

## The People Versus the Commission: Resistance to Land Registration in Fiji's Early Colonial History<sup>i</sup>

By Robert Nicole, University of the South Pacific

Since 2007 and 2008 and the world financial, food and fuel crises, countries in the Global South have progressively become caught up in a global transnational push for land reforms. One of the aims of these reforms is to transform customary land into “productive” land owned through individual title. This process has acquired notoriety as “land-grabbing” and many scholars and advocacy groups have likened it to a new form of colonialism.<sup>ii</sup> The likeness to the colonial experience can be instructive when it is set against the idiosyncrasies of each colony. This paper traces the effects of fifty years of daily petty acts of resistance against attempts by the British colonial administration to register indigenous Fijian lands.

Edward Said (1978) has shown that colonialism was a formidable writing machine with extraordinary power to extend itself discursively over its subjects. Yet, even as its machinery set out to “know” and thus control its subjects, colonialism paradoxically wrote into its own archive a multitude of fragments and signposts of protest. These included numerous characters and stories that have often been confined to the margins of history. When these discounted excerpts are patched and sown together, they form a “bricolage” that draws marginalised protagonists away from the periphery and reconfigures them at the centre of history. This quilted history reveals a long record of ordinary men and women interfering with and undermining colonial attempts at control and ordering. Although they might be “minor histories”<sup>iii</sup> they become rich in significance and consequence when considered in their collective effect.

Unlike colonies in parts of the Pacific (New Caledonia, New Zealand and Australia, especially) and other continents (Africa especially), Fiji's experience of colonialism did not lead to wholesale land alienation. Much has been written about the role that Fiji's first governor, Sir Arthur Gordon, played in ensuring the inalienability of indigenous Fijian lands.<sup>iv</sup> Indeed he is often hailed in popular culture as a heroic figure who saved indigenous Fijians from certain doom. Less known are the numerous efforts by which ordinary people continuously guarded their precious resource, and obstinately resisted various attempts by vested interests to wrest control of their lands from them.

When he arrived in the colony in 1875, Arthur Gordon set out among other things to define and register all native lands so that a clear system might be established to delineate properties that could be bought and sold, and those that could be leased. In keeping with his view of traditional land tenure, he argued that all existing lands in native ownership should be inalienable. After much debate with the Colonial Office and local European settlers, his view was formalised and enacted through the Native Lands Ordinance of 1882. In 1880, he instituted the Native Lands Commission (NLC) whose function it was to register all Taukei (indigenous Fijian) lands. Commissions, as Kaplan (1995) has pointed out, were a ritual-political means by which the British tried to establish authority and order in colonial Fiji. They set terms and relations of authority among all participants and routinized colonial power “in ways well beyond what any

use of force might have accomplished”.<sup>v</sup> However, their actual effect in establishing colonial hegemony is debatable. As we shall see, a long history of subversion suggests the commissions were actively undermined.

The first sitting of the NLC was a monumental failure. Villagers simply failed to respond and no submissions were received.<sup>vi</sup> This negative response had its origins in the experience of many villagers in an earlier commission which Gordon had set up in 1875 to resolve all pre-Cession disputes – the Lands Claims Commission (LCC).<sup>vii</sup> Many villagers felt cheated out of substantial portions of their land by the LCC process and they feared that the NLC would do more of the same.<sup>viii</sup> In addition, settlers and their lawyers had a quasi monopoly over the interpretation of the law. Consequently, Taukei of all classes were apprehensive and resentful about the advantage that settlers had in shaping the outcome of legal disputes.<sup>ix</sup>

