

SOCIÉTÉ DE L'HISTOIRE DES COLONIES FRANÇAISES

GEORGE PRITCHARD

FRANCE'S ENEMY IN TAHITI
(1796-1883)

by

L. JORE
GOVERNOR OF NEW CALEDONIA

FOR MY WIFE

To whom I affectionately dedicate this work

L. J.

This piece is the third and final issue of REVUE DE L'HISTOIRE DES COLONIES of the year 1939. Due to circumstances, our publications are temporarily suspended.

FOREWORD

During the first third of the 19th century, British public opinion had begun to regard the prospect of territorial expansion overseas with hostility. Spread thin by incessant wars with neighboring France and alarmed by a flurry of social and political movements in the years of 1815-1820,¹ Britain found itself disillusioned with colonial endeavors, which yielded little return on their high costs. Additionally, the recent uprisings in the Spanish territories had painfully resembled the undoing of their American establishment, and had not Britain only recently found itself involved in yet another American war [the War of 1812-1814]?

Although the British Government did not hesitate to use the 1815 Vienna Treaty to enforce the continued colonization of most of the territories it had conquered over the past twenty years, Britain did not acquire—if we exclude the strategic occupation of Singapore in 1819—a single new colony during the reigns of George IV (1820-1830) and William IV (1830-1837). In the early years of Queen Victoria's reign, Britain was content to occupy only Hong-Kong in 1841, and would not have imposed its sovereignty on New Zealand were it not forced into doing so by the actions of John Gibbon Wakefield and his handful of adventurers.²

Meanwhile, on the other side of the channel, the same sentiments prevailed. Our countrymen [the French], bitterly disappointed by the May 30, 1814 treaty with the British (which cost us the remaining constituents of our colonial empire) had no desire to resume a process that had proven both fruitless and shameful. They were content merely to retake possession of the few colonies and investments that their all-too-recent adversaries were willing to leave them. Events such as the maritime “demonstrations” that took place during our Restoration in Madagascar (in 1818-1819 and in 1829) precipitated no ensuing action.

It was not until 1840 that the colonial spirit was revived in our government. In the interim, a 1830 intervention in North Africa had been less than enthusiastically received by the public, so that it could only be said that it was “the force of circumstances” that made us conquer Algeria.

It would have been logical, in this political climate, for both of our countries to pay no heed to one another's activities in the far reaches of the world. However, this was not the case; every time a situation arose on an exotic shore or far-away island that necessitated some demonstration of one country's power, the other could not help but become interested and alarmed.

With their interests thus attracted, both governments would—more or less—base their responses upon the opinions of their respective subjects, depending on their political tendencies and the territories concerned.

Thus Britain was extremely disconcerted by the French expedition into Algeria and the subsequent action taken against Morocco in 1844³ with the bombings of Tangiers and Mogador. And when “a gentleman associated with the French Government,” asked the British Foreign Minister, Lord John Russel, exactly how much of Australia England intended to keep, he was summarily answered with: “The whole!”

It is not surprising, therefore, that British public opinion was extremely affected by the measures taken by France in the Pacific in response to the expulsion, in December 1836 and January 1837, of some French Catholic missionaries who were attempting to establish themselves in Tahiti—especially when it was learned in September 1842 that the States of the Tahiti under Queen Pomaré had been made a protectorate of France.

The dismay and resentment that the Protestant establishment had felt in seeing French Catholic missions install themselves successively in the Sandwich [Hawaiian] Islands (1827), the Gambier Islands (1834), Wallis (1832), New Zealand (1836), and in the Marquesas Islands (1838-39), would have slowly faded if it had not been for an unexpected event that inflicted lasting damage to the British spirit; on March 4, 1844, George Pritchard, a British subject, was arrested in Tahiti on the orders of Lt. Commander D'Aubigny, acting commander of the island, and incarcerated in a Papeete bunker.

We know the name of this former British Consul because of the repercussions that the famous “affair” had on French domestic politics and because his arrest nearly caused another war between France and Britain. However, we are generally misinformed of the events that led to Pritchard’s arrest and are told almost nothing of the man himself.

Thus, it will be interesting to gather together the facts, which are too often reported inaccurately, and to retrace Pritchard’s steps; from his early life in England, to his time in the Society and Samoan Islands.

The events that concern Pritchard lie so far in the past that the impartiality of their examination can be assured. We were careful to study all incidents objectively and without passion, and will be satisfied if our work contributes to the correction of the erroneous facts that have caused, for a century now, common misconceptions of the circumstances surrounding our establishment in Tahiti, as well as of the man who proved such a stubborn and inflexible opponent of French expansion in the Austral-Pacific.

We did not deem it necessary, for the scope of this work, to examine in any depth the calumnies that certain organs of the French press attributed to the private life and morals of George Pritchard, since the inaccuracy of these accusations cannot be doubted.

The imaginations of our journalists were given free reign when it came to this fervent enemy of France. For example, in 1844, we could read in *Le Monde* the following information reported by one “Julien,” under the heading “Commentaries of a Sailor”: “...this man Pritchard, a few years later... saw his wife and children accepted into the Catholic faith and the eldest of his daughters become a Carmelite residing in a London convent!”

We wish to thank here all the people whose obliging assistance kindly facilitated our task, particularly M. Hubert Dussol, the French *Chargé d’Affaires* in Mexico; M. Langlais, the French Consular Agent in Birmingham; Her British Majesty’s Consul General in Mexico; M. Huart, Deputy of Western Samoa; Dr. Williams, British Consul to Tahiti; Mgr. Darnand, Apostolic Vicar of Samoa; R. P. Bellwald of the Society of Mary in Samoa; M. L. R. George, Conservator of the Hove Cemetery in Hove (Sussex); the Directors of the London Missionary Society in London; and lastly, Mrs. Darlston, daughter of Mr. John Randall and Elisabeth Charlotte Pritchard, who put her family papers at our disposal and

obligingly sent us the work written by her grandfather, *Queen Pomaré and Her Country*, as well as George Pritchard's unedited work, *The Aggressions of the French at Tahiti and Other Islands of the Pacific*.

CHAPTER ONE
 GEORGE PRITCHARD'S YOUTH (1796-1824)
 MISSIONARY YEARS (1824-1837)

Halfway through the eighteenth century, a religious “awakening” came to Britain and incited many pious members of the dissident Churches to take the spiritual education of the populace into their own hands.

It was mostly in the big cities and the surrounding areas that this education took place. Through evening meetings and Sunday schools, a diverse group of organizations attracted members of the population who were anxious to perfect and instruct themselves. Preachers operated in the country as well, but their influence in that environment was less conspicuous.

The oldest of the “non-conformist” sects, the Congregational Church,⁴ had founded in Birmingham—already a big industrialized city—a chapel on Karr’s Lane, which was frequented by the local factory workers.

Of this group, a young man named George Pritchard distinguished himself for his rigor and piety sometime around the year 1813. The Karr’s Lane pastor, John Angell James, immediately noted the strength of these qualities in Pritchard, and saw in them an opportunity for the boy’s benefit. The sharp intelligence, ardent nature and noble ambition demonstrated by Pritchard as a neophyte would soon bear him up to a rank higher than that to which he was born.

