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

In finally declining cession in September 1861, the Colonial Office took particular note of the recommendations of Colonel Smythe. He had placed emphasis on the near impossibility of avoiding involvement in “native wars” and in “disputes with other civilized countries”.\(^2\) The Foreign Office needed no persuading, and in March 1862 the Colonial Secretary, the Duke of Newcastle, advised the Governor of New South Wales, Sir John Young, that Great Britain would not assume sovereignty over Fiji. Young was appointed to lead the delegation formally to advise the Fijian chiefs of the decision.\(^3\) In Fiji itself Pritchard, who had laboured so long to make cession a reality, notified his American colleague of the decision on 28 July.\(^4\) In submitting his report the previous year, Smythe had recommended to the Colonial Office that Pritchard be dismissed, principally on the grounds that irreconcilable differences had arisen between him and the Fijian chiefs.\(^5\) Disquiet in London concerning several aspects of Pritchard’s administration led the Colonial Office to instruct Sir John Young to appoint a Commission to investigate 12 charges against the Consul, most of which arose from Smythe’s representations to the Foreign Office. The Commissioners voyaged to Fiji in HMS *Miranda* and held hearings into the charges at Levuka in July 1862.\(^6\)
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The hearings, which accorded Pritchard unjust treatment and resulted in his dismissal from office, are not of immediate concern here. More important is the other reason for the Miranda’s visit to Fiji: to inform the chiefs of the British government’s rejection of cession. Once the vessel was in port, Captain Jenkins requested Pritchard to summon Cakobau “and the other chiefs who signed the document offering the sovereignty of Fiji to Her Majesty’s Government, to a formal meeting”. Four days later, Young informed the assembled chiefs “that Her Majesty’s ministers regret that they cannot advise Her Majesty to add the Fiji Islands to Her Dominions.” The most notable absentee from the gathering was Ma`afu, who was still visiting Tonga. For Cakobau, the refusal of cession, on which he had set his heart as a way out of his troubles, meant a return of the threats posed by American cupidity and Tongan ambition.

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

Although Ma`afu remained in Tonga during the Commission’s hearings, his name was several times heard in evidence. Waterhouse confirmed that Pritchard had “given permission” for the Tongans to attack Bau, a reference to the Consul’s petulance in the face of what he saw as Cakobau’s obduracy.
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Waterhouse was adamant that Ma`afu and those chiefs over whom he exercised influence would not recognise any treaty which Cakobau might make with a foreign power. Interpreter Edward Martin confirmed Ma`afu’s “great political influence in Fiji” as the representative of Tupou I. According to Martin, Ma`afu recognised Cakobau as Tui Viti, “nevertheless he goes about collecting property in derogation of Cakobau’s rights”. Now that the decision to refuse cession was known and with the restraining hand of Pritchard likely to be removed, the threat posed by Tongan power and influence in Fiji would increase. Cakobau would enjoy a breathing space only until Ma`afu’s return.

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

Joeli Bulu, the Tongan assistant missionary who had worked in Fiji for over 20 years, has left an account of this renewal of Tongan armed intervention. According to Bulu, Ritova had sent a tabua to Golea seeking his help in Macuata. In preparing to depart, Golea sought assistance from the Christian village of Waikava, adjoining the Fawn Harbour mission, and when that assistance was refused, threatened to raid the town after his return from Macuata. Alarmed, the lotu people at Waikava sent for Wainiqolo, who was then at Vanuabalavu. The immediate consequence of this request was the successful Tongan campaign in Taveuni. When the European missionaries, assembled at Levuka for a circuit meeting, heard of the hostilities, they requested help from Pritchard, still
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preoccupied with the Commission. The Consul referred the request to Tui Cakau, who declined to intervene. Bulu then appealed directly to Golea, whose promise to stop fighting soon proved to be false. Bulu indicates that when Wainiqolo visited Fawn Harbour, relations between then two Tongans, missionary and warrior, were greatly strained. Bulu exchanged only formal greetings with Wainiqolo and, in an effort to avoid further contact, left the mission to preach and baptise in the outlying villages. On his return, he was pleased to find that Wainiqolo had departed. He reported an eavesdropped conversation between Wainiqolo and Kuila, Raivalita’s cousin, “who joined himself to [the Christians] not because he loved the lotu, but because he wanted to kill Golea, who stood in his way”.16

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

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

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

American Vice Consul Isaac Brower, at his post in Levuka, was distanced from these urgent communications across the Somosomo Strait. He nevertheless envisaged danger from Tonga in a much broader context, advising his State Department of the “strong probability that the natives of … Tonga … will try to overrun and conquer this group … I do not doubt their ability to do so. I am aware that they have been restrained thus long only by the fear of interfering with the Cession … and thereby exacting the displeasure of the British Government”.26 Three days after Brower penned his gloomy missive, HMS Miranda, with Calvert on board as a guest of the official party, arrived at Fawn Harbour.27 In view of the hostilities, past and threatened, the arrival was opportune. A “reign of terror” had continued since Ritova’s return to his home and the assassination of Bete, with Tui Cakau “a prisoner of war for assisting Ritova and breaking faith with his old allies from Tonga”.28 Pritchard, despite his rift with the missionaries, found himself in agreement with them over the origins of the troubles. The Consul believed that the Macuata fighting had
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arisen from Smythe’s protests about him, following his decision to return Ritova to Nukubati. These differences between Commissioner and Consul, Pritchard claimed, caused Wainiqolo and his forces “to make a descent upon the [Macuata] coast”. These contemporary shades of opinion, instructive as they are, were then of far less moment than the need to overcome the crisis to whose origins Pritchard and the missionaries had devoted so much reasoned eloquence.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Since Ma’afu had a history of denying intent, his evidence cannot be accepted without question. Brower pertinently observed that Wainiqolo, a minor chief, could hardly have raised such a large force around Cakaudrove and openly attacked the fortress of one of the most powerful chiefs of that matanitu without Ma’afu’s prior consent. The most that can be said is that the case against Ma’afu is not proven, since any consultation with Wainiqolo would have been verbal, very likely away from prying ears.
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The *Tukutuku Raraba* recounts Ma`afu’s anger with the survivors of Wainiqolo’s force when he met them at Waikava, anger provoked by their supposed disobedience. Appearing determined to effect a reconciliation with Golea, Ma`afu took two young men with him in a *takia* across the Somosomo Strait in the pre-dawn darkness. Upon reaching Wairiki, Ma`afu approached Golea and his army. When he recognised Ma`afu’s voice calling him, Golea invited him into the compound, where Ma`afu convinced Golea, now Tui Cakau, of his peaceful intentions. After daybreak, a party of Ma`afu’s men, believing their chief had been taken prisoner to Wairiki, themselves traversed the strait, only to be greeted by Ma`afu, who told them not to do anything foolish. Some of the older men came ashore with offerings of food for Golea, as tokens of friendship. Reconciliation had been achieved.55

