our mission work. Our success is represented by £s.d.! The disparity between our finances and our spirituality—is so great that I cannot find sufficient courage to address a letter to the Missionary Notices! . . . The Miss. affair is in a large measure the effect of excitement and will collapse as sure as I am Geo. Minns. Let us wait a few years . . . , for there are difficulties ahead. (Minns to Chapman, 26 Jan. 1874, WMSA 1852-79)

Frustrated by his colleagues' opposition Baker wrote:

I believe Messrs. Moulton and Minns want me out of the district . . . My life at present is a perfect misery & I do not think I am called to endure it any longer.

Permit me to remark when I took charge of the district we used to draw some hundreds a year from the Committee. Now we send up thousands over and above our expenses . . . I think I have done my duty to Tonga—Methodistically in advancing Tonga as a nation. I may truthfully say no one will ever be able to leave their mark as I have done—through me they are free, most of their laws they owe to me—and yet all I get from my brethren is persecution—so I think now my children are growing up and my wife's health is failing it is time for me to leave. (Baker to Chapman, 9 June 1873, Baker 1860-79)

In fact Baker was worried over the security of his position, and he was unable to hide this fear. He wrote to the General Secretary:

I want you to give me your official opinion, not only for my own guidance but also for the future guidance of the district. The simple question was put by one of the highest chiefs here to this effect—'Who would have been superintendent of the Tongan Circuit if Mr. Moulton had happened to be appointed Chairman' . . . If after my success I am not worthy to be chairman I am not worthy to have any position in the Wesleyan ministry here, especially to have one 4 years my junior to be placed over me. (Baker to Chapman, 9 June 1873, Baker 1860-79)

But when he found out that the Conference had made no change, he excitedly wrote:

I need not say that not only myself—but also the King and Queen and chiefs and people were all anxiously waiting to see the decision of Conference, had it been against me I believe trouble and disaster would have ensued, but I am grateful the great Head of the Church so ordered the deliberations of Conference that all is peace. (Baker to Chapman, 13 May 1874, Baker 1860-79)

Baker then ceased to talk about leaving Tonga any more. 'As regards my asking to return', he wrote to Chapman, 'I know I shall never be happier than in the mission work . . . by God's will I remain at my post until it appears it is His will for me to go . . . so I will work on' (Baker to Chapman, 4 June 1874, WMSA 1852-79). He then started to advocate that the mission could do quite well with fewer missionaries. 'With three men', he argued, 'Like Brother Watkin and a schoolmaster (layman) for the College, I would undertake to work the whole of the Friendly Islands District for ten years to come—we have too much European Ministerial help' (Baker to Chapman, 16 July 1874, Baker 1860-79). This was an obvious way of getting rid of his opponents.

Less than a year after he had become chairman of the mission, in 1870, Baker had to face charges of immoral behaviour brought against him by his colleagues. He managed to absolve himself from the charges, but it was clear that opposition from his own colleagues was steadily growing stronger. In 1871 the bitter dispute over the College had at length come to a head and the Committee had come down in support of Moulton, much to Baker's disgust. In 1872 his colleagues were more vocal in their criticism of his missionary meetings, and the statement in *South Sea Bubbles* brought upon him a sharp reprimand from the Committee.

Frustrated by the mounting opposition of his colleagues, hurt by the apparent lack of praise for, and appreciation of, his 'success' from the Committee, Baker turned to King George and his chiefs, not only for support, but for public recognition, by championing their aspirations and ambitions. Baker knew that King George's two great ambitions were to maintain Tonga's political independence and eventually to make the mission in Tonga an independent church.

Towards the end of 1872 Baker left Tonga to attend the Conference in Sydney in January 1873. He took with him a letter from King George asking the Conference to make the Mission District in Tonga an independent church. The other missionaries reacted against this move. Minns, for instance, wrote:

This is a very critical period in Tonga and I am particularly anxious that no change should be made in the mode of working our church without much careful deliberation . . . We all hope that the time may come when this change may be effected in Tonga. Yet I am fully persuaded that day will not be in my time. There is a possibility of going too far, and of going too fast also. (Minns to Chapman, 4 May 1873, WMMSA 1852-79)

Moulton also wrote:

I was very much surprised to see in the 'Advocate' that Mr. Baker presented the request of the agents in these Islands, that Tonga should become an independent District, and that matter was carried in Conference and only prevented by the Committee. I am sure, Sir, however anxious you may be for such a 'consummation' yet you will reprobate any such attempt as that on the part of a Chairman to steal a march upon his brethren. Not one of us knew anything about it and no request was sent up. I have spoken to Mr. Baker on the subject and he says he was wrongly reported, having said 'request of the King' not missionaries. But it is very evident to me from the remarks made and resolution moved that the Conference understood it to be *our* request. (Moulton to Chapman, 2 June 1872, Moulton 1855-79)

These letters from Baker's colleagues indicate that they did not object to the idea of an independent church. What they objected to was the timing and also the way Baker had carried out the scheme, for it was quite contrary to Methodist usages. The Methodist procedure was that everything had to go through the Quarterly Meeting, then the District Meeting, before it went to the Conference. Baker ignored this constitutional procedure, and in order to justify his action before his authorities, he wrote:

I forgot to mention the remarks made concerning what I said in Conference. You will be surprised to hear . . . that the request I read in Conference I read at our Preachers Meeting here on my way to Conference and the Brethren Moulton, Rabone & Greenwood being present no objection was made to it by them, and hence I did as I did in Conference, moreover I made the same remarks in my speech at Saione our Circuit Church here at the Misy. Meeting the day previous to my sailing for Sydney. The King was in the Chair the Brethren Moulton—Rabone & Greenwood were present—they again made no objection, and yet, I am charged as I am . . . Surely this is a cunning world—and gets queerer every day. (Baker to Chapman, 30 Dec. 1873, Baker 1860-79)

It must be pointed out that the terms 'Preachers' Meeting' and 'Missionary Meeting' are ambiguous and misleading. The Preachers' Meeting and Missionary Meeting which Baker referred to in his letter would have meant, in Sydney, the Quarterly Meeting and District Meeting respectively, but the Tongan Preachers' Meeting was the weekly meeting of local preachers to obtain their instructions for the following week and there was literally no discussion at such meetings. The Missionary Meeting to which Baker was referring was simply the annual collection day, and not the District Meeting which would only have been attended by the missionaries. This episode shows how Baker did not hesitate to use cunning in order to serve his own purpose.

When Baker took over the chairmanship of the mission, he was reminded of the Society's rule that missionaries were not allowed to involve themselves in politics. For the first two years, at least, he seemed quite content with the prestige of the new position and refrained from openly aligning himself with King George and his government. In the latter half of 1872 he deliberately and decidedly turned to politics again. As has been pointed out, the King was in need of someone capable, whom he could trust, to be his political adviser. His secretary, David Moss, had proved disappointing. His relationship with most of the missionaries was such that he was not in a position to ask any of them for help. Moulton was a good and close friend but was averse to becoming involved in politics. Seeing this opportunity of winning the King's favour and support in the face of declining prestige in the eyes of his colleagues and the Committee, Baker threw himself in the King's lap. He became the King's physician, as well as his financial, political and spiritual adviser.⁷

When Baker left to attend the January 1873 Conference in Sydney, he wrote, 'I made a request to the King concerning the alteration of certain laws and customs—they have had a meeting of the chiefs and passed them all . . . I am aware of the great responsibility laid upon me and of the powerful influence I yield

⁷ In 1873 Baker lent the government a handsome sum towards the establishment of a sugar plantation (Baker to Chapman, 3 Dec. 1873). In 1875 Baker established a Government Savings Bank in Tonga (Baker to Chapman, 3 May 1876, Baker 1860-79).

[sic] . . . ' (Baker to Chapman, 12 May 1873, Baker 1860-79). Baker managed to get the King to dismiss David Moss in 1872, and he virtually became the King's secretary himself. Cries of opposition arose from various quarters, and Baker, defending himself, wrote:

The King has officially appointed Mr. Cocker a Sec.—and so I suppose the good friends will be quiet—All I have ever done has been to give the King my advice, but have always left him to act according to his own judgement anything that has been done has been the King's act not mine he may have acted on my advice but with himself has been the responsibility and certainly I cannot see any harm in it. Shall I let him in times of perplexity and difficulty let him be guided by men who are sworn enemies of the lotu and all that is good—No . . . ' (Baker to Chapman, 20 Nov. 1873, Baker 1860-79)

At their District Meeting in 1873 severe objections were raised by Moulton against Baker's involvement in politics. Serious discussion followed although no formal charges were laid against the Chairman. In December of the same year Baker reported:

At our D.M. Br. Moulton did not bring a charge against me but objected to my assisting the Government, as I had done and that I was virtually Sect. and also that I had the management of the Govt. Sugar Plantation.

I replied that as to the first, I was not Sec. nor had I acted as Sec. I have perhaps taken too prominent a part in assisting the King. And as matters were I intended to keep in the back ground and have as little to do with the Government as I could help, saving that I should always claim my right to advise the King when he sought advice.

I may simply add. It is a misfortune this has happened just now when the King is thinking of revising the constitution instead of refusing to help him I believe the right course would have been to have helped him. However, a future day will show who is right. (Baker to Chapman, 30 Dec. 1873, Baker 1860-79)

The King wanted a constitution and had obviously told Baker so. At the same time he probably asked Baker to draw up the constitution for him, for, while Baker was in Sydney towards the end of 1872, he used the opportunity to seek advice and assist-

ance on legal constitutional matters from the Premier of New South Wales, Sir Henry Parkes, who gave him a copy of all the laws of the government of New South Wales since its inception, and also from the Hawaiian Consul-General, E. Reeve, who had succeeded St Julian. As a result, in 1875 Baker was able to hand to King George his own very much coveted constitution; this was then presented to the Parliament which ratified it on 4 November of the same year.

Although Baker had hinted to the missionary authorities in Sydney that the King desired to have a constitution, his work in drawing it up was a closely guarded secret, for, when it finally came out, his missionary colleagues reacted unfavourably to it. Watkin, who usually supported Baker, wrote:

You will have heard ere this of the Constitution which has been set up—it will look or sound well from a distance; the affair to my mind has been altogether too hurried; . . . I think our Chairman has gone a little too far in the affair. (J. B. Watkin to Chapman, 12 Jan. 1876, Watkin 1855-79)

Later he again wrote:

I am not envious in the least of his [Baker's] position in the Church or of his influence with the King—he is welcome to all and if he is anxious to have the honour of making a nation of the Tonganese, he is quite welcome to this also. But 'tis not in mortals to command success' . . . I am sorry that the Chairman did not consult his Brethren when he was preparing this Constitution for the Tonganese. I think (without pretending to possess a little of the Chairman's knowledge) we might have made a few suggestions which might perhaps have been of a little use—at any rate this Constitution came out quite unexpectedly except perhaps the King . . . I stood by Mr. Baker, formerly, because I could do so conscientiously—and I am as conscientious now in failing to see as he sees, and act as he is acting . . . I am very much afraid that the political scheme embodied in the Constitution set up—will have the effect of splitting up, than of consolidating this small government of ours. (Watkin to Chapman, 10 June 1876, Watkin 1855-79)

Another missionary wrote complaining of the difficulties of raising funds in 1876 because of the adverse effects of the new constitution:

were it not for the fact that a so called Constitution has been introduced into Tonga—an affair, which so far as our work is con-

cerned and the interests of our nation in the South Seas, I wish had been blown to Hongkong and buried there.

This year has been a very difficult and unpleasant year to me principally through this Constitution. The work in this Circuit has been hindered, interfered with and injured by it. And hundreds of £ sterling that would have entered the Church, have through it been turned into other channels. (James Thomas to Chapman, 15 Sept. 1876, WMMSA 1852-79)

However, Baker did not share the pessimistic views of his colleagues; instead he wrote jubilantly in 1876 of successful meetings, and of over 200 new members joining the Society in one week. He added, 'the new state of things is working well to the admiration of almost all—as far as Tongatabu is concerned and all the years I have been in Tonga 17 years now I never knew it in a better state spiritually' (Baker to Chapman, 22 July 1876, Baker 1860-79).

In his decision to dissociate himself from the policy of his colleagues and champion the cause of the King and his chiefs, Baker certainly helped them in their legitimate struggle to make Tonga an independent nation and an independent church. There can be no doubt that Baker was motivated in his actions by self-interest, but neither can it be denied that he loved the Tongans and sympathised with their aspirations. It is to be regretted that he sometimes reverted to the use of rather dubious tactics in order to achieve his ends. However, in his determination to stand by the Tongans, in the face of bitter opposition from almost every quarter, and to champion a cause which the settlers and his colleagues regarded as lost, Baker showed a great deal of courage. In doing what he did, he enabled King George and his chiefs to bring about what, in fact, all Tongans regarded as one of the greatest achievements in the history of their country—*Ko e Fokai 'o e Konisitūtone*—the granting of the constitution.

11 *The Constitution of 1875*

At the opening of the Parliament of 1875 at which the constitution was discussed and passed, the King gave an admirable and moving speech. He outlined the position of the country, its foreign relations, and the laws he had recommended to Parliament and referred to the draft constitution:

You are called upon to meet and deliberate on the new work to be done by the Government, to pass the Constitution, and to govern the land and to have the law of the country in accordance with it. The form of our Government in the days past was that my rule was absolute, and that my wish was law and that I chose who should belong to the Parliament and that I could please myself to create chiefs and alter titles. But that, it appears to me, was a sign of darkness and now a new era has come to Tonga—an era of light—and it is my wish to grant a Constitution and to carry on my duties in accordance with it and those that come after me shall do the same and the Constitution shall be as a firm rock in Tonga for ever. (quoted in Neill 1955:101)

In contrast to the more common process of constitutional development in modern states, where guarantees of constitutional liberty have usually been wrested from the rulers by popular demand, the King's speech indicates that in this case the constitution was bestowed upon the people by their monarch. In Tonga there had never been any formal or even informal demands for a constitution from the rank and file of the people. Watkin reported that, as far as he could learn, the feelings of the chiefs and people were against the constitution.¹ Yet the King granted it. Earlier Watkin had written, 'sufficient time was not allowed to discuss the Constitution; the complaint of the chiefs is that they

¹ The opposition to which Watkin referred was mainly from among those chiefs (and their followers) who had not been included among the Tongan nobles, created by the constitution (Watkin to Chapman, 10 June 1876, Watkin 1855-79).

were not allowed to say what they wished—but were told to take what had been prepared for them, and be thankful' (J. B. Watkin to General Secretary, 12 Jan. 1876, Watkin 1855-79).

Evidently the constitution was a major innovation on the King's part, and the principal motives which actuated him to make such a move were clear: to maintain Tonga's independence by gaining recognition for it from the great powers; and to ensure its future internal stability and integrity, particularly after his death. However, this memorable document ought not to be viewed in isolation, for it marked the culmination of several progressive attempts by King George to achieve acceptable, Christian, civilised legislation for his country.

The first simple written Code of Laws in Tonga, the Vava'u Code of 1839, contained some constitutional measures. Although it did not end the rule of the chiefs, it put a stop to their arbitrary powers over their subjects and it established the rule of law. Judges were appointed and foreigners were expected to respect the laws. It also ensured the supremacy of the power of the King.

The more comprehensive Code of Laws of 1850 contained more constitutional measures. It laid down a comparatively more elaborate system of government and consolidated the King's position. It clearly and definitely expressed the supremacy of his rule (Clauses I and II). It limited the power of the chiefs (Clause V), defined the position of the judges (Clause III) and dealt briefly with land tenure (Clause XXIX). In Clause XIII individual ownership of property was also touched upon where it was made an offence to take anything forcibly without the owner's consent.

The 1862 Code contained further comprehensive constitutional measures, important new provisions with regard to the power of the King which subjected him to the rule of law (Clause I:3). The introduction of this measure by the King indicates the secure position he had achieved and was a triumph for the rule of law. The whole country now accepted his kingship, admired his abilities and leadership, and he had won the respect, loyalty and love of all his people, including those who disagreed with some of his views. In the minds of his subjects, the King's will and the laws

of the country were identical, and to obey the laws was to obey the will of their beloved sovereign.

Perhaps the most revolutionary constitutional measures introduced in the 1862 Code were the emancipation of the common people from serfdom, and the setting up of a state revenue out of which the remuneration of government officials was to be paid (Clause XXXIV). There was also a provision dealing with the allotment of farm lands to the people (Clause XXXIV:6 and 7).

The constitutional measures contained in the legislation discussed so far were largely incidental. The primary task confronting the legislators up to this stage was the formulation of laws. It was not until 1875 that a planned constitution was drawn up and promulgated. This constitution was a long document of 132 articles which were contained in three main divisions: Declaration of Rights; Form of Government; and The Lands.

The Declaration of Rights consisted of 32 articles. It contained the usual safeguards, following very closely those of the Hawaiian Constitution of 1852. The first article asserted the right to freedom of person and possessions of 'all people who reside or may reside in this kingdom'. The other articles guaranteed the liberty of every individual, the equality of all men—chiefs or commoners, Tongans or foreigners—before the laws of the country; freedom of worship, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press. The people's right to expect the government to protect their life, liberty and property was also guaranteed, and consequently they were expected to 'assist and pay taxes to the Government according to law'. The right to vote for the representative to the Legislative Assembly was given to anyone (native born or naturalised) who had reached 21 years and paid taxes, and who had 'not been guilty of any major crime such as treason, murder, theft, bribery, perjury, forgery and embezzlement or a like crime'. Jury service was expected of everyone eligible to vote excepting members of the legislature, missionaries, teachers and any government employees (see Appendix D, Clause 30).

The continuing influence of the missionaries was evident in such sections as the provision concerning the Sabbath which declared it to be 'sacred in Tonga for ever' (Clause 6).

In the provisions controlling the labour traffic it was stated

that the agreement and contract should be made between the employer and the recruits and 'be lodged in the Government Offices, stating the amount of payment they shall receive, the time they shall work for him, and promising to take them back to their own land', and that the government would see that this contract was carried out. It specifically excluded any Chinese from being brought to Tonga, on the grounds that they might bring leprosy as 'exists in the Sandwich Islands', but there seems little doubt that this provision was heavily influenced by the anti-Chinese sentiments current in Australia and elsewhere at this time (Clause 3).

The second section dealing with the Form of Government also closely followed the Hawaiian Constitution of 1852. It declared that the form of government was to be a constitutional monarchy and that the supreme power of the kingdom was divided between the Executive, consisting of the King, Privy Council and Cabinet; the Legislative Assembly; and the Judiciary.

The prerogatives of the King were clearly set forth and the rules of succession were laid down (Clause 35). The King was Commander-in-Chief of the army and navy, but he could not declare war without the consent of the Legislative Assembly. With the consent of the Privy Council, he had power to grant pardon to convicts except in cases of impeachment, and to convene the Legislative Assembly. If he were displeased with it, he could dissolve it and command new representatives to be chosen, but he could not lawfully dismiss any of the nobles of the Legislative Assembly, except in cases of treason. He was entitled to make treaties with foreign nations, but again could do so only with the consent of the Legislative Assembly, and he could appoint ambassadors.

The person of the King was declared sacred. He governed the land, and all laws passed by the Legislative Assembly had to receive his signature before they became law. He had the prerogative of bestowing all titles of honour, but he could not lawfully take away any title except in cases of treason. With the advice of his cabinet, he had the prerogative of arranging what money should be legal tender in the kingdom. Finally, he had power to proclaim martial law for any part of the land, or for

the whole land during civil war or war between the kingdom and another country.

The next division after the King was the Privy Council, which was composed of the Cabinet Ministers, the Governors and the Chief Justice. Its functions were to advise the King in his work and to serve as a final court of appeal.

Following the Privy Council was the Cabinet. It was composed of the Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Lands and the Minister for Police. The ministers were appointed by the King, 'from the Nobles, or from the representatives of the people, or from persons outside, And if so they shall enter the Legislative Assembly' (Clause 63:1). The duties of the Premier and of each of the ministers were all laid down (Clause 55).

The Legislative Assembly was composed of the ministers, nobles and the representatives of the people. The nobles consisted of twenty chiefs who were appointed for life by the King to the Legislative Assembly, and there were twenty representatives of the people who were to be elected by the people.

The judicial power of the kingdom was vested in the Supreme Court, the Circuit Court and the Police Courts. The Supreme Court consisted of the Chief Justice and two associated justices. These justices of the Supreme Court were to be appointed by the King with the consent of the Cabinet.

The King and the Legislative Assembly decided the number of Circuit Courts to be held in the kingdom, and these were held by one of the justices. All cases brought before the Supreme Court and the Circuit Courts were to be tried by a jury of twelve. The King and the Legislative Assembly also had the power to determine the number and frequency of Police Courts, and the Legislative Assembly was to regulate the powers of the police magistrates.

In the third section dealing with land matters, all land in Tonga was declared to belong to the King who could grant estates known as *tof'i'a* to the twenty nobles appointed by him. The titles and the *tof'i'a* were to be hereditary, and the laws of inheritance for the throne and these titles were set out in this section. The nobles were to lease portions of their *tof'i'a* to their people.

The constitution made it unlawful for anyone, whether he was King, chief or commoner, 'to sell one part of a foot of the ground

of the Kingdom of Tonga, but only to lease it in accordance with this Constitution' (Clause 109), and only leases approved by the Cabinet were to be recognised. Any lands which were not owned by anyone, or any *tofi'a* which failed to have legitimate heirs should revert to the government, and the government had the right to lease such lands.

The Constitution of 1875 marked the culmination of a gradual process by which King George had attempted to bring to Tonga the type of legal and constitutional machinery which would enable her to gain recognition from the civilised nations and maintain her own independent and stable government. Many of the provisions of this constitution departed altogether from traditional precedents, as, for example, in the laws of succession not only to the throne but also to the hereditary titles of the whole country.

Traditionally, hereditary succession to the throne was not automatic, but was decided upon by an 'electoral college' from among several claimants. The selection of successors to the other chiefly titles had been in the hands of the principal chiefs of the *ha'a* to which the title belonged. Usually they chose the most capable candidate. This was essential at a time when the welfare of the whole community depended almost entirely on the wisdom and abilities of its paramount chief. However, there had been bitter rivalry among the various claimants which often resulted in open conflict and war between factions.

By the 1870s there was considerable speculation among both Tongans and European settlers and British administrators in the South Pacific, as to who would become the successor to King George, after his long reign, extending from his rulership of Ha'apai since 1820, of Vava'u since 1833 and of the whole of Tonga since 1845. Many prophesied that civil war would break out over this question if nothing were done about it. As early as the 1850s the missionaries had repeatedly requested King George to declare a successor.² St Julian had also dealt with

² The Rev. R. Amos wrote:

On the 9th of December 1856 I invited the King and Queen to dine with the Prince at our residence on Olobeka Hill, and on that occasion I told His Majesty that some persons blamed him for not publicly proclaiming George as his successor. His reply was 'It is

the matter in one of his letters of constitutional advice (St Julian to King George, 26 June 1855). No doubt King George was well aware of the threatening political storm hovering over the kingdom and ready to burst immediately upon his death. The law of succession was a way of forestalling any such disaster. Subsequent events have proved the soundness of King George and his advisers in this matter, for Tonga was spared the factional warfare which raged for several years in neighbouring Samoa over this issue (Watson 1918:50-1).

