

3. Amery and the Aftermath

Sir Kenneth Maddocks replaced Garvey in 1958 and remained governor until 1964. Maddocks was different from Garvey in temperament and experience. Born in 1909, he had joined the colonial service in 1929 after graduating from Wadham College, Oxford, and served in Nigeria before coming to Fiji. Unhappily for him, his tenure in Fiji was punctuated by long periods of illness. While he did not have Garvey's sure touch, his familiarity with the Pacific or his wide-ranging friendships across Fiji, Maddocks' Nigerian career provided relevant experience in one important respect. In Northern Nigeria, he had been involved intimately in the process of transforming powerful native authorities into subordinate instruments of local government. Unlike Garvey, however, Maddocks was not one to show vigorous initiative; temperamentally, he was more reactive than proactive.¹ Be that as it may, Maddocks' tenure coincided with perhaps the most turbulent years in Fiji's postwar history. A year after taking office, Maddocks was confronted with deeply damaging industrial unrest in the oil industry in Suva in 1959 and in the sugar industry the next year. The overall effect of the unrest on the governor was to reinforce the importance of caution and gradual change and an acute appreciation of the political realities in the colony.

Maddocks' major concerns throughout his years in office were twofold: to address the imbalance between the two main races in the public service and to forge an appropriate path for the orderly constitutional development of the colony. Fijians were not only under-represented in the professions, as we have already seen; they were greatly outnumbered in the higher echelons of the civil service. This under-representation had a number of causes. Among them was the reluctance of traditional leaders, including Ratu Sukuna, to encourage academic education for their people whose appropriate place, they felt, was in the villages.² Indeed, a revamped Fijian Administration in 1944 had strengthened the authority of the traditional structures of Fijian society, especially the power of chiefs. While Fijians were advised to stay close to their traditional cultural roots under the guidance of their chiefs, Indo-Fijians were actively pursuing higher education for their children attending community-funded schools. The gap presented the officials with a delicate and difficult situation when making civil service appointments: preserving the principle of merit on the one hand, and increasing Fijian presence on the other.

To improve Fijian prospects in the civil service, separate scholarships under the Colonial Welfare and Development Scheme were inaugurated to enable select individuals to receive special training in the United Kingdom. Interestingly, the scheme did not attract much adverse comment from the Indo-Fijian community,

which was excluded from it, partly because its leaders had a prudent appreciation of its importance for the overall development of Fiji. During the 1960s, the special training schemes did increase, if not dramatically, the number of Fijians in the civil service. There were other unexpected benefits as well. The elite of the emerging Fijian leadership on scholarship in the United Kingdom came in contact and socialised with officials in places that mattered. Through informal and personal contacts, officials in London gained deeper and more sympathetic insights into Fijian thinking on critical issues, while a period in the United Kingdom increased Fijians' already considerable respect and affection for English institutions and values. The Indo-Fijian leaders had no such opportunity and no such contacts.

On the constitutional front, Maddocks sought advice from the CO about electoral systems and constitutional arrangements in other places that might have some relevance for Fiji. In particular, he inquired about the so-called 'Tanganyika Model' and about the functioning of legislative councils with unofficial majorities.³ The Tanganyika Model provided a mix of communal as well as common-roll seats, the latter reserved for each of the three principal racial groups of Europeans, Africans and Asians. Regarding the Tanganyika Model, the CO replied that the

crux of the matter is whether representation is to be on a racial or a party basis. If the intention is that the Fijians, Indians and Europeans should have the opportunity to return candidates acceptable to the majority of their respective *rac*es, thereby perpetuating communal divisions, then the Tanganyika system does not appear to be the solution.⁴

It would work to produce inter-racial cooperation if politics were conducted on party lines.

It was, however, the Tanganyika Model that was adopted in Fiji, where political participation had always been racially compartmentalised and where political parties were only recently formed — the Federation Party in 1963 and the Alliance Party in 1966, just a year before the introduction of a new electoral system. As for an unofficial majority, the CO advised against it. The practice had been used in a number of places — in Aden, Gibraltar, Tanganyika, Uganda and elsewhere — but the experience 'tended to produce frustration and to strengthen premature unofficial demands for greater executive representation and authority'.⁵ Official majority in Fiji's Legislative Council was not removed until after a constitutional conference in 1965.

Fiji's unique set-up required careful deliberation. Given the colony's history and ethnic sensitivities, the CO conceded that representation would have to continue on racial lines, but it did not favour extension on a racial basis. 'We think the important thing is to keep the way open for the development of

non-racialism in Fiji politics and not to take any avoidable action which involves establishing or confirming institutional forms embodying racial divisions,' wrote P. Rogers to the governor. 'We should, on the contrary, seek constantly to edge the community in the way of non-racial attitudes and behaviour, political and social, and to afford it time to develop and adopt such attitudes and behaviour.'⁶ As far as constitutional change was concerned, 'we want to keep one pace, but not two paces, in front of real political feeling and we certainly want to avoid widespread feelings of frustration'. The CO advised the governor to hold consultation with his senior officials and present fresh proposals for constitutional advance.

This the governor had been doing in any case with his most senior advisors: P. D. Macdonald, the colonial secretary, and Q. V. L. Weston, the assistant colonial secretary, with long experience of Fiji, the latter since 1940.⁷ Their views differed considerably. Weston argued that the only way Fijians could be persuaded to accept constitutional reform was if the paramountcy of their interests was acknowledged explicitly, perhaps through extra seats in the legislature. He cited the Deed of Cession in justification. Fijians were the indigenous community, they owned more than 80 per cent of the land and had always been loyal to the Crown. The reference to loyalty was intended to remind London of the Fijian's distinguished record of service in World War II. This contrasted markedly with the record of the Indo-Fijians, who largely abstained from service during the war — partly in protest against the racially discriminatory rates of pay soldiers received, and partly because the government distrusted their loyalty and wanted them to contribute to the war effort by remaining on their farms.⁸ Once the principle of paramountcy was accepted, Weston argued, the way would open for the introduction of a limited number of common-roll seats on the Tanganyika Model. The Indo-Fijian community, he thought, could be placated by reducing the number of European seats in the Legislative Council. He proposed doubling the number of Fijian members relative to the number of Indo-Fijian members (from five to 10), with the additional five being nominated by the Council of Chiefs.

Macdonald, with whose views Maddocks eventually agreed, opted for the retention of racial voting and the principle of parity. Common roll, in any shape or form, was anathema to Fijians and Europeans, he argued, and it would be impossible to gain their acquiescence to its introduction. For their part, Indo-Fijians could not be expected to accept Fijian paramountcy without protest, nor would Europeans be likely to accept reduction in their own numbers. European representation in its present form was necessary 'both in order to protect the Fijian, and in order to ensure that the confidence of European businessmen and investors in Fiji, now already shaken, does not result in a flight of capital and cessation of investment'. The way forward, Macdonald advised, was to reduce official numbers in the Legislative Council — something that had

been opposed by Suva and London in the past — and introduce a ‘member’ system in which unofficial members were given supervisory roles over collections of government departments.

