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An Executive Summary of the thesis:

Previous scholars addressed the problem of acculturation in the development of the Tongan Wesleyan Church in Tonga from their own perspective, (conflict, missiological, and power politics approaches) using their own lens to study the problem. This work attempts, from a cultural logic viewpoint to offer an in-depth study of the influence of the two concepts of Fakaongo and Tau’ataina, the tenets of traditional Tongan religion in the narrow context of the development of European civilization and religion, which led to the establishment of the Tongan religious identities known (in this work) as Kau Fakaongo and Kau Tau’ataina and, which in the wider context reflective of the Ha’a Tu’i Kanokupolu regime and Kainga confederations. A functional approach¹ is used to substantiate the functions played by Fakaongo and Tau’ataina in pre-contact history and the missionary period up to the year 1890, when they became institutionalized as respective identities of Kau Fakaongo and Kau Tau’ataina. It particularly depicts how the tenets of Fakaongo and Tau’ataina navigated all spheres; Tu’i, bou’eiki, and kakai, the church leaders, missionaries, resulting in their manifestations as Tongan Wesleyan religious identities. Evidence is drawn from Talatukufakaholo Tongan orality, as literature and history source documented by Europeans. Tales in qualitative oral narratives, primary materials and documented oral sources from family papers and genealogies; material cultures, monuments, landscapes and handicrafts, hold tales of past events in Tonga as well as the missionaries’ records, British subjects’ official correspondences and Government papers in libraries, archives in Tonga, New Zealand, Australia and Hawaii.

This Talatukufakaholo story aspires to enlighten and even present the problem of “acculturation” (which Rutherford, Connan, and Niumeitolu claimed) and in a more comprehensible version from the logic of culture. It challenges Tongan Wesleyans themselves in a positive sense; that their divisive religious identities of Fakaongo and Tau’ataina could be reviewed in the light of Christ’s loyalty to God the Father from his birth to his death on the Cross, as narrated in the Bible. The ensuing confusion between the Tongan Wesleyans’ Fakaongo loyalties to Tu’i, chiefs, Church leaders and their loyalties to God to obtain spiritual Tau’ataina liberty was truly enhanced by European civilization and Methodists’ doctrine let alone the hardships they faced. The interplay between these parties had finally formulated the Tongan Wesleyan religious identity of Fakaongo and Tau’ataina. Hence, the relevance of this study is that it offers a functional insider view of the problem of acculturation in Tongan context.

¹. Beside the Conflicting (Marxist dialectic) and Individualistic approaches (experiential and behaviouristic based), Functional approach is used to study the functions of the two outstanding tenets of Tongan traditional culture and their impacts on the institution of the Kau Fakaongo and Tau’ataina as Tongan Wesleyan religious identities in 1885.
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Introduction

Having been born to a Wesleyan Methodist family of the two brother ministers; Sione Latu I (Motu’a) and Sione Latu II, (Kauvaka) I always heard the story of the church division talked about in our *fale ‘o kainga* [house of the family]. Then in 1984, I was formally advised,\(^2\) that when the Wesleyan mission divided between Moulton and Tupou I and Baker in 1885, the elder minister (S. Latu I) took sides with *Kau Fakaongo* Moulton group and the younger brother (S.Latu II) took sides with the *Kau Tau’ataina* Free Church group. After years of studying about the history the Tongan Wesleyans, I came to learn that *Fakaongo* and *Tau’ataina* had been stigmatized as Tongan Wesleyans identity, but few works had been done to present an in-depth study of their causes and functions from an insider’s viewpoint. While the few works on Tongan Wesleyans divisions addressed the problem from their own perspective; missionary; politics; conflict, and the like, this thesis takes a functional approach.

It is the intention of this thesis to study how the Tongan traditional religion influenced the institution of the Tongan religious identities of *Fakaongo* and *Tau’ataina* which had significantly emerged as two different groups in 1885. It asserts that *Fakaongo* and *Tau’ataina* are two significant tenets of traditional Tongan religion and their impacts had been at large, the cause of what is claimed (Rutherford, Connan and Niumeitolu) as the problem of acculturation. In pursuing this study; it is hoped it will contribute to a better understanding of the problem of “acculturation” and present the Tongan Wesleyan divisive identities of *Fakaongo* and *Tau’ataina*.\(^3\)

---
\(^2\) Sione ‘Amanaki Havea, personal communication dated Nuku’alofa, 1\(^{st}\) April, 1994.
\(^3\) When the Tongan Wesleyans migrated overseas (USA, Australia and NZ), they instituted their congregations under the name Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga. After some years of fellowships, personal differences occurred and their divisions continued into further different groups. In New Zealand, from 1970 to 2010, there had been 12 different groups of Tongan Wesleyan churches. Unlike the *Kau Tau’ataina*, they had maintained (in New Zealand and in other countries) as one church under the name Free Church of Tonga. The author raised this problem of the *Kau Fakaongo* divisions in comparison to the *Kau Tau’ataina* church at the *Talanoa* Conference at University of Auckland, 2009, and the Theological *Talanoa* seminar at St. John’s Trinity in 2010.
The Tongan ancient society was a divisive confederation of *nonofo ‘a kainga* headed by a *Tu’i* who was believed to be god in place. In any attempt to study of social (religious) identity, there is a tendency that theories, practices and worldviews are dealt with in a deeper level. The tradition in theory and in practice divides the Tongan *Kainga* [an equivalent of tribal confederations] into three main *Ha’a* [familial dynastic lineages headed by Tuí] divisions of kingships; *Ha’a Tu’i Tonga* [Tu’i Tonga dynasty]; *Ha’a Tu’i Takalaua* [Takalaua dynasty] and *Ha’a Tu’i Kanokupolu* [Kanokupolu dynasty]; or that which the well known Pacific historian I.C. Campbell called “the tripartite kingships”.4 Campbell argued the formation of the tripartite kingships was a “device to legitimise a division of power which originated in rivalry and conflict”.

This thesis argues that originating from a theory of *fie nofo lagi* – [aspiration to dwell with the gods in the sky] it was the unified confederating of Tu’i [kingships]. The theory originated in practice when a Tongan lady (*Ilaheva Va’epopua*) cohabited with a god Tangaloa who was believed to have come from the sky. This theory was further consolidated by successive amalgamation of lineages through inter-marriages between chiefly lineages. This social incorporation may be described as “Unity in Diversity”; a blending of diverse chiefly blood lines. The fusion originated from the known union of the Lady *Ilaheva Vaépopua* and god Tangaloa ‘Eitumatupu’a, which gave rise to the first Tu’i Tonga, ‘Aho’eitu; the incarnated person of sky-related god. In the course of time later migrants to Tonga worshipped this sky-related god person of ‘Aho’eitu and socially attempted to ensnare the enjoined *Toto’i ‘eiki* [godly blood and attributes] of ‘Aho’eitu. This thesis claims this *Tala* story as essentially the Tongan world view. The essence of the Tongan *kainga* society is then embraced from its known history. The union of divisive units under the control of one person whose words, actions and wishes comprised the Law and *fakaongo*, [loyalty] to Tu’i and his words were the customary

---

practices of the society. Thus ‘Aho’eitu was the Tapu person in place, united all as one kainga people. The practices of the inter-marriages were further consolidated by way of feongoi’aki fakatoto [sensed blood relations and connections] and close relations of members of kainga, interwoven into what was known as Fale ó Kainga [the whole Tongan society]. The point at issue is that the received theory of Fakaongo was practiced by human persons, through sensing and accommodating another person (believed to be a Tapu god) to achieve their Tau’ataina [status of liberty], on the land of Tonga. In hindsight, this practice was embraced as the Tapu ethical relationships and world view which had significantly controlled the attitude and behaviour of the Tongan people for centuries.

Royal consanguinity to chiefly lineage of Fiji gave social significance to another dynastic lineage of Takalaua and to the Samoan chiefly lineage from Upolu gave rise to the Kanokupolu lineage. Thus, successive amalgamations of lineages by way of royal consanguinity (inter-marriages of Tu’i and princess of the other two lineages) was the normal practice by which the principal wife was known as Ma’itaki. It may be summed up in a single statement of fie nofo langi [aspiring to reside with a god in the spiritual abode or to ensnare its attributes]. As already stated, this theory had controlled the mental habit and practices of the Tongans for centuries, and thereby the fakakainga approach emanated from it. This thesis claims that belief in ‘Aho’eitu as the incarnated god and Tongan worldview was the ultimate basis of the so-called problem of “acculturation”.

This Tongan theory of fie nofo langi - aspiring to be god and lived in god’s dwelling place had since been embraced in Tongan kainga society from its known history. The consecutive practices were inspired by it; the aspiration to dwell in the heaven was always respected. ‘Aho’eitu and his successors as the apex of Tongan hegemony and the other two lineages provided support to the hierarchy. Kainga the union of divisive units under the control of one person whose words, action and
wish comprised the Law and *fakaongo* unite them all as *nonofo ‘a kainga* communally blood related people. The practices of the royal consanguinity among chiefly persons and inter-marriages among commoners were further consolidated by way of *feongo'i’aki fakatoto* [resounded of blood relations and connections] and close relations of members of *kainga*, interwoven into what was known as *Fale ó Kainga* [the whole Tongan society]. The point at issue is that the received theory of *Fakaongo* was practiced by human persons sensing and accommodated another person (believed to be godly related). To achieve such a social goal in life was to achieve their *Tau’ataina* [social status of liberty] on the land of Tonga. In due course of time the same theory and practice was embraced at the time of missionaries’ arrival; not to make babies but to employ the missionaries for a Tongan hegemonic purposes and not to allow a foreign power to take control. This theory and practice significantly carried on to later centuries, even to the arrival of the missionaries to form the churches in nineteenth and twentieth century.

When the Wesleyan missionaries came with European civilization and religion they found it hard to change this theory and practice. It turns out that the Tongan worldview was never changed. This point is what I call the “problem of acculturation.” Unless this Tongan worldview is changed, the asserted problem could not be solved. This work is an attempt to make this worldview understandable and meaningful as they are key factors of this Tongan traditional religo-cultural polity and key elements of ‘acculturation,’ which is the essential build-up of Tongan identity.

The four chapters to follow are an attempt to contribute to better understanding of the problem of “acculturation,” in the context of Tongan society. From a historical view point it presents the ways in which the theory and practices of the Tongan concepts of people *Fakaongo* [sensing god and its attributes] of the *Tu’i*, as their
leader, in pre-contact Tongan society. The purpose of this practice was to achieve their *Tau'ataina* [status of social liberty]. All people who had lived under the rule of the Tuí Tonga from 10th to 18th centuries or under the rule of the Tuí Kanokupolu in the nineteenth century *kainga* then possessed the ultimate task of sensing and acquiring the godly attributes of another lineage to consolidate one’s status (mana) in the social hierarchy. The way by which one sought such inter-relationships was marriage and inter-marriage among lineages. Such was the actual way of building up of *Haá* kingship lineages. The potential spouse *Fakaongo* [sounded or sensed] the presence of the godly attributes in the person of the other lineage (a princess or prince of usually higher status/blood line) before the marriage was to take place. The same theory, practice and worldview aggravated the conversion task of the Wesleyan missionaries; which most historians and missiologists asserted as “acculturation”.

Chapter 1 surveys and re-views the literatures which have dealt with the topic of *Fakaongo* and *Tan'ataina* in the context of the history of Tonga. It highlights two works that have studied the kau *Fakaongo* and not the *Kau Tan'ataina*, and suggests that the views about it are biased. Most literature presented the history of Tonga from a biassed position; so that the *Kau Fakaongo* are almost always defended. This thesis argues that the *Kau Fakaongo* and *Kau Tan'ataina* were in the same dire circumstances. Other literature on the history of Tonga is also reviewed for they provide background to a better understanding of the problem of acculturation.

Chapter 2, argues that the statement *Ko e 'Otua mo Tonga ko hoku Tofi'a* enjoined a pre-text towards an independent church and state. The statement was Tupou I’s emblem and it featured a double dynamic identity of loyalty to God and Tonga was manifested in the official seal of Tonga. This double identity was also a pretext for the divisions of both the missionaries and the people into two different groups which turn out in 1885 as the *Fakaongo* and *Tan'ataina* Church. Already, the
missionaries had introduced the tripartite Westminster type government of Privy Council; Judiciary and Legislative. The inauguration of the Constitution in 1875 was another landmark that enhanced the formation of Tongan modern government and sovereignty. Compositions on the centenary of the Tongan Constitution in 1975 showed continued appreciation of such a movement. When Tonga received her national sovereignty as an independent Christian kingdom among other nations of Oceania, her people were proud.

Chapter 3 - narrates the establishment of the Free Church in Lifuka Ha’apai by Baker and King Tupou 1 in Vava’u to who officiated over the move. King Tupou 1 also won J.B. Watkin’s loyalty as the first President of the Free Church. Following the event, the Wesleyan converts began to take side with either one of the two leaders; Baker and Moulton. The majority of the northern islands turned to the Free Church. Persecutions were enforced by Baker and his officials using the Name of King Tupou 1 to demand loyalty from the converts. Legalization was used to summon the Wesleyans to join the Free Church movement. Some Wesleyans voluntarily exiled themselves to uninhabited islands of Tofua, Kao, and Tonumea. Some brutal presecutions were undertaken by Baker’s regime. The institution of the Free Church caused a wider ridge in the two Wesleyan leader’s relationship.

Chapter 4 offers facts from primar sources about the attempted assassination of Premier Baker and the parties involved in the event. It is clear that the conspiracy to end Baker’s life involved the chiefs of Mu’a (Mu’a Parliament), the Europeans residents in Tonga at the time; Moulton and Tupou College officials and runaway bushrangers. The assassins were convicted and sentenced to the death penalty together with some Wesleyan ministers. His Majesty decided that only the chief conspirator and leader of Mu’a Parliament ‘Usaia Topui, together with five men who were involved in the actual shooting event of 13th January, 1887 were to be
executed at Malinoa island. The decision caused the loyalists of Moulton to go into voluntary exile on the uninhabited island of Ata. King Tupou 1 ordered the captain of the vessel Malokula to sail directly to Suva, Fiji. The so-called exiles lived in Fiji for three years. This movement to free themselves from Tonga identified them as Kau Fakaongo. On their return, their enemy Baker had already been deported from Tonga.

A Conclusion with suggestion is posted to round off this thesis. It is hoped that his thesis will offer a better understanding of the problem of “acculturation” a better understanding of the Tongan Wesleyans religious identities of Fakaongo and Tau’ataina.
CHAPTER 1: A review of the available Literature

The Problem of Acculturation:
John M. Connan studied one incident of the Tongan Wesleyan Divisions and argued that the “history of conflicts: there have been too many.” His argument is based upon “the struggles for power among the missionaries” and “between Tupou I and the missionaries” and much later “Queen Salote and Watkin” and in his conclusion stated “while the particular crises of 1977-82 are attributable in large part” to the then president, “they may be explained in terms of Tongan church history, the Tongan traditional style of leadership” and code of ethic for the president of the church to follow, which in all reflected “an originally inadequate missiology.”

Noel Rutherford in his book, Shirley Baker and the King of Tonga (1996) aimed at making some “small contribution to the understanding of the problems which faced Tonga in the later nineteenth century, and beyond that of the more general problem of acculturation.”

In the preface of another work Friendly Islands: A History of Tonga Rutherford stated,

Tonga adopted many western ways but somehow they always seemed to finish up being more Tongan than western. To satisfy western notions, for instance, Tonga had cabinet ministers, but their authority often came less from their new titles than from the fact that their ancestors in direct line had been exercising that sort of power for perhaps a thousand years. Similarly, Christian doctrines and denominational differences were tailored

---

to meet Tongan needs, often to the despair of the missionary mentors.\textsuperscript{7}

Taliai Niumeitolu’s doctoral research \textit{The State and the Church, the State of the Church in Tonga}, (2007)\textsuperscript{8} assessed the “place of Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga (FWC) in the faith life of the Tongan people” and based his argument on Gittins’ warning that “what Christians sometimes celebrate as Christianity making headway in the local “culture,” is not inculturation but mere acculturation, which may include the state using the acculturated church to support the status quo.” Niumeitolu concluded that “the FWC, reputed to be a faithful supporter of the status quo, must also grapple with the reality that all human society … [It] has the potential to be organized around the unequal value, unequal sanctity, unequal dignity and unequal human rights of its members,” and further challenged the FWC commitments to be extended to those on the margins.

Rutherford presents his view of the problem of acculturation in Tonga by studying Shirley Baker’s relationships with the ageing monarch King Taufa’ahau, downplaying Basil Thomson’s claim of Baker as a controversial figure. This is only one side of the problem. Niumeitolu from a ‘faith life’ view point explored the divisive Wesleyan development to only report the state of the church in Tonga; the aim of this thesis is to give a more understandable explanation of the problem of acculturation in Tonga from a cultural traditional view point. Since acculturation itself essentially embraces problems in cultural terms, I believe that this study must be addressed from a traditional cultural viewpoint and trace its perpetuation over a long period of time to detect the facts of its authentic continuity which finally realize its identities in the context of the European civilization and religion encounter with the Tongan culture in the nineteenth century Tongan society.

\textsuperscript{7} Noel Rutherford, (ed.) \textit{Friendly Islands: A History of Tonga}, (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1977), ix-x.
This chapter aims to review available literature that addressed the theme of this thesis: *Faka ngo* and *Tau’ataina* in the context of the religious and political development of Tonga from its known past to the year 1890. Of all the island nations of Oceania, Tonga arguably has more numerous writings on its social, cultural, anthropological, political and church history than any other.\(^9\) Despite the vast literature provided by various scholars on the history of Tonga, very little has specifically made an in-depth study of the discordant Tongan Wesleyan situation from a local perspective, and only two works directly addressed the theme of the *Kau Faka ngo* and almost next to none on *Kau Tau’ataina*. Nevertheless, there are numerous works relative to them; and they may provide a background to the topics; but no specific work has captured both themes in one work from an insider’s point of view. Works provided had only been either from an outsider’s perspective or from an insiders’ but with a biased view. Three main reasons may be tendered in explanation: i). The topics of *Kau Faka ngo* and *Tau’ataina* are delicate issues and controversial events for discussion in the Society of Tonga today. They contain unspeakable pages of persecutions and mal-treatments of the Tongans grandparents of all classes (*Tu’i, Hou’eiki & kakai*) in Tonga’s past. Study of the theme will open up discussions which will affect the harmony of their relationships and may create wider divisions. ii). With due respect, the traditions of the *Siasi ‘o Tonga Tau’ataina* [Free Church of Tonga] do not allow their history to be written and studied as an academic study, for they do not allow perusal of their records for any academic research. iii). Shirley Waldemar Baker’s papers only became readily available to the public in 2003; one hundred years after his death in 1903. Thus, the information about the *Kau Faka ngo* and *Tau’ataina* either existed in primary sources in archives and libraries overseas, away from Tonga; or were available in

---

\(^9\) These had been major works written by interested outside historians who were either missionaries of some sort or had engaged in some kind of a mission in Tonga. The bulk of the literatures had been the outcome of biennial meetings of and deliberations of the Tonga History association, initiated by the late professors of Tonga, the Late Rev’d. Professor Sione Latufe’, the late Professor Futa Helu, and Dr. Elizabeth Wood-Ellem. The name of this association had been lately changed to Tonga Research Association.
archives in Tonga and with families concerned. But, as already admitted, it is
alleged that to open this information up for discussion may arouse wider familial,
denominational, and other supporter’s differences today.

The Oral and Documentation:
Tongan source of knowledge and history was Talatukufak abol o and its way of
recording was fanongonongo tokoto orality, like any other island in Oceania. Moreover,
its political monarchical development was unique; it is the only remaining kingdom
in Oceania. Its religious divisive development was also unique.

Politically, Tonga had been led by its Tuʻi [tri-partite kingships] and supported by
its kainga confederations for many centuries. Her law of conduct was mostly
dictated by the Tuʻi himself, and familial inter-relationships had kept the kainga
confederations intact in peace and harmony. Essentially its law demanded Fakaongo
[sensed the truth or loyalty to] to achieve the state of Tauʻataina [state of liberty].
When the outside world made its first contact, Tonga was ruled by the Tuʻi
Kanokupolu kingship regime. This regime unified and led the people to accept
Christianity and British law and an ordered system of government, culminating in
the first Tupou’ inauguration of the Tonga Constitution in 1875. Thus the
Tongans’ Fakaongo was transformed. His acceptance of Christianity and Wesleyan
theology and system of polity paved the way for the mass of the population to
follow, leaving a minor portion of the population to Catholic and other
denominations. Until the 1880s King Tupou 1 saw it was beneficial for his
sovereign independent nation to begin an independent Wesleyan church. The
perpetual personal differences between the two chieftain missionaries developed
into wider divisions of the Wesleyan population which saw the Premier politician
Shirley Waldemar Baker and his loyalists as Kau Tauʻataina, and the missionary
educationalist James Egan Moulton and his followers as Kau Fakaongo. The
majority of the population showed allegiance to King Tupou 1 and joined the Free
Church movement and identified themselves as *Kau Tau’ataina*. The minority became loyal to Moulton and followed the Wesleyan Church administered by the Australia Conference, and identified themselves as *Kau Fakaongo*. The man in charge was His Majesty King Tupou 1, the then Tu’i of Tonga, and the builder of modern Tonga, who officially declared the Free Church as the State Church in 1885.

It is in the theme of the *Kau Fakaongo* and their relationships to *Kau Tau’ataina* which emanated from the traditional culture of Tonga, aggravated by personal differences of the two most prominent leaders of Wesleyan mission in Tonga - Baker and Moulton - over the most tumultuous period of the history of Tonga that forms the subject of this work. During their lifetime, they were both controversial figures, but after their death, were analysed separately by historians. The historians who were interested in Baker’s achievements for Tonga presented him together with the support he rendered to his Majesty King Tupou 1. Those historians interested in Moulton presented him together with his educational achievements for the island nation. Unfortunately, no works had presented them and their contributions together with the inter-relationships of their followers (loyalists) who had become the main problems of church life and the society. Especial problems were the two churches of *Kau Uesiliana* [Moultonians] and *Kau Tau’ataina* [Bakerians] and the two arch-rivals - ex-students of the two schools *Tupou College* and *Tonga College* which the rival missionaries erected for Tonga.

**The Available Literature on this theme:**

Moulton’s successor as Tupou College principal, Siupeli Taliai, in his article *Kau Fakaongo* has opened up a discussion of a most controversial term in Tongan society.\(^{10}\) Taliai had defined the term *Fakaongo* as a *hingoa pauú* (nickname), in the

---

\(^{10}\) The term *Fakaongo* is one of the debatable terms in Tongan society today. It remains a sensitive issue with Tongan families whose members were involved in this tumultuous period in Tonga. The late Sione ‘Amanaki
context of the division of the people of Tonga between the “King’s new Free Church of Tonga” (Siasi Tanátaina ó Tongá), and the Tonga District (colloquially known as Kau Fakaongo), who remained as loyalists under the administration of the Australia Methodist Conference. Taliai’s treatment of the Kau Fakaongo is no more than a report of the event illustrated by testimonies of the Kau Fakaongo from primary sources. He took the literal sense of the term, that it was a derogatory term for ‘those who chose to be slaves to the Foreigners and not the King’.

This thesis views Taliai’s work as no more than a biased report that is reinforced by narration of the “formal investigations” by Sir Charles Mitchell, the British High Commissioner to the Western Pacific, which accounts for complaints by Moulton for the treatment of Moulton loyalists. Taliai presented the complaint laid by Moulton and testimony of 13 Kau Fakaongo Tongans of the pain and agony faced by Moulton loyalists during this tumultuous situation. In his conclusion he quoted Clauses 1, & 5, of the 1875 Tonga Constitution and items 37 and 64 of the solemn oath sworn by His Majesty and Premier and members of Privy Council to observe the Tonga Constitution. Taliai concluded by stating, ‘The persecution of the Wesleyans (Kau Fakaongo) by the Government of Tonga has been the saddest open violation of human rights in Christian modern Tonga. The Constitution was trampled underfoot and the oaths that were made under the Almighty God were totally ignored.’

In footnote 1, it is stated that Taliai, “descended from Fakaongo Havea, for example, always referred with emotion in his sermons to his father being punished 75 times during Baker’s regime, as a penalty for not turning to the King’s church. Rev. Tevita Finau of Tupou College was sentenced to imprisonment for life after the court sentence announced regarding conspiracy in the attempted assassination of Baker, and whose great grandson Tevita Finau is now working as a probationary minister with New Zealand Methodists. Nasili Vakáúta who is tutoring the Hebrew Language at UOA, Theology Department, is also the great-great-grandson of the Rev. Jabez Bunting Watkin, the first president of the Tau’ataina—Free Church. There is also The Rev. Setaita Veikune; the great-great-grand-daughter of the late Pauliasi Taumoepeau, who was among the Matimatika and Helohelo students of Moulton’s Tupou College and was selected among others as the first Head Tutor of Baker’s and Tupou I’s Tonga College at Kolisi Pule’ang in Nuku’alofa in 1882. I, myself, am a great-grandson of two brother ministers of the Tonga District under the Australia Conference when, in 1885, the elder minister John Latu I advised the younger minister John Latu II to join the Tau’ataina-Tupou I church, while he himself continued as a Fakaongo. I beg that you allow me to open up these untouchable, unspeakable pages of the history of our forefathers and draw some issues for our Talanoa today...
on both sides of his family” and as a student of Tupou College, educated in Moulton’s educational philosophy would tend to distort his views. Secondly, the testimonies presented in his work included that of his grandfather Henele Taliai, who was banished by Baker’s regime during the persecution. It is truly a one-sided presentation. Though his argument is well supported by facts of history, and his narration testimonies of the Kau Fakaongo presents a kind of confessional history, Tau’ataina as the other side of the coin needed to be also revealed.

The genealogist and historian Gareth Grainger, in his *The Fakaongo Exiles from Tonga to Fiji 1887-90*, presented his point of view of the exiling of Kau Fakaongo. He admitted that ‘he has approached this subject with some real trepidation because [he] realize[s] that after 115 years the events of 1885-90 are still sensitive issues in Tonga’.

Grainger, as the husband of a Tongan lady descended from the Kau Fakaongo, surely was influenced by her to present the event from the exiles’ point of view. He defined the term Fakaongo as, “one of abuse applied to Tongan Wesleyans from 1885”, and it meant, ” the subject ones: those who wait for instructions from overseas”. Moreover, he clearly admits, “the name [Fakaongo] had been worn with some pride as a badge of distinction by the descendents of those people”. The term was also worn by those palangi missionaries and Tongans who did not agree to join the newly-established Free Church of 1885. The strength of Grainger’s work relied on the authoritative sources he used. He had drawn facts of the past from primary reports; Sir Charles Mitchell's report of the events in 1887; the inquiry held by Sir John Thurston in 1890; and the record of Rev. George Brown who was General Secretary for Missions and a missionary
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15 . Ibid. 162.
for a total of 47 working years;\textsuperscript{16} the record of J. Fekau ʻOfahemoʻoni, “A Bad Time in Tonga,” translated by Sioana Faupula, made available by the Pacific Manuscript Bureau, ANU, Canberra; and from the invaluable research by the missionary and educator who worked in Tonga in mid-twentieth century,\textsuperscript{17} Almost all of these sources supported Moulton and not Baker and the Free Church movement. For Baker’s side however, Grainger cited Noel Rutherford, who addressed the partnership of Shirley Waldemar Baker and the ageing King Tupou 1 to form Tonga as a sovereign nation and Siasi Tau‘ataina. But Rutherford’s work aimed to provide evidence to counter the attack by Basil Thomson on Baker (see below) and not on the relationship of the Kau Fakaongo and Kau Tau‘ataina. The facts of history Grainger selected from above sources had been supportive of the Kau Fakaongo and the exile and not the Kau Tau‘ataina. Grainger concluded his work by listing the names of the 90 Kau Fakaongo who went as exiles to Fiji,\textsuperscript{18} which also compounded Fakaongo fundamentalism.

This thesis will analysis the ill-will and the tensions between the Kau Fakaongo and the Kau Tau‘ataina during this scrutinized period of tumultuous Tongan history. It will also employ the definitions given by Grainger in regard to given definitions of the term, Kau Fakaongo.\textsuperscript{19}

Noel Rutherford’s Shirley Baker and the King of Tonga\textsuperscript{20} offers a well-researched account of the attack against Baker made by Basil Thomson in his The Diversions of a Prime Minister. Thomson portrayed Baker as “the ignorant, venal, tyrannical and

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{18} Gareth Grainger, “The Fakaongo Exiles from Tonga to Fiji 1887-90”, in Elizabeth Wood-Ellem, (ed.) Tonga and the Tongans and Identity, (Victoria: Elizabeth Wood-Ellem on behalf of the Tonga Research Association, 2007), 161-177.
  \item \textsuperscript{19} Ibid. 162.
  \item \textsuperscript{20} Noel Rutherford, Shirley Baker and the King of Tonga,(Noel Rutherford and Pacific Press, 1996).
\end{itemize}
hypocritical parson who manipulated Tongan politics for his own aggrandisement.”

Rutherford argued against Thomson’s work as being a “biased witness,” and concluded by stressing Baker’s achievement: “Baker wrought a revolution of tremendous significance in Tonga.” Though Rutherford’s emphasis is on Baker’s achievement, it provided background for the period under study and the Tau’ataina movement.

The mid-twentieth century missionary and educator to the Free Wesleyan Church school in Tonga from the Methodist Church of Australia, Rev. Harold Geoffrey Cummins, in his study, “Missionary Chieftain: James Egan Moulton and Tongan Society,” offered a well-researched masterpiece of Moulton’s life as the chief missionary to Tonga. In his opening chapter Cummins drew a conclusion from Moulton’s journal when he stated, “In a sense he had written his life’s agenda during the voyage and in the journal - the commitment to mission, the appeal of music and poetry, the love of commanding heights, storms, and ‘old England’, the desire for command and respect, the envy of authority, the battle with illness, and struggles, as his metaphor for life.” Cummins cited the poem written by Rev. E.E.V. Crosby, a colleague of Moulton, as the conclusion. It read, “He does well, who does his best; is he weary, let him rest.” His study presents Moulton as a scholar, a theologian, an educator, a composer, a linguistic, and lover and pursuer of truth. Both Rutherford’s and Cummins’ works had their respective line of arguments and emphasis, which dictated their conclusion, however, their contribution had always been to support one side of the coin and not both.
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21. Ibid. 3.  
22. Ibid. 228.  
24. Ibid. 29.  
25. Ibid. 332.
Taliai Niumeitolu’s doctoral research *The State and the Church, the State of the Church in Tonga*, (2007) assessed the “place of Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga (FWC) in the faith life of the Tongan people” and based his argument on Gittins’ warning that “what Christians sometimes celebrate as Christianity making headway in the local ‘culture’ is not inculturation but mere acculturation, which may include the state using the acculturated church to support the status quo.” Niumeitolu concluded that “the FWC, reputed to be a faithful supporter of the status quo, must also grapple with the reality that all human society … has the potential to be organized around the unequal value, unequal sanctity, unequal dignity and unequal human rights of its members,” and further challenge the FWC commitments to be extended “to those on the margins.”

The works by Connan, Taliai, Grainger, Rutherford, Cummins, and Niumeitolu, are invaluable assets and have tackled the problem in part. It therefore seems vital to investigate further the “problem of acculturation” argued by Niumeitolu in the development of the Wesleyan Church in Tonga. This proposed thesis, on another level of interpretation of facts, attempts to map out the development of the two concepts of *Fakaongo* and *Tau’ataina*. It is believed they had dominated and very much regulated the mindset and world views of the Tongan people from its known history to the present and had become the Tongan Wesleyan religious identities. It is an aspect which was not dealt with to a great extent in any scholar’s works.

**The Theme in Context:**

The purview of the concept of *Fakaongo*, and *Tau’ataina* are rooted in Tongan culture. *Fakaongo* is a loaded term and in the Tongan Language, the Tongan Dictionary offers four distinct definitions for the term, *Fakaongo*, (i) “to defer (to, *ki*), be differential, show deference; to accept authority of (*ki*), to be subject or
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submissive to.” (ii) “to report or carry or convey news or order” from one position to another. (iii) “to keep one’s ears open (on the alert) to or for something.” (iv) “to sound” (a person or his chest, etc., as a doctor does). Of these four dictionary definitions of the concept Fakaongo: the first three are political and administrative, which somewhat demand duties in loyalty be paid by subjected ones to authority. The last definition offers a physical sense and also a social level as a religious sound (sense), and deeper in sensing the noise, echo, resonance or clatter within another being. Further, it is sensing one’s power and mana, and even to sensing god’s presence or attributes in another person, another object or things in life. In all, the four definitions rendered for Fakaongo, if placed alongside one another, may connote physical duties paid by subjects to authority and in return, the loyalists sensed the power of the authority (which may in other culture called mana) for a purpose in life.

For the term Tau’ataina, the Tongan Dictionary offers a single definition, “to be at liberty, free (not imprisoned, enslaved or in subjection), emancipated or independent.” Thus, it is clear that this single definition essentially prescribed an independent status achieved. By placing both concepts of Fakaongo and Tau’ataina alongside one another, in the hierarchy of the Tongan language it can be seen that Fakaongo is a pretext of the Tau’ataina. We may conclude that for one to truly observe Fakaongo to its fullest; the independent status of being Tau’ataina is the end result.

This thesis will employ the above definitions to map out how they have played significant roles in Tongan religious development, and will review the definitions suggested by Taliai, and Grainger offered above, to provide an in-depth study of the Kau Fakaongo and the Tauátaina from primary sources and from a local
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28 Grainger, with a genealogical interest, employed the Biblical term “exile,” and probably its definition, to represent the tortured situation inflicted by Baker, but the Moulton loyalists’ choice to escape from Tonga to Ata island was voluntary and it was King Tupou 1 himself who directed the vessel to Fiji and not Ata island.
perspective. This thesis argues that Fakaongo refers to the Tongan way of sensing god in their Tu’i, ‘eiki, and European leaders and their civilisation and religion, in order to afford Tau’ataina status of liberty and living as free people, the point which Taliai quoted from the Tonga Constitution to judge the way the Kau Fakaongo were being treated.\(^29\) This work takes the two concepts of Fakaongo and Tau’ataina as the Tongan world view; where their theories and practices of life emanate and are very much centred.

Perhaps it is vital at this point to state that this thesis does not wish to emphasise that Tonga is different from other societies in any way. Nevertheless, it seeks to identify how Europeans as ‘Outlanders’ and Tongans as ‘Inlanders’ (Borofsky’s term) interacted as they met in the Talatukufakaholo context of the logic of culture (cultural logic). Fakaongo and Tau’ataina had dictated, and are still known to control the Tongan thinking (psychology) and rationality (philosophy), in matters of religion. In doing so, this thesis may widen the knowledge of the Tongans themselves and their divisive backgrounds of nonofo ‘a Kainga which may in a way be perpetuated in their church formation. It is hoped it will provide pathways to tackle the problem of acculturation, which Rutherford and Niumeitolu suggested in their respective studies.\(^30\) An appreciation of the Tongan culture and the nature of its original perceptions at the time of interaction with the European culture is a significant basis for the discussion of Fakaongo and Tau’ataina in the divisive history

\(^{29}\) Tau’ataina is the motif of Tonga Constitution, item 1, (Declaration of Rights), reads, “Seeing it appears to be the Will of God for man to be free, as He has made of one blood all nations of men, therefore shall all people of Tonga be forever free, and all people who reside or may reside in this kingdom. And the lives and bodies and time of all people shall be free to possess and acquire property, all doing as they like with the fruit of their hands, and using their own property as they may seem fit.” See Part 1 Declaration of Rights, Constitution of Tonga, 1875, Appendix A, in Sione Latukefu, *The Tongan Constitution: A Brief History to Celebrate its Centenary*, (Nuku’alofa: Tonga Traditions Committee Publication, 1975), 90-116; See also Appendix D, in Sione Latukefu, *Church and State in Tonga: The Wesleyan Methodist Missionaries and Political Development, 1822-1875*, (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1974), 252-284.

of Tongan nofo ‘a kainga and the discordant Tongan Wesleyan Church developments.\textsuperscript{31}

It should be clearly stated at the outset that Fakaongo, from this local perspective, is the “sensing of the presence of god in a person, a leader, an object, a material, a place, and a monument, or a message.” One group of kainga will sense the presence of god in a person, and will relate to such a person in a social kainga way. While this is so; another group of kainga will sense god in a different leader. This way of sensing god may be equivalent to what is referred to in Maori culture by Allan K. Davidson in his Aotearoa New Zealand: Defining Moments in the Gospel-Culture Encounter, as the ‘Mana’ – “the power and prestige associated with a person that was both given and gained.”\textsuperscript{32} The way of sensing god could only be aggravated when other means were involved like personal differences, culture, politics, theology or doctrinal investments, although the consolidation and the hybridized build-up of Fakaongo and Tau’átaina would always be enforced.

It is therefore significant to study how these ways of Fakaongo, [sensing god] and Tau’átaina [freedom status achieved by Fakaongo] drove the island people of Tonga to respond in the course of the ‘outlanders’ and “inlanders” interactions upon Tongan shores. It will show how Tongans accommodated foreign realities by way of sensing god, in various circumstances and situations.

The Context and View Point:

\textsuperscript{31} This thesis understands that since the Methodist mission was established in Tonga in the early nineteenth century, there had been five different groups of Wesleyan churches. This work does not wish to analyse the whole development of the five different Wesleyan churches. Rather, it seeks to map out how the Tongan concept of Fakaongo and Tau’átaina had been interwoven into the system, in the course of the encounter between the Tongan traditional cultural context and the European civilization and religion prior to the actual formulations of the later churches of Wesleyans in Tonga in the early twentieth century. See Taliai Niumeitolu, “The State and the Church, the State of the Church in Tonga,” PhD Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2007.