Another departure from the traditional Tongan system was the adoption of a constitutional monarchy, a departure both in its degree of centralisation and in the acceptance of limits to the King's authority in the rule of law. Although the King's power was still great, in that he could veto legislation and had the prerogative to appoint and dismiss the ministers of the Crown, he could no longer lawfully act on his own in matters of political importance without the approval of either the Cabinet, the Privy Council or the Legislative Assembly. In comparison with pre-constitution days, there were drastic limitations of the King's powers. Some have claimed that, in practice, King George failed to adhere strictly to this part of the constitution. This was understandable, for he was an extremely able ruler, whose subjects accepted and revered him, whether or not he acted in accordance with the letter of the constitution. At the same time, the primary purpose of the constitution was to make the Tongan government acceptable in the eyes of other nations, and to furnish a blueprint for his successors and future generations of Tonga. In both these respects the constitution proved successful.

There was a vast difference in the composition and working of the new Legislative Assembly and the traditional *fakataha*,

unnecessary—all the Chiefs know my mind . . . he is my only legitimate son—I was never married to the mothers of my other three sons, either after Tonga or Christian fashion—he is too young to proclaim yet, a boy who is still a spider-catcher is not fit to sit with the elders of the people—I shall one day proclaim him as my successor with the title of Prince of Ha'afuluhao.'—I stated that it would be well to proclaim George that he might be acknowledged by civilised governments. (Amos to Eggleston, 26 Oct. 1857, WMSA 1852-79)

which had actually been a council of chiefs. The *fakataha* were held at irregular intervals, depending upon whether the King wished them to be held, and the chiefs acted in a purely advisory capacity. There were several quite revolutionary features in the new Legislative Assembly. For instance, it included an equal number of chiefs and representatives of the people and, for the first time, commoners joined the chiefs in discussing political matters. This was a remarkable innovation in a land where commoners had been regarded as mere tools and possessions of the chiefs.

The teachings of the missionaries on the equality of all men before God had significantly raised the social status of commoners, and their participation in church organisations together with the chiefs had helped to prepare the ground for their greater social and political acceptance. This was further assisted by the founding of Tupou College in 1866, where Moulton implemented a policy of treating all students alike, be they chiefs or commoners. The only hierarchy recognised within the College was a hierarchy of intellectual achievement. Since significant numbers of commoners passed through the College, a mutual respect began to develop between them and the chiefly class, and this made it less difficult for the nobles to accept the constitutional provisions for commoner representation in the Assembly. Only those chiefs who had failed to gain a place for themselves in the Assembly showed any resentment.

It is paradoxical that the very constitution which set out to limit the powers of the monarchy should have created a new landed aristocracy with increased powers. This would appear to be the very reverse of what both the missionaries and King George had been trying to achieve with the earlier legislation, which aimed at limiting the power of the chiefs and raising the status of commoners. In the new constitution a certain number of chiefs were now to be chosen by the King and made the nobles of Tonga;³ they were to be given tracts of land to be their *tofi'a* or hereditary estates.

³ In the Hawaiian Constitution of 1852 upon which this was modelled, the King appointed thirty nobles for life (Chambers 1896:19).

The new constitution, in effect, gave the nobles a form of indirect power over their people. The fact that the commoners received their leases of land from the nobles made them feel obliged to give *polopolo* (first fruits) of their crops, the best of anything produced or acquired, or their services to the nobles. Observance of these obligations was regarded as evidence of one's loyalty and as a sign of good citizenship. Applicants and would-be applicants for land had to be particularly generous with their gifts if they were to win favour with their landlord.

Later on, when provisions were made in the laws allowing commoners to register their land, the noble would allot a piece of land for a trial period, the length of which depended upon his own personal whim.⁴ If he was satisfied with the applicant's 'behaviour' (particularly his generosity and servility) he would then permit him to register the land, but if he were displeased, he could take back the land and give it to someone else.

In a recent study of land usage in Tonga, Maude writes:

Since the Emancipation of 1862 the chiefs of Tonga, of whom the nobles are the only ones now recognized in the Constitution, have lost most of their power over their people; they have however, retained some control over the distribution of land, for the title-holder's approval is needed before the grant for an allotment of his estate can be registered by the Minister of Lands. By law the objections of an estate-holder to the grant of an allotment may be overruled by the Minister, but few villagers would ever go to him with a complaint against a noble, . . . Since throughout the period of 'probation' a farmer will be careful to give food and other gifts to the title-holder to improve his chances of obtaining the necessary approval, and since after registration with its consequent security of tenure such gifts are considerably less frequent, some nobles delay registration or even refuse it indefinitely so as to retain some economic control over their people. (A. Maude 1965:105)

The commoners' tribute and subservience, which openly acknowledge the superiority of the nobles, helped to water down the declaration in the constitution that all men were to be equal in the eyes of the law and that everyone had a right to his life

⁴ According to Dr A. Maude, who surveyed the land tenure in Tonga, the earliest registration known to the Lands Department in Tonga was in 1898 (personal communication, 20 Oct. 1966).

and property, which many chiefs viewed as a threat to their power and prestige. The chiefs naturally desired to see these acts of submission perpetuated in order to maintain their privileges. The continuance of these customs in modern times has proved a major obstacle to the social, economic and political development of the people.⁵

Economically the nobles continued to amass wealth at the expense of the common people. Maude's study of land tenure in Tonga has shown that some of the nobles became reluctant to subdivide their *tofi'a* into bush allotments for those who were eligible for them and that they also tried to hinder those who already held leases from registering these allotments. The nobles of course realised that, once such land had been registered, they could no longer reclaim it, providing that its holder abided by the land laws. They further realised that their land was their sole means of securing their privileges. As a result, a considerable proportion of land remained unregistered, and the resulting insecurity of tenure diminished incentives for land improvement, since the tenants were only concerned with satisfying their immediate wants.⁶

From the perspective of the present, the creation of the landed nobility appears to have been a blunder, for it helped to create some of the very problems it sought to eliminate. However, this move must be seen in relation to the time in which the constitution was promulgated. It can be regarded as an ingenious step on the part of the King and his constitutional adviser, Baker, to make some concessions to the chiefs in the face of their mounting resentment at their loss of power. It was also based upon the realisation that the constitution could not succeed without the support of the powerful chiefs, particularly if King George's immediate successor should prove to be a weaker ruler. The creation of the nobility helped to quell the opposition from the most powerful chiefs and won their support and loyalty.

⁵ There are of course other factors which must also be considered such as lack of ambition, customary obligations, etc. (see A. Maude 1965:164).

⁶ Quite recently a land survey was completed in Tonga and the subdivision of much of the *ngaahi tofi'a* was undertaken. At the present time (1972) the Lands Department is busy distributing them to successful applicants (A. Maude 1965:107).

Significantly, as the King stated in his closing speech to the 1875 Parliament which ratified the constitution, the basis for selecting the nobles was not that of traditional rank but of the numerical strength of their supporters. Those with large numbers of people living under them were more likely to prove troublesome than those of higher rank but without supporters.

The land section of the constitution, particularly the prohibition on the sale of land, and the provision making it unlawful for any noble to lease land to European settlers without the consent of Cabinet, has proved to be immeasurably beneficial to Tonga. Firstly, it ensured that a great proportion of the land remained in Tongan hands. Secondly, it helped to maintain the political independence of Tonga. Sale of land would have attracted a great many European settlers, and with a larger economic stake in the country they could have applied more effective pressure on the great powers to annex Tonga—as settlers in Fiji and Hawaii exemplify (see Morrell 1960:82, 148; Derrick 1963:223; Chambers 1896:8). Thirdly, it saved Tonga from the racial problems which other islands, particularly Fiji, have had to face. The virtual absence of European plantations in Tonga made it unnecessary to import labourers from other places.

It cannot be said that Baker, the author of this constitution, was an authority on constitutional matters; nor did he bring to the highly specialised task he had decided to undertake an adequate educational background or training in law. However, he followed the Hawaiian Constitution of 1852 very closely, adapting it with the help of King George to the local conditions and needs of Tonga. His other sources appear to have been the English constitutional practice, which he probably derived from the laws of New South Wales, given him by Sir Henry Parkes, the previous Tongan Codes, and the Bible.

Critics were quite merciless in their denunciation of the constitution. A. Mackay, a business man who was in Tonga during the height of Baker's power, and who was very anti-Baker, asserted that the constitution was unsuitable, unworkable and abortive, and certainly reflected no credit on anyone connected with it (*Sydney Evening News*, 21 Oct. 1897). Basil Thomson (1894:229) wrote 'that the pretentious document beginning,

"Seeing it appears to be the Will of God for man to be free," with its complicated machinery, designed to deceive strangers into the belief that Tonga was a State growing in importance and prosperity, was utterly unsuited to the Tongans'. Alfred Maudslay, who was British Consul in Tonga in 1878, claimed that he had never met 'a Tongan from the King down who pretended to understand it and if one might form any judgement from the English translation, this was little to be wondered at' (Maudslay to Salisbury, 23 Jan. 1879, Britain 1876-1880).

These criticisms were not groundless. It was true that the people of the time could not understand most of the constitution, and that able, but perhaps biased, observers were genuinely convinced that it was unsuitable and would not work. However, time has proved that the critics were over-pessimistic. Later J. S. Neill (1955:100-1), who was British Agent and Consul in Tonga for ten years from 1927 to 1937, gave a more favourable evaluation of its worth:

The 1875 Constitution has been amended from time to time, but it remains, in substance, the law of the land. When first granted, and for many years after, it was quite beyond the understanding of the people. Its life has been marked by vicissitudes, for its provisions were sometimes disregarded, but it is now administered as its Royal Founder would have wished and, in my experience, faithfully observed.

The success or failure of the constitution may be measured by its acceptance, nationally and internationally. Nationally, the constitution was accepted by the people. In his Tongan paper, called *Boobooi* (II, 1 (1875): 2-3), Baker did his best to explain its meaning before it was promulgated. He compared the function of the constitution in government to that of the Bible in the church. King George stated:

When the Constitution has been passed it shall be a palladium of freedom to all Tongans for ever. It is quite clear now that they are free; and let this be the most valuable privilege of the country, for by the passing of the constitution a Tongan can boast that he is as free as were the Romans of former days and as the British are now. (Neill 1955:101)

The Tongans accepted the constitution in this spirit and were

immensely proud of it, even though they did not understand it fully. It has since been a popular theme for glorification by poets, talked about in the *faikava* (kava party) and, as Thomson (1937: 143) pointed out, has been regarded by the Tongans as 'Holy Writ'. The very sanctity which the constitution had assumed in their minds posed some further problems, for it made them reluctant to accept any amendments to it, even when such were required to meet the demands of a new era.⁷ Internationally, the constitution, with all its limitations, led the civilised nations of the world to recognise Tonga's independent sovereignty—in 1876 Tonga signed a treaty with Germany (Thomson 1894:386), in 1879 one with Britain, and in 1888 one with America (Wood 1932:59)—and the country came to be regarded as having a government capable of managing both its internal affairs and external relations. In actual fact, Tonga was not able to manage its own affairs. Hence the sending to Tonga of Basil Thomson in 1890 to tidy up the mess in the Tongan government after the deportation of Baker, and the Treaty of 1900 giving the British Consul the power of veto over finance and external affairs. However, it saved Tonga from being annexed (see Thomson 1902: 153).

Although the missionaries cannot be held fully responsible for the gradual constitutional development, they played a significant role in it. The impact of their teachings on King George and his people, not only religiously but as agents of Christian civilisation, was so effective, that these teachings, together with other factors, produced a gradual but marked change in Tongan society. The assistance the early missionaries gave, as a body, with earlier legislation was of great importance, and although most of the later ones were reluctant to become too deeply involved in politics, Baker gave his wholehearted assistance to King George in his political innovations, arguing that he was entitled to do so when the King had called for his help.

⁷ Basil Thomson (1894:229) states: 'My principal difficulty lay in the Constitution. Though the king readily consented to the abrogation of the laws, he had an almost superstitious dread of tampering with the Constitution.'

The main criticism levelled against the constitution was not that it was legally unacceptable but that it was too advanced for the people. True, the Tongans did not fully understand it at the beginning, and for a while they were unable to administer it properly, which caused some discontent. But these short-term deficiencies were far outweighed by the long-term benefits which Tonga has reaped from it. Its mere existence provided a means of political education for later generations. Its unquestioned acceptance and reverence by the people assisted in the maintenance of internal stability, thereby ensuring slow, perhaps, but definitely peaceful and continuing development. It gave rise to a feeling of security never felt before, particularly in respect of Tonga's independence and integrity as a nation.

12 Conclusion

In spite of the Society's official policy of 'no politics', its missionaries participated significantly in Tonga's political development during the period under study. They did not precipitate political development as such, for the indigenous political system had undergone a process of evolution—quite dramatic at times—long before any Wesleyan Methodist missionary set foot in Tonga. Similar processes of change had also occurred in Africa as well as other Polynesian societies such as Hawaii and Tahiti where there was a transition from tribal society to state. In the case of Tonga, the growing contact with Fiji stimulated dramatic change in the socio-economic and political arena. This process of change was further accelerated by the arrival of the Europeans whose wealth, technology and power the islanders came to covet so much. The role played by the missionaries in this process was an integral part of the general European impact on Tongan culture, and it cannot therefore be viewed in isolation. However, the missionaries' influence was crucial in deciding the direction which political changes took subsequent to their arrival. This was a natural consequence of the task which they had undertaken and of the circumstances in which they found themselves.

The missionaries' primary task was the conversion of the heathen. Although many of them were inadequately educated and equipped for this work, they were men of deep conviction and strong faith. They were convinced that Jehovah, in the end, would inevitably triumph, in spite of all the difficulties and occasional set-backs. Hence there could be no compromise. Working through the existing political leaders, and using every available means at their disposal, such as providing medicines, promoting education, and conducting religious revival meetings, they soon succeeded in making the majority of the population of Tonga at least nominally Christian.

As politics was so closely interwoven into the total fabric of

Tongan society, it was unavoidable that it would be affected by the new teaching. When the religious basis of the old order was undermined, much of the framework of the traditional society collapsed with it. Christianity became the foundation on which the new structure had to be built. It was inevitable that the missionaries, who were instrumental in destroying much of the old social order, should become the principal designers of the new, particularly in its early stages, for then the chiefly builders were ignorant of the new design; and unlike other island groups in the Pacific, Tonga had no other Europeans qualified to act as an alternative source of guidance at this time. It follows that, while the policy of non-involvement in politics might succeed in their home country, where monarchy and government already rested firmly on Christian principles, the missionaries in Tonga realised that politics had to be christianised if their primary objective was to be achieved.

In the final analysis, however, the greatest credit for the successful transition to a constitutional monarchy is due to Tonga's remarkable ruler, King George, and his Tongan supporters. He recognised the advantages of adopting Western civilisation, its ideas, wealth, technology and religion—Christianity—and he seized on every available opportunity for furthering both his own interests and those of his people. It was he who took the initiative and though he sought the advice of the missionaries and often relied heavily upon it, it was he alone who made the final decisions. His astuteness as a statesman and politician led him to look further afield for advice, and he did not confine himself to the missionary sphere alone; it is quite erroneous to look upon him as simply a puppet in their hands.

At the same time, it would be equally mistaken to claim, as some writers have done (see, e.g. Webb 1965:32) that conversion of the rulers to Christianity in Tonga and other places in the Pacific was simply a means used by these politically ambitious individuals to serve their own economic and political ends. This interpretation applied to King George and the Tongan situation would be quite superficial and misleading. King George's adherence to Christian principles throughout the later stages of his career had a positive effect on his political actions, as this study

has shown. His adherence to the missionaries' teachings went much deeper than mere lip-service. They helped him to develop his remarkable gifts for leadership, which enabled him to surmount severe opposition and to withstand the vicissitudes of his long reign during the most critical period of Tongan history. Without the guidance and assistance of the Wesleyan missionaries he could hardly have succeeded in his ambitions, and to this extent their influence on Tongan political changes during this period was considerable.

Tonga's political integrity was assisted to some extent by her geographical isolation and by the fact that it was less attractive to planters than, for instance, the neighbouring Samoa and Fiji groups, but ultimately it was the favourable combination of circumstances which brought together a ruler such as King George and the Wesleyan missionaries that helped to determine the political destiny of Tonga. Without this conjunction, the course of political development in Tonga might have had a very different outcome, and perhaps the little kingdom would have suffered the same fate as the other small kingdoms of the Pacific, such as Tahiti and Hawaii, which failed to survive into the twentieth century.

Appendix A

CODE OF VAVAU, 1839¹

These are the names of the King and the Chiefs in Council at Vavau Haafuluhao.

GEORGE The King

Jobe Soakai, Steward or Governor

Osaiasi Veikune, Chief Judge or Magistrate

Eliesa Kijikiji, Judge

Tiofilosi Kaianuanu, Judge

I George make known this my mind to the chiefs of the different parts of Haafuluhao, also to all my people. May you be very happy.

It is of the God of heaven and earth that I have been appointed to speak to you, he is King of Kings and Lord of Lords, he doeth whatsoever he pleaseth, he lifteth up one and putteth down another, he is righteous in all his works, we are all the work of his hands, and the sheep of his pasture, and his will towards us is that we should be happy. Therefore it is that I make known to you all, to the Chiefs and Governors and People, as well as the different strangers and foreigners that live with me.

That the Laws of this our Land prohibit.

1.

Murder, Theft, Adultery, Fornication and the retailing of Ardent spirits.

If any shall transgress these laws of ours, the case must be made known to the proper authorities, that the judge may examine into it.

¹ Spelling throughout as in original.

If any woman shall beat herself or by drinking any liquor or by useing [*sic*] any means cause her child to depart from her, her case shall be brought before the judge.

In case of ones eating a poisonous fish or shell fish, knowing it to be destructive to life, the case shall be brought before the judge.

And should one die from taking poison, knowing it to be such, he shall not be buried in the christians burial ground or as a christian.

In case of a person being found dead a man, woman, or child and it is not known by what means the person came by his or her death, the judge shall be informed of the case, upon hearing of which he shall fix upon a house to which the body shall be removed, he shall then choose three men out of the four nearest villages to the place where the corpse was found, being twelve in number, who shall assemble at the place appointed with the judge, who shall inform them of the object of his calling them together, they shall then proceed altogether to view the body, and the place where it was found, after which they shall return to the house and sit in judgement on the case, and each speak his mind as in the presence of God, as to the cause of the persons death, viz whether by the visitation of God or by violent hands, and if their minds are satisfied that the person has been killed, they shall make every enquiry in order to discover the perpetrator who if found shall be brought to judgment, put into confinement, and wait the consequence of his crime.

N.B. No person shall be put to death, except by the express command of the King.

If any person shall rise up and lift up a club (or any other instrument of death) against another for the purpose of killing him, the person so offending shall be brought before the judge, and judgment passed upon him.

2.

My mind is this. That all my people should attend to all the duties of religion towards God; that they should keep holy the sabbath day, by abstaining from their worldly occupations and

labours, and by attending to the preaching of the word and the worship of God in their places of worship.

Should any man on shore or from on ship board come to the chapel for the purpose of sport or to disturb the worship; should he insult the minister or the congregation, he shall be taken and bound, and be fined for every such offence, as the judge shall determine.

3.

My mind is this. That each chief or head of a people, shall govern his own people, and them only: and it is my mind that you each show love to the people you have under you, also that you require them to be industrious in labouring to support the government and in their duties to you their chiefs; and that you divide to each one of them land for their own use, that each one may have means of living, of supporting his family procuring necessities, and of contributing to the cause of God.

4.

It is my mind that my people should live in great peace, no quarrelling, or backbiting, having no wish for war, but to serve the God of peace in sincerity, 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 what ever you may require their services; but I make known to you it is no longer lawful, for you to hunuki, or mark their bananas for your use, or to take by force any article from them, but let their things be at their own disposal.

5.

And it is my mind that the land should be brought into cultivation and planted; hence I inform you it is unlawful to turn your hogs outside the fence or sty: in case of a pig being found eating the yams or destroying the produce of the earth, the owner of the pig shall be apprised directly of it, that he may put his pig up, also he shall make amends for the mischief done; in case the owner pays not attention to his pig either to confine it or to

recompence the damage done, and the pig is again found eating the plantation, it shall then be lawful to kill the pig, and the person owning the plantation shall claim it.

6.

In case of an Englishman, or any other foreigner wishing to remain in this land, he will be expected to obey the laws of the land and contribute in some way, (as he may have the means) to the support of the government, by working occasionally for the King, or by what means he may choose, while he does this, the laws of this land will protect him and his from evil.

7.

I beg of you my Chiefs and heads of the people that you pay attention to these words, and make known these laws to your people, and see that they practise them.

8.

In reference to the small and light offences, each chief will examine and adjust, in his own place but all the more important offences must be brought to Mua at Neiafu.

N.B. The day for hearing cases of disorder at Neiafu, is the first tuesday in the month and you need not come at any other time.

On the day of hearing it is expected that the following persons will be present, viz. Jobe Soakai, Osaiasi Veikune, Eliesa Kijikiji, and Tiofilusi Kaianuanu.

N.B. The King will be present and take a part when ever convenient.

In case of a person retailing ardent spirits, he shall pay a fine to the King of Twenty Five Dollars and be liable to have the spirits taken from him.

In case of a man either living on shore, or from on ship board, being drunk and, causing disturbance, he shall be taken, and imprisoned, and for the first offence pay a fine of six dollars, which fine shall be doubled in case the offence is repeated.

In case a man living on shore, shall entice or otherwise induce any seaman to leave his vessel for the purpose of living on shore he shall pay a fine of eight dollars to the King; in case

a person fails to make known one whom he knows to have run away from his vessel, such an one shall be fined according to the nature of the offence.

In case a man leaves his wife and escapes, she shall claim his plantations and whatever other property he may have left.

In case a woman forsakes her husband, she shall be brought back again to him, and in case she will not remain with him, it shall not be lawful for her to marry any other man while her husband lives.

It is not lawful to *tatatau* or to *kaukau* or to perform any other idolatrous ceremonies, if any one does so, he will be judged and punished and fined for so doing.

It is unlawful to leave the island in a clandestine manner, also to give away or enslave any person.

It is also unlawful to cut down timber without liberty so to do.

Appendix B

THE 1850 CODE OF LAWS

I.—The Law referring to the King

1. The King, being the root of all government in the land, it is for him to appoint those who shall govern in his land.
2. Whatever the King may wish done in his land, it is with him to command the assemblage of his Chiefs, to consult with him thereon.
3. Whatever is written in these laws, no Chief is at liberty to act in opposition, but to obey them together with his people.
4. The King is the Chief Judge; and anything the Judges may not be able to decide upon, shall be referred to the King, and whatever his decision may be, it shall be final.