These views were being canvassed in Suva when parliamentary undersecretary of state at the CO, Julian Amery, arrived in Fiji. Amery was a well-connected Conservative (his father, Leopold, had been secretary of state for India in the 1940s), supremely self-confident and had a penchant for sharp, unequivocal judgments. During his two years (1958–60) at the CO, he developed a particular interest in island colonies, whether in the Caribbean, Mediterranean or the Pacific. While his views did not always command support among officials, they always demanded attention. Amery arrived in Fiji at a particularly unfortunate time, when the colony was in the middle of a prolonged and devastating strike in the sugar industry. Some Indo-Fijian leaders, including A. D. Patel, told their followers that Amery had been sent by London to help end the strike. That, of course, was not strictly the case, though the purpose of the visit was deliberately cloaked in secrecy and thus open to all sorts of interpretation. Feelings were inflamed against the Indo-Fijians, with troops being sent to the sugar belts to ‘protect’ farmers who wanted to harvest. Fijians were still reeling from the recommendations of the Spate and Burns commissions, feeling isolated, apprehensive and abandoned. Understandably, their attitude to change had hardened.

The timing of Amery’s visit was critical because his recommendations were to have a far-reaching effect on thinking about official policy towards Fiji (his report is reproduced in Appendix 1).⁹ The problem of the racial divide was already known in London, and the CO had access to a wide range of informed opinion about the colony. Amery, however, put the issue vividly so that his name and words echoed in most major policy statements throughout the 1960s. He was blunt in his assessment. ‘The Fijians and Indians are more distinct as communities than Jews and Arabs in Palestine, Greeks and Turks in Cyprus or even Europeans and Bantu in South and Central Africa.’¹⁰ Fijians feared Indian domination, and had hardened their attitude to change. Their confidence in British intentions had been shaken. They regarded the recommendations of the Burns Commission for internal reform within Fijian society ‘as an attempt to give the Indian community control of the land by breaking up traditional Fijian society’. It had to be remembered that it was the Fijians who had been the loyal community — the reference here being to the non-active participation of the Indo-Fijian community in the war effort. The Fijians provided 75 per cent of the armed forces. ‘The islands could hardly be governed without them, let alone against them.’ This was an obvious point, but it had not been made by a responsible official in such stark terms before. Amery continued:

We must, I think, accept that it is impracticable to think in terms of a single Fijian nation or of a common roll at any rate for the foreseeable future. Any suggestion of this is bound to arouse Fijian suspicions that the Indian would dominate by counting heads. The moderate Indo-Fijian leaders recognise this. This points to the conclusion that we shall have to recognise the equality of the Indian and Fijian communities irrespective of their numbers. There is no other way of reconciling both the pledges in the Deed of Cession and those in Lord Salisbury's despatch, let alone the need to keep communal peace. We should, therefore, let it be known that any constitutional advance must be so designed as to preclude the domination of one of the two main communities by the other.

Instead of gradually abolishing the separate system of Fijian Administration, as the Burns Commission had recommended, Amery urged its retention because the Fijians were 'determined to resist any move in this direction'. Indeed, he recommended an Indian counterpart to it. The principle of parity in the civil service — in each grade of each department — should be the aim of the government. Finally, Amery recommended a move towards a 'quasi-ministerial system' while retaining the official majority in the Legislative Council. His overall policy direction was clear.

Hitherto we have held up the concept of a single multi-racial community as the goal towards which Fijians and Indians alike should strive. The Fijians will no longer accept this; and the more we lay the emphasis on multi-racialism, the more suspicious they will become that we plan to sell them out to the Indo-Fijians. The only way, in my view, to exorcise the fear of communal domination, is to make it clear — as of now — that we stand for equal rights for both communities and that we shall not pull out until both ask us to do so.

Amery's views were canvassed widely in the CO. It was generally agreed that Amery's prognosis was probably correct, though some remarked on the unfortunate timing of the visit, with industrial riots in Suva in December 1959 and the strike in the sugar industry in 1960. The latter was regarded by the Fijians 'as an Indian attempt to gain control of the sugar industry which is vital to Fiji's economy. These fears of the Indians have consolidated the Fijian ranks and made them most reluctant to give any concessions which they think would be to the advantage of the Indians.'¹¹ Sir Hilton Poynton, the permanent undersecretary, accepted that the challenge of making Fiji into a cohesive non-racial state was difficult, but argued that 'to decide now that we should abandon the attempt [towards non-racialism] and base all our future policy on a constitutional and racial partition (even though not a geographical one) seems to me to be a counsel of despair'.¹² If Amery's view were accepted, Poynton went on:

We should be left perpetually holding the ring between what in effect amounted to two separate administrations and communities in Fiji. This might be all right for a time and might get us out of some immediate political difficulties. But the time is bound to come when there is a demand for at least full internal self-government in Fiji and possibly even national independence — especially when New Zealand grants Western Samoa independence next year. I should hate to find ourselves in the kind of position that we faced in Palestine between Jews and Arabs or in Cyprus between Greeks and Turks with the racial antagonism aggravated and, indeed, officially recognised in the constitution and ourselves unable to let go without leaving Civil War in our trail when we went. To abandon our policies for such a counsel of despair is a very big decision to take before we reverse the engines. If we do reverse them I doubt we would ever be able to re-reverse them again. The specific recommendation with parity in the Legislative Council or in the Executive Council or in the public service, and the question of whether or not to abolish the Fijian Administration are really subsidiary to this major issue of long term policy.

Elsewhere in the CO, there was general consensus on the broad thrust of Amery's report. The strength of the Fijian opposition had to be recognised and respected. The Fijian Administration would not be abolished in favour of a more multiracial system of local government. After all, the Fijian government, with CO authorisation, had done much in the 1940s to reinvigorate the separate system of Fijian administration, elevating 'chiefs to greater status and authority than they had ever held before',¹³ partly as reward for the enthusiastic Fijian war effort and partly because of the enormous influence of the pre-eminent Fijian chief, Oxford-educated and decorated soldier Ratu Sir Lala Sukuna, the traditionalist panjandrum of impeccable conservative credentials, who was also Secretary for Native Affairs.¹⁴ Fijians had their reasons for refusing to accept change, but London was also caught in a bind: it could not reverse the wheels it had set in motion and reject the legitimacy and foundations of an order it had nurtured so assiduously. Robert Norton has remarked on the irony of the CO's position: approving 'the reinforcement of chiefly power and ethnic separation just as it was embark[ing] on the project of decolonisation throughout the empire'. This contradiction, he continues, 'encouraged the reactionary stance of the newly empowered Fijian elite: their determination well into the 1960s, to cling defensively to colonial rule as the rulers prepared to end it'.¹⁵