In some of the most fertile districts of the country (especially in Sigatoka) it was feared that the LCC adjudications would expel Taukei occupants and transfer lands into European ownership.<sup>x</sup> The LCC had also failed to compensate Taukei for the guns which they were now instructed to surrender to the state. As one aggrieved chief argued, these guns had been traded in return for large tracts of land: “If the guns are now taken away, the land should also be returned”.<sup>xi</sup> Hence, neither the LCC’s adjudications nor its response to Taukei compensation claims, inspired much confidence in the NLC process. In fact, in the early 1880s, one of the LCC commissioners and long-time resident and administrator in Fiji, Walter Carew, observed that Taukei were clearly “determined that nothing shall be final as far as land boundaries are concerned”.<sup>xii</sup> By the end of the decade, the incidence of people who harassed government surveyors, or altered land boundaries, or simply pulled survey pegs, became so frequent that Regulation 1 of 1889 was enacted to make such sabotage unlawful.<sup>xiii</sup>

The failure of the first commission led to the convening of a second commission in 1892 with instructions to turn over “any land not utilised by chiefs or tribes to the state”.<sup>xiv</sup> Despite their greater powers, the commissioners managed only marginal progress. The slow progress forced J.B. Thurston (Gordon’s successor) to plead with the chiefs at the 1894 *Bose vakaturaga* (Council of Chiefs) to have their people register their lands.<sup>xv</sup> A few months earlier, he had been obliged to enact another ordinance to stop the ongoing obstruction of surveyors. Those who tampered with or removed surveying equipment would thereafter be liable to six months imprisonment with hard labour.<sup>xvi</sup> But barely three years later, further amendments were needed as villagers continued to show their contempt towards the commission. In the Nakelo district (Rewa Delta) the activities of surveyors employed by the all-powerful Colonial Sugar Refinery (CSR) Company brought matters to boiling point. The lead commissioner, David Wilkinson, wrote in his report that had it not been for the intervention of a local missionary, the leading surveyor “with his paraphernalia would without doubt have been thrown into the river”.<sup>xvii</sup>

Surveyors and the instruments by which they named, marked out and mapped the land, were regular targets of retribution. They represented the means by which colonisation advanced physically on the ground. As Giselle Byrnes has argued, surveyors were “charged with extending the boundaries of empire” and “operated literally at the cutting edge of colonisation”, turning space into place.<sup>xviii</sup> In Fiji however, British ‘space’ was already ‘place’ to indigenous Fijians. Williamson, the chair of the LCC, had observed in the 1870s that “every inch of Fiji has an

owner. Every parcel or tract of land has a name and the boundaries are defined and well known.”<sup>xxix</sup> Hence, when they obstructed surveyors, ordinary people struck at the physical instruments by which their conceptual sense of ‘place’ was being attacked. These were mostly non-violent and anonymous tactics but they were very costly and disruptive to the colonial administration, the CSR company and their attempts to impose their own matrix of land ownership in Fiji.

The file containing records of the Nakelo agitation reveals the convergence of other sources of discontent. Villagers complained that “scheming” and “nefarious” chiefs from the powerful island of Bau were “browbeating them into acquiescence with the scheme of despoiling them of their lands”. People also had complaints against their own chiefs, whom they accused of being always on the lookout for plunder. “Our chiefs,” they said, “in olden times oppressed us, oppressed us sore, But they always conserved our land right, but to day our chiefs join with Govt. officials to dispoil us of those rights”.<sup>xx</sup> The role of chiefs in freeing up land for lease to the CSR Company and other planters is complex. Some chiefs could expect to earn up to 10% of the value of leases and were thus greatly encouraged to use their power to pressure landowners into leasing land. Yet, as the first decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century would prove, when chiefs acted as a unified body, they represented a very powerful defence of Taukei land.

The question of land became much more contentious following the appointment of Everard im Thurn as the new governor of the colony in 1904. A few months after his arrival, im Thurn announced his decision to overturn Gordon’s land policies and allow native land to be sold. He did so by re-interpreting the fourth clause of the Deed of Cession (1874) that the sole proprietorship of all lands not shown to be then alienated, or not then in the actual use or occupation of some chief or tribe, or not actually required for the future support and maintenance of some chief or tribe should vest in Her Majesty, her heirs and successors.<sup>xxi</sup> He took this to mean that the state had every right to (i) allow the sale of native land provided it was done through the governor in council; and (ii) acquire native land (even without compensation) for public purposes. “Public purpose” was redefined much more broadly to include any undertaking that would advance the interests of the colony. Finally, im Thurn thought that Taukei as individuals – rather than as members of an extended family or mataqali – ought to obtain the right to own and sell land. Ordinances to reflect these views were duly legislated.<sup>xxii</sup>