The immediate context to which this thesis is addressed is the encounter between the outlanders and the inlanders. Robert Borofsky in his “An Invitation to remake History” in Remembrance of Pacific Pasts, addressed the issue of the encounter between the outsiders and insiders in the context of the Pacific as “Outlanders” (a still loose term for those who settled in the region in the past three centuries) and “Islanders” (a loose term for early residents of the Pacific islands). He introduced his work by discussing “three inter-connected issues involved in examining the region’s varied pasts - regarding objectivity, representation, and narration.” He hopefully urged, “the need for conversation across differences - involving challenges drawn from overlapping audiences with overlapping perspectives - as a way of collectively thinking with the region’s varied past, as a way of weaving new narratives and new conversations.”

For the point of “conversation across” and “thinking with” Tonga’s varied past to weave new narratives and new conversations, regarding Tongan kingships, Ian Campbell in his Classical Tongan Kingship, summed up earlier works of foreign and local historians who viewed the “divided kingship” as having been devised to provide balance in Tongan politics and to preserve stability.” He himself offered another explanation based on a power politics approach. Campbell stated that “the tripartite dynasty was a device to legitimate a division of power which originated in rivalry and conflict.” This thesis wishes to offer another explanation from a local perspective: the tripartite kingship of Tonga was not a device, rather it was an intelligible cultural approach of fakakainga where a princess or prince of one lineage cohabited with a prince or princess from another lineage; as occurred in the original cohabitation of Ílaheva Va’épopua and the sky-god Tangaloa Éitumatupúá,
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and thus gave rise to the first Tu’i Tonga Áhoéitu in 950AD., who was then revered as an incarnate god.\textsuperscript{36}

From this cohabitation originated the known Tu’i Tonga culture, which attracted related lineages to entrap and secure the godly blood vested in the later offspring of Tangaloa Ëitumatumupuá. Over time, the entrapped godly blood became significant enough to be ensnared by other chiefly lineages. The Tu’i Tonga Fefine, Sinaitakalaflangileka,\textsuperscript{37} for example, cohabited with \textit{Tapu},\textsuperscript{38} from the Tu’i Lakeba chiefly lineage in Fiji to further consolidate the \textit{Ha’á Tu’i Takalaua} [Takalaua kingship] in the fifteenth century. The final approach to form the last kingship was by the sixth Tu’i Ha’átakalaua, Mo’úngatonga, who cohabited with \textit{Limapo Tobu’ia} of \textit{Safata}, Samoa, that gave rise to the \textit{Ha’á Tu’i Kanokupolu} kingship,\textsuperscript{39} from whom the present ruling kingship of Tonga emanated.

From this perspective, this work as a whole is an attempt to present a ‘local view point’ of the \textit{Fakaongo} [sensing god] and \textit{Tau’ataina} [free status achieved] movements in the narrower context of the Tongan-European (missionaries included) encounters from its known history to the actual formation of the Wesleyans’ discordant situation; and in the wider context of Tongan \textit{Talatukufakaholo} oral history. It will, for example, maintain its argument from the oral traditional narrative, to be understood in the course of this thesis as a “cultural

\textsuperscript{36} . Salesi Tu’áófa’eiki Havea, a scholar and Wesleyan minister, interpreted the name Áhoéitu as “Tu-god” and “’aho’eitu” means “god being incarnated on earth”. Lecture on Contextual Theology, Siaátoutai Theological College, Tonga, 1989.

\textsuperscript{37} . Sinaitakala’ilangileka was daughter of the 30th Tu’i Tonga Fatafehi, who built the Paepae o Tele’a tomb in memory of his father Tu’i Tonga Tele’a, who died in Samoa. This Paepae o Tele’a monument is still used as Ha’aTakalaua’s burial tomb in Lapaha, Mu’a, Tongatapu. The latest chiefly funeral held there were of the late Tu’i pelehake and Princess Kaimana Tuku’aho, who died of road accident in California, USA in July, 2006. See Table of Ha’a Tu’i Tonga in Appendix 1.

\textsuperscript{38} . From Vacivaci tradition the name was Tapu and not Tapuosi. However, oral traditions in Tonga holds this story and refer to this Fijian man Tapu’osi who married the Tu’i Tonga Fefine Sinaitakala’ilangileka the sister of the 30th Tu’i Tonga Fatafehi. See A.C.Reid, \textit{Tovata I & II}, (Suva: Fiji Museum, 1990), 5.

\textsuperscript{39} . Tradition of Kanokupolu by \textit{Tangi ki he Kelekele Akuóla}, a retired Education officer and local preacher of the Wesleyan Church of Tonga; related this story that Limapo was the daughter of ‘Amalele of Safata Samoa. Interviewed by the author in Kanokupolu in August, 1994. This tradition was confirmed with Dr. Amalele Tofaeono, lecturer at Theology Department, Univeristy of Auckland, 20 October, 2010.
logic” perspective.\textsuperscript{40} The encounter in particular sees the cultural logic theory of “cohabitation” as the Tongan’s way of acting and paying loyalty to a visitor(s), in the remote past to achieve the social tasks of cultural accommodation. It will elaborate further on how this cultural logic theory had been practised over time leading up to the actual realization of the \textit{Kau Fakaongo} and \textit{Tau’ataina} as two different churches at the end of the nineteenth century.

This thesis sees in the \textit{Talatukufakabolo} [oral narrative] the original 950AD encounter of Tangaloa and ‘Ilaheva Va’epopua as the first known practice of Fakaongo [sensing god in a person]. I will employ Borofsky’s two critical points about narratives: First, “Narratives are not simply \textit{about} ‘the past’- about the content or analysis of this or that event. They constitute ways for people to \textit{think with the past}.”\textsuperscript{41} Narratives comprised participations; they make the present realize the past and engage with the past to enlighten the present. They establish dynamic categories in the society and for the society. The voice of this Tongan princess, ‘Ilaheva Va’epopua, for example in Fakaongo [sensing god] in Tangaloa is here suggested to enable us to think about the Tongan past. Secondly, \textit{Tala} [stories] are central focal points of Tongan historiography, telling and orality which are told in contexts. Stories are not only presented but listened to. Informants (storytellers) and audiences tend to collectively and responsively participate in the unfolding of oral narrative. The story of Ilaheva and Tangaloa’s debate in the past has been told, unfolded and reinterpreted by generations over time to become the \textit{Tala-tuku-fakabolo of Tonga} [oral traditional narrative of Tonga].

\textsuperscript{40} This work understands that Robert J Schreiter defines Cultural Logics from his theological perspective to mean, ““a paradoxical effect takes place as the global meets the local,”” which he has derived from Ronald Robertson’s phenomena of “glocalization”, and from Jonathan Friedman’s definition of cultural logics as “ways that cultures choose to respond to the pressures of globalization”. See Robert J. Schreiter, \textit{The New Catholicity: Theology between the Global and the Local}, (New York: Orbis Books, 1998), 21.

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid. 22.
Tonga cannot be different from any other country of the world in accepting the fact of the Great Migration. The context in which the encounter of ‘Ilaheva and Tangaloa took place was ‘migration.’ If Tangaloa was the storyteller and ‘Ilaheva represented the audience; they both partook in the formation of the primordial narrative for the island kingdom of Tonga. Thus, it is suggested that the actual beginning of the Tongan known encounter with the outside world, civilization and religion which formulated the Tu’i Tonga culture and tradition, was in that context of the Great Migration. It followed then, that the son born of the encounter was a new hybridized identity. The facts to support the arguments in the later chapters will mostly be drawn from Talatukufakaholo [oral traditional narratives] as recorded and preserved in Tala ‘o Tonga [Tongan traditions],\(^\text{42}\) and primary documented records of the Catholic and the Wesleyan missionaries to Tonga.

For a description of the outlander-islander encounter and interactions from a genetic hybridization point of view, one part would tend to be dominant and the other part may be recessive. Although various scholars have tried to narrate the history of outlander-islander interactions in Tonga, they have witnessed in most cases that the Tongan part was always dominant. Elizabeth Besi Wood-Ellem commented,

“It is a Eurocentric view that in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries papalangi, especially “missionaries” (the most abused term in Pacific historiography), had greater power in Tonga than the local chiefs...Tongans found certain things in European material culture very attractive, and they used their own methods of owning these; but to say that European shaped Tongan’s destiny
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\(^{42}\) Talatukufakaholo itself is used in this work as the composite of Tongan Tales and stories from ancestors passed through later generations to the present. The term is described by Queen Salote in her record known as Queen Salotes Papers, and was also used by other sources such as the Catholic Church in the Tongan newspaper Taumá Lelei, June, 1991, p.7., in narrating the history of the church. Their use of the term clearly depicted the oral tradition of ancient Tonga referred to above as Talatukufakaholo-oral tradition. Other Tongan scholars like Okusitino Mahina in his The Tongan Traditional History Tala e fonua: A vernacular Ecology-Centred Historico-Cultural Concept, PhD. Thesis, ANU Canberra, April, 1992, used the same from his own anthropological view point titled it as Tala-e-fonua-Tales of the Land. Another scholar, Alaimaluloa Tamiwhere, a PhD student at UOA used the term Tala ó Tonga to signify the same concept.
prior to 1965 is to underestimate the ability of the Tongans themselves to make choices, to ignore much of what they were offered, and transform much to their own design.”

A.H. Wood (1983) wrote in favour of the missionaries, and Sione Latukefu and Noel Rutherford and his edited work supported Taufa’ahau’s leadership and the impact of the local chiefly tradition. The situation needed much deeper study.

The works by Wood and Rutherford were based on the missionaries’ primary sources with an outsider’s viewpoint and their description of European-Tongan encounters enhances our knowledge of the Tala-tuku-fakaholo — the oral traditional narrative. Noel Rutherford’s view, for example, best illustrates the point:

Political independence was coupled in Tonga with a large measure of cultural integrity. Of course Tonga adopted ‘ministers and nobles and parliaments’ as well as ‘apostles who live to sing and preach’, but these were absorbed with remarkably little dislocation into a way of life and a political system with its roots in remote antiquity. Tonga adopted many western ways but somehow they always seemed to finish up being more Tongan than western. To satisfy western notions, for instance, Tonga had cabinet ministers, but their authority often came less from their new titles than from the fact that their ancestors in direct line had been exercising that sort of power for perhaps a thousand years. Similarly, Christian doctrines and denominational differences were tailored to meet Tongan needs, often to the despair of the missionary mentors.

Elizabeth Wood-Ellem in her *Chief Justices of Tonga, 1905-40*, suggested that,
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Virtually all papalangi who have come to reside in Tonga in the last 150 years have come with a mission: to change something about the Tongans and their ways - their economy, their political alliances, and their beliefs system. These papalangi had their own priorities, which were only sometimes to the advantage of the people of Tonga or their Government.\(^{50}\)

Wood-Ellem also recognized the conflict in loyalties “to place of origin or to employer” as being the cause of the “advantage of the people of Tonga or their Government”, winning in the above encounter.

**Local View Point and Culture Logic:**

Since culture (the way people thought, view, and practice) is the lifeblood of the people in every society, most particularly in Oceania,\(^{51}\) it is also important at this stage to relate the culture of Tonga, contained in social status, social roles, and social functions and obligations, as the cultural built-in devices that give culture logic. Other contemporary writers have studied outlanders-inlanders encounters in the global sphere from their own perspectives. Robert J. Schreiter in his *The New Catholicity: Theology between the Global and the Local,* defined “cultural logics” as “a paradoxical effect [that] takes place as the global meets the local,” where “globalizing processes homogenize the world, they create at the same time a heightened sense of the particular.”\(^{52}\) Further, he asserted that “the local takes on a considerable variety of forms which can range from accommodation of the global to an assertive resistance to it.” Robert J Schreiter also acknowledged that his definition derived from Ronald Robertson’s phenomena of “glocalization”,\(^{53}\) and
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from Jonathan Friedman’s definition of cultural logics as “ways that cultures choose to respond to the pressures of globalization.”\textsuperscript{54} Moreover, Schreiter adapted “three kinds of cultural logic” that animate theological strategies; “antiglobalism”, “ethnification”, and “primitivism”. This thesis will consider, from Schreiter’s point of view, the encounter of European mission in Tonga; where from local attempts at accommodation, certain aspects were resisted, fundamentally devising “an alternative order” which corresponded appropriately with Tongan cultural ways. Further, from Schreiter’s point of view, the situation in Tonga was of “ethnification” in the sense that the identity of Fakaongo [loyalty] was one of the four Tongan cardinal virtues. This allowed the Tongans to assert their own identity in the midst of the Europeans’ venture to change and convert them from their Tan’útaina [Oceanic free] island ways.

Despite the fact that merging and hybridization were an inevitable part of the process, however, this work argues that the local identity maintained dominance. Wood-Ellem commented of how Queen Salote Tupou III accepted “alliances with the British representatives and with “loyal” missionary confidants, and a rejection of the values of those traders of the Beach who sought to reshape both political priorities and the economy of the country.”\textsuperscript{55} Only certain aspects of the British influences found meaningful to the culture were accepted, whereas other values were rejected. Although this work captures Schreiter’s point of “cultural logic” it also adds that what was logical to the recipient (Tongan) culture in the process of the encounter was what defined its logicality. This work also uses Schreiter’s term “primitivism” in defining a cultural framework of Talatukufakaholo [Tongan oral narratives] whose meaning is asserted here and engaged as the essence of the Tongan historiography. Outsiders’ use of such terms as “primitivism” and the like are ways of pushing insiders backward to their pasts, and is not accepted. All

societies (perspectives) of the world had their own primitive line (even savage period) but they have all been transformed along the line of development by various means. The same is applied here with Talatuukufakabolo – as the Tongan historiography and perspective that reads history in a lineal pattern of processual stages from the past to the present. Contexts would make the differences in regard to matters and evidences relatively logical to each culture. While Schreiter drew his examples from the continents of America, Africa and Asia, this work differs from his as it will dwell on island nations of Oceania, specifically on the Tongan Tu’i culture and the nonofo ú kainga tradition from a local and historical viewpoint.

This “cultural logic” reciprocal way of encounter is to be known in this work as fakakainga [relating to one another] by way of a nonofo [cohabitation] approach.\(^{56}\) Noel Rutherford commented on the importance of the part played by culture:

> Tonga’s good fortune did not result from absent-mindedness on the part of [the superpowers], … nor from its unimportance as a prize, but rather from its own positive and sustained efforts over half a century. Political independence was coupled in Tonga with a large measure of cultural integrity.\(^{57}\)

The function(s) played by the integrity of Tongan culture its political development is quite significant. That is why this work takes a functional view point.

Taken together, the points made by these writers suggest that although the missionaries came with the intention of converting and changing the island ways of the Pacific people, it never happened that way in Tonga. The missionaries only provided helped to indigenise by way of contextualisation a local church and government. We shall see how the tenets of Fakaongo and Ta’ataina were moulded

---

\(^{56}\) This fakakainga approach is presented as an alternative to Ian Campbell who viewed the Tongan society development from a power politic perspective. He argues that formation of Tonga tripartite kingships was based upon “rivals and conflicts.” See Ian C. Campbell, Classical Tongan Kingship, (Nuku’alofa: Atenisi University, 1989).

by factors of European Civilization, Methodist doctrine, and Christian faith to shape as Tongans own ways of contextual theologizing.

The General Background Literature:

The major category of literature that will provide background for this study surveys the history of Christianity in Tonga. John Garrett narrates voluminous works on general history of the missionaries in the Pacific.\(^{58}\) Alfred Harold Wood,\(^ {59}\) who lived in the period under study, viewed it from a mission perspective.\(^ {60}\) He wrote a history based on original primary sources, highlighting the achievements of the missionaries themselves. Wood cites Chapman’s description of the Methodist mission as “A House Divided against Itself”,\(^ {62}\) and examines the consequences of the division. Wood has some chapters on the period at the centre of this research although his book is a general narrative treatment. The rise of the divisions and tensions within the church and their inevitable consequences are shown in Wood’s chapters on the events prior to the promulgation of the Constitution in 1875 and subsequent developments during the rest of the century. The missionaries sided with either Moulton or Baker; the main divisive issues and personalities were reinforced particularly by Moulton’s school, Tupou College, and Baker’s alliance with King George. In the final analysis, Wood presents his case from the mission perspective, highlighting the positive impact of the missionaries on the Christianisation of Tonga. This work suggests that because Wood was palangi, the practice of fakakainga – accommodation – by nonofo – cohabitation – was quite insignificant to him and further he was a Wesleyan minister, so doubtless he would

---


60 In 1784 John Wesley’s colleague, Dr. Thomas Coke, often called the “Father of the Methodist Missions, put forward his “Plan of the Society for the Establishment of Missions among the Heathens” and to go as far as Tonga and Samoa in the Pacific, see A.H. Wood, *Overseas Missions of the Australian Methodist Church: Tonga and Samoa*, (Canberra: Aldersgate Press, 1975). p.vii.

61 Benjamin Chapman was Secretary of the Methodist Mission in Sydney, Australia, at the time.

reject ideas that such a practice of accommodation should be promoted as a way of life. However, in his lecture at the Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga Conference at Nuku’alofa in 1984, he concluded that “divisions seemed to be well infused in the bloodstream of the Tongan people”. 63 His statement endorsed this study from a local perspective.

Insiders like Sione Latukefu took it as their task to “de-mythologise” the religious propaganda from the facts of history in which for example Latukefu re-examined “the significance of the part played by the Methodist missionaries in the political development of Tongan society” from 1826-1875. Instead of de-mythologising the propaganda, he concluded that “the favourable combination of … King George and the Wesleyan missionaries… helped to determine the political destiny of Tonga.” 64 He adopted a narrative method in which “facts of the past”, played a central role. 65 Latukefu 66 directly addresses “Basil Thomson and his supporters’ views that ‘the constitutional development in Tonga’ was ‘a disastrous error’ and the Methodist missionaries were to blame.” 67 Basil Thomson, who was in the Western Pacific High Commission in Suva, was sent by Sir John Thurston 68 in August 1890 to check on the “laws and finances” in Tonga. He spent nine months as an assistant to the Premier and later published a book criticising Shirley Baker’s administration. 69 Thomson’s book 70 demolished the achievements and reputations

---

63 Unfortunately, due to unknown reasons, this statement is an afterthought to his work, but does not appear in the written form of his lecture to the Free Wesleyan Ministers in May, 1985. A.H. Wood, on many occasions in speeches to the Free Wesleyan Church Conference in Tonga, pronounced the statement: “Divisions seemed to be well infused in the bloodstream of the Tongan people.” Quote A.H. Wood, Ko e Hisitolia ‘o e Siasi Uesliana Tau’ataina o Tonga, (Nuku’alofa: Potungaue ‘Evangelio, 1985).

64 Sione Latukefu, Church and State in Tonga: The Wesleyan Methodist Missionaries and Political Development, 1822-1875, (Canberra: Australian National University, 1974), 220.

65 Certain facts of the past are being selected by a researcher or historian for a particular purpose or study.


68 The Secretary to High Commission in Suva was sent to Tonga via HMS Danae to take account of the disturbed situation. See Noel Rutherford, Shirley Baker and the King of Tonga, (Wellington: Pasifika Press, 1996). 139.

of Baker and the missionaries. The main focus of Latukefu’s work has been to reclaim their accomplishments. Latukefu draws his evidence from the missionaries’ records. He “assess[es] critically and objectively the significance of the part played by the Methodist missionaries in the political development of Tonga from the re-establishment of their mission in 1826 to the promulgation of the Tongan Constitution in 1875.” Latukefu did justice to his task in appraising the achievements of the Methodist missionaries in an objective manner and in delineating King Taufa’ahau’s own accomplishments. King Taufa’ahau’s initiative in establishing and developing his own island nation was much more than the mere enterprise of overseas missionaries. Through King Taufa’ahau’s leadership and the missionaries’ endeavours Tonga remained independent and free from the colonial political appropriation and takeovers which Australia, New Zealand, Fiji, Samoa, Tahiti and New Caledonia, Papua New Guinea, Solomon, Rarotonga and Hawaii experienced. The missionaries’ achievements and conversions laid the foundation for the island king to develop his political ambition of “Tonga ma’a Tonga,” (Tonga for Tongans)\(^{71}\) which this work labels as the Tongan policy of sustaining her native governance. This policy was the source of King Taufa’ahau’s politics, and his administration in the years leading up to 1875. Latukefu’s work provides much of the political background and early foundation for this study but not the theological aspects. The differences between Latukefu’s work and this study are the different time frames, different perspectives and methods of history and in a divergence from Latukefu’s arguments against Thomson’s claims. The divisions which emerged after 1875 will be examined with Taufa’ahau’s achievements in mind and with a particular focus on the role of Methodism and Tongan traditions in bringing divisions in Tonga.

\(^{70}\) Basil Thomson, *Diversions of a Prime Minister*, (London, 1894).

\(^{71}\) According to traditional history this policy of *Tonga ma’a Tonga* - “Tonga for Tongans” was a common way for the Tui to politicise other powerful chiefs. They were told to leave Tonga for the Tongans if they were not happy with a command; in other words, to leave Tonga to seek possibilities for themselves on other islands.
David M. Stowe\textsuperscript{72} reviewed Latukefu’s work and states “the book reflects both the author’s personal involvement with this history as an ordained Methodist minister and his objectivity as a careful scholar.”\textsuperscript{73} The Christian culture, together with the “Victorian Anglo-Saxon lower middle-class Dissent”\textsuperscript{74} intermingled with the Tongan culture and gave King Taufa’ahau, as the leader of the island kingdom, strong support. Stowe’s review agrees with the above claim that King Taufa’ahau was the key to the unity of Tonga and was well supported by people, both Tongans and Europeans, because of their confidence in his ability. Stowe agrees also with Latukefu’s final analysis where Latukefu concludes that:

The greatest credit for the successful transition to a constitutional monarchy is due to Tonga’s remarkable ruler, King George [Taufa’ahau] and his Tongan supporters. He recognised the advantages of adopting Western civilisation, its ideas, wealth, technology and religion – Christianity – and he seized on every available opportunity for furthering both his own interests and those of his own people.\textsuperscript{75}

My personal view on Latukefu’s work cited above is that the work is very Western in its perspective and method, and is not a true de-mythologising work. It is unclear whether the task of de-mythologising was twisted by an editor who edited Latukefu’s work or that Latukefu himself saw it was an impossible task to de-mythologise the opinions of the recorder(s), who were largely Western, from the facts of history. Thus, he continued to present a combination of views (Western and Tongan) which in the end present the history of Tongan society in a mixed Western-Tongan view and method. However this work agrees with his conclusion: “He [Taufa’ahau] recognised the advantages of adopting Western civilisation, its ideas, wealth, technology and religion – Christianity – and he seized on every

\textsuperscript{74} Ibid, 5.
\textsuperscript{75} Sione Latukefu, Church and State in Tonga: The Wesleyan Methodist Missionaries and Political Development, 1822-1875, (Canberra: Australian National University, 1974), 219.
available opportunity for furthering both his own interests and those of his own people” as the aim of the Tongans in all encounters.

Noel Rutherford\(^7^6\) argues along the same lines as Latukefu but draws from other sources less favourable towards Basil Thomson and his supporters. Rutherford highlights Shirley Baker and “his relationship with the ageing Tongan monarch, and his role in Tongan history,”\(^7^7\) and the way in which this sustained the independent sovereignty of the island state with the emergence of the independent churches. His work is a biography of Baker and he concludes that:

> Baker wrought a revolution of tremendous significance in Tonga. Under his guidance a tribal, quasi-feudal society was transformed into a modern constitutional state; government by the whim of the powerful was replaced by the rule of law; and from dependence on subsistence agriculture the country was enabled to progress to a money economy based on trade.\(^7^8\)

Rutherford’s argument was directed towards Thomson’s claim of missionary interference and not against King Taufa’ahau. From different sources and viewpoints Latukefu and Rutherford draw different conclusions. Latukefu depicts the leading role of King Taufa’ahau while Rutherford highlights the achievements of Shirley Baker. In the final analysis, the perspective and selected sources play a vital role in these different conclusions. The different audiences which the authors had in mind also contributed to their divergence, but neither work, however, touches on the divisive climate that prevailed in Tonga in the nineteenth and twentieth century’s. Most importantly, Rutherford’s work entails the tug of war between the two opposite dynamics — Baker (Western) and Taufa’ahau (Tongan), although they were co-workers in one task, at times their strategies reflect their differences. This study takes up their strategic differences and highlights their

---


\(^7^7\) Ibid, 2.

\(^7^8\) Ibid, 228-9.
interactions in the development of the divisive situations and circumstances in the history of Tonga.

Even Sione Latukefu, himself a Tongan, who narrated the laws of Tonga, recited only the history and development of customary law within modern Tonga and the promulgation of the Tongan Constitution without mentioning the inborn differences among the kainga confederations. However, King Taufa’ahau Tupou IV noted in the introduction that “it is the Constitution which establishes the form of the State and regulates the land tenure but its primary goal is to bring together the King, Chiefs and People in administering all States affairs and to preserve Freedom.” Latukefu concludes that “two main aims in granting the Constitution were to maintain efficient administration as a means of attaining internal stability and to encourage the recognition of the country’s sovereignty by the main powers.” For reasons diametrically opposed to Latukefu’s conclusion, this work claims that the peace observed in Tonga after the granting of the Constitution in 1875 was not only a direct effect of the Constitution itself (for in general people had not understood the Written Constitution and it prospective impact for their island kingdom) but the combination of European laws and the Tongan customary laws. The Westminster type of government with the merged European-Tongan law and order scaffolded the whole governance system while the internal structure of politics was run by the Tongan kainga organisations by the Tu’i and later successors. By this is meant the maintenance of peace in the villages was carried out by the town and district officers together with their respective chiefs. However, Tonga escaped colonisation because of the national sovereignty assumed in the granted Constitution by the Judiciary and Privy councils. This work will take the Constitution as part of its groundwork and will put the stated achievements of

---

80 Ibid, xiii.
81 Ibid, 88.
Taufa‘ahau to the test against the various circumstances described in the primary sources that have caused further divisions in the state and church, covered in the study of the hundred years beyond 1875.

Rutherford, in his edited history of Tonga, claimed uniqueness for Tonga because “it is the one Polynesian society that has maintained its political independence unbroken and its cultural heritage largely intact.” In this work Rutherford states that it was “no historical accident that this tiny state managed to retain its independence in the face of the overwhelming might of the colonial powers.” This was achieved neither “from the absent-mindedness” of the super powers, nor “from its unimportance as a prize, but rather from its own positive and sustained efforts over half a century.” He concludes by stating “political independence was coupled in Tonga with a large measure of cultural integrity.” This work counter-balances the heavy claims made in favour of the missionaries’ efforts and King Taufa‘ahau as to the cause of Tonga’s political independence. Rutherford’s book contains well-researched chapters from Jen Poulsen, Robert Langdon, H.G. Cummins, Niel Gunson, Sione Latukefu, Hugh Laracy, Noel Rutherford, and ‘Eseta Fusitu’a, A.H. Wood and Elizabeth Wood-Ellem, George E. Marcus, and John R. Baker, who are all well-known historians with their own approaches to the period under study. Generally, these articles provide insights into the history of Tonga ranging from pre-contact period to the modern time, without any mention of the divisions. There are, however, differences in perspective — for example,

83 Ibid, x.
84 Ibid, ix.
85 Ibid.
between Latukefu’s and Laracy’s chapters, which also point to differences between
the Methodist and Catholic doctrinal teachings and mission strategies in respect to
church and state relations.
James Egan Moulton\(^ {87} \) wrote a biased sketch of his father, Dr. J.E. Moulton, and
offers no critical insights of Moulton and his poor relationship with Baker, who is
depicted as the key figure in leading the Kau Fakaongo.

**METHODOLOGY**

This thesis accepts the fact that there have been other methods of viewing history
which include ‘Functionalistic’; ‘Conflicting’ and ‘Individualistic’ approaches,
however, it seeks to employ a functional approach and offer another view and
another method of *fakakainga* based on logic of culture.\(^ {88} \) This thesis sees the
functions of the facts of history, the subjects and objects in events under study and
reflects on the spirits and how they have played in the events according to the logic
of culture. It also acknowledges the local methods pertaining to context of Konai
Helu Thaman’s *tui-kakala*;\(^ {89} \) and Steven Halapua’s *Talanoa*-narrative forms;
however, in a real sense, they are both problematic. The *tui-kakala* is unrealistic in
that no one would *toli* sweat in education and *tui* get a degree and then *luva* gave it
away to someone for his or her own benefit and enjoyment. The *Talanoa* is also
problematic in the sense that *Talanoa* has double meaning; which, one is meant for
“claiming the value of *noa* zero”; and the other means “free association of some
knowledge”. This thesis wishes to employ the traditional method of *Tala-tuku-
fakabola* [Tongan traditional narrative and historiography]; which, not only
contained a history of Tongan past but also recorded, reinterpreted and re-created.

---

\(^ {87} \) James Egan Moulton on his *Moulton of Tonga* (Queanbeyan: Buoyant Economies Pty. Ltd., 2002), a reprint
of the 1921 edition.

\(^ {88} \) See an article by Frederick S. Downs, “Identity: Integrative Principle,” *The Asian Journal of Theology,*
6 (2), 2 October, 1992, 238-249.

\(^ {89} \) Helu-Thaman, K. “Concepts of Learning, Knowledge, and Wisdom in Tonga, and their relevance to Modern
Hence, *Tala-tuku-fakaholo* is self contained; it provides the story in itself as a record of the past and the method of recreating it for a social purpose. *Tala* was the baseline of Tongan historiography; opposite to European scholarship which is based upon the authority of the writer (informants), which perhaps derived from Greek term *eidenaï* meaning “enquiry” aiming “to know”. While we understand full well that knowledge and the person cannot be separated, the *Talatukufakaholo* emphasis is placed on the *Tala* story, tales, tradition and the function(s) it plays in the whole social development. Hence, *Tala* in itself offers story of past events\(^90\) and also invites *Talanoa-dialogue with* people and *tuku* unfolded tales to create further *Talanoa-dialogue with* scholars and interpreters to *fakaholo* recreate the received stories for a social purpose.

Thus, this *Talatukufakaholo* method is presented as an alternative story to I.C. Campbell’s “rival and conflict” approach of reading Tongan history; which is also problematic. Tonga is no difference from any other society in the world. Rivalries and conflicts are main constituents of every social development, and were not the only way all society was build, nor also the only perspective that all social developments were to be viewed. It attempts to give a contrast on the I.C. Campbell (the Atenisi School of thought) conflicting argument which claimed that the Tongan tripartite dynasty originated from rivalry and conflict. Nevertheless, it also highlights how the *Tu‘i*; [King] *Hou‘eiki* [chiefs] and *Kakai* [common people] played their different roles as individual subjects in the history of Tonga where their different purviews significantly impacted the whole development. This thesis believes this is the way the divisive history of the Tongan Wesleyans can be made to make sense and, most importantly, enlighten the problem of “acculturation”.

\(^90\) The Tongan term *Tala-tuku-fakaholo* embraced both a definition as Tongan oral traditional history and a Methodology. As a composite term it enjoined various *Tala* of Tonga; ranging from *Tala-oua* (Theological tales about gods); *Tala-tupu’a* (Creation story); *Tala-'a-kainga* (genealogy); *Tala-e-fonua* (Cosmology); *Tala-tala-i-fale* (ethos of life); and the most intimate personal concept of *Tala-noa* (inter-personal discourse). As a Methodology of presenting Tongan historiography it literally means, *(Tala-tuku-fakaholo)* a combination of three verbs; of which *Tala* means a discourse; a tale or a story which was *Tuku* recorded, carved, crafted, woven or landscaped; *Fakaholo* – re-view, re-created, re-told, re-iterated, and re-story for a purpose in life.
The work edited by Robert Borofsky, *Remembrance of Past Pasts*, which affirms an invitation to remember and re-think the Pacific history, addressed the question: “how does one make sense of the Pacific’s varied pasts?” The book emphasised three inter-related principles as points of reference for “thinking about” and “reflecting on” Pacific pasts: firstly, “recounting times past—however seamlessly ordered—is always incomplete,” secondly, “history’ is more than a product to memorise,” and lastly, “history-telling lies less in the teller than in the dialogue the teller shares with his or her audience.” The editor believes that by offering the above as points of reference will assist both readers and narrators to think *with* other narrators to *weave* “further narratives and develop further conversations.” The editor also admits that the work only “seeks to cut through the Gordian knots entangling Pacific history-telling today and what is offered in the book are only words which would invite the Oceanians “to turn promising words into reality.”91 This thesis wishes to respond to such a call for a local version of the history of Tonga.

From the sources described above, three main assumptions have already arisen from the literature:

1) Almost all presentations of the history of Tonga were from outsiders who do not understand fully the theories, practices and world views of the Tongan people, and the supporters of Moulton and the Kau Fakaongo. Very few presented *Kau Tau’ataina* (Baker’s side) in its interactions with the *Kau Fakaongo*. Even, writers who presented Baker’s side had their own agenda but not as it related to the *Kau Fakaongo*.

2) Division is a problem of acculturation. FWCT Church has remained in the mould of the Tongan demeanour represented by the monarch. The Gospel (Christian teachings) was not inculcated but rather acculturated and the church

---

only promoted and maintained the status quo, leaving the poor and oppressed people on the margin untended so that in no way the practice of justice and love of Christ as taught in the Gospel was seen.

3) A great impact of the division in the church was the regulation by tenets of traditional Tonga Tu’i culture and religion, aggravated by personal differences of missionaries. To tackle the problem of acculturation, we must attempt a deeper study into the tenets of Tongan traditional religion and its impact upon the practices and worldviews of the Tongan people.

Given all the above, it therefore seemed significant to study the development of *Fakaongo* – [sensing god] mana of local or European leadership and teachings – and *Tauátaina* – [status achieved] the status of liberty achieved by observing *Fakaongo* to its fullest. The pollar-pull forces worked in matters of the church – and the way they have been hybridised over time by various situations and circumstances, whether for administrative, educational, Pentecostal revival, foreign or local leadership, political or religious pressures. It is hoped that this work will make some small contribution to understanding the problems of the Tongan Wesleyans, their hybridised contextual theologies, and above all, the perpetual problem of acculturation.
On 30\textsuperscript{th} May 1865, James Egan Moulton and his wife Emma, the niece of John Eggleston, Missionary Secretary, arrived from Sydney, as the Australia Conference’s reply to King Tupou I’s request. They worked in Tonga for 40 years.
On 14 February 1866, Moulton began a school at Nuku’alofa which the Minute of Australian Conference noted the title as, “Native Training Institution”, and “District Training Institute”. The name “Tupou College” was not applied as the name of the Institute until 1869. Tevita Tonga Mohenoa from the Fijian-Tongan community in Koulo village, Ha’apai islands was the first head tutor and who was always renowned for his dedication to Moultonism. Moulton admitted women as student of the school in 1870, and three years later he agreed that the school accepted the motto, “Ko Tonga Mo’unga ki he Loto”—“a Tongan stronghold is his mind.”93 It is evident from Moulton’s perspective that the key for Tongans to develop their society in social, economical, political and religious spheres would depend entirely on enlightened minds.94 In retrospect, Tupou College had produced thousands of scholars who are dedicated supporters of various aspects of Tongan society; manifesting Moulton scholarship and making good use of his educational teachings in various corners of life.

Moulton, who was a true loyalist of the Christian, Wesleyan and European tradition of education and world view, was not able to be fakakainga by Tupou I to the extent as his Majesty did for Thomas, Baker, and Watkin. The missionary to Tonga and historian Harold Geoffrey Cummins, who studied Moulton, described him as, “The Man of Two Worlds.”95 Truly, Moulton was a man of both European and Tongan worlds. Perhaps, Moulton was able to use the knowledge he gained to deliver in the Tongan language for educational purposes. While converts in other nations were required to study in English, Moulton saw it easier for him alone to learn Tongan language and translate set books for each subject into Tongan language to ease his students learning.