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

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

> I found on my return a change in the relations and conditions of my lands ... When I heard of it I went to [Tui Cakau] ... I said ... `The war arose when I was at a distance and the result has been no good and you have sold portion of the land. What profit is there in the death of all these people? I have come that there may be peace’. 56

According to Swanston, Golea had felt that selling some of the lands of his people who had sided against him was the only way he could hope to defy Ma`afu.57

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

---

55 *TR*, Sawana village...
56 Evidence of Ma`afu, LCC R930.
57 Evidence of Robert Sherson Swanston, LCC R930.
Ma`afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji
to Macomber. Laucala, Mago and other islands were also sold, with Mago being conveyed to William Hennings for $350 in merchandise and cash.\(^{58}\) Golea claimed that he had not been motivated solely by a desire to punish those of his people who had betrayed him. He also apparently believed that the whites who purchased his lands would help to protect him against the Tongans, although he was later to tell Ma`afu that he sold only after the whites had made him drunk.\(^{59}\)

Golea's land sales exemplified the “defiance” accorded Ma`afu, who responded by asking Tupou to come to Fiji with a force of 1,000 warriors. Again rumour predominated: the “enquiries” being undertaken by Ma`afu and Tu`i Ha`apai were supposedly part of a pretence which would end in the invasion and occupation of Fiji by Tupou’s forces.\(^{60}\) It was only in December that Cakobau finally received Tupou's letter of 7 August, written in response to the Vunivalu’s letter to him. The King’s tone was provocative:

> You say I am to govern Tonga and you will govern Fiji. What Fiji is it that you speak of? Do you rule over Thakaundrovy? Do you rule over the Windward Islands? Do you rule at Mathuata? Or, do you rule at Rewa? And, as it regards Bau, that you have given to Britain. So what Fiji is it that you govern?\(^{61}\)

Since, on 7 August, Tupou did not yet know the British decision concerning cession, his words can be regarded as a fair statement of Cakobau’s actual power, although he takes no account of the great prestige attached to Bau and to the Vunivalu. The implication of Tupou’s admonition is that whatever future action he might take respecting the Tongan lands in Fiji need not concern Cakobau unduly, since those lands lay beyond Cakobau’s control. The King spoke of the “ill-treatment” accorded Tongans in Fiji, a comment Calvert correctly regarded as “sadly one-sided”, in view of Tongan rapacity over many years.\(^{62}\) Tupou appeared to have been offended by Cakobau, and whether that offence were genuine or feigned scarcely mattered. When Calvert learned on 30 December that Ma`afu had failed to secure another interview with Golea at Wairiki and had sent his schooner to Tonga for reinforcements, his alarm was genuine.\(^{63}\) Whether or not he had been manipulated by Ma`afu, Tupou was clearly prepared to act

\(^{58}\) Calvert to GS, WMMS, 6 Jan 1863, WMMS ILTF; Evidence of Ma`afu, LCC R930. For the sale of Mago see CRD No 345, 19 Aug 1863.

\(^{59}\) LCC R930. See also Statement of Ma`afu regarding the Tongan claim to Vanuabalavu and adjoining islands, BCFP.

\(^{60}\) Report of the Australasian Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society for the year ending April 1863, Fiji District, 43–44.

\(^{61}\) George Tupou to the Vunivalu King of Bau, 5 Aug 1862.

\(^{62}\) ibid.

\(^{63}\) Calvert to GS, WMMS, 3 Mar 1863.
decisively and quickly in defence of Tongan interests in Fiji. Like the news of the stockpiling of gunpowder, Ma’afu’s requests for reinforcements strongly suggests that active plans for an invasion had been made.

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

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

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

Cakobau remained bewildered by the refusal of cession and apprehensive concerning Tongan intentions. Early in January he called a meeting of chiefs, who were reported to be “united and determined to resist Tongan aggression”. In a move not devoid of irony, Cakobau announced plans to prepare a set of laws after the fashion of those proclaimed by Tupou at the 1862 Tongan Parliament. The Vunivalu, for once the statesman, urged the chiefs not to forget that Tupou

64 Evidence of William Tungi, Report of an Interview between Mr Consul Owen and the Commissioners appointed by King George of Tonga to wait on Her Britannic Majesty’s Consul in Reference to certain unsettled Differences concerning Lands in Fiji, 21, BCFP.
65 Quoted in John Whewell to Calvert, 4 Mar 1863, in turn quoted in Calvert to GS, WMMS, 28 Mar 1863, WMMS ILTF.
66 Trade and General Report [Fiji], 31 Dec 1862, FO 58/96.
and his warriors had been his saviours at Kaba. The chiefs were urged to do nothing to provoke the Tongans now.\textsuperscript{67} Meanwhile, crews of vessels recently arrived at Levuka confirmed that ammunition was indeed being laid up at Tonga. “100 kegs of gunpowder had been purchased at Ha’apai from one vessel as a preparation for war in Fiji, should Ma`afu fail to get matters settled”, Calvert noted, alarmed at the prospect of a war which he thought would last for ten years and cost thousands of lives.\textsuperscript{68}

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

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

Calvert did not forbear to add that Ma`afu had “abandoned the drinking of spirituous liquors”. Ma`afu’s words might serve as a classic statement of the guiding principles of his career in Fiji. How often had he sweetened missionary ears with a recitation of the evils of violence; how often had he plausibly denied his active involvement in the instigation of war, insisting that it was always thrust upon him? The missionary cannot have been surprised when, following his eloquent speech and again according to old habits, Ma`afu sought permission to meet in class. The following Saturday, by coincidence the anniversary of his baptism in Nuku`alofa 33 years earlier, Ma`afu and his henchman, the notorious Semisi Fifita, “prayed with great humility and earnestness in the chapel at Fawn Harbour”.\textsuperscript{69} Great also was their capacity to deceive, and great the naïveté of James Calvert, although the missionary gave the errant Tongans some credit for the example vouchsafed to their people.