II.—The Law concerning Taxes

Whatever the King deems proper, shall be done by the people for the King.

III.—The Law referring to the Judges

1. It is the province of the King to appoint all the Judges in his kingdom.
2. This is the office of the Judges:— If any one or more be charged with having committed a crime, it is the business of the Judges, when such are brought to trial, to hear the person by whom the charge is made, as also the statement of the prisoner. The trial being over, and his guilt proved, the Judge shall then pronounce sentence, according to what is written in these Laws.
3. The remuneration which the Judges and Officers shall have made to them by the King, is the distribution of the convicted persons amongst them, to labour for them at their respective places.

A brief allusion to the business of the Judges

1. There shall be no respect of persons with the Judges in their trial of offenders. Though the offender be a Chief, or next in rank, he shall be tried according to these Laws; it being unjust to differ between the trial of a Chief, and that of a common man.
2. On no account for the Judges to receive food or payment from those about to be tried: should any one so receive, and it be discovered, he shall be deposed from his office, having acted unjustly.

* * *

4. The day of trial arrived, and the Judges seated, the prisoner, complainants, and witnesses, shall be brought before them; and the Judge then state the crime with which the prisoner is charged, and about to be tried for.
5. The Judge shall then inquire of the accused, whether the charge against him be true or not; and if he admits its truth, the Judge shall at once pronounce sentence; but if he denies it, the Judge shall order the witnesses to state what they know, the accused being at liberty, if he can, to produce witnesses to prove his innocency of the crime of which he is charged.
6. Should the accused wish to question the witnesses on anything they may state, he is not at liberty to address them, but make known his inquiry to the Judge, and for the Judge to put his question to the witnesses, that on no account there be either talking or quarrelling in the presence of the Judges; and if any one breaks this law, it is with the Officers present in court to put a stop to it.
7. And with regard to any serious crime, such as murder, incendiarism, the burning a canoe, or personal assault, or the like,—when the Judges shall have tried the case, and they are of one opinion as to the punishment to be inflicted, not for it to be enforced immediately, but for the Judges and King to confer; and should the King deem it proper to lessen the punishment, well, but not for him to increase it.

IV.—The Law referring to Witnesses

If any one accuse another, or any one confirms it, but on trial it is afterwards found that both the accuser and witnesses have

lied, the punishment which would have been inflicted on the accused, the Judge shall order to be enforced against the accuser and false witness; but when any one works unjustly through a false accuser and a false witness, the Judges shall order the false witness to pay him who has laboured contrary to justice, according to his amount of work done for the Governing Chief, and punish the false witness accordingly to the punishment unjustly inflicted on the accused.

V.—The Laws of the Chiefs and those who govern

1. The Chiefs to whom these Laws refer are those whom the King has appointed to govern portions of the land, and their people.
2. It is with those Chiefs only to harangue and govern their people, and it is not admissible for any other to order or govern those people.
3. And any one, not being a chief of high rank, who shall break this law, shall be tried for the same, and be ordered to pay to such persons according to the work they have been made unlawfully to do for him.
4. This is the labour which the Governing Chiefs shall lawfully demand from their people yearly, even to the extent they may think proper; and such Chief shall pay strict attention in seeing the King's work properly executed, but in case of his negligence, his people shall do the less for him.

VI.—The Law referring to Officers

1. On the perpetration of a crime being made known to the Judges, it is the province of the Officers to take care and bring the offender to the place of trial on the day appointed.
2. On the accused being brought before the Judges, it is for them to prevent confusion and quarrelling between the persons on trial and the witnesses; and should any speak loud, or shout, it is for them to put a stop to it, and demand silence.
3. The trial of offenders being over, and they being condemned to pay or work, it is for the Officers to see that their payment is brought on the appointed day, and to see that the work of the offenders is performed in a proper and correct manner.

4. It is with the King to remunerate the Officers according to their labours.
5. It is the duty of the Governing Chief of the land or place to bring the offender to the place of trial.

VII.—*The Law referring to Man and Wife*

1. Marriage is a covenant between man and woman, that they shall be one, and their property one, until the termination of the existence of one of them.
2. Those who are eligible to marry must be 16 years of age, and no one who is less than 16 can be married.
3. No man can have two wives, no woman two husbands at once, but each to live with his or her lawful partner; should this law be broken, the parties shall be judged, and work as for committal of adultery.
4. Another thing forbidden is, the improper interference of any one to promote or stop a marriage. Where the parties are of one mind to marry, they shall not be prevented, unless there be a just and sufficient cause; should this law be broken, the punishment to be inflicted shall be with the Judge.
5. When a man and woman marry, their parents shall no longer govern them; they shall act as they like, and no relative shall forcibly influence them; should they, it is with the Judge what punishment to inflict.
6. From the present evil and impoverishing system at marriages, whatever the friends may think proper to present to either the man or woman about to be married, it shall be his or hers, and on no account be again distributed.
7. Let all men know that it is just to labour and provide food for their families, and in case of their voyaging, to leave food for them; and whosoever shall neglect to keep this law, the Judge shall inflict punishment to the extent he may think proper.
8. In reference to man and wife separating, this is the law:— Nothing can justify their separation but the crime of adultery committed by either party. And if any man cast away his wife, or any woman her husband, save for that crime, the Judge shall

order the offending to support the offended party, and on refusal, the man or woman offending shall labour until such time as he or she shall be willing to live together again. In case of separation, these things are to be regarded:—

(1) the thing which makes it lawful for a man and wife to separate.

(2) But the thing which is right and commendable is, to forgive, and live together again; and on no account, after so doing, ever more to refer to it.

(3) In case of either party doing wrong, and the other takes no notice of it at the time, but they continue to live together; at any future time, when the mind of the injured party may be pained towards the other, he or she shall not then be at liberty to refer to it.

(4) Let all know that the separating of man and wife is a difficult matter: since the marriage contract is a command of God, the Minister must first marry them; but, in case of trial, and the crime proved, then the Minister must pronounce them separated, in the large Chapel, before all the people, even as their marriage was performed. Then the writing of divorce shall be given to the innocent party.

(5) All parties who have separated, but not according to this law as here written, shall be considered as man and wife; and it shall not be lawful for either again to marry whilst both are still living.

(6) Where both parties do wrong, and it is in their minds to separate, they may separate; but it shall not be lawful for either of them to marry until one of them become deceased.

VIII.—*The Law referring to Adultery*

When a man or woman shall be tried for adultery, and be found guilty, if the man has transgressed, he shall pay to the injured man, with whose wife he has sinned, three large hogs and sixty yams, and afterwards work three months; and where the woman sins, the payment shall be the same as in the other case.

IX.—*The Law referring to Fornication*

When a case of fornication is tried, and proved, the guilty man shall work for two months, as also the guilty woman. Where the

crime is repeated, the parties shall work three months, and so on.

X.—The Law referring to Illegitimate Children

Let all persons know it shall not be just for a relative to take forcibly a bastard child from its mother, but by her consent only; and if any one break this law, the Judge shall order the child to be restored.

XI.—The Law referring to Dances, and other Heathen Customs

Let all people know that Dancing is strictly forbidden, as well as all Heathen Customs: and if any are found practising such, they shall be tried, and on being proved guilty, work one month; and in case of a repetition, two months.

XII.—The Law referring to the Sabbath-day

The breaking of the Sabbath is a great sin in the sight of God. Work which cannot be dispensed with, such as preparing food for a sick person, may be done, or any unforeseen accident occurring; but other works, such as house-building, making canoes, gardening, seeking fish, journeying to a distance, and assembling together for wicked purposes, are all forbidden. Any person found guilty shall work one month, and on repetition of the crime, two months.

XIII.—The Law referring to taking anything forcibly

Let all persons know, that taking anything forcibly, or on the score of relationship, is strictly forbidden. If any one takes that which is the property of another without his (the owner's) consent, the Judges shall reprimand him, and he shall bring back that which he took; and in case of his repeating the act, he shall pay four times the value of the article he has taken by force; or, on the score of relationship, twice the value of the thing taken to the owner, and twice its value to the King.

XIV.—The Law referring to Fighting, Quarrelling, and things very disorderly

Should any persons fight, quarrel, or create any disturbance, they shall work three weeks; and if all concerned be equally bad, their punishment shall be the same.

XV.—*The Law referring to Murder*

Persons committing murder, from an evil mind, shall be hung.

XVI.—*The Law referring to Manslaughter*

The signification of manslaughter is, the killing another accidentally, whilst working, or with the weapon of another, but not designing to kill. Should such a case occur, be tried, and an individual found guilty, but it appear that he had no bad design towards the deceased, or expectation to commit such an act, but that it was purely accidental, he is not guilty and shall be discharged. But on trial, if it be discovered that they quarrelled, or fought, or fought with clubs, or wrestled, or did anything from which sprang the death of one, but which was not done with an intent to kill, he shall work for the space of two years.

XVII.—*The Law on producing Abortion*

That to which this Law refers is a most disgusting crime, and highly deserves punishment. In case any woman should take any medicine, or eat anything, or do anything, in order to produce premature delivery, and she be tried and found guilty, she shall work for the King a whole year.

XVIII.—*The Law referring to Incendiarism*

Should any person set fire to a canoe, or house, with intent to destroy it, and be found guilty, such person shall pay the value of the house, as well as of all the property it contained.

XIX.—*The Law referring to Robbery*

If any one steals a thing from the house or plantation of another, or from elsewhere, the thief shall pay four times the value of the thing stolen, half to the person he robbed, and half to the Government. Any one stealing a trifle, whom the Judges think proper to punish, it shall be done unto him as they may see to be right.

XX.—*The Law referring to the breaking, or committing a nuisance on, a Canoe*

If any one breaks, or commits a nuisance upon, a canoe, the property of another, and is detected, he shall be tried, and the

Judge order him to pay a carpenter for repairing her. The offender shall afterwards work for Government according to the extent of damage he has done to the canoe. This law extends also to a similar injury done to a house.

XXI.—The Law referring to breaking of Fences

Should a man or woman break the fence of any one, the person so transgressing shall repair it, and work for Government according to the extent of the injury committed. If the animal of any one, whether dog, pig, or goat, shall injure a good fence, the property of another, the owner of such animal shall repair the fence; and should he not afterwards secure the animal in his own premises, but permit it again to injure a fence, he shall forfeit his animal to Government, and Government shall do as it deems proper with it.

XXII.—The Law referring to Pigs, and all destructive animals

In case the animal of any one be discovered injuring a plantation, or anything else, it shall first be made known to the owner of such animal that he may put it in a sty, or tie it up. If the same animal should destroy a second time, the Judge shall order the owner of it to pay the person who has sustained the injury, that which may be equivalent to it, and forfeit the destructive animal to Government. But should the fence injured be an old or rotten one, the owner shall pay for the first damage it does, agreeable to this law, but he shall not forfeit his animal to Government for the first offence.

XXIII.—The Law referring to lost Property

1. Anything, the property of a person being lost, and found by another, the finder knowing the owner, but does not make it known to him shall be tried as for theft. Anything being found, but the owner unknown, it shall remain with him who finds it.
2. Payment shall not be demanded by the person who finds the lost property of another.

XXIV.—The Law referring to such persons as shall make known a Crime about to be perpetrated

Should any persons agree to commit a great evil, whether two,

three, or ten; and they shall have determined to perpetrate it, but one shall repent and make known what they were going to do, he shall be forgiven; but all the others concerned shall be punished according to the evil they intended committing, even as though it had been committed.

XXV.—The Law referring to Chiefs and People who may cause any Evil to arise in the Land

If such Chiefs or people are discovered, the same shall be banished from the land they live in, into another land; nor shall they be permitted to return to their land, but it shall be with the Government, their returning or remaining until the end of their lives.

XXVI.—The Law referring to Voyaging

Should any Chief, with his crew, voyage and do wrong in any land, on his return they shall be tried, and punished according to the evil committed. It shall not be lawful for persons voyaging to bring away the people of the shores they may visit, unless at the request of the Chief of such land—in that case they may; but if they are brought away without the knowledge of the Chief of the land, such Chief so taking them shall pay ten dollars.

*

*

*

XXIX.—The Law referring to the Soil

It shall not be lawful for any Chief or people in Tonga, Haabai, or Vavau, to sell a portion of land to strangers (i.e. foreigners); it is forbidden; and any one who may break the law shall be severely punished.

XXX.—The Law referring to Carpenters

Carpenters, working at their trade, shall do their work faithfully, and shall be paid by those for whom they work; but should those for whom they work not pay them, the Judge shall order them to pay them even more than was originally designed.

XXXI.—*The Law referring to waving to Canoes*

Canoes may be waved to, and should the canoe not come to the beckon, the person in it shall be fined a pig. In particular cases of urgency, Chiefs may wave to a canoe under sail.

XXXII.—*The Law referring to the Roads of the Land*

The Chiefs shall see that the roads are hoed. The payment for not hoeing a road of any length, shall be a pig and twenty yams; and the not hoeing a short path, the fine shall be twenty yams.

XXXIII.—*The Law referring to the digging Graves*

It shall not be lawful for any other than the appointed persons, called 'Haatufuga,' to dig graves; but, should there be no Haatufugas where the deceased is to be interred, in that case only others may dig the grave. The relatives of the deceased shall pay to the Haatufuga according to the work done; and, should the friends of the deceased refuse to do so, the Judges shall compel them to pay the Haatufuga.

XXXIV.—*The Law referring to Deceased Persons*

There shall be five days of cooking food for the Chiefs, four days for the matabule or gentlemen, and three days for the common people; the 'tukuofu,' with the 'toka' and the 'lanu kilikili,' shall be given up; and if the friends have not wherewith to inter the dead in, others may furnish what is needed. The thing most becoming is, for the relatives to take care of the afflicted whilst yet alive; to feed, clothe, give drink, &c., and contribute some thing towards the burial before his decease. The people shall please themselves about the cooking at the burial. If the corpse is buried as to-day, not to cook until to-morrow; and not for the burial to be as a feast, for it is a visitation of God to that family, and it is right that they should humble themselves before God.

XXXV.—*The Law referring to the Tortoise*

If any man catch a tortoise, and take the first he catches to the Governor, and then take another, the second shall be his, the third he catches shall be the Governor's, the fourth his, and so on.

XXXVI.—*The Law referring to Men*

You shall work and persevere in labouring for the support of your family, as well as yourself, and in order to trade and contribute to the cause of God, and the Chief of the land; and each man shall seek his piece of land to cultivate. Any man not willing to work, he shall neither be fed nor assisted; all such persons being useless to the land and its inhabitants, and unprofitable to their friends.

XXXVII.—*The Law referring to the Women*

You must work, women, and persevere in labouring to clothe your husband and children; unmarried women shall work to be useful to their relatives and parents. If they do not work, they shall not be fed or assisted; for our assisting the indolent, is supporting that which is an evil.

XXXVIII.—*The Law referring to Chiefs, and those who have people under them to govern*

The duty of such is, to make known these laws to the people they govern, whether they keep them or not; and, if they do not keep them, exhort them to do so: but, if they still break them, make known their disobedience.

XXXIX.—*The Law referring to persons who depreciate the character of others, and to Evil-speakers*

If there is any one who shall depreciate the character and speak evil of the King, the Chiefs who govern the people, the Judges, or the Missionaries, and, when tried, are found guilty, the Judge shall order him to be punished according to the evil he has done.

XL.—*The Law referring to Foreigners*

If any foreigner desire to reside in this kingdom, and will act agreeable to the laws of this land, the laws of this land shall protect him; but if he breaks the laws of this land, he shall be tried as the people of this land; and if any of the inhabitants injure him in any way, they shall be punished accordingly. Foreigners shall pay yearly according to the portion of land they

hold, whether large or small; and it shall be with the Judges to demand such payment from the foreigners.

XL I.—The Law referring to Clothing

The Chiefs, Governors, and people shall clothe.

XL II.—The Law referring to Catching Fish

Any persons catching the larger fish shall not do as they please with them, such as the turtle, albicore, bonito, and ulua, &c., but, on obtaining one, shall take it to the Chief; the second he takes shall be his, and so on afterwards.

XL III.—The Law referring to Disobedience

All persons disobedient to the King, or to the Governors of the people, shall be taken to the Judge to be punished, according to the evil they have done.

Translated by G. R. H. Miller

Appendix C

THE 1862 CODE OF LAWS

I.—*The Law concerning the King*

1. The King is the root of all government in the land, and it is with him to appoint those who shall govern in his kingdom.
2. But should the King intend any weighty matter to be done in his land, it shall be with him to assemble the Chiefs and Governors to take counsel with him upon it.
3. And whatsoever things are written in these laws, it shall not be lawful for the King to act contrary thereto, but to act according to them as well as his people.
4. The King is the Supreme Judge, and any case which the judges cannot settle shall be brought to the King, and the King's decision shall be final.

II.—*The Law concerning the Land*

It shall in no wise be lawful for a chief or people in this kingdom of Tonga to sell a piece of land to a foreign people—it is verily, verily forbidden for ever and ever; and should any one break this law he shall work as a convict all the days of his life until he die, and his progeny shall be expelled from the land.

III.—*The Law concerning the Judges*

1. It is the province of the King to Commission judges in his kingdom.
2. This is the duty of the judges—when any one is accused of a crime, and is brought before the court, it is the duty of the judge to hear the statement of the accuser and also of the accused; and after the crime is proved against the accused the judge shall sentence him to punishment according to what is written in these laws. A short admonition to the judges on their duty—show no

partiality in judging criminals; be he chief or gentleman, judge according to the laws; for it is unjust to make a difference in judging chiefs and common people.

3. It is forbidden to the judges to take a bribe from a person about to be judged, and should any judge do so he shall lose his office and give up the bribe to the Government.

4. The judges shall put no one on his trial until they have received certain information.

5. On the days of judgement, when the judges are set, there shall be brought into their presence the accused, accuser, and witnesses, and then shall the judge state the offence with which the prisoner is charged.

6. The Judge shall then ask the accused if he be guilty of the charge, and if he plead guilty the judge shall at once pass sentence; but if he plead not guilty then witnesses shall be called to prove the charge; and it shall be lawful for the accused to call witnesses to prove his innocence if he be able to do so.

7. It shall be lawful for the accused to examine the witnesses against him, but the questions shall be put through the judge, that there be no confusion or dispute in the presence of the judges, and if any act otherwise the officers of the court shall silence him.

8. And in case of any great crime, as murder, house burning, canoe burning, and such like, when it has been judged by the judges, and the punishment is determined, it shall not be executed immediately, but the King and the judges shall consult, and if the King wish to lessen the penalty he may, but he cannot increase it.

IV.—*The Law concerning Witnesses*

If any one shall accuse another, or bear witness against another, and it shall afterwards be found that the accusation, or the witness was false, the punishment due to the accused, had the crime been proved, shall fall upon the false accuser and false witness; and if any one shall be unjustly put to hard labour in consequence of the false accusation or false witness, the judges shall make the false accuser and false witness pay back to the accused the amount of labour done for the Government.

V.—*The Law concerning Governors or Rulers*

The Governors to whom this law applies are—those whom the King has commissioned to govern a territory and its people, and it shall be the duty of such Governors to make known these laws to the people whom they govern, and if any Governor fail in this he shall be fined thirty dollars, and if he neglect his government, or the national works appointed by the King, or Government, he shall lose his office.

VI.—*The Law concerning Officers (i.e. Police)*

1. The duty of officers is—when an offence is reported to the judges it is their duty to bring the offender to the court on the proper day.
2. And in the presence of the judges it is the duty of officers to see that no confusion arise among the prisoners and witnesses, and should any arise it is their duty to silence it.
3. And after judgment is given; and the guilty are sentenced to fines of money or labour, it is the duty of officers to see that payment be made on the proper day, or that the labour be well and duly performed. It is the province of the King to pay the officers.

And because this land now pays tribute the prisoners shall work for the Government every day, and one officer shall be stationed where prisoners are at work, and see that the work commences at sunrise, as ordered by the King or Government, and lasts diligently until sunset. Also to watch the capital each day, to inspect its streets, to tell of some of the convicts for the purpose of levelling and sweeping the streets, and to appoint two of themselves to watch the capital during the night, and this shall be done from sunset until sunrise, the two so watching to be free from duty on the following day.

VII.—*The Law concerning Marriage*

1. Marriage is a covenant made between man and woman, to dwell together as one, until the death of one of the parties; marriage is both a religious and a civil compact.

2. The parties eligible for marriage must be sixteen years of age, nor is it lawful for any one to marry under that age; and should any one break this law he shall be fined ten dollars.

3. It shall not be lawful to have more than one wife, or husband, but each one shall live with the person to whom he or she is married; and whoever shall break this law shall be kept to hard labour for the space of three years, and shall put away the person to whom he or she was last married.

4. And besides, it shall not be lawful for any one to interfere to prevent a marriage, if the man and woman wish to be married; and let no one forbid it, except for a great and just reason; and any who break this law shall be fined ten dollars.

5. And when parties are married their parents shall have no further jurisdiction over them, but they are at liberty to do as they please; nor let any friend interfere with their affairs; and if any break this law they shall be fined five dollars.

6. Because the present usage at marriages is bad and impoverishing, if any friends wish to make a present to parties going to marry, it shall belong to the man and woman, it shall not be again distributed; and if any break this law he shall be fined twenty dollars.

7. The Wesleyan Missionaries and the priests of the Pope's religion are the persons to celebrate marriage, severally to the people of their own religion; and if a Wesleyan marry a Papist, or a Papist a Wesleyan, man or woman, the marriage shall not be one-sided, but the ceremony shall be performed by the ministers of both churches; and whoever shall break this law shall be fined ten dollars and the marriage shall be invalid.

8. The ministers shall please themselves whether they call the banns of marriage for three Sabbaths in their places of worship or not, each one according to the usage in his own church; and the marriage performed without calling of banns shall be lawful if the parties bring a certificate from the Judges appointed by the King to the minister, to certify to him that there is no civil obstacle in the way to their marriage. But should any Judge give a certificate unjustly to a man or woman whom he knows cannot

lawfully marry, he deceives the minister celebrating the marriage, and shall himself be fined in the penalty of one hundred dollars.

9. All the marriages celebrated in the Wesleyan and Papal churches by their ministers shall be valid, and the King and chiefs will protect them if they be according to these laws; but if any marriage take place illegally it shall be void.

10. And in the matter of divorce. It is not lawful for them to separate except for adultery; and in case of separation the innocent shall be at liberty to marry, but the guilty shall not marry again until after the space of three years, when they may marry. In divorce observe the following things:—

11. Know that the separation of man and wife is a very difficult thing, for it was God who instituted marriage. And let them who wish a divorce be judged by the Governors and Judges to see if it be right that they should separate; and the minister shall divorce them in the church before the people, in the same way they were married.

12. If any one wish to marry without calling of banns he must first make it known to the Rulers or Judges, and if he be free to marry he shall receive a certificate from the Rulers or Judges to make known to the minister his condition; and if he obtain no such certificate, and a marriage take place without one, that man shall pay a fine of one hundred dollars.

13. No one shall be able to cast off causelessly either a wife or husband, and whoever does so shall be judged, and fined a hundred dollars.