Moulton’s intellectual calibre and wisdom was evident in the way he used the Tongan language at the highest levels and translated school teaching materials and
the Bible into the Tongan language. Some of the books Moulton composed or translated for teaching at his new school included *Ko e Kalama o e Lea FakaTogai* (The Tongan Language Grammar Book); *Ko e Vusika* (The Physics); *Ko e Makasini á Kolisi* (The Magazine); *Ko e Fononga á Pilikimi* (Pilgrim’s Progress); *Ko e Siokalafi ko e Tohi ó Mamani* (The World’s Geography) *Ko e Jiokalafi FakaÝfsika* (Ethics); *Ko e Jiokalafi Fakaenatula* (Nature Studies) *Ko e Jiokalafi FakaeFonua* (Land); *Ko e Hisitolia ó Mamani* (The History of the World) *Ko e Febale á Ísópe* (Aesop’s Fables) and *Ko e Fakamatala kia Éukaliti* [The Story of Euclid] and many others.\(^96\)

Chapman, who was Secretary of Mission, in the District meeting of 1866, suggested that a revision of the translation by West be made and all missionaries were given opportunity to note errors and suggest areas for improvement.\(^97\) Cummins cited Moulton’s view of West’s translation with amazement, because he knew West’s background according to the record as, “a classical scholar as well as a good linguist, yet his Bible was a very indifferent translation,…..”\(^98\) However, the corrections and editing work for West’s translation continued. In the 1875 District Meeting when it was unanimously moved by both European and Tongan ministers to ask the Australian Conference to allow Moulton two or three years in Great Britain to translate the Scriptures for Tongan Wesleyans. This was another job for Moulton beside his numerous books already published by the College’s press for the school (Tupou College). The permission was granted and Moulton, with his helper Tevita Finau of Nukunuku, left Tonga for Great Britain in 1877. On their return in 1880, the edition known as Moulton’s Translation was hailed by the District Meeting chaired by Watkin in December, 1880. The Minutes noted,

The District Meeting desires to express its thanks to the
Rev. J.E. Moulton for the very important service he has

\(^{96}\) . Copies of the above materials are available at the THE PACIFIC MANUSCRIPT BUREAU, at ANU, Canberra, Australia. S/B 315. PMB.
\(^{97}\) . Resolution (VI) Australia District Meeting; Friendly Island District Meeting; also on Stephen Rabone letter to Baker, dated 12 Sept. 1870;
rendered for the Church and people of Tonga by translating and carrying through the press our new edition of the New Testament.99

Taliai testified of Moulton as, “a great servant of his Lord, a rare faithful and gifted missionary par-excellence, a remarkable man with strong and distinctive educational views.” A later missionary A.H.Wood, honoured Moulton’s students and loyalists stated of Taliai as,

Two of the leaders today typify the dedication of the church to its task. The Secretary of Conference is Siupeli Taliai, B.A., Dip.Ed., L.Th., still a comparatively young man, and first Tongan to be Principal of Tupou College….Unusually energetic and forthright in religious and educational affairs alike, he insists on challenging the people always to obey the one Master, Jesus Christ, whose will should determine the course Tonga is setting – in family life, in the church and the nation.100

One can see how Moulton was highly revered by his followers and loyalists. In 1910 the King, Taufa’ahau Tupou II, unveiled Moulton’s memorial stone at Tupou College, the institution Moulton founded in 1866 and named Tupou College in 1869, and read out the inscription, (quoted here in part),

Sacred to the memory of Dr. Moulton, Founder of Tupou College ... He commenced his labours in Tonga in May 1865, and retired from active work in 1906. He devoted his life to the highest interests of the Tongan people, to raise them intellectually and spiritually. Rest after labour.101

Moulton ended his work in Tonga in high regard. In his humble speech during a farewell Polotu for him at Saione, Sia ko Veionga, before he left Tonga in 1906, Moulton said words that have always been recited by later leaders of the church

---

101 . Though the original event was held in Maamaloa, Tupou College, Nukuálófa, when Tupou College was later moved to Nafualu in 1921; and again moved to Toloa in 1948, the obelisk was moved with it and placed at the entrance to the college hall. See H.G.Cummins, “Missionary Chieftain: James Egan Moulton and Tongan Society, 1865-1909,” PhD Thesis, ANU, 1980. 1.
and that are still fresh in the memory of most Tongan Wesleyans. In Moulton’s farewell saying, “Óku ikai ko ha tangata poto au ka ko e motná faá vavaku pe,” In Tongan language, there are two levels which is a literal and formal translation, and perhaps, if I may attempt to translate the above of Moulton on literal level it may give this meaning, ‘I am not a man of wisdom but merely an old man who scratches around for what can be found for a purpose’. But if I may attempt another formal translation of Moulton’s statement it would equivalently say, “Óku ikai ko ha tangata poto au ka ko e motná faá vavaku pe,”- which means, ‘You may not remember me in the future as a man of wisdom; but an old man who always searched for the ultimate truth.’ Since Moulton’s statement was made when he was at his prime, his statement is no doubt proverbial when stated. When one gives translations for Tongan sayings/proverbs one needs to decide whether a literal/formal translation, or use functional equivalency, where the literal meaning is changed by the circumstances and events that colored the statement used. This is an excellent example of why the Biblical translations of West and Moulton described above can vary so much. The fact is evident in the use of the translated Bible; the simple straight forward translation was used by the Free Churches while Moulton’s culturally rich translation was used only by the Wesleyan churches where Wesleyan theology of “rational divinity” was the predominant practice.102

In the 1860s, King Tupou 1 seems to have observed the presence of the Living God and His attributes in the works of the Wesleyan missionaries in Tonga and to have trusted them to justify a sovereign state and independent church.

[Source: FWCT archive, Photo Book. Nuku’alofa, Tonga.]
Apart from oral tradition and references made by King Tupou I himself in his speeches, no documented record of the historic dedication of Tonga to the Living God can be found. Nevertheless, from Baker’s Memoirs it is stated,

Before the freedom from serfdom, [dated by Baker to 1873], King George held a meeting with the chiefs. Some of them wished to ask England to annex Tonga, some to ask America. The King, in answer to them:-
“Tonga is my inheritance; the Bible tells us not to put our trust in horses and chariots, but to trust Jehovah. So to you my people, God and Tonga are our inheritance.”

From the same, it is also stated that in “1864, Dr. Baker was asked to give them their flag,” and “a system of municipal regulations,” and “laws for the keeping and making of roads.”

It also indicated that Baker was then asked by King Tupou I “to become his Premier” but he refused at first. However, when he accepted the position 16 years later Baker was able to draw both the flag and the seal for the government in 1864.

The influence of European system of education was evident in the presence of James Egan Moulton, and in the impact of European politics in the presence of Baker. From them both as missionary and their leadership in church, qualities and the procedures of the Wesleyan democratic formal church meeting were adopted by His Majesty Tupou I for holding the local chiefs’ biennial meetings for matters of politics and governance of Tongan society. His Majesty chaired the quarterly meeting of the chiefs in Nukuálofa on 22 December, 1874, and his opening

---

104. Ibid.
105. This quarterly meeting of Tupou I and the Tongan chiefs should not be confused with the Church quarterly meeting, which was always chaired by the appointed missionary Chairman of Tonga District, under the Australia Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. From the Methodist formality and ways of holding meetings, King Tupou I adopted it to run his chiefly quarterly meeting in search of discussing matters of government and the society. Prior to the formal meeting at Parliament in 1862 and afterwards, this form of quarterly meeting was regularly held by King Tupou I to deliberate on matters of the society.
speech referred to their earlier meeting in Vavaú, where the decision was made to dedicate Tonga to the Living God for protection and stated,

\[ Ko \text{ étāu fakataha i Vavaú naa tau behe ke tau tuku á Tonga ki be Ótua, bea óku pebo hono tobi, ‘Ko e Ótua mo Tonga ko boku Tofi’a.’ }^{106} \] [In our meeting in Vavaú, we decided to dedicate Tonga to God, and there we stated on our record, ‘God and Tonga are our Inheritance.’]

King Tupou I occasionally referred to the historic 1839 Vava’u dedication event, and the inauguration of the Tonga Constitution in 1875 in most of his public speeches. In the meantime, Ratuseru Cakobau ceded Fiji to Great Britain on 10 October, 1874.\(^{107}\) The Tongan related Fijian-born Wesleyan minister from the island of Vulaga,\(^{108}\) David Baleiwaqa, studied the influence of the Wesleyan Methodists in Fiji and stated that, “the head of the turanga bale institution Ratu Seru Epenisa Cakobau, the Vunivalu of Bau, became a Wesleyan Methodist in 1854, twenty years before he ceded Fiji to Queen Victoria.”\(^{109}\) Further, about the actual cession of Fiji to the British Crown, Baleiwaqa stated, “Disposing the land as she pleased, after the unconditional cession of Fiji to the British Crown in 1874, Queen Victoria through Gordon, confirmed native ownership of the land through ancient land custom.”\(^{110}\) Further to his Majesty’s speech, the King contrasted the situation of Tonga to Fiji, and said, “\[ kei lelei á Tonga ko étau fala la ki be Éiki, vakai ki Fiji kno māu é be buleanga poto. \]” [While our neighbour island of Fiji had been ceded to and controlled by the powerful nation, let Tonga continue to trust in the Living God.] King Tupou I had, to this stage, convinced that his people must be led to pay loyalty to God first and to Himself and the rules of chiefs.

\(^{106}\) Ko e Bo’oibo’oi, No.S.7.8., dated Januali mo Febueli, 1875. p.114.
\(^{107}\) A letter of cession of Fiji to Great Britain signed by Takobau T. was published on the Bo’obo’oi, No.S.7.8., dated Januali mo Febueli, 1875. p.126.
\(^{108}\) On a Master of Theology class presentation in Pacific Theologicla College, Suva, Fiji in 1997, Baleiwaqa shared that his ancestors came from Bangai, Hihifo, Tongatapu. Baleiwaqa was welcomed by the family in Tonga in 1997 on his research trip Tonga and on one occasion recited their genealogy which went back to the previous three centuries.
\(^{110}\) Ibid. 174.
By 1873 when the Home Mission Fund was approved, the idea of shifting Tonga from being a “District” to an independent Church had already echoed within various circles of authority including the correspondence between the Tongan and Australian Conferences, the District meetings, and the discussions between King Tupou I and Baker in matters of politics. Within the circle of the Australia Conference, the Missionary Committee resolved on 3 February, 1874, “This Committee hails with satisfaction the attempt of the Tongan Church at self support.”\textsuperscript{111} But at a much later date Sir Charles Mitchell, who was later sent as Deputation to inquire about the matter (of an independent church) pointed back to the failure of the Australian Conference in 1874 to grant “the desire of the king and people of Tonga to assume a more independent position in the Wesleyan body than that hitherto accorded to them.”\textsuperscript{112} Mitchell believed that if the Australia Conference had acted with caution to the King’s request it would have changed the situation. Further, in Mitchell’s report, it indicated no trust at all in the Tongan

\textsuperscript{111} Christian Advocate and Wesleyan Record, Sydney, 2 March, 1874. MLS

\textsuperscript{112} Report of Sir Charles Mitchell, 1887. p.3.
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church which was considered as being too young to manage its own affairs. Baker’s stance was also much queried by the Church authorities. Lastly, the report alluded to a sense that the move towards an independent church was for local control of the church; in actuality the formation of a Tongan chiefly church. This allegation was true of a much later development of the Free Church. The report seems to locate it as the aim of King Tupou I’s move. However, negotiations between Tongan leaders and the President of the Australian Conference continued. During the whole dialogue the Conference authorities did not quite understand the vision held by King Tupou I. It was alleged by Conference authority that his Majesty’s move to see Tonga as an independent church was so that his Majesty himself would have maintained its island Tauátaina [Tongan chiefly control]. They did not quite see that the differences between Baker and Moulton had been cultivated to a point where they would divide the Wesleyans into two churches, and would manifest the stated theme enjoined in the seal of Tonga; where one group would claim loyalty to God in Moulton’s theological way, or to His Majesty and Baker’s way to claim independence.

The best description of this ambivalent situation in respect to the Tongans’ loyalty to God and Tonga is best described in the statement entered by the editor of the Bo’obo’oi in 1874,

*Ko e fuka kuo ma\u2019u fusi ‘oku na hono lanu bea óku tuú á e lea ni ke “Jiaji mo Buleánga á Tonga,…bea óku mau kole atu ki be kainga Tonga, á e Honéiki mo e kakai, ha’u ke tau kau í be ngaue ni, ke ngaobi ‘á Tonga maá Tonga, ke tuú maú be á e moto á Tubou í be sila ó ho tou bukánga, ko e “Otua mo Tonga ko hoku tofiá.”*\(^{114}\) [The flag we are hoisting today bears two colours; thus it stands for the vision to have Tonga an independent church and sovereign state…and we besiege you all, chiefs, and people of Tonga to please

---

113. This was the problem of acculturation which Niumeitolu asserted in his work. See T. Niumeitolu PhD Thesis.
114. *Ko e Bo’obo’oi, “Vaivai ka e Tuli be.”* Nuku’alofa: Na’e buluji ‘e Aleki Malani ‘i he Fale Buluji in Nuku’alofa, 1 Ma’aji, 1874. 2.
come forward and join in solidarity to have kept Tonga for the Tongans alone and to prove King Tupou’s vision enjoined in our coat of arm, that ‘God and Tonga, are our inheritances’.

A double dynamic dilemma was enjoined in the two colours of blue and red (church and state). The blue colour derived and symbolized the Wesleyan theology and its aspiration for Scriptural righteousness and eternal holiness. The latter colour symbolized the blood of Jesus Christ, which represented sacrificial actions in life. From an independent viewpoint, these colours as symbols essentially substantiated how King Tubou I understood the church to be the uho [essence] and the state provided the fua [form]. The symbol is believed to continue features of pre-contact ‘time and space’ conceptions from traditional Tu’i culture. ‘Áhoéitu as a person was the fua [incarnated form] of the uho [blood - essence] for example, which was the personification of the toto’i eiki [sacred blood invested by Tangaloa in Ílaheva] which was the essence of Tongan culture. In any familial inter-relationships, the status of a person (form) was determined by the degree of chiefliness of one’s blood. But, in usage on the seal of Tonga, the form symbolized the paradigm shift from the traditional god Tangaloa to Living Holy Trinity God which essentially comprised; The Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and Tonga as a nation which essentially comprised of the Tu’i, chiefs and her people.

The form – essence nature of governance perception already spoken of saw the existence of the church and the state in synchronic manner. This thesis asserts that it is the case. Elizabeth Wood-Ellem, arguably the most authoritative person of

115 The sky blue colour has been the symbol of the Wesleyan Church in Tonga ever since and it is derived from the Wesleyan theology of Scriptural righteousness that John Wesley, the founder of the Holy club, originated. It is not known whether King Tupou I or Moulton had chosen the sky blue color as the color of eternal righteousness. The colour is associated with Moulton’s work and is vividly embraced by Tupou College and ex-students as their colour.

116 The red color had been chosen by Baker as the color of the government of Tonga which is shown on the Tonga flag and seal. The color was also used as the government college’s flag and symbol where on their seal the cross of Jesus with the five stars representing the five wounds on Jesus’ body at the crucifixion, drawn on red plain to symbolized sacrificial service of all under the cross.

117 Elizabeth Wood-Ellem is the daughter of A.H.Wood, a missionary to Tonga in 1925 - (principal of Tupou College for many years). She has numerous writings about Tonga and who also, like her father who understands
the history of Tonga, noted from tradition that when Tupou I dedicated Tonga to God at the event of the Tauátaina Emancipation in 1862, the king proposed three different mottos: Ko e Ótua mo Tonga ko boku Tofiá [God and Tonga are my inheritance]; Ko Tonga Mo’unga ki he Loto [Tonga stronghold is the mind/heart]; and lastly, Tonga maá Tonga [Tonga for the Tongans]. It is only in the first emblem that enjoined the double dynamic of God (church) and Tonga (state); which substantially connoted loyalty to Living God and Tonga. In the event of the Emancipation Tupou I chose the first motto as the seal of the government of Tonga; while the second motto was later used by Moulton as the seal of Tupou College established in 1866; and the last motto was used as the Government College seal in its establishment by Baker and Tupou I in October, 1882. If all these mottos originated with King Tupou I’s vision; they showed the double dynamic nature of what the church and state ought to give Tonga in the days to come; perhaps a synchronism of supportive interactive religion-political identity, marked by the influence of Wesleyan theology. Putting this double dynamic policy in Tongan language, it may say, Lotu ki he ‘Otua pea ‘apasia ki he Tu’i mo e fonua. [Faithfully trust God and loyal to the king and tradition]. The whole policy revolves around loyalty.

Tongan language, custom, traditional culture and history of Tonga and also captures both the palangi and Tongan perspective. This work holds Wood-Ellem as the most authoritative historian of the History of Tonga. She captures the local perspective and had written most of her writings about the Royal family history, which is quite evident in her latest books. See Elizabeth Wood-Ellem, Queen Salote of Tonga: The Story of an Era 1900-1965, (Auckland University Press), 1999); ..........(ed.) Songs and Poem of Queen Salote, (Tonga: Vavaú Press, 2004).

118. Note that Elizabeth Wood-Ellem asserted that the event of Tukufonua ki Langi [dedication of Tonga to God], was held on the same date of the Emancipation in 1862, which is different from the date the oral stories claimed to have been held on the 20 November, 1839, and to which King Taufaáhau Tupou IV, on his foreword of Tevita Vea, Ko e Tohi malanga , asserted that the event took place before the 1850, which is most probably referred to 20 November, 1839.

119. See Notes 1. on Chapter 8: “God and Tonga are my Inheritances” in Elizabeth Wood-Ellem, Queen Salote of Tonga: The Story of an Era, 1900-1965, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1999), 332.

120. The same influence of Wesleyan theology on National identity on Fijian identity was studied was studied by Rev. Baleiwaqa of the Methodist Church of Fiji. See Tevita Baleiwaqa, Rerevaka Na Kalou Ka Doka Na Tui, Fear God and Honour the King: The Influence of Wesleyan Methodists on the Institutions of Fijian Identity, PhD. Thesis, Australian National University, Canberra, 2003.
For this situation in Tonga, some missionaries held the allegation that to allow Tongans an independent Church was a total handover of the Church to the rule of the chiefs. The Tonga District Meeting in 1874 recorded the decision of a meeting of King Tupou I and the chiefs, which envied Greenwood, and reported the danger of having an independent church that would be dominated by the chiefs. From the beginning of the mission in Tonga and the call of the first Tongan minister, Benisimani Latuselu, in 1848, the Tongan ministers and lay persons were not allowed to be present as full members of the Circuit Quarterly meetings until 1874.121 That long delay to include the Tongan ministers in the decision making of the church surely had already been duly considered within the community of the King, chiefs, and Tongan people. One can imagine such feelings and the concern felt within the circle of the local leaders as they experienced and dialogued about the way their *falala’anga* [trustworthiness/credibility] was being downplayed by the *papalangi* ministers and church authorities. One can imagine various questions asked in the circles of the local community about the situation.

King Tupou I’s ambition is also made explicit in a speech published by the editor of the *Bo’obo’oi*, on which the King used the analogy of human development, of *tamaji* [childhood]; and *tangata* [manhood], to describe his wish for the political development of his island kingdom, Tonga. Further, Baker reported that Tupou I wished that Tonga would ‘*ofa ko e tangata mooni, ko e jino mo Laumalie ke Buleanga mo Jiaji*’,122 [become a mature person with a true spirit and physical body, as an independent church and sovereign state] in matter of trustworthiness. One can see here the mind of the King and his perception of the relationship of Church and State, in the context of the encounter of *palangi* [European] and Tongans. The Church would provide the innate spiritual elements of the nation while the state

---

121. Until 7 April, 1875, it was admitted that the first Tongan minister named Jione Latu preached at the quarterly Meeting held at Kolovai, Tongatapu. *Ko e Bo’obo’oi*: No.3. Vol.II, Ko 1 Me, 1875, p.21.
122. *Ko e Bo’obo’oi*, “*Vaivai ka e Tuli be.*” Nuku’alofa: Na’e buluji ‘e ‘Aleki Malani ‘i he Fale Buluji in Nuku’alofa, 1 Ma’aji, 1874, p.2.
provided the governmental strategies and physical structure of the society to maintain order.

There was also pressure from the *palangi* group who had found refuge in Tonga at the time and fought through the unsettled situation for a right to claim a stance in the society. Further, in the same edition of the *Bo’obo’oi*, Baker attempted to give further elaboration to some *palangi* who were at the time living in Tonga. They had criticized various decrees passed by Parliament which included a demanded tax payment from them; in its quarterly meetings and in the formation of the 1875 Constitution.\(^{123}\) The *palangi* party poured forth rumours and accused the national cerebration of the Constitution in 1875 of being a *katoanga kai puaka* [celebration of pork feasting]. They wrote a petition that all twenty two Europeans signed.\(^{124}\) A very long letter, signed by Mr. Cocker as King’s secretary, replied to the *palangi* petition and is quoted in part here, “His Majesty says that your request amounts to a pledge of loyalty to the Flag of Tonga.”\(^ {125}\) It is clearly explained in the letter that they have not been naturalized to become true citizens of Tonga, and that their petition for representation at Parliament was not in line with international policy for naturalization because Tonga was yet to become a nation.

The double-dynamic nature of loyalty to God and Tonga was also embraced in the Tonga Constitution, 1875. To both the Tongan minds and the *palangi* groups in Tonga Baker in his *Bo’obo’oi* newspaper 1874 further explained that the Tongan

---

\(^{123}\) A petition to consider their representative at Parliament signed by Misa Iongi, [Young], Kuluka [Crooker], and Hatesoni [Mr Hutchinson] and 22 other palangi. n.d. was published by Baker of Bo’obo’oi and to which Baker replied to on behalf of Tupou I, dated 25 November, 1873. Both letters are printed on Bo’ibo’oi, issue, vol. p.5.


Constitution was equal to the Holy Scriptures. He stated that to answer the question regarding the Tonga Constitution one must understand why the Bible was written. Baker defined the Bible as, *ko e Tobi óku ne fakamatala mai á e anga óku tau tauátaina ai fakalaumalie, aé ngaahi meá óku totonu ke tau fai mo e ngaahi meá ke tau li’aki.* [It is the Book that instruct us how we should live and behave as righteous people spiritually; and the do’s and don’ts of life]. He further explained that the Bible also tells us how *kainga* should live harmoniously among themselves as humans, and between humans and their king who ascends his throne and rules his people including the lowest of all in God’s kingdom. The Bible also tells us about *á e anga totonu hono bulei á e Jiaji, bea ke fai ‘e he Jiaji.* [The ethics of how God rules his church]. As Baker drew further comparison between the Bible and the Constitution he stated, *ko e Tobi ia ó e Tauátaina mo e anga ó e Bulei á e Fonua, Óku fakamatala é he Konisitutone á e anga óku fakanofo á Kingi mo ia óku totonu ke bule.*126 [The book declares the Rights and Freedom of all humanity, the way the king rules and the ethics of his ruling]. As he further elaborated on the question of the kind of *tauátaina*[Freedom] envisaged for Tonga he stated that, *tauátaina ka e kei fanonganongo, tauátaina ka e kei feiúmu.*[freedom within loyal boundary, liberty through service].

As early as 1873, the described situation had expanded for all parties involved, to consider seriously the founding of a Free Church. Contextually, the differences between Baker and Moulton had already alarmed the missionaries themselves and had reached the table of the Wesleyan-Methodist Conference in Australia that an ambivalent situation existed in practice. The two minds among the missionaries had already brooded on the Mission in Tonga. Nevertheless, no personal differences had gone quite as far and as beyond control as that between Baker and Moulton. The move towards a Free Church and State resulted from such an

126 *Ko e Bo’obo’oi, “Vaivai ka e Tuli be.” Nuku’alofa: Na’e buluji ‘e ‘Aleki Malani ‘i he Fale Buluji in Nuku’alofa, 1 Ma’aiji, 1874. p.3.*
ambivalent situation. Their embraced mana had driven people to their respective sides. King Tupou I elegantly stood behind Baker because he found him worthy to be used for his political purpose. Directly opposing him was the Australian Conference who backed up Moulton to maintain loyalty to the Australian Conference. However, sandwiched in between these two forces was the Western Pacific High Commission who sought to maintain a neutral position, at the time was only represented by Queen Victoria’s representative, a High Commissioner, who was based in Fiji and pressing to cede Fiji to Great Britain.

Neither Baker, nor Moulton, took adequate consideration of Henry Greenwood who stated in his Journal, “Our district is torn with dissention.” Greenwood, who was born at Clayton, New Yorkshire in 1842, with his wife served in Tonga from 1869 to 1875. Although Greenwood supported Baker, he was aware of the divisive situation already sparked. The person of Baker was the centre of discussion because he was smartly able to fakakainga [relate] to king Tupou I in a very compromising way. Although Baker returned to Tonga in 1869 as the appointed chairman of the Tonga District, his reputation after serving in Tonga for six years had been significantly damaged by his immoral behaviour.

THE SHIRLEY WALDEMAR BAKER

From the side of the missionaries, Baker’s close affiliation with Tupou I aroused discomfort within their circle with a big question mark upon his *fakaongo*-loyalty to their mission tasks, not only as a British citizen but also as a Wesleyan minister. His colleagues, W.G.R. Stephinson and David Wylie, filed charges against Baker’s moral behaviour. The matter was the main agenda of the special District Meeting held in Lifuka, Ha’apai, on 23 August 1870.\footnote{Minute of Tonga District Meeting dated Lifuka, Ha’apai, 23 August, 1870.} Other ministers like Moulton, Watkin, Stephinson, W.T Rabone, David Wylie and Greenwood were all present at the Meeting with their own reservations about Baker’s moral behaviour. The charges laid revealed Baker’s limitation as a person and the motive of his conversion was left in question.

Nevertheless, viewing the situation from a local perspective, Baker’s *mana* as a *faifekau* and prompts contributor to Tonga’s politics was valued regardless. Noel Rutherford,\(^{129}\) who studied Baker from facts of history, revealed more than the biased biography of Baker written by his daughter Beatrice, which failed as a publication,\(^{130}\) and revealed in his study some of the sketchy details of Baker’s upbringing. His study included being a stow away child on a vessel from Great Britain to Australia in 1852,\(^{131}\) and his unremarkable educational background, that one would not expect any better moral behaviour from such a person. Although twenty pages of the Minute Book of the Special District Meeting 23 August, 1870 have been torn out (by whom and when it is not known) Rutherford quotes from the Records at the FWCT archives at Nukuálofa, the charges laid against Baker by the special District Meeting verbatim,

1. Elizabeth Kaufoóu, a young woman of between twenty and thirty, pushing her down nearly flat in the boat, preventing her rising when she made an effort to do so drawing her hair through your fingers and tickling her neck, it being nearly dark at the time.
2. Also chasing her with a stick on another occasion on the green.
3. Examining the private part of a young married woman between 9 and 10 pm in a small room, no third person being present. Also acting unbecomingly to the same person on another occasion, to the great indignation of her husband.
4. Pulling the breasts of sundry woman, and pricking with a pin the hinder part of another.
5. Chasing sundry girls around the mission premises and poking them in their sides.
6. Poking and pinching the private parts of a man named Samiuela Nauhaámea.\(^{132}\)

---


\(^{130}\) A biography of Baker was compiled by his daughter Beatrice Baker, *Shirley Baker and the King of Tonga*, (Auckland: Noel Rutherford & Pasifika Press, 1971), 12.


\(^{132}\) Ibid. Rutherford, 48.
Judging his behaviour from common sense, who would entertain such performances form a *faifekau*? Moreover, the situation was further aggravated because it was hard for Baker to vacate the chair for his own trial in this special District Meeting held in Lifuka, Ha'apai, 1870. Justice was not reached because the offender chaired his own trial, a point which Watkin and Greenwood protested against. However, Tongan loyalty to Baker was evident; they did not wish to give testimony against Baker because from a Tongan point of view, the presence of god in his person (mana) demanded reverence paid to him, regardless. The works had Baker done for the nation and in support of King Tupou I was so well known to most Tongans that he was given respect. Furthermore, judgments against such leading people of the society were only made by the *Tui* who was believed to be god in residence. If the claim by A.H. Wood that Baker was already “regarded as a great chief in Tongan custom,” could be justified, then this study also believes that the mana in him as a *faifekau* and his being a *palangi* together with his intimate affiliation to Tupou I, restrained Tongans from testifying against Baker. Thus Tongans were aware that their own personal judgments could not be publicly used to judge a *faifekau* or matters regarding the church. Tongan loyalty towards *faifekau* and church matters is such that regardless of how serious any offences committed by *faifekau* they would always feel reluctant to judge. We shall see more examples of this claim in later chapters. The Australian Conference in its Hobart sitting recorded the Minutes of a Special Committee meeting in which Baker’s charges were discussed,

> Mr Baker’s conduct has in some respects been wanting in that gravity and caution which belong to the character of a Christian Missionary and it recommends his

---


134. Despite this, allowances were always given to Tongans to *ngulungulu feiʻumu* [a chance for expressing their opinions] and imposing their personal interest upon another, such impressions were only to be held at the *ʻumu* [cooking place] kitchen only.
attention to be called to the need of greater circumspection in his intercourse with the natives.135

Baker’s behaviour and attitude to the mission meant that he might have been recalled from Tonga as early as 1871. Given the above, he had preached justice yet he had been quite unsuitable to serve as a fai’ekau. A.H. Wood’s judgment of the Baker situation stated,

…it would have been far wiser for the Conference to have recalled Baker in 1871….The authorities in Australia could not have foreseen the fatal consequences of leaving him in Tonga, but they should have recalled him for the sake of the properties.136

Perhaps the view expressed above is an outsider view; however, from an insider perspective, his contribution to the set up of a free church and an independent state was more valued than his behaviour.

The Tongan-born Jabez Bunting Watkin is said to have claimed Baker’s conduct to be normal. However, the Conference decision given above somehow encouraged Baker in his ways. Baker continued in politics and simultaneously served the needs of the German company in Tonga. In 1872, Baker became Tupou I’s secretary, and on questioning regarding this role for the King, he insisted that he was only giving advice when needed. Baker published two papers: The Bo’obo’oi [Tongan language newspaper] in 1874, and Times of Tonga [Ko e Taimi ó Tonga] first released in 1876. Baker used these two publications to discuss political issues; advocating his own political views and controversial opinions. In the first Bo’obo’oi issue the editor defended Tupou I’s political ambition, Ke Siasi mo Buleânga á Tonga [Tonga to become a free church and an independent state].

---
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Baker’s support for King Tupou I and his aspirations towards an innovation of the way of governance was quite explicit. By this time, Tupou I had already used Baker for the preparation of the Tongan Constitution of 1875. Baker was warned in the District Meeting of 30 December, 1873; that in regard to his political role his loyalty to the mission was very much in question. Moulton’s letter to Chapman, the Secretary of Mission, stated,

Our District Meeting was concluded yesterday, and though it has been in many respects a painful one, yet the result is on the whole satisfactory. The evil I spoke of has been stopped without our being reduced to the necessity of sending up a formal charge.\textsuperscript{137}

However Baker continued to be a business man. In 1873 Baker lent money to the government of Tonga for a sugar cane plantation in preparation for a sugar industry, but did not even admit where the money had come from. Again, in 1875, Baker in his capacity as Chairman of Directors also lent money, half of the paid up capital of 15,000 pounds, to the government for a bank to be established, leaving the other half for the government to pay. These ventures ended in failure and the funding of it all remained a mystery. What is clear is that Baker had some revenue from his medicine business and the German firm who bought copra from the Tongan people. There is no doubt that he did all this for his own benefit, and to win the favor of the king and the government, given that his relationship with all his missionary colleagues was extremely poor most especially with his rival Moulton. These actions, with his contribution to formulating the Tongan Constitution at the direction of the king, still gave Baker a high stance in the Tongan \textit{kainga}.

The loyalty of Baker was demanded within three circles of administration. Firstly the circle of the missionaries themselves demanded that Baker should live up to

\textsuperscript{137}. Moulton to Chapman, Catalogue 99. M.O.M.C., Methodist Records at Mission office, Uniting Church of Australia; Methodist Overseas Mission, Sydney.
the standard of a *faifekau* and a British citizen, but he breached that by his political involvement and representation of the German business firm; let alone his immoral behaviour reported earlier. H.G. Cummins, in his study of Moulton, summed up the facts about Baker and stated,

In 1877 when [Moulton left] for England, there had been conflict enough—quarrels among the missionaries about educational policy and the idea of an independent church, disagreement over Baker’s pro-German views and his political influence with the king, agitation by white residents who chaffed under Baker’s laws, concern in Conference because of queries from missionaries and the British authorities about Baker’s activities, and the king’s anxiety that certain Europeans, and perhaps some of his own subjects, sought British annexation of the kingdom.\(^{138}\)

The second circle was the Australian Conference and their concern that Baker had breached his loyalty to Methodist discipline and Christian Teachings. Chapman wrote to Baker in 1876 about his actions in declaring Bankruptcy after a year of operation and stated that, “the bitter experience you have had” has brought “injury to our work in the past.”\(^{139}\) The last circle that demanded loyalty from Baker was King Tupou I for the sake of his island kingdom. Baker was able to yield to Tupou I and his *fakakainaiga* [drawing Baker to him for a purpose] policy and used him for political aims. Baker’s ambiguous identity was an opportunity for the situation to be used for anything, political consultation or otherwise. But most importantly, King Tupou I had already looked at a helper who would draw up the Constitution for Tonga, and the person he needed was such a person whose submission to his dictates would be at its highest degree. That person was Baker.


\(^{139}\) *Tongan Papers*, FWCT. Archive, Nuku’alofa.
A justification of why Baker was involved in the formation of the Tongan Constitution is evident in the letter appearing in the Bo’obo’oi \(^{140}\) in which Baker himself stated,

Two years ago, Tubou said to me, “Excuse me, Mr. Baker, but you will translate into Tonga for me the roots of the laws of your own and other countries, which is spoken of as Constitution, and anything which you think we can do which will be useful for Tonga, that I may examine it; for I am anxious to set up in Tonga laws similar to those of other countries, to make Tonga a real Government.” I answered thus – “it is well.” This then, is the writing I gave to the King, who has told me to print it in the Bo’obo’oi, so that the country may be made aware of it, and it be a basis for the deliberation of the chiefs in the Parliament which we are expecting to meet in September.\(^{141}\)

Baker admitted his purpose in publishing the explanation in the Bo’obo’oi, was to “prevent groundless fears and much talk.”\(^{142}\) Besides, Baker also designed the Tongan flag and both he and Moulton tendered compositions for the Tongan national anthem with tunes appropriately chosen. Baker’s composition was accepted as the national anthem while Moulton’s composition was published as one of the Wesleyan hymns.\(^{143}\) The Missionary Review records the Tongan words and the English translation of the National Anthem,

\[\begin{align*}
&‘É ‘Otuá Mafimafi, Ko ho mau Éiki Koe, 
&Ko Koe ko e falalaánga, Mo e Ófa ki Tonga: 
&Áfio hifo émau lotu á ia óku mau fai ni, 
&Mo ke tali ho mau loto, Ó Maluí á Tupou. \\
&O, almighty God, our Lord, 
&Our shield Thou art, defending sword,
\end{align*}\]

\(^{140}\) This Boóboói Newspaper was Baker’s initiative to provide official news for public was published in 1874 to 1877.  
\(^{141}\) An Extract from Supplement to the Bo’obo’oi, No. 6, vol.2, 1875. SB/244.  
\(^{142}\) “Ko e Tala Teuteu” in Ko e Konisitutone ‘o Tonga: Ko e ‘Uluaki Fakalahi, No.6. Vol. II., Sept. 1875.  
\(^{143}\) See Hymn Number 390, titled, ‘Ko e Hiva ó e Tuí,’ Naé fai é he kau Faifekau, Ko e Tohi Himi á e Siasi Uesiliana Tauútaina ó Tonga, (Nukuálofa: Friendly Island Bookshop, 2001), 119.
Our rock, forever guiding hand.
Ever protecting our dear land.
We beseech Thee, hear our prayer,
Our Sovereign Queen keep in Thy care,
Guard, defend, maintain her throne,
Tonga relies on Thee alone.\textsuperscript{144}

The contents of the national anthem essentially condensed loyalty to God and loyalty to the Tuí of Tonga and a prayer for sustenance of Sovereignty.\textsuperscript{145} The Granting of the Tongan Constitution on 4\textsuperscript{th} November, 1875 concluded the Parliamentary sessions of that year. Quoting part of King Tupou I’s speech on the inauguration of the Constitution,

I am grateful to you, the representatives of this parliament,... of your glad acceptance of the Constitution—because the majority of you agreed that it should become the Law of the Land. And you who have disagreed, let the day soon come when you will realize that the Constitution established by the Parliament is the greatest possession of our country...Let it become the foundation stone of our country for ever, ...May each of you inscribe on your hearts:— “Tonga for Tongans.” If Tonga will remain as it is now, I will not say that it is because of our intelligence or our knowledge or whenever it is we can do, but only because of our intelligence or our Knowledge or whenever it is we can do, but only because we are with God. As I have said before I will say again, “Tonga is dedicated to God.”\textsuperscript{146}

\textsuperscript{144} The Missionary Review, dated August, 1947.
\textsuperscript{145} There is a slight difference in the translation of the Tongan version and the English version; where the Tongan version ended with a phrase of prayer to “defend, guard, and secure” his Majesty King Tupou, whereas, the English translation ended with a statement enjoined a Tonga’s total reliance on God. The translation was also made in the twentieth century when Queen Salote ruled Tonga as Tupou III.
\textsuperscript{146} Sione Latukefu, \textit{The Tonga Constitution: A Brief History to Celebrate its Centenary}, (Nuku‘alofo: Tonga Traditions Committee Publications, 1975), 43.
Substantially, this thesis sees in this draft of the granted Constitution the centrality of loyalty to God\textsuperscript{147} as its motif as written as its first item, “The Declaration of Rights” stating,

\begin{quote}
SEEING it appears to be the Will of God for man to be free, as He has made of one blood all nations of men, therefore shall the people of Tonga be forever free, and all people who reside or may reside in this kingdom. And the lives of and bodies and times of all people shall be free to possess and acquire property, all doing as they like with the fruit of their hands, and using their own property, all doing as they like with the fruit of their hands, and their own property as they may seem fit.\textsuperscript{148}
\end{quote}

It was quite clear from the inaugurated written Constitution that there was a paradigm shift from the \textit{FakaTonga} [Tongan way]: from being the King’s word as Law and ruling, to the Constitutional Law and Order way. We shall put this very first item of the Constitution into test in a later chapter. Above all, what is left is the proper appropriation and application of the Constitution by King and people. Evalate Imi Soni, noted the \textit{fakaTonga} way in his statement made for the \textit{Tuí mo e Houéiki ‘o Tonga}, [King and chiefs of Tonga], stating, \textit{kuo hulu áupito ho’o mou anga fakaTonga, ke bule tokotaha be á e Tuí}. \textsuperscript{149} [You have been ruling things the Tongan way; the King’s decision is Law]. We shall check the \textit{fakaTonga} by way of \textit{fakakainga} in the later chapters.