Some of Amery's other recommendations were rejected. The idea of a separate Indian administration was not only unacceptable in principle because of London's long-term commitment to multiracialism, it was impracticable because of the structure and settlement pattern of the Indo-Fijian community. Fijians needed

help and protection, officials in London agreed, but they had also to be taught 'to face up to modern economic realities' — and officials favoured the gradual racial integration of public institutions. Amery's offhand remark that women should not be enfranchised if men did not favour it was shrugged off as an itinerant thought of an idiosyncratic mind. In November, Poynton wrote to Maddocks that Amery's recommendation to retain the communal system was 'purely a continuation of the present set-up, and [the governor was] not to be drawn into any statement that this is to be the pattern for all time'. The long-term goal was a non-racial state. This was to be achieved through a 'withering away' rather than 'an overt extinction of the communal roots of society'. He emphasised also to the governor that 'we should avoid any statement which commits us forever to communal representation'.¹⁶ The overall impact in London of Amery's visit was summarised by Hugh Fraser, Amery's successor as parliamentary undersecretary of state. He described the CO's stand as a holding position or middle course between 'the Burns non-racial line and the Amery communal approach'. Fiji was a potential trouble spot in the Pacific. Sooner or later (the next year, according to Fraser), clearer policy guidelines would be needed.¹⁷

On the future of the Fijian Administration, about which Amery had expressed firm views, Poynton said that the CO accepted that its abolition in the present circumstances was 'just not on', though he hoped that 'something should be done to streamline and modernise it insofar it affects the development of individualism amongst the Fijians'. In particular, he encouraged the governor to encourage *galala* (independent) farming. 'We think that an increase in the number of *galala* would encourage enlightened self-interest amongst the Fijians and probably bring them into greater contact with the realities of life and possibly also with Indians and Europeans. This, in due course, should have some effect on their political outlook.'¹⁸ Encouragement did not, however, come from where it mattered most: from the leading chiefs in the provinces, who feared the corrosive impact of *galala* on their leadership and the overall cohesion of indigenous village community, and from the officials of the Fijian Administration, who were opposed to it from the start — opposed to the 'withering away' of their cherished handiwork.

While waiting for a fuller policy on constitutional advance, Maddocks sought the CO's approval of the Fijian government's draft proposal for constitutional reform. The reform was to proceed in two stages. In the first stage, selected unofficial members of the Legislative Council would be invited to accept supervisory roles — with no executive authority — over a number of government departments, working within the conventional framework of collective responsibility exercised in the Executive Council: the membership system. The second stage would be a transition to a full ministerial system in which members would exercise executive responsibility. London approved the governor's proposal, with the proviso that the title 'member' would be used in

the first stage and 'minister' with full executive authority in the second — much to the disappointment of Maddocks, who thought the term 'member' was a colourless one while the use of 'minister' might make it more acceptable and also inculcate a greater sense of responsibility'. But he 'would not stand on this point'.¹⁹

The government's constitutional proposals were debated in the Legislative Council between 21 and 24 April 1961. It was the liveliest debate for years. What mattered more than anything else was the reaction of the Fijian leaders. With one lone exception (Semesa Sikivou), all of them rejected the motion, which, the government was at pains to explain, was not seeking approval or decision but was intended to gauge the views of the people. E. R. Bevington, the Acting Colonial Secretary, said in an almost pleading tone: '

We have had our constitution for a long time. We must look into the future and try to establish for ourselves a long term objective. If we don't, we will lack a sense of direction. It is not good sitting down and saying 'I want the status quo.' Changes are taking place and we must decide how we are going to move with these events. We don't want to wait until these forces have built up against us and we have to do things as a matter of urgency. Let us think ahead. Let us see what is coming. Let us be ready for it and let us do what we have got to do in our own time and by our own choosing. Do not let us forget the forces outside. They are there and they are real.²⁰

Ratu Mara, who by a combination of his intellect, education and chiefly birth had emerged as the dominant Fijian leader by the early 1960s,²¹ set the mood. Confident that he was speaking for the majority of the Fijian people, he opposed the motion. 'The reason why I am opposed to this motion is that I feel the direction is towards the complete independence of the Colony even though it might be in the Commonwealth.' The proposals were 'ill-conceived' and 'ill-timed', Ratu Mara said, accusing the government of ignoring the Deed of Cession, which, he suggested, had never contemplated the severance of the link between Fiji and the United Kingdom.²² In private, however, he tended to be less dogmatic. Fijians, he said, would accept constitutional reform towards greater self-government if Fiji were guaranteed a continuing link to the United Kingdom similar to that enjoyed by the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man. This was the first mention in Fiji of a proposal often mooted publicly subsequently that Fiji might somehow be integrated with the United Kingdom.

Ratu Penaia Ganilau, an important conservative Fijian leader close to his people, supporting Mara, chided the government for not consulting the public before announcing the constitutional proposals and raised fears about the introduction of common roll. Ravuama Vunivalu, perhaps the ablest debater on the Fijian side, summed up what he called the message from the Fijian people. 'We cannot

reconcile the implications of these proposals with the assurances that have been given from time to time that our interests in this, our native land, shall always remain paramount.' His people regarded the Deed of Cession as 'a contract which can only be revoked by mutual agreement of the two contracting parties. There can be no question of a unilateral revocation.' In any future constitutional arrangements, he continued, Fijians must have majority representation in the Executive as well as the Legislative Councils. He also asked the government for an 'unequivocal statement' about its 'interpretation of the place of Deed of Cession in the affairs of this colony today'. Fijian preconditions for accepting constitutional reform were made explicit for the first time: recognition of the principle of paramountcy of Fijian interests and a continuing link with the United Kingdom. Nothing less was acceptable.

The Fijians' united opposition to the proposals for constitutional reform had its effect on the government. In July 1961, the governor sought clearance from the CO for a passage he intended to include in his Cession Day address in October to reassure the Fijian people that the pace of change towards internal self-government would heed the advice of their leaders. Maddocks wanted London to agree that it would not 'hand over power until a substantial measure of agreement has been reached among the different races', and that before the introduction of self-government, 'agreement would have to be reached about the safeguarding of legitimate Fijian interests after the transfer of power'.²³

The first condition was superfluous: Fijians could not be forced into self-government against their wish, H. P. Hall minuted. At the same time, the United Kingdom could 'not accept a Fijian veto on any changes whatsoever [for example] the introduction of the membership system'. Sir H. Poynton was characteristically blunter:

The doctrine of consent is an admirable one if you can get consent; but if you cannot then the Secretary of State cannot escape the responsibility for taking a decision. To give one community in a colony a power of veto over constitutional changes even when that community is the indigenous race in a multi-racial community, is tantamount to an abdication by the Secretary of State of his responsibilities to Parliament for the orderly constitutional development of the territory. The point of principle is the same whether we are talking about the Fijians in Fiji, the Dominion Party in Rhodesia or the late Group Captain Briggs in Kenya.²⁴

The CO view prevailed. London had 'no intention of forcing the pace of constitutional advance in Fiji', it advised the governor, by declaring that the 'extent and timing of such advance will continue to take into account the need to safeguard legitimate Fijian interests and [Her Majesty's Government] will only decide on any major changes after full consultation with the representatives of the various communities in the colony'. Notwithstanding Fijian opposition, it

was 'in the general interest that some measure of increased responsibility should be given to unofficial members as soon as they are ready'.²⁵ The concept of a Fijian veto was removed. Maddocks had also flagged the subject of increased Fijian numbers in the Legislative Council to recognise the principle of Fijian paramountcy.²⁶ He suggested six Fijian members — four elected and two nominated by the Council of Chiefs — and five Indo-Fijian and European members each, four elected and one nominated.