14. When a marriage is celebrated the man shall make it known to the Scribe, that it may be registered; and if he delay it more than three weeks, he shall be fined one dollar. And this law shall also apply to divorces, which must be reported to the scribe that he may register the day of their separation.

VIII.—*The Law concerning Adultery*

When a case of adultery is judged and proved, the offender shall pay to the injured party the sum of fifty dollars, and shall work for the Government a whole year, and whether it be man or woman the punishment shall be the same.

IX.—*The Law concerning Fornication*

When a case of fornication is judged and proved, the culprits shall be put to hard labour for two months, and if two offences three months, and so on; if a child be born in consequence of fornication, the father shall be bound to maintain it for the space of thirteen years, which maintenance shall be two shillings a week paid to the mother of the child.

X.—*The Law concerning Murder*

Those who kill others from malice shall be hung.

XI.—*The Law concerning Manslaughter*

The meaning of manslaughter is this—if any one meet his death through another, but the other did not intend to kill him, and after it is judged and found that the offender really had no hatred towards the deceased, nor intended to kill him, but that it was purely an accident, he shall escape; but if it shall transpire in the examination that the parties had differed, or wrestled, or fought, or cudgelled, or done anything which caused death, the criminal shall be put to hard labour for two years.

XII.—*The Law concerning Abortion*

If a woman shall purposely injure herself, or take drugs, or do anything to procure abortion, when it is judged and proved, she shall work as a convict all her life.

XIII.—*The Law concerning House Burning and Canoe Burning*

If any one shall set fire to a house or canoe, intending to destroy it, when found out, judged and proved, he shall make good all damages, and if life be lost through the fire he shall be hung.

XIV.—*The Law concerning Robbery*

If any one shall steal anything from another's farm, or elsewhere, he shall pay the owner the value of it, and work for the Government according to the magnitude of his crime.

XV.—*The Law concerning Sabbath Breaking*

It is not lawful to work on the Sabbath day—either to build houses, or canoes, or to farm, or go fishing, or such like; but there are things that may be done on the Sabbath, such as providing for sickness, or accidents. And whoever breaks this law shall be fined eight dollars, and for the second offence sixteen dollars.

XVI.—*The Law concerning Fighting and Quarrelling*

If any are determined to fight, let them go into the bush and fight it out, but it is expressly forbidden to fight in a public road, or green; and whoever commenced the quarrel shall be fined six dollars: but if both be to blame both shall be fined.

XVII.—*The Law concerning Destroying Canoes*

If any one shall break or injure a canoe belonging to another, the Judges shall make him pay to the owner the value of the canoe, and he shall work for Government according to the offence.

XVIII.—*The Law concerning Destroying Fences*

If any one destroy another's fence he shall make it good again, and work for Government according to the nature of the offence. If the animal of any one destroy a good fence, the owner of such animal shall make the fence good again; and if the owner neglect to keep the animal at home, and he destroy fences again, the animal shall be forfeit to the King.

XIX.—*The Law concerning Voyages*

If a chief make a voyage, and he and his crew do evil in any land, on his return he shall be judged, and punished as his crimes deserve. It shall not be lawful for voyagers to bring back any inhabitants of other lands against their will, but when the King of the land grants permission they may let them come; and if any one bring a person by force the captain of the canoe shall be fined ten dollars. And this shall be the usage of voyagers—if a vessel sail the vessel shall have papers from the Rulers, and then it is lawful to go; but if a vessel sail without papers it shall be seized, as it is a runaway, and be fined thirty dollars.

XX.—*The Law concerning all Destructive Animals*

If an animal is known to destroy the crops of another person, it shall be made knowns [*sic*] to the owner of the animal, that he may keep him fenced in, or tied; and if he neglect it, and the animal commit further depredation, the Judges shall order the owner of the animal to pay an adequate sum to the injured party, and the destructive animal shall be forfeit to the King; but if the animal went through a rotten fence, then the payment shall be for the first damage only, nor shall the animal be forfeit according to this law.

XXI.—*The Law concerning Lost Property*

If one lose a thing and another find it, and the finder know to whom it belongs but does not restore it, he shall be treated as a thief, and judged; but if the owner cannot be found it shall be the finder's; and if the owner be found, the owner shall pay to the finder one-third of the value of the property so found, as a reward.

XXII.—*The Law concerning Turning King's Evidence*

Should any conspire to commit a great crime, as murder, or some great evil; and after the conspiracy is arranged, if one should repent, and reveal the conspiracy, the King shall pardon him, but the other parties concerned shall be punished as though the crime intended had actually been committed.

XXIII.—*The Law concerning Indecent Assault*

If judged, and proved, he shall pay to the woman thirty dollars, and work for Government ten months.

XXIV.—*The Law concerning Rebellion*

Should any chief or people stir up strife, or instigate rebellion, that chief or people shall be banished from the land; nor shall it be lawful to return, but it shall be at the pleasure of the King whether they return, or be exiled until death.

XXV.—*The Law concerning Sleeping*

If a man enter a woman's sleeping apartment he shall work for Government three weeks, if a man and woman (unmarried) sleep under the same coverlet they shall both work a fortnight.

XXVI.—*The Law concerning Calling Canoes*

It is not lawful for people to call canoes for no reason, but one cause can justify it, which is that his own canoe is in danger, and if in such case the canoe does not come it shall be fined fifty dollars.

XXVII.—*The Law concerning Public Roads*

The roads shall be cleaned after two months, and within a fortnight, and shall be inspected on the third week, and the people and Rulers shall attend to this, if the Rulers do not attend to it, the fine is four dollars, and the fine for not cleaning the roads is to be one shilling for five fathoms.

XXVIII.—*The Law concerning Funerals*

It is not lawful for all persons to conduct them, but undertakers only; and if there be no undertaker in the place, then any person may conduct them, and the friends of the deceased shall properly pay the undertaker, which if they do not, the judges shall order them to pay him five dollars, which shall be paid to whoever undertakes the funeral.

XXIX.—*The Law concerning Slander and Evil Speaking*

If anyone shall speak evil of the King, or Ruling Chiefs, or Judges, or Missionaries, or anyone else, and it be judged and proved, he shall be fined ten dollars.

XXX.—*The Law concerning Foreigners*

Any foreigner wishing to dwell in this kingdom must obey the laws of the land, and be judged as the people of the land, and if any here injure them, they shall be judged, and punished as they deserve. And the foreigners shall pay to the King an annual rent for their premises, according to the size of the allotment on which

they live, whether large or small, and the Judges shall collect this rent from foreigners annually. It shall not be lawful for any foreigner to come and dwell in the land ignoring the King, or Governor.

XXXI.—*The Law concerning Cocoa Nut Trees*

If any one wish to cut down a cocoa nut tree he must first plant three cocoa nuts, and then cut down the tree, but should he cut down the tree and neglect to plant the nuts, he shall be fined five dollars.

XXXII.—*The Law concerning Parents who Neglect their Children's Education*

Whoever shall neglect to send their children to the schools shall be fined ten dollars.

XXXIII.—*The Law concerning Impudent Persons*

Whoever shall commit depredation, or nuisance, upon the dwelling of another, and gets beaten for it, the person inflicting the punishment shall be held justified.

XXXIV.—*The Law concerning Tribute*

1. All laws fermely [*sic*] printed in the code of laws of Tonga relating to serfdom are repealed, and the following is the law of Tonga instituted by the King and Chiefs of Tonga, in the Parliament House at Nukualofa, in Tongatabu, on the fourth day of June, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-two (1862).

2. All chiefs and people are to all intents and purposes set at liberty from serfdom, and all vassalage, from the institution of this law; and it shall not be lawful for any chief or person, to seize, or take by force, or beg authoritatively, in Tonga fashion, any thing from any one.

3. Every one has the entire control over every thing that is his.

4. All chiefs and people shall pay tribute (or taxes) to the Government; and the King shall pay the salaries of all Governors, Rulers, Judges, Officers, (Police) and other persons in Govern-

ment employ. The tribute for the first year shall be three dollars each person. This tax is right; and after the proclamation of this law no people will provision canoes, or support voyagers gratis, because if a canoe go on the business of the King or Governor, it will be provisioned at Government expense and all national works will be paid for by the State. And if other voyages be undertaken, the voyagers must look to their own friends to provide for them, but it shall not be lawful for the Rulers to order any one in the land to which they go, to wait upon them as vassals; or to appoint any work to be done by any one for himself, or the state, except clearing his own frontage on the public roads.

5. The rent to be paid by the people to their lawful chiefs (or landlords) shall be two shilling a year each person.

6. And the chiefs shall allot portions of land to the people as they may need, which shall be their farm, and as long as the people pay their tribute, and their rent to the chief, it shall not be lawful for any chief to dispossess them, or any other person.

7. And the King affectionately recommends that the size of the farms be increased according to the number of the family.

8. And these are the persons who shall pay tribute—all males of sixteen years of age and upwards.

XXXV.—*The Decree of a Festival*

And it was on the fourth of June, in the year one thousand eight hundred and sixty-two, that civil liberty came to Tonga, when that day shall arrive in each year, all and every land in this kingdom of Tonga shall keep it as a festival, in memory of the liberty of Tonga, and it shall be so for ever and ever.

XXXVI.—*The Law concerning Judges, Rulers, and Officers*

1. If any Governor, Judge, Ruler or Officer be drunk, the King shall immediately depose him, and stop his salary.

2. The King shall pay from the State Treasury the salaries of the Governors, Judges, Rulers and Officers, and shall pay them quarterly.

3. Criminals shall work for, and pay fines to the State as they have done, and the money shall go to the Government.

4. Fines may be levied for these offences—cursing, drunkenness, and light offences: but adulterers, fornicators, and all such as violate weighty laws, shall be put to hard labour upon the roads, and works appointed by the King or Governor to be done.

5. And fines shall be paid in money, according to the week or month to which the sentence of the criminal refers.

6. And to add to the salutary effect of their sentence, the convicts working for Government shall provision themselves, no food will be provided by the Government.

XXXVII.—*The Law concerning Spiritous Liquors*

1. It shall be lawful to sell spirits by license from the King, but not otherwise.

2. The price of the annual license shall be 100 dollars.

3. And these are the regulations for sellers of spirits:—

(1) He shall sell nothing else, but spirits only. If he wish to carry on other business besides, he must have two licenses, one for spirits, and another for general trade.

(2) On no account whatever, must they sell on the Sabbath.

(3) They may sell from sunrise, until 10 o'clock p.m.

(4) On no account must they sell to one who is drunk.

(5) It is forbidden to mix drugs with the spirits.

(6) If any licensed person persist in breaking these laws, his license shall be revoked, and not renewed hereafter.

(7) If any one sell without a license, he shall pay the penalty of 200 dollars.

(8) The payment shall first be brought to the King, or Governor, and then the license shall be given to the applicant.

4. All spirits landed shall pay duty, and the party landing them shall pay the duty.

5. Brandy, Rum, Gin and that kind, shall pay two dollars a gallon duty—all kinds of Wine, one dollar a gallon. This law relates to all foreign liquors.

6. For all spirits made in Tonga, the duty shall be a dollar a gallon—all Tonga wines shall be free.

7. He that breaks these laws shall be fined 100 dollars, or to be sentenced to six months hard labour.

8. Every one found drunk in the road, or on the green, or in another person's premises, shall be fined five dollars.

XXXVIII.—*The Law concerning the Scribe (or Registrar)*

The King has, with the chiefs, appointed three Registrars to be the Scribes of the kingdom—one at Tongatabu, one at Haabai, and one at Vavau; and it is their duty to write the affairs of the kingdom—births, marriages, divorces and deaths.

1. If after three weeks the birth of a child be not registered, the parent of the child shall be fined one dollar.

2. And if a person marry, but do not register his marriage, he shall be fined one dollar.

3. And if parties be divorced and do not register the divorce, they shall be fined one dollar each.

4. And if a funeral take place, and the death be not registered, he to whom the dead properly belonged shall be fined one dollar, as it is not lawful to bury any one whose death is not registered. These laws are made that the King and Chiefs may know if the land is prospering, or otherwise and to prevent confusion.

5. It is also the work of the Scribes to collect the tribute, and to make known the pleasure of the King or Governor. When the time fixed for making the tribute, (by the King, or Governor) is expired, and there be some who have not paid up, it shall be lawful for the Scribe to sell by auction as much of their property as will pay the tribute.

XXXIX.—*The Law concerning Fire-arms and Ammunition*

It is not lawful for any one in this kingdom to land arms or ammunition, be he Tonga man or foreigner, without the knowledge of the King or Governor; and if the Government do not wish to purchase them, they may be landed, but he who lands them shall pay duty—for a musket or rifle, two dollars, and for a cannon, ten dollars. For large shot, four dollars a bag, and for loose powder, one shilling a pound.

XL.—*The Law concerning the Division of Lands*

When the land is divided among the people, if there be a part that is not used by the people, as farms, or in any way, it shall be resumed by the Government. And when any one dies, leaving his land to no one in particular, it shall be claimed by the State.

Translated by R. Amos

Appendix D

CONSTITUTION OF TONGA, 1875

PART I

DECLARATION OF RIGHTS

SEEING it appears to be the Will of God for man to be free, as He has made of one blood all nations of men, therefore shall the people of Tonga be for ever free, and all people who reside or may reside in this kingdom. And the lives and bodies and time of all people shall be free to possess and acquire property, all doing as they like with the fruit of their hands, and using their own property as they may seem fit.

2. No one shall be obliged to work as a servant to another excepting he is willing to do so, saving in breaches of the law: and any slave running away from any country to Tonga (if he is not running away from the law of any land in consequence of being a murderer, thief, or guilty of any crime or debt) shall at once be free on putting foot on Tongan soil; for no one shall ever continue to be a slave under the protection of the Flag of Tonga.

3. Any one wishing to bring people from different islands to work for him, it shall be lawful for him to agree with them for how many years' service they shall work for him; and an exact copy of the agreement and contract made between him and them shall be lodged in the Government Offices, stating the amount of payment they shall receive, the time they shall work for him, and promising to take them back to their own land. And the Government will see such contract carried out on behalf of those who may engage and those who may be engaged. And any such persons coming shall be subject to the law of the land, and shall pay

taxes and duties the same as all people residing in this kingdom. But it shall not be lawful for any one to make any contracts with any Chinese to come and work for him, lest the disease of leprosy be brought to Tonga the same as exists in the Sandwich Islands. But it is not by this intended to prevent any Chinese coming to Tonga, but to prevent them coming as labourers the same as is done in many places. But any Chinaman wishing to reside in Tonga must first produce a doctor's certificate that he is free from such disease: then it shall be lawful for him to reside in Tonga.

4. There shall be but one law in Tonga, one for the Chiefs, and commoners, and Europeans and Tongese. No laws shall be enacted for any special class to the detriment of another class; but one law equally the same for all persons residing in this land.

5. All men are free to perform their worship and to worship God as they may deem fit in accordance with the dictates of their own consciences and to assemble to perform their worship in such places as they may appoint to do so. But it shall not be lawful for them to construe this privilege (liberty) to commit evil and licentious acts under the name of worship; acts which are not in accordance with the law and peace of the land.

6. The Sabbath Day shall be sacred in Tonga for ever and it shall not be lawful to work, or artifice, or play games, or trade on the Sabbath. And any agreement made or document witnessed on this day shall be counted void, and will not be protected by the Government.

7. It shall be lawful for all people to speak, write, and print their minds and opinions, and no law shall be enacted to forbid this for ever. There shall be freedom of speech and newspapers (Press) for ever. But this does not nullify the law relative to libel, and the law for the protection of His Majesty and the Royal Family.

8. All people shall have the right of writing to or petitioning the King or Legislative Assembly, and assemble and consult concerning things which appear to them necessary to petition to the King

or Legislative Assembly for the purpose of making enactments or repealing, so long as they meet peaceably without arms and without disorder.

9. The law of the writ of Habeas Corpus is the right of all people, and it shall never be suspended for ever excepting in cases of war or rebellion in the land, and then it shall be lawful for the King, with the consent of the Legislative Assembly to suspend it.

10. No one shall be imprisoned or punished because of any offence he may have committed until he has been judged according to law, in the presence of a court having jurisdiction for the same.

11. No one shall be judged or commanded to appear before any court, or punished for not appearing, unless he has previously received a written indictment. (Except in cases of impeachment or for small offences within the jurisdiction of the police magistrate, or for contempt of court while the court is sitting.) The written indictment shall clearly explain what is charged against him, and why he is to be judged. And when being judged the witnesses against him shall be brought face to face and he shall hear their evidence, and it shall be lawful for him or his council to question (cross-examine) them and to bring in any witnesses of his own, and to plead or explain himself or through his counsel, because of what he may be charged. But any one who shall be indicted for any great crime such as treason, rebellion against the King, theft, bribery, perjury, forgery or embezzlement, or of a crime of a like nature shall be tried by jury. This law shall be inviolable for ever. And all large debts shall be tried by jury, but it shall be with the Legislative Assembly to determine what shall be the amount of debt that shall be tried by jury.

12. No one shall be judged twice for any offence for which he has already been judged, whether he was acquitted or convicted, except in cases where the guilty persons shall confess after having been acquitted by the court, and then only when there is sufficient evidence to prove the truth of the same.

13. No one shall be judged for any thing else but what appears in the writ or warrant that for which he was brought to be judged.

14. No one shall be compelled to witness against himself, (in any criminal case) nor shall his life, property or liberty be taken away but according to law.

15. It shall not be lawful for any judge, or for any juryman to sit in any case which concerns his relative either as plaintiff, defendant or witness. It is not lawful for any judge to sit in any case which concerns himself. It shall not be lawful for any judge or juryman to receive any present or money or any thing else from any one who is about to be judged, or from any of his friends, but for all judges and jurymen to be entirely free, and in no case whatever to be an interested party or accomplice in their duties.

16. It shall not be lawful for any one to enter forcibly the house or premises of another, or to seek any thing or to take any thing the property of another, excepting by the command of the judges according to law. But should there be any one who shall lose any property or other things and know that it is hidden in any place, house or premises, it shall be lawful for him to make affidavit in the presence of the judges that he thinks that it is hidden in that place. He shall describe particularly the nature of the property so hidden and the place that he thinks that it is so hidden, and the judges shall issue a search warrant to the police to seek the property according to the affidavit so made.

17. The King conducts his Government on behalf of all the people, not for the purpose of enriching or benefitting any one man, or any one family, or any one class, but on behalf of all the people without partiality, but for the good and benefit of all the people of his kingdom.

18. All the people have the right to expect that the Government will protect their life, liberty and property, and therefore it is right for all the people to assist and pay taxes to the Government according to law. And if at the same time there shall be war

in the land, and the Government shall take the property of any one or any thing from any one, the Government shall pay to whom it belongs that which is right. And if the Legislative Assembly shall decree to take from any one or any number of persons their premises or a part of their premises, or their houses for the purpose of making Government roads or other work of benefit to the Government, the Government shall pay that which is right; such payment shall be made according to the directions of four arbitrators, two to be chosen by the Government, and two by the person or persons to whom belong the premises or houses. And these four shall choose another to be their chairman, and what they shall agree to shall be considered the lawful payment.

19. It shall not be lawful to increase or decrease the taxes or duties but with the consent of the Legislative Assembly. Nor shall any money be paid out of the Government Treasury, or debts contracted with the Government, but as shall be arranged by the Legislative Assembly, excepting in cases of war or rebellion or fearful epidemic or a like calamity. And in such case it shall be done with the consent of the Cabinet, and the King shall call together at once the Legislative Assembly, and the Treasurer shall give the reason why that money was expended, and the amount.

20. It shall not be lawful to enact any retrospective laws.

21. All the military shall be obedient to the laws of the land. Whether they belong to the Guards, the Artillery, or to the Militia (see 23rd clause) and should any of them break the laws of the land, they shall be judged in the courts of the land the same as any one else. And it shall not be lawful for any officer to quarter any soldier to the premises of any one for them to provide for him, except in time of war, and then only as shall be enacted by the Legislative Assembly.

22. Any one who shall have arrived at the age of 21 years and pays taxes, the same being one of the land, or one who has taken the Oath of Allegiance and can read and write, and from the time of the Constitution becoming law has not been guilty of any

great crime such as treason, murder, theft, bribery, perjury, forgery and embezzlement or a like crime (these depriving a man of his liberty as a subject, preventing him from joining in the government of the land, according to the 25th clause of this Constitution) it shall be lawful for him to vote for representatives to the Legislative Assembly, such election being made by ballot. And on the day appointed to vote for representatives to the Legislative Assembly he shall be free from summons because of debt, but this law does not refer to the issue of warrants because of crimes in accordance with the 25th clause of this Constitution.

23. It shall be lawful for the military (that is Guards and Artillery) though they may not pay taxes, if they have arrived at the age of 21 years and if they can read and write, and if they have not been guilty since the passing of the Constitution of any great crime as mentioned in the 25th clause, for them to vote for representatives to the Legislative Assembly: and when the day of election shall arrive, the Commanding Officer shall so arrange for them to have time to go and ballot. During the time of peace it shall not be lawful to press any one to join the military excepting for the purpose of completing the number of the Guards if they cannot be completed from those who are willing to join: such being the case the number required to complete the Guards shall be divided out to the different lands according to the number of the population, and it shall be arranged thus:— All the unmarried men of the land shall draw lots, and those to whom the lot falls being equal to the number of those apportioned to that land, they shall join the Guards for a period of seven years; and it shall be with the King and the Legislative Assembly to determine how many. But if there should be any disturbance in the land it shall be lawful for the King to call all those capable of bearing arms to join the Militia and to make laws for their government: and when peace shall be proclaimed the Militia shall be dispersed, and the military of the land shall consist only of the Guards and Artillery. (See clause 22 relative to the military.)

24. Any one who shall have arrived at age, and shall be able to write and read, and since the passing of the Constitution shall not

have been guilty of any great crime such as treason, murder, theft, bribery, perjury, forgery, and embezzlement, or any like crime, in accordance with the 25th clause, and has paid his taxes, and is not heavily in debt so that if judged it would appear that he would not be able to pay his debts, it shall be lawful for him to enter the Legislative Assembly if chosen by any electorate as a member according to law. But any one holding a position of trust or payment in the Government, it shall not be lawful for him to enter, excepting members of the Ministry. And any judges receiving payment,—either one of the high judges or police magistrates, it shall not be lawful for him to enter the Legislative Assembly. This law has reference also to all Governors whilst they hold the position of Governor.

25. It shall not be lawful for any one who has committed a great crime such as treason, murder, theft, bribery, perjury, forgery, embezzlement or a like crime, if such has been done since the passing of the Constitution, for him to hold any position in the Government of Tonga, whether one of payment or honour, or to vote for representatives to the Legislative Assembly if he has not received pardon from the King and it is expressly declared in his pardon that he can again hold his position in the kingdom, his liberty as a subject and lawful to vote for representatives to the Legislative Assembly according to the 22nd clause.