Whether the Constitution was fully understood by all Tongans it was for them something to proud of, given in its first article, \textit{Ko e Tohi ó e Tauátaina} [The Book of Independence], that their \textit{tau’ataina} [freedom] was officially legalized and grounded

\begin{footnotes}
\item[147] The Tongan translation reads its first item as “\textit{I. - Ko e Tohi ó e Tauátaina, Ko e meá i he ha mai ko e finangalo ó e Òtua ke tauátaina á e tangata, ko e meá i he éne ngaohi ó e toto be taha á e kakai kotoa pe.”} [The Book of Tauátaina, \ldots\ldots\ldots] see a copy of the original 1875 Tonga Constitution in \textit{Tonga Government Publications}, Note: SB/256-265 filmed as PMB Doc.463. PMB 1203.
\item[149] Ko e Folofola á e Fakafofonga Lahi ki he Òtu Pasifiki Uesite ki he Tu’I mo hono Hou’eiki, Evalate Imi Soni ki he Tuí mo e Houéiki ó Tonga, S/B. 296/2. Reel 4. 271, PMB 1203.
\end{footnotes}
not only in King Tupou I but also in the Will of the Living God. Various compositions about the Constitution on its centenary (1975) reflected the happiness of the Tongan in having a Tongan Constitution, a historic achievement. From another perspective, the Constitution facilitated the recognition of its status in international level, to gain Tonga’s national sovereignty. From King Tupou I’s perspective his ambition for recognition as a sovereign state was achieved. The aspiration to separate the church from the state since the church’s inception in 1826 was been fully realized in the inauguration of the 1875 Tonga Constitution. However, the matter of a Free Church for Tonga became the next item on the agenda. The truth of the situation may be contained in a letter written a year earlier, which contained the resolution reached in a meeting of King Tupou I and the chiefs held early in 1874, and recorded in the Minutes of the District Meeting,

(1). That the time has come when the Church and state should be separated…It is now 21 years (sic) since the liberation of the people was made, but in Church affairs the former system is still continuing, and is therefore oppose to the law of liberty, and this meeting says that the time has now come to fulfil the promise made by the missionaries in this matter, and that Trustees be appointed by the Church who shall have the control and superintendence of all matters connected with the church, and all arrangements for the erection and support of church &c. shall emanate from the Trustees Meeting, according to the usual Wesleyan law, and not as is the custom here at present.

(2). With regard to the money which is now collected regularly, this meeting says it is true the people complain of the large sums sent away from the country which are collected at the missionary meetings…This meeting says that the time has come when Tonga is able to support the entire expense of the Mission in Tonga, the support of the missionaries, the assistant missionaries, and the whole of the agents employed by the Church, and this meeting earnestly desires that the Committee and Conference will allow the Church in Tonga to become an independent Church, to be supported by the people of Tonga as their Church, as becomes a people who
know and understand the Gospel…. As it is a present it appears that the possession of Tonga has become the property of another.¹⁵⁰

Though the content of the letter above clearly depicted the move towards an independent Church, the phrasing of the resolution of the Chiefs’ meeting was probably done by Baker, which no doubt still raises further questions.

The correspondences received in the government office in Tonga contained letters, “criticizing Baker and Tupou I.” In response, the letters sent overseas by Baker also contain charges against Moulton. Their colleagues also offered their own judgment as had the General Secretary Mission, George Brown, who in his autobiography, observed,

That prior to the Rev. J.E. Moulton’s visit to England in 1787, Mr Baker had become very jealous of Mr. Moulton’s influence with the people, and his close friendship with King George, and that he did his best during Mr. Moulton’s absence to ingratiate himself with the King, as far as possible to make it apparent that his own services were indispensible to his Majesty.¹⁵¹

Whatever the truth of the above is, King Tupou I’s policy was to have Tonga self administered in matters of the church. It was apparent at this stage that he was not able to fakakainga Moulton [include Moulton under his political umbrella]. But considering the effort and time King Tupou I and Baker had put in, it is certain that to institute a Free Church Baker would have needed to be instrumental in such a move.

Loyalty played in a multifaceted situation. In 1879 an enquiry instigated by Sir Arthur Gordon took place in Tonga searching into the heart of charges against Baker. Rev. B.C. Chapman, the General Secretary of Missions, and Rev. W. Clarke
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were sent by the Board of Missions to conduct the investigation in Tonga. The content of charges is contained in a letter from Auckland, written by Chapman, to Consul Maudslay in Tongatapu informing him of their coming. The letter substantially stated, “We shall have to look to you for the evidence by which you propose to establish the charges made against Mr. Baker in your letters (official and unofficial). I trust that by furnishing this evidence you will assist us to arrive at the truth. I forward to your care a letter from Sir A. Gordon, and shall be obliged if you will place it in His Excellency’s Hands as early as possible.”152 Six charges were laid against Baker including, “being a secret agent of a German firm Godeffroy & Co.”, and “conducting a large part of the business of the Government of Tonga…business transactions…and considerable influence in the management of the local finances…” and “interfering in political matters” by appointing “Mr Trood” as Secretary to Government, and concluding a Treaty “with Germany almost entirely by Mr. Baker’s Management and influence, by which considerable advantage was granted to Germany, including a tract of land as a coaling station,” in Vavaú. The last three charges concerned him censuring “officers of our church for countenancing or assisting in enquiry conducted by the British Consul,” advances of money to some of Godeffroy’s agents immediately before or on the day of Mission collection,” and lastly some “misleading and untrue” statements regarding natives who had “incurred liabilities for the Missionary meeting.”153 It should be noted that Baker’s own stance in Tonga at the time was that he was using the business of the German firm, of which Mr Weber, the Imperial German Consul, was the Manager, to further German interests in Tonga. W. Treshow, manager of the Tongatabu agency of this company, stated in the affidavit sworn before the Deputation that the business of the company was that of buying people’s copra at “one and half cents”. And at one time “owing to the request of

the people, Baker told Mr. Treshow to “raise it to two cents, which [he] had done for the last three years.” Baker’s double identity here stood out but from the British authorities’ perspective the German involvement in Tonga was the issue of their interest.

Baker’s loyalty to King Tupou I afforded His Majesty an opportunity to defend Baker’s stance and is revealed in King Tupou I’s letter, translated by J.B. Watkin, which substantially said, “I King George, state as follows”

1. Mr. Baker had nothing whatever to do in the obtaining, by the Kingdom of Germany, the lease of the coaling station in Vava’u. Before Mr. Baker knew about this matter, ‘Uga and I had decided about it; and therefore he did not persuade us, or have anything to do with it, in any one thing.

2. With reference to the letter to the Emperor of Germany to bring a secretary, Mr. Baker did not speak about it, or express his opinion, or influence me; it was my own wish.

3. And to say that we desirous for Mr. Baker’s removal; are not our eyes filled with tears at our anticipated separation from him? It is our wish that he should remain in Tonga forever.

Other missionary colleagues had their opinions of the event. Mr. Minn’s letter to Chapman stated clearly his view of the matter, “I am decidedly opposed to our becoming an independent Church, and am astonished that the Conference entertained the question for a moment.” From the chiefs, William Tugi also wrote a letter to defend Baker. Essentially, Tugi’s letter argued that Baker was only requested by King George to be “on board of the German man-of-war ‘Herta’ when the Treaty was being made,” and that the lease agreed was meant for

---

154. Extract of W. Treskow, Affidavit, in Reel 4, 1581, PMB 1203.
155. For his own defence Baker placed on table of the Deputation several letters including Jioaji Tubou to Deputation Chapman and Clark, dated King’s Palace, 24th October, 1879. S/B 327, Reel 4, 1557. PMB 1203.
156. Minns’ letter to Chapman, dated 4th May, 1873. Item 170. M.O.M.C.
the island of Rotuma and Vava’u (Hafuluhao) for a coaling station. Tugi’s letter was also noted to have been translated by Watkin. Another letter written by Tevita ‘Uga; then Premier, in support of Baker, was also placed by Baker before the deputation for his defence. Úga’s letter stated that “Baker had nothing to do…or control the Government business in Sydney… and to say that we did not receive an account of debts is entirely incorrect”; and lastly, “I have no recollection of saying that ‘Mr. Baker commanded the King not to tell me his request to the Emperor of Germany to bring a secretary to Tonga.” 158 The truth of the matter, in regard to the move towards independent church, was supported by Baker’s involvement. It is not known whether Baker was able to read the will of Tupou I at the time but the support and loyalty he paid was well received by the authorities and chiefs at the time. It was true that King Tupou I had always thought of working towards an independent Church but the time to begin it was left for the future to decide.

Moreover, more news reached the Mission Board, claiming Baker had increased the “amount of missionary contribution in Tonga”. This, coupled with the charges laid by Consul Maudslay, led to Baker being asked to take leave from Tonga while the investigation held by Rev. B. Chapman and Rev. W. Clark, the Deputation team sent to Tonga to investigate the matter. 159 In a letter to the Deputation team Baker argued that he “believed” that he had been “unjustly and illegally recalled”. Further he thought it was “not only unmethodistic, but unEnglish to be condemned without a trial”. 160

Wilfred Collet Esq., Secretary of Western Pacific British High Commission in Suva, extracted part of one of the letters of Baker about the situation in which

---

Collet judged as libellous of officers in authorities, both of the High Commission and of the Australian Conference. The extract from Baker’s letter stated by Collet,

I should certainly have thought you, who escaped a fellon’s cell at Suva because I was made your scapegoat— for it is well known the understanding between the officials of the British Government and Messrs Chapman and Hunt; that if I were not sacrificed and recalled you would not escape, but if I were recalled you would be let go free on the charge of having murdered the innocent children of New Zealand in your murderous raid upon them—would have acted more honourably to an absent friend.161

The substantial extract of Baker’s letter cited above led to his deportation from Tonga at a later date. However his actions (like those of any other person) really indicated the kind of person he was. One may conclude from the above that Fakaongo [loyalty] is a slippery term, and because it assumes an undefined identity, libel and other dirty politics will always be the inevitable inclusions. It would be interesting to see if all or the majority of all living persons on earth acted likewise because a person’s bias is an indication of one’s loyalty and this emphasis may leap from one side or the other. We may also conclude that no person can maintain a proper neutral position without any bias.

George Brown, who was General Secretary in 1880’s and was also sent to Tonga in a Deputation, reported in his Autobiography that, “In 1874, the Tonga Home Mission and Contingent Fund was formed, in accordance with the wishes of the Tonga Government and the District Meeting.”162 Though this move was approved of by the Australian Conference of 1875, they did not quite understand the motive behind it. Perhaps, this time King Tupou I had already considered the large

161 “In Dr. Baker’s statement references are made to letters that passed between the High Commissioner and Dr. Baker, Extracts and correspondences, in Western Pacific High Commission Records. S/B.334. PMB 1203. Reel 4. 661.
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amounts of Tongan oil and money drained out from Tongan economy to overseas for the cause of missionary work. There is no doubt that the king somehow felt that his people’s generosity was being exploited. This study asserts that this was part of the basis of forming an independent church in Tonga in order to have the money stayed in Tonga; and contextually, was also part of the move for a Home Misson Fund. King Tupou I was satisfied by the Conference approval of the Home Mission Fund and as Brown reported, “in the following year he signed a lease granting to four trustees for a term of ninety-nine years the properties then occupied by the Wesleyan Church”.

The early 1880 Conference, which Baker attended, resolved that Baker be “recalled” and he “received permission to rest for one year and to reside in New Zealand.” This decision by the Conference was not well received by King Tupou I. A letter signed by Úga, dated the King’s Palace, Nukuálofa, 6 October, 1879, stated King Tupou I’s dissatisfaction with the Conference decision to recall Baker from Tonga. The letter also stated that His Majesty signed the leases “believing that this said deed had become the law and rule of the management of the Wesleyan Church in Tonga; and if it not be abided by, and Mr. Baker is removed without the investigation provided for in the said deed before the tribunals therein provided for, you must forgive him when he says that the leases shall at once become null and void.” This was because His Majesty signed the leases only in the understanding, that the signed deed would be kept by both parties. In the letter of Chapman and Davies to Baker in reply he was told of his “recall” and that he was “no longer a member of this District meeting”. A long reply was written by Chapman and Davies to King Tupou I explaining the benefits of the offered leased land to the Wesleyan churches and schools and that this was for the benefit of his

---

163. Ibid. p. 417.
164. This letter by ‘Uga is no doubt was written and worded by Baker himself. See Úga, letter to The Rev. B. Chapman, and the representative of the Church in Sydney, dated Nukuálofa, 6 Oct., 1879, in Letters and Correspondence in Re Tongan Affairs, dated Nukuálofa, 6 Oct., 1879. S/B.Reel 4. 014. PMB 1203.
165. Chapman and Clark, to Baker, dated Nukuálofa, On board of John Wesley, 6 October, 1873[9].
own people from which they “have derived so much profit”. In the course of
this exchange of letters between the deputation team and His Majesty, a letter
replying to the deputation and signed by ‘Úga stated, “This is the root of his mind,
for Tonga to be a church, and his Majesty wishes for there not to be anything in
which Tonga and the church may come in collision.” Further, the letter listed the
following, (quoted in part)

1. For the Church in Tonga to be governed by the
   Conference and the President of Conference.
2. Tonga to pay all salaries of the European Missionaries
   in Tonga…the same amount …in Sydney….
3. Not have any Missionary removed without trial…. 
4. ….Missionaries; one for Nukuálofa and Muá, and
   Haápai, and Vavaú, and the college, for no station of
   a Missionary to be vacant.
5. …What his Majesty is desirous of obtaining whilst he
   is still alive, ‘For Tonga to be a church.’…Therefore
   His Majesty earnestly begs you will beg the
   Conference to grant His Majesty’s request, ‘For
   Tonga to be a Church.’
6. ….they wish for it to be plain to the elders that His
   Majesty and his people are one in their mind, for
   ‘Tonga to be a Church.’

A petition letter against Baker’s removal from Tonga, written by the Tongan
ministers; “Ilaisa Langi; Filipe Taufa; Jotame Havea; Uikilifi Fuji; Meli Taufa;
Baula Fukofuka; Semisi Latu; Nafitalai Toga; Tevita Malaéfoóu; Samiuela Mafi;
Samiuela Ikahehengi; Lijiate Fifita; and 2970 other signatures” essentially contained
the same argument about Baker being “taken away without being tried.” It was
interesting how Baker’s impact was valued by the Europeans in Tonga at the time
and noted their wish to “cordially acknowledge the valuable assistance,” Baker had
rendered to them in Tonga.

166. Chapman and Clark, to King George, dated on board the John Wesley, 8 Oct., 1879
168. Ilaisi Langi and others to Chapman and Clark, dated, Toga, Nukuálofa, 28 October, 1879.
169. Listed Europeans signed the letter were, Joshua Cocker; W.Terskow, Manager of the firm of Messrs
    Godeffroy; W.D.Barnard; T. Heinkermyne; Cramer Walter, Manager of the Manager firm Messrs, Ruge and
    Co.; N. Nielson; Marcus Frederick Hamilton; John Pursely; T. Kohnkie; W. Lombard “Madonna”; B.L. Cocker;
Baker’s rival Moulton himself, though his efforts for Tonga had been rated highly by E.E.V. Collocott in his *Ko e Taú é Teau*, stated, Áua ko éne ngane ko e fu’u kato kohoa kuo fonu he ngaahi lelei fungani,170 [His work is like a huge woven basket full of all rich island delicacies], could not control his anger at his missionary brother Baker, as is evident in his official and personal communications.

While Moulton was away in Great Britain some very unexpected and sad events took place in the house of the royal family. The king’s son, Tevita ‘Únga, died in Auckland in October 1879. Baker, who was already in Auckland by that time, wrote a long letter to Rev. Watkin dated 23 October, 1879, and in the letter stated,

You will be sorry to hear ‘Uga is no more, he died on the 11 - views rely the day before the Doctor’s thought have a little better – but in the morning of the 11, I saw a great change – as a result before 9 we had a family prayer with him. That is myself and the lad Savou and Baula and his wife, he responded very fervently – a little while afterwards I went in and spoke to him and asked him if he fancied anything or wanted to say anything, and he answered no – he seemed oppressed but I do not think he thought his end was so near…and after sitting up, he said to Savou, *Taumaia!* And laid down and died.171

The letter indicates the extreme care Baker gave to the King’s son leading up to his death. Baker then assumed the task to fulfil in relationship; a duty to the King as stated in the letter, “I thought it my duty to try and send him to Tonga.” Baker made official communications to the “Superintendent of Police” in Wellington to get “permission from the Crown also from the Customs & Registrar to obtain a lot of Affidavits etc.” In the letter Baker also indicated that he was so thankful for the

---


permission allowing him to return to Tonga. He also tried to get a lead coffin for the
dead body of the prince. Baker sent all the documents to Watkin asking him to
translate them for the King. In the conclusion of the letter he made this statement,
“May I ask you to tell the King by no means to allow the leaden coffin to be
opened. It is now beautifully [punchcally?] sealed and will last for 100 years if
untouched.” Baker also warned that fever might severely affect the people if they
opened the coffin.

This tragic event gave Baker a way back into Tonga. In another letter Baker wrote,
“I am sorry to say after having put the coffin on board and the ship sailed, he has
had to put back again, there being a leak in the coffin,”172 The same message
contained a letter written by Baker to the King in Tongan that stated,

Neu Sila
Tisema 26, 1879.

Ki he Éne Áfio ko Kingi Jiaaji

É Tubou,

Óku faingata’a ‘áubito kiate au ken fakatau Folofola atu ki boó
Áfio i he mamahi ni – ka ke ke fakamolemole-
Naé folau á e vaka ni mo e meá fakaēiki, ka kuo angatuú á e
kau vaka mo e kakai beka folau bea óku ikai te nau fie folau
Kouūbi kuo mama jii á e buba. Ka óku ou toe ngaobi bea é
fakamatala á Savou á e anga a b. [ono] ngaobi – bea te u ómi é
au á e meá be liliu mai a e vaka. Ka ke fakamolemole óku
mamahi áubito hoku loto i he taē lava ni á e meá fakaēiki – ka
ke feimalie te u lava be.

Ófa atu áubito, áubito.
Ko a u Misa Beika.173

[It is very hard for me to state direct to your Majesty this
unexpected tragedy. The ship was about to leave with
the coffin but the passengers protested; claimed the
coffin is leaking. Hence I have unloaded it and it will
take time to fix it. Savou will explain to your Majesty

172 Baker to Watkin dated Auckland, 26 Dec., 1879. PMB. 1203. Reel 1.106.
what actually happened. Please be at peace, I promise I will myself bring the coffin to Tonga in another way.]

It is quite clear from the letter above that Baker sought permission from Tupou I for him in person to bring the coffin of Prince Tevita Únga to Tonga. The leak of the coffin is not confirmed. However, two months later another letter written by Baker to the King indicated another development. It is evident from the salutation of the letter by Baker that King Tupou I gave permission for Baker to come to Tonga and bring the coffin. The statement goes, “Ne u maú hoó tohi bea ne u fakafetai ai.”174 [I received your letter and am quite thankful]

In this February letter Baker outlined the following,

1. That I will bring the coffin on the German warship.
2. He [who?] is feared of any visit from Fiji and anything might happen.
3. (written words are unreadable).
4. A letter was sent to you [who?] from the Conference stating that your request was referred to the General Conference.
5. I spoke to the Conference and indicate to them your will, “Ke jiaji mo Buleánga á Tonga”- [that Tonga may become an independent church and state].
6. I have also made known to the Conference that I will come back to Tonga and will do whatever you may wish me to do.175

It is evident from the letter, the development he asked for in his previous letter to his Majesty regarding the leak in the coffin, was negotiating a German ship for shipping the coffin to Tonga. It is also evident that Baker attended the Conference in Sydney in early 1880 to seek permission to return to Tonga. However, in Baker’s letter to Watkin he stated that he was given a chance to make a speech and was granted “for 1 year [to] live at Auckland.” Again, he indicated in the letter that the Conference had elected a chairman for the Tonga District and the result was

“Moulton – 8,” and “Watkin 24.” Waterhouse stated that “Mr. Baker embraced the opportunity” of the death of Prince Tevita Únga “to pay a short visit to Tonga, as he had to take back the body of the King’s son, who has died in Auckland.” Baker used the event as a pretext for him to return to Tonga and to assure King Tupou I of his loyalty and willingness to assist with any development that His Majesty wished him to make in government. After the long wait the body of Tevita Úga reached Tonga on the German warship *Nautulus* in May, 1880. It was through Baker’s negotiations that the warship was able to convey the coffin from Auckland to Tonga. The funeral of His majesty’s son, Tevita Úga, the first Premier of Tonga, was held at *Malaé Lahi* in Úiha island, Haápai. The funeral was attended by King Tupou I and all the Chiefs of the government of Tonga. The funeral was held in the usual Tongan way of mourning a person of the house of the Tu’i; where *tangis* [mourning] and other traditional rituals were observed the Tapu of the dead person were seriously performed.

On the September, 1880, the Tongan Government Gazette recorded the following,

> His Majesty King George has been pleased to make this day the following appointments:-
> To be Premier of His Majesty’s Government and Member of His Majesty’s Privy Council: Rev. Shirley W. Baker.
> To be His Majesty’s Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of Lands: Rev. Shirley W. Baker.

By His Majesty’s Command. W.C. Tupou Malohi.
A.D.C. 178

The reason for such a move by King Tupou I is contained in His address recorded in the High Commissioner’s correspondence that stated, “…His Majesty’s pleasure that one who had made Tonga all it is, had given it a Constitution, a flag, a good

---

laws, should represent him in the present Parliament as prime Minister.”

Other matters in the same record also state that, “The attention of the members would be directed to the proposed independence of the Tongan church. His Majesty said that His feelings on this point were so strong that this independence was the condition on which he should continue to subscribe to the faith.” One may argue at this point that despite King Tupou I declaring a shift from his own wish as law to the written Constitution, his Majesty’s wishes prominently featured in the quoted speech. This Parliament session was very short and it was believed that it was only held to confirm Baker’s appointment and expressed that “it is the King’s wish,” that He needs a palangi to help him explain the “white-man’s fashion” which His Majesty declared he did not fully understand.

On a different occasion of King Tupou I’s speech at Parliament in November, 1880, His Majesty thanked God for “it is with him what shall happen and his will has been done.” Further, His Majesty frankly appreciated the work done by Baker to bring his son David [Únga] “to be buried in the land of his ancestors.” Lastly His Majesty also revealed to the members of Parliament that he had informed the Australia Conference of his desire “for our church here to become an independent church like the church in Sydney.”

While King Tupou I acted alone to consider things befitting his own island nation, the Australian Conference acted democratically to decide things for the church in Tonga through meetings. Here the culture conflict continued where the King’s single wish decided all matters and was generally accepted by the Tongan people because of his mana. Waterhouse in his report indicates that the request of King

---

Tupou I for an “independent District” must undergo several meetings, and would also need the Tonga District Meeting to show their opinion.\textsuperscript{181}

In December, 1880, a proclamation was issued by King Tupou I respecting an Establishment of Independent Church that stated,

\begin{quote}
I, George Tubou, being still possessed sufficient power (ability) to govern my people, and having made up my mind that my people and country shall be entirely free and independent [\textit{tauátaina}], and having thoroughly resolved that Tonga shall be an independent church, I take this opportunity of publishing my intention, so that the Elders of the Church in Sydney, the missionaries, and the whole world shall see I am determined to have separation….
\end{quote}

(signed) Jioaji Tubou.\textsuperscript{182}

From Baker’s labelled Private letter to the President of the Australian Conference regarding Moulton’s actions that had grieved His Majesty, King Tupou I, Baker, stated that Moulton one day addressed His Majesty in these words,

\begin{quote}
\textit{Ko ‘Usaia koe …}You are Uzziah. The king asked why? Mr Moulton replied. \textit{Koeúhi kuo ke ala ki he Lotu!} Which means because you have touched the Lotu, and also added not only so – but the Lord has visited you – Your son Tevita Uga has died – and your grandson Albert [Álipate]will die – who was then lying ill.\textsuperscript{183}
\end{quote}

King Tubou I wrote a letter to the President of Conference, published in Tongan in the \textit{Tobi Fanonganongo FakaPuleánga}, [Tonga Government Book] and which was also translated into English, informing the President and ministers of Conference of Moulton’s action against him and his family.\textsuperscript{184} The letter was signed by Baker’s supporters namely, Tubou Malohi, \textit{Kovana Vavaú} [Governor of Vavaú]; Tevita

\begin{footnotes}
\item[183] S.W. Baker, Private Letter to the President of Australia Conference, dated Nukuálofo, 18 July, 1887. SB/55.
\item[184] Ko e Tohi á Jiaoji Tubou Ki he Balesiteni mo e Houéiki Faifekau mo e Houéiki i he Konifelenisi i Sitene, dated Lifuka, 30 Okatopa, 1883. S/B 283. Reel 4. 035., PMB 1203.
\end{footnotes}
Ahome’e, *Tu’i Fakamaau Lahi* [Chief Justice]; Sekonaia Tuúhetoka, *Minisita Polisi* [Minister of Police]; Josateki Tonga, *Peimasita Lahi* [The Paymaster]; Misa Beika, *Palemia* [Premier]. The above action of Moulton to King Tupou I appears prophetic and from a Christian perspective the action itself was a *talatuki* [cursing] of the king. The tone of the letter is very low which reflected the impact of this action respecting someone who was so dear to the heart of the king. For the king who highly valued Moulton’s actions in education for his own people this action was hard to receive. King Tupou I in his letter noted Moulton’s was “continually fighting the Government”. Further, on in the same letter His Majesty noted one of Moulton’s speeches in a District Meeting where he openly stated “Mr Baker is my enemy; I have fought him; I am fighting him, and I will fight him.” For Moulton to publically voice his anger at his brother missionary was quite strange and unethical for he was the man with scholarship and the chieftain of all Wesleyan missionaries to Tonga. At the centre of the letter, the King noted that he himself along with the Privy Council begged that the Conference would,

… have love to me and Tonga, and recall Mr. Moulton; for I do not still wish to see him, or wish to hear him preach: he is no longer of any service in Tonga. I therefore beseech you to recall him, and to let Mr Watkin return to Tonga, to reside with me. If you grant my request, I hereby promise that you will never repent it; but if you do not, it will be plain enough to me and my people you do not wish for Tonga to be at peace and prosper:…

But in his conclusion King Tupou I stated clearly his next move, where the vision for an independent church comes clear,

….when my church, which I am building in Nukuálota, is finished, I shall seek a minister of another denomination to conduct my services and that of my

---

185. King George Tupou I Letter to The President and Elders of the Conference in Sydney, dated Lifuka, 30 October, 1883. Translation of the King’s petition against Moulton’s action cited above.
186. Moulton had already revered by his loyalists and students as, scholar, theologian and the minister with special mana.
people. But I trust you will have respect to the petition, and tears of an old man, who has almost completed his year of jubilee in the Wesleyan Church.

In all it was very strong of Moulton to have stated that the death of Tupou I’s own son was taken by the Lord because of his actions against the Lotu. But if we may ask further, why did the Conference not accept the request of the king to avoid the division?

Baker used this action of Moulton to consolidate his position. The Tonga Government Blue Book records a series of Charges and documents read by the Rev. S.W. Baker before the Ministers’ Committee on Tonga Affairs, regarding his relationship to Moulton. He denied this being a “personal matter,” at all. In item 4 of Baker’s statement the point at issue is regarding “Mr Moulton’s political and obnoxious conduct to the King and his Government.” And again after acknowledging Moulton’s effort in establishing better education for Tonga, in item 6 Baker repeated,

Mr. Moulton has become a political adversary, dangerous to the best interest of Tonga, obnoxious to the King, and obnoxious to the government—for the sake of Methodism and the peace of the land—that the Conference, in its wisdom should permit Mr Moulton to return to the colonies….

Baker stated clearly in item 7 that on matters relating to Moulton’s being “obnoxious to the King” not only “has Mr. Moulton embittered” him but listed the following,

(1) By cursing him;
(2) By translating secretly the petition to the Queen;
(3) But also by taking the part of the prisoners, and continually going to the King with the Consul about them;
(4) And now he has given in his Magazine, in the article about the Miranda, an insult to the King and Tonga

---

Government, which neither the King nor any of his own chiefs will ever forget.

In item 10 Baker stated,

10. - Should Mr. Moulton be send back to Tonga as superintendent of Tonga circuit, then of course, all friendly relations between Tonga Government and the Methodist Church will at once cease, and the New South Wales will have violated the compact made by the General Conference to Tonga District and His Majesty… and should such be the case, secession will take place.

And on touching the matters regarding schools, “The first thing will be the Tonga Government College will secede, and of course Mr. Moulton will not have anything to do with the King’s church.” And regarding the students of Moulton’s school, “Tupou College,” Baker stated, “if Moulton does not leave, the Government will refuse to employ any of its students in any position whatever…Mr. Moulton’s removal means life to Tubou College.” In conclusion, Baker in regard to reconciling himself and Moulton stated, “No! Mr. Moulton has so united himself with a clique that it is impossible for him to separate himself from them; he has educated them to their present position; he dare not, and he cannot leave them.”

Baker purposely did his utmost to get rid of Moulton from Tonga. His statement about Tupou College reflected his ill-feeling about Moulton’s work at Tupou College. The differences went even wider as the Tonga Government Blue Book further records the series of charges brought by Baker on behalf of the Tonga Government against Moulton, and the reply by Moulton duly made to the District Meeting of the Wesleyan Church, at Lifuka, Ha’apai, on 24 October, 1883, and the replication of Baker to the same. 188 Charge I was for “libel” to which Moulton demanded clarification as to whether the Government had laid the charges?

---

188 Tonga Government Blue Book Containing Lists of Charges brought by the Premier of Tonga (Rev. S. W. Baker), on behalf of the Tongan Government…S/B. 286. PMB 1203, Reel 4.047.
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Moulton stated, “The king denied it; and on my asking the Prince he denied it too.” Moulton summed up his conclusion by stating that, “it is plain that the charges are not laid by the Government.”189 As the Meeting concluded with a vote of guilty or not guilty, the result of the ballot was, “Not guilty ……7; Guilty……5; Did not vote ……..3.” In accordance to the vote Moulton was not guilty of the first charge. However, the committee further discussed a challenge to David Tonga’s and Jemisi Havea’s votes because David Tonga was an interested party in the case and Jemisi Havea had not become “legally a member of [the] District Meeting, his name not being on the Minute of Conference,”190 because he had just arrived from Fiji. The challenge was considered and agreed upon; thus the result of the vote was changed from 7 to 5 “not guilty.” Further Pita Vi’s vote, which Mr. Moulton had challenged earlier for his being “deaf”, was duly reconsidered by the committee and agreed to be counted. Thus, in the concluding of Charge 1 it was claimed “that Mr. Moulton has been found guilty by his District Meeting on this, the first charge.” Charge II concerned Mr. Moulton “translating secretly, and unknown to His Majesty and Government, a petition to Her Majesty the Queen of England.” On voting the committee voted 7 guilty and 5 not guilty; hence the chairman left “the matter to his Conference.”191 Charge III, concerned “using the Mission Press against His Majesty and his Government” and the printing of the “Niu Vakai” newspaper. An opportunity was given for clarification by both parties, was duly considered, and was voted 5 guilty and 0 not guilty while 9 did not vote. Charge IV concerned Moulton “uttering a gross libel” against [Baker’s] character in a sermon delivered by him on Sabbath, Nov. 19, 1882. Moulton had preached from the text Luke ix.25, and read his lesson from 1 Samuel, xviii. Moulton replied to this charge and stated the circumstance that led to preaching this sermon “was the trial of the three college students for stealing.” They were “sentenced to work on the roads for six months,” but an appeal to a higher court was made and they

189. Ibid. p.2.
190. Ibid. p.4.
191. Ibid. p.5.
were later “set at liberty.” Baker “interfered and ordered” them to work at once. Moulton sent the tutor, the Tongan minister David Finau, to Baker “to ask the reason,” and in the interview that followed Finau was horsewhipped.” Moulton thought the matter could not be judged in Tonga, nor was there a court in Tonga that might try Mr. Baker, the Premier himself, who did the horsewhipping of the Tongan church minister. Hence, Moulton did it from the pulpit as he thought that if such an action of a minister being thrashed by the Premier took place in Sydney, “[he] thinks every pulpit would ring with it.” But Baker, on replying to David Finau’s horsewhipping, stated he had laid, “the whip across David Finau’s shoulders when he so grossly insults [his] wife in [his] presence, and in her own house, and on her verandah.” Thus the truth was partially imparted. However, for Charge IV, the record indicated the voting resulted as follows, Guilty – 7 and for this particular vote the names of the ministers voting guilty were, J.B.Watkin, Wickliffe Fusi, John Latu, Phillip Taufa, Abel Kaufuji, William Langi, and Paul Vi; or Not Guilty – 0; and for those who did not vote - 6. The names entered above, would be Baker’s closest partners in the move towards an independent Church, because they have shown to take side with him.

Before the vision for the Free Church was exhibited, King Tupou 1 at the instrumental of Baker established a government college to manifest his Majesty’s ambition of keeping Tonga for Tongans. His Majesty’s relationship with Moulton, the man whom he entrusted the educational vision for his people in 1866 may have become blurred.

From a Privy Council meeting in 1881, the following resolution was reached regarding the establishment of the Government College.

---

192. Ibid. p.8.
[Re: The Government College, The Privy Council resolved by unanimous show of hands to establish the Government College in Tonga and to accept the application from a Victorian scholar to be the first president of the College; and all matters regarding the college shall be left to the Premier to take care of.]

Tonga College was established by King Tupou 1 and Baker on 30 October, 1882, and the name speaks for its purpose;

‘I he folofola ‘a e Tu’i na’a ne fakaba ‘ene faka’amu ke ako’i ‘i be Kolisi ni ‘a e fanau tangata ‘a e hou’eiki ‘oe fonua pea moe kau tangata ke ngaue ‘i be Pule’anga pea e nau ngaobi ‘a e tukui kolo ke fokotu’u ai ha ako’anga, ‘o hange ko ia ‘oku lolotonga fai ‘I ‘Aositlelia, Ko e finangalo ‘o ‘ene ‘Afio ke poto ‘a hono kakai pea ke nau taubl ‘a e fonua ko Tonga ma’a e kakai Tonga. Na’a ne fakahingoa leva ‘a e ako’anga ko e Kolisi Tonga, pea ko ‘enau moto leva ko e “Tonga ma’a Tonga.” [His Majesty pronounced his wish for the college as a place where the chiefs children and men of the nation be well matriculated purposely to work the government and for them to begin schools in various villages, in the Australia education system. His Majesty also wished his people to be well educated and for them to keep Tonga for Tongans. His Majesty named the College “Tonga College,” and gave its motto as “Tonga for Tongans.”]

193 The above insertion is an original or the resolution reached at the King Tupou 1’s Palace, by Privy Concil Meeting dated 29 June, 1881. Adapted from Dr. S. Tapa, (ed.). Mate ma’a Tonga: Senituli Kolisi Tonga, 1983. (Nuku’alofa: Fale Pulusi ‘o e Pule’anga, 1983), 5.
It is evident from His Majesty’s speech cited above, that the vision he entrusted Moulton to educate his people had partly fulfilled. Putting His Majesty’s wish for another school in the context of Moulton’s conflicting relationship with Baker, and His Majesty’s movement towards a sovereign state; it is clear the King needed some government workers.

Source: *Mate Ma’a Tonga* Magazine, Senituli Kolisi Tonga, Nuku’alofa, Tonga.1983. The first principal was the Victorian scholar named John Hartley Roberts, (later Professor Roberts) a lay preacher of the Australia Methodist Conference. On the same day Roberts was inducted to principal of Tonga College, he was also inducted as Director of Tonga Ministry of Education from 1882-1906.

King Tupou 1 wished a preacher to lead the school and to share the Gospel to the students at morning assembly; a tradition that is still carried out by the present principals of Tonga College. The Wesleyan Minister Rev. Pauliasi Taumoepeau, a *Matimatika* student of Moulton’s school who was then superintendent minister of Leimatu’a circuit in Vava’u island, was called to take up the position of the first head tutor.
PAULIASI TAUMOEPEAU:


In December, 2010 Tonga College students trip to Sydney, an ex-student named Rev. Viliami Petelo, with the group visited Professor Robert’s graveyard at Rockwood, Sydney. Petelo reported that on the headstone, it was written, Professor Roberts last word says, “To’o ‘oku Ha’ amonga.” [Take my burden].

195 These photos of Professor John Hartley Roberts headstone, was taken by Rev. Viliami Petelo, head tutor of Sia’atoutai Theological College, Tonga at Sydney, Asutralia, purposely for this work in December, 2010.
Tonga College from then onwards, produced scholars who worked the government and lived King Tupou I’s world view of an independent church and state. The youths and male children of those of the society who supported the move towards a Free Church attended Tonga College.

King Tupou I himself wished a vocational school to prepare young people to take up practical jobs of Tonga government. The *Tohi Fanongonongo* (1932) reported the deliberations of Tonga Parliament and the Commission of Education in 1882, about the will of King Tupou I for Tonga College,

\[ Ko e me’a ‘eni ‘e taba, ‘I be ngaahi me’a ‘oku mamafa kiata au, ko e ako’i ‘o e fonua, ka e tautautefito ki be ngaahi poto ki be ngaue kebekebe, ‘a ia ‘e ‘aonga ki ho tau fonua. \]

The above deliberation depicted the vision of His Majesty about the institution of Tonga College; to prepare young people of Tonga for clerical jobs and other office works of the government. The deliberation also noted that His Majesty was aware of the fact that Moulton school aimed at *ako’i ‘o e ngaahi me’a faka’atamai ma’olunga.* [introduced intelligible realities and higher education].