London required a fuller explanation for a proposal that entailed a fundamental redirection of policy, upsetting the principle of parity that had been the hallmark of Fiji's constitutional arrangements since 1937. In a long dispatch of 21 July 1961, the Acting Governor, P. D. Macdonald, provided the justification.²⁷ An extra seat for Fijians, Macdonald argued, would among other things be a 'token of positive recognition by Her Majesty's Government of the rights of the Fijians in their own country, and also of their loyal, spontaneously offered, and meritorious services in two World Wars and in the emergency in Malaya, in which conflicts Indians in Fiji contributed virtually nothing'. An additional seat might encourage the Fijians to move forward towards a membership or ministerial system more readily and even encourage them to have a more liberal attitude towards the vexed land issue. For Fijians, Macdonald continued, land was the issue at the heart of the debate. 'They have, as you will be aware, a deep-seated and by no means unreasonable fear that the Legislature will one day come under the control of the Indians, who will amend legislation in such a way as to remove from the Fijians, not only the control over, but also the title to, their lands,' he wrote. Fijian loyalty was

closely related to the undertakings concerning their land which they read into the Deed of Cession and it seems certain at present that there will be no further measure of constitutional advance in the foreseeable future unless firm safeguards are written either into any future constitution or proclaimed in some other way as to ensure that the title to their lands cannot be taken from them.

Macdonald was rehearsing well-known prejudices and fears that had long informed colonial politics. There was no conceivable way that Indo-Fijians, or anyone else for that matter, including the colonial government itself, could dispossess Fijians of their lands and other assets. Europeans had tried to do this and failed in the early years of the twentieth century. The enormous practical difficulties aside — the Fijians, after all, dominated the armed forces, as Amery had so clearly stated — Indo-Fijian leaders had repeatedly stated since the 1940s that the ownership of land was not at issue; the terms and conditions on which it was leased were. This was the view of the colonial government itself. The Burns Commission had made the same point in its wide-ranging report. Macdonald knew, however, even as he wrote to London, that his claim about

the Indo-Fijian 'take over bid for Fiji', as he put it, lacked substance and conviction. If Fijians could not be given an additional seat, he would be content with the principle of parity.

The CO rejected the proposal for an additional Fijian member for the Legislative Council. A. R. Thomas, assistant undersecretary of state, noted that this 'would be needlessly provocative to Indians faced with opposition to have anything short of parity of representation between them'.²⁸ Maddocks conceded that giving Fijians one more seat was not the best way of protecting Fijian interests; it was the governor's duty to protect the vital interests of the people, especially the Fijian people.²⁹ London also rejected the proposal that the unofficial members of the Executive Council should be elected by the Legislative Council as a whole, preferring them to be appointed at the governor's discretion. The principle of electing unofficial members could complicate the appointment of a chief minister when the full ministerial system came in. It would be best to let the governor appoint the person best able to command majority support in the lower house. Alsp, common roll, even in a limited form, was 'clearly unacceptable at present because of the attitude of the Fijians and the Europeans'.³⁰ The best that could be hoped for was a 'bridge' between common roll and communal roll.

Fijian concerns and interests and how best to accommodate them did not fade away. The next year, 1962, Maddocks resumed his correspondence on the subject, reminding London of the difficulty he encountered in getting the Fijians to accept the idea of inter-racial local government.³¹ This had been one of the recommendations of the Burns Commission. 'The insurmountable obstacle to the introduction of local government,' he told the CO,

is the fear of the Fijians that any advance towards inter-racialism in matters of importance is a step towards Indian domination. The Fijians judge this proposal, as they did proposals for an extension of inter-racial education, the abolition of the Fijian Administration, and constitutional reform, not on logical or utilitarian grounds, but from the point of view of the effect which such proposals will have on the status of the Fijians in relation to the Indo-Fijians. Any reform or innovation calculated in their opinion to undermine the racial identity of the Fijians is condemned irrespective of its merits, and any significant development towards inter-racialism is liable to be regarded by the Fijians as having this tendency.

He quoted the words of Ratu Penaia Ganilau and Ratu George Cakobau during the 1961 Legislative Council debate that at independence Fiji should be handed back to the Fijians. This sentiment, he said, was shared broadly by many in the indigenous community. The reference to Amery's report in the dispatch gave an insight into the governor's broad frame of mind and that of his senior officers, many of whom supported the principle of Fijian paramountcy in any case. This

concession, they felt, was necessary to get the Fijians to accept change. The best way forward, Maddocks suggested, was 'Fijian racial majority on the Legislative and Executive Councils, with the Indo-Fijians next in numbers, and the Europeans combined with the other racial groups, coming last'.

The reply from the CO was blunt and was informed by growing anti-colonial pressure at the United Nations and by studies undertaken by the CO itself of Fiji's place in the wider context of U policy towards its remaining colonial dependencies. The Fijians could not expect the United Kingdom to be in control of Fiji in perpetuity. Nor could London accept the recognition of Fijian paramountcy as practicable. It would find it difficult persuading the Indo-Fijian community to accept the principle when it constituted the majority population. Secretary of State, Duncan Sandys, told Maddocks:

I do not see that we could possibly persuade, and it would be wrong and impossible politically to try to compel, the Indians to accept a constitution which recognized Fijian paramountcy. Ever were we to do so and however such a provision was entrenched. I find it unrealistic to think that they, with a growing majority of the population, their economic dominance and well known propensity for self-advancement, would accept it after our departure, and I should expect them to receive considerable outside support in revolting against what would surely seem to the world at large to be the negation of democracy. However innocent the Fijians may be of the historical developments which have brought the Indians to the position today. The Indians are there to stay and their position must inevitably become increasingly important. It seems to me that any solution which does not recognize these facts is doomed to fail.³²

Sandys then suggested another approach, a kind of 'shock tactic' — that is, to tell Fijians that they could not expect the United Kingdom to hold their privileged position indefinitely, and that the 'only future for Fiji worthy of her past and suitable for her position in the modern world is as a multiracial state in which citizens of all races have full opportunity to play their part according to their abilities'. Multiracialism was not only a desirable goal but an attainable one, Sandys continued. To 'fall back either on entrenched separation or on the indefinite continuation of the *status quo* is a counsel of despair'. He sought further 'positive recommendations' from Maddocks about the future direction of constitutional policy.

Sandys' dispatch was a document of uncommon candour, intentionally, provocatively designed to force Suva to fresh, creative thinking about alternative solutions to Fiji's complicated problems. It was sent when the CO was also contemplating what to say about Fiji in preparation for regional talks at the official level in Washington on the future of colonial territories in the Pacific

with representatives from the US, Australian and New Zealand governments. A draft on Fiji was described by officials as controversial, because it tried to outline 'the makings of a policy for resolving the Colony's internal problems which we frankly have not yet got'.³³ Three solutions were under consideration — abandoning attempts to foster integration, acknowledging Fijian paramountcy or furthering attempts to bring the communities together — but the United Kingdom had yet to decide which to pursue. Only one point seemed certain: the economic value of Fiji to Britain was described as 'nil'.