26. It shall not be lawful for any one holding a position in the Government whether one of payment or otherwise, to hold any position or receive any payment from another Government, without first obtaining permission from the King and Legislative Assembly. And it shall not be lawful for any one holding a position of payment from the Government to trade or work for any one else.

27. All men who have arrived at the age of 16 years shall pay taxes whether they have plantations or not. And all foreigners or strangers who shall come and reside in this land, whether as traders, or carpenters or artificers, whether they have premises and plantations or not, after they have resided six full months in the

land shall pay taxes the same as all other people, notwithstanding they may have trading licenses or may pay for leases or not.

28. Any one who shall be really poor, whether arising from sickness or old age, if he cannot really pay taxes, whether a Tongaman or foreigner, shall appear before one of the high judges on a day appointed by the Government, and it shall be lawful for them to give him dispensation to be free from paying taxes; but it shall not be lawful for them to free any one holding a lease of land, as such cannot come under the class of paupers.

29. Although it is hereby appointed that all men who have arrived at the age of 16 years shall pay taxes, yet it shall not be lawful for them to become the heir of any inheritance or any name until they have arrived at the age of 21 years. But the Royal family shall be considered to have arrived at the age of maturity at 18 years.

30. All the people of the land who shall have arrived at the age of 21 years and pay taxes, can write and read, and have not been guilty of any great crime as explained in the 25th clause of this Constitution shall be liable to serve on juries; and once every year the names of all those who are liable to serve shall be printed. Any one who neglects to take his turn shall be punished as shall be enacted by the Legislative Assembly. But members of the Legislature, Missionaries, assistant missionaries, teachers, schoolmasters, collegians, Institution lads, servants of the Government, clerks of the Bank, military officers, the Guards and Artillery-men, and all officials of the Government shall be free from this law.

31. Any foreigner or stranger from any one of the great nations who shall be guilty of any great crime as expressed in the 25th clause of this Constitution, or who shall owe a large amount, (it is with the Legislative Assembly to enact what shall be the amount of debt to be judged by jury) shall be judged by jury, six being foreigners resident in the land who pay taxes, and six Tonga jurymen whose names stand on the jury list of the place where the court is held.

32. That any nation which has recognised Tonga as a kingdom, it shall be lawful for the people from that nation after they have resided in Tonga for the space of two years to take the Oath of Allegiance. Such persons shall have the same privileges as the native born subjects of Tonga. And for the benefit of strangers residing in Tonga after the 1st January eighteen hundred and seventy-six, any law which may be enacted by the Government shall be printed both in Tongese and English. And if in the arraignment of any foreigner it shall appear that there is a difference of meaning between the law published in English from that published in Tongese, the case shall be judged according to the English version of the law, which shall be held to be the meaning of the law. And should any foreigner be judged and there shall be no Tonga law to meet the case, he shall be judged according to the British law which shall be held to be the law of Tonga in such cases, until a law has been passed by the King and Legislative Assembly to meet the same.

PART II

FORM OF GOVERNMENT

THE form of Government for this kingdom is divided into three divisions:— 1st, the King, Privy Council, Cabinet. (The Ministers.) 2nd, the Legislative Assembly. 3rd, Judicial. These three shall always be distinct, and it shall not be lawful for any judge to be a member of the Legislative Assembly.

34. The form of Government for this kingdom is that of a Constitutional Government under His Majesty, King George Tubou, his heirs and successors.

35. The Crown and Throne of this kingdom is possessed by His Majesty, King George Tubou; and it is hereby confirmed that it shall be possessed by him, and to him who was begotten by him David Uga, and to him who was begotten by him Wellington Gu, and to them who shall be begotten by him in marriage; and if

there shall be no heirs by marriage of Wellington Gu it shall descend according to the law of descent. This is the law of descent:— It is lawful only for those born in marriage to succeed. The succession shall be to the senior male child, and the heirs of his body: but if he should have no descendants, to the second male child and the heirs of his body, and so on until all the male line shall be ended. Should there be no male child it shall succeed to the first female child, and the heirs of her body; and if she should have no descendants it shall descend to the second female child and the heirs of her body until the female line is ended. And if there should be none of this line, lawful descendants, by marriage to succeed to the Crown of the King of Tonga, it shall descend to Henry Maafu and his lawful heirs, those that shall be begotten from his body by marriage, and to their heirs that shall be begotten by them: and if there shall be no lawful heir the King shall appoint his heir if the House of Nobles are agreeable to it. (The representatives of the people have no voice in the same.) And the same shall be declared heir to the Crown publicly during the King's life. Should there be no heir or successor appointed to the Crown; one who has been publicly proclaimed the premier shall call together, and in his absence the Cabinet, the Nobles of the Legislative Assembly (the representatives of the people having no voice in the same) and when they meet the House of Nobles shall choose by ballot some one of the Chiefs that they are agreeable to succeed as King. And he shall succeed as the commencement [new stirps] for a new Royal family, and he and his heirs from his body born in marriage shall possess the Crown according to law. And in the event of there being none to succeed according to this law, the Premier shall again call together, and in his absence the Cabinet, the Nobles of the Legislative Assembly in accordance with this law, and they shall choose a King, one to succeed to the Throne, the beginning [or stirps] of a new Royal family, and so on again according to this law for ever.

36. It shall not be lawful for any member of the Royal family,—any one likely to succeed to the Crown,—to marry any person without the consent of the King. And if any one should thus

marry it shall not be considered a legal marriage, and it shall be lawful for the King to forfeit the right of such a one for on no account to succeed to the Crown of Tonga, or his heirs. And if he shall thus act, it shall succeed to the next one in succession to him, and he shall be considered the heir, and the offender shall be considered as dead.

37. After this Constitution shall become law His Majesty shall take this Oath on a day appointed, and it will also be taken by those who shall succeed in the succession to the Crown:— 'I solemnly swear in the presence of Almighty God to keep in its integrity the Constitution of Tonga, and to govern in conformity with the laws thereof.'

38. No one shall ever succeed to the Crown of Tonga who has been judged and found guilty of any infamous crime, or who is insane, or an idiot.

39. The King is the Commander-in-Chief of the forces on the land and sea. It is with him to appoint the officers, and to make arrangements for the training and governing of the forces as he shall think best for the benefit of the land; and it shall not be lawful to make war without the consent of the Legislative Assembly.

40. It shall be lawful for the King, with the consent of the Privy Council, to grant pardons to all who have broken the law after conviction, saving those who have been convicted according to the 55th clause,—cases of impeachment. For such it shall not be lawful for him to grant any pardon.

41. The King, by the consent of the Privy Council, convenes a Legislative Assembly, and they shall always assemble in the principal town of the Kingdom,—Nukualofa. It shall not be lawful to meet in any other place except in case of war. And if the King shall be displeased with the Legislative Assembly it shall be lawful for him to dissolve the Assembly, and to command for new representatives to be chosen for them to enter the Legislative

Assembly. But it shall not be lawful for him to dismiss any one of the Nobles of the Legislative Assembly except in cases of treason, and then only in accordance with the 48th clause. But it shall not be lawful for the kingdom to remain without a Legislative Assembly for a longer time than two years; and if anything extraordinary shall arise in the land, the Legislative Assembly shall be called together at once to consult about it.

42. It is with the King to make treaties with foreign nations; but it shall not be lawful for him to make treaties contrary to the laws of the kingdom, or to alter the duties without the consent of the Legislative Assembly. But it is with the King to appoint his representatives to other nations according to the law of nations.

43. It is the prerogative of the King to receive and acknowledge public ministers, and to send word to the Legislative Assembly, by writing, things concerning the kingdom, and also concerning matters that he wishes to bring under their notice to consult about.

44. The person of the King is sacred. He governs the land, but his Ministers are responsible. All laws that have passed the Legislative Assembly must have His Majesty's signature before they become law.

45. Should the King die before his heir is 18 years of age, a Prince Regent shall be appointed according to the 46th clause.

46. Should the King wish to voyage from the land, it shall be lawful for him to appoint a Prince Regent who shall administer the affairs of the kingdom during his absence. And if the King should die whilst his heir is under age,—that is, not arrived at the age of 18 years,—and has not left a will as to whom he wished to be Prince Regent whilst his heir was yet young, the Premier or the Cabinet shall call together at once a Legislative Assembly (the representatives of the people having no voice in it) and they shall choose by ballot who shall be Prince Regent; and the one whom they choose shall administer the affairs of the kingdom in the name of the King until the years of the Prince, the heir, shall be complete.

47. The King is the Sovereign of all the Chiefs and all the people. The kingdom is his.

48. It is the King's prerogative to give all titles of honour and to appoint and give all distinctions of honour. But it shall not be lawful for him to take away the name of any one who has an hereditary name, such as Chiefs of the divisions of the land, and Nobles of the Legislative Assembly, those to whom the lands belong, and the hereditary name of the Legislative Assembly according to the 41st clause of this Constitution, except in cases of treason. And if any one shall be judged and found guilty of treason it is with the King to say who of that tribe shall succeed to the name and inheritance of the guilty party.

49. It is the prerogative of the King, with the advice of his Cabinet, to arrange as to what money shall be legal tender in this kingdom, and to make arrangements for the coining of currency money of this land which shall be impressed with the King's head upon it. But until other arrangements shall be made by the Legislative Assembly, the following shall be the legal currency in this kingdom: all English money and French money, except 1 franc pieces, all United States money, quarter dollars, half dollars, and all gold.

50. Should there be civil war in this land, or war between this land and another, it shall be lawful for the King to proclaim martial law for any part of the land, or for the whole of the land.

51. The Flag of Tonga, the flag of King George, shall not be changed for ever, and shall always be the flag of this kingdom. And the present Royal Ensign, shall be the ensign of the Royal family of Tonga for ever.

52. Inheritances of the King and the property of the King is his, to do with it as he pleases. The Government shall not touch it, nor shall it be liable for any Government debt. But all houses built for him by the Government and any inheritance which may be given to him as King shall descend to his successors as the property and inheritance of the Royal line.

53. It shall not be lawful to judge the King in any court for a debt, without the consent of the Cabinet.

PRIVY COUNCIL

54. The King shall appoint a Privy Council to assist him in his work in great and important affairs. The Privy Council shall be composed of the Cabinet in accordance with the 55th clause, and the Governors in accordance with the 58th clause, and the Chief Justice. And if any thing shall arise in the land, or any great dispute because of any debt, or concerning any inheritance, if such has been judged in the Supreme Court it shall be lawful to appeal to the Privy Council to re-judge the same, and such shall be the final court. But it shall not be lawful for the Privy Council to re-judge any criminal case; only civil cases and the like.

CABINET

55. The Cabinet of the King or his Ministers shall be the Premier, Treasurer, Minister of Lands and Minister of Police. It is the prerogative of the King to appoint the Ministers. They shall hold their position during the pleasure of the King. It shall be lawful to impeach the Ministers by the Legislative Assembly, if their administration and work is not according to law. The Ministers shall enter the Legislative Assembly as Nobles of the Legislative Assembly; and any order which may be passed by the King and Privy Council shall not have any effect in the land until the signature of the Minister to whose department of work such order concerns is attached. And if such order shall be wrong he alone shall be responsible.

(1) It is with the Premier to appoint Bule Kolos, (Mayors) and to make arrangements for the cleaning and inspection of Government roads; to make new roads; to take care of the Legislative House, prisons, and all houses of the Government; and to take care of and govern the vessels of the Government. It is with him to provide for the military, and for the houses of the military; to provide for the various courts; to see to the work of the Registrars (those whose duty it is to register births, marriages and deaths); and also to appoint all Police Magistrates. He also

has charge of the Great Seal of the Government and to all the working of the Government which does not belong to any other particular Minister. He also represents the Government to other nations (Minister of Foreign Affairs); and transacts all business in connection with the same.

(2) It is with the Treasurer to see that the taxes are collected as arranged by the Legislative Assembly; to collect the duties and payment for licenses; to receive from the Premier fines from the courts; from the Minister of Lands payment for leases, and to pay all the debts or expenses of the Government as enacted by the Legislative Assembly.

(3) It is with the Minister of Lands to take care of all Government premises and town sites; to make all town roads; to arrange for the proper position of the houses in the town; and to make arrangements for the leasing of lands to foreigners with the consent of the King and Privy Council; and to see that the Government leases are complied with in accordance with the Constitution as enacted by the King and Legislative Assembly.

(4) It is with the Minister of Police to see that the land resides in peace, and to prevent all disturbance; to see that the police report all breaches of the law; and that the laws of the land are carried out as it shall be enacted by the King and Legislative Assembly; to govern all the police; to prosecute in the Supreme and Circuit Courts, or those persons who have been committed from the Police Courts; to see punished all prisoners as sentenced by the judges, and that every thing is carried out as far as concerns the laws of the land.

(5) Each Minister shall draw up a report once every year, explaining to the King the nature of the work of his department; such report shall be sent by the King to the Legislative Assembly when it assembles, and if the Legislative Assembly shall wish to know any thing concerning the department of any Minister, he shall answer the question made by the Legislative Assembly and explain every thing in connection with his department.

56. Each member of the Cabinet shall have an office in Nukualofa, the principal town of the Kingdom; and it shall be with him to see how all the servants in his department perform their

duties. And the Government shall build or rent offices suitable for the carrying out of the work of each Minister.

57. When the Legislative Assembly shall meet, the Minister of Finance (Treasurer) shall report on behalf of Cabinet, the first week of their meeting, all monies which have been received and expended during that year, or since the last meeting of the Assembly, and the nature of the receipts and expenditure.

58. The King shall appoint, with the consent of the Cabinet, Governors to Haabai, Vavau, Niuafuou, and Niuatobutabu, but because of the King residing in Tonga and also the Premier no Governor shall be appointed to Tong Tabu [*sic*], (because of their [*sic*] being no work to do). And it shall not be lawful for the Governors to enter the Legislative Assembly; but they shall be members of the Privy Council whilst they hold the office of Governor, and they shall be Governors only during the pleasure of the King.

59. It shall not be lawful for any Governor to enact any laws; but his work is to see that the land where he resides complies with the laws. They shall be changed every seven years. If their administration be wrong it shall be lawful to impeach them by the Legislative Assembly in accordance with the 58th clause which has reference to the Ministers.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

60. It is with the King and Legislative Assembly to enact all laws; and the Nobles and representatives of the people shall sit in one House. And when the Legislative Assembly shall agree upon any thing, the same having been read and voted for by the majority three times, it shall be presented to the King for his pleasure; and if he approves of the same and fixes his name to it, it shall at once become law. Voting shall be considered either by the raising of hands or standing up in division, the same as is done in the Legislature in Sydney, or by ballot according to the various clauses of this Constitution, or by speech,—‘aye’ or ‘no’ as is the manner of Legislative Assemblies.

61. The Legislative Assembly shall be called the Legislative Assembly of the kingdom of Tonga.

62. The Legislative Assembly shall meet every second year in the second week of June, or before that time if the King shall wish it; and if any important affairs transpire in the land it shall be lawful to command the Legislative Assembly to meet to consult about the same.

63. The Legislative Assembly shall be composed of the Ministers in accordance with the 55th clause, and the Nobles and representatives of the people.

(1) **MINISTERS.**—It shall be lawful for the King to choose his Ministers from the Nobles, or from the representatives of the people, or from persons outside. And if so they shall enter the Legislative Assembly in accordance with the 55th clause.

(2) **NOBLES.**—After the Constitution shall be passed the King shall appoint twenty Nobles who shall be members of the Legislative Assembly; such Chiefs shall become the Nobles of Tonga and their heirs for ever in accordance with the 48th clause; and they shall be appointed as follows:—Tonga Tabu, 9; Haabai, 5; Vavau, 4; Niuatobutabu, 1; and Niuafouu, 1.

(3) **Representatives of the People.**—The land shall choose twenty representatives of the people who shall be appointed as follows:—Tonga Tabu, 9; Haabai, 5; Vavau, 4; Niuatobutabu, 1; and Niuafouu, 1.

64. The following Oath shall be taken by the members of the Privy Council:—‘I solemnly swear in the presence of God I will be truly obedient to His Majesty King George Tubou the rightful King of Tonga; and I will keep righteously and perfectly the Constitution of the Government of Tonga; and I will assist to the end of my power and ability in all things in connection with the Privy Council.’ The following Oath shall be taken by Ministers:—‘I solemnly swear in the presence of God I will be truly obedient to His Majesty King George Tubou the rightful King of Tonga; and I will keep the Constitution of the Government of Tonga, and perform my work in my department to the end of

my ability for the benefit of the King and this Kingdom'. The following Oath shall be taken by the Nobles and representatives of the people:— 'I solemnly swear in the presence of God that I will be truly obedient to His Majesty King George Tubou the rightful King of Tonga; and I will keep righteously and perfectly the Constitution of the Government of Tonga, and perform truly and righteously the duties and work of the Legislative Assembly'. The members of the Privy Council shall sign their Oaths and read them in the presence of the King; members of the Ministry shall sign their names to the Oath and read the same in the presence of the King; the Nobles and representatives of the people shall sign their names to the Oath and read the same in the presence of the Legislative Assembly.

65. The King shall appoint the Chair of the Assembly from one of the Chiefs of the Legislative Assembly; but all other officers shall be appointed by the Legislative Assembly. They shall make also all rules in connection with their meetings in accordance with the usage of other Legislatures.

66. No one shall succeed to the position of Noble until he shall have completed the 21st year of his age; and no one shall succeed to that position, or enter the Legislative Assembly, who is insane or an idiot, or who has been guilty of a great crime as is stated in the 25th clause. It shall not be lawful for the King to increase the number of Nobles to more than twenty, saving at the petition of the representatives of the people; and that repeated twice or two years between each petition for him so to do, and it shall then be lawful to increase their number by the King according to the petition.

67. The representatives of the people shall be chosen by ballot. It shall not be lawful for any one to enter the Legislative Assembly who is insane or an idiot; only those who are free in the law according to the 24th and 25th clauses. The mode of ballot shall be as follows:— The names of the candidates who have been nominated, shall be printed, those who are desirous to enter the Legislative Assembly, from which the voters shall choose (those

are entitled to vote according to the 22nd clause), and they shall cross out the names of those whom they are not willing to vote for, and leave those names to stand they wish to vote for, and then sign their name to the paper. Such papers shall be collected by the Scribe (Registrar) who shall be appointed by the Premier for the purpose; and he shall see whose right it is to enter the Legislative Assembly; and he shall announce on the day of election who has been elected, and report the same at once to the Chair of the Assembly. He shall also collect all the ballot papers, and such ballot papers shall be preserved in the Government offices for the space of seven years.

68. It shall not be lawful for any one who is insane or an idiot to vote in the election for representatives of the people to the Legislative Assembly, only those who are free in the law according to the 22nd clause.

69. If any one shall use threatenings or shall use bribery for the purpose of getting people to vote for him, and he should become elected to enter the Legislative Assembly, such a one shall be unseated by the Legislative Assembly when the same shall be reported to them and when judged it shall be found to be correct.

70. With reference to all laws in connection with the King, Royal Family and Nobles of the Legislative Assembly, the whole of the Legislative Assembly (that is both Houses) shall first vote together in accordance with the 60th clause, after which it shall be lawful only for the Nobles of the House to vote; and if they shall be willing to the same after it has been read and passed three times by a majority of the Nobles, it shall be taken to the King at once for his pleasure; and if the majority of Nobles are not willing, the same shall be dropped, although it may have passed the majority of the whole of the Legislative Assembly, and if also it is not approved of by the King it shall not become law in accordance with the 60th clause of this Constitution.

71. If the Legislative Assembly shall agree and pass any law in accordance with the 60th and 70th clauses of this Constitution

it shall be taken to the King, and if he does not approve of the same it shall not be lawful for the Legislative Assembly again to discuss the same in that session.

72. It shall be lawful for the Legislative Assembly to judge the conduct of its members; and although all members of the Legislative Assembly may not be present it shall be lawful for the Legislative Assembly to discuss and pass laws should one-third of the members of the Legislative Assembly be present, or ten members. But if there are less they shall adjourn from that day to another day until one-third of the House shall be present, or ten members. But when they meet again if there still be less than one-third of the House or ten members present, it shall be lawful for them to command the presence of all the Nobles and all the representatives of the people; and if they do not attend it shall be lawful for them to declare their punishment for such disobedience.

73. If any one shall speak or act disrespectfully in the presence of the Legislative Assembly, it shall be lawful for them to imprison the same for thirty days; and if, while the House is in session, any one shall write libellous articles on the Legislative Assembly, (false reports) or threaten any of its members or his property, or shall rescue any one that has been commanded by the Legislative Assembly to appear before them, it shall also be lawful for them to imprison the same for thirty days.

74. Should any one of the Nobles act unbecoming to his position either whilst the House is sitting or not, it shall be lawful for the Nobles to judge the same. (But it shall not be lawful for the representatives of the people to take part in such judgment.) And it shall be lawful for them to depose him from his position as a Noble; and should such be the case it shall be with the King to appoint one in his stead from his tribe to the Legislative Assembly. But it shall not be lawful to take from him his name or his inheritance excepting for treason.

75. The Legislative Assembly shall keep a journal of its proceedings, and the 'ayes' and 'noes' of the Legislative on any

question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered in the journal of the Assembly.

76. The Nobles and representatives of the people shall be free from arrest whilst the Assembly is sitting, excepting in cases as enumerated in the 25th clause. And no member of the Legislative Assembly shall be liable to judgment for any thing said in the Legislative Assembly.

77. It shall be lawful for the Nobles and also the representatives of the people to impeach any one of the Ministers or Governors or Judges for mal-administration (or misconduct), and when the same shall be judged and shall be proved to be true, the Legislative Assembly shall have power to depose the same from his position, but it shall be with the Courts to punish the same according to law should he be brought before them.

78. If any one of the representatives of the people should wish to resign his position in the Legislative Assembly it shall be lawful for him to send in his resignation to the Speaker, and after sending the same his connection shall end with the Legislative Assembly.

79. Should any one of the representatives of the people resign or die, the Speaker shall immediately command that electorate which he represented to elect one in his place. But the Legislative Assembly shall not in consequence adjourn although their number may not be complete but they shall go on with their proceedings.

80. All the representatives of the people shall be chosen every five years, but it shall be lawful for the King to dissolve the Legislative Assembly of the representatives of the people although their five years may not have expired should he so wish to do, and to command the electorates to choose again representatives to the Legislative Assembly according to law.

81. It shall be with the Legislative Assembly to arrange the amount of taxes which shall be paid by the people, and also the amount

of duties; also the amount of payment which shall be made for licenses; and it shall be with them and them only to pass the estimates of the expenditure and work of the Government in accordance with the 19th clause. And when the Legislative Assembly shall meet it shall be with the Minister of Finance to report the amount of revenue received in the two years preceding the meeting of the Assembly, and also the amount of money paid in the expenditure of the Government. And it shall be with the Legislative Assembly to determine the amount of estimates for the expenditure of Government for the two succeeding years. Whatever may be the amount which they may determine for the expenditure and support of the Government the Ministers shall distinctly carry out such estimates made by the Legislative Assembly.