\textsuperscript{67} Calvert to Rowe, 3 Mar 1863, Personal Papers; Calvert, Journal, 1–2 Jan 1863.
\textsuperscript{68} Calvert, Journal, 2 Jan 1863.
\textsuperscript{69} Calvert to Rowe, 3 Mar 1863. See also Calvert, Journal, 14 Jan 1863; Calvert to Rowe, 30 Jan 1863, Personal Papers.
The degree of reconciliation Ma`afu had achieved with Golea, recounted in the *Tukutuku Raraba*, can be questioned. Although Ma`afu had apparently sent three messages to Golea requesting a meeting, the latter refused to cross to Waikava, insisting instead that Ma`afu should come to Wairiki, which he was reluctant to do. The impasse caused Ma`afu to despatch his schooner back to Tonga.70 At the same time, the British Consul received a “requisition” signed by many resident Europeans, including the French priests, urging the Consul to “request any British ship of war that may come to prevent the Tongans from over running”.71 Despite the invitation from some of their number to Tupou, the state of anxiety among the white community appeared to match that of Cakobau.

Ma`afu meanwhile continued to impress Calvert both with his humility at prayer and his ardent desire for peace.72 On 20 January Calvert and Joseph White were at Wairiki, where the former advised Golea, as he had Ma`afu and Cakobau, to work towards peace. Golea assured his visitors that he much preferred peace to war.73 His land sales to Europeans might be seen as evidence of this preference although, if such sales are considered blameworthy, not all of the blame attaches to Golea. George Henry, the “purchaser” of Vanuabalavu, had in 1860 persuaded the inhabitants of Adavaci, an island within the Vanuabalavu reef, to sell their island to him. Henry had assured the people that such a sale was the only way they could retain their land in the event of British annexation of Fiji. Ma`afu's attempts to dissuade them were futile. Now, amid the uncertainties of early 1863, Henry successfully pressed Golea to sell him the whole of Vanuabalavu, in spite of the agreement between Tuikilakila and Ma`afu. The latter’s customary rights were ignored, another example of Golea’s mistrust of the man with whom he was supposedly reconciled.74 Ma`afu later wrote in protest to Acting British Consul William Owen, reminding him that “all Vanuabalavu is Tongan … it is my wish that you should not enter that sale until I see you with some of the aged or principal men of that land”.75 Such men would acknowledge that Vanuabalavu belonged to Ma`afu according to Fijian custom. Golea purported to believe that the *i soro* rights which Ma`afu had received on Vanuabalavu were now inoperative, following Wainiqolo’s defeat.76 Similarly, Laucales was sold despite its having been given Ma`afu after the first offer of cession.77
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who seemed to enjoy Golea’s confidence, also noted that Tui Cakau had “sold two good and large islands for ammunition”. The missionary hastened to inform the chief “that Ma’afu had kind feelings towards him”.

At the end of January, Calvert was ready to escort Cakobau, accompanied by Owen, on a visit to Wairiki to discuss peace with Golea. The missionary continued to heap praise on Ma’afu who, he hoped, would “adopt the Tongan laws at Lakeba so far as they are practicable in Fiji. He appears to be disposed to be one with Cakobau”. Calvert was sanguine concerning the prospects of a “united and strong government” under the two chiefs, so often rivals in the past. Owen, although very much the new chum in such company, lost no time in advising Tupou that although Great Britain had declined the sovereignty of Fiji, “it by no means ceases to watch over and protect (through me) the lives and property of its subjects in these islands”. Owen urged the King to do nothing “which might disturb those friendly relations which now exist”. Owen’s courteous tone contrasted with the belligerence of Brower, who warned the King that if Ma’afu and his “agents” interfered with arrangements being made in Fiji for payment of the American “debt”, Tupou would be held personally liable for the debt, as well as “sums in damages”. The King was solemnly warned not to prosecute his “ambitious designs” on Fiji.

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

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

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

During the short voyage, Bulu attributed the orderliness of the fleet to Maʻafu’s “earnestness in religion”. This was music to Calvert’s ears; he was delighted that Maʻafu, like Tupou before him, had “got right in his soul”, a change that boded well for the future of the Tongan community in Fiji. The missionary noted in passing that he had many times urged on Maʻafu “the necessity of having a fixed residence and of having a well-ordered township – of having laws, and of keeping all in order”. If Calvert was the dupe of Maʻafu concerning the latter’s “earnestness”, so too was Bulu. Either Maʻafu had deceived both of his religious mentors, or he was subject, in the light of his uncertain political prospects, to a spiritual rebirth that as yet showed no signs of flagging. In his defence, it should be remembered that Joseph White was convinced of his sincerity and remained so 18 months later.
The arrival of the *folau* off Wairiki caused alarm and preparations for battle, but Tui Cakau’s forces were reassured by the presence of Calvert and Bulu. The party went ashore and, in the presence of Cakobau and the missionaries, Ma`afu and Golea shook hands, “had a comfortable conversation, and agreed to have peace”. A meeting of Cakaudrove chiefs two days later passed equally pleasantly. Cakobau subsequently suggested a written agreement involving Ma`afu, Tui Cakau and other leading chiefs in a pledge never to renew hostilities against each other. The Vunivalu also favoured regular meetings of chiefs at Bau.\(^{91}\) Ma`afu later appeared “manifestly delighted” at the prospects both of the treaty and the chiefly conclaves.