To the extent that Sandys' dispatch was designed to provoke a response, Maddocks rose to the challenge. The governor stood his ground and responded equally forthrightly.³⁴ The policy of nudging Fiji towards multiracialism would contradict past assurances given to Fijians about their special place in the country, he said, and would provoke 'anger and amazement' among them — and Europeans and Fijians would feel betrayed. The policy of multiracialism 'would destroy the balance between the races which rests on the Fijians being accorded protection for which, in return, they have given their full cooperation to government, and have adopted a tolerant attitude towards the Indians'. Echoing Amery, Maddocks continued that if Fijians lost confidence in the British, they might embark on the path of passive resistance, which would hinder moves towards self-government and might even lead to violence. London, he said, did not appreciate fully the strength of the Fijian opposition to change. Nor did it appreciate that not all Indo-Fijians wanted multiracial self-government; many had a prudent and pragmatic appreciation of the Fijian position. Of course, Britain could not be expected to hold on to Fiji indefinitely, but it was too soon to announce that policy publicly. Nor was it wise of London to be preoccupied with long-term goals. The best way forward was to prepare the ground for internal self-government, and acknowledge the special position of the Fijians, perhaps through a Treaty of Friendship similar to the one enjoyed by Tonga.

Maddocks acknowledged the deleterious effects of a racially segregated electoral system, but was also mindful of total Fijian and European opposition to non-racial politics. This problem could be solved partly through the adoption of the Tanganyika Model. The Fijian people were not unreasonable, Maddocks assured the CO; they would accept change if they felt their vital interests were protected. He continued:

The type of compromise solution that I have in mind, and to which the Indians might well agree, is that when, ultimately, Fiji reaches the stage at which it is appropriate to appoint a chief minister, the chief minister should be a Fijian; that legislation affecting rights over Fijian land should require a majority of two-thirds or three-quarters of those present and voting; and that a balance in the Civil Service should be preserved. This would be a departure from the usual practice but no more so than was

approved in the case of the constitution of Malaya; but if anything is certain it is that the normal democratic practices of the western world will not, in the foreseeable future, work here.

Within Fiji, with elections due in early 1963 and with the announcement of Undersecretary of State Nigel Fisher's visit about that time, the leaders began to manoeuvre for advantage. Among them was Ratu Mara. Although sometimes voicing liberal opinion in private, he adopted a hardline approach in public. For example, he acknowledged privately that the system of Fijian administration was in need of an overhaul. He favoured the introduction of multiracial local government, and the introduction of the membership system; but he opposed them in public for fear of alienating his Fijian constituency. In a private meeting with other high chiefs in September 1962, Mara alleged that while in London, he had sighted an agreement between Ratu Sukuna and the British government on the future of the Fijian people, implying that London was reneging on the agreement. '*Me satini vakavinaka mada na nomu masi*', the Fiji Special Branch reported him as saying, 'Be prepared to go to war or be prepared to accept whatever is given to you.'³⁵ No one in the CO knew anything about the supposed secret agreement, while Sir Ronald Garvey said 'with absolute certainty, so far as I am concerned, that no such document exists'.³⁶ It was in all probability a political ploy to put pressure on the government about the protection of Fijian interests. Mara perplexed officials in London. '[H]aving preached to all of us while he was here the need for Fijians to emerge into the modern world,' wrote J. E. Marnham to Garvey, '[he] has since his return been playing the arch-traditionalist guardian of every jot and title of Fijians rights.'³⁷ Garvey thought the emerging Fijian leader 'very intelligent with a weird dose of immaturity mixed up with it and extremely ambitious both for himself and his people'.³⁸

At the same time, the CO grappled with Maddocks' suggestion about the Tanganyika Model: it was relevant and appropriate superficially, but problematic on closer scrutiny.³⁹ The governor wanted a predetermined outcome: Fijians on top, with a Fijian chief minister. An appropriate — not necessarily a democratic — system would have to be devised to achieve that outcome. There were other problems as well. The Tanganyika Model worked well because political parties existed in that country. There were no political parties in Fiji when the governor advanced the proposal. Moreover, the population was unevenly distributed racially throughout the colony, which, as one CO official commented, would make it silly to have a constituency dominated by Indo-Fijians, with few Fijians and hardly any Europeans, and yet have a seat each for the three races.⁴⁰ In the end, Maddocks' view about constitutional advancement prevailed, with London proposing to reassure the governor that in future, a 'more gradual programme' of change would be adopted.⁴¹

Simultaneously, questions were asked about whether anything was to be learned by comparing the position of Indo-Fijians in Fiji with that of the Chinese in Malaya. Not much, it was found: the historical and contemporary situations of the two communities were different.⁴²

Nigel Fisher, parliamentary undersecretary for the colonies, visited Fiji in January 1963 as part of his wider Pacific tour, the purpose being 'to listen, to confirm a view, and to advise the Secretary of State on his return'.⁴³ He was advised to use 'verbal ingenuity' to avoid causing 'alarm and despondency' by suggesting that the United Kingdom was about to force constitutional change upon the people of Fiji, but at the same time 'avoid saying anything which might be interpreted as a pledge not to introduce change until all sections of the community wanted it'. Fisher proved equal to the task. In Fiji, he listened carefully to a wide range of opinion through petitions and submissions. H. G. Nicholls, chief inspector of the CSR in Fiji, urged London not to 'turn Fiji loose as a self governing territory without ensuring that it can depend in many essential ways on the neighbouring and friendly countries who are more advanced and economically stronger'.⁴⁴ The Suva Chamber of Commerce expressed the fear that 'if the British administration in the Colony ceases, our rights as free citizens of a democratic state may be seriously affected', and it urged Britain to safeguard their economic interests as traders and their citizenship rights, promote more local government and adopt a policy of gradual localisation.⁴⁵

London wanted above all to gauge the breadth and depth of Fijian opinion about the pace and direction of constitutional change, for as the correspondence from Amery onwards shows, it was what the Fijians thought that counted. What it heard was sobering. The Fijian Cane Growers Industrial Congress, based in western Viti Levu, the heartland of Indo-Fijian settlement, bluntly said: 'We Fijians will not give up our rights. We would like to state that there should be no changes in the present constitution of the colony until [the] Council of Chiefs and we Fijian people express our desire for further Constitutional changes.' They wanted to be reassured that the bond between the Fijian people and the Crown was intact. 'We [would] very much like to know whether our bond with [the] Crown [is] still the same as when our Fijian Chiefs ceded our land and people to Queen Victoria.'⁴⁶ Apisai Tora, a politician and trade unionist, made a written submission in which he railed against the Indo-Fijians, the government and Fijian chiefs, demanding more representative administration and more representation of Fijians in it.⁴⁷

Tora could be — and was — dismissed, but not so the Fijian Affairs Board. Its submission — popularly known as the 'Wakaya Letter' after the Fijian island on which it was formulated — captured the various strands of Fijian political thinking and articulated them with force and coherence for the first time.⁴⁸ The letter was signed by all members of the Fijian Affairs Board, which consisted of

three 'paramount' chiefs with the highest ranks in Fiji: Ratu Mara (from Lau), Ratu Penaia Ganilau (Cakaudrove) and Ratu George Cakobau (Bau). Its other signatories were A. C. Reid and R. M. Major, both senior civil servants, and J. N. Falvey, European member of the Legislative Council and the board's legal advisor. The letter asked for the 'spirit and substance' of the Deed of Cession to be strengthened, links between Fiji and the United Kingdom preserved — along the lines enjoyed by the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man — Fijian land rights secured, Fiji to be declared a Christian state and the policy of racial parity in the civil service enforced. Only then would Fijians entertain the possibility of further constitutional change. The letter reminded the CO of the 'insistence of the Fijian people that the initiative for any constitutional change should come from them'. The Wakaya Letter, with its demand for Fijian veto power on matters of constitutional change, was a powerful negotiating document with wide-ranging implications. Its existence became known publicly in January 1963 — long after it was first presented.