82. It shall be lawful for the Legislative Assembly to consult with regard to any amendments of the Consitution should such amendments not interfere with the laws of liberty (Declaration of Rights), the laws with reference to foreigners, the succession to the throne, and the inheritances and titles of the Nobles and Chiefs of the land. And any clause of the Constitution which the Legislative Assembly may wish to amend shall, after it has passed three times, be left over until they meet again in the next Assembly to be held after two years. And if they shall still approve of it and it shall be passed again three times, it shall be lawful to take it to the King, and if it receives his consent such amendment shall become part of the Constitution.

83. The enacting style in making all laws shall be,—‘Be it enacted by the King and Legislative Assembly.’

84. To avoid confusion in the making of laws, every law shall embrace but one object, and that shall be expressed by its title.

85. The present laws of the land shall still be in force until altered by the Legislative Assembly, excepting in such cases where they are contrary to the spirit of this Constitution. And any law which may be passed contrary to the spirit of this Constitution shall not become law or be put in force.

JUDICIAL

86. The Judicial power of the kingdom shall be vested in the Supreme Court, Circuit Courts and Police Courts.

87. The Supreme Court shall consist of the Chief Justice and two associated justices, any two of whom may hold a court. And should the Chief Justice not be there the senior associated justice shall preside. All three justices have equal powers and rights.

88. It is with the King with the consent of the Cabinet to appoint justices to the Supreme Court. And the justices of the Supreme Court shall hold their offices during good behaviour, and shall receive their salaries from the Government as may be arranged by the King and Legislative Assembly. And whilst they hold their position, although it may be lawful for the Legislative Assembly to increase their salaries, it shall not be lawful to diminish them. But should it appear to the Legislative Assembly that the conduct and adjudication of any one of the judges is altogether wrong and inconsistent, it shall be lawful for the Legislative Assembly to impeach and judge such an one according to the 77th clause.

89. It is with the justices of the Supreme Court to arrange the manner of holding the lower courts, and also to draw out all forms, and make rules for all the business of the same.

90. Should any case of impeachment be tried by the Legislative Assembly of any one of the Governors, or Ministers or Justices, the Chief Justice shall preside in the Legislative Assembly whilst the case is being heard. But should at any time the Chief Justice be impeached by the Legislative Assembly, the King shall appoint some one to preside during such trial.

91. Should the Supreme Court be held and the three judges be agreed in any case, or any two of them, such decision shall be final. And it shall not be lawful to grant a new hearing, if such was a trial for a crime in accordance with the 25th clause. But should it be a cause for debt or dispute about any inheritance it

shall be lawful to appeal to the Privy Council in accordance with the 54th clause.

92. The powers of the Supreme Court shall extend to all cases in Law and Equity arising under the Constitution and laws of this kingdom, and treaties made or which shall be made; and to all cases affecting Public Ministers and Consuls, and all cases of Admiralty and maritime jurisdiction.

93. It shall be lawful for the King, or the Cabinet, or the Legislative Assembly to require the opinions of the Justices of the Supreme Court on important questions of law and difficult cases.

94. It shall not be lawful for any Justice or magistrate to sit alone on any new trial or appeal in any case on which he may have given a previous judgment.

95. The Chief Justice and Associated Justices shall take the following Oath:— 'I swear in the presence of God that I will be obedient to King George Tubou the lawful King of Tonga, and that I will perform righteously and truly with impartiality my work as a Justice in accordance with the Constitution and laws of this land.' The Justice shall sign and read this Oath in the presence of the Cabinet.

96. It is with the Legislative Assembly to decide what shall be the court fees in the various courts; but in case any trial shall take place where the Minister of Police is prosecutor no fees shall be paid. A copy of all cases judged in the Supreme Court shall be kept in the Record office of that court.

97. It shall not be lawful for any Justice or Police Magistrate to receive a portion of any fine or fines which may be paid by persons because of breaches of the law; or for the Government to portion out prisoners to work for any Justice, or magistrate, or police, or juror, or any other person as payment for work done by them.

98. It is with the Legislative Assembly to regulate the mode of summoning and empannelling jurors, or what fees they shall have.

99. It is for one of the Justices to hold the Circuit Courts, and it is with the King and Legislative Assembly to arrange how many Circuit Courts shall be held in this kingdom.

100. All cases tried before the Supreme Court and Circuit Court shall be by jury, and any one prosecuted for the committing of any crime as stated in the 25th clause, or any case which has been committed for trial from the police court shall be tried by a jury of twelve; and this law shall not be repealed for ever.

101. It is the duty of jurors in all criminal cases to pronounce whether the person accused is guilty or not guilty according to to the evidence produced, (and the evidence alone). In civil cases they award payment or compensation as the case may be, and according to the merits of each case.

102. It is the duty of the Justice or magistrate in criminal or civil cases to direct the jury as to the principlees [*sic*] of the law bearing upon each case as it is tried and thus to assist them in their deliberations as to what conclusion it is right for them to come to. It is also with the Justice or magistrate to decide all questions of law, or as to the admissibility of evidence which may arise during a trial.

103. It shall be lawful for the Circuit Courts to judge all criminal and civil cases, but not to judge both kinds of causes on the same day. Different days shall be appointed to hold the Criminal Sessions, and also different days to hold the Civil Sessions.

104. Should any case be tried in a Circuit Court, and the plaintiff or defendant not be satisfied with the decision of that court it shall be lawful for him to appeal to the Supreme Court. And if it shall appear to that court the decision of the Circuit Court was wrong it shall be lawful for them to reverse the judgment.

105. The Chief Justice shall report once every year to the King with regard to the administration of justice and the state of morals, and as to what improvements or changes in the law it appears to him ought to be made. When the Legislative Assembly meets, the King shall lay this report before the Assembly in the same manner as the reports of the Ministers.

106. It is with the King and Legislative Assembly to regulate how many police courts shall be held in this kingdom, and how often. And it shall be with the Legislative Assembly to regulate the powers of the Police Magistrates in criminal and civil cases, and also the amount of debt he can judge, and what cases are to be committed to trial to the Circuit Courts. Criminal and Civil cases shall be held at different times as stated in clause 103, which has reference to the Circuit Courts.

107. Should any one of the Legislative Assembly lay an accusation against any one of the Cabinet, or Governors, or Justices for the purpose of his being impeached by the Legislative Assembly, the impeached officer shall have a written accusation of the same seven clear days before it shall be lawful to try the same. Such trial shall be held in the same way as all trials are to be held, as stated in the 11th clause. After all witnesses shall be heard the accused shall retire whilst the Assembly deliberates; and when the Legislative Assembly shall have arrived at a decision he shall be brought before them and the decision of the Legislative Assembly announced to him. If found guilty it shall be lawful to remove him from his position; but if acquitted it shall not be lawful to impeach him again on the same grounds in accordance with clause 12.

108. Causes which warrant impeachment are those as stated in clause 107, breach of the laws or the regulations of the Legislative Assembly, maladministration, incompetency, destroying and embezzling the property of the Government, or the performance of acts which may lead to difficulties between this country and another.

PART III

THE LANDS

109. It is hereby solemnly declared by this Constitution that it shall not be lawful for ever for any one of this country, whether he be the King or any one of the Chiefs or any one of the people of this land to sell one part of a foot of the ground of the kingdom of Tonga, but only to lease it in accordance with this Constitution. And this declaration shall be a most solemn covenant binding on the King and Chiefs of this Kingdom, for themselves and their successors for ever.

110. It is hereby declared by the Constitution, that the Government shall hold and possess the sites of all towns in this kingdom at present inhabited; and it shall be with the Minister of Lands to hold in trust and govern the sites of all such towns on behalf of the Government, in accordance with the 3rd paragraph of clause 55 of the Constitution Act.

111. It shall be with the Cabinet to fix what shall be the payment for the various leases in the different towns as they may seem fit; but it shall not be lawful to lease any ground in any town to any one for a period of upwards of 21 years, saving for Church purposes,—the two denominations which are now here, the Wesleyan and the Roman Catholic, according to the 117th clause:—and also to the King for his premises in Nukualofa, Lifuka and Neiafu, which shall be leased for a period of 99 years. But should there be premises of any great Chief of any town whose was the town according to former custom, and such land was the inheritance of his forefathers—it shall be lawful for that Chief to have a lease of that land, and his heirs after him, for a period of 99 years—and they shall pay to the Government, whether such premises be large or small, the sum of one dollar per annum on account of such lease.

112. And if any one shall lease any premises in any town from the Government it shall be lawful for him to re-lease such premises

or any portion of such premises to others, should he so wish to do. And it shall be with those who thus re-lease such premises to pay to the Government according to the original lease.

113. It shall be with the Minister of Lands to define the boundaries of all towns now inhabited and such shall be possessed by the Government. Such boundaries shall be printed in the GOVERNMENT GAZETTE and after being proclaimed it will be tabu to enlarge the sites of the towns owned by the Government. And should any high Chief feel aggrieved at the boundaries of the towns thus proclaimed by the Minister, it shall be lawful for him to appeal to have it adjudicated, according to the 123rd clause of this Constitution.

114. The deeds, as have been prepared and approved of by His Majesty King George, are hereby proclaimed the model deeds of the Government of Tonga, according to which all future deeds of leases, either for the Government or the Chiefs, shall be made. Those deeds of leases to which His Majesty has affixed his royal signature, such model deeds, together with the Constitution, shall be preserved in the office of the Government at Nukualofa.

115. This Constitution does not affect any leases which have been made by the Government or any leases which they have positively promised shall be made, whether leases of land in the interior or in town; such leases will be protected by the Government. But this arrangement does not include any new lease which may be made after the Constitution becomes law.

116. No more leases shall be granted (beyond those which have already been made) of any town sites in any town either to the Wesleyan Church or to the Roman Catholic Church, or for the premises of a teacher, should there not be more persons, including both men and women of such Church, those who have arrived at the age of 16 years, (leaving out the children) equal to the number of twenty in such town. And no more leases of sites for school-houses, or the premises for school masters will be granted should there not be in such town children to the number of thirty, constant attendants at the school of such Church.

117. It shall be lawful for the two Churches,—the Wesleyan Church, and the Roman Catholic Church,—to have leases of their premises, in accordance with clause 111, for the term of 99 years. But it shall not be lawful for them to use those premises for any other purpose than that of religion, or to re-lease to any one else for them to use or reside therein; and shall such be the case, and when tried found to be true, the leases of such premises shall revert to the Government.

118. It shall not be lawful for the Government to lease to any white resident, or to any one of his family, any town site greater than 5 acres; and it shall not be lawful for the Government to grant permission to any Chief to lease to any white resident or white residents in company any land in the interior upwards of 1000 acres added together.

119. All the beach frontage of this kingdom belongs to the Government from 50 feet of high water mark. But it shall be lawful for the Government to lease a portion of any beach frontage for the purpose of erecting a store, jetty or wharf; and it shall be with the Minister of Lands to grant such lease with the consent of the Cabinet.

120. The deed of any lease granted by the Government to any white resident shall be made out in the English language.

121. Should the King or Cabinet be willing to grant any lease and such lease be made, the Minister of Lands shall sign his name to such lease in the name of the King, and affix the seal of the Government; and such deed shall be witnessed by the Premier and Treasurer, and an exact copy of it shall be kept in the office of the Minister of Lands, and such registry shall be preserved for ever.

122. It shall be with the Cabinet to arrange what shall be the charge for registering deeds in the office of the Government (The office of Minister of Lands). The leases made by Chiefs, and all sub-leases shall not be considered to be in force until such shall

have been registered, and the deed first registered will be the one protected by the Government.

123. Should any dispute arise between the Government and any Chief because of any town site (or site of a town), or between one Chief and another because of any lands, it shall be lawful for them to petition to the Government to have it adjudicated. The manner of adjudication shall be as follows: The Minister of Lands shall choose four arbitrators, and those who are appealing for adjudication shall also choose four arbitrators, and the Minister of Lands shall appoint either one of the justices or one of the police magistrates to preside over such Court of Arbitration, and all parties shall abide by the decision to which that court may come. But should either the petitioner (or petitioners) or the respondent (or respondents) be not satisfied with such decision, it shall be lawful for him to appeal to the Supreme Court; and if he be not satisfied with the decision of the Supreme Court it shall be lawful for him to appeal to the Privy Council, and whatever the King and Privy Council shall decide upon shall be final.

124. After the Constitution has come in force the King shall appoint and cause to be printed in the GAZETTE and BOOBOOI the names of those Chiefs that held titles which shall be hereditary together with their lands from father to son,—that is the Nobles who shall enter the Legislative Assembly according to the 63rd clause, and those also who may not enter the Legislative Assembly but who shall hold hereditary titles and land.

125. This is the law of inheritance: It is lawful for those only born in marriage to inherit. The law of inheritance shall be to the senior male child and the heirs of his body; but if he should have no descendants then to the second male child and the heirs of his body; and so on until all the male line is ended. Should there be no male child, the inheritance shall succeed to the first female child and the heirs of her body; and if she should have no descendants, then to the second female child and the heirs of her body, and so on until the female line is ended. It shall then revert to the eldest brother of him whose was the inheritance, com-

mencing with the first and his heirs in succession, to the last and their heirs in accordance with this law of inheritance. And if the brothers shall have no descendant it shall descend to the eldest sister and the female line, as it had previously done to the male line. And if these should have no descendants, and there should be no legally begotten heir (in marriage) it shall revert to the Government in accordance with the 127th clause.

But in case a female shall succeed to the inheritance of any one of the Nobles, and should take this place, it shall be lawful for her to appoint the male heir that succeeds to her in accordance with this law of inheritance to represent her in the Legislative Assembly, or she may consult her relatives as to whom shall represent her, (until such time as she may have a son and he becomes of age). Should this be so arranged, such representative shall receive one-third of all monies received because of the inheritances belonging to such title. But should a party be appointed unfit for such a position, it shall be lawful for the King and Legislative Assembly to command her to choose another representative. This regulation has also reference to the hereditary inheritances of all Chiefs who hold hereditary titles and lands. And should at any time any Chief refuse to take his legitimate title, it shall be lawful for that particular tribe to consult and appoint some one to that position; but should they appoint a person unfit for such a position, it shall be lawful for the King and Privy Council to command to seek a substitute.

126. Should there be any inheritances which are not still owned by any one,—a Chief to whom properly belongs a town or district or land, such land shall revert to the Government, and it shall be lawful for the Government to lease such lands in accordance with the 127th clause, and the Government shall be at liberty to use such monies for the benefit of the Government.

127. Should it occur there are no legitimate heirs to any portion of land, (hereditary titles) such lands shall also revert to the Government, and the Government may possess it in accordance with the 126th clause.

But should his Majesty desire to appoint any one to such lands and titles, it shall be lawful for his Majesty so to appoint; and any one so appointed shall become possessors of said title and lands, and his heirs.

128. It shall be lawful for the Chiefs to whom belong the various districts of land, to lease any such land to the Tongese for the various terms of 21, 50, and 99 years, as they may so arrange. But should any Tongese not be willing to lease the lands (they have hitherto held) from their Chief, they shall pay to their Chief to whom belongs that district of land; as shall be directed by the Cabinet. But after the space of two years it shall be lawful for the said Chief to command for the said lands to be given up to him, and to lease the said lands to any one who may be desirous of so doing; or to allow the said Tongese the use of the same lands for another space of two years, in accordance with this regulation, and to continue to do so as long as he be so willing.

129. It is with the Legislative Assembly to regulate what shall be the payment per acre to be made by the Tongese for their garden lands, and whatever shall be decided upon by the Legislative Assembly such regulation shall be binding upon all the Chiefs until the space of 21 years shall have transpired from this Constitution coming in force. After the space of 21 years it shall then be lawful for the Chiefs to make what agreements they like with the people.

130. It shall not be lawful for any Chief to lease any premises to any white resident without having first obtained the permission of the Cabinet. This clause is not made to prevent the leasing of land to white residents, but to prevent any Chief acting foolishly in leasing the whole of his land to white residents, and driving the Tongese into the sea.

131. Should any one lease any premises, whether town sites or country sites, either from the Government or Chiefs, it shall be lawful for him, should he be so desirous, to bequeath such sites by will, in accordance with the 125th clause.

132. This Constitution became the law of Tonga on the 4th day of November, 1875.

GEORGE TUBOU, King.

Postscript

This Constitution was originally compiled, at the request of His Majesty King George, by the Reverend Shirley W. Baker; afterwards amended and completed by His Majesty himself, together with certain alterations made by the Legislative Assembly, 1875.

By His Majesty's request the Rev. S. W. Baker translated this Constitution from Tongese into English.

WELLINGTON T. GU.

AIDE-de-Camp.

Bibliography

- Adams, T. 1850-3. Letters to his family, Tonga. Originals held by Mrs Harrison, London. Copies held by the author.
- Bain, K. R. 1954. *The Official Record of the Royal Visit to Tonga. 19th-20th Dec., 1953*, London (contains traditional material).
- Baker, Lillian and Beatrice Shirley, 1951. *Memoirs of the Reverend Dr Shirley Waldemar Baker*, London.
- Baker S. W. 1860-79. Letters to Committee, ML, MOM item 169.
- 1883. Papers of . . . , ML, C193.
- 1897. *An English and Tongan Vocabulary, also a Tongan and English Vocabulary, with a List of Idiomatic Phrases; and Tongan Grammar*, Auckland.
- Bates, K. M. 1933. *The Foundations of Modern Tonga*, M.A., University of New Zealand.
- Bays, P. 1831. *A Narrative of the Wreck of the Minerva, Whaler of Port Jackson, New South Wales, on Nicholson's Shoal, 24°S 179°W*, Cambridge.
- Beaglehole, E. and P. 1941. *Pangai, a Village in Tonga*, Wellington.
- Bienstock, G. 1937. *The Struggle for the Pacific*, London.
- Blacket, J. 1914. *Missionary Triumphs among the Settlers in Australia and the Savages of the South Seas*, London.
- Blamires, G. G. 1939. *Little Island Kingdom of the South*, London.
- Blanc, J. F. 1934. *A History of Tonga or Friendly Islands* (translated from the Tongan by C. S. Ramsay), Vista, California.
- Brierly, O. W. 1852. 'Brief Geographical sketch of the Friendly Islands with an account of the visit of H.M.S. Meander . . . to the island of Tongataboo, June 1850'. *JRGS*, vol. 22, 97-118.
- Britain, Consul to Fiji and Tonga 1862-1869. Miscellaneous Papers of Fiji-Tongan Relations, Folder (g). Fiji Archives, Suva.
- 1862. Despatch, Pritchard to Colonial Office, 15 May. Fiji Archives, Suva.
- 1863-76. Outward Letters, general, 4 vols. (30 January 1863 to 30 December 1865, 4 January 1866 to 27 August 1869, 11 March 1872 to 13 March 1874, 14 March 1874 to 7 April 1876). Fiji Archives, Suva.
- 1874-6. Letters to persons other than officials, 15 March 1874 to 9 May 1876. Fiji Archives, Suva.

- 1876-80. Correspondence Relating to Tongan Affairs, British Foreign Office Confidential Prints, No. 4285, item 44, Foreign Office, London.
- Brookes, J. I. 1941. *International Rivalry in the Pacific Islands 1800-1875*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Burrows, E. G. 1939. 'Breed and Border in Polynesia'. *AA*, vol. 41, 1-21.
- Calvert, J. 1855-79. Letters to Committee, ML, MOM item 99.
- 1860. *Fiji and the Fijians Vol. II Mission History*, G. S. Rowe (ed.), London.
- 1861, 1866. Letters to G. S. Rowe, two (19 November 1861, 1 November 1866), NLA microfilm reel 37.
- Cameron, R. M. 1954. *The Rise of Methodism: A Source Book*, New York.
- Capell, A. and Lester, R. H. 1945-6. 'Kinship in Fiji', *Oceania*, vol. XV, 109-43; vol. XVI, 234-53, 297-318.
- Cargill, D. 1841. *Memoirs of Mrs Margaret Cargill wife of the Rev. D. Cargill . . . Wesleyan missionary including notices of the progress of Xty in Tonga and Feejee*, London.
- 1842. *A Refutation of Chevalier Dillon's Slanderous Attacks on the Wesleyan Missionaries in the Friendly Islands: In a letter to the General Secretaries of the Wesleyan Missionary Society*, London.
- Chambers, H. E. 1896. *Constitutional History of Hawaii*, Baltimore.
- Chatterton, E. K. 1930. *Whalers and Whaling*, London.
- Chevron [Father]. 1861. Letter to Father Poupinel, Library, Marist Fathers' Headquarters, Sydney.
- Churchward, C. M. 1953. *Tongan Grammar*, Oxford.
- 1959. *Tongan Dictionary*, London.
- Clark, C. M. H. (ed.) 1958. *Select Documents in Australian History, 1788-1850*, Sydney.
- Clarke, A. 1822. *Origin and End of Civil Government*, London.
- Collocott, E. E. V. 1921. 'Notes on Tongan Religion', *JPS*, vol. XXX, 152-63, 227-40.
- 1923a. 'Sickness, ghosts and medicine in Tonga', *JPS*, vol. XXXII, 136-42.
- 1923b. 'Marriage in Tonga', *JPS*, vol. XXXII, 221-8.
- 1924. 'An Experiment in Tongan History', *JPS*, vol. XXXIII, 166-84.
- 1927. 'Kava ceremonial in Tonga', *JPS*, vol. XXXVI, 21-47.
- 1928. *Tales and Poems of Tonga*. B. P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 46, Honolulu.
- 1845-1929. Collection of Tongan Manuscripts, ML, Uncat. MSS. Sets 206-7.
- n.d. (a) King Taufa, typescript copy held by the author.
- n.d. (b) *Koe Ta'u Teau, Koe fai ma'ae Kau Helohelo*, London.
- and Havea, John. 1922. *Proverbial Sayings of the Tongans*, Occasional Papers of the B. P. Bishop Museum, vol. VIII, Honolulu.
- Colwell, James (ed.) 1914. *A Century in the Pacific*, Sydney.
- Constitution of Tonga 1875, 1877*. Nuku'alofa, Fiji Archives.