According to the *Ko e Tohi ‘o e Ngaahi Lao ‘o e 1889, Vahe 55, Kubu 3,* it was recorded that the Tonga government College was purposely instituted to provide vocational studies thus was named as “*Ko e Koliji Tonga Ako Ngane,*” [Tonga College Vocational school].

---

On the above headstone of its first principal it is clearly written as, “J.H.Roberts, the first principal of the Tongan Government College and founder of their State educational system, ‘Oku mo’u’i ‘ene ngaahi ngaue.” The statement also indicated how the establishment of Tonga College coincided with the institution of the state system of education, for J.H.Roberts was also the first director of Tongan government department of education.

The institution of Tonga College immediately before the establishment of the first Free Church in 1885, surely was a good preparation to pave way for peopling the Free Church development; as did the missionaries when they put up mission schools for the development of Wesleyan Methodist Church in Tonga. However, as the personal differences between the two leaders permeated the hearts of the people and divided their relationships, so as the students of the two schools. Such circumstances, put the Government College (known as Baker’s) from the start as it is claimed by various historians as the rival of Tupou College (known as Moulton’s). This conflict is still perpetuating to this day and it is largely claimed by the general population as the reiteration and reverberation of the legacies of Baker and Moulton conflicting relationships in the 19th century.

**Concluding Remarks:**

The point of narrating these events regarding the differences between Baker and Moulton is for the purpose of presenting how serious personal differences had developed and damaged a great many things in the government, church and family. Surprisingly one can see how the Scripture had been smartly used as a tool to convey personal messages and how it was used by Moulton to accuse and even curse King Tupou I. The significant point to note in this chapter was the existence of the synchronisms of God and Tonga, Church and State, Tongan Culture and European civilization, Bakerism and Moultonism, and the perpetual institutionalization of Fakaongo and Tau’ataina movements and refining for each
identity. We shall see in the next chapter how these synchronic developments faced out to manifest their divisive essences in different material, personal and religious identities.
CHAPTER 3.

Tauátaina Identity - The Free Wesleyan Church movement

Will each man be allowed to worship God according to his conscience, as the Constitution of Tonga provides? Again and again we [Deputation] asked the question, but he [Baker] only replied, “There can be no peace while Mr. Moulton is here.”

The accommodation of Wesleyan theology and practice was finally realized its independent identity in the beginning of the year 1885 when Baker instituted the first ever Siasi Tauátaina [Independent Church] on 4th January, 1885, at Lifuka, Haápai. It had always been King Tupou I’s vision to have Tonga administer its own church matters. However, the date to begin was not yet confirmed. Though the move is historic, the question at issue was the freedom of religion. Since this thesis in whole is an attempt to map out the development of Fakaongo and Tauátaina, the year 1885 saw its actual manifestation as two different bodies with their respective leaders. The church that maintained its administration under the auspices of the Australian Conference was from this date known as the Siasi Uesiliana [Wesleyan Church] which comprised the Kau Fakaongo [loyalists of Moulton]; and the newly established Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga (by Baker) known as the Siasi Tauátaina [Free Church] which was made up of the Kau Tauátaina, [loyalists of King Tupou I] and the Tongan way of doing church.

The Kau Tau’aataina saw themselves in their new religious identity, The Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga.

It happened that Baker was in Haápai at the time, and found opposition from the Vi family because the son of the veteran Pita Vi, namely Paula Vi, was suspended.

---

at the October 1884 district Meeting,\textsuperscript{200} for uttering treasonable speech about the new Church. Henry .C. Oldmeadow, who was minister in charge of Haápai Circuit,\textsuperscript{201} in his \textit{Diaries} recorded Paula Vi’s speech, quoted here in part as, “if a new church was set up, he [Paula Vi] would join it.”\textsuperscript{202} This statement by Paula Vi paid him dearly in his appointment for he was then minister of Tongaleleka church in Haápai.\textsuperscript{203} The statement no doubt indicated that the move to begin a Free Church had already been talked about at Tongaleleka and among the Tongans. Paula Vi’s letter to Tevita Tonga Mohenoa on the 13\textsuperscript{th} February, 1885, indicated that the whole congregation of \textit{Tongaleleka} had all turned to the Free Church.\textsuperscript{204}

However, the decision of the District meeting affected the Vi family dearly. From a Tongan view point their veteran Father, Pita Vi, had held a respected position in the church, and as the father of the local ministers had made a name for himself as one of the first group of baptised converts into the Wesleyan Church in Nukuálofa in 1829. Further, there was his dedication and commitment as Taufa’ahau’s local mentor at Lifuka, prior to the coming of any palangi missionary to the island. Pita Vi and Baula Tabu, were thrown into the sea by Taufaáhau, on their way to Haáno, to test their faith at the mouth of the shark, Taufaa’itahi, in 1830’s.\textsuperscript{205} They escaped unharmed and this was a strong testimony for all the people of the truth of the Christian God. The district meeting decision inflicted a loss of face on the family’s name. It had a great impact upon their hearts and their commitment and antagonising their loyalty to the \textit{Lotu Uesiliana}.\textsuperscript{206} Whether Baker knew of this dissension before he came to Lifuka or not it is sure he used this conflict to give the way of the Free Church a start.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[200] Tonga District Minute, FWCT. Archive, Nukuálofa, Tonga.
\item[201] Friendly Island District Minister’s Appointments 1884, shows James Egan Moulton as Chairman of District; H.C.Oldmeadow as minister in charge of Haápai Circuit; and Paula Vi, as minister charging Tongoleleka congregation.
\item[203] The Friendly Islands District Ministers’Appoinment, 1884.
\item[204] Letter Baula Vi, to Tevita Tonga Mohenoa, dated Ko Lifuka, 13 Febueli, Moulton Papers, 1885, Mss 804.
\item[205] See the contribution of Pita Vi to the Lotu Uesiliana in Lifuka, Haápai as narrated by E.E.V. Collocott, \textit{Ko e Ta’u ‘e Teau: Ko e Fai Maæe kau Helohelo}, (Lonitoni: Maæe Siasi Uesiliana Tauátaina ó Tonga, 1972), 39-52.
\end{footnotes}
Baker began with an outdoor service where about 500 people attended in the morning of 4th January, 1885. Another service was held in the afternoon, and more people attended. There, Baker asked for a show of hands of those who loved Tupou 1 and would join the Free Church. A great number of over a thousand people in Lifuka showed their love of the king and were happy to be Free Church members. Baker, having used the name of King Tupou 1 as his zeal for this Free Church movement, indicated that he would use other means to orchestrate the development of the Free Church movement.

Baker worked out his way to convince King Tupou 1 in Vavaú of the initiative he had made in Lifuka. Whether or not King Tupou 1 agreed, his sole signature on the Free Church Constitution of 4 January, 1885, indicates that he agreed. And his Majesty’s installation of J.B. Watkin as the President of the Free Church, and Royal Chaplain, on 15th January, 1885, also indicated his will to accommodate Baker and Watkin into the Free Church movement. J.B. Watkin, in his letter of resignation to J.H. Fletcher, President of the New South Wales and Queensland Conferences, stated here in part,

Finding that King George had fully determined to secede from the Wesleyan Church, though I asked His Majesty not to take action until the arrival of the deputation appointed by General Conference, but he most emphatically stated that his mind was fully made up and he would wait no longer; and in addition to His Majesty’s determination to secede, several thousands of natives in Haápai and Vava’u already joined with the king in the secession movement. When, therefore His Majesty requested me to take charge of the new movement. I felt it my duty to accept the position and assist in conducting it to a successful issue.

---

206. The Constitution of the Free Church as signed solely by King Tupou 1 on the 4th January, 1885.
207. J.P.Fletcher also happened to be President of Australia Methodists General Conference.
Source: FWCT archive, Nuku’alofa, Tonga.
The will of King Tupou 1 is made clear in the above letter by Watkin. It should also be worth noting that J.B.Watkin was born in Haápai in 1830, when his parents worked as missionaries there. Although at times Watkin came into conflict of interest with Baker, Watkin was the kind of missionary who claimed to be a true Wesleyan and his acceptance of His Majesty’s invitation to head the Free Church indicated that he also had loyalty to King Tupou 1’s Free Church movement. The first Conference of the Free Church was held in Nuku’alofa, on 7th August, 1885. The preamble of the drawn Constitution reveals the ministers who met and deliberate on its first Conference included, J.B.Watkin (Pres.), S.W.Baker, Bita Vi, Jione Latu II, Ilaiasi Langi, Semisi Havea, Filipe Tongilava, Uikilifi Fuji, Melekiseteki Taufa, ‘Ebeli Kaufuji, Baula Vi, Uiliami Langi, and Mesake Bahulu. His Majesty King Jioaji Tubou signed the Constitution on the 8th August, 1885. The official name of the church shown on item 1, is “Ko e Jiaji Uesiliana Tan’ataina ‘o Tonga,” The Free Wesleyan of Tonga. The second item titled, Ko e Ngaahi Akonaki: [Doctrinal Teachings] indicates the church will follow the doctrinal and theological teachings of the Wesleyan church.

Until the year 1898, His Majesty King Taufa’ahau Tupou II, who succeeded King Tupou I after his death in 1893, issued a statement on Ko e Kasete: Ko e Tohi Fanongonongo Fakabule’anga, [Government Gazette] declared a new name for the church which Tupou I and Baker instituted in 1885, to be known as the Siasi ‘o Tonga Tan’ataina [The Free Church of Tonga]. It is also reported in this Gazette that this Free Church would become the state church.209 This movement by Tupou II was used by Watkin as a ground for his move from the first Conference of the United Fakaongo and Tan’ataina church in 1924, to begin the official Free Church of Tonga as separate body. Hence, the year 1924 is the actual beginning of the Free Church of Tonga. Nevertheless, the present leader of the Free Church President Semisi Fonua, issued an official statement based upon the 1898 Tupou II

---

209 Ko e Kasete: Ko e Tohi Fakabule’anga, Tohi XII, Ko Hono 1., Nuku’alofa, Tonga, 27 January, 1898.
declaration of *Siasi Tau’ataina ‘o Tonga’s* beginning to the King Tupou I 1885 Free Wesleyan Church.

Watkin was the longest serving President of the Free Church, from 1885 till his death in 1925. He was well known to have been the leader who strove to keep the Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga true to its Wesleyan theological teachings and practices. Watkin was so obsessed with this attitude that it led him to be disloyal by refusing Queen Salote’s attempt to unite the *FakaOngo* and *Tauátaina* Churches in 1924. Watkin’s disloyalty somehow led him, with the support of Tongan ministers, to begin the Free Church which continues to today as the *Siasi ó Tonga Tauátaina.* [Free Church of Tonga]. This Church inherited the original 4th January, 1885 Constitution of the Free Church that was solely signed by King Tupou 1, and hence thus claimed their origins to 1885.210

From Lifuka, Ha’apai, the news spread all over the Tonga islands that the Free Church was born under the expectations of King Tupou 1, and that all Tongans must join the Free Church. Any opposition to the Free Church movement was stigmatized as “disloyalty” to the King. Moulton arrived in Lifuka, two days after, on the 6th January, and learnt of Baker’s institution of the Free Church. Viewing the situation from the Australia Conference, Jabez B. Waterhouse produced a report based on various extracts from missionaries’ correspondence. Moulton’s letter dated 10th January, 1885 said that he sailed to Ha’apai for the District Meeting and stated,

> [He] reached [there] on Tuesday 6th January, [and] found that on the preceding day,...a movement was made to commence the setting up of a separate Church. It was announced as being the wish of the King. Papers were sent around, asking the people whether they loved the

---

210 This *Siasi ó Tonga Tauátaina* Free Church of Tonga celebrated their first centennial in January, 1985, dating back their beginning to January, 1885.
king, and if so, to join his religion…The result was a considerable number of names was secured….

Moulton, on hearing that King Tupou 1 was then in Vavaú and that his Majesty might have not approved of what Baker had initiated, left Ha’apai thinking that the movement was a failure. He returned to Tongatapu to hold meetings with his loyalists to defend their position. This rally by Moulton was supported by a minority in a group from Muá, Tongatapu who expressed their opposition to the Premier Baker in a wild way. We will narrate Baker’s manoeuvring to justify his move to establish the Free Church and the policies he executed to further develop their cause. However “persecutions were carried out as against the so-called Wesleyan’s party.”

Baker had used his power as Premier to enact new Laws for the protection of his move to force people to join the Free Church. These new Law formations included the three major Laws: “The Law of the Six”; “The Law of the Thirty”; and the “Law of the Three Hundred Fathoms.” These laws were accordingly enacted to “prevent disturbances that sprung from the ‘ecclesiastical regulations’ at the present time.” This was agreed upon by the King and Parliament of Tonga in a decree as follows:

1. It is forbidden to “preach” (fai ha malanga) in connection with any Church in any town, unless there are six adults in that church, men and women – “rightful inhabitants” (kakai totonu) of that town – all told. And if anyone break this law and is tried and convicted, he shall be fined $20.

2. It shall not be lawful for anyone to go and act as paid steward (or hired local preacher “tauhi fonua”) in connection with any church unless there are in those church thirty (30) adults, according to the

---

Constitution. But those who are permitted to go and act as paid stewards are ordained ministries, probationers, and the Catechists whose names stand in the church minutes (lit. the great book of the church”) and if anyone break this law, it shall be lawful for the [?] of the Manor or the town-ruler to expel him and to take away his plantation and apportion it is to someone paying taxes yet without a plantation.”

Accordingly, as it was reported in Advocate, the “Law of the Six” was enacted to forbid any sermon conducted in any “town where there were fewer than six (6) adults in all, men or women natives of the town,” and any one known to break this law would be fined 20 dollars. The emphasis of this Law was to assist in “holding [of a] religious service” in a village only by the kakai totonu [true citizens] of the village. No people from the next village were allowed into another village to make up numbers. The “Law of the Thirty” was to “ensure there were thirty adult people in the village” to legalize the existence of a Wesleyan Church and that it was not allowable for anyone to take charge of any church if there were fewer than 30 adults in accordance with the Constitution. Moulton, writing to Baker, claimed that if a faifekau had worked in a village for the past two years, and was sent away or banished from his ministry, the Law “would be setting up an ex post facto law, to banish a man [or woman] first and then pass a Bill of panis, and penalties on account of his not being at the station.”

The “Law of the Three-Hundred Fathoms,” was to ensure that the Free Church buildings and the Kau Fakaongo Church buildings were well distanced for freedom.

---

213 J.E. Moulton Papers, ‘Supplementary, Recent Legislative Interferences with our Rights,’ dated Sept. 1886. Mss A808. FWCT. archive, Tonga. These laws were also published on Government Gazette, by Minister of Police, Tuúhetoka, dated June, 1886.


215 A Letter regarding the above as “Lotu Laws,” was written by J.E. Moulton to High Commissioner Sir Charles Mitchell, dated Mission House, 25 April, 1887.

216 J.E. Moulton, Papers, Persecution 1885, included paper clippings of the The Weekly Advocate, n.d.

of religion. J.E.Moulton, who appealed to Sir Mitchell, complained regarding the Law of the Three Hundred Fathoms and stated,

The Free Church are about to build their new church on the square in front of the Mission House, which has lately been taken away from us; although we received a verbal promise from the Government some years ago that it stands not to be built upon. The erection of this church in the immediate vicinity of our buildings will throw the control of all our religious services in Zion & the College into the hands of the Gov’t. officials & prevent altogether some of them.

This location which Moulton complained about above is the area in front of the Mission House in Nukuálofa where the new Centenary Church is now located. His complaint not only concerned the distance of this Free Church from the Wesleyan Church at Funga Sia, but said it would attract the Wesleyans to them. Moulton’s complaint did not stop the building of the Free Church there. His Majesty King Tupou II and the Queen attended and worshipped in this Free Church at the close of the nineteenth and beginning of the new century. Their daughter, Salote, also attended until she became Queen Tupou III and attempted unification of the Fakaongo and Tanátaina Churches in 1924. The Free Church Building was moved for use by the Ako Teu Nuku’alofa until it was demolished in c.1980. The position was freed for the building of the present Falelotu Senituli [Centenary Church] [New Zion Church] in 1953, to commemorate the first century of the Wesleyan missions in Tonga which was held way back in 1926.

The reasons given as the background of the Lotu Laws were aimed at ensuring peace in the society, but this did not happen. However, Tongan government officials were always ready to take the laws into their own hands and oppressed disloyal people in various situations. Even more, the Kau Fakaongo [loyalists] of Moulton in their resistance to such legal means decided to take themselves to
uninhabited islands for their own freedom, and to enable them to conduct their services according to their conscience and faith.\(^{218}\)

Baker continued to use government officials to police and to question the people if their loyalties were to King Tupou or to Moulton. They were also to observe the execution of the above laws by the *Kau Fakaongo* in various villages. Laws were also enforced to check the people’s loyalty to King Tupou and went as far as keeping the grass cut, sweeping the rubbish and even the way to keep their domestic animals like horses. It is evident from the Records of “Police Court Summons” that government officials were also ordered by the authorities to issue warning notes charging allotments of the Fakaongo Churches for “*ïkai tafi á e malaé òe Jiaji*….”\(^{219}\) [for not cutting the grass and collecting the rubbish from the lawn of the church property].

Thus through these ways government officers moved to observe the Laws and give credit to the Free Church at the expense of persecution and abuse of powers over the *Kau Fakaongo* minority. From various islands and villages where minorities of the *Kau Fakaongo* lived, reports were sent to the Australian Conference concerning the inflicted persecutions in various islands in Tonga.\(^{220}\) The situation was aggravated by the missionaries’ conflicts of interest which had already been experienced among them. Wood’s statement, made known from Chapman’s phrase, was “A House Divided against Itself.”\(^{221}\)

\(^{218}\) Moulton’s Papers, Labelled No.6. “People sent from Lofanga to Kao” dated May, 1885, Mss. A804.viii; See also J.E.Moulton letter of complain to S W.Baker, dated Mission House, 24 May, 1887. Mss.B100.iii.
\(^{219}\) Police Court Summons 1886,, dated,11 October, 1886. Mss A 815. Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga, Miscellaneous Documents. PMB 980.
\(^{220}\) A full report of the persecutions is edited by Jabez, B. Waterhouse, (ed.) *The Secession and Persecution in Tonga*, (Sydney: Wesleyan Book Depot, 1886); Another report is known as *Tonga No.2 (1887), an Appendix to Report by Sir C.Mitchell, High Commissioner for the Western Pacific, in Connection with the Recent Disturbances in and the Affairs of Tonga, containing further inclosures in that Report*, (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office by Harrison and Sons, 1887).
A Constitution of the Free Church was recorded to have been signed by King Tupou 1 in January, 1885. It is evident from the face of the Constitution that it was a quick formulation to account for the event of establishing the Free Church on the signed date. However, a formal Conference of the Free Church was held in August, 1885, and a second Constitution was then signed by King Tupou 1 and others on 8th August, 1885. It was declared in the second Constitution that the Name to be adopted and registered in Government was The Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga (FWCT). Its doctrine and practices were purely of Wesley’s teachings. The only stated difference of this Church with the Fakaongo Church was that no connection was to be made with any other church. This difference is still observed by the Free Church with any other Church to date. The second Constitution of the FWCT was signed by King Tupou 1, President Watkin, S.W.Baker, and many leading Tongan ministers. This copy was held by J.B.Watkin in his possession; until 1924 when the union of the two churches was negotiated by Queen Salote. The FWCT church was in short known as The Free Church, in Tongan Siasi Tanátaina, which in hindsight demonstrated loyalty to the Tuí and independence from foreign administration.

Baker and Watkin had been well accommodated into the Free Church movement. It is not known whether their allegiance with Tupou 1’s Free Church movement was based on religious belief, loyalty to the Tuí culture and tradition in matters of the Church, or whether they had a different hidden agenda. The Tongan-born Jabez Bunting Watkin was the president of the Tanátaina Free Church and J.E. Moulton was chairman of the Kau Fakaongo church. Correspondingly, these movements have had strong bearings upon the divisive life situation of the people of Tonga both in the church and in the society today.

223. The ghosts of the two missionaries Baker and Moulton had been enlivened in the lives of the students of Baker’s college, Tonga College est., 1882; and Moulton’s College, Tupou College est., 1866. There had been
The associated persecutions imposed upon the *Kau Fakaongo* were regularly reported by the Rev J.E.Moulton and E.E.Crosby to the Office of Mission, and through various newspapers in Australia including the *Weekly Advocate*. J.E. Moulton, in his letter to the Editor, titled *Tongan Affairs*, which was published by the *The Daily Telegraph*,\(^{224}\) outlined seven possible kinds of persecutions following the institution of the Free Church which included, ‘chiefs’ deposed from office; ‘men and women driven from homes’; ‘personal violence’; ‘banished to uninhabited islands’; ‘forcible possession taken of our church’; and lastly ‘general persecutions’.\(^{225}\)

Perhaps it is worth reviewing the immediate negotiations previous to the actual formation of the Free Church in 1885. When the resolution (on Tongan Affairs) of the 1884 Conference reached Tonga, King Tupou I no doubt advised Baker to act on his behalf. It is evident in Baker’s own hand written letter to the Wesleyan Conference Christchurch, NZ, dated 2 Nov. 1884, in his capacity as Premier, which outlined some points which represented the wishes of King Tupou I and where his Majesty declared his change of membership because of the division of the *Fakaongo* and *Tauátaina* Wesleyans,

His Majesty wishes me to say that as he is no longer a member of the Wesleyan Church in connection with the New South Wales and Queensland Conference but a member of the Tonga Wesleyan Free Church, many of the matters to which reference is made in your letter require now no reply from His Majesty….he deeply regrets the action taken by the General Conference, in so unnecessarily prolonging the unhappy state of the rivalries and conflicts between the two schools that ended up in court settlements in the most recent years. Let alone the difficulty of cooperation between the Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga (FWCT.), being that of Queen Salote Tupou III, 1924 United Church of the *Kau Fakaongo-FWCT* (loyalists of Moulton) and that of the *Siasi Tauátaina-Free Church of Tonga* (loyalists of Tupou I & Baker) members.

\(^{224}\) Letter to the Editor by J.E. Moulton titled, “Tongan Affairs”, *The Daily Telegraph*, dated Monday 22\(^{nd}\) March, 1886.

\(^{225}\) Ibid.
Wesleyan Church in Tonga, ad in so doing causing the secession which once taken place. 226 The search for possible causes of all the disturbances associated with the Free Church movement, from King Tupou 1’s statement above, points to the Conference in Australia.

From another view of the move to independence, the inquiry held by Sir Charles Mitchell into the strife in Tonga in 1887 was concerned with the failure of the Church authorities in the Australian Conference in 1874 to accept the request of King Tupou I, his chiefs and his people, “to assume an independent position in the Wesleyan body than that hitherto accorded to them.” 227 Mitchell in his report outlined four main points to account for that failure which included the Missionary Committee resolution recommended to “Conference to appoint the General Secretary [Chapman] to visit the Friendly Islands as a deputation and report to the next Conference,” 228 of the following year, 1875. Further Mitchell noted that there was no confidence by the Mission authorities that Tonga, as a young Polynesian church, could manage its own affairs. The report also noted the undecided and undefined identity that Baker had in the Mission as well as how far he would manage an independent church. And lastly, there was suspicion of too much local control in matters of the proposed independent church. Despite these, the fact that King Tupou I himself in his letter dated 24 March, 1874, admitted that the present church in Tonga, “owes its present position to Christianity,” not forgetting the labour of the pioneer missionaries, “Thomas, Rabone, Watkin.” His desire was to work out a way that was beneficial to both church and state, and “that it is his desire to live and die a Wesleyan.” 229 It is apparent from the above that the leaders

---

227 Report of Sir Charles Mitchell, 1887, p.3.
228 Christian Advocate, 2 March, 1874.
229 Tonga District Meeting, Minute, 30 November, 1874. FWC. Archive, Nukuálofa. Tonga.
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of the Australian Conference at this stage (for matters of the Church in Tonga) did not seem to trust King Tupou 1 as much as they trusted Moulton.

However, although the two churches had personal ill-feeling between them in matters regarding church, rituals, and doctrines, as if they are different, yet the two had exactly the same doctrinal basis, and goals of doing church.\textsuperscript{230} Baker’s letter cited earlier continued to clarify that point. “His Majesty wishes me also to say that though separated from N.S.W and Q. Conference, yet the Wesleyan Free Church is established on the same lines, holding the same doctrines, maintaining the same discipline as held by yourselves.”\textsuperscript{231} Further, Baker mentioned that His Majesty deeply acknowledged with reverence “the labours of the old missionaries, than those now instituted by Mr. Moulton,” and that the only difference between the two churches is that the “Wesleyan Free Church of Tonga…manages its own financial affairs.” The letter also indicated that if a Deputation be appointed by General Conference to visit Tonga, King Tupou I would be most happy to receive them and, “most likely their presence and counsels may be of great service at the present juncture of affairs between the two churches, otherwise, perhaps the closing history of the Wesleyan Church in these islands may not end so satisfactory as could be wished.” However, this thesis states that the point of difference of the established Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga and the Tonga district was their loyalty to leaders and the administration: where the former resembled loyalty to the Tu’i culture and tradition while the latter continued to pay loyalty to the leadership of Moulton and the Australian Conference.

Nevertheless, in the background of all the above manoeuvrings was Baker’s wish to have Moulton appointed away from Tonga.

\textsuperscript{230} A member of one of these churches cannot enter the other for worship, or otherwise. Their differences claimed personal inabilities which accounts to something of the hearts and not of any peculiar physical phenomenon that one can easily rectify.

\textsuperscript{231} Ibid.
In regard to Baker’s relationship to J.E. Moulton, it was apparent in a meeting held in ‘Úiha island, Haápai, where His Majesty King Tupou I and all the leading chiefs of Tonga presented; Baker wrote a letter reporting to Conference, “that the line of conduct which Mr Moulton is at present pursuing must ultimately lead to a bunch of [unreadable word] the chiefs and their people.” In the conclusion of his letter, he urged, “the New South Wales Conference [to act] immediately [and] exercise your authority and remove Moulton and thus if you do not do so His Majesty must hold you responsible for the consequences, whatever thing maybe.” The President replied in a letter to Baker stating “as President of the Conference I posses no such power of recall as that which you attributed to me.” For the Free Church movement it is clear that Baker’s ultimate task was to remove Moulton from Tonga so that everything was under his control, and the way forward for the Free Church development.

Two letters written by Baker and published in KO E TOHI FAKAPULEÁNGA, [A GOVERNMENT DECREE] stated,

Ko Nukuálofa
Ko h. 14 Febueli, 1885.

Kia Misa Molitoni

Tangataéiki,
Naé omi kiate an á ne bongibongi ‘e ha tangata ko e fekanu e Tuivakano ha tobi buluji na’e atu kiate ia, bea kuo ai ki ai ho bingoa, pea i he tobi ko ia óku bebe hono lea.

Ko Nukuálofa
Ko h. 13 o Febu. 1885.

Ki he Kainga Tonga

Ko óku tobi eni kiate kimoutolu koe’ubi ko e fakamana óku fai i be fokotu’u ó e lotu fo’ou, kemou hanga ó tobi ó ‘omai kiate au á e ngaabi lau fakamana óku fai ‘o bebe ke tautea tautau, tele ihu & mo e to’ó e ápi mo e fale mo e kahunji. Knou tobi kia Tubou

---

232 Baker, Premier and Minister of Foreign Affairs, to The Rev. I.A. Nolun, President of NSW. & Q. Conference, dated Úiha, 25 March, 1885. Mss A312, i.
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The content of Baker’s letter cited above is an accusation against Moulton of sedition. Further in the letter, Baker narrated King Tupou I’s letter that was read in a fono in Hihifo and Muá and the substance of His Majesty’s letter stated, Ka ai baamou ‘Ofa kiate au, bea mou ului leva ki be Jiaji Tauátaina ‘o Tonga bea fokotu’u ia i bo mou ngaahi ápi.’” [If you love me, join the Free Church of Tonga and begin to do so at your own home]. Loyalty to King Tupou 1 was used as the motive of summoning people to join the Free Church. As the letter continued, Baker was trying to defend that the established church is to be called Jiaji Uesiliana Tauátaina ó Tonga,[The Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga] and it is not a different church from the Jiaji Uesiliana Fakaongo ki Papalangi,[The Loyal Wesleyans to European rule] which its akonaki [teachings], malanga [preachings], tokateline [theology], Tohitabu [Scripture], Sakalameniti [Sacrament], Bapitasio [Baptism], lotu fehuí [catechisms], kau malanga [preachers], kau akonaki[catechists], and nothing new.

Baker concluded the letter to Moulton by stating that this established Free Church in nature is in line with the original Wesley Mission which John Thomas began. However, in actuality, two major differences of the Free Church and the Tonga District were noted; (1). This Free Church is independent from the administration of the European ministers. (2). This Free Church manages its own financial matters. Baker reiterated in the last paragraph, the obnoxious statement of Moulton about his Majesty stated, Kuo vale angaua á ‘Ene Áfio. Bea óku ikai ke ne kei bule totonu. [His majesty is insane and he is no longer fit to rule this nation], and óku

---

234 Ibid.
235 Ibid.
236 Ibid.
íkai ha femamabiākí ‘a Éne Áfio mo e Jiaji Uesiliana ka kiate koe be, koeúbhi ko hoó ngaobi kovi’i ia, mo éne bebe, kuo ke fakatupu ha mavabeve ‘i hono kakai.’\[\text{237}\] [there is no ill-feeling between His Majesty and the Methodist Church, but you and yourself [Moulton] had caused much pain to him in your words, actions and attitude, and his Majesty has accused you to have caused divisions among his people.] Note, this accusation laid upon King Tupou I that his Majesty was no longer fit to rule was also made by Baker in his later period of working in Tonga, but was proved wrong.

At the same time the concern of the Australia General Conference is explicit from the Jabez B. Waterhouse report; “the secession, however, officially threatened more than four years ago, having become a lamentable reality,…”\[\text{238}\] This Waterhouse Report published “the Report of the Deputation appointed by the General Conference,” together with “the resolutions adopted by the Conference” on the situation of the Wesleyan Mission in Tonga.\[\text{239}\] The report is made up of extracts from letters sent to the Deputation, which shows the workings and reasoning of the native [Tongan] minds. The following statement is an extract from the report regarding the “Secession” and the “Persecution” of the Kau Fakaongo – loyalists to Moulton and the “New South Wales and Queensland Conference” in Tonga over the period of 1885-1887.

A new thing has been created by Mr. Baker, - a new worship, a new church. The Church now created is carried on by force, and is a terrible thing in its way.\[\text{240}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{\text{237}} & \quad \text{Ibid.} \\
\text{\text{238}} & \quad \text{Jabez, B. Waterhouse, (ed.) The Secession and Persecution in Tonga, (Sydney: Wesleyan Book Depot, 1886), dated 3 February, 1886.} \\
\text{\text{239}} & \quad \text{The New South Wales and Queensland Conference met in January, 1886, and the Report referred to above was edited by Jabez, B. Waterhouse, (ed.) The Secession and Persecution in Tonga, (Sydney: Wesleyan Book Depot, 1886).} \\
\text{\text{240}} & \quad \text{Jabez, B. Waterhouse, (ed.) The Secession and Persecution in Tonga, (Sydney: Wesleyan Book Depot, 1886), 36.}
\end{align*}\]
The report listed four reasons for the institution of the new church. The first being an economic ground, that a meeting was purposely held to “explain therein the origin of this new church - namely, the money - none of which was to be taken to white man’s land, but should remain in Tonga and all used there.” The second point comprised the use of force to frighten and compel the Kau Fakaongo-Wesleyan church adherents [Moulton loyalists] to turn to the new church [Free Church]. The listed means were (1). Those with high positions in Government were to be deposed if they did not turn to the new church. (2). The land owned by either chief of commoner were to be taken; followed by exiling to uninhabited island if refused to turn to new church. (3) Severe punishments were to be imposed on any person who would talk or speak about the new church and its goodness thereof. Thirdly in the report, chiefs of every village were to summon the villagers in a fono – monthly village meeting conducted by the chief of the village where he checked on matters relating to them and give them instruction or decree from government; and persuaded them to turn to the new church. Fourthly, interrogations of individual by chiefs and scribes from government demanding their prompt answers to the question, “Do you love Tubou or Moulton? Whom will you worship with? Tubou or Moulton?” Moreover, “officers” together with “adherents of the new church,” were sent to all house, every village, and every night to “listen to what is said; “whether anything be spoken unfavourably of the new church,” and any case was found; heavy punishment was imposed in court. Inflicting these penalties on most people, resulted their turning from the Wesleyan church to the Free Church only on the basis of fear.

It is quite apparent from the cited report, the questions used by the government officials were directed towards the people’s loyalty to King Tupou 1. Whether they were loyal to King Tupou I and his policy of keeping Tonga as a Tauátaina-independent state and Free Church or they prefer to be administratively fakaongo-under the control of Moulton and the Australia Conference that thus indicated the
question of Fakaongo [loyalty] was significant to the life of the Tongan people. The report, for example shows a reply from certain loyalists to Tupou I which stated,

‘The question, ‘Do you love Tubou or Moulton?’ is replied to in this fashion by the people, ‘We love Tubou.’ ‘With whom will you worship? ‘With Tubou or with Moulton?’ The reply is, ‘With Tubou.’ It is our habit to obey our chiefs in all things. If our chiefs tell us to do a thing, it is quite clear to us that it is wrong, we must nevertheless do it.’

The loyalty to Tui culture and tradition is here well portrayed as a custom and tradition derived from nowhere but the past.

The report continued, “So in this matter. Numbers have gone over through fears alone; their bodies have over, their souls are with our church. Numbers have gone in tears to the newly-created church.” The mood of the reporter which is no doubt of Moulton himself is included in the report stated, “Oh! It is a painful thing that I have now met with in my life. I cannot endure to see the religious people go against their wills to that Church.” Further, the report continues,

It is also an unfortunate thing that Mr. Baker has tempted with a bait some of the native ministers; their minds fall in with what had been held out to them. But there is a matter I rejoice in, - that numbers wish to die in our church, and they undertake to endure all the hardships and pain of this thing. We are in evil plight. We are very miserable. I am like Esther, ‘If I perish, I perish.’ I shall not leave the Wesleyan Church ….. By God’s help I will follow this out.

The whole report gave instances of the way in which the Kau Fakaongo [Moulton loyalists] were being persecuted for not turning to the Free Church began by Baker at the wish of Tupou I. Chiefs holding appointments in government were deposed for not turning to Tupou’s church, the chiefs Job and Celeb Utuhouma,

---

242. Ibid.
whose title was Tau’atevalu and David Latukefu who was a policeman [town officer] were all deposed of their titles and government positions.\textsuperscript{243} Mr. Baker who was being asked by the Deputation of Messrs Watsford and Langham; admitted to them, that it was true and that his actions were in accordance with what he had been ordered by King Tupou himself.

Furthermore for examples, Ata, chief of Hihifo, held a \textit{fono} at Kolovai called Latukefu, Manuobangai and Lamatau to question their loyalties and they all replied that they would remain Wesleyan. Ata deposed Latukefu from his position as town officer.\textsuperscript{244}

The chief Lajike conducted a \textit{fono} at Kanokupolu, and reported that the meeting began at 8.00am and continued until three o’clock in the afternoon. The policeman’s name was \textit{Folaubaámoa}. A very sick and old lady named \textquoteleft\textquoteleft\textit{Alisi Mafi} had been laid sick for three years and could not stand on her own, was carried to the meeting place. Laijike was very angry with her, and was questioned of her belief and because of her fear she was there changed to become \textit{Jiaji Tanátaina}. Lajike ordered her release and abused her as being \textit{fakalielia}.\textsuperscript{245} Lajike ordered all the Free Church members to come under the shade and left the Wesleyans under the direct heat of the sun. On the same report a man named Taufa Taumohaábai was questioned for his loyalty, “\textit{Óku ke ófa kia Tubou pe ko M.Moultoni?} [would you pay loyalty to Tupou or Mr. Moulton]. The questioning continued, \textit{Óku ke lotu belotu fe?} [which church do you attend?] Taufa replied, \textit{Óku on kei lotu pe ki be lotu naá tau muáki lotu ai}. [I am still attending the church where we were at first]. Loyalty was really forced as Lajike ordered all that they either turn to become Free Church or they would be taken to Nukuálofa until they changed their minds. They were threatened that their

\textsuperscript{243} See ‘Schedule of Complaints put in by Mr. Moulton during (A) period from foundation of Free Church to attempt on Mr. Baker’Life (4\textsuperscript{th} January, 1885, to 13\textsuperscript{th} January, 1887). In Inclosure 5. Of Appendix to Report by Sir C. Mitchell, High Commissioner for Western Pacific, in Connection with the Recent Disturbances in and the Affairs of Tonga, containing further Inclosures in that Report. Presented to Both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty, August, 1887.

\textsuperscript{244} Note dated 2 February, 1885. Mss A805.

\textsuperscript{245} Letter, dated Kanokupolu, 30 Maáji 1885. Mss.A805.
town allotments would be taken and their properties ruined. The witness of this fono at Kanokupolu also recorded those who did not change their mind to join the Free Church, Fifita Ma‘ulalo; ‘Ilisabesi; Baula Fineōfa; Sinjitene Usa; Semisi Ákauola; Uiliami Moala; Vili; Tobaiasi, Tahī, ‘Elikena Átnaisa Taufa, ‘Amelia Ákesa, Jione.246 Another letter indicated an allegation that those whom were known to insist on their loyalty to Moulton were said to have agreed that Tonga be colonized by Great Britain.247 A point alluded in the background and known to have aggravated the situation.