im Thurn was responding partly to the persistent clamour of local white planters to free up more land for development and partly to his own view that the development of the colony would be best ensured by “the actual release, by every available means, of as much native land as possible for development by European settlers”.<sup>xxiii</sup> In early 1905, he informed the chiefs of his decision and justified it by claiming that Taukei owned “a great deal more land” than they could use, and that under the new laws, Fijians could use the money from the lease and sale of their lands to develop their own individual enterprise and thus save their race from impending doom.<sup>xxiv</sup>

The Lands Department was duly created to oversee the individualization of native titles. This tactic had been effective in securing a rapid transfer of native land to European settlers in other colonies.<sup>xxv</sup> However, replacing communal with individual ownership did not automatically translate into actual transactions or land acquisition. Whether land was surplus or legitimately owned was yet to be determined. Because of the boycott through the 1880s and 1890s, most land

had not yet been surveyed or registered, nor had the claims of would-be owners been certified. This evoked the notoriously slow NLC and the negligible progress it had made in twenty five years of trying. Hence, when im Thurn changed the laws, the pool of legally defined lands and owners was still small. Had people collaborated more readily with the NLC in the previous two decades, the pool of registered land available on the market in 1905 might have been sufficient to render the process of individualising and selling all native land irreversible.

Nevertheless, the impact of im Thurn's new laws was quite dramatic. Within two years, 104,142 acres of Fiji's best agricultural land were sold. Some transactions were hotly disputed and continue to be resented in the present day. Among them was one very large transaction by which the Thomas brothers bought almost eight thousand acres of disputed land in Yaqara in Ra for the modest sum of £900.<sup>xxvi</sup> This site is currently used by a pastoral company and the American-owned "Fiji Water" company to extract its multi-million dollar commodity. In 1906, discontent was also expressed in the Rewa Delta where the CSR Company was desirous of acquiring land for a 99 year lease over a vast area of this heavily populated region of Fiji. The company drew the ire of villagers because it was only willing to pay "exceedingly low rent" and did not care to consult with the inhabitants or proprietors of the lands. Speaking on this matter in the House of Lords, Arthur Gordon (now Lord Stanmore) spoke of the almost unanimous opposition of villagers to the scheme. He added that villagers had been "exposed to a great deal of pressure and temptation in the way of bribes" and had "stoutly refused" to be swayed by the money. He surmised that "the belief among the natives that they are likely to be deprived of their land is creating a great deal of feeling of a serious character, which may, if something is not done to reassure them, lead to very serious consequences."<sup>xxvii</sup>

Other criticisms were published in *Na Mata*, the Taukei language newspaper, in which a contributor condemned the law outright saying that the chiefs were taking all the money from the sale of lands, spending it, getting drunk, with the result that both the land and the money were lost.<sup>xxviii</sup> Eventually, im Thurn was instructed by the Home Government to seek the views of Taukei in the matter of his land policies.<sup>xxix</sup> He was suddenly faced with the prospect of consulting the *Bose Vakaturaga*, a body whose use he had discarded from the beginning of his tenure. Still smarting from their unceremonious exclusion, the chiefs demanded the laws repealed and with Gordon's active lobbying in the House of Lords, the controversial ordinances were annulled.<sup>xxx</sup> However, while the chiefs and Gordon's actions finally stopped the sales, the alienation of native land would have been much greater had it not been for the steady boycott of the earlier land commissions by thousands of ordinary Taukei villagers.