- Cook, James. 1809. *The Voyages of Captain James Cook Round the World*, vol. V, London.
- and King, J. 1784. *A Voyage to the Pacific Ocean*, vol. 1, London.
- Coult, A. 1959. 'Tongan Authority Structure: Concepts for Comparative Analysis', *Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers*, vol. 20, 56-70.
- Coupland, R. 1923. *Wilberforce, A Narrative*, Oxford.
- Cowherd, R. G. 1956. *The Politics of English Dissent: The Religious Aspects of Liberal and Humanitarian Reform Movements from 1815 to 1848*, London.
- Crocombe, R. G. 1964. *Land Tenure in the Cook Islands*, Melbourne.
- Crosby, E. E. n.d. Note books containing a chronology of Tonga, 3 vols. ML, Uncat. MSS, set 206.
- Cross, W. 1841-2. Extracts from letters and diary, January 1841 to July 1842, ML, MOM item 134.
- Davidson, J. W. 1942. European Penetration of the South Pacific, 1799-1842. Ph.D., Cambridge.
- 1967. *Samoa mo Samoa*, Melbourne.
- 1970. 'Peter Dillon: the voyages of the *Calder* and *St Patrick*', J. W. Davidson and Deryck Scarr (eds.), *Pacific Islands Portraits*, Canberra.
- n.d. 'Peter Dillon and the South Seas, 1788-1842', typescript, ANU.
- Davies, J. 1961. *The History of the Tahitian Mission 1799-1830*, C. W. Newbury (ed.), Cambridge.
- Derrick, R. A. 1963. *A History of Fiji*, Suva.
- Diapera (scil. Diaper), W. 1928. *Cannibal Jack: The True Autobiography of a White Man in the South Seas*, London.
- Dillon, P. 1829. *Narrative and Successful Result of a Voyage in the South Seas . . . to ascertain the actual fate of La Perouse's Expedition . . . with Accounts of the Religion, Manners, Customs, and Cannibal Practices of the South Sea Islanders*, 2 vols., London.
- Dyson, M. 1858-65. Journal, 4 vols. ML, A2579-82.
- 1858-1908. Papers of . . . , 7 vols. ML, A2583-4.
- Edwards, E. 1915. *Voyage of H.M.S. 'Pandora' Despatched to arrest the Mutineers of the 'Bounty' in the South Seas, 1790-91*. London.
- Edwards, M. L. 1948. *After Wesley: A Study of the Social and Political Influence of Methodism in the Middle Period (1791-1849)*, London.
- Eggleston, J. 1858. Letter to editor of *Sydney Morning Herald*, 11 January 1858, ML, AS60.
- Ella, S. (trs.) 1899. 'The war of Tonga & Samoa, Origin of the Name Malietoa', *JPS*, vol. VIII, 231.
- Ellis, W. 1831. *Polynesian Researches*, vol. III, new edition, London.
- 1844. *History of the London Missionary Society*, vol. I, London.
- Erskine, J. E. 1853. *Journal of a cruise among the islands of the Western Pacific, including the Feejees and others inhabited by the Polynesian negro races, in her Majesty's ship Havannah*. London.

Etheridge, J. W. 1858. *Life of Adam Clarke*, London.

Farmer, Sarah S. 1855. *Tonga and the Friendly Islands: with a Sketch of their Mission History* . . . , London.

Fetuani, S. n.d. Fakamatata ki he Tuku mei Pulotu ki Maama, o fai mai ki he Hōlongā Tu'i o Tonga ni, typescript held by the author.

Findlay, G. G. and Holdsworth, W. W. 1921. *The History of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society*, vol. III, London.

Firth, R. 1930-1. 'Totemism in Polynesia', *Oceania*, vol. I, 291-321. ———1940. *The Work of the Gods in Tikopia*, 2 vols., London.

Fitchett, W. H. 1914. 'The Greatest Sea on the Planet', J. Colwell (ed.), *A Century in the Pacific*, Sydney.

Fletcher, C. B. 1917. *The New Pacific: British Policy and German Aims*, London.

Fortes, M. and Evans-Pritchard, E. E. (eds.) 1961. *African Political Systems*, Oxford.

Freeman, J. D. 1959. 'The Joe Gimlet or Siovili Cult: An Episode in the Religious History of Early Samoa'. J. D. Freeman and W. R. Geddes (eds.), *Anthropology in the South Seas: Essays presented to H. D. Skinner*, 185-200, New Plymouth, New Zealand.

Gifford, E. W. 1923. *Tongan Place Names*, B. P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 6, Honolulu.

———1924. *Tongan Myths and Tales*. B. P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 8, Honolulu.

———1929. *Tongan Society*, B. P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 61, Honolulu.

Goldman, I. 1960. 'The Evolution of Polynesian Societies', S. Diamond (ed.), *Culture and History*, New York.

Grattan, C. Hartley. 1963. *The Southwest Pacific to 1900: A Modern History*, Ann Arbor.

Green, R. 1966. 'Linguistic subgrouping within Polynesia: The implications for pre-historic settlement'. *JPS*, vol. 75, no. 1, 6-38.

Greenwood, H. 1869-72. Journal, 21 April 1869 to 13 March 1872. ML, A1756.

Gregory, B. 1888. *A Handbook of Wesleyan Methodist Polity and History*, London.

Grey, George. 1847-50. Letters to King George Tupou. NZNA, G33/1.

Griffin, J. 1815. *Memoirs of Captain James Wilson, Containing an Account of his Enterprises and Sufferings in India, His Conversion to Christianity, His Missionary Voyage to the South Seas, and His Peaceful and Triumphant Death*, London.

Groube, L. M. 1971. 'Tonga, Lapita Pottery and Polynesian Origins', *JPS*, vol. 80, no. 3, 278-316.

Gunson, W. N. 1959. *Evangelical Missionaries in the South Seas. 1797-1860*. Ph.D., ANU.

- Halévy, E. 1960. *England in 1815* (trs.), London.
- Hammer, G. E. 1952. The Early Years (1822-1855) of the Wesleyan Methodist Mission in Tonga, M.A., University of New Zealand.
- Harrison, G. E. 1935. *Methodist Good Companion*, 2nd ed., London.
- Havea, J. n.d. Notes on history and customs of Tonga. Included in Collocott 1845-1929. ML, Set 207.
- Havea, Soatame. 1868. Narrative (translated from the Tongan). ML, MOM item 32.
- Havili, J. n.d. History of the nineteenth century in Tonga, 3 vols. included in Collocott 1845-1929. ML, Set 207.
- Hazelwood, D. 1841-50. Diary, ML, MOM item 132.
- Henderson, G. C. 1931. *Fiji and the Fijians 1835-1856*, Sydney.
- Hobbs, J. 1833-5. Journal, June 1833 to December 1835. TCL. 1833-7. Correspondence. WMM.
- Hocart, A. M. 1913. 'Fijian Heralds and Envoys', *JRAI*, vol. XLIII, 109-18.
- 1915. 'Chieftainship and the sister's son in the Pacific', *AA*, vol. XVII, 641-6.
- Hoebel, E. A. 1961. *The Law of Primitive Man*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Hogbin, H. I. 1934. *Law and Order in Polynesia: A Study of Primitive Legal Institutions*, London.
- Howse, E. M. 1952. *Saints in Politics*, Toronto.
- 'Tongi, S. H., Traditional recollections, typescript, held by the author.
- Jagger, J. J. 1838. Journal. Methodist Archives, Epworth House, Suva, Fiji.
- Keesing, Felix, M. 1934. *Modern Samoa*, London.
- 1953. *Social Anthropology in Polynesia*, London.
- Kenihan, G. H. (ed.) 1964. *The Journal of Abel Jansz Tasman 1642; with documents relating to his exploration of Australia in 1644*, Adelaide.
- Keys, Lillian. 1957. *The Life and Times of Bishop Pompallier*, Christchurch.
- King, Joseph. 1899. *Christianity in Polynesia: a Study and a Defence*, Sydney.
- Koe Boobooi, vol. II, nos. 1-6, 1875. Reprinted by Authority of Her Majesty in Council, from copies in the private collection of Mr Justice Hammet, Suva.
- Koe Fafagu (Tongan Roman Catholic paper, begun about 1900. A few copies are held by Bishop Rodgers, Nuku'alofa.)
- Koe Fetu'u o Tonga, September 1869, ML, A1960.
- Koe Gaahi Lao oe Buleaga o Toga, aia nae Fokotu'u i he Fale Fakakaukau oe Buleaga i Toga Tabu . . . 1862. Bea nae fakatonutonu ihe Fakataha i Haabai . . . 1864. Bea nae toe fakalahi he Fakataha nae fai i Vavau i he tau e 1866. Bea nae fakaoji ihe Fakataha Lahi oe Buleaga i Toga Tabu ihe Mahina ko June . . . 1868. Fiji Archives.

- Koe Havea*: koe makasini oe Kolisi ka Tubou. *Koe Jioubeli*'oe ta'u e 75, 1866-1941.
- Koe Makasini a Kolisi*. Ko hono ua tau. Koe fai 'e he Faifekau ko Misa Moulitoni pea mo Tevita Finau koe Tiuta i he Kolij. Nau Buluji 'i he Koliji ko Tubou i Nukualofa.
- Koskinen, A. A. 1953. *Missionary Influence as a Political Factor in the Pacific Islands* . . . Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae . . . Tom. 78, Helsinki.
- 1960. *Ariki the first-born—An analysis of a Polynesian Chieftain Title*, Helsinki.
- Kuykendall, R. S. 1940. *Constitutions of the Hawaiian Kingdom: A Brief History and Analysis*, Papers of the Hawaiian Historical Society, 21, Honolulu.
- Lātūkefu, S. 1964-5. Collections of notes and tape recordings of Tongan oral traditions. Held by the author.
- 1966. 'The Opposition to the Influence of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionaries in Tonga', *Historical Studies, Australia and New Zealand*, vol 12, no. 46, 248-64.
- 1968. 'Oral traditions: an appraisal of their value in historical research in Tonga'. *JPH*, vol. 3, 135-43.
- 1969. 'The Case of the Wesleyan Mission in Tonga', *Journal de la Société des Océanistes*, XXV, 96-112.
- 1970. 'King George Tupou I of Tonga', J. W. Davidson and Deryck Scarr (eds.) *Pacific Islands Portraits*, Canberra.
- Lawry, W. 1818-25. Diary. ML, MOM item 134.
- 1850. *Friendly and Feejee Islands: a Missionary visit to various stations in the South Seas in the year MDCCCXLVII* (ed. E. Hoole), London.
1851. *A Second Missionary visit to the Friendly and Feejee Islands in the year MDCCCL* (ed. E. Hoole), London.
- Laws, J. M. 1829. Report to the Commander-in-Chief of vessels in India, 3 May, concerning the 'Excellent influence of English Missionaries in Tonga'. N.S.W. Governors' Despatches, vol. 15, 820-2. ML, A1204.
- Lee, George. 1862-6. Journal, Tonga. Held by Miss G. L. Davies, Adelaide, Australia.
- Low, C. R. (ed.) n.d. *Captain Cook's Three Voyages Round the World, with a sketch of his life*. London.
- Luke, H. C. 1954. *Queen Salote and her Kingdom*, London.
- Lyth, R. B. 1836-54. Letters to and from. ML, A836.
- n.d. (a) Journal, vols. 1 and 8. ML, B533 and B540.
- n.d. (b) Tongan and Feejeean Reminiscences, 2 vols. ML, B549.
- McArthur, N. 1966. 'Essays in Multiplication: European seafarers in Polynesia', *JPH*, vol. 1, 91-105.

- Macquarrie, H. 1955. *Friendly Queen*, London.
- Malupō, 'Elia, Ngaahi Talatupu' a faka-Tonga. Included in Collocott 1845-1929.
- Martin, J. 1827. *An Account of the Natives of the Tonga Islands, in the South Pacific . . . from the extensive communications of Mr. William Mariner*, 2 vols., Edinburgh.
- Martin, J. 1911. 'Origin of the Name of Tonga Island', *JPS*, vol. XX, 165-6.
- Martin, K. L. P. 1924. *Missionaries and Annexation in the Pacific*, London.
- Masterman, S. 1934. *The Origin of International Rivalry in Samoa 1848-1884*, London.
- Matthews, H. F. 1949. *Methodism and the Education of the People 1791-1851*, London.
- Maude, A. 1965. Population, Land and Livelihood in Tonga. Ph.D., ANU.
- 1971. 'Tonga: Equality overtaking privilege', in R. G. Crocombe (ed.), *Land Tenure in the Pacific*, Melbourne.
- Maude, H. E. 1964. 'Beachcombers and Castaways', *JPS*, vol. LXXIII, 254-93.
- 1968. *Of Islands and Men*, Melbourne.
- Maudslay, A. P. 1930. *Life in the Pacific Fifty Years Ago*, London.
- Mead, Margaret. 1930. *Social Organization of Manua*, B. P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 76, Honolulu.
- Meade, H. 1871. *A ride through the disturbed district of New Zealand together with some account of the South Sea Islands*, London.
- Minns, G. B. (comp.) 1930. A complete list of the missionaries of the methodist Church, who have served in Tonga. Held by the author. *Missionary Transactions*. London Missionary Society periodical.
- Monfat, A. 1893. *Les Tonga ou archipel des Amis, et le R. P. Joseph Chevron étude historique et religieuse*, vité, Lyon.
- Moister, W. 1871. *A History of Wesleyan Missions, in all parts of the World from their Commencement to the Present Time*, 2nd rev. ed., London.
- Morrell, W. P. 1960. *Britain in the Pacific Islands*, Oxford.
- Moulton, Hettie, n.d. Notes on Tongan History. Held by the author.
- Moulton, J. E. 1855-79. Letters to Committee. ML, MOM item 99.
- Moulton, J. E. 1921. *Moulton of Tonga*, London.
- Murray, A. W. 1885. *Martyrs of Polynesia. Memorials of Missionaries, Native Evangelists, and Native converts, who have died by the Hand of Violence, from 1799 to 1871*, London.
- 1888. *The Bible in the Pacific*, London.
- Nayacakalou, R. R. 1959. 'Land Tenure and Social Organization in Tonga', *JPS*, vol. 68, 93-114.
- Neill, J. S. 1955. *Ten Years in Tonga*, London.
- Oliver, D. L. 1961. *The Pacific Islands*, rev. ed., New York.

- Oldmeadow, Henry C. 1876-80. *Journal of some of my first days in Tonga*. Held by the author.
- 1876-85. *Diaries*, 9 vols. Held by Miss Oldmeadow, Melbourne.
- Orange, J. 1840. *Life of the late George Vason of Nottingham One of the Troop of Missionaries first sent to the South Sea Islands by the London Missionary Society in the Ship DUFF. Captain Wilson. 1796. With a Preliminary Essay on the South Sea Islands . . .*, London.
- Orton, Joseph. 1832-41. *Journal*, 2 vols. ML, A1714-15.
- 1832-42. *Letter books*, 4 vols. ML, A1717-19.
- Palmer, Eliza Ann, 1869-71. *Description of a trip to Tonga with a missionary party*. ATL.
- [Pembroke, Earl of . . . , and Kingsley, G. H.] 1872. *South Sea Bubbles*, London.
- Philip, J. 1828. *Researches in South Africa*, 2 vols., London.
- Pompallier, J. B. 1888. *Early History of the Catholic Church in Oceania* (trs. A. Herman), Auckland.
- Pritchard, W. T. 1866. *Polynesian Reminiscences: or, life in the South Pacific Islands*, London.
- Rabone, S. 1845. *A Vocabulary of the Tongan Language, arranged in Alphabetical order: to which is annexed a list of idiomatic Phrases, Vava'u*.
- 1856. *Letters received from Adams and Amos*. ML, Uncat. MSS., Set 197, Item II.
- n.d. *Journal*, 2 vols. ML, Uncat. MSS., set 47.
- Rendell, F. J. 1847. *Letter to the Royal Navy Commander-in-Chief, Australian Station regarding Tonga*, 19 August. NZNA, RNAS 42.
- (The) *Report of the Australasian Wesleyan-Methodist Missionary Society . . . with an Account of the Contributions*, Sydney, May 1858-April 1876.
- Roberts, J. H. n.d. *English and Tongan dictionary*, 2 vols. Held by the author.
- n.d. *Tongan papers, proclamations and official correspondence*, printed and manuscript. ML, A1638.
- Roberts, S. C. 1924. *Tamai: The Life Story of John Hartley Roberts of Tonga . . . With an account of Tongan affairs from the native side, not previously published*, Sydney.
- Ross, A. 1964. *New Zealand Aspirations in the Pacific in the Nineteenth Century*, Oxford.
- Rowe, G. S. 1885. *A Pioneer: A memoir of the Rev. John Thomas, Missionary to the Friendly Islands*, London.
- Rutherford, N. 1966. *Shirley Baker and the Kingdom of Tonga*. Ph.D. ANU.
- 1971. *Shirley Baker and the King of Tonga*, Melbourne.

- Sahlins, M. D. 1958. *Social Stratification in Polynesia*. Seattle.
- 1962. *Moala: Culture and Nature on a Fijian Island*. Ann Arbor.
- 1963. 'Poor Man, Rich Man, Big Man, Chief! Political Types in Melanesia and Polynesia', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. V, 285-303.
- St Julian, C. 1855. Letters to King George Tupou, 26 June and 15 October. Archives of Hawaii, Honolulu.
- 1357. *Official Report on Central Polynesia*. Sydney.
- 1358. Holograph letter to the Rev. John Eggleston regarding the government of King George in Tonga. ML: AS60.
- Seemann, B. 1862. *Viti: an Account of a Government Mission to the Vitian or Fijian Islands in the years 1860-61*, London.
- Sharp, A. 1964. *Ancient Voyagers in Polynesia*, London.
- Shepherd, W. 1938. The Position of Tubou College in the Educational System of Tonga, B.Ed., Melbourne University.
- Somerville, H. B. T. 1936. *Will Mariner: A true record of adventure*, London.
- Stephenson, W. G. R. 1858-64. Journal, Tonga. Held by Mrs C. Halliday, West Wyalong, New South Wales.
- Stevens, A. 1860. *The History of the Religious Movement of the Eighteenth Century, Called Methodism, Considered in its Different Denominational Forms, and its Relations to British and American Protestantism*, 2 vols., London.
- Stow, D. 1840. *The Training System*, Glasgow.
- Sutton, J. 1963. Education in Tonga: Church and State: An Appraisal of the Functions of Church and State in Education, Dip. Ed., Auckland University.
- Taumua Lelei*, Sune 1829—Sanuali 1933.
- Tawney, R. H. 1948. *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, London.
- Taylor, E. R. 1935. *Methodism and Politics 1791-1851*, Cambridge.
- Temperley, H. W. V. 1934. 'The Age of Walpole and the Pelhams', *The Cambridge Modern History*, vol. VI, Cambridge.
- Te Rangi Hiroa [Sir Peter Buck] 1935. 'Material Representation of Tongan and Samoan Gods', *JPS*, vol. XLIV, 12.
- Thomas, John. 1825-35. Draft letter book. ML, A1959.
- 1825-67. Journal, April 1825 to 6 August 1867. NLA microfilm reels 42-9.
- 1827-72. Memoranda. ML, A1959.
- 1827. Calendar and diary. ML, A1959.
- 1834-50. Letters of Rev. John Thomas and his wife to parents and friends and letters received by them 1836-44. ML, A1960.
- 1879. History of the Friendly Islands. ML, A1961.
- Thomas, Julian ['the Vagabond'] 1886. *Cannibals and Convicts: Notes of Personal Experiences in the Western Pacific*, London.

- Tippett, A. R. n.d. Scrap book containing news cuttings, held by him.
- Thomson, Basil. 1894. *The Diversions of a Prime Minister*, Edinburgh.
- 1902. *Savage Island, an Account of a Sojourn in Niué and Tonga*, London.
- 1937. *The Scene Changes*, New York.
- Townsend, W. J., Workman, H. B., Eayrs, G. (eds.) 1909. *A New History of Methodism*, 2 vols., London.
- Trotter, Coutts. 1888. 'Among the Islands of the South Pacific: Tonga and Samoa', *Blackwood's Magazine*, 759-76.
- 1890. 'A Recent Chapter in Tongan History', *Blackwood's Magazine*, 742.
- Tupou, King George. 1847. Letter to Sir George Grey, 28 August, NZNA 47/2575.
- 1854. Letter to Charles St Julian, 26 November. Archives of Hawaii, Honolulu.
- 1856. Letter to Queen Victoria, 12 May. Included in WMSP 1856-75. ATL, Wellington.
- Tupou, Kuini Sālote, n.d. Traditional and Historical Reminiscences, typescript. Held by the author.
- Tupou, Siosaia. 1844. Letter to Queen Victoria, 19 February. NZNA 47/2575.
- Turner, George. 1861. *Nineteen Years in Polynesia: Missionary Life, Travels and Researches in the Islands of the Pacific*, London.
- Turner, J. G. 1872. *The Pioneer Missionary: Life of the Rev. Nathaniel Turner, Missionary in New Zealand, Tonga and Australia*, London.
- Turner, N. 1822. Extracts from Journal, 22, 25 June, ML, BT. Box 52.
- 1828-9. Letters to Hobbs, WMM.
- n.d. Personal papers including journals. ML, microfilm reel 42.
- Turner, Peter. n.d. A brief account of myself, from my birth to the time when I became a Wesleyan missionary in 1829. ML, B323.
- 1830-67. Sermons, 2 vols. ML, B317-18.
- 1830-73. Journal, 16 vols. ML, B301-16.
- 1831-8. Missionary papers. ML, A1508.
- 1832-73. Books read. ML, B322.
- 1834. Private journal. ML, A408.
- 1840-1. Private journal. ML, B320.
- 1843-7. Private journal. ML, B321.
- Vayda, A. P. 1960. *Maori Warfare*, Polynesian Society Maori Monographs, 2, Wellington.
- Vi, P. n.d. Account of the beginnings of Christianity in Tonga. Included in Collocott 1845-1929.
- Waldegrave, W. 1834. 'Extracts from a private journal kept on board H.M.S. Seringapatam, in the Pacific, 1830', *JRGS*, vol. III (1833), 168-96.

- Ward, J. M. 1948. *British Policy in the South Pacific, 1786-1893*, Sydney.
- Warner, W. J. 1930. *The Wesleyan Movement in the Industrial Revolution*, London.
- Waterhouse, J. 1855-78. Letters to Committee. ML, MOM item 100.
- Watkin, J. B. 1830-9. Journal, 2 vols. ML, A834-5.
- 1832-3. Papers. ML, A1540.
- 1855-79. Letters to Committee. ML, MOM item 99.
- Watson, R. M. 1918. *History of Samoa*, Wellington.
- Wearmouth, R. F. 1945. *Methodism and the Common People of the Eighteenth Century*, London.
- 1947. *Methodism and the Working-Class Movements of England, 1800-1850*, London.
- 1957. *The Social and Political Influence of Methodism in the Twentieth Century*, London.
- Webb, W. C. 1965. 'The Abolition of the Taboo System in Hawaii'. *JPS* vol. LXXIV, I, 21-39.
- Wesley, John. 1872. *Journal* (standard ed., 8 vols.).
- Letters* (standard ed., 8 vols.).
- Works* (14 vols.), London.
- 1905. *Journal of . . .*, abridged by P. L. Parker, London.
- 1958. *Journal as abridged by Nehemiah Curnock*, London.
- n.d. *Sermons on Several Occasions*, 2 vols., London.
- Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society 1818-36. In letters: Australia and the South Seas. ML, A2832-39.
- 1822-55. Letter book, ML, A342.
- 1827-49. Minutes of meetings, 15 February 1827 to 9 May 1849. ML B668.
- Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society of Australasia 1833-5. Tonga, sundry letters, ML, MOM item 169.
- 1852-79. Tonga missionary letters, ML, MOM item 170.
- (The) *Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine . . . being a continuation of the Arminian or Methodist Magazine; first published by Rev. John Wesley, A.M.*, London, 1827-76.
- Wesleyan Missionary Letters 1823-64. ATL.
- (The) *Wesleyan Missionary Notices relating to the Missions under the direction of the Australasian Wesleyan Methodist Conference*, Sydney, July 1857-January 1876.
- Wesleyan Missionary Society Papers. 1856-75. Tonga, official correspondence. ATL.
- West, Thomas. 1865. *Ten Years in South-Central Polynesia: being reminiscences of a Personal Mission to the Friendly Islands and their Dependencies*, London.
- Whiteley, J. H. 1954. *Wesley's England. A Survey of XVIIIth Century Social and Cultural Conditions*, London.
- Wilkes, Charles, 1845. *Narrative of the United States' Exploring Expedition During the years 1838, 1839, 1842, condensed and abridged*, London.