After these various arrangements Ma`afu, professing himself anxious to dissuade Tupou from coming to Fiji with a large force, asked that one of the schooners be sent to Tonga to convey news of the proposed treaty to the King. Even with peace having been agreed, the potential dangers from a large Tongan force were great. Cakobau meanwhile urged Calvert to visit Tonga to discuss the Tongan indemnity with Tupou. The missionary was tempted to comply, since he also wished to raise with the King the question of Tongan land acquisition in Fiji and the need “to send a fine fellow who would work with Ma`afu – and require Ma`afu to settle down”.\(^{92}\) Because of the possible implications of such a visit, however, Calvert decided to remain in Fiji.\(^{93}\) To read the missionary’s correspondence from these weeks is to gain the impression that Ma`afu was content with the agreements made at Waikava. Yet he was not, since he appears to have lost no time in laying claim to large portions of Fiji, “under the right of property given or services rendered”. The claim included not only Lau, the Yasayasa Moala and Vanuabalavu, but also Cakaudrove, Macuata, Bua, the Yasawas, Nadroga, Beqa and part of Kadavu, in fact all parts of Fiji that had ever possessed a connection with Tonga.\(^{94}\) Ma`afu was later to write formally on two occasions to Owen on the same subject, protesting in his first letter against Golea’s sale of Vanuabalavu to George Henry.\(^{95}\) His second letter referred to “the land belonging to Tonga in Fiji”. He stated that he was writing himself “as the King has not arrived yet” and signed himself as “the assistant of the King”. He was to claim in 1864 that he intended the letters principally as a protest against this sale to Henry.\(^{96}\)

\(^{91}\) Calvert, Journal, 1 Jan 1863.
\(^{92}\) Calvert to Rowe, 4 Mar 1863, Personal Papers.
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\(^{94}\) Calvert, Journal, 23 Jan 1863.
\(^{95}\) Ma`afu to British Consul, 4 May 1863 and 30 Apr 1863, BCFP. See also Dutton Papers, Vol. 1; Deeds 357, 358 and 359, CRD. Owen in reply reminded Ma`afu that the deed of sale to Henry had been registered by Pritchard, but promised to investigate any appearance of injustice. (Owen to Ma`afu, 2 May 1863, BCFP).
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7. “Tonga is too small for him…”

Apprehension mounted in Fiji after news arrived in April of Tupou’s impending visit. Although the King’s intention was supposedly “not to fight”, most commentators believed his arrival in force could have no other consequence than hostilities, given the determination of Cakobau and other chiefs to lose no more land to the Tongans.⁹⁷ Ma’afu, having earlier announced his wish to prevent Tupou’s force from coming, now admitted that he no longer wished to do so, since only discussions with Tupou could resolve matters to everyone’s satisfaction.⁹⁸ In the meantime Tevita ‘Unga arrived at Vava`u on 14 February in order to attend a meeting of Tonga’s principal chiefs, including his father the King, to discuss the situation in Fiji. The Vava`u chiefs were initially opposed to plans by their counterparts from Ha`apai and Tongatapu to send an expeditionary force to Fiji, in order to protect Tongan interests there. However, unanimity of purpose was achieved at a second meeting, where the chiefs resolved to raise a force of 1,000 men from the three archipelagos “to go in twelve canoes to Lakeba, to investigate the matters causing the war between this group and Fiji”. Tupou was to lead the expedition and to head the enquiry at Lakeba. Missionary George Lee was not impressed, lamenting, “It all seems a farce”.⁹⁹

Despite the determination of the chiefs and the European community in Fiji to resist the Tongans, some Fijians were thought likely to ally themselves to Tupou’s force when it arrived.¹⁰⁰ Fear and apprehension quickly dissolved into relief in both Fiji and Tonga with news that “the projected visit of King George and his warriors is quite given up … [the] king seems to have become ten years younger since he gave up the affair”. Missionary John Whewell believed that the letters from Consuls Owen and Brower had caused Tupou to change his mind.¹⁰¹ The letters in fact made the King realise “that the whites and half-castes were one with the Fijians – and that any aggression by Tongans in Fiji would interfere with the interests of Foreigners (who have possessions in most parts of Fiji) and would be at their peril”.¹⁰² Instead of leading an expeditionary force, Tupou was sending a commission of enquiry consisting of the governors of Tongatapu and Vava`u and the chief judge of Ha`apai. Their brief was to resolve the question of the Tongan lands in Fiji during consultations with the British and American Consuls. Ma’afu was evidently not to be included, although he
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⁹⁸ Calvert to Eggleston, 28 Mar 1863, MOM 99.
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expressed his agreement with Calvert that the Tongans were an integral part of Fiji and would prosper if they would settle down in orderly communities, “become industrious” and cease their vagabondage and aggression.  

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

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

Although acknowledging that there was “much good” about Ma’afu”, Calvert saw the chief’s way of life as a microcosm of all that was wrong with the Tongan presence in Fiji.

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

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

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

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

---

109 King George Tupou I to Dr Brower, 6 May 1863, Archives of the Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga, Nuku’alofa. Quoted in H.G. Cummins (compiler), Sources of Tongan History. A Collection of Documents, Extracts and Opinions in Tongan Political History 1616–1900, 254–255.

110 Twelve years later, Tupou spoke to the Tongan Parliament of his gratitude concerning Tongan disengagement from Fiji. It had helped to guarantee Tonga’s independence. (Ko e Boobooi, Vol. 11, No. 6, 1875: the King’s speech at the opening of the 1875 Parliament).
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did however vouchsafe that if Britain did not take Fiji, arrangements would be made to hand Nadroga over to Tonga. When the Commissioners visited Nadroga, a document was prepared, signed by Tui Nadroga and three other chiefs, which “solemnly declared” that their land “is part of Tongan dominions under the King of Tonga”.112

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

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

112 Abstract of Papers in Possession of the Government connected with Ma’afu’s claim to “Nadroga”, BCFP, Miscellaneous Papers.
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119 Present at the meeting were Owen; Viliame Tungī, Governor of Tongatapu; Ma’afu, “Representative of King George in Viti’; Josaia Lausi’i, Judge of Ha’apai; David Ahome’e, Judge of Tongatapu; Josadeck Vuna, Judge of Ha’apai; Methuselah Fifita, Judge in Fiji; Reverend William Moore, Consul Owen’s interpreter, and Joeli Bulu, Tongan interpreter.
European and Polynesian concepts of the process of negotiation. Owen said that he considered Tupou’s failure to protest after the document was signed as signifying the King’s approval of its content.