Born in Birmingham on August 1, 1796, George Pritchard was the fifth child and first son of a poor family. His father, a simple foundry worker, could not provide more than a rudimentary education for the boy and had him apprenticed at a very early age.

However, the boy’s master saw to his tutelage and, once his education had properly commenced, Pritchard progressed rapidly. Admitted in 1814 to the Association of the Congregational Church, he was soon authorized to preach in the suburbs and later, in the city itself. Already, Pritchard was forming a vocation for himself, and at Karr’s Lane chapel he confided his intention of becoming a missionary to Reverend James.

His youthful passions could not but be inflamed by the narratives of sufferings endured by the pastors and catechists who had gone (at the end of the eighteenth century) to Oceania and (at the beginning of the nineteenth century) to southern Asia and Africa in the service of Christ. Pritchard dreamed of sharing in these hardships and of providing salvation to the savage masses immersed in barbarism and paganism.

The Reverend Norman James (most likely the father of the Reverend John Angell James) consented to recommend him to the London Missionary Society, which, after Pritchard had passed their exam in August 1819, put him under the protection and guidance of Reverend Chalmers, of Stafford, with whom he stayed a whole year.

At the end of this period, Pritchard took a new exam, which required theses in two subjects: “The Qualities that a Missionary Must Possess,” and “The Doctrine of Justification.” Based on the

results, Pritchard was admitted to Gosport Seminary, directed by the Reverend D. Bogue, who specialized in the preparation of youths for foreign missions. On March 22, 1824, after four years of study, Pritchard was nominated by the Examination Committee of the London Missionary Society for a mission in the South Seas and was ordained on April 22, 1824 in his dear chapel at Karr's Lane. Three months later, he married a young woman three years his junior from Hampshire. Eliza Aillen (or Ayllen), as she was called, had most likely met Pritchard during his time at Gosport Seminary.⁵ On July 27th of the same year, the newlyweds set sail for the South Seas aboard the *Fox Hound*, under the command of one Captain Emmets. They arrived in Tahiti on December 14th.

The London Missionary Society,⁶ like many great religious and philanthropic organizations, was a product of the evangelical renaissance of Whitefield⁷ and the Wesley brothers.⁸ The Society was founded in 1795 to “disperse evangelism and its tenets in countries dominated by paganism or immersed in error.” It was during one of the Society's first general assemblies that the decision to send a mission to Tahiti and a few other islands in the South Seas was reached. It took a year to put together a team and prepare a fleet to transport them. On September 24, 1796, the missionary ship *Duff* set sail from Portsmouth. Due to bad weather, fleet commander Captain Wilson forsook a route through Cape Horn, choosing instead to sail through the Cape of Good Hope and proceed around the southern tip of Australia. On May 5, 1797, the *Duff* arrived in Tahiti's Matavai Bay.

The majority of the missionaries,⁹ eighteen men and four women, settled on Tahiti, the rest were taken by the *Duff* to the Marquesas and Tonga. Although the missionaries found themselves welcomed by the Tahitians, it did not take long to realize that their mission would not be easily accomplished. On August 13, 1797, Mr. Jefferson, secretary to the small community, wrote, “the more I see of the customs, the character and the conduct of these people, the more I am confirmed in the opinion—which I have had for some time—that our success will not be quickly achieved... the only activities to which the indigents give their constant and firm attention are the application to monstrous sin and the celebration of religious rites of a nature both horrible and bloody.” (Lovett, *The History of the London Missionary Society*, I vol., p. 147-148)

The missionaries' work was also made difficult by the presence on the island of European and American castaways and deserters, bad types who rallied the indigents against the new arrivals. These men, in their attempt to prevent the captain of a ship called the *Nautilus* from selling weapons and munitions to King Pomaré I, provoked the ire of the young monarch.¹⁰

Feeling overwhelmingly menaced, most of the missionaries left for Sydney aboard the *Nautilus* on March 31, 1798; however, a pastor named Eyre, his wife, a man named Henri Nott, and a few others decided to stay and carry out their mission, demonstrating a faith and courage worthy of the greatest praise and admiration.

A third obstacle presented itself to the members of the mission: the extreme difficulty of obtaining even adequate fluency in the local dialect. Only one among them, Mr. Nott—who, incidentally, was nothing but a simple bricklayer—achieved thorough mastery, and so it was he who translated the Bible into the Maori language.

The 1801 arrival of a second contingent of missionaries aboard the *Royal Admiral*, as well as the return of some of the original party's members, reinforced the small bastion that had remained on Tahiti. This small group had been slowly winning the favor King Pomaré II, but the grave defeat the

King suffered on December 22, 1808 lost him all of his power. Four of the Tahitian missionaries were forced to take refuge with him on Moorea; the others, out of precaution, had moved to the island of Huahine at the beginning of the conflict.

Due to instability of Tahitian politics at the time, all the missionaries, with the exception of Henri Nott, decided to leave for Australia, where they arrived on February 10, 1810.

However, the missionaries returned to the Society Islands when they learned that Pomaré, under the influence of Nott, had expressed sentiments favorable to Christianity. On July 18, 1812 the monarch asked to be baptized but for many reasons the missionaries had to delay this satisfaction until 1819.

At this point in time, Pomaré returned to Tahiti with a few British pastors and catechists in tow. Attacked soon after by a group of the island's inhabitants, this time Pomaré emerged victorious and consented to the wishes of the missionaries: to refrain from massacring his prisoners and defiling the bodies of the dead, as ancient custom dictated. His restraint in this matter rallied former adversaries to his cause and made conditions favorable for the spread of Christianity (1816).

Upon the death of Pomaré II in 1821, the Protestant mission thought to finally take its seat behind the reins of Island politics and power. The deceased monarch had entrusted his son to the mission, and he was raised at the South-Sea Academy, established in Moorea for the mission's children. But the hopes placed upon Pomaré III were short-lived, for the young king died on January 11, 1827. Another setback swiftly followed; the British Government, to which the prince had appealed (on the advice of his mentors) to establish a protectorate in his states, replied with a courteous but firm refusal. (Letter of October 5, 1825).

Being so ill informed as to the public opinion of their country, the missionaries were sure that their request must merely have been made at an inopportune moment. Inopportune indeed, since, as we have earlier noted, all classes of British society were at this time completely against colonial endeavors. When solicited by the Foreign Office for guidance in the matter of Pomaré's request, the Minister of the Colonies made it clear that it was very unlikely that Britain would want to acquire a new colony in the Pacific, for she had no colonizers to send to it.

Forgetting that a British Consulate had been established in Honolulu in 1825 with jurisdiction over the entire Pacific, the Minister of Colonies suggested that a consul be established for Polynesia. He took no heed of the interests already being cultivated by France in the region, despite recent news that they were working to found a Catholic mission in the Sandwich Islands (Hawaii).