Aside from land sales, as the Rewa Delta example suggests, land leases were also contentious. In this respect, the prominent Bauan chiefs Ratu Joni Madraiwiwi and Ratu Penaia Kadavulevu played significant roles. The first used his office as Roko Tui Bua in 1905 to identify and help release sixty-nine thousand acres of Bua lands for 99 year leases. Landowners were compensated with the trifling sum of ten shillings per thousand acres.<sup>xxxi</sup> Ratu Kadavulevu, on the other hand, was active in his province of Tailevu where he pressured villagers into giving up large tracts of land for lease to European planters.

In his sights, as well as those of the native commissioner W.A. Scott, and several interested planters, were the fertile flats of Waidalice in the district of Sawakasa (Tailevu North). In 1909, a

series of meetings took place between officials and villagers of Sawakasa during which the former tried to persuade the latter that they were “poor and miserable”; that they were “too indolent to cultivate their lands”; that they were “dying off”; that their lands were “lying idle and unproductive” and that consequently they should hand over their lands to the government so that these “might be leased for their benefit”.<sup>xxxii</sup>

In response, villagers raised the collective concern of the Sawakasa district that the leasing of land had not yielded wealth. On the contrary, it had impoverished those whose lands had been leased. They pointed to their newly landless neighbours in Lodonu who were now frequent visitors to Sawakasa to beg for food and land to cultivate. They declined the offer but yielded following more government pressure, having obtained assurances they would be adequately compensated.

The government reneged on its promises and within days, the villagers were forbidden access to their land, including large quantities of the bananas that they had planted and that were ready for cutting and selling.<sup>xxxiii</sup> The villagers responded by pulling the new survey pegs, hiring a lawyer, procuring the support of Ratu Wainiu (prominent Bauan chief), and repeatedly petitioning their provincial office, the native commissioner, the acting governor and finally the new governor, Henry May. Frustrated by the lack of response from the authorities, one disillusioned villager exclaimed “one thing is clear to us, that these lands of ours have been simply stolen”.<sup>xxxiv</sup> For the next three years, they refused to accept any of the rent money, accusing Ratu Kadavulevu and the government of trickery.<sup>xxxv</sup>

Even if villagers had chosen to take the money, as some did in the district of Namalata, the potential for investment from this money was minimal. Once the chiefs, including Ratu Kadavulevu, had taken their share, very little was left for individuals other than to purchase a few goods at the local European stores. Within a few months, the villagers went from being self-sufficient banana farmers to being landless dependents, stripped of their main asset and their capability to determine their own economic development. In the words of Ratu Wainiu, it was as if their bread had been “snatched from their mouths”.<sup>xxxvi</sup>

Such experiences did nothing to enhance the government’s reputation among Taukei landowners and Governor May’s attempt at resurrecting the NLC in 1911 suffered the same fate as its predecessors. Villagers resumed their undeclared war on the commission and organized numerous covert activities. These were highly coordinated. Before the Commission arrived in the villages, local meetings were called to decide on the best strategies to circumvent the commission. G.V. Maxwell, the chairman of the NLC, was well aware of it. In 1914, he reported that Taukei resorted to “every possible means to conceal the truth” about their lands.<sup>xxxvii</sup> A year later he explained that he was witness to “an organised resistance to investigation by means of carefully prearranged suppression of inconvenient truths, accompanied in most cases by a somewhat grotesque fabrication of palpable untruths by which the parties hope to improve their position”.<sup>xxxviii</sup> Villagers purposely modified their oral accounts so that historical veracity could never be certified, forcing weeks of prior work to be disregarded and the process started over. Charges of perjury were difficult to lay given the oral nature of the testimony, and hence the presentation of divergent truths, or “fraud” as the commissioners described them, brought little ill consequence for the perpetrators.<sup>xxxix</sup>

Landowners also forced delays to proceedings by opting not to turn up. The government reacted with an ordinance which proclaimed that “any tribe refusing to make a submission [would] be deemed not to own any land”.<sup>xi</sup> It is unlikely that the law was enforced with any conviction. In his report for 1917, Maxwell explained with yet more despair and frustration that numerous petty acts of sabotage continued to impede the Commission’s work:

I regret to have to report that the progress has again been seriously retarded by the attitude of the native land owners, who for weeks together have refused to attend to point out tribal boundaries to the surveyors. No less than *one hundred and sixty – one* working days were lost in this manner and of course it has affected the cost of the work done.<sup>xli</sup>

As Newland has shown, the government also had to battle the various creative ways by which people used customs to avoid their lands from passing into the hands of the Crown. For instance, the customary practice of *veilakovi*<sup>xlii</sup> which was normally used to strengthen a mataqali when it ran out of male members and heirs, was now used to defeat the legal concept of *ultimus haeres* whereby the Crown inherited mataqali’s lands on the death of its last surviving male member. With hundreds of mataqali under threat of extinction, this cultural subversion protected thousands of acres of native land. And when mataqali did become extinct, other mataqali would carefully conceal this information so that they could continue to draw benefits from the extinct mataqali’s lands.<sup>xliii</sup>

One of the most important factors in bringing an end to the boycott of land registration was the end of indenture in 1920. By then, thousands of “free” Indo-Fijian labourers were flooding the agricultural lands market in search of land to farm. They offered lease rates to landowners that were much more attractive than those of the sugar companies. This development occasioned a shift in Taukei attitudes from a sense of suspicion to an appreciation of potential opportunities.

Perhaps even more important was the appointment of Ratu Josefa L.V. Sukuna to the NLC. The Bauan chief had returned to Fiji from London in 1921 with his law degree and within a year he was appointed to serve on the NLC. The effect was immediate. From reporting deliberate obstructions and “obstinate refusals” of certain landowners in his 1921 report<sup>xliiv</sup> C.A. Holmes, the Lands Commissioner, remarked in 1923 that there had been a “decrease in the vexations and time-consuming delays” that the commission had previously encountered.<sup>xlv</sup>

Ratu Sukuna adopted a deliberate vakaturaga method of enquiry which entailed a transformation of the face and voice of the Commission. In “browning” the commission, he enlisted Ratu Savenaca Komaisavai (Tailevu), Ratu Joni Mataitini (Rewa), Ratu Aseri Latianara (Serua), Ratu Penijimini Veli (Macuata), and Ratu Viliame Gucake (Lau) – all Taukei chiefs who commanded respect in their various provinces, spoke the language, and whose influence and sympathy could put people’s fears to rest. In addition, Ratu Sukuna ensured that the Lands Department employed Taukei draughtsmen and surveyors to work in the field.<sup>xlvi</sup> And while Robert Boyd was the nominal head of the NLC, Ratu Sukuna was its effective leader.

Over the next 15 years, the work brought him in contact with ordinary people from across the length and breadth of the colony. This exposure fashioned him into a recognizable “national”

figure whose power among Taukei was unmatched. He interpreted and mediated the process of land registration for the Taukei people and although some of his decisions were disputed (and continue to be disputed in the present), his work is generally regarded as a tribute to his fairness.<sup>xlvii</sup>

The outcome of Fiji's convoluted process of land registration, is a system of communal ownership that has stood the test of time. The establishment of the Native Lands Trust Board in 1940 cemented a partnership between the government and landowners in the use of native lands which lasted into the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. During this time, debates about security of tenancy and land productivity have arisen at regular intervals especially in relation to Indo-Fijian tenants. In 2010 however, a Land Use Decree came into force with a Land Bank as its centerpiece. The bank is intended to stimulate economic growth by transferring underused customary lands to more productive users (local and foreign). Customary landowners are now encouraged to entrust land to the bank for onward leasing to investors for periods of up to 99 years. This may seem justified as Fiji seeks to exploit the full potential of its land resources to boost its economic recovery after years of political upheavals.