- Williams, John. 1838. *A Narrative of Missionary Enterprises in the South Sea Islands; with remarks upon the natural history of the Islands, origin, languages, traditions and usages of the inhabitants*, London.
- Williams, J. and Barff, C. 1830. Journal of a voyage undertaken chiefly for the purpose of introducing Christianity among the Fegees and Haamoas. ML, A1636 (also A403).
- Williams, Thomas. 1858. *Fiji and the Fijians Vol. I—the Islands and their Inhabitants*, G. S. Rowe (ed.), London.
- Williamson, R. W. 1924. *The Social and Political Systems of Central Polynesia*, vols. I-III, Cambridge.
- 1933. *Religious and Cosmic Beliefs of Central Polynesia*, vols. I-II, Cambridge.
- 1937. *Religion and Social Organization in Central Polynesia*, R. Piddington (ed.), Cambridge.
- 1939. *Essays in Polynesian Ethnology*, R. Piddington (ed.), Cambridge.
- Willis, A. 1908. *Letter from Bishop Willis and Report for 1908 of the Anglican Church in Tonga*, London.
- [Wilson, James.] 1799. *A Missionary Voyage to the Southern Pacific Ocean, performed in the years 1796, 1797, 1798, in the Ship Duff, commanded by Capt. James Wilson compiled from Journals of the Officers and the Missionaries . . . with a Preliminary Discourse*, London.
- Wright, Louis B. and Fry, Mary I. 1936. *Puritans in the South Seas*, New York.
- Wright, O. 1955. *The Voyage of the Astrolabe—1840*, Wellington.
- Wood, A. H. 1932. *A History and Geography of Tonga, Nuku'alofa*.
- Young, Robert. 1854. *The Southern World. Journal of a Deputation from the Wesleyan Conference to Australia and Polynesia*, London.

Index

- Adams, Thomas, 75, 170
 'Aho'eitu, 1
 'Ahome'e, 113
 Aleamotu'a, Siosaia, 36, 38, 50, 60,
 61, 65, 84, 86, 91, 93-4, 96,
 105-17, 120, 146-7; installation
 as Tu'i Kanokupolu, 61, 86
 Amos, Richard, 74-6, 79, 81, 191,
 209-10
Astrolabe, 34, 35, 144
 'Api, 10n.
 Ata, 28-9, 33, 45-9, 51, 55, 63
 Ata Tōfua, 94, 113-14, 154
Atalina, 154
 Attale, Brother, 135, 145-6
- Baker, Shirley Waldemar, 171-4,
 181, 185, 193-203, 213-16
 Bataillon, Bishop, 149-50, 153
 Bays, Peter, 57
 Beachcombers, 26, 33, 35-6
 Belland, Captain, 155, 166
 Bible, The Holy, 54, 56, 67, 73-4,
 77-8, 81-2
 Blanc, Bishop, 125-6, 131, 136,
 150
Boobooi, 215
 British Wesleyan Methodist Con-
 ference, 27
 Brooks, William A., 139-40
- Cakobau, King, 181, 183
 Calinon, Father, 154-5, 166-8
Calliope, 154
 Cannibalism, 12, 16-18, 20
 Cargill, David, 39, 70, 100
 Chanel, Father, 144
 Chevron, Father, 135, 145-6, 149-
 50, 167
- Chiefs (*hou'eiki*), 3-11, 17-20, 22-
 3, 28-33, 56, 59-61, 83, 204;
 arbitrary powers, 22-3, 122-3;
 and King George, 64, 85-6, 90,
 94-5, 158; and legislation, 128,
 133, 173-4; and missionaries, 29,
 31-3, 56, 60-1, 118-19, 144-51,
 157-60, 170-4, 180-3; legal re-
 striction of powers, 122-3, 131,
 172-3, 205; French man-of-war,
 144-5, 147, 151, 153-5, 166-9;
 nobles, 98, 208, 211-14; rebel-
 lion, 103-16; non-missionary
 Europeans, 13, 16, 19, 33-6, 160,
 184-6; *see also* Ha'a Havea; Ha'a
 Ngata Motu'a; Tāufa'āhau; Tu'i
 Tonga; Tu'i Kanokupolu; Wars
 Chinese, 206-7
 Church and State, 119-20, 157-60,
 170-4, 180-203; *see also* Wes-
 leyan missionaries; Roman Cath-
 olic missionaries
 Code of Laws 1839 (Vava'u
 Code), 121, 221-5
 —1850, 128, 172, 226-37
 —1862, 156, 172-9, 187, 238-51
 Colin, Father, 143
 Commoners (*kau tu'a*), 8-9, 22-3,
 30, 32, 72-3, 123, 173, 187,
 211-12
 Constitution, 156, 161-5, 191-217,
 252-83
 Converts, 50-3, 60-2, 72-3, 103,
 158
 Cook, James, 12, 25
 Courts of law, 126, 175, 208
 Croker, Captain, 116-17, 143
 Cross, William, 28, 51-2, 55-6, 61
- Daniel, George, 75
 Davis, Walter J., 75, 170-1

Dillon, Peter, 34, 37, 39, 50, 100,
133-4, 143
Douarre, Bishop, M., 149
Du Bousset, Captain, 144, 147
Duff, 25
Duke of Portland, 19
D'Urville, Dumont, 35, 144

Education, 54-6, 74-80, 148, 190-1,
195-6; *see also* Tongan
language; Tupou College
Electoral College, 60-1, 85-6
Ellis, William, 57, 128
Emancipation, declaration of, 173,
187, 212
Europa, 139
Europeans in Tonga, 13, 16, 19,
33-6, 41, 59, 120, 159-60, 184-6;
see also Beachcombers; Settlers;
Traders

Fa'ahinga, 10n., 112
Fa'e, 21, 145
Fahu, 3, 86
Fakataha (council of chiefs),
210-11
Family and marriage laws, 123-4,
129-30
Farmer, Sarah, 77, 101
Fatongia, 4, 86, 90, 173
Fatu, 27, 28
Fie'ota, 146
Fifta'ila, 145-6
Fiji, 11-13, 18, 50, 94-5, 120, 145,
164, 181-3, 191-2
Firth, Frank, 181
Fohe, 152, 154
Fono, 10, 114, 127
Fortresses, 18-22, 90, 101, 104,
109
French warships, 144-7, 151-5,
166-9
Fuanunuiava, 22
Futuna, 143-5

Gods, 4-5, 8-9, 30-1, 45, 64-6, 77,
88, 101-2, 112-13
Grey, Sir George, 161

Ha'a, 10n., 17, 209
Ha'afeva, 91-2
Ha'a Havea chiefs, 18, 20, 24,
60-2, 85-7, 93, 98, 151-3; armed
resistance, 95, 105-17; defiance
of King's authority, 151-3
Ha'a Ngata Motu'a, 17, 86
Ha'ano, 69
Ha'apai, 1, 6, 12, 16, 18, 20-2,
63, 65, 70-1, 90, 94, 101, 104,
126-7, 167
Haehaetahi, 64
Halaevahu, Mata'aho, 90
Hau, 2
Haumono, Sūnia, 152
Havea, Dr John 'Amanaki, 76n.
Havea, Sālesi Mānoa, 76n.
Havea, Sione, 76n.
Hawaii, 120, 131, 163, 166; con-
stitution, 206-7, 211, 214
Henry, Samuel Pinder, 38, 50
Hihifo, 16-9, 21, 26, 28, 30, 33,
46-7, 63, 94
Hikule'o, 4, 5, 23
Hobbs, John, 70
Hologna, 147, 149
Home, Sir Everard, 154-5
Houma, 81, 149, 154
Houmofaleono, 85, 87
Huahine Code, 128, 131-2
Hule, 109-11
Hutchinson, John, 28-9, 33, 35,
45-6, 70n.

'Inasi festival, 4, 5, 15, 23
Independent Church, 198-200, 203

John Wesley, 128, 161-2

Kāinga, 10n., 83, 119
Kaufana, 91
Kau'inima (finger sacrifice), 8
Kau'ulufonua Fekai, 2
King George, *see* Tāufa'āhau
King, powers of, 132, 175, 205,
207

Kolovai, 28
Kotonga (Kolonga), 147, 149

La Bayonnaise, 167
L'Allier, 144
La Moselle, 155
Land legislation, 125, 162-3, 172,
208-9, 211-14
Land tenure, 3-4
Langi, 50, 60
Laplace, C. P. T., 138
L'Aube, 144
Laufilitonga, Tu'i Tonga, 21, 62,
72, 86, 90, 92-3, 149-51
Lausi'i, Siosaia, 167-8
Lavaka, 87, 95, 109, 114, 146, 152
Lavaud, M., 144, 146
Lawry, Walter, 8, 27-8, 33, 35, 41,
45, 50, 75, 79-80, 127, 161
Laws, J. M., 56
Lee, George, 195
Legislation, 121-30, 171-9, 205-17,
221-83; *see also* Vava'u Code,
1839; Code of Laws 1850; Code
of Laws 1862; Constitution 1875
Legislative Assembly, 208
Legislative Council, 191
Lifuka, Ha'apai, 72, 87, 90, 152,
167
Lilley, George, 27-8
Liquor, 39-40, 125-6
Lofanga, 69
Lolohea, 35
Lolohea, Leonaitasi, 94
London Missionary Society
(L.M.S.), 25-7, 50, 81, 118; *see
also* Vason, George; Huahine
Code
Louis Phillipe, King, 137-8, 143
Lualala, 66, 103, 105, 110
Lyth, R. B., 67, 98, 126

Ma'afu, son of Aleamotu'a, 94-5,
183
Ma'afu of Vaini, 85, 87, 95, 152
Ma'afu'otu'itonga, 89
Macanoe, 27-8

Mackay, A., 214
Maealiuaki, 12-13
Malua College, 76
Malupō, 89, 92, 103-4
Mana, 4, 85
Ma'ofanga, 149
Mariner, William, 13, 16, 19-20, 22
Marists, 143
Masilamea, 104
Mataele, son of Ata, 45
Mataele Ha'amea, 12
Matāpule, 9, 87
Matekitonga, 93, 94, 97
Maude, A., 212-13
Maudslay, A. P., 178, 215
Maui, 4, 5, 77
Meander, 161
Miller, George, 149
Ministers, 208
Minns, George, 196-7
Missionaries, *see* Church and
State; Roman Catholic mission-
aries; Wesleyan missionaries
Moeaki, 146
Moengāngongo, 17, 21
Moerenhout, Consul, 139
Moheofo (principal wife of Tu'i
Tonga), 3, 89, 90
Monfat, 2
Mosey, Eliza, 19
Moss, David Jebson, 192, 200-1
Moulton, J. E., 76-9, 190-1, 195-
201, 211
Mo'ungamotu'a, 2
Mo'ungatonga, 3
Mu'a, 27-8, 33, 150-1
Mulikiha'amea, 12-13, 15-16, 26-7
Mumui, 12-13, 25
Mumui, Setaleki, 76

Nallier, M., 153
Nau, Paula, 68
Neiafu, Vava'u, 75, 126
Neill, J. S., 215
Ngata, 3
Ngatu, 32
Ngele'ia, 105, 108
Niua Fo'ou, 69, 73
Niua Toputapu, 69

- Nobles, 98, 208, 211-14
 Nomuka, Ha'apai, 65, 91
 Nuku'alofa, 18, 20, 28, 50-1, 55,
 76, 81, 105
- Pangaimotu, 12, 146
 Parkes, Sir Henry, 202, 214
 Pāunga, 21, 89
 Pau'u, Lupe, 72
 Pea, 18, 111, 146, 149, 152, 154
 Pembroke, Earl of, 196
 Pentecost of Tonga, *see* Religious
 revival
 Persecution of converts, 101, 105-6
 Philip, J., 118
 Phillip, Governor of N.S.W., 33
 Picpus Fathers, 134, 138
 Pilolevu, Sālote, 90
Polopolo (offering of first fruits),
 4, 212
 Pompallier, Bishop Jean Baptiste
 François, 134-5, 137-8, 139-41,
 144-7
 Pope Gregory XVI, 134
 Population movement, 80-1, 105-6
Port-au-Prince, 18-20, 34-5
 Priests, traditional, 4-5, 8, 20, 23,
 27, 29, 30, 64, 88, 102, 119
 Printing press, first, 57
 Pritchard, G., 161
 Pritchard, W. T., 182-3, 191
 Privy Council, 208
 Puakatau, 91
 Pule, 21
 Pulotu (paradise) 4-5, 8-9
 Punshon, W. M., 156-7
- Rabone, Stephen, 40, 70, 74, 84-5,
 95, 106-7, 110-11, 115, 144, 199;
 shooting of sacred bird, 112-14
Raiatea, 139
 Reeve, E., 202
 Religious doubts, 23, 60, 62, 107
 Religious revival, 69-72, 141, 158
 Religious superstition, 82
 Roman Catholic missionaries, 133-
 55; educational background,
 134-5; opposition to Wesleyans,
 135-7, 139-41, 147-8, 167-9; and
 French government, 136-8, 144-
 7, 151-5, 166-9; and Tu'i Tonga,
 150-1; medical work, 158-9;
 schools, 148; *see also* Brother
 Attale; Bishop Bataillon; Father
 Calinon; Father Chevron; Bishop
 Pompallier
 Rouchouze, Monseigneur, 134
 Rotuma, 40
 Rutherford, Noel, 195
- Sabbath, sacred in Tonga, 44, 80,
 124, 206
 Sacred houses, 8, 64, 115
 Sacrifice, 2, 5, 8
 Sanctuaries, 8, 16
 Samoa, 10, 76, 120, 164, 191
Séringapatam, 59
 Settlers, 185-6
 Singleton, John, 34-5
 Siovili, 148
 Slaves (*kau pōpula*), 9, 173, 187,
 212
 Soakai, Siola'ā, iv, 87
 Social classes, *see* Chiefs; Com-
 moners; *Matāpule*; Slaves
 Socio-political units, *see* 'Api;
Fa'ahinga; *Ha'a*; *Kāinga*
 Solages, Bishop de, 134-5
 Stephenson, W. G. R., 185, 195
 St Julian, Charles, 161-5, 182,
 191-2
 Succession, laws of, 209-10
 Sydney, Australia: visit by King
 George, 95-6, 161-3; by Tēvita
 'Unga, 162
- Tahiti, 27, 38, 50, 60, 81, 128,
 131-2, 139, 142, 145, 153, 155,
 166, 180
 Tākai of 'Oneata, 50, 60
 Tākai of Pea, 18, 20-1, 146
 Takanoa, 54
 Tangaloa, 1, 4, 5
Tapu, 2

- Tasman, Abel, 9
 Tāufa'āhau, King George: advised and supported by Wesleyan missionaries, 83, 84, 95, 106, 142; conversion and involvement with Wesleyans, 60-5, 74-9, 120; clemency towards enemies, 97-8; Constitution, 161-5, 191-3, 201-17; conversion, 61-7; destruction of traditional religion, 64-5, 101; establishes kingdom, 83-4, 95, 127; Ha'a Havea chiefs and, 62, 85-6, 93; fears of British annexation, 160, 174, 180-1; King Cakobau and, 181-3; legislation and, 121-32, 156, 162-3, 173-6; opposition to Tu'i Tonga, 89-90, 151; parentage and pedigree, 21, 85-8; relations (with Rev. Shirley Baker) 171, 193-203, (with Rev. John Thomas) 63, 127, 160, 180-1, (with non-missionary Europeans) 154-5, 161-5, 192, 200-1, (with Roman Catholic missionaries) 139-41, 150-1; religious convictions, 67, 72, 97, 141, 174; rift with Wesleyan missionaries, 157-60, 170-1, 174, 180-203; ruler of Ha'apai, 21, 89, 93; ruler of Vava'u, 66, 93; treaty with France, 166; wars, 107-17, 152-5; visit to Sydney, 95-7, 152-5
 Taufa'itahi, 64, 88
 Taxation, 188-9
 Teukava, 18, 22
 Thomas, James, 181
 Thomas, John, 8, 28-33, 35-6, 44-9, 55, 60-3, 65, 70, 85, 120-1, 126-8, 139-41, 147, 149-50, 158, 170
 Thomson, Basil, i, 88, 108, 117, 129, 153, 156-7, 177-8, 214-16
 Tindall, Charles, 27-8
 Tofi'a (hereditary estate), 4, 209, 211-13
 Tokemoana, 89-90, 93
 Tongan customs: prohibition, 31-2, 41-2, 125-6, 130, 170; Roman Catholic tolerance for, 168-9
 Tongan flag, 193
 Tongan language, 51, 56-7, 77, 148, 158
 Tongatapu, 9, 18, 21-3, 60, 71, 83, 93
 Trade goods, 11, 19, 25-7, 29, 33, 37-8, 58, 63, 159
 Traders, 38-9
 Traditional religion, *see* Gods; Haehaetahi; Hikule'o; Maui; Priests; Pulotu; Sacred houses; Sacrifice; Sanctuaries; Tangaloa; Tāufa'itahi
 Treaties, i, 166, 207, 216
 Trotter, Coutts, 42
 Tucker, Charles, 70-1, 79, 115, 120
 Tucker, Mrs C., 77, 79
 Tu'i Ha'atakalaua, 2-3, 15-16, 26-7
 Tu'i Kanokupolu, 2-4, 10, 12, 16, 18-19, 21, 25, 37-8, 60-1, 81, 83, 85, 94, 127, 132-3, 146, 150
 Tu'ineau, 50
 Tu'i Tonga, 1-4, 5, 10, 21-2, 83-4, 89, 92-3, 149-50
 Tu'i Tonga fefine, 3
 Tuivakano, William, 105, 109-10
 Tuku'aho, 13, 15, 18-20, 25, 85, 89
 Tuku'ofa (funeral rites), 31-2, 170
 Tungua, 65
 Tupou College, 76, 77, 79, 190-1, 195-6
 Tupou, Queen Sālote, v, vi, 87
 Tupoulahi, 12-13
 Tupoumālohi, 18
 Tupoumohefo, 13-15
 Tupouniua, 15-17, 20-1
 Tupouto'a, 15, 17-18, 20-1, 60, 85-7, 89, 103
 Turner, Nathaniel, 28-9, 36-8, 49, 51-2, 54-5, 58, 61-3, 65, 66, 69-70
 Turner, Peter, 37, 39, 44, 51, 65, 96, 102, 114, 119, 121, 126, 131, 148-51; involvement in religious revival, 69-70, 72
 Tu'uhetoka, 91
 'Uiha, 65, 87-9, 91-2, 101, 103-4
 Ulakai, 51, 60-2, 91, 113-14

- 'Ulukālala I, 13-15
 'Ulukālala II (Fangupō), 14-23, 26, 89
 'Ulukālala III (Tuapasi), 21, 35, 61, 63, 66, 83, 93, 65, 101-2
 'Unga, Tēvita, 162
 'Uvea, 143-5, 147-8
- Vaha'i, 17-18, 94
 Vaea, 152, 154
 Vason, George, 16-17, 22, 26-7
 Vava'u, 1, 7, 12-13, 17, 20-2, 35, 65-6, 75, 83, 101-2
 Vava'u Code (Code of 1839), 121, 221-5
 Ve'e'hala, Setaleki, 106, 114
 Veikune, 'Osaiasi, 94
 Velata, 90
 Vessels, captured, 18-19, 33
 Vi, Pita, 54, 63-5, 68
 Vuna I, 12
 Vuna Takitakimālohi, 89
- Waldegrave, Hon. William, 59
 Wars, 15-20, 22, 26, 62, 90-5, 103-16, 153-5; threat of war with Fiji, 181-3
 Waterhouse, J., 88
 Watkin, James, 52, 68-9, 84-5, 101, 108, 198, 204
 Weiss, I. V. M., 28, 51, 61
 Wesley, John, 42-3, 54-5, 69, 148
 Wesleyan missionaries in Tonga, 22, 24, 27-32, 35; attitudes to Tongan chiefs, 33, 159, 161; British men-of-war, 59, 76; conversion of Tongans, 52-4, 68-70, 103, 158; education, 54-6, 74-7; educational background, 42-5, 51; influence on legislation, 122-6, 129, 171-9, 187-9, 193-203, 213-16; King and chiefs' advisers, 106, 118-21, 127-8, 142; involvement in politics, 181, 190, 200-1, 218; medical work, 57-8, 73, 158-9; oppose Fiji invasion, 182-3; oppose heathenism, 100-6; oppose Roman Catholic mission, 142, 145, 147, 149; rift with King and chiefs, 157-60, 170-4, 180-203; support for King, 95-6, 114; resentful of St Julian, 165, 182; religious revival, 69-72, 141, 158; relations with traders and settlers, 38-9, 185-6; taxation and church collections, 188-9, 196-7, 202; *see also* Thomas Adams; Richard Amos; Shirley Baker; William Brooks; David Cargill; William Cross; George Daniel; Walter Davis; Frank Firth; John Hobbs; John Hutchinson; Walter Lawry; George Lee; R. B. Lyth; George Miller; George Minns; J. E. Moulton; Stephen Rabone; W. G. R. Stephinsson; James Thomas; John Thomas; Charles Tucker; Nathaniel Turner; Peter Turner; James Watkin; I. V. M. Weiss; Thomas West; John Whewell; Francis Wilson; Matthew Wilson; William Woon
 Wesleyan Methodism in England, 43-4, 83, 100
 West, Thomas, 96, 150, 152, 154, 163
 Whalers, 37
 Whewell, John, 167-8, 181
 Wilkes, Commodore, 86-8, 112, 115
 Williams, John, 51, 118
 Williamson, R. W., 2
 Wilson, Captain, 25
 Wilson, Francis, 75
 Wilson, Mrs F., 79
 Wilson, Matthew, 79
 Women, 40, 129, 130
 Wood, A. H., 166, 178
 Woon, William, 36, 52, 57, 70
- Yaws, 57
 Young, Robert, 73, 78, 80, 156

Sione Lātūkefu was educated at Tupou College, the Teachers' Training College, and Sia'atoutai Theological College, Tonga, and subsequently at the University of Queensland and the Australian National University. He is an ordained Methodist minister. He has been a teacher and inspector of schools in Tonga, and is now Senior Lecturer in History at the University of Papua New Guinea.

Text set in 10/12 Times Roman
and printed on 75 gsm Jeffcote
by Wright and Carman Limited,
Trentham, New Zealand