Nigel Fisher reassured the Fijians that the United Kingdom would respect the terms of the Deed of Cession, although he pointed out accurately enough that the deed was 'primarily concerned with the transfer of sovereignty over Fiji to Her Majesty's Government'.⁴⁹ He undertook to examine the proposal for Fiji to have a relationship similar to that the United Kingdom enjoyed with the Channel Islands. He reassured the Indo-Fijian community that they were equal, not second-class, citizens of Fiji. And he emphasised the need to develop a more multiracial approach to the problems facing Fiji. Sandys wrote to the governor in August 1963 to say that he had 'studied carefully' the contents of the Wakaya Letter. He hoped for further progress towards internal self-government but 'in consultation with representatives of the people of Fiji', and not one section of it as demanded by the Fijians.⁵⁰ As for a relationship along the lines of the Channel Islands, the circumstances of the two countries were dissimilar, so the constitutional arrangements would be different although where appropriate some relevant features might be adapted for Fiji. Opinion within Whitehall was rather more candid on this point. In a note for an Official Committee on Future Policy in the Pacific in April 1963, the CO weighed the arguments for and against the United Kingdom confirming that a link of some sort would be maintained between Fiji and Britain.⁵¹ On balance, the arguments were in favour, despite the difficulties this might cause with the anti-colonial movement at the United Nations and the precedent that might be seized on by other UK territories anxious for similar treatment. Confirmation of a continuing link — its precise form to be determined later — was required to persuade the Fijians to enter a constitutional dialogue and, while other colonial powers would have to be consulted, a continuing link would doubtless please the Americans for whom strategic considerations were uppermost in deciding whether Pacific territories might progress to independence. The United Kingdom agreed that the 'creation

of new independent states should be undertaken only if adequate arrangements for the security of the area involved can be assured'.⁵² The Foreign Office in Whitehall was never backward in reminding the CO of the importance of the strategic dimension.

Against this background Sandys proposed in August 1963 a constitutional conference in London to 'try and agree upon concrete proposals' for constitutional change.⁵³ In April 1964, the CO gave the new governor, Sir Derek Jakeway, who had assumed office in January, its response to the Wakaya Letter and outlined broadly the line he might take in his discussions with the leaders in Fiji. London would try to work out a constitution that was as advanced 'as the Fijians will swallow'. The links with the United Kingdom that the Fijians sought would be preserved in the ministerial system though precisely how was not made clear. The governor would be vested with a range of powers over advisory and statutory bodies — such as the public service and police commissions — to ensure that the interests of all the communities were protected, obviating the need for a precisely formulated pledge that the Fijians wanted. It might be counterproductive for Fijians in any case to push too hard for an 'ultimate solution' lest it unduly antagonise the Indo-Fijians and invite the attention of the United Nations.⁵⁴ The demand for Fiji to become a Christian state should be abandoned in favour of the principle of non-discrimination. London was acutely aware of the deep sensitivities on the ground in Fiji, and advised Jakeway not to commit himself to any particular cause of action before further consultation.

Jakeway was a complete contrast with Maddocks. He was energetic and involved, unlike his predecessor, who was distant and detached and often in ill health. More than personality, however, Jakeway's background was important. He had been chief secretary in British Guiana in 1956 when Cheddi Jagan's Peoples Progressive Party had accused the government of gerrymandering the division of constituencies to favour its opponent, Forbes Burnham. Surviving the controversy, Jakeway left to serve as chief secretary in the former British protectorate of Sarawak, which became part of the Malaysian Federation in 1963. In Sarawak, he came to know first hand the service of Fijian soldiers fighting the Chinese communist insurgency in the 1950s. He developed a sympathetic understanding of the problems of the Malays, and there is little doubt that he saw the Fijian dilemma through the lense of his Malayan experience, describing Fijians as a huskier version of non-Muslim Malays. In Fiji, Jakeway was active behind the scenes, advising Mara to form a multiracial political organisation along the lines of the 'Alliance' party in Malaya. In the process, Jakeway fell foul of the Indo-Fijian leaders, who petitioned London to recall him. London did not, and a politically damaged Jakeway remained to guide Fiji through its most intense and contested period of constitutional development. Whether Fiji

might have taken a different turn had another person with a different background and a more impartial approach been at the helm remains an interesting question.

Fiji's first election for an expanded legislature under a new constitution, replacing that of 1937, held in April 1963. It was an important election for a number of reasons. For the first time, elections were fought on the basis of universal adult franchise, with no property qualification for voters or candidates. It was also the first time that the ballot box had reached the Fijian people, enabling them to elect their representatives directly. Until then, Fijians were sent to the Legislative Council by the Council of Chiefs. In the Fijian constituencies, all three sitting members of the council — Ratu Mara, Ratu Penaia and Semesa Sikivou — were re-elected. Among the Indo-Fijians, the contest was fiercer and more unpredictable. Emotions in the community were raw over the sugar strike of 1960, with the result that the election came to be seen effectively as a referendum on the strike and on certain people's role in it. Among them was A. D. Patel, the leader of the strike (who had been a member of the Legislative and Executive Councils from 1944 to 1950 but had retired to his flourishing private law practice after several electoral defeats in the early 1950s).⁵⁵

Patel won the election easily along with other members of the recently formed 'Citizens Federation', James Madhavan and S. M. Koya. It was an interesting and unusual combination of a Hindu, a Christian and a Muslim representing the Indo-Fijian community, especially in view of the persistent argument that Muslims and Christians could not be elected from a predominantly Hindu electorate of the colony. Patel's re-entry galvanised the political scene. His uncompromising stand on the common roll was to become one of the most deeply contested issues during the 1960s as Fiji moved towards independence. With Patel in the council as the leader of the Indo-Fijian community, Fiji had at its helm in the mid-1960s three exceptionally talented and tough-minded men, attached — in the case of Mara and Patel — to strongly held principles, unwilling to compromise, each seeking advantage for their respective political ideologies, one demanding the recognition of 'race' as the main principle of political representation, the other striving for a non-racial political culture.