* * *

As we said at the beginning of the chapter, George Pritchard arrived in Tahiti in the middle of the short reign of Pomaré III. At first, he was dispatched to the small district of Fao; less than twelve months after he set foot on the island, he was made head of the parish of Papeete (1825).

The change was appreciable; since ships no longer accessed Tahiti through Matavai Bay, Papeete was becoming a relatively important location. Though the port was somewhat difficult to access, it was well protected by a coral reef. This offered very reliable shelter for the local authorities, and it was this port that they used to make contact with Europeans.

Pritchard had understood his influence to extend no further than his parish in Papeete. However, chance must have favored his ambitions and allowed for him, in less than four years, to become the veritable master of the island's local government.

While still in the early days of Pritchard's stay in Tahiti, the circumstances of the island's indigenous political scene seemed completely in opposition to the success of the British Protestant mission.

After the premature death of Pomaré III, the order of succession called his sister, Aimata, to the throne, who took for herself the name Pomaré Vahiné IV.

Since the hopes of the missionaries had always been placed upon the shoulders of young Pomaré III, they had utterly neglected to cultivate the attentions or favors of his sister. Aimata was primarily interested by the pursuit of pleasure and left governance to her chiefs of state, choosing instead to dedicate her days and nights to amusements in the company of boys and girls her age. Additionally, the young queen fell under the influence of a political party that took a hostile view of Christianity.

These were all factors that threatened to both destroy the work of the mission and lead Tahiti into anarchy. Unrest had broken out on the neighboring islands, where several chiefs were resuming old ancestral quarrels in efforts to increase their power.

Further confusing the missionaries' predicament in Tahiti was the founding of a religious sect by a native priest who had once been a Protestant deacon. This sect, called the Mamaias, attractively combined Christian dogmas with local fetishism while granting complete moral freedom to its members; it became instantaneously popular and grew rapidly from the moment of its inception.

As this state of affairs grew more alarming, the missionaries began to prepare for a mass exodus from the island. Pritchard was charged with visiting the Austral Islands and the Marquesas to seek out new fields for their work. On March 17, 1829, he boarded a little vessel called the *Olive Branch* in the company of a colleague named Simpson. The two missionaries headed south, stopping at Raivavae and Rapa. On May 10th, they headed for the Marquesas.

This was not the first attempt to evangelize the archipelago. Two missionaries had previously been deposited there by the missionary ship *Duff*; one left immediately, while the other succeeded in maintaining his position—though not without difficulties—for two years. Just prior to Pritchard's visit, American missionaries based in the Sandwich Islands had made a survey of the Marquesas and recoiled from the savagery, ferocity and immorality of its natives. It did not take long for Pritchard and Simpson to see that there could be no question of leaving the Society Islands for that wild place. When the two men returned to Tahiti, they advised the members of their mission to stay where they were.

In 1831, after a year of licentiousness in the Îles Sous-le-Vent, young Queen Pomaré returned to Tahiti and joined the Mamaias sect. Fearing that the sect leaders would supplant them, the great chiefs of the island buried their ancient quarrels and joined together to force the Queen to abandon her distressing friends.

How did George Pritchard manage to get the upper hand in the missionaries' struggle with the Queen? This question may never be answered. However, it would not have been impossible for him to

have instigated the high chiefs of Tahiti's conspiracy against the Mamaias and their protectors in the Queen's circle. Whatever the case may be, George Pritchard must have had used the greatest artistry to gain his ends, for at that time the Queen felt no love for the missionaries and their obvious disapproval of her scandalous conduct.

Let us pay no attention to the oft-made insinuations regarding Pritchard's success in this matter. Nothing would have us believe that he could have departed from the severity of his morals, the perfect respectability of his private life, or from the obligations imposed upon him by his beliefs and his position.

In 1831, Rev. George Pritchard came to the aid of the descendants of the *Bounty* mutineers, whom the British Government brought to Tahiti from Pitcairn Island, on the suggestion of one Captain Beechey.¹¹

"These people [of Pitcairn]," writes J. A. Moerenhout in his *Voyages to the Pacific Isles*:

...were in despair, for they had long ago written to England begging for the sake of kindness not to be torn away from their homes, but their pleas had no effect; and they did not dare refuse to leave. They contented themselves with asking that they should be permitted to return to Pitcairn, were they to find themselves unhappy in their new residence. I do not know whether this was promised to them, nor do I believe that the Captain would make such a promise, but it is certain that the Pitcairners were counting on it.

They arrived in O'Taïti on March 24, 1831, landing in the Bay of Papeete... I hastened there at once; since I was the only person they knew on the island... From the first night, the Pitcairn Islanders realized all the dangers of the move that been forced upon them, as well as the horror of witnessing such scenes as they had never dreamed of or dared to suspect existed... On their first day on the island, they went to the Captain to declare that they could not and would not remain in a place so infested with debauchery and demanded that they be returned to Pitcairn immediately.

It was too late. No one was in a position to return them. They left for Papaoa, the location of the new land granted them by the British Government but, after a few days, they returned to Papeete and lodged together in a large house in which they were less exposed to the actions and sounds that so assaulted their delicacy... Discouraged, defeated, anxious, these unfortunates soon succumbed to a nostalgia which, in short time, proved fatal to some...

I had come from Valparaiso on a great schooner. I promised to use it to take them back to Pitcairn but this ship failed to arrive and sickness was taking hold of them. I offered to buy the missionaries' schooner and return them to their island. I offered Mr. Williams 2,000 Spanish piastres for his boat. He accepted, but an unforeseen obstacle led to fresh delays and an increase in the sickness's victims.

At last, an American ship was chartered. What means the Pitcairners possessed in copper and other objects left them by the battleship was added to the contributions of four missionaries; Pritchard, Simpson, Wilson and Nott, along with a few other white residents. The missionary Pritchard here deserves the greatest praise. Sympathetic to the Pitcairners' plight from the day of their arrival, he contributed powerfully to their rescue and return to their island. They left O'Taïti on August 14, 1831.

CHAPTER TWO

GEORGE PRITCHARD IS NAMED BRITISH CONSUL IN TAHITI (1837)

Because George Pritchard was well liked by the native authorities, it was only natural that he came to serve as intermediary between them and the British subjects established in, or visiting Tahiti. He performed his role energetically and skillfully, not only because he wished to improve his position, but also because of the praiseworthy feeling that he was rendering a service to his religious group as well as to his country.

Also, Pritchard never refused aid to British sailors in need; he exerted his good influence on these crude men, who were prone to the most regrettable excesses.

With the thought that his efficiency might be increased if he was granted his wish of being invested with some kind of official power, he persuaded Queen Pomaré to ask the British Government to confer upon him the title and powers of British Consul. This was in January of 1832.

The Foreign Office took no action in regard to her request, and the matter was put to rest. However, in January of 1836, when a Belgian merchant who had settled in Papeete returned after a long voyage to Europe and America bearing his own commission as Consul for the United States, George Pritchard was consumed with great anxiety for the state of his prestige and influence abroad. This Belgian was no other than Mr. Moerenhout.