One of the chiefs, Vahaí of Foúi in a fono [chief monthly meeting] questioned two of his villagers Boasi Valu and Kuli, both addressed with the questions, “Te ke Jiaji Fakaongo pe Jiaji Tauátaina?” [would you choose to belong to Jiaji Fakaongo or Jiaji Tauátaina?] and they both replied, “Fakaongo.” Vahaí ordered them on the spot, “Ko kimoutolu ko e kau Uesiliana, e tu’a fakatau kimoutolu ki be bouëiki ke mou bobula mo boomou fanau, bea é toó boómou ng. àbi – é ikai ke mou toe kau ai, ka te mou hook ko ekau bobula ki be bouëiki.”248 [all of you who are Wesleyans will be sold together with your children to the chiefs, and your town allotment will be taken from you, for you’ll all go as slaves]. Another fono of the same kind of Fono was held in the village of Áhau, by Tovi, “ko e fono ni koeúhi koe kau talangataa; mo bau’u kia Tubou i Áhau ni, é ikai hala kabau teu tobi kimoutolu ko e kau baúí mo tau kia Tubou, tuku hoo mou fieboto, ‘o lau ko e kau átamaí kimoutolu, óku ou talaatu ko e kau ngangau kimoutolu…ko boomou nui ki be kebe óku nofo mai ki beni…”249 [this meeting was called because of those who opposed to King Tubou I’s command, you who are ignorant and foolish, you do not understand that you have given up your loyalty and follow the instruction of this foreigner who have come to lead you astray].

246 All people Named above signed the letter and the two testifiers signed their names Tevita Finau and Uiliami Tubou. Dated Kanokupolu, 30 Mājī, 1885. Mss. A805.
248 This statement was sworn before the British Consulate at Tonga, “Boasi Valu” signed by Hammond Esquire Symonds, British Vice Consul, dated Foúi, 19 Nov., 1886. Mss, A806.
249 Testimony given by ‘Etuate Taufa, Ko e Faifekau, recorded under the same enquiry by Hammond Esquire Symonds, British Vice Consul, dated Áhau, 22 Me, 1886. Mss, A806.
Equally important, from Haánó, Haápai, two women named Fakajili (this name in another source is written Vakajili) and Ána Mohulamu did not want to pay loyalty to the order for them to turn to Free Church. Fakajili and Mohulamu were ordered to be exiled to Kao Island. Another woman by the name of Susana was also ordered into exile but later changed her mind to join the Free Church and her parent. The record narrates the name of the vessel was Tahaafae, was from the village of Fakakakai, owned by Filimoeulie and the crew on board were Fanueli Funaki, Timote Malubo, Tevita Latu and another man from Vavaú. From Ána Mohulamu’s and Fakajili’s testimonies, a letter from King Tupou I ordered that the Haánó culprits (those who refused to turn to Free Church) be taken to the side of the uninhabited volcanic island of Kao facing Vavaú. But when the vessel reached Kao Island, they were ordered to climb up the high cliff which elevated from the valley named Vaifatuhaka, and at the top, threw themselves down the cliff onto the deep blue sea. The two ladies persisted in their faith as Fakaongo Wesleyans and they finally resort to return to Haánó. We shall see a testimony of Fakajili before she died later part of this chapter.

In the same document, the record further testified for people from Lofanga who voluntary chose to escape their island and lived in the island of Kao. No food crops were available for food at Kao Island and they had to turn certain trees as their food, like Aka (scientific name unknown) and Ji (Cordyline fruitcosa). The root of the latter is baked in earth oven and its taste is extremely sweet as sugar cane. The names of the Lofanga people recorded were, Samisoni Mahe, Setelo Baongo, Heamasi Fanua, Lisainasi (Reynold) Vaénuku, Lisala Kaufuji, Nafetalai Vakafuhu, Uapenuji Tabua, Jione Ita, Tevita Na’a, and others, totalling fifty people altogether. A letter by Samisoni Mahe to Moulton dated 3 May, 1885, the first trip was left for Kao on 28 April, 1885, and the second trip was on the 4th May, 1885. They were

250. dated Nukuálofa, 19 June, 1886.
settled at a place called Tobuefo. There were 73 men and women not counting children.\(^{252}\) From Samisoni Mahe’s own letter stated regarding Kao Island, “This is a good land for the body, we are quite at home there, but the best of all is, no talking about our lotu and our liberty, and we are left at liberty to do our work for our souls.”\(^{253}\) This statement reflected the rationale of the same movement (later made to Ata Island but diverted to Fiji) which some historians called ‘exile’, but this thesis would say it should be called voluntary exile.

In the events of Baker’s regime summoning people to the Wesleyan Free Church, reports from outer islands testified to their loyalty to Moulton. David Finau who was minister in charging of the Vavaú circuit, when they received the news that Tuí, chiefs, and people of Tongatapu had all turned to the Free Wesleyan Church, recorded “pea kaila leva á Lavinia Fotu [of Leimatuá] Malie! Lelei! Ke te álu kita kia Misa Moultoni óku maónióni, he kuo te fiu kita be loi.” [shouted Lavinia Fotu of Leimatu’a Great! I will remain loyal to Moulton because he is righteous, gone are the days of lies and myths] She concluded, ‘Tala atu á e Tui Totonu.’\(^{254}\) [Please proclaim the true faith].

From as far as the isolated Niuafoóu island the minister Semisi Latu who (together with Jioeli Nau) charging the circuit in 1886 wrote to Moulton stating in Tongan, “ko ‘eku talanoa atu ki Niua ni kuo nau Jiaji Tauátaina kotoabe á e kakai i be manavahe…óku kei tangutu be á e tokolahi teéki ke nau álu ki ha lotu….óku te hange ko e muli jióto ngobi kovii kaneongo ia óku íkai tete lauga ai be óku te ílo ko bono aga ia ó e kainga ó e Éiki óku fehiá kiai á mamani ki be kakai á e Ótua.”\(^{255}\) [let me tell you what happened

---

\(^{252}\) There were Several prominent Church leaders have descended from these people like the Late Rev. Dr. Kalapoli Baongo who was President of the FWCT Education department; the Late Tupou Posesi Fanua who was known orator and informants of Tongan oral history; among others.

\(^{253}\) Copy of Letter from Samson Mahe to Rev. J.E.Moulton, (translated by Moulton) dated Lofanga, 3\(^{rd}\) May, 1885. Moulton Papers, (No.6.), Mss 804 viii.


\(^{255}\) Letter by Semisi Latu was addressed Kia Misa Molitoni, Ko e Fakafafonga oe Ótua óku i Nukuálófa, to [Misa Molitoni, the representative of God who resides in Nukuálófa,] dated Angaha, Niuafoóu, 21 Febueli, 1886. Archive of the FWCT. Nukuálófa. Mss. A109, ii.
here in Niua, the majority of the people of this island have turned to the Free Church because of fear, and a few still undecided and stayed in their home not attending any church,...we have found ourselves like foreigners in the way they have lately treated us; however, we understand that is how faithful people are being treated by the people of the world.] Another letter from Jioeli Nau quoted the words of God to Elijah from 1 Kings xix.15, described the situation in Niuafoóu, stated here in part, “...Ke fa’itelihia pe á a Éiki, ka ko hono finangalo ke behe ni be, bea óku te behe e lelei.” 256 [May the Will of God for us be done! we accept to be treated in such way]. Mockery of Moulton loyalists took place in Lakalaka compositions and songs played by the people of the island. Jioeli Nau admitted in the above quoted letter that although he is not comfortable with the Catholic Church school; his children must attend the Catholic primary school because they could not stand the bad treatment they had received from a government officer, named Taniela ‘Otukolo, in the Government school. In the conclusion of the letter Rev. Nau stated that he and his family are in a “Loto afi kakaha”[burning fire situation], and Nau requested that he be transferred to Fiji to escape the situation.

Another problem of the division of the Wesleyans regarded the properties of the Church. When the Free Church was instituted in January, 1885, an order was also issued by Baker in his capacity as Premier to take control of the properties in islands and villages where people have all turned to the Free Church. This government decree caused a lot of scuffles between the members of the two churches in villages and islands because it was against their conscience. The burden of this government order was strongly felt by the Kau Fakaongo [loyalists of Moulton]. Several government officers were sent to take control of the properties from being used by the kau Fakaongo. T. Tuionuku and B. Latu were sent from Lifuka to outer islands to take control of the Church properties. A letter from Lifuka, Haápai, stated by B. Latu that he paid a visit to the island of Tugua, and the

Haveahateiho [Tuí Haáteiho] ordered the *falelotu* to be locked up (from the *Kau Fakaongo*) for the use of the Free churches (loyalists of Tupou I). In respond, B. Latu sent for Rev. Tevita Tonga Mohenoa, the Superintendent of the Haápai Circuit of Wesleyans to have T. Mateialona, the then Governor of Haápai, to come to Tungua. On arrival, Mateialona acted on behalf of the government and Haveahateiho refused to comply with the order. A conflict of interest and loyalties was observed by these two chiefs and Tuíhateiho kept locking the chapel. Mateialona ordered that the door be torn apart and had their worship held inside. But on the following week when Mateialona left for Nomuka, Haveahateiho ordered the doors and panels of the chapel to be all nailed tightly.²⁵⁷

Another letter written by the minister in charge of Haápai Circuit, Rev. Tevita Tonga Mohenoa, also noted the same disputes in Lifuka about the ownership of properties. Mohenoa’s letter to Moulton included records of the development of the Free Church in Lifuka. Part of the news is quoted here, “Kuo aú mai á Mija Uatekini ánepi. Naá na bolotu ánepo pea ne talanoa éne feiloaki moe faiśeau pule i Ninsila,…bea óku nau loto ki be Jiaji Tanátaina,…Meliboane bea óku nau loto tatau mo Ninsila.”²⁵⁸ [Rev. Watkin arrived last night and they held a Love Feast where Watkin announced that an official from the Methodist Church in NZ agreed with the Melbourne [missing word] for the move in Tonga District to become a Free Church]. In the letter it was revealed that Salote, the daughter of king Tupou I remained as a Moulton loyalist. Mohenoa’s letter also revealed that the Free Church in Haápai had take control of the bells, and other properties of the Tonga District Church, which had begun since the institution of the Free Church assumed the trade name of the *Kau Fakaongo*. Salote the king’s daughter was very ill as well as Jetelo [Baongo of Lofanga] but because they were both loyalists of Moulton, the owner of the vessels of the Malokula, refused to run on hire to take the ill-**kau fakaongo** for treatment. Baula Fukofuka who was in charge of the Êua

circuit reported the same takeover of the properties by Baker’s regime for Free Church usage in the whole island except Bangai Haáluma.\(^{259}\) Reports from Vavaú and a letter from Jione Latu who was minister in charge of the church in Niuatoputapu, noted the same kind of torture and abuse exercised by the government authorities upon the Moulton loyalists.\(^{260}\)

Inward correspondences from various places by local ministers in charge contained the same report of how Baker and the government regime closed churches and took properties from the Tonga District church members. The allegation included a suspicion that the claim by those who sought to be loyal to Moulton were ignorant of the fact that he (Moulton) and other missionaries of the Australia Conference were trying to have Tonga submitted politically to Great Britain as did Fiji in 1874.\(^{261}\) Further to that they were “feinga ke to a Tupou ki be tuútamaki.”\(^{262}\) [trying to placed King Tupou 1 into a politically troubled position]. Another witness named Fetokai on the quoted *fono* at Kolofoóu stated, *Ko e fono ni koe finangalo totonu ó Tubou….Ko ia é ika tafoki mai ó lotu, ó fai ki boho f[inangalo] bea álu mei he Buleánga ni, he ko boko kekekele éni. Ko babalangi éna, ko Fiji éna, ka mou tui atu be aa ki be fuú babalangi kaka mo moaúli kuo ne hai ó moaúlii kimontolu.*\(^{263}\) [this meeting was Tupou 1’s own will that if anyone do not want to follow the King’s Will and turn to the Free Church, let him leave this island and move to overseas, there is Fiji for them. It appears to the King that such kind of people wished to pay loyalty to him [Moulton], who is a scapegoat of the European domination and colonization]. Various measures were assumed threatening the people to turn from being loyal to Moulton and the Australia Conference to the Free Church.

\(^{259}\) Letter by Baula Fukofuka to Misa Molitoni dated 26 Me, 1886. Mss A109, xiv.,

\(^{260}\) Letter by Sione Latu to Misa Molitoni, dated, 3 Me,1886. Mss A109, x.

\(^{261}\) Report (in the hand writing of Moulton) of a Fono held in Kolofoóu, by J. Fetokai, dated, 27 Maáji, 1885.

\(^{262}\) Letter Jioeli Nau to Misa Molitoni, dated 5 Septemá, 1885. Mss A 105.xii.

\(^{263}\) Report (in the hand writing of Moulton) of a Fono held in Kolofoóu, by J. Fetokai, dated, 27 Maáji, 1885.
The chances of escaping the tough circumstances and situations in Tonga to another island in the Oceania for their own freedom were already talked about in the Kau FakaOngo circle. Tevita Tonga Mohenoa in another letter to Rev. E. Crosby reported the situation in Haápai and the testimony of the young woman Fakajili of Haáno, who remained loyal as a FakaOngo and her faith remained up to her death. Mohenoa recorded her testimony as she testified, “Na’e lelei ‘anuito á e bekia á Fakajili. Í be éne kei lelei…Bea ne tali, Ko Hevani ‘oku ou ‘amanaki ki ai. Ko bono úbinga ia ‘uku fienmalie be i be éku mahamabaki mo boku fakabee‘I holo, ko éku îlo ‘oku ai boku fonua mo boku toji’a ko hevani. ‘Oku ou fienmalie be ‘I be tu’utu’uni á e Éiki kuo fai mai ki beé ku mooi, bea ‘oku ou tatali be ki baá ne ha’u ke áve au ke nonofo ma’u mo ia &.”

264 [Fakajili died peacefully. She was asked to testify to her faith and she replied, ‘Heaven is my only hope, from which the courage that kept me through when I was diseased and even when I was in exiled (this lady whom with Ána, (of Haáno) were exiled to Tobuefio of the uninhabited island of Kao in the year before). 265 I know Heaven is my home. I accept the situation I have faced, it is all from God, and I am awaiting his coming to take me home and sojourned with Him ever after]. And as the letter continued Mohenoa narrated that Fakajili told her mother and kainga if she dies, and Tuí Haángana, the chief of Haáno was not willing to allocate a piece of land at faítoka [cemetery] for her graveyard, she would be very happy for her mother and the minister of the Fakaongo to perform her burial service on the beach and afterwards throw her body to the ocean. 266 According to Mohenoa, Fakajili knew quite well that Havea Tuí Haángana was not happy with her loyalty to Moulton and the Lotu Fakaongo. Havea Tu’i Ha’angana was the strongest supporter of King Tupou I in the Haápai group, and his commitment to follow and paid loyalty to the Free Church was definitely intact. The worst of the

266 . The Tongan version of the T.T.Mohenoa’s letter reads, “Na’a ne tala be ki heéne fué mo hono kainga, ka ne bekia bea ikai loto á houéiki ke fai au i ha fa’itoka, bea malanga’i be au i Matatahi bea toki áve o li ki tahi. Óku hange naá ne îlo pe á e taéoto á e Tuí Haángana ke fai i ha faítoka.” Tevita T. Mohenoa to Moulton, FWCT Inward Correspondences, from Ministers, Missionaries and teachers, 1885-1924, 28 August, 1885. PMB 977.
reports about the situation from Haápai, was in another letter by T.T.Mohenoa to Rev. Crosby who stated that he was put on trial at court with 11 charges and sentenced for $50.1.0. In the second trial he was presented with 21 charges on behalf of Moulton and was fined $42.3.0., with a long term imprisonment. At the end of the court session, the judge awaited King Tupou I’s final decision, and his Majesty ordered them to put into prison. From prison on Rev. Tevita Tonga Mohenoa’s own word, ‘Oku ma tu’u be i fale ni ó boko ko e falevao, ko e Ófa be á e Ótua óku ma moúi ai. Ófa atu.”267 [We live and sleep, and disposed in this tiny room as lavatory; with regards to our health; our only hope is in the Love of God. With much Love]. The record of the Wesleyan members in Haápai at the time as according to Moulton’s record, “Foa 5, Felemea 5, Nomuka 10, Koulo 27 members, the congregation about 60. Lofanga (see letter of Samisoni Mahe). [There were over] 100 members of the society in Haápai.”268

The abuse of powers extended to government decisions on divorce. Tevita Finau in another record stated that a man from Kolovai named Tevita Tu’iono was applying to Baker for a letter of divorce from his wife. The man was first asked by Baker whether he was a member of Free Church and on replying he would become a Free Church member, his application for divorce was then granted by Baker.269 Watkin was also recorded to have persuaded a man named Setiveni Latu to turn from Fakaongo to Free Church and in reply, Setiveni refused and said, “Jiaji Fakaongo be.”270 The question of loyalty was taken as means to an end. Baker and the Free Church authorities enforced it for a purpose. Another testimony recorded by Jione Faubula of a Fono in Foúi where it was stated, “Ko e kakai óku nau kei tuú i be Jiaji Fakaongo kuo ban ke tantau bea tuútuúaki á e beleta, bea tafoki leva á e

268 . Note 10a. of Moulton’s Papers, Mss A804, viii.
took 10 í Fóui ánäfí ko e manavahé í be me’a ko ía.” 271 Those who remained as loyalists of Moulton must be executed by hanging and their bodies cut into pieces and as result of fear, ten people in Fóui village turned to Free Church. To which Moulton sent a letter to the Vice Consul requesting his good office and the Tongan Government “to put a stop to the many vexations & repressive measures now being adopted by some Government officials towards the Wesleyans. The old threatening language is being revived, so that those who would join us are afraid to do so.” 272 Various letters by Moulton (from the same source) reveal the same appeal to the Vice Consul and Government to stop the harassment of the Kau Fakaongo. A testimony by Jione Manu sworn before the Her Majesty’s Vice Consul at British Consulate Henry Symonds stated that Nuku was chief of Kolonga conducted a fono and he made three announcements thereon; that the Wesleyans will all be shot at once by soldiers who will be sent by Baker. The second announcement was that King Tupou 1 will return from Vavaú Island to fetch fire woods and the Wesleyans will be the pieces of woods he will collect for fire. The last of the announcement Nuku ordered the Free Church members to punish the Wesleyans. Jione Heluhelu was the man whom Nuku appointed to watch for any Wesleyan in Kolonga. 273

The harassment of the Wesleyans by government officials also included students. Moulton recorded, “Jione Havea is one of the unfortunate Akoteu lads who were dropped on by Baker last year. His offence now was sleeping when he ought to have been preparing his lautohi lesson.” Accordingly, this lad was judged and fined for $3. and “the judge sent for him if he would J[iasi].T[onga], he should have easy

works.” Because Jione Havea was a strong dedicated Wesleyan lad, and who did not turn to J.T., his imprisonment was an eight days treatment as follows,

1st day carrying heavy stones (some two fathom square). He was told he must carry the whole lot in the one day or it would not count.

2nd day carrying stones…terribly knocked about but he stuck pluckily to his work.

3rd day making copra. He could not have managed stone carrying.

4th day carrying stones.

Days 5th & 6th. Building wall of the stones, he had a boy to help him; hitherto he has been alone, the other prisoners having easier work.

Moulton’s handwriting underlined this statement, “the story is distinctly a case of religious persecution by Gov’t.” An European who was in Vava’u at the time swore on oath and testified to a fono held by King Tupou I at Neiafu, “on his return from the funeral of Prince Wellington Gu at ‘Uiha, Ha’abai about the end of March,” no doubt 1886. King Tupou I urged the Vava’u people to collect weaponry of axes, bovai, [clubs] arrows with bows and cane knives, brought to Tongatapu, and “that war is expected.”

Baker’s regime so far gave enough pretext to infuriate the Houeiki [Chiefs] of Mu’a, to conclude that Baker had worked under the political shadow of King Tupou I. Members of the Mu’a Parliament consisted of high chiefs of Ha’ab Tu’i Tonga o Kanbala’uta [Chiefly Tu’i Tonga traditional lineage and were potential candidates to premiership and other government offices. Since the ousting and dethronement of their leader, the last Tu’i Tonga Laufitonga at the Velata war in Lifuka, Ha’apai in 1826, by Taufa’ahau and the Kanokupolu dynasty; their anger was somehow kept

---

275. Ibid.
under control. While King Tupou I made political manoeuvrings over the years, the Ha’a Tuí Tonga lineage kept seeking a space to get involved in the political game. Perhaps, to this period, their patience was at boiling point and anything could happen from their side to clear their relationships with King Tupou 1. Thus, the faction in Tongatapu that resisted Baker’s regime was by majority the chiefs and residence of the Ha’a Tuí Tonga in Muá, eastern district. The perspective of the Catholics of Baker was reported by A.W.Mackay to the *Sydney Morning Herald*,

They said (The Catholic Priests) that Baker was feared by many, but hated by all, loved and respected by none; Mr. Moulton was loved and respected by all.277

While Tongatapu and mostly the Mu’a district had mixed impressions of Baker, the view of the Vavaú, Haápai, Niua and Éua populations was different. The majority of the population from the outer islands had been summoned to gather in Tongatapu at the order of King Tupou I for a Fono at malaé Pangai. King Tupou I had already indicated his will in a fono in Úiha, Haápai, stated here, in part, “and I am not willing therefore for a Tongan to listen to Papalangi; and should there be one who does not wish to be one with me, he can leave, and seek a land, and listen to it.”278 The members of the Free Church preached some very injurious sermons to the hearts of the Wesleyans. A man named Malakai Vuki of Muá in a sermon said, “The King is coming to hang all belonging to the Wesleyan Church, and their tongues shall hang out of their mouths and shall be dried in the sun.”279 Another testimony from Tevita Tuionuku stated, “I Jone heard Nuku say that the Premier had instructed the chiefs to persecute all who are Wesleyans, and to please themselves what evil things the chiefs might do to the people who remained Wesleyans.”280 Moulton also recorded the few Wesleyans in Tongatapu who

279 No.4A of Moulton Papers, n.d. Mss 804, viii.
280 Ibid.
remained loyal to be Wesleyans, as, “Áhau, 50 people turned to Free Church (FC.); Haákame – 4 turned to FC; and most families had their services in their own private homes.” At the village of Haákame, the Wesleyan minister went to conduct service there but was stopped and told off by the Chief of the village and said, “Let it be so. I will do to ask the King has commanded. The King has said, only two lotus shall be here, the Roman Catholic and the Free Church.” The tragic situation for the Wesleyans became worse when Moulton complained to the Minister of Police and the Minister accordingly replied, “[It] is difficult to me for I have no grounds for actions, for it is a dispute and not violence (bau′u).”

The men from the northern islands had weaponry ready for any order to conduct against the Wesleyans. Waterhouse in his report based on a letter from Moulton dated 1st August, 1885 said that “orders were sent to bring every Wesleyan to town. Not one was to be left; ill or well they were to come…” And as Waterhouse’s report continues, it narrated deep emotional testimonies which reflected the “spirit of [Moulton’s] brave Tongans as they rose to the occasion.” They are worth quoting here to explain their dedication and commitment as loyalists of Moulton and the Kau Fakaongo. The report continued, “One woman, who had just given birth to a child, said to her husband, ‘You go down, but promise me that as soon as the hanging begins, you will come and fetch me, and let us die together.’ And another was left behind for he was too ill to move, “when the (false) report reached him that the hanging had begun, managed to get on horseback and came crawling down.” And, as his Kau Fakaongo friends expressed their concerns and surprise, he answered, “I was afraid that I should be too late to be hung.” The reporter of these events concluded by stating, “It strikes me that this heroism
equals Thermopylae.” And as the people gathered unto malaé Pangai for this Fono, the Wesleyans gathered at the chapel on Mount Saione, (Sia ko Veiongo), where they had prayers and intercessions to support one another in their faith and dedications and to prepare for any order for them. Waterhouse reported from Moulton’s letter, “people however, continued to pour in until there was scarcely standing room, and crowd had to wait outside. None of us will ever forget that morning prayer-meeting. There was no mistake about it; these people were looking death in their face.” Baker’s supporters were at the foot of mount Saione, carrying axes and weapons, and one of them said to one woman of the Wesleyans, “Yes we will have some of heads off directly.”

The Wesleyans’ meeting at Mount Saione (Sia ko Veiongo) began with a hymn composed by Moulton for the situation, “an adaptation of the 23rd Psalm.” The first line of the hymn states, É ikai te u masiva au pe tukubaunia, he ko e Eiki Aoniu, ko boku tauhi ia. [The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want.] and in the fourth verse was taken up it reads, Neongo éte baélea á e bala fu’u mamalu, ‘ou ‘alu bifo be tele’a mamalu ange fau, [Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for Thou art with me.], Moulton’s first minister David Tonga chose a tune and started singing the hymn, “the rush of feeling was overwhelming; all fear and agitation vanished; and when suddenly the great drum struck for the ‘fono’ there was no hesitation; all were ready to take whatever came. Blessing them in the Name of the Lord, we send them forth.” Moulton kept a distance from the gathering at Pangai and noticed his Kau Fakaongo leaders, “worked to the front. There was almost a race as to who should be first. At least a score had determined

---

286 Ibid.
287 Ibid. 56.
288 Ibid.
289 This hymn when sung in Wesleyans worship services in Tonga, this memorable occasion is well remembered and the encouragement it gave to the Wesleyans of the day as they prepared to face death because of their faith. Ibid.
290 see # 403, of Ko e Tohi Himi á e Siasi Uesiliina Tauataina ó Tonga, (Nuku‘alofa: The Friendly Island Bookshop, 2006,) 124. See also Note on Waterhouse report, Jabez, B. Waterhouse, (ed.) The Secession and Persecution in Tonga, (Sydney: Wesleyan Book Depot, 1886), 56.
291 Ibid.
when the hanging came to rush forward at once and offer their necks, so as to give the people courage.”

Moulton further reported, King Tupou 1’s face was visibly changed and his mood showed sympathy with the approximated 2500 “surging in” to the fono at malaé Pangai. King Tupou I “was grieved at the opposition of his people, &c., but the laws would be observed.” The report concluded about this memorable event by stating, “The King was Mr Baker’s great card, and when he played that game [it] would be lost, &c…” This Baker’s game gave enough fuel to spark the anger to the chiefs of Haá Tuí Tonga and Muá Parliament to orchestrate something to stop him from playing in the political shadow of King Tupou I. These actions by Baker was intolerable to the chiefs of Mu’a most especially Tungi.

Some European men had already lived at Muá at the time and the most prominent of them all was Robert Hanslip. This gentleman was charged for inducing hatred in the heart of the people of Muá and opposing Baker’s regime. This conspiracy was tabled at the Privy Council’s meeting and the Chief High Commissioner Sir Arthur Gordon was requested by the Privy Council on 13th August, 1877, to assess the evidences provided. The Verdict reached was announced by the Chief High Commissioner Arthur Gordon regarding the trial between R. Hanslip and Tonga Government recorded in Tongan. The government charged Mr. Hanslip with five charges in 1882, and Arthur Gordon, the High Commissioner summed up his decision regarding the laid charges. Gordon dismissed the first charge of fakaílo á Hanisilipi…fakaáíái e kakai ó Muá ke nau angatan’u pea fakaloto’i kinautolu ke nau fai ha tobi ki be Kuini ke áve mei be fonua ni á e tokotaba ó éne kakai óku nofo ó fai e ngane á Tupou, [Hanslip invoked the people of Mu’a to oppose the government orders and helped them designed a petition to the Queen that someone [Baker] who had

---
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295. Charge 1, in Ko e G.[aahi] Tu’utu’uni á e Talafekau Lahi, The Decision of the Chief Commissioner,...
helped Tupou in his political manoeuvrings be removed from Tonga]. To this he dismissed since there was not enough evidence provided. Gordon also indicated in his concluding statement of charge 1 that, Ko e meá óku ba mai ‘oku ne féhiá mamahi ki be angi á e Palemia…. [It thus appears that Hanslip deeply hated what Premier Baker was conducting in Tonga]. The second charge renders that Hanslip did the same conspiracy to the Chiefs of Mu’a (Muá Parliament) to oppose the Premier and his political orders, and this Gordon dismissed as no case. The third charge regarded Hanslip drafting the petition to the Queen, and Gordon concluded dismissing it as no case. He emphasized that it was right for all people of every nation to petition in letter, to show their own will. The fourth charge regarded Hanslip as chief conspirator of the “bush rangers” who attempted to assassinate Baker. To this charge, Gordon also stressed that no evidence was provided to prove the truth of what Hanslip had done. Gordon stressed that stigmatizing these men as “popula” was inappropriate because they had not been put on trial and found guilty of the charges. The last charge accused Hanslip of faka’ai’ai influencing the people of Kolofoóu to fakakikibi argue against the ownership of King Tupou 1’s land and property. To this charge, Gordon concluded by referring to the Tonga Constitution, and stated, “‘Oku ‘ikai ko e Lao ó e fonua ni i onopooni, á e finangalo óe Tu’i: be koe meá pe óku kau ai á Éne ‘Afió ki be Lao, ko éne finangalo ki be ngaahi Lao, kuo loto ki ai á e Fale Alea.” 296 [The Law of the Land is not the sole will of the King, but the statement which the Parliament has agreed to and signed for by His Majesty.] In Gordon’s concluding statement, he declared that after assessing all given documents and evidences regarding the accusation of Mr. Hanslip, He had found him not guilty of all charges and that he cannot issue a letter for his deportation from this land. He also suggested to the King that he install in his government some ministers who will help him in his governance.

296 . Charge 5 in Ko e G.[aahi] Tu’utu’uni á e Talafekau Lahi, The Decision of the Chief Commissioner,...
This thesis wishes to give another view of the above judgment. The judgment was made from a European perspective of Law and Order, where technicality of proofs and evidences provided for at the court hearing was insufficient; it did not rule out the fact that Mr. Hanslip was involved in all manoeuvrings regarding the attempted assassination of Baker. Gordon’s judgment rested heavily on technicalities of the case rather than focusing on the issue and case in charge, that Hanslip played a significant role in the conspiracy. The evidences to support the case did not, in Gordon’s view, prove that the intention of Hanslip was backed up by his actions. The technical failure of Gordon’s judgment of Hanslip’s case had led the assessment astray, leaving the key factor of a court hearing which the judge should have addressed whether the Mens Rea – the intention of ill-will [fakakaukaun bia] agreed with the Actus Reus – actions [meá naá ne fai] of Hanslip in relation to the laid charges. Given other facts that Hanslip supplied guns and bullets for the attempted assassination of Baker, the accuser was guilty. However, from Gordon’s view point, based on evidences provided for him at the time, on all probabilities; the evidences provided did not convince him that Hanslip had Mens Rea – the intention of ill-will [fakakaukaun bia] and no evidence of his Actus Reus – actions [meá naá ne fai] that support wrongful acts. That constituted his conclusion to release Hanslip as “not guilty”. One can note on the above case a shortfall of the judge on the Law and Order judgement.

Basil Thomson who was a young civil servant in Fiji visited Tonga in 1886 and on his record noted that Baker was already unpopular in the eyes of the chiefs of Mu’á, because he had “treated the chiefs as negligible, like commoners.” Basil Thomson further reported,

I heard enough in Mu’a to convince me that the people, not old Wesleyans only, were reaching the end of their

---

tether and that an explosion of some kind, not against the king but against Baker, was imminent.298

The point to note here is that the ill-feeling laid in the hearts of certain people in Tonga against Baker’s policy in running the Tongan government was already looming. At the same time, Baker already shared the same feeling and told the German-Consul in Apia, his feelings at the time; asking for a war ship to dock in Nukuálofa harbour for his support. The letter is quoted here in part,

My dear Mr. Weber,
I am sorry to say that King George is very unwell and I am almost afraid of him. I have thought it well to ask you if you have a German man-o-war in harbor at Apia, could you not send her on here for a few weeks in case anything might happen….

Yours very truly,
Shirley Waldemar Baker. 299

It is evident that Baker had already felt anything could happen at any time. King Tupou I’s health was not a problem at the time and no German warship came for Baker’s support. However, Baker’s loyalty to King Tupou and his call to Premiership at this time was undergoing threats. Nevertheless, the situation forced some hidden agendas to arise; most especially his leaning towards the German Consul in Samoa for support. We shall see in the next chapter the next phase of this development.

Perhaps as a summary of this chapter, it is appropriate to tabulate the laid complains by Moulton on the ill-treatment of the Methodist loyalists. From Inclosure 5 of Tonga No.2 (1887), Appendix to Report by Sir Mitchell, High Commissioner for the Western Pacific, in Connection with the Recent Disturbances in and the Affairs of Tonga,

298 . Ibid. pp.52-3.
299 . Western Pacific High Commission, Suva,- No. 340/1890, Basil Thomson from Nukuálofa, 14 November, 1890, to W. Collet, Secretary t High Commissioner, with copy of Baker’s Letter, 26 November, 1886.
Sir Mitchell wrote a letter to His Majesty King Tupou I dated 27 March, 1887, outlined the complaints laid by Moulton and to which his Majesty replied, “I shall be glad to meet your Excellency to-morrow at 10.30am.” The complaints laid by Moulton regarded the ill-treatments of the Wesleyans from the foundation of the Free Church to the attempt assassination on Baker’s life. (4th January 1885, to 13th January, 1887):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaints numbered in Charges:</th>
<th>Names and Nature of Complaints by J.E.Moulton against Baker and Tupou I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charge I.</td>
<td>Baker started Free Church in Ha'apai, January, 1885, and various kinds of persecutions have been resorted to in order to make the Wesleyans join it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge II.</td>
<td>Chiefs who refused thus resulted in their title taken away: Vaea, Valu, Mohulamu, 'Ahio, Galugalu, and others, in Feb. 1885.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge III.</td>
<td>Government officials dismissed from their jobs: Magistrate Valu, and the following town officers, Lamatau, Jiobe Afu, Vaea, Mohulamu, Ikahihifo, and Latukefu and Tolofua were officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge IV.</td>
<td>Intimidations and Violences to the people and individuals: Fono at Nuku'alofa 27 March, 1885; ‘Ahau 4th April, 1885 by Lajike; of Ula at Neiafu, 30 March, 1885; at Hofoa, 31 March, 1885; of Lavaka at Folaha, 2 April, 1885; of Lavaka at Nukuhetutu, 2 April, 1885; Sspech of Halutolo at Bolotu at Nuku’alofa; Fono at Niuatoputapu, Mar. 1885; Tugi’s threat, 10 May, 1885; Fono of Tu’ivakano 8 June, 1885; Fono of Ata 24th April, 1885; Tugi’s thrashing Ha’apai with a whip, 10 May, 1885; Halaholo thrashing men at Fafa, 13 June, 1885; binding of forty men and women a Niuafo’ou and incarceration of minister Jioeli Nau, September, 1885.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge V.</td>
<td>Expulsions of bodies of Wesleyans from their towns and residences: People of Folaha and Nukuhetuku, 2 April, 1885; ‘Ahau, 14 April, 1885, Ma’ufanga, Kolovai, May, 1885. Deportations f about seventy Wesleyans to the Island of Kao, April, 1885. Deportations of seven women to be island of Tonumea, April, 1885. Deportations of Wesleyans: From vava’u, August, 1886. From vava’u, Moses Fale, Aug.1886. Deportations of ministers and people: From Niuafo’ou, October, 1885. …….Niuatoputapu, &amp; Vava’u.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge VI.</td>
<td>Interferences or violence in or connected with the leased premises: Removal of cartaker – Ha’apai Tei Tuipulotu, April, 1886. ………..Tei Tuionuku, …….. …………..Juliasi Tagtaoleao……….. Vava’u Toto, June, 1886. Kamoto …….. Armed invasion of the College [Tupou] 20 July, 1885… Joshua Lolohea assaulted while holding service in our church at Tafo’ou, 17 April, 1885.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

300 Inclosure 4 “The King of Tonga to Sir C. Mitchell,” in Tonga No.2 (1887), Appendix to Report by Sir Mitchell, High Commissioner for the Western Pacific, in Connection with the Recent Disturbances in and the Affairs of Tonga, dated, King’s Palace, 27 March, 1887. p.539.
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Andrew Funaki assaulted by Chief Lavaka as he was entering our church at Bea for the purpose of holding religious service, 15 November, 1885.
Baula Mo’unga and others not allowed to worship in our church at Buke, 29 March, 1885.
Nailing-up of church doors at Nomuka by Baula Ma’afu, March, 1885.
Ditto of Kolonga church by Buku, 15 July, 1886.
Preventing our minister from entering Ha’akame church, 29 ----1885, and subsequent seizure of church.
Seizure of our churches generally in Vava’u, 1885.
Seizure of our church in Ha’ano and others in Ha’abai, August, 1886.