With the election over, Jakeway proceeded to prepare the colony for the introduction of the membership system. That came on 1 July 1964. The government appointed three members, a Fijian, an Indo-Fijian and a European each: J. N. Falvey became the Member for Communication and Works (part-time), Ratu Mara the Member for Natural Resources and A. D. Patel the Member for Social Services. The choice of the three was to be expected: they were the acknowledged leaders of their respective communities. Mara's portfolio included agriculture, cooperatives, fisheries, forestry, geology, lands, livestock, marketing and mining — all areas of particular concern to the indigenous community. Patel was responsible for broadcasting, cultural activities, education, health, prisons

and social welfare. Falvey's portfolio, meanwhile, included meteorology, postal services, civil aviation, tourism, transport and hotels — areas in which the Europeans had major investments and interests. The members had a collective responsibility for the implementation of policy, and were answerable to the Legislative and Executive Councils for the departments under their charge. In the end, however, theirs was only an advisory role; all policy matters were the responsibility of the governor alone.

The membership system was cumbersome. It was intended to give members administrative experience within a framework of collective responsibility, but members — elected representatives of their respective ethnic communities — had their own interests to safeguard while participating in a government with whose policies they might not agree. Wires were certain to be crossed, and they were, especially between Patel, as the leader of the Indo-Fijian community, and Jakeway, as the head of government (and indeed between Patel and his own supporters).⁵⁶ As preparations began for the constitutional conference in London in 1965, the political temperature in Fiji increased. Patel's Federation Party raised issues — about common roll and independence, for instance — that aroused strong emotions. Inevitably, they came under attack from the conservative Australian-owned newspapers, in particular the *Fiji Times*, whose New Zealand-born editor, L. G. Usher, was virulently anti-Patel, according to Acting Governor P. D. Macdonald, who told the CO that Usher 'slyly hints at the unreasonableness of the attitude of the Federation group, and the rightness of the stand taken by the other groups'.⁵⁷

The Federation Party was attacked even by the government's own public relations department, which, ironically, had been in Patel's original portfolio but was withdrawn after threats of mass European resignations. The Fiji Broadcasting Commission (FBC), a statutory body, called members of the party '*badmash*', hooligans, which they found 'abusive, insulting and provocative'.⁵⁸ The government chose to remain silent, saying that it did not know the meaning of the word and that, in any case, the FBC was a self-financing and self-regulating body.

When Patel attacked the FBC publicly, Jakeway rebuked him and demanded his resignation if he could not observe the rules of collective responsibility entailed in the membership system. How could a member of government publicly attack a branch of that government? Jakeway was determined to bring Patel into line. 'I cannot condone such flagrant violation of the principle of collective responsibility,' he informed the CO.⁵⁹ The governor wrote to Patel asking him to 'explicitly and immediately' dissociate himself from the attacks; failure to do so would 'bring into question your continued membership of Executive Council'.⁶⁰ Patel reminded the governor of the terms and conditions on which he had accepted the appointment. He could not be expected to consider himself

'responsible to defend the wrongful acts of civil servants or defend them against public criticism' when, as member for social services, he had no power himself to hold officers in his portfolio to account. He had joined the government to 'serve my people — not to forsake them; and I am not prepared to sell my soul for a mess of potage'.⁶¹ He offered to resign if that was what the secretary of state and the governor wanted.

Patel's offer put the governor in a bind. He could, as he had indicated, accept his resignation, but that would deprive the government of the leader of the majority Indo-Fijian party in the Legislative Council, and the undisputed leader of the Indo-Fijian community in the colony. It would be a severe setback for the experiment of multiracial cooperation that the government was undertaking. Or the governor could swallow his pride and keep Patel on, though with no particular hope of eliciting active cooperation from him. Trafford Smith, assistant undersecretary of state, sympathised with Jakeway but alerted him to the 'serious and far reaching' consequences of not having Patel — and his fellow party member James Madhavan — in the Legislative Council. Might they not adopt a more extreme position, which could potentially affect race relations, internal security and effective and smooth running of government? Jakeway reluctantly heeded the advice. He wrote to Patel:

I value your membership of Executive Council and believe it to be in the national interest that you should continue to be a member and to retain your portfolio. I realise that this from time to time presents you with a conflict of loyalties, and I have hitherto much admired the way in which you have reconciled that conflict. At this juncture, in particular, it would be a setback to the ideal of national unity for which we are both striving if the leader of the majority Indo-Fijian party withdrew from the Government.⁶²

London hoped that the 'whole incident has not so seriously undermined the confidence of the other communities in the Indians as to make progress between now and the conference impossible'.⁶³ Its hopes were in vain.

The altercation between Patel and Jakeway could not have come at a worse time: on the eve of the constitutional conference in London. Relations between the two men, never close, became frosty. S. M. Koya, the deputy leader of the Federation Party, openly called Jakeway 'anti-Indian' and challenged his impartiality and integrity.⁶⁴ The governor's refusal to allow the Indo-Fijian community to accord a formal Indian welcome ceremony for Secretary of State, Fred Lee, dismayed many, especially when Fijians were allowed to welcome him traditionally at the chiefly island of Bau. Jakeway's statement during the course of a visit to Australia that 'it is inconceivable that Britain would ever permit the Fijian people to be placed politically under the heel of an immigrant community', and that 'the Indo-Fijians do not want self-government, because this would

immediately cause racial strife', provoked a storm of protest, which did not abate quickly.⁶⁵ The Federation Party protested against the characterisation of the Indo-Fijians as an 'immigrant' community — with all the political implications it entailed at a time when the constitutional future was being decided. Jakeway's statement, the party said, had seriously prejudiced the forthcoming conference by prejudging important issues. It petitioned the CO to recall Jakeway. For his part, trying to save face, the governor responded that he had been misrepresented. He was not. London backed the governor, but worried if his 'reputation for impartiality had been substantially damaged'. For the Indo-Fijian leaders, it had.

ENDNOTES

¹ Davidson, J. W. 1966, 'Constitutional Change in Fiji', *Journal of Pacific History*, vol. 1, p. 165, had Maddocks and his senior advisors in mind, whom he accused of 'benign paternalism', of not having any 'deep sense of commitment to self-government' and of not possessing 'much political sensitivity or skill'.

² An admiring biography of Sukuna is by Scarr, Deryck 1980, *Ratu Sukuna: Soldier, Statesman, Man of Two Worlds*, Macmillan Education, London. Meli Bogileka, a prominent Fijian politician from western Fiji, chided Sukuna publicly for siding with the colonial administrators in keeping Fijians 'near-slavery'. See *fijilive*, 21 May 2005.

³ Sir Kenneth Maddocks to P. Rogers, 24 June 1959, CO1036/307, no. 32.

⁴ P. Rogers to Sir Kenneth Maddocks, 14 August 1959, CO1036.307, no. 34.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ The following quotes for Weston and Macdonald can be found in 'Brief on constitutional reform', Fijian government note sent by P. D. Macdonald to A. R. Thomas, 20 September 1960, CO1036/612, no. 6.

⁸ This is discussed at length in Lal, Brij V. 1992, *Broken Waves: A History of the Fiji Islands in the 20th Century*, University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu, pp. 108–25 (n. 3). See also Ravuvu, Asesela 1974, *Fijians at War*, Institute of Pacific Studies, Suva.