J. A. Moerenhout was far from being a stranger to Pritchard. He had first come to Papeete from Chile in 1829, where he had lived three years a secretary to Mr. Dhourster, a well-known merchant in the port of Valparaiso, and who also served there as Consul. Mr. Dhourster had sent Moerenhout and two other men to the Gambier Islands to establish a trade in pearls and mother of pearl, and to organize regular commercial interaction between Chile and the Pacific. Pritchard had supplied Moerenhout with valuable information regarding the Society Islands and had helped him handle certain difficulties with the natives arising from his commercial and agricultural ventures.

A cordial relationship was thus established between the two men and, when Moerenhout returned to Tahiti in early 1834 with a young wife newly wed in Valparaiso, Pritchard who offered him hospitality while he awaited the completion of his house.

Thus, it is not surprising that Moerenhout has spoken of the pastor of Papeete as a “most companionable man.” (*Voyages to the Pacific Isles*, 1 vol., p.243).

Little did he know that in ten year’s time the man would become his most irreconcilable enemy.

After Moerenhout’s return as an American Consul, Pritchard took the first opportunity to urge Queen Pomaré to send the following letter to the British Government:

Tahiti, February 23, 1836

Queen Pomaré, along with the governors and chiefs of Tahiti write you this short letter so that you may make its contents known to the King of England. It is our desire that the

King name a consul for Tahiti and its neighboring islands, to represent the King in this area and to act with real authority in his various interactions with foreigners. You may remark that long ago the King named Mr. Charlton His Consul to Tahiti. This is true, but of what use to us is a consul who lives in the Sandwich Islands, far away from this region?¹² Whenever trouble arises in Tahiti he is not present. What can we do in such a case? Must we send someone to the Sandwich Islands to beg him to come every time a difficulty arises? This is why we think it would be better if there were an authorized person residing in Tahiti. The American Government has sent a consul to Tahiti—yet another reason why we think there should be a British Consul on our island. It is not fitting that Great Britain should be relegated to the background. It is from her that we have received our teachers, from her that we have received the many good things that have lifted up our people. It is our wish to maintain permanent and close contact with the British Government. The man that we wish to have as Consul in Tahiti, should His Majesty wish to accord him the position, is Mr. Pritchard. We wish to see him named because of his great knowledge of our language and customs. In fact, he has already been performing the duties of a consul for a long time. Already, he has spent a great deal of money for the relief of British sailors in distress. He is completely qualified for this position. We write this letter to you in hopes that it may please His Majesty to give this appointment to Pritchard so that he may officially become Consul to Tahiti and its neighboring islands.

That is all we have to say; peace be with you and with the King. May His reign be long and glorious!

Signed:

Pomaré, Queen
 Hati, Principal Councilor
 Mare, High Chief
 Tati, High Chief
 Poroi, District Judge

At the same time, a letter signed by twenty-four English residents of Tahiti was sent to Lord Melbourne.¹³ Citing the fact the United States had recently named a consul, they expressed their desire that George Pritchard receive an official commission to the same post, since Pritchard had been performing the duties of British Consul for several years in all but name. The candidate's perfect knowledge of the Tahitian language, his activity, his zeal, and his great influence with the Queen and local government were all points to be considered in favor of his nomination.

The signers added that they did not find the fact of his being a missionary to be an obstacle to his nomination.

Eventually, Mr. Pritchard himself took the trouble to submit his candidacy to Lord Melbourne in a letter dated March 5, 1836:

My Lord,

Given that the Tahitian Government and English residents of this island have written to Your Lordship concerning the nomination of a resident consul in Tahiti and given that they have wished to recommend me to the benevolent interest of His Majesty, I take the liberty of writing these few lines to Your Lordship on the same subject.

There is no need for me to emphasize to Your Lordship that I am thoroughly English. An absence of twelve years from the country of my birth has relaxed neither the sentiments of high respect and deep veneration that I have always professed regarding the British Government, nor the feeling of patriotism that must always burn in the breast of all who have the honor of being a subject of His Majesty.

By reason of divers circumstances, I have assumed consular functions over the course of the last two or three years on this island. Both the Tahitians and the foreigners are, in general, satisfied, I believe, with the manner in which I have acquitted myself of these duties and are now desirous of seeing me obtain a regular nomination to this position from His Majesty's Government, so that I may act with authority—also that I may have the assurance of reimbursement for the expenses I have repeatedly incurred in the relief of needy British subjects. I do not wish to present my qualifications myself but, if His Majesty would consent to do me the honor of conferring this post upon me, I would not spare myself in my efforts to acquit myself of my various duties in a manner that would bring honor to the government which I have the privilege of representing and satisfy the people of the land in which I now reside.

If a person unfamiliar with the Tahitian language were to be named, the task of acting as his interpreter would inevitably fall to me; that person, however perfectly qualified to fill the job in all other respects, would feel incredibly difficulty in his lack of the influence that only time and various circumstances can bring. I take the liberty of calling to Your Lordship's special attention the necessity of establishing a resident consul in Tahiti, since it is impossible for Captain Charlton to be here and in the Sandwich Islands at the same time. The various affairs that can commonly present themselves require immediate and official intervention, any delay is likely to result in serious consequences.

In conclusion, I humbly beg Your Lordship to bring the request of the Tahitian Government and Tahiti's foreign residents to the attention of His Majesty and, when you judge it fitting, to make known to me His Majesty's decision in this matter.

Signed: George Pritchard

Pritchard entrusted his written request to Rear Admiral George Hammond, Commander of the British Forces in the Pacific, and Captain Fitzroy, who was then in London, but whom Pritchard had gotten to know in 1835 when Fitzroy visited Tahiti aboard his ship, *The Beagle*.¹⁴

This time, the British Government received Pritchard's candidacy favorably, but demanded that he retire from his work as a missionary. The London Missionary Society, knowing full well that his retirement would be a formality that would not actually break ties with Pritchard, hastened to express their agreement in the matter, even adding their own recommendation to his candidacy (January 11, 1837).

On February 14, 1837, Viscount Palmerston, who had succeeded Lord Melbourne as Foreign Minister, informed George Pritchard of his appointment as Consul for the Society Islands and the

Samoan Islands. A second letter arrived on the same day informing Queen Pomaré that her demands had been met. The Minister added:

In consequence, Mr. Pritchard will act in the future as His Majesty's Consul and I ask of Your Majesty that he be accorded every assistance in the execution of his duties. His Majesty sends this letter, as well as the act containing Pritchard's commission, by battleship, so that its captain may express to you His Majesty's goodwill and happiness in placing a consul by your side who will, from this point on, do his utmost to prevent any British subject from giving you the least cause for complaint.

The King, my master, charges me to tell you that he hopes Your Majesty will pay heed to the representation that Mr. Pritchard will present on behalf of all British subjects, to whom, His Majesty does not doubt, complete justice will always be accorded.