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

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

An agreement signed between Owen and Tungi on 12 August established guidelines for the projected meeting. The two Consuls were to preside, with four European settlers present, two British and two American. Four Fijian chiefs and four Tongan chiefs would also participate, the first to be nominated by Cakobau and the last by Tupou, while any decisions made by the conference should be unanimous and would be binding on all parties. These provisions, ostensibly
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120 The lands specified were Lakeba, Totoya, Matuku, Moala, Mago, Kanacea, Naitauba, Yacata, Cikobia-i-Lau, Munia, Susui, Yanuca, Katavaga, Yanuyanu, Avea, Taveuca, Rabe, Cakaudrove (except Kioa), Macuata, Bua, Yasawa, Beqa, Nadroga, Nabukulevu, Yani, Nukutubu and Gasele.

121 This account is based on Report of an Interview between Mr Consul Owen and the Commissioners appointed by King George of Tonga to wait on Her Britannic Majesty’s Consul in reference to certain unsettled differences concerning Lands in Fiji, BCFP.

122 Agreement signed this Twelve Day of August eighteen sixty-three between WILLIAM TUGI, Commissioned Representative of King George of Tonga, of the first part, and WILLIAM OWEN Esquire, Her Britannic Majesty’s Consul, of the second part..., BCFP.
made to ensure that all interests were represented, would place the Tongans at a
distinct disadvantage. They would be outnumbered by the Europeans and Fijians,
with the result that their land claims would never be recognised. Divided as the
Europeans were from the Fijians, and as the leading chiefs were among themselves,
they were united in their desire to dilute Tongan power in Fiji. When a document
was prepared for signature, following conclusion of a verbal agreement between
Tungi and Owen, the Commissioner refused to sign. A second document was then
drawn up, but Owen declined to sign it on the grounds that it did not reflect the
agreements that he had made with Tungi following their lengthy discussions.
Owen blamed Joseph Waterhouse, acting as an interpreter, for encouraging the
Tongans not to sign away their prospects. The most significant difference between
the two documents was that the second provided that any land disputes should be
settled by a committee of four, consisting of the relevant Consul, one European,
one Fijian and one Tongan.123 The Commissioners reasonably claimed that they
had come to the Consul to discuss land disputes between Tongans and Europeans,
not between Tongans and Fijians.124 While such an arrangement would have
ensured a better hearing for Tongan interests, fundamental disagreement from
the beginning effectively stultified prospects for a resolution of the Tongan lands
question in the manner envisaged.

Despite these difficulties, Owen was quick to advise Tupou of the essentials
of the unsigned agreement, expressing his hopes for the preservation of peace
and reminding the King that the prosperity of the Tongans in Fiji depended on
the agreement’s provisions being honoured.125 Yet the cause was already lost. In
addition to the disaffection of Tungi and his fellow Commissioners, the actions
of Golea rendered impossible the implementation of whatever resolutions might
result from the planned conference. Golea, who would have been one of the
chiefly participants, had no interest in allowing the agreement to run its course.
So anxious was he to rid himself of the meddlesome Tongans, and of Ma’aflu
in particular, that he quickly resumed land sales to Europeans. Only a week
after the agreement was signed, Golea sold the islands of Mago, Kanacea and
Katafaga, all subject to Tongan claims, to various European settlers.126 Not that
it mattered very much: by mid September, Calvert was advising his Society that
“the arrangements made between the Consul and the Tongans failed – and were
laid aside, as the Tongans refused to sign”.127

The most significant absentee from the conference at Levuka was Cakobau, whose
apprehension concerning Tongan plans mounted during the Commissioners’
visit to Fiji, especially when they failed to make an early call at Bau. They

125 Owen to George Tupou, 15 Aug 1863, BCFP, Miscellaneous Papers.
126 LCC R4, R6 and R118.
127 Calvert to GS, WMMS, 14 Sep 1863, WMMS ILTF.
finally arrived in late August, accompanied by Ma’afu. Missionary Frederick Langham, stationed at Lakeba, reported that Cakobau had written to the governor of New Caledonia, asking that a French warship be sent to protect him if the Tongans came in force.128 Cakobau took the step partly through fear, since he became increasingly suspicious of the Commissioners’ motives as their tour proceeded.129 When he finally had their collective ear, he expressed his displeasure at the lateness of their visit, but also assured them of his strong desire for peace. He urged them to return to Tonga and to ask Tupou to write at once, asserting the same desire on his part. If the Commissioners agreed to those requests, Calvert believed, Cakobau was likely to agree to the Tongan land claims.130 Fortunately, the decision was not Cakobau’s to make, not only because he did not rule all of Fiji, but also because none of the so-called Tongan lands was subject directly to him. While the Commissioners were at Bau, Owen, incensed by Tungī’s objections to the original agreement, wrote both to him and Tupou “to [withdraw] from any recognition of your unsettled differences with the Fijian chiefs”.131

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

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

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

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

In late 1863, the rival encampments of Ma`afu at Waikava and Tui Cakau across the Somosomo Strait at Wairiki manifested the danger confronting Fiji. About the end of November, the two rival chiefs held a surprise meeting, under the auspices of Calvert, on the island of Kioa in Bua Bay. While no definite agreement was forthcoming, both Ma`afu and Golea appeared resolved not to wage war. The meeting was followed by a call at Wairiki by some members of Ma`afu’s entourage and the visit to Waikava of Golea’s matanivanua, Mai Kavula, to invite Ma`afu to Wairiki. Although the Tongans at Waikava, apprehensive about Golea’s intentions, sent Mai Kavula back without their leader, Ma`afu secretly left Waikava the next night “in a small paddling canoe”. The following morning, Elenoa joined a large group of Tongans that set out in search of her husband. Calvert and other missionaries, also setting off a day later in their schooner, were alarmed on hearing noise of musket fire early in the morning.