**Charge VI.** Persecution or oppressive actions of laws, law courts, administrations, &c-
Law of the “Six” } Parliament of 1885.
Law of the “Thirty”}
Order in Council of the “Three Hundred Fathoms,” 24 June, 1886.
Twelve Ha’akame people fined for hearing a sermon, 10 Feb., 1886.
Talofou’ou Case. Eight people and minister fined each 22 dol.1c., 4 May, 1886.
Matahau Case. Eleven fined 2o dollars, 25 May, 1886.
Kolonga Case. Minister and benitubou fined each 25 dollars, 4 September, 1886.
Fo’ui Case. Twenty-nine persons fined about 25 dollars each, December, 1886.
Joel Nau, sundry fines, August 1886.
Semisi Havea, two years and 100 dollars to Mr Baker.
Esafe Katoa, trial and sentence, 1885……
Caleb ‘Otuhouma’s case, 1885…..
Baula Tabuaka’s trial, 1885…..
Akabusi Tau’alupe condemned to six months as a thief for drinking one of his own nuts…..
Jone Latu, sundry trials, March, April and May 1886. Fined 41 dol. 3 c. for not keeping a place in order, Government refusing to allow him to hire a man &c…….
David Finau, S. Toto. S. Kamoto, S. Yeniua. Fined for neglect of premises after the Government had removed the caretakers from said premises. Several dates about September, 1886.
Juliasi Tagataoleao, Tevita Tuionuku, Tevita Tuibulotu. Case similar to above, but Juliiasi and Tuionuku and were in prison for 105 days. Same date as above.
Calling out into the militia a considerable number of the students of Tupou College, while passing over Government and Roman Catholic College……
Also retaining in the ranks those Wesleyans who were entitled to be free by age, while letting the others retire. Also increasing the sentences of sundry of items, and making the executions of all the sentences depend upon their refusal to leave the church.
Bringing over Wesleyans was only from ‘Eua to serve in the militia.

Another letter of J. Egan Moulton dated Nuku’alofa, 30 March, 1887, outlined the following complaints:

The Ha’apai warriors were sent for, and they, in conjunction with some Tongans traversed the country in armed bands, menacing the Wesleyans with guns and clubs, &c., to induce them to turn over to the “Free Church”, and looting the premises of those that refused. They stated that they acted under authority. A considerable number of the remaining Wesleyans were then expelled from their towns and dwellings, and afterwards driven or deported to the towns to the towns or islands where their ancestors lived, and then compelled to join the “Free Church” through brutal violence. The remainder were then banished from the group. Tupou College was broken up by force.

**Charge I**
Looting the premises of the Wesleyans and intimidations.
Fua’amotu, Kolonga, Niutoua, Te’ekiu and Majilamea, Nukunuku, Matahau, Houma, Utulau, Hologa, Fatai, Nuku’alofa, Maufaga, Mua, Haajini, Tubou College, between the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Expulsion of Wesleyans from their towns and dwellings: Houma, Uutaau, Niuotua, Kologa, Nukunuku, Hologa, Kolofou'ou, Maufaga, Fuamotu, held between 22nd January, to 29th January, 1887.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Forcible breaking up of Tupou College and expulsion of students, 5 February, 1887.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Breaking up of congregations by deportation of Wesleyans to towns or islands where their ancestors lived, 7 February, 1887.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Imprisonment or banishment – Banishment of the Wesleyans of Tongatapu, 23 Feb., 1887. Banishment of the Wesleyans at Ha’apai… James Koloamatangi and four others to Tofoa for attendning family worship at my house, March…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Making use of the Queen’s letter to King George as an intimidation – Paper in 1885 (this is the document resulting from Mr Thurston visit). Letter in 1887.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

His Majesty King Tupou I was examined by the Chief Judicial Commissioner on the above charges, most especially of His accountability to the item 1 of the Tonga Constitution, 1875, which declares freedom of all people to practice their religion according to their conscience. His Majesty replied, “That when the Free Church commenced there was no idea of commanding any one to go to it by force.”

This above statement of His Majesty reveals that the use of force and Tupou I’s name to force people to join the Free Church could here be accounted as Baker’s

---

301. Q.2. A.2. of Inclosure 6, “Examination of the King of Tonga.” in Tonga No.2 (1887), Appendix to Report by Sir Mitchell, High Commissioner for the Western Pacific, in Connection with the Recent Disturbances in and the Affairs of Tonga, dated, King’s Palace, 27 March, 1887. 8.
own manoeuvre in oppose to Moulton. His Majesty also maintained the position there was no connection between the laid charges with the establishment of the Free Church in 1885, and that “The Free Church was an after affair but the disturbances commenced by Mr. Moulton before the Free Church was inaugurated.”

This next statement reveals that His Majesty’s relationship with Moulton to this point was down to nil. The conclusion of the examination, the king emphasised that, “it is not right for himself or His Government to interfere in the particular religious views of the people: but in this affair with regard to the Wesleyan church, the affair has risen because of the unpleasantness and situations to which he has referred.” In all, the arrows were pointing to Moulton and his resistance to the formation of the independent church.

---

CHAPTER 4.

Fakaongo Identity - Ko Tonga Mo’uga ki he Loto Loyalists.\(^{303}\)

The Attempted Assassination of Baker:

The mana of Baker, as Premier of the government of Tonga, had been put into question by certain groups of Tongan chiefs, by Moulton and the Kau Fakaongo, and they together with certain Europeans made a conspiracy for his assassination, as if it was the best possible way to end his regime. The event caused wider divisions among the Wesleyan Tongans; chiefs and people. The split cultivated personal differences in the society and the Wesleyan church circle which persisted on to this century. As early as 1882, it was apparent that the chiefs of Mu’a (Mu’a Parliament) were not happy with the way Baker’s loyalty to King Tupou I had been swaying into manoeuvring the political shadow of the King’s power and government.\(^{304}\) Tupou Malohi’s letter indicated that Baker’s manipulation under King Tupou I’s shadow was not well received by the Fale Alea o Muá [Mu’a Parliament] which led by Topui, Kiteau, Kailahi and Manuobangai. A letter by Tupou Malohi to the Premier indicated the involvement of two European namely Mr. Hanslip, a European trader who have lived in Tonga for years and Mr. Basil Thomson, who was a young magistrate from the Lau group in Fiji who visited Tonga and lived with Tungi in Muá.\(^{305}\) Some outlaws who were on the run, conspired with the Muá Parliament to end Baker’s life by way of assassination. The attempt assassination event is well reported on various reports; the reports of the Minister of Police Tu’úhetoka to His Majesty King Tupou I; the Western Pacific

\(^{303}\) Chapter Seven presents the conspiracy for the assassination of Baker’s life and the related parties who conspired to end the Premier’s life. The involvement of the leader and members of Tupou College in the failed assassination. Moulton’s loyalists were stigmatized as Kau Fakaongo in abused sense. Voluntary exile to other islands was in place. Moulton steadfastly held meetings with the minority of Wesleyans in Tonga. Baker’s regime continued to beg for the removal of Moulton from Tonga but never succeeded. Sources for this chapter will be from government records, Court papers, Minister of Police findings, and of the correspondences between Baker (as Premier) with Moulton at the time.

\(^{304}\) “Ko e kii vailolo ke hinga ai á e kovi i he fatu ó e kau fie boto,” See Letter in Tongan of Tupou Malohi, Kovana ó Vavaú Ki he Balemia ko Misa Beika, Nukuálofa, 29 Tisema, 1881. SB/56. PMB 1203 Reel 1.

High Commissioner’s Reports on Tongan Affairs 1887; the missionaries’ correspondence with officials of the Australia Conferences at the time; and the internal communications between Premier Baker’s regime and his Tongan government officials. This chapter will narrate the attempt assassination and its aftermaths. Some stories from oral narratives will also be interpolated to put events into perspective.

Sir Charles Mitchell, the then British High Commissioner to the Western Pacific, in a letter to the King of Tonga stated that he “had been directed by Her Britannic Majesty’s Government to inquire into and report fully on the cause and effect of certain disturbances,” that took place in Tonga under His Majesty’s rule. King Tupou 1 replied in a letter stating, that he is “glad to meet” with his Excellency the next day. The “certain disturbances” to which Mitchell was referring to above, particularly included the attempt on Baker’s life and the political turmoil that followed; including the abuse of powers and persecution of the Tongan people, the deposing of officials and chiefs because of their religious choice and the enactment of laws to support only the rights of loyalists to Baker’s regime which was consequently used against the Kau Fakaongo.

The Assassination Event:

Premier Baker and his family had lived at Fai ‘a Koka, a beach residence beside the beach road at Kolomotuá that leads towards the centre of Nukuálofa Township. On the night of Thursday, the 13th January, 1887, at about 7.40pm, Baker and his son Shirley and daughter Beatrice, were travelling on their buggy for an evening

---


ride.309 Baker took the front seat and drove the buggy, while his children seated immediately behind him. As they rode the buggy enjoying the cool sea breezes, they passed by Mele Halaevalu’s house, situated on the lower hill side of the Sia ko Veiongo [mount Zion] where, as Baker later related, their buggy “shied at a native who was standing directly in the road.” His son Shirley immediately called out that the, “man has a gun.” Shirley immediately hopped off the buggy to beg the man to put down his gun. According to oral tradition, this man was Tavake, son of Topui.310 As the five men set at their planned assassination point to succeed their attempt, Tavake was too anxious to take part in the assassination and slotted himself at a distance before the place where the five assassins were. Tavake attempted to fulfil the task himself but failed to fire the gun at target, thus, his move disturbed the whole plan. Baker testified that he was not able to stop the buggy, and noticed “another man also with a gun, in a stooping position.” As the buggy journeyed along the road, the buggy’s lamp revealed the faces of the other four men, each holding a gun. Baker stated “there was also what [he] took to be a woman at a little distance....”311 Amidst the confusion and commotion, Beatrice stood up and threw her arm to guard her father [Baker], as the men started firing. Beatrice’s reaction was later hailed as “heroic conduct” by the Sydney Herald newspaper.312 The double flash of the firing guns, prompted Baker’s conclusion that, “it must have been a double-barrel gun that was used.” His son Shirley was hurt on the spot as a bullet hit him while he tried to divert the shooting from his father. Beatrice turned from her father to reach out to her brother crying, “I must go to Shirley; he is shot.”313 Baker noticed in the fore shadow of the risen moon, the five men beside the road, each holding a gun as one horse plunged at one of their bullets. Beatrice was thrown back and landed on her back. This fall fractured

310 . Personal interview with Viliami Va’inga ‘i Hakau, Ta’e’iloa (Kapukava), chief of Holonga (DoB.) 17/12/1948) and great grandson of Topui. Auckland on 23. February, 2011.
311 . Ibid.
313 . Ibid.
her back, leaving her hunched for the rest of her life. In the end, Beatrice and Shirley both made it back to the buggy, and they scurried towards the Minister of Police, Tuūhetoka’s residence with Baker unhurt.

The attempt assassination of Premier Baker failed. Another perspective of the situation was a report by the President of Tonga College, who wrote, “I was engaged that evening in teaching a class. I heard a Tongan give a warning cry from near the gate and a pupil said, ‘The Premier.’ Shortly after the Premier entered and said, ‘The escaped convicts had shot Shirley.’” In no time John Hartley Robert and his students arrived at the spot where the attempted assassination happened and “found it but too true.” He further recorded that, “Miss Beatrice is in a very great danger. Her wounds received in trying to shield her father from the dastardly murderers,” and “the injuries to her spine and neck, received in jumping out of the buggy are very serious indeed.”

It was later revealed that the guns and bullets used in the shooting were supplied by Mr. Robert Hanslip a palangi trader of European descent who had lived in Tonga for many years. The four culprits from Muá, were Palu, Naisa, Fehoko and Latu, together with a woman named Lita, and another two men named Lutoviko and Benisio Hau who were all bushrangers. From oral stories, the assassins, soon after the failed attack, returned to Habake [eastern district] and hid themselves at the uninhabited island at the swamp, Niutao, in the village of Talafo’ou. They lived there for two days and later decided to surrender themselves to the Police in Mu’a on 15 January, 1887. The attack on Baker’s life caused further turmoil and violence over the land. His Majesty King Tupou 1, thought the event was an attack on him and his government, sent for his supporters from the northern islands, to

---

315. The same report also appeared in The Evening Star newspaper, dated 8 Feb., 1887.
317. Personal communication with Kapukava, the descendant of Topui.
come to Tongatapu for his security. The Tongatapu chiefs were also called to show their support.

Soon after the failed assassination, His Majesty King Tupou I ordered a full investigation from the Minister of Police. His Report (Tonga) stated that the conspiracy was initiated by certain men from Mu’a, who was Topui, Leka, ‘Aisea Kamoto. They confided that the culprits had been on the run from Nuku’alofa gaol, as kaivao “bush rangers,” since 5 September, 1886, ke labaji ‘a e Palemia moe Hou’eiki ni’ibi.[to assassinate the Premier and certain chiefs. They frequently met to plan the assassination and their leader was Topui]. Other parties involved were his men from Mu’a, and some members from the Koliji Fakaongo [Tupou College]. ‘Usaia Topui318 was the son of Tavake, who was also the son of Luani Naufahu319 and Balu Leleva,320 the sister of Fatu.321 Customarily, Topui is the Fahu person of Mu’a and other chiefs like Tungi Halatuituia, Fatafehi Tu’ibelehake, and Laifone who were all cousins of Topui. ‘Usaia Topui was also cousin to both Chief Tungi of Muá and the late Prince Tevita ‘Únga. From that Fahu and Tapu relationship, he acquired the power to be the chairperson and dictate the institution of the so-called Mu’a Parliament, to conspire the assassination of the European Premier of Tonga; Waldemar Shirley Baker.

318 . The name Topui as according to Kapukava was Tavake’s word’s to Taufa’ahau in Fiji, when they went to assist Ratu Cakobau of Bau at the battle with Mara at Kaba. Before the war began, Taufa’ahau sent Tavake to take a parcel of goods to the Catholic priests who then lived at the island of Ovalau. After Tavake conveyed the parcel to the island of Ovalau, and on return he was shot with an arrow by the Fijian warriors from Mara’s party. As Tavake received the arrow into his body and was badly hurt, he struggled to reach Taufa’ahau and his last word to Taufa’ahau stated, Kuo u to ‘i ho’o pu’i, (Topui) [I have fallen but your message had been conveyed]. Kapukava, Auckland. Dated 23.02.2011.
319 . This Luani Naufahu was also one of those Vava’u warriors (Pupunu, Kakahu, and others) whom Finau ‘Ulukalala ‘i Feletoa suffocated at sea during the Fono at Makave, for being antagonistic against him.
320 . Fatu, and his two sisters were children of Mulikiha’amea. The sister of Balu Leleva was Balu Vava’u who married Chief Fulivai of Hunga, and their son was Benisimani Latuseru who was the first Wesleyan Tongan minister to have been installed to ministerial office in 1848. Benisimani Latuseru in turn married his cousin Tupou ‘Ahau (daughter of Fatu) and their daughter was Tae Manusa. From Tae Manusa was born Ma’atu, chief of Niua and his sister ‘Ofa ki Vava’u, who was married His Majesty Taufa’ahau Tupou II at the beginning of the twentieth century. Personal interview with Kapukava, (Viliami Va’inga ‘I Hakau Ta’e’iloa) the chief of Holonga, and descendant of Topui, Auckland, New Zealand, dated 23.02.2011.
321 . This Fatu was the son of Mulikiha’amea, and the man of Mu’a who welcome the pioneer Methodist Missionary Rev. Walter Lawry and his family at Mu’a, in 1822.
Before the assassination, the culprits were jailed on different civil cases. Palu described as from Navutoka village served a term for adultery and theft. Naisa, Fehoko, and Latu were all from Muá, and were sentenced for minor offences. While in jail, they attempted to steal a boat to escape to Fiji. They attained the boat successfully, but instead of landing in Fiji, they drifted and landed in Ha’apai. They were later detained and brought back to Tongatapu for trial where each gained extra penalties and imprisonment for the second set of offences; boat stealing and stealing rifles from the police. The primary record stigmatized them as *kaivao* “bush rangers,” which incited Baker’s insistence that they were to be brought into custody. The move to capture the runaway bush rangers was burdened by the people of Mu’a who harbored them. Harbouring such outlaws from re-capture by government officials indicated protests against the government. But in hindside, their resistance was also indicated another dimension of opposing everything Baker did, thus indicating their support of Moulton. In fact, by this time, Moulton was already known to have some influence on the chiefs and people of Mu’a purposely, to resist certain movements led by Baker and the then government.

However, more evidence from Minister of Police Tu’uhetoka, about the assassination was revealed by the assassins on trial. The Report indicated that there were three plots. According to the assassins’ testimonies, the conspiracy to assassinate Baker was first planned for the Sunday evening of the New Year’s Eve (December, 1886).\(^{322}\) This plan was left to the students of the Tubou College to convey but failed.\(^{323}\) This first plan ascertained the active participation of Moulton on the move to resist Baker’s regime. The second plan was for the evening of Wednesday 12\(^{th}\) January, 1887, but the assassins arrived late in Nukuálofa for the full moon was already in full bloom and they decided to postpone the attempt to

---

\(^{322}\) Reference?  
the next evening. Thinking it would be a long way to return to Mu’a and come back to Nuku'alofa the next night, they decided to rest for the night with their friend Lavuso who was a staff of Tupou College – Maamaloa, in Nuku'alofa. Lavuso and his wife housed and fed the outlaws for almost twenty four hours. The Minister of Police report noted the kakai Koliji na’a nau ‘ilo, [The College’s pupils who knew about the presence of the outlaws at Tupou College] were, Tevita Finau, Jone, Tu’itavake, Jione Fekau and many other students. On the night of the assassination, Thursday 13th January, 1887, Naisa, Latu, Fehoko, Tavake and Lavuso came down to carry out the plan. The involvement of Moulton and Tupou College would not have been known, if it had not been for the failure of their first attempt and the assassins’ decision to hide themselves at Tupou College. However, the failure of their first attempt led the assassins to expose Moulton and Tupou College’s involvement in the whole development as was made clear from the evidences provided.

But before this failed attempt at Baker’s life, Alfred Harold Wood in his book, indicated that;

A larger plot against Baker’s government in which, it appears, some of the chiefs were involved; this aimed at capturing Baker and transporting him to Fiji. When this plot was abandoned, an alternative conspiracy was formed against Baker’s life.

The above plan indicates the anger of certain chiefs and people of Tonga at Baker’s regime had been at boiling point and even to exiling the Premier to Fiji.

---

324 Ibid.
325 Tupou College was originally established in Maamaloa, Nuku'alofa, (where the first Mission House and Centenary Church now located, before it was moved westward to Nafualu, in 1921. But on the FWCT Annual Conference of 1947, a decision was resolved that Tupou College be moved again to a 200 acres land on Kalaniuvalu’s estate at Toloa, in 1948.
326 Ibid.
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Another letter (in Baker’s Papers)\textsuperscript{328} to ‘U. Topui was written in Tongan and apparently in his own hand writing signed by T. Tuákalau read,

\begin{verbatim}
Hоло́нгa M[u’á Kaутха]

Тисема б.[ono] 17, 86

E ‘U. Topui mo e kau maú tuúnga,
Óku ou fai atu á e tobi ni koe fakaba atu kuo mau tali boo mou
tobi ke tan tau i б.[ono] 29 ó Tisema. Pea kuo loto ki ai homo
kotoa á e tan ni.

Kоau T. Tuakalau
Ojfа аtu.\textsuperscript{329}
\end{verbatim}

Substantially, the above letter indicated there was a meeting by ‘U. Topui and the leaders (possibly the Muá Chiefs), about the assassination. The letter above was sent as a reply from the supporters to these men of Holonga, village a suburb of Muá, where Topui’s relatives resided. The letter also depicted the date planned for the actual attempt at Baker’s life to have been late December, 1886. Other testimonies give more clues to the actual conspirators in the attempt, and people known to have been involved. However, most importantly the letter gave answers to the question of who was loyal to whom?

Two other testimonies are worth citing from two New Zealanders; one was that of the trader Charles Allen Edenborough (No.73) who gave his testimony to Mitchell, stating,

\begin{quote}
In January last, I was here, and called at Mr Moulton’s. I had a conversation with him. This was on either 11\textsuperscript{th} or 12\textsuperscript{th} of January. Mr Moulton said, “You (Baker) were liable to be assassinated at any moment. He said reflection would be cast upon him if it took place.”\textsuperscript{330}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{328} Baker’s Papers, PMB 1203, Reel 1-5. Available at FWCT, Archive, Nuku’alofa, Tonga; a copy of this record is also avalibale at UOA archive, Auckland, New Zealand, where the original is kept by the PMB archive, Canberra, Australia.

\textsuperscript{329} A little note on the same stated, \textit{Ne u maú á e tohi ni mei he kato leta á Leka i Mu’a.}[this folded letter was retrieved from a suit case owned by Leka of Mu’a, signed by B.Tubou] Letter T. Tuakalau to H. Topui mo e Kau Maú Tuúnga, dated 17 Tisema, 86, SB/95. Baker’s Papers, PMB 1203. Reel 1. 1433.

\textsuperscript{330} Appendix. Report of Sir C. Mitchell etc.etc. 1887, p.55.
His further reflection on Moulton’s statement above, suggesting that he thought Moulton would have meant that some prisoners had escaped at the time. But when cross-examined by Moulton on trial, he returned the statement to Edenborough’s mouth, who replied back to Moulton, “You said it was not the Wesleyans alone, but the whole country that was smarting under Baker’s tyranny.” Another witness was the master mariner Robert G. Hatten (No.74)\textsuperscript{331} who testified,

I remember calling at Mr Moulton’s on the Monday night before the attack on Mr Baker….Nothing was said about an attack upon you. Mr. Moulton said that it was common talk that the people might rise at any moment. Mr. Moulton said that he would always counsel the people to obey the law, and that he had always done so.\textsuperscript{332}

Once more, it is evident from the above that Moulton knew of the conspiracy against Baker’s life. The reason for attempting to assassinate Premier Baker was not known until the Minister of Police Tuúhetoka was ordered by King Tupou 1 to thoroughly investigate the matter and provide a full report. One can imagine, what happened in a society which relied heavily on oral stories by way of \textit{fanongoongo tokoto}, [oral narratives]; different versions of the event had been reformulated according to one’s bias confusing people’s decisions and loyalties.

King Tupou 1 viewed the attempt assassination as opposition against himself and his policies of developing Tonga to become \textit{Siasi Tauátaina} [independent Church]. In no time, a message was sent for the Vava’u and Ha’apai men of war to gather in Tongatapu. This order, according to Baker, was made to summon them to capture the bush rangers who were on the run. King Tupou 1 also called for support from the chiefs in Tongatapu. But obviously, the chiefs of Muá would not response to

\textsuperscript{331} Reports of Sir C. Mitchell was given in numbered paragraphs and bracketed numbers hereinafter must be referred to numbered paragraphs in Sir. C. Mitchell’s Report.

\textsuperscript{332} Ibid.
the call of King Tupou I because of their anger at Baker’s tyranny. However, Baker’s statement (No. 162) to High Commissioner Mitchell relayed,

I advised the King to send for them, because attempt had been made previously to catch the outlaws, and they had always failed. The Police reported that the Muá people were in league with the outlaws, and they were consequently always being put upon the wrong scent. We had reason to believe that treasonable conspiracies were being carried on in the same district.333

It is evident from above that Baker had tried to avert the summoning of the men from the northern islands in the search for the prisoners (so called bush rangers) who were on the run “for five months” at the time, and not to impose assaults on the Wesleyans in Tongatapu; after the event of the attempted assassination. Baker also admitted in his statement,

I think that some of the conspirators were hostile to the King. The majority of them were hostile to me personally. The outlaws were, I believe the tools of others. I believe that Mr. Moulton knew that my life was in danger. I think he had deep convictions that the outlaws would shoot me.334

Baker cleverly twisted everything to compound the case by interpreting the attempted assassination as opposition to King Tupou 1 himself and his government. However, he also admitted that the attempt was directly personal to his life and that Moulton knew about it.

An oral story335 narrated by a lady who was a house keeper at Moulton’s residence, on the night of the unsuccessful assassination, reported that a man ran into the Mission House, where Moulton was, then seated at the verandah of his house. The

334 Ibid.
335 This story was told by Rev. Samiuela Toa Finau, at PTC, Suva, 1996, said that this lady who was house keeper and kitchen hand at Moulton’s house was his grandmother and the story was orally passed on to him by his mother.
unidentified man reported to Moulton saying, *Kuo bala e fana,* [they had missed the target]; and to which Moulton exclaimed, “*Oiaue, kuo tau tu’utamaki.*” ‘Oh dear, we are in great trouble.’ The reliability of this oral story could still be questioned, however, adding this story with other evidences provided; one may conclude that it is definite, that Moulton had already known of the attempt assassination before it was conveyed. Further, from Moulton’s reply statement itself included himself in the whole conspiracy.

And, in relation to the involvement of the Mu’a chiefs in the whole plot, a letter from an unnamed student of Tupou College to Tuúhetoka and Buleánga [Government] dated 31st January, 1887, laid argument against the claim by the assassins, that they were instructed by Laifone and Tukuáho to attempt the assassination. It hinted that Tu’ibelehake held frequent meetings with Naisa and made plans for the attempts. Naisa later informed the bush rangers that Tukuáho asked if they could implement the plan to assassinate Baker. The truth as it was later exposed is that Tu’ibelehake twice met with the outlaws at Álaki (the nearby village of Muá). The student’s letter emphasized that *Naisa* used Laifone and Tukuáho’s names as chief conspirators, because Tuíbelehake was his close *kainga* relative. The student also stated that he was also a close *kainga* relative of Tuíbelehake and Naisa. His testimony argues that the whole scheme for the assassination attempt was organized by many; which included *kau meá kuo tamate’i* [those who were killed at Malinoa island] and the *Kau FakaOngo tokolahi* [loyalists of Moulton], and *Tu’ibelehake mo Misa Hani mo e kau babalangi ni’ibi* [Tu’ibelehake, Mr. Hanslip and other Europeans]. In the conclusion of his testimony, the student emphasized that the five who conducted the attempts were innocent, yet the key conspirators were *Tuí Belehake*, the *Kau FakaOngo* and the Europeans. No name was signed on the letter however, it was indicated that he was a student of Moulton’s school.

---

336 Letter: Student to Tuúhetoka and Bule’ánga, Re-attempts to shoot Mr. Baker, dated 31 January, 1887. SB./101. PMB 1203, Reel 2.
The assassins together with Luvuso, and Topui were put in jail in Nukuálofa. They were put on trial before the Chief Justice Tevita Áhomeé on 26 January, 1887. On 31st January, 1887, all the accused including Topui and his son Tavake, Lavuso, the carpenter at Tupou College, John Fekau Ófahemoóni - the head prefect of the Tupou College, Áisea Kamoto and Tuitavake of Mu’a, together with the four culprits were found guilty and sentenced to death. The head tutor of Tupou College Rev. Tevita Finau, was also accused as a partner in crime, and sentenced to 22 years in custody. Éliesa Leka, another chief from Mu’a was further imprisoned for later trial.

After the trial, the Chief Justice Ahome’e issued sentence against the accused, and the Minister of Police Tu’uhetoka headed for the Palace to give the whole report to his Majesty King Tupou 1. Baker followed the Minister of Police to the Palace to beg the King to commute the death penalty. The king gave no response but called the Minister of Police to his presence at 2.00am of the same night; and His Majesty ticked out the names; Topui, Kamoto, Lavuso, Naisa, Latu, and Fehoko and ordered Tu’uhetoka to execute them by firing squad at the isolated island of Malinoa. A.H.Wood identified the denomination these men belonged as “three of the six were Wesleyans, two were Roman Catholic, and the sixth was not identified.” The witnesses were two Europeans who heard of King Tupou 1’s order to execute the six culprits at Malinoa, and went to witness the execution on the night. They reported, “They all died like men, standing upright with their irons on, and without shiver or a flinch.”

The report of the Minister of Police Tu’uhetoka dated 2 February, 1887 gave His Majesty King Tupou 1 fair explanation of the reason behind the attempted

---

337. An oral story narrated that Baker begged His Majesty, that he would not continue to serve his Majesty’s government as Premier if the death penalty was not averted.
340. Sekonaia Tu’uhetoka, Minister of Police’ Nukuálofa to His Majesty King George dated Nukuálofa, 2 February, 1887.
assassination. The report also revealed the reasons of the above decisions made by the Chief Justice Ahome’e from the trial.

THE REPORT OF THE MINISTER OF POLICE TU’UHETOKA TO HIS MAJESTY KING TUPOU I REGARDING THE ATTEMPTED ASSASSINATION OF PREMIER BAKER.\footnote{Baker’s Papers, Reel 5, 336, PMB 1203.}
The Supporters of The Assassination Conspiracy:

However, another source entitled, “Points in my letter I should like sustained,” no doubt was Premier Baker’s letter to King Tupou 1 regarding the trial and is worth citing here,

(1). That Tobui was the proved ringleader of the sedition also the intention to collect the arm and ammunition – also that he was an opponent of Tupou and government.
(2). That the four assassins were secreted by Lavuso – the fact stated by his wife that on a previous night he had gone down with some of Moulton’s College boys to club you.
(3). Jone Fekau – his visiting the house where assassins were secreted his company Balu – his meeting with the assassins – when a plan for killing some of the leading chiefs was talked over.
(4). Tevita Finau – his knowledge of intended assassination.
(5). That a number of Moulton’s students were implicated.
(6). Deny Moulton’s statement, “The Other Church have been long waiting an oppt.[opportunity] of attacking.”
(7). Moulton public insult to the Ha’apai people – men’s bodies, but minds of women.342

The evidence provided so far, all proved the involvements of major parties of society in the attempt assassination; the Muá Chiefs, some Europeans, and the workers of Tupou College. There is also indication that Moulton knew of the attempt and had been part of several meetings about the attempted assassination. However, the poor outlaws got scrutinized because they were the ones who conducted the crime. The most striking point was the evidences pointing strongly to the involvement of Moulton and Tupou College men in the attempts. Several days afterwards, the report of the trial was submitted by Minister of Police Tuúhetoka to King Tupou 1, an order was issued to Moulton, the then Chairman

342. Letter titled “Points in my(no doubt of Baker) letter I should like sustained,” in SB/102. PMB 1203. Reel 1. 634.
of District and President of Tupou College to close down the college on the 5th Feb., 1887.  

Tuúhetoka, Minister of Police together with another man called ‘Isileli Fehoko testified that they went to convey King Tubou I’s order to close down the College on 4 February, 1887. Oral tradition holds that Moulton on the Saturday night of 4th February, received the letter from Minister of Police Tuúhetoka. Moulton went to Maamaloa, the College hall where the students were, as usual gathered to prepare hymns and anthem for Sunday service. There, Moulton sat down at the back of the hall, downheartedly, took out his pen and recorded his feeling when he received the order to close down the college. Moulton composed a hymn and gave it a tune and as the college sang it, he offered a prayer for the school before he dismissed them according to the King’s order. Moulton’s composition is now a famous hymn of the Kau Fakaongo. [Moulton’s loyalists] Tongan Hymn Book 482 reads,

Hili á e laálaá, e to á e úha; [Do expect showers of rain after a drought]
Álotamaki e, toki áfua; [a good sunny day will follow a day of bad weather]
Ósi faingata’a, é faingofua; [peace will always follow hardships]
Hili ‘a e vahanoa, hopo ki úta; [a good landing is always awaiting a rough sea voyage]

Hili masiva e, kae mauí koloa; [an enriched life always follow poverty]
Hili á e vaivai, malohi noa; [power becomes prominent when we are so weak]
Ósi á e ítengia, to mai á e ófa; [love will always harmonize an angry heart]
Hili á e ngaue, malolo aa [good peaceful rest after a good day work]

344 Letter signed by Sekonaia Tuúhetoka, dated 4 Feb., 1887. MSS A806.
Hili á e fakaheeí, foki ki ápi; [one must return home from exile]
Hili á e ilifia á e ámanaki; [fear will always bring good hope]
Hili á e loímata á e malimali; [a good smiling face will dry running tears]
Hoko á e fiefia ki he mamahi. [happiness extinct sorrow hearts]

Hopo á e maama e hili poúli; [heavenly lights will dawn after darkness]
Mui á e ututaú ki he tutuu’i; [the harvest cannot be compared to seeds sown]
‘Osi fa’itoka na, toe mouí; [life after death is a must]
Hili kolosi e ma’u á e Kalauni.345[crown will certainly be put upon the faithful after the Cross]

It was hard for Moulton as a father to send his students back to their homes, knowing they were not involved in the conspiracy for the attempted assassination of Baker. However, he was to obey the command of the Law. As a token of encouragement, he offered his students the above composition to remind themselves of the hope that awaits their predicament. Substantially, the verses contained messages about the banished situations the Kau Fakaongo faced. The first verse essentially provided a promise to ‘expect water of life after the(assuming we a referring to the ‘situation’ at that time) drought’; to anticipate ‘abundant richness, after poverty’; a warm ‘welcome home will follow exiling’; and the last verse in full contained, ‘heavenly lights will dawn after darkness’, ‘the harvest cannot be compared to seeds sown’; while ‘life after death was a must’ and yet the ‘crown will certainly be put upon the faithful after the Cross’. This hymn described vividly the situation faced the Kau Fakaongo.

The British Subjects’ View of Tongan Affairs:

345 Ko e Tohi Himi á e Siasi Uesiliana Tauátaina ó Tonga, á ia naé faú é he Kau Faisekau, 482. (Nukuálófa: The Friendly island Bookshop, 2006), 152.
Another nineteen page report letter from the Minister of Police Sekonaia Tu’uhetoka, (written in Tongan copied in Baker’s hand writing)346 to His Majesty King Tupou 1, dated Mei, 1887,347 gave more facts about the assassination attempt. The report is quite long so this thesis will select certain points to give light to the problem. The content of the letter is also contained in a letter of His Majesty King Tupou 1 to Sea Jone Koatoni, Kovana o Fisi, [Sir John Gordon, and the Governor of Fiji].348 [Tu’uhetoka stated that the disturbances happened in Tonga actually began when Topui and Naisa returned from their exile in the Ha’apai islands. The letter also suggested that the Kaunisela Beletania ko Misa Saimone [British Consul Symonds] mo e Kovana Fisi [and the Governor of Fiji] did not agree with the penalty imposed by Government upon the outlaws regarding the offence they had conducted in 1886, before the attempt assassination. For this purpose, the Consul and Misa Hani [Mr Hanslip] sent letters advising the outlaws, that the penalty inflicted upon them was inappropriate. Hence, from the statements the assassins, under oath, further revealed, that Consul Symonds and Mr Hanslip indicated that His Majesty and Government be sued for the outlaws’ rights, and that a large sum of money should be paid to them as compensation, by the Tongan Government.

The letter continued to stress the fact that the British Government should be blamed for Symonds’ and his clerk Mr Hanslip’s actions as the initiator of all disturbances incurred. One palangi [a European - who is presumed to be Basil Thomson] came and lived with the Kau Fakaongo in Muá. It is not known whether he influenced them, but it was obvious that this palangi at times criticized Baker in public. From the testimonies of the bush rangers, on the night of their escape from prison; they took arms and ammunitions supplied by one of them; Mr. Hanslip the

346. This letter is not original. However, it is rather a nineteen pages (19) long letter. It is evident that the letter was copied by Baker or his daughter’s hand writing in a much later date. Despite the fact, it contains some very important evidence which correspond equally with evidence provided in other related sources, yet the credibility of the letter is very much in question.
348. Ko e Tohi Éne Áfioko ki he Kovana o Fiji, Ko Sea Jone Koatoni, dated Fale ó e Tu’1, 15 Jiulai, 1889, SB/130.
clerk of the British Consul’s office. The involvement of the Kau FakaOngo who harboured the outlaws made it difficult for the Police to capture the outlaws. The outlaws stole a boat and sank it in the Ocean to make the government think they had sailed away to Fiji. It was a ploy to avert the government while they were holding meetings with the Chiefs and people of Muá, together with some men from Tupou College. Topui was the ringleader and he interpreted for the Tongans what the Palangi had told them.

From another perspective, the statement in Paragraph 65 of Sir C. Mitchell’s Report (No. 65) regarding the attempted assassination suggests his opinion of the whole event as being an act of “Loyalty”, as stated,

> On one point, I think, there can be no difference of opinion, and that is on the absolute loyalty of all the people, without distinction of rank or creed to King George Tupou. The very people who disobeyed him in the matter of the Free Church would, I believe, die for him if he were in danger. If a conspiracy existed in the end of 1886, and I am inclined to believe that one exists, it was directed against Mr Baker and his Government, and not against the King.  

The essence of the above statement is loyalty of all people to King Tupou 1. Sir C. Mitchell himself, in his opinion, recognized the interplay of loyalty in the whole tumultuous event in Tonga.

The decision on Paragraph 68 of the Report Sir C. Mitchell offered his conclusion of the case stating,

> The conclusion to which I have arrived is not favorable to Mr. Baker: although great allowances must be made for the difficulties of his position in the earlier, and for the perturbation of mind (caused by the attempt to assassinate him) during the later period. I should, undoubtedly, have exercised the power vested in me, under the Western Pacific Order in Council, of

---

349 Paragraph 65, in Report of Sir C. Mitchell etc.etc. London, 1887.
prohibiting Mr Baker from remaining in Tonga for a period, had it not been that I felt that his presence with the King would, after the warning which my visit to Tonga had given, be best means of preserving peace.\textsuperscript{350}

It is clear from the concluding statement of Mitchell above that Baker’s presence in Tonga would come to an end. His partnership with the King had imposed ill feeling in the minds of the Tongans causing some of them to attempt the assassination. Most importantly, their loyalty to their Tui was disturbed by his presence.

While the people of the land was divided in confusions and sadness of the late execution in Malinoa, the \textit{Kau Fakaongo} had already determined that they should free Tonga to another land for the exercise of a free conscience and faith in the way they believed. United they stood in faith and conscience; the ministers and local preachers, parents and children. Some ministers of Tonga District and their families lived on in Tonga but most of those whom were then stigmatized as \textit{Kau Fakaongo}, decided to leave.