To add more ceremony to the installation of Mr. Pritchard as British Consul for Tahiti, the London Government, as it had informed Queen Pomaré, had entrusted the letters of notice and introduction to the *Imogene*, a battleship under the command of Captain Bruce, who duly placed them in the hands of their recipients while his ship was anchored in Papeete.

On November 20th, the new Consul was presented to the Queen and her chiefs by Captain Bruce and by Captain Bethune, commander of the *Conway*, arrived from Sydney the day before. The large number of officers present at the ceremony greatly impressed the population and the native authorities.¹⁵

In spite of Pritchard's promise to end his ecclesiastical ministry, the new Consul actually believed it to be his duty to continue it. As a reason, he gave the fact that the Rev. J. Rogerson, who had been named his successor, was not able to preach in Tahitian. He was careful to add, in a report to the Foreign Office, he would preempt authorization from Minister of Foreign Affairs and continue to perform both his functions as he awaited a reply.

Pritchard's hasty action was actually approved of by one Commander Elliott, an officer of the British Navy, in a report to Rear Admiral Ross dated November 13, 1838. We believe that we ought to reproduce not only the part of the report which relates Pritchard's assumption of the dual functions of pastor and consul, but also a part in which Ross, the commander of the sloop *Fly*, traces a flattering portrait of the British Consul for Papeete:

Mr. Pritchard is a 'gentleman' of opinions and liberal education, gifted with great good sense, great worth of character. After studying as a candidate for orders in the Established Church, and while still very young, he joined the London Missionary Society and was sent overseas. He has lived in these islands as an ordained pastor for fourteen years.

A thoroughly pious man, his attitude, like that of all the missionaries in the Society Islands, though possessing no less piety nor religious success, makes a happy contrast to the deeds of their American counterparts in the Sandwich Islands, by reason of their more moderate and judicious use of their extra-confessional influence.

The fact that Mr. Pritchard has been charged with the important district of Papeete, containing the seat of government, has garnered him an unlimited and

unreserved influence over the Queen and her chiefs. They, along with all the inhabitants of the island, revere and respect him, holding him in the highest esteem.

While Mr. Pritchard shows ardent devotion, good sense and great judgment, he has naturally much to learn regarding the theory and practice of consular functions.

That Mr. Pritchard has continued to preach has occasioned reproach and ill-feeling on the part of several displeased British subjects. The circumstances which led him to act as he has are as follows: In accepting the Consulate, he had broken his ties with the London Missionary Society and thus a certain Mr. Rogerson arrived from the Marquesas to temporarily undertake the double leadership of the parishes of Papeete and Papara, a district four miles away from his place of residence. But, as Mr. Rogerson did not know (or hardly knew) the native language and, the two parishes being far too much for a completely prepared man, Mr. Pritchard proposed to undertake half of the task; that is to say, he would preach from time to time in Papeete until a qualified successor should arrive—which should not be long, as the Rev. Williams has just arrived in Sydney en route to Tahiti in the company of an important group of missionaries. As his removal might have resulted in the loss of a large group of faithful followers, I do not think that Mr. Pritchard's scruples of conscience could have been more deserving of respect. The spiritual assistance that he has provided in a time when he might have remained outside church doors, confining himself in relative idleness to the dignity of his official post, proves that the work of a consul is very light. In fact, this same man had freely performed the same duties for many years before being officially charged with them.

To summarize, I am of the highest opinion that the respectability of Mr. Pritchard, and the high esteem in which he is held by the native authorities, give him a special designation as British Consul to render services to his country that are both useful and appreciable.

In fact, the British Government seemed to quickly lose interest in the controversy over Pritchard's dual roles; he continued to serve both as pastor of Papeete's church and as British Consul without any objections.

The point of view of the British pastors in Tahiti concerning the accumulation of Pritchard's duties differed greatly from that expressed by the commander of the *Fly*.

Richard Lovett, author of *History of the London Missionary Society*, takes the part of the pastors and explains their reasoning:

Although no longer a member of the London Missionary Society's staff, Pritchard resolved to continue his work in the capacity of "volunteer"; his activity in this respect and in others was appreciated by his colleagues in a variety of ways... Pritchard's desire to perform evangelist and consular activities at the same time played a large role in causing the many difficulties that later arose.

What Pritchard's colleagues felt in this matter may be seen in their letters. For example, on December 7, 1837, Mr. Darling writes: "The chiefs and the churches seem to condemn the idea of a missionary also serving as a consul. When Pritchard returned to

Papoa after his nomination to administer communion, the whole congregation left the church.”

Adding to the difficulties created by Pritchard’s behavior was the age-old controversy of whether preachers had the right to enter into commerce, the debate was revived and became itself a new source of complications...

The act of combining consular and missionary obligations gave rise to new dissension within the mission. After much discussion, the natives elected him sole pastor of the church at Papeete with the intention of paying him themselves. As a result, Mr. Thomas Joseph, the official pastor, was evicted and removed to Pare, where he took up his functions. Reason for Pritchard’s unusually rebellious behavior might be found in the fact that his work as Consul consumed only a few hours each week; perhaps he felt that his official work had in no way replaced his interest in the Church and his desire to pursue this interest. (Lovett, vol. 1, p.310-311, 315)

The salary allotted to the Representative of His Majesty in Tahiti by the British Government was not sufficient to provide for the needs of Pritchard’s family. It is for this reason that, after his nomination to Consul, George Pritchard continued to participate in trade.

Like most of his colleagues, Pritchard had opened a small shop. The London Missionary Society, though vastly wealthy, could not completely provide for the pastors and catechists that were sent all across the globe. Ships were rare in the South Pacific and it was very difficult to get money to the missionaries. Also, the natives were much more interested in trading for merchandise than they were in the use of currency.¹⁶

These facts justify the liberty that the London Missionary Society gave its members in the world of business. Anxious as they were to see their missionaries established in Oceania, they could not take issue with the fact that to do and survive, they were also becoming merchants.

However, the Society’s attitude has been vigorously attacked in print, in particular by the English historian K. L. P. Martin. This man, prejudiced against the missions, declared that the London Missionary Society had not fulfilled its duties regarding its personnel. (*Missionaries and Annexation in the Pacific*, p. 15)

J. A. Moerenhout had also expressed regret, in his *Voyages to the Islands of Oceania*, that missionaries were “entering into businesses,” although he loyally recognized that this was necessary for them to live decently.

Later, he accused the missionaries of influencing the Tahitian Government to pass legislation protecting their commercial interests; that foreigners were not to disembark at the island without previous permission from the authorities. But this accusation was unfounded. The law in question had no other purpose but that of preventing the entry of convicts from the Australian penitentiaries, escaped or freed, as well as deserters from merchant and whaling ships; extremely rough and often dangerous characters who set a deplorable example for the native population.