However, in light of the economic liberalism that currently dominates global policy and the continued influence that financial institutions, land-hungry multinational corporations and free-trade agreements exercise on governments in the Global South, landowners may face pressures to free up land that are comparable if not greater than those of their ancestors at the turn of the last century. In this regard, the recent experience of their Papua New Guinean neighbours will also be instructive. The country has recently become the world's most targeted country in the global land rush (land acquisitions, leases and concessions concluded between January 2000 and January 2014) with close to four million hectares (or twice the total land area of Fiji) of customary land alienated within a decade.<sup>xlviii</sup>

Yet, as the end of indenture showed, changes also create opportunities. Resistance to land registration did not mean that village landowners were antagonistic to change *per se*. They were quite adept at seizing opportunities when they calculated these to be favourable. In addition, the boycott and the multitude of unspectacular daily acts of subversion, suggest that villagers rarely depended on the colonial administration's capacity or willingness to protect them. And while such statesmen as Gordon, im Thurn and Ratu Sukuna monopolise the headlines in our history books, ordinary villagers have shown that they know how to secure outcomes that are historically consequential and beneficial to them. Will present and future generations match the determination of their ancestors to protect and retain control over their capital and heritage? Will current and future governments retain sufficient policy space to help them preserve and develop this power? These are questions that are best left for future studies to answer.

---

<sup>i</sup> Some parts of this paper have been previously published in Robert Nicole, *Disturbing History: Resistance in Early Colonial History*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2011.

<sup>ii</sup> See Liz Alden Wily, "Looking back to see forward: the legal niceties of land theft in land rushes" in *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 39: 3-4, 2012; Andreas Neef "Law and Development Implications of Transnational Land Acquisitions: Introduction" in *The Law and Development Review* 7:2, 2014; Stefano Liberti, *Land Grabbing: Journeys in the New Colonialism*. London: Verso Books, 2014. Advocacy groups include Pacific Network on Globalization (PANG), Bismark Ramu Group (BRG), GRAIN, Via Campesina, and Global Witness.

---

iii See Sudesh Mishra, “Bending Closer to the Ground’: Girit as Minor History” in *Australian Humanities Review*, 52, 2012.

iv See Peter France, “The Founding of an Orthodoxy: Sir Arthur Gordon and the Doctrine of the Fijian Way of Life”, in *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*. 77: 1, March 1968. 6-32. And France, *The Charter of the Land: Custom and Colonization in Fiji*, Oxford: Oxford UP, 1969.

v Martha Kaplan, *Neither Cargo nor Cult: Ritual Politics and the Colonial Imagination in Fiji*. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1995. 144.

vi France, 1969: 131-2.

vii The LCC met for the first time on 10 December 1875 and completed its work at the end of 1881. During these six years, it held sittings in 27 different places around the colony and made 1327 reports.

viii See Letter to the Queen in “Proceedings of a Native Council,” 1876. 34.

ix “Proceedings of a Native Council,” 1878. 46. See also “Proceedings of a Native Council,” 1879. 3.

x Gordon to Carew, 22 March 1880. The Carew Papers. Hocken Library, Dunedin.

xi “Proceedings of a Native Council,” 1881. 20. National Archives of Fiji (NAF).

xii Minute by Carew to CS, 19 October 1889, CSO 89/2980. NAF.

xiii See Paper 15: “Regulations of the Native Regulation Board.” in *JFLC*, 1890. See also Ordinance XVII, 1876 in *Ordinances of the Colony of Fiji*. Suva: Government Printer, 1906. For individual cases of sabotage in the late 1870s, see CSO files 78/1061, 78/1621, and 78/1650. NAF.

xiv “Native Lands Ordinance, 1892.” in *Supplement to the Royal Gazette*. 2 December 1892. NAF.

xv See Thurston’s closing address in “Proceedings of Native Council,” 1894. NAF.

xvi “Amendment to the Native Lands Ordinance, 1892.” in *Supplement to the Royal Gazette*. 20 1893. NAF.

xvii Minute from Wilkinson to CS, 30 October 1897, CSO 97/4573. NAF.

xviii Giselle Byrnes, *Boundary Markers: Land Surveying and the Colonisation of New Zealand*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2001. 5.

xix See SS to im Thurn, 26 October 1907. MS 2/10/vi. im Thurn Papers. NAF. See also the “Report of Commodore Goodenough and Mr Consul Layard on the Offer of Cession of the Fiji Islands to the British Crown.” London, July 1874. 10. NAF.

xx Minute by David Wilkinson, 30 October 1897, CSO 97/4573. NAF.

xxi Deed of Cession. NAF.