---
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Ma’afu, prince of Tonga, chief of Fiji

coming from the direction of Wairiki. Later, they heard news that Ma’afu and Elenoa had been honourably received at Golea’s house and that the musket fire was by way of bidding them welcome. The Tongan party was feasted, peace was concluded and Ma’afu and Golea even discussed plans for a joint campaign in Macuata against Ritova.\textsuperscript{145} Calvert saw the establishment of peace as a “cause of great rejoicing”, following as it did accounts from Tonga of Tupou’s peaceful intentions after the return of his Commissioners. Yet the problem of land remained, since the Commissioners had failed to achieve any written agreement and Golea continued to sell land to settlers. As the missionary observed, “there will doubtless be trouble ere long on the land question”.\textsuperscript{146}

Whether or not in consequence of the peace between Golea and Ma’afu, the latter’s authority in Vanuaabalavu seemed to have evaporated during the ensuing months. In January 1864, the island appeared in “abject subjection” to Cakaudrove, when Tui Cakau, “having for many months kept from oppressing the people”, was visiting with a large entourage. Food and canoes were requisitioned in large quantities and “the poor people” were thought likely “to endure a closer grinding, as it is known that they ceded their island to the Tongans”.\textsuperscript{147} Golea, clearly determined to remind the Vanuaabalavu people who their master really was, nevertheless kept the peace with Ma’afu, while Tupou was apparently still favourably disposed towards Fiji.\textsuperscript{148} Ma’afu returned to Lakeba after making peace with Golea and for the next nine months he and his forces appeared quiet, avoiding overt involvement in local squabbles. Ma’afu was able to exercise the rights in Lakeba that were denied him on Vanuaabalavu. The divisions within Fiji were seen as leaving the islands as “potential prey to Tongans, half-castes and whites”, while Bau and Lakeba remained “distant with each other”.\textsuperscript{149}

There was soon to be a new and important player on the Fijian stage: Captain Henry Michael Jones VC, a hero of Crimea and new British Consul. He had been advised by the Foreign Office that the exercise of magisterial jurisdiction over British subjects and other Europeans, established by Pritchard, was illegal without a treaty between Britain and “the bona fide ruling authorities of Fiji”. He was required to determine the expediency of properly obtaining such jurisdiction and also to ascertain “whether a chief or chiefs of the group have authority to enter into Treaty arrangements with other Powers”.\textsuperscript{150} After spending time in Tonga,\textsuperscript{151} Jones reached Fiji on 2 October 1864. He had noted

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[145] Calvert to GS, WMMS, 1 Jan 1864, WMMS ILTF; Calvert, Journal, 8–10 Dec 1863.
\item[146] Calvert to Nisbet, 23 Dec 1863, Nisbet Papers.
\item[147] Calvert to Stephen Rabone, 26 Jan 1864, WMN(A), No. 27, Apr 1864, 428.
\item[148] Calvert to GS, WMMS, 15 Mar 1864, WMMS ILTF.
\item[149] Calvert to GS, WMMS, 2 Jul 1864, WMMS ILTF.
\item[150] Lord John Russell to Jones, 14 Sep 1863, FO 58/124.
\item[151] Missionary George Lee met Jones in Tonga and found him worthy of a Jane Austen drawing room: “free, easy of address, and quite the Gentleman in language and manners”. (Lee, Journal, 1 Sep 1864).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Tupou’s undisputed authority in Tonga and in particular the King’s “excellent code of laws”, a copy of which he despatched to the Foreign Office. Jones recorded Tupou’s desire to conclude a formal treaty with Great Britain along the lines of Tonga’s treaty with France of 1855. In Fiji, by way of contrast, Jones advised his masters that there was “no law … but little order and no sovereign chief”. He referred also to the “nominal sovereignty of Bau” and expressed his hopes, as yet undiluted by real experience of Fiji, that a centralised authority and a code of laws might be established. No mention was made, in this early communication, of the Tongan presence in the islands.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Cakobau articulated his dilemma to Jones as well as to his old friend Calvert. He said, “‘I am not like the man chosen to become captain of a ship. I was born captain – born a chief’”.163 So he was, but so long as his direct rule extended over such a small area of Fiji, the dilemma would remain. In the immediate context of the Tongan land claims, Cakobau announced on 23 November that he would never relinquish Lau, while Brower, realising that the Tongans could never be driven away, agreed to their possession of Lau, “provided they undertake to pay a portion of the American claim”.164 During a meeting at the British Consulate the following day, Cakobau declared that he had no land he would relinquish to the Tongans. “If Ma’a‘fu and the Tongans were to go to Tonga”, he said, “that would not interfere with a continuance of friendship”. Calvert interpreted this as a desire by Cakobau to retain all lands in Fiji while remaining on good terms with the Tongans and able to request their help when
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needed. The Vunivalu was reminded that when he first interviewed Maʻafu and Moss at Bau, he had expressed himself as satisfied with their proposals to take possession of those lands gained through conquest. Then, the blow had been softened by the Tongans’ assurances that the £12,000 indemnity would be forgiven and that they would “require the chiefs of Rewa, Bua and Mathuata to become his dutiful subjects”.165

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

Tongan occupation of their claimed lands would work against the interests of the Europeans and “half-castes” living there, since oil, land and labour would become more expensive. Nevertheless, Jones was convinced of the justice of the claims, not only to the three islands nominated by Maʻafu, but also to Rabe, ceded to Tupou in 1855. Expressing his annoyance with Cakobau, whom he felt had been unduly influenced by the Europeans, the Consul “plainly told the Tongans to go at once to take possession of Vanuabalavu, Moala and Matuku”.167 They lost no time in doing so: on 3 December, Tui Yaroi and six other Matuku chiefs acknowledged, in a deed prepared by Moss, that Matuku belonged to the Tongan government and was subject to Tongan law. A similar deed had been signed on Moala three days earlier.168 Finally, on 9 December, some chiefs of Vanuabalavu also acknowledged that their island had long been Tongan and that only Maʻafu had the right to sell their land. Jones later acquiesced in the
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cases of Matuku and Moala, but would not countenance the conveyance of Vanuabalavu, since it had been purchased by a British subject. The Consul was also concerned that no influential chiefs on Vanuabalavu favoured Tongan rule and that “messengers were sent to Tui Cakau entreating him to protect the island against the Tonguese”. Moss was instructed to have the Tongan flag lowered on Vanuabalavu and not to pursue Tongan claims there until George Henry’s purchase had been fully investigated. Jones also declined Moss’ suggestion for a commercial treaty between Britain and Tonga on the grounds that “there is no precedent for … the British Government recognising one of its own subjects as the responsible agent of a foreign power”. 169

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

Ma`afu’s imposing physical appearance and his “genius” impressed George Ryder. “If he had been born a white man … [these qualities] would have placed him in the highest rank in his country”. Known apparently as “the Bismarck of the Pacific”, Ma`afu was friendly towards the Ryders. They reciprocated, “knowing that his protection was worth a great deal”. He was, after all, “heir to the throne of Tonga, after the King’s demise”. 170 So the year closed with Ma`afu in possession, lawful as far as it went, of most of the lands he coveted, including the prized Vanuabalavu. With Jones determined to play a part in any future land disputes, it seemed unlikely that the Tongans could be seriously threatened either by Cakobau or Tui Cakau.