⁹ 'Policy towards Fiji', 8 November 1960, CO1036, no. 11. (Reproduced as Chapter 6.)

¹⁰ Amery's characterisation of Fiji's divided society was echoed repeatedly in official correspondence. See, for example, Sir Kenneth Maddocks' dispatch to the Colonial Office, 14 April 1961, no. 33.

¹¹ Minute by H. P. Hall, 8 November 1960, CO1036/865.

¹² Minute from Sir H. Poynton to Hugh Fraser, 10 November 1960, CO1036/865.

¹³ See Norton, Robert 2002, 'Accommodating indigenous privilege: Britain's dilemma in decolonising Fiji', *Journal of Pacific History*, vol. xxxviii, pp. 2, 135.

¹⁴ See Scarr (1980).

¹⁵ Norton (2002:135 [n. 69]).

¹⁶ 'Future of Fiji', letter from Sir H. Poynton to Sir K. Maddocks, 17 November 1960, CO1036/612, no. 17.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ Sir K. Maddocks to H. P. Hall, 17 January 1961, CO1036/612, no. 29. See also H. P. Hall to Sir K. Maddocks, 6 February 1961, CO1036/612, no. 30; and 'Fiji government proposals for constitutional reform', 27 February 1961, CO1036/612, no. 38.

²⁰ This and the following quotes are from the debate reported in *Fiji Legislative Council Debates* (1961).

²¹ Mara's account of his career is in Mara, Ratu Kamisese 1997, *The Pacific Way: A Memoir*, University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu.

- 22 In private, however, Mara was not as dogmatic, telling the Colonial Office in October 1961 that he was 'convinced that the Fijian administration had to be overhauled and he was in favour of the establishment of multiracial local government'. He was also in favour of the introduction of the membership system, which, he said, the Fijian people themselves would come to accept in time.
- 23 Minute by Sir H. Poynton to H. Fraser, 12 July 1962, CO1036/62.
- 24 Ibid.
- 25 Ibid.
- 26 On the Fijian understanding of paramountcy, see A. C. Reid to I. S. Wheatley, 28 April 1962, CO1036/775, no. 5.
- 27 P. McDonald to Mr McLeod, 21 July 1961, CO1036/613, no. 67.
- 28 Minute by A. R. Thomas, 10 August 1961, CO1036/613.
- 29 Dispatch from Sir K. Maddocks to Mr Maudling, 28 October 1961, CO1036/613, no. 94.
- 30 Minute by A. R. Thomas, 10 August 1961, CO1036/613.
- 31 Dispatch from Sir K. Maddocks to Mr Maudling, 19 June 1962, CO1036/775, no. 8.
- 32 Dispatch from Duncan Sandys to Sir K. Maddocks, 31 July 1962, CO1036/775, no. 10.
- 33 Minutes by J. E. Marnham, A. R. Thomas and Sir H. Poynton on future policy in the context of talks with other powers about colonial territories in the Pacific, 3–13 July 1962, CO1036/654.
- 34 Dispatch (reply) from Sir K. Maddocks to Mr Sandys arguing in favour of gradual change, 10 October 1962, CO1036/775, no. 21.
- 35 P. D. Macdonald to J. E. Marnham, 18 October 1962, CO1036/703, no. 16.
- 36 Sir R. Garvey to J. E. Marnham, 14 November 1962, CO1036/703, no. 3.
- 37 J. E. Marnham to Sir R. Garvey, 12 November 1962, CO1036/703, no. 13.
- 38 Sir R. Garvey to J. E. Marnham, 14 November 1962, CO1036/703, no. 3.
- 39 Minute by I. S. Wheatley, 4 December 1962, CO1036/618.
- 40 Ibid.
- 41 Minutes by J. E. Marnham, 6 December 1962, and A. R. Thomas, 11 December 1962, CO1036/618.
- 42 Minute (reply) from C. R. Roberts to I. S. Wheatley, 6 December 1962, CO1036/618.
- 43 Minute by J. E. Marnham on Fisher's brief for his visit to Fiji, 18 December 1962, CO1036/775, no. 33.
- 44 Memorandum by H. G. Nicholls, Chief Inspector, CSR, Fiji, 19 January 1963, CO1036/1392, no. 5.
- 45 Suva Chamber of Commerce memorandum presented to Nigel Fisher, 16 January 1963, CO1036/1392, no. 38.
- 46 Fijian Cane Growers' Industrial Congress memorandum to Fisher, 12 January 1963, CO1036/1392.
- 47 'Political future of Fiji', memorandum presented to Fisher by the Fijian Western Democratic Party, January 1963, CO1036/392, no. 40.
- 48 Fijian Affairs Board memorandum on Fijian rights presented to Fisher, 17 January 1963, CO1036/107, no. 8.
- 49 Maddocks' dispatch to Sandys, 13 March 1963, enclosing report by Fiji Intelligence Committee, CO1036/1214, no. 5.
- 50 Dispatch (reply) from Duncan Sandys to Sir K. Maddocks, 31 July 1962, CO1036/775, no. 10.
- 51 'Future Policy on Fiji', *Cabinet Paper*, 134/2403 PFP (63) 3; and *Cabinet Paper*, 134/2403 PFP 1 (63) 2.
- 52 'Strategic importance and security of the Pacific Islands Region', *Cabinet Paper*, 18 January 1963, 134/2403 PFP (63) 1.
- 53 Dispatch from Duncan Sandys to Sir K. Maddocks, 15 August 1963, CO1036/1067, no. 93.
- 54 J. E. Marnham to Sir D. Jakeway, 13 April 1964, CO1036/1067, no. 15.
- 55 See Lal, Brij V. 1997a, *A Vision for Change: A. D. Patel and the Politics of Fiji*, National Centre for Development Studies, The Australian National University, Canberra, n. 4.
- 56 I am grateful to Rod Alley for background information on Patel's difficulties with his own community over his role as member for social services.
- 57 Macdonald to Greenwood, 6 August 1965, CO1036/1216, no. 83.
- 58 Letter from A. D. Patel to Sir D. Jakeway, 30 April 1965, CO1036/1263, no. 24.

- ⁵⁹ Inward telegram from Sir D. Jakeway to Trafford Smith, 27 April 1965, CO1036/1263, no. 20.
- ⁶⁰ Letter from Sir D. Jakeway to Mr Patel and Mr Madhavan, 27 April 1965, CO1036/1263, no. 24.
- ⁶¹ Letter from A. D. Patel to Sir D. Jakeway, 30 April 1965, CO1036/1263, no. 24.
- ⁶² Letter from Sir D. Jakeway to A. D. Patel, 6 May 1965, CO1036/1263, no. 26.
- ⁶³ From Trafford Smith to Sir D. Jakeway, 17 May 1965, CO1036/1263, no. 26.
- ⁶⁴ Fiji Intelligence Report, September 1965, CO1036/1216, E/91, in which Koya is reported to have attacked Jakeway.
- ⁶⁵ Jakeway's statement about 'an immigrant community' is in the CO brief for Eireen White's visit to Fiji, April 1965, in Annex D, CO1036/1551.