CHAPTER THREE

GEORGE PRITCHARD SERVES AS INTERMEDIARY BETWEEN THE TAHITIAN GOVERNMENT AND CAPTAIN DUPETIT-THOUARS WHEN THE LATTER COMES TO DEMAND REPARATION FOR THE EXPULSION OF THE PICPUS BROTHERS (AUGUST-SEPTEMBER 1838) HE DEPARTS FOR ENGLAND ON LEAVE (FEBRUARY 1841)

George Pritchard, attentive to all events in the Central Pacific, had learned with anxiety of the Vatican's creation of the "Apostolic Vicarage of the Pacific Islands" in 1823 and of the arrival of two members of the Congregation of Sacred Hearts of Picpus (May 1834) in the Gambier Islands; they were the Rev. Fathers Caret and Laval, as well as Columbine Murphy, an Irish Priest of the same order.

His apprehension only increased when he learned that, according to his informants, the priests in question had first planned to establish themselves in Tahiti on the advice of a certain French Captain Mauruc,¹⁷ whom they had met in Valparaiso. Fearing that they would not be authorized to settle on the island, the Picpus brothers decided to first go to Gambier where they would await the arrival of the Apostolic Vicar of Central Oceania.

This prelate, Monseigneur Rouchouse, landed at Mangareva in May 1835 and immediately began the task of re-establishing there the mission that had been founded in Honolulu by the Picpus Order and subsequently closed following the expulsion of Fathers Bachelot and Short in December 1831.

To this effect, he hurried Brother Columbine Murphy toward Honolulu via Tahiti, where whaling vessels would stop from time to time on their way north.

Disguised as a ship's carpenter, Columbine landed in Papeete on May 21, 1835 and left the following July. Upon arriving, he was met by George Pritchard, who, after trying in vain to make the man divulge his true profession, suffered him to enter the town, not daring to prevent the landing of a traveller with a British passport.

The local authorities kept a discreet watch over all the Picpus brother's movements during the two months he spent in Tahiti but they failed to bring to light any evidence against him. However, the fact that Msgr. Rouchouse never received the letter Murphy sent him from Papeete allows one to suppose that this correspondence was intercepted. If this were true, Pritchard would have known that the Apostolic Vicar of Central Oceania had not given up on extending his control to the Society Islands, since his agent had been instructed to use his time there to find out how the population might receive the Catholic missionaries. George Pritchard did not fail to inform London of Columbine Murphy's passage through Tahiti and asked that measures be taken to prevent any Catholic missions in Queen Pomaré's domain. In addition, he enclosed a letter personally signed by the Queen requesting intervention, but the English Government refused the entreaty.

In November of 1836, the captain of a sailing vessel arriving from the Gambier Islands brought the news that Brothers Caret and Laval had tried to obtain passage to Tahiti aboard his ship. Upon his refusal, they boarded the *Eliza*, a little schooner captained by Hamilton, an Englishman of Tahiti who was married to one of Queen Pomaré's ladies-in-waiting.

Pritchard immediately notified the Queen and asked her to have the coastline of the island watched so as to prevent the priests' landing. However on November 20th, they landed at Toutira, the furthest point on the island from Papeete, and headed towards the capital on foot. There, they were received in the home of J. A. Moerenhout, whose wife was a "good Spanish Catholic" and to whom their letters of recommendation were addressed.

Thanks to Moerenhout's position as American Consul, Brothers Caret and Laval were received by Queen Pomaré, to whom they offered a shawl and four ounces of gold. At Pritchard's urging, she returned the gifts, only to have them immediately re-bestowed upon her, and, the second time, she did not give them back.

Although they had not yet been authorized to remain on the island, the Catholic missionaries were hopeful that permission would be granted them. However, they had not taken into account the great activity and influence of George Pritchard, who succeeded in having the Queen and her chiefs sign a decision to the contrary. On November 27th, at an assembly of the principal inhabitants of the island, the brothers were informed that they must soon leave Tahiti. They answered that they could not take to sea aboard the little ship that had brought them, as they had no faith in the captain, and they asked if they might be allowed to remain until the arrival of a French battleship.

The official speaker of the assembly read to the priests Article 4 of a local ruling that prevented foreigners from landing without the official permission of the Queen and her chiefs. Mr. Moerenhout declared that he had no knowledge of this law, the legality of which seemed to him a most debatable question. A few minutes later, the assembly rose to their feet in the midst of the extreme confusion that had ensued.

After several days of hesitation, the Queen at last yielded to pressure from Pritchard and had a formal order presented to Brothers Caret and Laval to the effect that they were to leave Tahiti at once. Upon their refusal, they were forcibly placed aboard the *Eliza* on December 12, 1836 and the ship placed under the command of a new captain. By December 31st, they were once more in the Gambier Islands.

Scarcely had they left Papeete when the port received a new arrival in the form of the English battleship *Acteon*. Pritchard hurried to present himself to its captain and to tell him of the recent events in Tahiti.

Lord Edward Russel had no wish to involve himself in an affair that he considered to be closed. He merely advised Pomaré that, if she wished to complain of the American Consul's actions, she could write to Washington. Lord Russel had in fact very recently intervened on behalf of a Picpus priest, a British subject, who was refused permission to land in the Sandwich Islands. This put him in an embarrassing position and he could not in good conscience approve of the measures taken against the French Catholic missionaries in Tahiti, when they were in exactly the same position as their colleague in the Sandwich Islands.

In a report addressed to the Secretary of State in Washington, Moerenhout declares that during a meeting at which Lord Russel was also present, he obtained a formal declaration from the chiefs that the expulsion of the French priests was due to orders given by George Pritchard, "which put the man into such a state of fury that he lost all control of himself and addressed the most gross and insulting

words to me, upon which my sense of simple dignity forced me to leave the assemblage.... Lord Russel,” adds Moerenhout, “came to see me after the meeting to express his regret at the conduct of Mr. Pritchard, conduct of which he openly disapproved and for which he would hold him accountable, obliging him to send apologies, which came to me shortly afterwards.”

Mr. Lovett says, to the contrary, that Pritchard had absolutely nothing to do with the measures taken by Queen Pomaré. “There is no doubt that the Queen acted upon her own initiative; that the chiefs, as well as herself, wished for the priests to be refused entry to Tahiti. But the terms used by Pritchard in his letters to Moerenhout later gave his enemies a chance to misrepresent the reasons for his action and that of the Queen.”

At any rate, Pritchard had no difficulty in convincing the Queen that she should follow Lord Russel’s advice, and wasting no time, had Queen Pomaré sign a letter addressed to the President of the United States complaining of the American Consul’s interference in local affairs. In addition, Pritchard felt he ought to write a personal letter to emphasize the accusations leveled against Moerenhout.

Several days later, on January 18, 1837, news reached Papeete that Father Caret, accompanied by Father Maigret, had returned aboard the *Colombo*, an American vessel that had just arrived. This time, the missionaries were not allowed to disembark.