\textbf{The So-Called Fakaongo Exiles to Fiji, 1887-90.}

Since Siupeli Taliai in his article \textit{Kau Fakaongo}, has opened up a discussion of this controversial term in Tongan society;\textsuperscript{351} this thesis wished to respectfully follow his

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{350} Paragraph 68, in Report of Sir C. Mitchell, etc. etc. London, 1887.
\item \textsuperscript{351} The term \textit{Fakaongo} is one of the controversial terms in Tongan society today. It remains a sensitive issue to Tongan families whose members were involved in this tumultuous history of Tonga. The late Sione ‘Amanaki Havea, for example, always referred with emotions in his sermons to his father being punished 75 times during Baker’s regime, as penalty for not turning to the King’s church. Rev. Tevita Finau of Tupou College was contempt of all counts and sentenced to imprisonment for 22 years after the court arrived at a verdict of conspiracy on attempt assassination of Baker. His great grandson Tevita Finau worked as minister of New Zealand Methodists. Nasili Vakaúta who is tutoring Hebrew Language at UOA, Theology Department, is also the great-great-grandson of Rev. Jabez Bunting Watkin; the first president of the \textit{Tau’ataina-Free Church}. There is also The Rev. Setaita Veikune; the great great grand daughter of the late Pauliasi Taumoepeau who was among the \textit{Matimatika} and \textit{Helohelo} students of Moulton’s Tupou College and was selected among others as the first Head Tutor of Baker’s and Tupou I’s Tonga College at \textit{Kolisi Pule’anga} in Nuku’alofa in 1882. I, myself am a great grandson of two ministers John Latu 1 & John Latu 2, both of the Tonga District under British and Australia Conferences when in 1885, the elder minister (John Latu 1) ordered the younger minister (John Latu 2) to leave.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
report on the testimonies of the *Kau Fakaongo*. Taliai rightly defined the term *Fakaongo* as a *bingoa pauú* (nickname), in the context of division of people of Tonga between the “King’s new Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga” (*Siasi Uesihana Tauátaina ó Tonga*), and the Tonga District (verbally known as Kau Fakaongo) who remained as loyalists of Moulton and under the administration of British Methodist Conference. This thesis adopts Taliai’s analysis of the *Kau Fakaongo* as “confessional history” where the testimonies and confessions of those involved in the situation are narrated to speak for themselves and the situation. Further, Taliai took the extreme sense of the term that it was a derogatory term for ‘those who chose to be slaves to Foreigners and not the King’.\(^{352}\) While Taliai’s work emphasized the loyalties of the Kau Fakaongo to Moulton; Gareth Grainger in his *The Fakaongo Exiles from Tonga to Fiji 1887-90*, presented his view of them as Moulton loyalists, and also labelled them as “exiles”. Grainger’s labelling of the Kau *Fakaongo* voluntary journey to Fiji as exile may be justified in the sense of the term. Truly, the situation in Tonga was stressful and abusive circumstances restricted their rights to exercise their religion. However, there are evidences that the *Kau Fakaongo* departure to Fiji was a peaceful negotiation where they voluntarily decided to flee to the uninhabited island of Ata, for the sake of their religion. In response, King Tupou 1 ordered the captain of the vessels to sail directly to Suva, Fiji.

A letter by Leefe revealed a request by Moulton for him “to get a permission of the Tongan Government for the remnant of [Moulton’s] adherents, some twenty-five in number to immigrate to Fiji.”\(^{353}\) No doubt at this stage, Moulton sympathized with the loyalists and had already thought of sending them to Fiji. However,

---

2) to join the *Tau’ataina*-Tupou I church, while he himself continued as a *Fakaongo*. There are many, many more.... I beg that I may be allowed to open up these unspeakable pages of the history of our forefathers and draw some issues for our *Talanoa* today.


\(^{353}\) Letter of the British Consul to Tonga, Leefe to Moulton, dated British Consulate, Tonga, 17 January, 1887., Correspondences inwards from British Consul. Mss 201. VII.
another letter of W. Gile to Moulton contained this statement, “Jonny Mann’s wife...expressed her fears that either she or her daughters were to be deported to ‘Ata with the other Wesleyans…”354 This British subject also understood the plan by the Wesleyan to free themselves to Ata island.

Some of those who chose to escape Tonga included ministers and workers of Tupou College who were sentenced for imprisonment. The Rev. Tevita Finau for example was sentenced for 22 years in the end of January trial. His Majesty knew full well that they were sentenced by law for misconduct, but it was agreed that they might go to another island of their own choice. Hence, labelling the journey of the Kau Fakaongo as “exile” should be reconsidered. Grainger’s statement implied “that they went as exiles in Fiji,”355 which may be justified in the sense of the term and the way Baker regime forced them to turn to the Free Church. Since, their escape from Tonga was voluntary, the old Tongan policy of allowing anyone to leave the land in their own choice is apparent. However, from King Tupou 1’s view point of the situation, “It was the same religion, with the same forms as before….But there was no new religion, and the doctrines were the same in the new Church as in the old.”356

Hence, if the church of the Kau Fakaongo and Siasi Tauátaina church were the same, then the driven force for the Kau Fakaongo to escape Tonga to another place was based on different motives; political, cultural, spiritual, or otherwise. For political reasons, Moulton stayed on in Tonga, yet they persisted in leaving, so it was not political. For cultural reasons, the innate sense of the Tongan cardinal

virtue of taefieauna [unwilling to be defeated or vanquished],\(^{357}\) is seen here as one of the dominant factors. The interplay of these Tongan cardinal virtues in the actions and attitudes of the Tongan Wesleyans in the history of Tonga as religious idealism in the context of political turmoil is evident. For spiritual motives, Taliai and Granger’s works show the testimonies of the Kau Fakaongo which give accounts of their spiritual dedication. The two main motives were cultural taefieauna [unwilling to be defeated or vanquished] and their spiritual faith and dedication to the object of their beliefs. Thus, the imperatives that had driven the Kau Fakaongo to leave Tonga were culturally and spiritually based. The same stimuli drove the Kau Tanataina to continue their loyalties to Tu'i and his Free Church policy together with political motivation; in the sense of keeping the Tongan Wesleyan Church managed by Tongans only.

The Kau Fakaongo Journey to Ata Island:

The minority group of Tongan Wesleyans finally identified themselves as the Kau Fakaongo [loyalists of Methodist and Moulton fundamentalism] in 1887. Gareth Grainger in his article The Fakaongo Exiles from Tonga to Fiji, 1887-90, presented the list of those who went as “exiles” to Fiji and lived at the island of Koro for three years, 1887-1890. Grainger’s approach is genealogical and together with Siupeli Taliai’s Ko e Kau Fakaongo provide background of the Kau Fakaongo devotion to their faith. They were determined to leave their homeland and practiced their faith on another land.

\(^{357}\) Ko e Ngaahi tefito’i anga faka’ei’eiki mo fakamatapule ‘o e Tonga, [The four cardinal chiefly and gentle virtues of a Tongan person]; Ko e Faka’apa’apa-[respect and observed Tapu relationships]. Faka’aki’akimui-[lowly and humble; humility with unassuming nature] Ta’efieauna-[unwilling to be defeated or vanquished]. Ofaaongofiua-[generously hospitable]. See Queen Salote Ko e Ngaahi Tohi ‘a ‘ene ‘Afio, 1958-1959: Ngaahi Tefito’i Anga Faka’ei’eiki mo FakaMatapule (The Writings of Queen Salote), T.S.copies some with translations) in Palace Office Papers (POP); also in Bott Spillius papers (box 11, folder 2), n.d.
This thesis is indebted to Gareth Grainger who has provided a list of the 31 families, 90 individuals in all, who, as according to Hanslip, were originally destined to the uninhabited Ata island, but were redirected to Fiji.\textsuperscript{358} Moulton in his letter to the Consul stated, “His Majesty has determined to remove for the present those who are today still adherents of Mr. Moulton…to the island of Ata.”\textsuperscript{359} This news came and Moulton admittedly “smiled at” it. Hence before the \textit{Kau Fakaongo} departed for a new land, their leaving Toga had already been discussed by Moulton and the Consul. In another letter dated 23 February 1887, Moulton noted to the Consul, “The names of the native ministers to have left on the \textit{Malokula} are Andrew Funaki, Caleb ‘Otouhoma, Watson Tatafu.”\textsuperscript{360} If Moulton’s record above is correct, then the other ministers Tevita Tonga Mohenoa, David Finau, Kolo Mako, Samisoni Mahe, Siosiua Lolohea, Sione Hafoka, Sione Fekau, Filimone Tuitupou, Sefito Moala, and Taniela Kaufusi must have boarded the second vessel which was the \textit{Falaogoogo}. The tradition (reflected in the hymns of exiles used in the church),\textsuperscript{361} told that on this day of the departure of the \textit{Malokula} from \textit{Vuna} wharf, Nukuálofa, Moulton stood on the wharf watching his loyalists boarding the vessel with courage and great determination and penned his experience. This Moulton composition is recorded in the Tongan Wesleyan hymnbook and it vividly narrated the situation of the day from Moulton’s perspective, stating.

1. ‘Oku fai fufunaki pe, á e pule á e Ótua;  
   Ko e fu’u misiteli ia, talu mei muá ‘i mu’a ‘  
   ‘Oku ne kofu ‘aki ia ha áo poúli fau;  
   Pea ne heka he afá mo hala he peau.

2. ‘Oku ne ‘ave ‘a e lelei ka e tuku pe ‘a e kovi;  
   Ko tonu ‘oku lusa pe, kaukaua pe á loi  
   Ko Taivasi ta’e lotu ee kai katoanga ia

\textsuperscript{358} I am indebted to Gareth Grainger for compiling the list that is quoted here word by word from his work presented in the THA conference in Melbourne July 2005.  
\textsuperscript{359} Letter of Moulton to the HMB Consul, dated Mission House, 17 February, 1887.  
\textsuperscript{360} Letter, Moulton to HMB Consul, dated 23 Feb., 1887.  
\textsuperscript{361} The known Hymns composed by Moulton during the period of persecution of the Wesleyans Kau Fakaongo included 400, 403, 482, 523, 529, 545, 558, 620, 663,…of the \textit{Ko e Tohi Himi Siasi Uesiliana Tauátaina ó Tonga.} 2006.
Papala fu’u á Lasalosi mo nofo fiekaia

3. Vakai he ngahai laumalie ‘o e kau ma’ata
Ko futu énau tangi ee í lalo ólita.
“‘Ei, é sauna nai áfe, á ho mau toto ni?”
Kae tuku pe ta’efakamaau ‘a honau fakapoongi.

4. ‘E ‘oua naá tau fakaanga á e ngaue á e ‘Otua
‘Oua ‘e fai mamata pe kae fakatui mu’a.
Ko e matamata houhou e ko ‘ene ‘ai pulonga;
Ka ‘oku malimali pe á si’ono fofonga.

5. Ka malu áki mai ha áo, óua é tu’atamaki;
Kuopau ke faifai pea to, ko e koto tapuaki
Ha kovi nai á e talamuka, mahi á e lau mo kona;
‘Óua ke fisi pe mo fua kae faka’ofo’ofa.

6. Ko e tufunga á e Ótua ko ho tau ngaohi éni.
‘Oku tuai ‘a e ngaue ia, ko e ái pe ke fu’u lelei
‘Óku ha fakakonga pe koe’uhi ke tau tui;
Ko hono ‘a’alonga pe ‘e ha kotoa ‘amui.362

Moulton enjoined in the above composition, words of encouragement for the Kau Fakaongo as they tearfully boarded the Malokula vessel and Falaogoogo and headed for the open sea. The first verse substantially contains words about God who rules in a mysterious way, and even at the worst days of our lives. For the scenario of the status quo in Tonga, Moulton drew the analogy of Divas and Lazarus from the Gospel. It could be inferred by interpretation that Baker as Divas, and his regime dined happily on their rich table without noticing the Kau Fakaongo, as the Lazarus of the day, sorely and tearfully living on crumbs falling from Baker’s table. The exiled and tortured Kau Fakaongo were brave martyrs whose bloods had been laid and crying on the altar; and yet they have not been judged. As such, Moulton warned that no one should criticize the works of God. The distress we encounter today ensures that we will receive rewards tomorrow in faith. For though we are

quivering on a rough sea, God’s smiling, loving and kind guidance will forever abide with us. Hence, let us not be panic because of this cloudy day, for soon befalls in our midst, divine delightful gifts [will fall; they will bring good divine beauties]. God is the architect of our lives, slowly but surely we know it in part, and in His own way and time, He will reveal the totality of this mystery.

The names are listed here in the order of Grainger’s arrangement. Further explanations about their status in society and relationships within the nofo á kainga are being added to the Grainger’s provided list from Official Genealogies stated as follows;

1. HRH Princess Salote Pilolevu, (1824-1891) was eldest daughter of King George Tupou I[d.1893], mothered by Finau Kaunanga, (the daughter of Alo and whose mother was Finau). Salote was half sister of the first Tongan Premier Tevita ‘Ungatangitau who died in Auckland, Nov. 1879 (whose mother was Kalolaine Fusimatalili, daughter of Naufahu, son of Finauhaákili); and half sister of Vugakoto (whose mother was Fusibogi, daughter of Falekaono); and half brother of ‘Isileli Tupou(whose mother was Basikole); and also half brothers of Vunatakakimalohi (1839-42), and Tu’uakita (1844-62), (their mother was Kuini Lupepau’u(d.1889 and was former wife of Tu’i Tonga Laufilitonga), daughter of Makamalohi, son of Halaevalumoheofo, daughter of Finau ‘Ulukalala). Princess Salote married Tu’ipelehake Filiaipulotu and their son was Tu’ipelehake Fatafehi who married Fusipala, (daughter of Tevita ‘Ungatangitau) and their son was Taufaáhau who was in turn became the second Tuí Kanokupolu in 1893

363. King Tupou I had six children of five different mothers(through Moheofo rites), whom were princesses of different chiefly lineages brought to cohabit with King Tupou 1, and Finau Kaunanga was the first of the Moheofo, to which princess Salote became the eldest daughter.

364. This Makamalohi is claimed by Elizabeth Wood-Ellem as the son of the Tuí Tonga Fefine Fatafehi ‘o Lapaha. See Figure 2.2 ‘Some of the Descendants of Tupou 1.’ in Queen Salote of Tonga: The Story of an Era 1900-1965, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1999).

after the death of King Tupou 1; and the father of Queen Salote Tupou III. Thus, in actual Tongan cultural terms, Queen Salote was *bakoí Fakaongo* – the descendant of the loyalists of the *Kau Fakaongo* who voluntarily went as exile because of their religious faith. According to Gareth Grainger, when Princess Salote went on this trip to Fiji, she was then the wife of the noble of Kolovai, Siosaia Tautalanoa Ata.366

2. Viliame Maealiuaki, eldest son of the King’s cousin and Tonga’s Treasurer, Sunia Mafile’o (son of Ulakai) of Kolomotu’a, and his mother was Losaline Mafikaunanga, (daughter of Maluótaufa, son of Malubo, of Úiha, and mother Feke.).367 Maealuaki was sometime Governor of Ha’apai, together with his wife Ma’ata Blake went on this trip to Fiji.

3. The Honourable Sosaia Tava Vaea, the former Noble of Houma who was (together with Valu of Útulau, Mohulamu of Fuuamotu, Áhio of Kolovai, Latukefu of Kolovai, Ngalungalu of Kanokupolu were) deposed of title for not turning to Free Church in February, 1885.368

4. The Reverend Tevita Tonga Mohenoa, son of Tevita Tu’ipulotu of Koulo, Ha’apai; and his wife Rachel [Lesieli].369 They had been serving for years in the church in Tonga. According to Sione ‘Amanaki Havea, Tongamohenoa was the most outstanding of the pioneer students who began the Moulton school in Nuku’alofa in February, 1866. In 1868 Tongamohenoa was dux of the school and was honoured with title *Maamaloa* [highly intellectual class],

---


and together with him in the same the class were ‘Atunaisa Taufa, Pauliasi Taumoepeau, Kepueli Faupula, and Sione Mataele. Tongamohenoa became the first head tutor of Moulton School when it was named as “Tupou College” in 1869. His brilliance in matters of education and compassion in matters of shepherding people of God, led him to be asked by King Tupou I, ‘E Tevita,..ko ‘oku kole ke mou omi ki hoku Siasi.” [Tevita, I beg you to come and join my church], and to His Majesty, Tongamohenoa humbly but honestly replied after a long pause, ‘E Tupou, tuku ke u nofo ‘i be siasi ‘oku maun ‘i ai, telia na’a man biki atu, pea mole ‘i ate kimautolu ‘a e ngaahi lelei, ‘oku ke boijna mai ai kiate kimautolu.” [Tupou, let me continue with the Wesleyan church, for I am afraid, if we all join you and your church and that human qualities that you admire from us will no longer exist.] His name is listed on the Minutes of the Australian Methodist Conference: Ministers Appointment, 1876, as Tevita Tonga, beside J.Egan Moulton of Tupou College. He served as minister in many parishes and as superintendent of the Ha’apai circuits in 1885-7 during the tumultuous years of persecutions of the Kau Fakaongo, up to the time of their departure to Koro in Fiji. While in Koro Island, Tevita and Lesieli were sent as deputations to Australia. There, they preached in various churches and the donations offered by the Wesleyans in Australia were given as their token of love to support the Tongan Wesleyans who were then, in Koro Island at the time. Lesieli was a great educator and mentor of the baby Princess Salote who was to be Queen Salote Tupou III in the early twentieth century.

5. Kelepi ‘Otuhouma Tau’atevalu of ‘Utulau, the former Magistrate of ‘Eua, and his wife Ema Fetu’u with their children, including Lu’isa Lakai who would grow up to be the mother of the late Reverend Dr. ‘Amanaki Havea.

6. Reverend Kolo Mako, faifekau of Nomuka island in Ha’apai.

7. Reverend Anitelu Funaki, faifekau of Fua’amotu and his wife Ana.

8. Reverend Samisoni Mahe faifekau of Vaotu’u and his three daughters. Mahe was the leading minister from Lofanga island in Ha’apai, who led the fifty (50) Wesleyans *kau Fakaongo* on their voluntary exile to free themselves into the island of Kao, Ha’apai..

9. Rev. Uatesoni Tatafu, faifekau of Niuafo’ou and his wife Asinate and son Ikani (Egan).


11. Suli Leao of Lofanga and his wife, Seni Lu’isa who would die in Fiji.


13. Pita Na’a’ifualu, a matapule from Bea with his son Sau.

14. Rev. Sione Fekau [Tafolo] of Neiafu, Vava’u who went to London with Mr. Moulton to work on the Tongan translation of the Bible, together with his wife Salote and his children. This is not the same person as the J. Fekau ‘Ofahemo’oni, the head student of Tupou College, who was sentenced to death for involvement in the assassination attempt of Baker and who was still languishing in his prison cell in Nuku’alofa. If this Rev. Fekau Tafolo is a descendent of Tafolo, then he was of the *Sina’e ‘eiki*.

15. Rev. Tevita Finau, faifekau of Nukunuku and his wife Mele Havea sister of the Rev. Sione Havea, (daughter and son of the Rev. Jotame Havea of ‘Utui Vava’u) together with their children including Mouliton Finau. His sentence of twenty two years imprisonment appears to have been commuted to banishment from Tonga.


18. Rev. Taniela Kaufusi, faifekau from Haveluloto and his wife Temaleti and four children.


20. Hingano Aleamotu’a, the seventy five year old daughter of the late King Siosaia Aleamotu’a Tupou by his wife Moeia, sister of renowned Setaleki Ve’ehala of the Ata family who had courageously championed the acceptance of Christianity in Hihifo in the time of the Rev. John Thomas. Hingano had been married in 1828 to Tupou Toutai, son of Tupouniua and Papa, a daughter of King Mumui and wife of two successive Atas, Fis’ihoi and Sefesi.

21. Paula Tu’itavake and Sione Lamipeti aged 14 and 19 respectively, the younger sons of Sunia Mafile’o ‘Akaveka of Kolomotu’a, a member of the King’s cabinet.

22. Samiuela Tuli’akiono of Kolomotu’a and his wife Nanisi together with their seven children, including Tevita Kavapalu. Their married daughter Susana Niupo’ou, was the wife of the Rev. Sione Hafoka whom I have described earlier. Accompanying Samiuela Tuli’akiono was Mele Fakaheke, the only child of his older twin brother Langi, who I believe was that Sekonaia Langi of Nukuleka/Nuku’alofa whose beating and subsequent conversion to the Free Church at the direct behest of the King I have described earlier. These men were the sons of Semisi Vaotea and were, I believe the brothers of the accused conspirator, ‘Eliesa Leka, matapule/chief of Nukuleka. Mele Fakaheke was treated by Tuliakiono as his oldest daughter. She took with her into exile her infant daughter, Ana Loloma, whom [Grainger] met when she was very old lady
in ‘Utulau, the wife of Siaosi Vakameilalo. Mele Fakaheke was expecting her second daughter who was born in Fiji and was named Moala Folau in commemoration of this voyage. Mele Folau would become [Grainger’s] wife grandmother. A son born after her return, Taniela Fuka, would become Town Officer of Kolomotu’a and a long served steward of Zion Church, Nuku’alofa. His grand daughter is a minister of the Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga namely Rev. Lineti Fuka Tu’itupou, now serving in United States of America.


24. Havea of Hofoa and his wife Losana, who were dependants of Viliame Maaliiuaki and his wife.

25. Keviki and his wife Lesieli, who were dependents of Princess Salote Pilolevu.

26. Semisi Ma’u of Tongaleleka, Ha’apai and his wife ‘Ahino and daughter.

27. Maile Fehoko of Kolomotu’a and his wife Mo’unga, daughter of Sione Fo’i’akau of Neiafu, and their son.

28. Lausi’i and ‘Ilaiu of Kolomotu’a, more young relatives of the King.

29. Palei of Kolomotu’a, mother of Alivaleti Havili.

30. Tevita Mafi of Haveluloto.

31. Tevita Tu’ipulotu of Koulo, Ha’apai, who may have been the father of the Rev. Tevita Tonga Mohenoa and of the Rev. Filimone Tu’ipulotu who are mentioned earlier in this list.

The Kau Fakaongo Wesleyan exiles left Tonga in tears, leaving behind their leader Moulton with some of their group either in prison or in outer islands,
and not able to come to Tongatapu in time for the departure of this journey. Mr. Robert Hanslip, testified in his own statement about this so-called exile of the *Kau Fakaongo* stated, “On the morning of the 19th February (Saturday) [1887], a policeman came to my part of the town and told the Wesleyans to get ready to be shipped to Ata (Pyllstaarts), I mean by this that they told those whose names were down on the list.” On a later date, Hanslip noted,

> On the 24th Feb. 1887 I witnessed the embarkation of a number of Wesleyans on board the schooner Malokula, and Falaogoogo. The scene was a most painful one and the distress of these left behind [was] very great….As soon as the Malokula sailed with apportion of the Wesleyans, it became known for the first time that Fiji was to be her destination.\(^{372}\)

The so called exiled *Kau Fakaongo* Wesleyans remained in Koro Island in Fiji from 1887 until 1890. On their return to Tonga, they proudly identified themselves as *kau Fakaongo*. Their descendants are known in Tongan as *hako’i Fakaongo*, and are associated with the name as faithful Methodists. They cherished the Methodist practices and values in their worship. Though the *Fakaongo* and *Tau’ataina* factions were later unified by Queen Salote in 1924, one can easily identify those members who were of the *Kau Fakaongo* and those of the Kau Tau’ataina within the unified church, in their attitudes, values and emphasis. The former would, for example, claim the use of Moulton’s hymn compositions, (361-663, THB) whereas the latter would prefer the hymns composed by earlier missionaries (1-360THB.) in their worship services.

After thorough investigations by British subjects between the years 1887-1890, The Western Pacific British High Commissioner (W.P.B.H.C.), His Excellency John Thurston issued the order for the deportation of Shirley Waldemar Baker from

---

\(^{371}\) Affidavit of Robert Hanslip sworn before Mr. Consul Leefe, dated 5th March, 1887, p.49.

\(^{372}\) Ibid.p.53-54.
Tonga in 4 July, 1890. The rationale of the deportation action is revealed in the correspondence between the High Commissioner and Baker in the preceding year, 1889. Sir John Thurston had interviews with chiefs and especially those opposed to Baker, five men, two nobles, and three chiefs, reported by Thurston that they swore on oath, that if Baker “remained in Tonga, there would be another attempt at assassination. Two of these chiefs, after the act of deportation signed on oath a statement that they had requested Mr. Baker to be removed.” Sir Thurston sent a letter to King Tupou 1 and on the afternoon had an interview with His Majesty, and there, “Sir John Thurston spoke of the laws, alleging they were inconsistent, that they were one thing one day and another thing another day and that there was a difference between the English and the Tongan versions.”

On Saturday July 5th, 1890, Baker received the letter of deportation handed him by the vice-consul and the High Commissioner Secretary Mr. Collet. Baker left Tonga but as the Tongan saying, *Kuo Hola e Fai ka e Tuku e Foto:* THE STINGRAY HAD GONE BUT THE TOXINS STAYED ON with the people of Tonga. Baker did not escape the situation through assassination as was planned but through deportation. The *Kau Fakaongo* and *Kau Tau'ataina* had final identities. Despite worshipping one God, same doctrine and worship service, religious fundamentalism had differentiated them. The Tongan worldview of *fie nofo langi* persisted. However, the spirit of sensing God through different leaders Moulton and Baker was still very strong. Even, more than that, their loyalty to God stood out, for some, even death, their loyalty persistently prevailed.

---

CONCLUSION:
This thesis has demonstrated how the Wesleyan missionaries used European Civilization and Methodist Teachings to transform the Tongan traditional religion. However, at the end, whether intentional or otherwise, it only ended up in a merging process whereby their intellectual, legalistic and Christian practices were accommodated only for the enhancement of the tenets of the traditional culture of Fakaongo loyalty and Tau'ataina independence. This merging process saw an ambivalent situation which also consolidated the hybridized religious fundamentalism of Moultonism and Bakerism known in 1880’s as Kau Fakaongo and Kau Tau'ataina groups. Essentially, the leaders (Moulton and Baker) of these two groups fought their way through to materialize their fundamental beliefs. (Moultonism versus Bakerism). However, their followers loyally waged all means, which included personal, cultural, political, administrative, and spiritual motivations towards the extreme for one (Fakaongo) to voluntarily exile to uninhabited islands and even death as the ultimate price of their intimate clinging to their fundamental beliefs.

The thesis also narrated the fact that the man who navigated the rough seas of this tiny island nation towards independent state and church was His Majesty King Tupou 1. It is obvious from his perspective, that Tau'ataina was his main motivation in merging the European Civilization and strategies with Tongan custom and culture, evident in Tongan 1875 Constitution. This move was backed up by the sovereign state inaugurated in 1875 and the Free Church institution in 1885. While Moulton and majority of the missionaries fought for Tonga District to remain loyal under the administration of the Australian Methodist Conference, King Tupou 1, with the help of Baker and Watkin, sought to create an independent state and church. This status gave Tonga unique status amidst the masses of colonized nations in the entirety of Oceania. It also indicated the quality of a leader who accounted for his people and fought for their independence.
The merging process not only encompassed good strategies but also foul devices which had negative consequences in the long run. Personal differences of missionaries, as well as internal conflicts among Tongan kingships of Kauhala’uta, which nestled eminently in Mu’a, (Mu’a Parliament) and the Kanokupolu, vaingloriously adamant in Hihifo, led by King Tupou 1, also succumbed. That ambivalent situation was aggravated in the merging processes by individual, personal differences and vices.

Essentially, the mechanism of Fakaongo in its attempt to achieve social freedom and independency where the *Kainga* motivation was very strong, resulted in divisions and consequently embodied the perpetual merging process to the present day, which is defined as the problem of “acculturation”.

Though Baker was in the end deported in 1890, followed by His Majesty King Tupou 1 death in 1893 and Moulton’s final exit in 1906, each departed as stingrays leaving behind carcasses and toxins of divisions and hatred to infuse and infect the blood of all Tongans (locals); and religious *kainganization* - divisive reformulated into the *kainga-lotu* perpetuated to this century. These episodes, thus coincide with A.H.Wood’s theory in part; Tonga divisions had merged into their life blood and the way they have divided among themselves also proved G.H. Cummins’ theory that the church divisions in Tonga had developed along the pattern of the traditional Kainga motivation. Hence, in all the European civilization, and Methodist teachings phenomenologically influence the formation of the Tongan Wesleyan religious identities of *Fakaongo* and *Tan’ataina*, which, from a theological perspective, they may represent Tongan ways of contextual theologizing of European Methodist Christian good news (Gospel).
APPENDIX 1.

Titles of the Ha’a Tu’i Tonga; Tu’i Tonga Fefine; Ma’itaki, and Moheofo by Talatukufakaholo:

KAUHALA’UTA:

Ha’a Tu’i Tonga

1. ‘Aho’eitu
2. Lolofakangalo
3. Fang’a’one’one
4. Liha
5. Kofatu
6. Kaloa
7. Ma’uhau
8. ‘Apumea
9. ‘Afuhlanga
10. Momo
11. Tu’itatui
12. Talatama
13. Tu’itonganiokoetamato
14. Talaiha’apepe
15. Talakahaiaki
16. Talafapite
17. Tu’itoga Ma’akatoe
18. Tu’itoga Pniipni

MUIFONUA: Ha’a Tu’i Kanukupolu.

1. Ngata
2. Atamat’a’ila
3. Mataeletu’apiko
4. Vina
5. Mataeleha’amea
6. Ma’afu’otu’itonga
7. Tupoulabi
8. Ma’aliniaki
9. Tu’ibalafatai
10. Tupounahisi’i
11. Mulikiba’amea
12. Tupoumobeofo
13. Mumit
14. Tu’kua’bo
15. Ma’afu’olimuluoa
16. Tupou Malobi
17. Tupouto’a
18. Tupou Faletui’ipapai
19. George Taufa’ahau Tupou I
20. George Taufa’ahau Tupou II
21. Queen Salote Mafile’o Pilolevu Tupou III

19. Hare I
20. Tafu’i’eikimeimu’a
21. Lom’aetupn’a
22. Hare II
23. Takalaua
24. Ka’u’ulufonafekai
25. Vaka’subu
26. Pnupi’satu
27. Ka’u’ulufonu I
28. Tapu’osi I
29. Ulhakimata I Tele’a
30. Fataféhi
31. Tapu’osi II
32. Ulhakimata II
33. Tu’ipulotu’ilagitu’ofe’fa
34. Fatana’ana’a
35. Tu’ipulotu’ilagitu’otua
36. Paulaho
37. Ma’ula’pekotofa
38. Fataféhi Fuanunuava
39. Lafiilitonga

KAUHALALALALO:

Ha’a Tu’i Takalaua

1. Mo’ungamotu’a
2. Tanekingsotonga
3. Vaeamatoka
4. Siulagapo
5. Vakalabimobe’uli
6. Mo’ungatonga
7. Fotofiti
8. Vaea
9. Morakiola
10. Tafu’i
11. Kafoa
12. Tu’ionukulava
13. Silivakaijangah
14. Fratakijolaha
15. Ma’eleinaki
16. Mulikiba’amea
17. Tupouto’a
18. Tupou Faletui’ipapai
19. George Taufa’ahau Tupou I
20. George Taufa’ahau Tupou II
21. Queen Salote Mafile’o Pilolevu Tupou III
22. Taufa‘ahau Tupou 23. George Tupou V.

IV.

MAA’ITAKI OF THE TU’I TONGA: (principal wife of Tu’i Tonga).

1. Momo Nua
2. Takalaua Va’elaveamata
3. Kau’ulufonuafekai Tanfa’aitoa
4. Kau’ulufonua II Vainu’ulasi
5. Tapu’osi I Va’enopo
6. ‘Uluakimata I Tele’a Mata’ukipa
7. Fatafebi Kaloaftotonga
8. Kau’ulufonua III Takala
9. ‘Uluakimata II Toa
10. Tu’ipulotu’ilagitu’ofesafia Halaevalu

MOHEOFO OF THE TU’I TONGA: (wife from Ha’a Tu’i Kanokupolu).

1. Fakana’an’a’a Tongotea
2. Tu’ipulotu’ilagitu’oteau Lanmanukilupe
3. Paulabi Tpoumobeofo
4. Fatafebifuanununiava Tpou Veiongo

TU’I TONGA  TU’I TONGA FEFINE: (Tu’i Tonga’s sister and his fahu).

TAMAHA

1. Tu’itatui Latutama -
2. Talatama Fatafebi -
3. Fatafebi Siaitakala’ilagileka Fonokimoana
4. Kau’ulufonua III ‘Ekntongapiipiki Tu’imala
5. Tu’ipulotu’ilagitu’ofesafia Sinaitakala II Simuoko
6. Tu’ipulotu’ilagitu’oteau Sinaitakala III Mo’ugaolakepa
7. Paulabi Sinumafua’uta Latufuipeka
8. Ma’ulupekotofa Nanasipau’u ‘Amelia Fakahikuo’uiha
9. Fatafehi Fuanunuiava  Siaitakala IV (known as Fatafehi Ha’apai) -
Appendix 2.

Glossary of Tongan Terms:

‘Ahovaleamoemapa – the moment of joy when a princess is chosen to be the ma’itaki (principal wife) of the Tu’i Tonga.

‘eiki – chief or chiefly quality of a person ie. blood related to the chiefly lineage.

Fabu – the sister’s children’s cultural right over the brother’s children life and properties.

Faka’apa’apa – attitude of respect, where an individual humbles oneself against the presiding chief and others as superior than oneself.

Fakatapu – an honourary preface to show respect in a speech.

Fanau – the parents’ biological children.

Fatonga – obligation and duties to be fulfilled by lower class to the Tu’i Tonga.

Fie’eiki – to mimic chiefly attributes or to be snobbish.

Fihu – fine soft white-mat.

Fonua – the land and people, When Taufa’ahau dedicated Tonga to the God of heaven in Vava’u, in 1839, the event was symbolized by the minister John Thomas raising a handful of fonua to the sky which means land and people.

Ha’a – tribe, clan or lineage.

Ha’ele – regal term for walk used only for the Tu’i.

Hala – road or pathway used for the presentation of fatonga-gifts at a funeral or wedding, and death of the Tu’i.

Han – term used in reference for or of the highest political ruler of the nation.

Heilala – Garinia sessilis sp. Identified by their flowers; Male plants are fisi’iniu and female plants are pulu.

Heliaki – metaphors or metaphoric usage of Tongan language in poetry. e.g.

Heilala is a heliaki for the person of the Tu’i Tonga.

Hiapo – Broussonetta papyrifera sp. the paper mulberry plants; its bark is bounded with a ike to make tapa clothes.

Hulufe – Nephrolepis hirsutula sp. fern.

Kainga – the confederations of ha’a or tribes.

Kainanga e fonua – symbolical of the commoner class who exerted a servitude way of life.

Kape – Alocasia macrorrhizsa sp. Giant taro. The only edible plant which Fevanga and Fefafa planted on the beach of ‘Eueiki, and while Lo’au landed there, he enjoyed the shadow of its
leaves, hence forced the couple to slaughter their daughter Kava as sacrifice to him (Lo’au) for there was nothing else to offer in honour of his visit?

Kauala – catafalque used to carry a dead corpse at funeral.
Kauhala’uta – the chiefly title holders of Ha’a Tu’i Tonga of Mu’a.
Kauhalalalo – the chiefly title holders of Ha’a Takalaua of Mu’a.
Kava – *Piper methysticum* sp. the fibrous plants that is pounded green or dried and mixed with water ready for ritual drinking in cultural ceremonies.
Koka – *Bischofia javanica* sp. Plant located at Bangai Lahi, Hihifo, where the installation of Tu’i Kanokupolu was held.
Koli – *Syzygium neurocalyx* sp. Plants with fragrant fruits are worn pendant-like on a string around the neck for their pleasing aroma. The juice from its bark is used as medicine for constipation.
Lotu – worship or religion, i.e. *Laulau* – chanting a prayer.
Maile – *Alyxia stellata* sp. The scan-dent shrub used for making *lei* garland.
Ma’itaki – principal wife of the Tu’i Tonga.
Moheofo – the way of ensnaring the *toto’i eiki* by offering a princess of one lineage to cohabit with the Tu’i Tonga for an off spring.
Niu – *Cocos nucifera* sp. A coconut plant.
Nonu – *Morinda citrifolia* sp. A medicinal plant.
‘Olive – *Murraya paniculata* sp. A herbal shrub with scented flowers used as fragrance of a home.
Olotaha – a woman whose first-born baby is with the Tu’i Tonga.
Olona – a woman who has given birth to her second baby with the Tu’i Tonga.
Orava – *Ficus prolixa* sp. A banyan tree.
Pako – *Cyperus Stoloniferus* sp. Sedge plants; its fragrant tubers are mixed with and fragrance coconut oil.
Paongo – *Pandanus whitmeeanus* sp. A pandanus plant; its leaves are used for weaving mats.
Pua – *Allamanda cathartica* sp. A shrub; flowers are used for making *lei* garland.
Si – *Cordyline fruticosa* sp. The ornamental plants whose; leaves are used for making sisi and the roots, when baked for hours, its sap produces an extremely sugary flavour. This plant was used for food of the *Kau Fakaongo* who voluntary exiled themselves from Lofanga to the uninhabited volcanic island of Kao in Ha’apai island in 1887.
Talatukufakaholo – oral traditional narratives and Tongan historiography.
Talo – *Colocasia esculenta* sp. A starchy corm and tubers; common Tongan staple family food.
Toa – *Casuarina equisetifolia* sp. The ironwood plant.

Toi – *Alphitonia zizyphoides* sp. Large forest tree. The stems are best for making *tutua*.
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