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

---
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peace” between the province and Tonga. The treaty also provided for reciprocal rights between Bua and Tonga, including the right of residence, and allowed the citizens of one entity the privilege of attaining high office in the other. It was signed by Ma’afu, Tui Bua and four other Buan chiefs. Witnesses included Moss, Thomas Baker and David Wilkinson, an Australian who had settled in Bua and become Tui Bua’s secretary.\(^\text{171}\) This orderly process contrasted with news from Tonga that the king had “six tons of powder ready to help in demanding and defending what he believes to be his rights”.\(^\text{172}\) The day before witnessing the treaty with Bua, Moss had written to the Foreign Office seeking “price lists of cannon, shot and other ammunition”.\(^\text{173}\)

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

Ma’afu’s activities in northern Fiji and the actions of the Tongan Commissioners left Cakobau increasingly marginalised. Distracted by minor hostilities in Rewa and with French help increasingly unlikely, the Vunivalu still refrained from showing his hand. Calvert believed that the best option for Cakobau now would be to accept Tupou’s proffered friendship and his offer to waive the claim for £12,000 compensation. In return, Cakobau would have to recognise Tongan control of those parts of Fiji claimed by right of conquest. However, he was still under pressure from resident Europeans to oppose the Tongans by all available means. In Vanuabalavu confusion also prevailed. Despite Ma’afu’s presence and his resettlement there of the Mago people, Tui Cakau still visited to exercise his arbitrary rule, while the Europeans’ claims for possession remained unresolved.\(^\text{176}\) The repudiation by Jones of the “treaty” between nine Vanuabalavu chiefs and Moss cast further doubt on the island’s legal and

\(^{171}\) CRD No 371 [Bua], 3 Jan 1865.
\(^{172}\) Calvert to GS, WMMS, 12 Jan 1865, WMMS ILTF.
\(^{173}\) Tubou Ha’apai to FO, 1 Jan 1865, enclosed with J. Barry to E. Hammond, 25 Apr 1865, FO 58/106.
\(^{174}\) Ryder, 18.
\(^{175}\) Statement by George Lyon Ryder, LCC R6.
\(^{176}\) Calvert to GS, WMMS, 12 Jan 1865; Calvert to Rowe, 12 Jan 1865, Personal Papers.
customary ownership. In January, Ma`afu went to Rewa, avowedly to seek a witness for Jones’s impending arbitration of the Vanuabalavu dispute. Calvert apprehended that the disaffected Tui Dreketi would take advantage of Ma`afu’s presence to draw the Tongans to his side against Cakobau. When the latter finally protested to Jones about the Tongan occupation of Matuku and Moala he was, Calvert believed, showing his true colours at last. In view of Cakobau’s continued opposition to the Tongans’ occupation of their lands, Ma`afu might be only too willing to heed Rewan entreaties.

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

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

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

The controversy lay in whether Tui Cakau gave Ma`afu only levying rights, which were never in dispute, or whether the right to “rule over” the islands, which Ma`afu was later to do, was also implied. In his Petitioner’s Plea, Ma`afu referred to his voyage with Tuikilakila in 1849 from Lakeba to Lomaloma. En route, Ma`afu declared, Tuikilakila said to him, “I here give you all the islands between Lakeba and Taveuni”. Ma`afu deposed that he lived at Lomaloma for 18 months thereafter before returning to Lakeba, having commenced “to lay [Vanuabalavu] under contribution for sinnet, yams etc”. The Plea further stated that during the valu ni lotu, the Christian chiefs of Lomaloma sent one of their number, Mafoa, to Tui Nayau with a request for help. When Tui Nayau refused, Mafoa turned to Ma`afu, who sailed with two canoes to Susui, where the Lomaloma Christians had fled. Subsequent hostilities between Ma`afu’s forces and those from Yaro vanua in northern Vanuabalavu resulted in the capitulation of the Yaro chiefs, who presented tabua and baskets of earth to Ma`afu as tokens of submission.
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The most revealing evidence heard at the hearing was that of Golea. He deposed that he had sold Vanuabalavu to George Henry, knowing it belonged to Ma`afu, because he was vexed with the Tongan. The sale, made at Henry’s suggestion, took place at Wairiki. Henry, who had reminded Golea of Ma`afu’s renunciation of all Tongan land claims in Fiji, duly presented Golea with guns and percussion caps in payment for the island, a payment the chief returned because he was afraid of Ma`afu. Golea said that his initial anger against Ma`afu had arisen because Ma`afu had come to Waikava prepared to fight.179 Golea acknowledged to Jones that Ma`afu’s sovereignty derived from the surrender of the people of Vanuabalavu and also from his father’s gift. Of these, Golea believed, his father’s gift provided the better title.

Whatever Tuikilakila’s intentions had been in 1849, Ma`afu’s sovereignty was accepted as a fait accompli by 1865. The Court admitted a further petition, signed by 34 chiefs, stating that Vanuabalavu and 12 specified islands nearby180 have for a long time past belonged to the Tongan government … we have never sold any of the said islands, or consented to the same by other party, we knowing well that Ma`afu, as representative of the Tongan government was the only party who had the right to do so.