Pritchard’s differences with his fellow Consul did not prevent him from coming to his rescue after the outrage that Mr. Moerenhout and his wife fell victim to on the night of June 9, 1838. The writer Marc Wilks gives the following details of the British Consul’s reaction:

Mr. Pritchard, who was sound asleep, was wakened by knocking at his door and the cries of the community. Though he had scarcely spoken to Moerenhout since the latter’s intervention in the affair of the Catholic missionaries, Pritchard hurried to the scene of the crime. He found husband and wife lying on the floor, bathed in their own blood; he lifted them both and put them in their beds, then sent for a surgeon and cut their hair, bandaging and assisting the doctor throughout his entire examination. In the evening, after having retired to the mission to rest, he was sent for by Mr. Moerenhout. Loss of blood had rendered the wounded man so feeble that he felt himself to be mortally wounded. He expressed his wish that his affairs be entrusted “to the chief of the savages” (his nickname for Pritchard). Pritchard advised him to dictate a will, which Moerenhout was in no condition to do. However, he asked Pritchard—the cruel and infamous Pritchard—to take charge of all he possessed and put his affairs in order. In the presence of two foreigners (required as witnesses since the wounded man was not able to sign his own name), he transferred to Pritchard all the necessary powers for the protection and safeguarding of all his property. Then and there, he placed his most precious possessions under Pritchard’s guard and seal, including a box of pearls of considerable worth.

Though very grave, Moerenhout’s wounds did not prove fatal, and the American Consul recovered. It was not the same for Mrs. Moerenhout, who died on December 20, 1838, after much suffering.

According to Marc Wilks, the French held the English Protestant missionaries, and in particular George Pritchard, responsible for the crime.

If we check with sources, we can see that Wilks's statements are inaccurate. Dumont d'Urville considers the Protestant missionaries indirectly responsible for the attack on account of their incessant defamation of Moerenhout's character. Louis Reybaud writes that the "English" murderer believed he was satisfying the hatred of his fellow Protestants. Dupetit-Thouars discerns motives in the affair that are "generally believed to be more political than personal." Finally, Marc Wilks quotes from a letter written by a French Government agent in Tahiti and published in the *Journal de Debats*: "Moerenhout has just escaped a murder commissioned on whose instigation? I do not dare tell you whom they suspect."

However, there is no doubt that Pritchard was formally accused by Admiral Dupetit-Thouars of hiding one of the guilty parties, as well as by Messieurs Vincendon-Dumoulin and Degraz.

A precise explication of the facts should be sufficient to clear the British Consul and Protestant missionaries of all suspicion.

In an account sent to Washington on June 28, 1838, eighteen days after the attack, Moerenhout writes: "One of the murderers had been identified; an English deserter of an American whaler and there is much evidence to allow belief in his guilt." On his part, Pritchard stated in a June 23rd letter to Commodore Sullivan: "Two persons have been arrested, one of them a British subject, the other a Spanish Negro."

This Negro, named Sambo, surely the principal—and perhaps the only—actor in the crime, confessed his guilt. He was condemned to death and hung in December 1838 or January 1839.

The "British subject" alluded to by both Moerenhout and Pritchard had been accused by Sambo and also arrested. One can presume he was perfectly capable of having taken part in the crime, but no evidence could be found and he had to be released. It is possible that the British Consul had found a way to rid the island of this reprehensible character by arranging his departure aboard a passenger boat, which may have given rise to the later rumor that he had saved the man from punishment.

Could the moral or indirect responsibility of the Protestant mission have been elsewhere involved? Certainly not. The author of the crime had had no other motive for stabbing the American Consul than that of taking merchandise and money. Doubtless, he knew that Moerenhout possessed pearls of great value. Surprised by the unexpected return of Moerenhout and his wife, he did not hesitate to get rid of all witnesses.

As to whether the diatribes of the Protestant missionaries had had any influence, it does not seem as if Sambo could have been influenced by them, since, as Marc Wilks notes (not without humor), he was a Catholic; and the fact that he was from Spanish America would make him entirely indifferent to rivalries between pro-English and pro-French factions.

It is most regrettable that the enmity between these two groups could have caused these reciprocal accusations, all equally unjust and damaging.

After Lord Edward Russel's departure, the excitement quickly died down in Tahiti. The memory of the events of December 1836 and January 1837, and the Picpus brothers' unfruitful attempt to gain a foothold on the island, was all but faded away when suddenly, on August 29, 1838, the French battleship *Venus* entered the harbor of Papeete.

The following day, an officer from the ship presented himself to Queen Pomaré along with a note from Captain Dupetit-Thouars, demanding:

1. That a letter of addressed to the King of France apologizing for the violence and affronts inflicted upon French subjects be sent to the commander of the *Venus* within 24 hours;
2. That 2,000 Spanish piastres be turned over within the same 24 hours; and
3. That the French flag be planted on the little island of Motu-Uta in the bay, to receive a twenty-one-canon salute at noon on September 1st.

Failure to fulfill these demands within the time allotted would result in hostilities being immediately opened upon the Queen's domain.

In case he should be obliged to open fire, Dupetit-Thouars officially offered refuge to the American and British Consuls and their families aboard his ship.

Mr. Moerenhout acknowledged this notice immediately. In stark contrast, Mr. Pritchard gave his messenger only an oral reply: that he was not in a position to answer as he lacked both ink and pen!

The British Consul then found himself very embarrassed, for the Queen and chiefs left to him the task of somehow procuring the 2,000 piastres demanded by Dupetit-Thouars, a sum she claimed not to possess.

George Pritchard was no wealthier than she. After adding the 500 piastres that he possessed personally together with 200 more, on loan from Pastor Bicknel, and adding that to the loan of 1,000 he had received from Pastor Vaughan, Pritchard boarded the *Venus* on August 10th at 5 o'clock in the evening along with the missionaries Barff and Rogerson. They took the 2,000 piastres to the ship's treasurer and brought a letter of apology from Pomaré to the commander himself.

On August 31st, cannons saluted the French pavilion on the islet of Motu-Uta. Lacking ammunition, the Tahitian Government had had to ask Dupetit-Thouars to furnish it himself, and the inexperienced native artillerymen had to appeal to the direction of several English volunteers. Contrary to what is often said, the British Consul did not man one of the guns himself; we read in the unedited manuscript which Pritchard left to his descendants, which has been kindly sent us by Mrs. Darlaston, the following sentences:

While the cannons were being prepared, an officer from the frigate was sent to my home to ask me to tell the Queen that the Captain was very surprised to see that the French pavilion had not yet been saluted and that, if the salute did not begin within ten hours, he would open fire on the town. I entreated the officer to tell him that it would be futile for me to bring this message to the Queen as she would not be able to handle the matter but,

if the Captain would trouble himself to glance from the bridge of his ship, he would see the natives and their English friends preparing the cannons.

On September 1st, the American and British Consuls made an official visit to the *Venus*'s commander. He then went ashore to greet the Queen and inform her that he had just appointed Mr. Moerenhout to serve as Tahiti's French Consul. A treaty was then presented to Pomaré. After studying it, the Queen affixed her signature to the document on September 4th.

The treaty simply stipulated that from then on there would be peace and friendship between the French and the people of Tahiti; that the French could come and go freely, live on and transact business in the islands under Tahitian government, and finally, that they should be received and protected as the most favored of foreigners. In exchange, the subjects of the Queen of Tahiti would be received and treated as the most favored of foreigners in France.