- 
- <sup>xxii</sup> See Ordinances IV of 1905, V of 1905, XVI of 1906 and IX of 1907. *Fiji Royal Gazette*, 1905-1907. NAF.
- <sup>xxiii</sup> Paper 14: “Governor’s Address.” in *JFLC*, 1905. 4. NAF.
- <sup>xxiv</sup> Proceedings of a Native Council, Suva, 1905. 2, 5. NAF.
- <sup>xxv</sup> Timothy Macnaught, *The Fijian Colonial Experience*, Canberra: Australian National University, 1982. See also Alan Ward, *An Unsettled History: Treaty Claims in New Zealand Today*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 1999.
- <sup>xxvi</sup> *Fiji Royal Gazette*, 15 May 1908. NAF.
- <sup>xxvii</sup> House of Lords Hansard. Fiji: 16 July, 1907. 475, 483. <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/1907/jul/16/fiji>  
Last retrieved, Thursday 10 September 2015.
- <sup>xxviii</sup> Cited in France, 1969: 156.
- <sup>xxix</sup> Paper 25: “Governor’s Address.” in *JFLC*, 1908. NAF.
- <sup>xxx</sup> France, 1969: 161.
- <sup>xxxi</sup> im Thurn Papers (MS 2). im Thurn to Secretary of State for Colonies, 13 and 28 January 1907. NAF.
- <sup>xxxii</sup> CSO 11/4274. Scott minute of 29 May 1912. NAF.
- <sup>xxxiii</sup> CSO 12/3180. Ratu Wainiu to Governor, 18 April 1912. NAF.
- <sup>xxxiv</sup> CSO 11/4274, undated translation of unsigned “Paper B”. See also CSO 12/7297, Fitzgibbon to CS, 21 August 1910. NAF.
- <sup>xxxv</sup> CSO 11/4274. Statement of rentals. NAF.
- <sup>xxxvi</sup> CSO 12/3180. Ratu Wainiu to Governor, 18 April 1912. NAF.
- <sup>xxxvii</sup> See Paper 27: “Report of the Chairman of the Native Lands Commission.” in *JFLC*, 1914. 3-4. NAF.
- <sup>xxxviii</sup> Paper 61: “Report of the Chairman of the Native Lands Commission.” in *JFLC*, 1915. 4. NAF.
- <sup>xxxix</sup> Paper 61: *JFLC*, 1915. NAF.
- <sup>xl</sup> Address to the *Bose Vakaturaga* in “Proceedings of a Native Council,” Suva, 1914. 8. NAF.
- <sup>xli</sup> Paper 58: “Lands Department: Report by the Commissioner of Lands for 1917. in *JFLC*, 1918. 2. See also Paper 14: “Report of the Chairman of the Native Lands Commission.” in *JFLC*, 1917. NAF.
- <sup>xlii</sup> Linda Newland, “The Governing of Indigenous Systems of Land Tenure in Colonial Fiji.” Unpublished and undated paper, Suva: University of the South Pacific.
- <sup>xliii</sup> Paper 6: “Native Lands Commission”. *JFLC*, 1921. 1. NAF.
- <sup>xliv</sup> Paper 49: “Lands Department”. *JFLC*, 1921. 2. NAF.
- <sup>xlv</sup> Paper 61: “Report by the Lands Department”. *JFLC*, 1923. 2. NAF.

---

<sup>xlvi</sup> See various Lands Department reports from 1923 to 1933. NAF.

<sup>xlvii</sup> Ratu Joni Maraiwiwi, “Fossil or Savant: Ratu Sir Lala and Contemporary Fiji.” Public Lecture to Commemorate Fiji during World War I. Suva: University of the South Pacific, 25 March 2015.

<sup>xlviii</sup> Neef: 190.