… we again state that we wish to belong to no other power except Tonga. We also desire Tongan laws to be promulgated in our country, to which said laws we shall render due obedience.181

The chiefs’ apparent unanimity probably owed much to pressure from Ma`afu. It is important to note, however, that the chiefs, some of whom gave evidence in person, believed that Ma`afu’s rights derived from sources other than Tui Cakau’s gift. Evidence was heard concerning Ma`afu’s intervention on the side of the Lomaloma Christians against the heathen chiefs of Yaro in 1854. Following the defeat of the Yaro forces, that vanua’s chiefs presented tabua and baskets of earth to Ma`afu, “expressly stating that they gave themselves and their district, and during the same week that chiefs of the Lomaloma district for the second time they having presented earth to Ma`afu on his first arrival”.182

As their gifts of tabua and baskets of earth reveal, the Vanuabalavu chiefs recognised Ma`afu as the legitimate owner of their island. Samate, a matanivanua to Tui Cakau, had voyaged from Lakeba with Ma`afu at the time of the latter’s intervention on Vanuabalavu. Samate gave evidence that the gifts were presented in order “to beg pardon” of Ma`afu. Samate had continued to Somosomo, where
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he informed Raivalita of the chiefs’ submission to Ma`afu. Raivalita’s response had been to say to Samate, “‘All right we could not have interfered being ourselves at war on Vanua Levu’”. He acknowledged that his father Tuikilakila had given Vanuaabalavu to Ma`afu. Another chief named Tavaki deposed that when Raivalita heard of the submission, he said, “‘Very good, if ever I want to go there I will ask Ma`afu’” 184. Other chiefs supported Samate and Tavaki; one of them, a Lomaloma chief named Tevita, stating that “we thought we had only to do what Ma`afu told us”, indication enough of how little choice the chiefs really had. Mafoa declared that he and the other chiefs were Tongan subjects who acknowledged Ma`afu as their head chief. Tui Mavana, in response to the question, “Did you give the earth to me?” from Ma`afu himself, answered that he had done so through friendship. 185 Finally, an unnamed chief from Mualevu declared that the gifts to Ma`afu were “a request for our lives”. 186

Ma`afu confirmed everything the chiefs had said, declaring that the baskets of earth were given him “for the land”, while the “whales’ teeth [were] for their lives”. 187 In view of this seeming unanimity, the question arises as to why Golea had sold the island in apparent violation of Ma`afu’s customary rights. According to George Henry, he had done so because “he was afraid of Ma`afu and wished the Tongans away”. 188 Golea shared the resentment his brother had felt, and when opportunity in the form of George Henry came along, he was not slow to take advantage.

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

Be it known to all men that Vanuabalavu and all other Lands situated in Fiji and which were formally given to me, that in the year eighteen fifty-five I gave the said lands to George Tubou and the Government of Tonga, and the only connection I have now with the same is that I am Governor of the people and Lands belonging to the Government of Tonga and situate in Fiji. 189

In giving his evidence under oath, Ma`afu claimed to have placed the Tongan lands in Fiji under Tongan law “when we got laws printed”, meaning after the introduction of the 1862 Law Codes in Tonga itself. He claimed to have given
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his Fijian lands to the Tongan government, an action Golea acknowledged to be Ma’afu’s right. In his judgment, Consul Jones found that Vanuabalavu and the islands within its reef were lawfully subject to Ma’afu, both through the original gift from Tuikilakila and by recognition from the chiefs and people of the islands. The only exceptions were any islands since alienated by lawful deeds of sale.\footnote{190 CRD, No. 381. Report of Proceedings in Re Vanua Balavu; Ma’afu vs Henry. Proceedings of a Court of Arbitration held at Lomaloma during the 1st and 2nd days of February 1865 to investigate a claim preferred by Ma’afu a Tongan chief against George Matthew Henry a British subject for possession of the island of Vanuabalavu now held by George Matthew Henry. The exception to Jones’ finding was Munia, sold to John Macomber, an American citizen, on 4 Dec 1863 for $400. See also Statement by Ma’afu regarding the Tongan claim to Vanua Balavu and adjoining islands, Nov 1864; Calvert to Rowe, 13 Mar 1865, Personal Papers; see above, n. 59.}

Jones had been opposed on principle to the Fijian chiefs’ selling lands to Europeans. He had apparently advised Henry, \textit{apropos} of the latter’s deed of sale of Vanuabalavu, “You can get a way of [the chiefs] for a glass of grog. … Your deed is not worth the paper it is written on”.\footnote{191 Calvert to Rowe, undated fragment [c. Dec 1864], Personal Papers.} Despite the presiding officer’s predisposition on a matter of principle, however, evidence at the Court strongly suggested that Tui Cakau acquiesced at Ma’afu’s control of Vanuabalavu and was unlikely to oppose it in the future.

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

\begin{quote}
Jones: Was the grant by Tui Kila Kila to Ma’afu or to the Tongan government?

Tui Cakau: I don’t know.

Jones: Was it to Ma’afu and the Tongans?

Tui Cakau: Ask Ma’afu.\footnote{192 Report of Proceedings in Re Vanua Balavu…, 16.}
\end{quote}

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

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

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

> The right of Ma’afu to deal with lands of his government has been so often referred to me in cases of a similar kind … in past years that it will be sufficient if I draw attention to the fact that Ma’afu had beyond his power in Lau and Fiji generally peculiar rights in Vanua Balavu – first from the chiefs and people themselves then from Tui Cakau Supreme Chief and finally from the British Government represented in the first instance by Consul Jones who in … 1865 declared that after enquiry he found that Ma’afu was the owner of Vanua Balavu.”
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At another hearing, this time concerning disputed land in Vanuabalavu, Mafi, Native Stipendiary Magistrate and former matapule of Ma’afu, referred to “the time when Consul Jones held Court at Loma Loma and Vanua Balavu was given to Ma’afu by Tui Cakau. Then commenced the law, the making roads, division of lands and tax making”. Recognition of Tongan control of Vanuabalavu and the Yasayasa Moala in 1865 by the British Consul and by most of the leading chiefs marked a new era in Lau. Henceforth, Ma’afu would be considered as a de facto chief of Fiji. The events of the mid 1860s, culminating in Consul Jones’ ruling, made abundantly clear the extent to which Ma’afu and the Tongans, alongside other “outsiders”, had become genuine competitors for power in Fiji. They were indeed more significant in most respects than the other contenders, a fact largely obscured by Fiji’s subsequent colonial history.
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