Five days later, Captain Dumont d'Urville, who was in command of an expedition made up of two ships, the *Astrolabe* and the *Zélee*, and who was passing through Tahiti on a voyage around the world, stopped and visited the British Consul. "Mr. Pritchard," he wrote in the description of his travels:

...is a man of about forty-five [Pritchard was then exactly forty-two], he is thin, dry and bilious and he bears in his manner that pride, that air of cold, reserved dignity so natural to Englishmen whenever they are elevated by Fortune from the lower classes into a position of some importance. Mr. Pritchard got up to receive us with all indications of civility, but, as soon as I step over his threshold, I say to him: "Mr. Pritchard, I have come to visit you as a representative of a great nation, long the rival and enemy of another great nation but today her friend and ally. I should have been happy to perform this courtesy to you solely in your capacity as an English missionary who I have always been a friend to in my previous voyages; I should have been pleased to learn that you have always reconciled the duties which the title of Christian imposes with those of humanity; it has been otherwise, and of that I am sorry. I would like, at least to believe that from now on you will better understand the duties imposed on you in your position as an English citizen, and that you will protect, even at the risk of your life, all French citizens, should they ever again be exposed to similar affronts."

Seeing him stop with an air of uncertainty, I add, "Mr. Pritchard, do I speak English correctly, have you completely understood me? If not, I shall ask Mr. Moerenhout to repeat my words to you." Then Pritchard hastens to assure me that he has understood me perfectly and adds that he doubtless had been disparaged in my mind and that, furthermore, he would always be ready to protect the subjects of any nation. "That is sufficient for me," I say, and I go into his house. The conversation turns on foreign affairs and we part very pleased with one another, at least in appearance.

Captain Dupetit-Thouars left Papeete on September 18, 1838. His colleague, Dumont D'Urville, preceded him by several hours.

The official report of the incident with the French, written for the Foreign Office, could not be sent off before November 9th, doubtless because there was no opportunity. This report, it must be

admitted, was conceived in moderate terms, but Pritchard shrewdly added to it a protestation signed by the Queen and four chiefs, and addressed to Queen Victoria. No doubt the document was composed under his guidance.

Pomaré's letter, dated November 8, 1838, did not make a single allusion to the recent French intervention, or to the Treaty of September 9th; after expressing the obligation that the Tahitians felt toward England, it pointed out that commerce and industry in the island were attracting ever greater numbers of white men who were superior both materially and intellectually to the Polynesians and that the latter could no longer be left to their own authority. Queen Pomaré and the other signatories; Tate, Ubani, Paofai and Kitooi, consequently asked to become an English Protectorate.

Notified of Pomaré's letter to Queen Victoria in advance, the London Missionary Society used all the power in its possession to make the British Government view the proposition agreeably, but all their efforts were met with deaf ears.

In the dossier of the incident sent July 23, 1839 to the Marquis of Normanby,¹⁸ the Minister of War and Colonies, the Hon. W. Fox Strangways, Permanent Secretary to the Foreign Office, as representative of his superior, states:

That the [Tahitian] law forbidding any person from the teaching of religious doctrines other than those of the English missionaries seemed to Lord Palmerston an indefensible act of intolerance and I have been commissioned to point out to you that, in spite of the brutal and peremptory manner with which the French frigate commander comported himself, it is nevertheless necessary to realize that the expulsion of French missionaries constituted an unfortunate act of violence.

On the instructions of the Marquis of Normanby, Mr. Stephen, the Permanent Secretary to the Minister of Colonies, replied on August 1st:

I have been ordered to ask that you make known to Lord Palmerston that, because of the vast territorial extent of the actual possessions of Great Britain in the South Seas and the resulting necessity of extending Her Majesty's sovereignty to certain parts of the islands of New Zealand; and because of the expense involved and the inherent difficulties in these enterprises as well as the need for protection of the persons living under allegiance to the Queen in that part of the world, Lord Normanby deems it dangerous and impolitic to contract obligations of the same nature toward the people of Tahiti or to have them accept the Queen of England as their sovereign.

For the second time, England had refused to grant her protection to Tahiti and the islands dependent upon her.

In view of these considerations, which he made his own, Lord Palmerston sent the following instructions to the British Consul in Tahiti on September 9, 1839:

Sir,

I have studied your dispatch of last November 9th [1838], regarding the actions of the French frigate *Venus* in Tahiti on the preceding August 31st, which included a letter that Queen Pomaré and her chiefs judged suitable to address to Her Majesty, asking her to place the islands of Tahiti under the protection of the British flag.

In reply, I beg of you to inform Queen Pomaré of the profound sympathy that Her Majesty feels for her and her difficulties but, at the same time, you will make known to her that, in view of the great extent of the possessions of the British Crown in the South Seas and the difficulty of suitably providing for the protection of persons who already recognize Her Majesty's rule and live in those parts of the world very far from Great Britain, Her British Majesty deems it impossible to fulfill with any efficiency the obligations of protection to the government and people of Tahiti that would result from a similar bond.

It is for this reason, great as Her Majesty's interest is in the welfare of the Society Islands as well as in the happiness and prosperity of Queen Pomaré, that Her Majesty must decline the proposal to make any precise promise of this nature suggested to her.

However, you will assure Queen Pomaré that Her Majesty is prepared to examine, on any occasion, any claims that Queen Pomaré might desire to make and that she will always be happy to grant the aid of her good offices to Queen Pomaré, should differences between Queen Pomaré and any other power come to a head.

This letter could scarcely have reached Papeete before March or April of 1849. But by no means did it discourage George Pritchard, who continued to inform London of all the details that he thought capable of causing a conflict with France. The Foreign Office, learning of his troubles in 1838 with the landing of the Picpus brothers in the Marquesas and of their settling in the same valley where an English pastor, Mr. Stalworthy, had already lived for some time, limited itself to expressing to the Quai d'Orsay the wish that their Catholic missionaries might pursue their apostate on islands where the Protestant preachers were not already exercising theirs.

The indifference shown by the London Cabinet regarding the behavior of the French in the Pacific was exasperating to the British Consul. Could England allow France and "Papism" to take a foothold in Oceania? George Pritchard thought that the best course was to go himself to London to plead the cause that, to him, was sacred. Having obtained a leave of absence, he left his family in Tahiti and set sail for England on February 2, 1841, arriving there in July.

In spite of the support of the London Missionary Society, George Pritchard could not obtain an audience with the Minister before March 19, 1842!

He describes the matter himself in the following letter, written to Mr. Bidwell, an official in the Foreign Office:

35 Paternoster Row, March 31, 1842

Dear Sir,

I have the honor of informing you that on Saturday the 19th of this month, I have been honored with an interview with the Lord of Aberdeen. His Lordship inquired what I wished done by his department in the matter of the cession of Tahiti to the French. I

replied that I was not able to say what the suitable thing to do was, but that I hoped Her Majesty's government would act in a way that would safeguard the independence of the islands, for I was persuaded that, if this independence were maintained, the islands would have a usefulness essential for commerce and British interests in general, especially in regard to New Zealand and New South Wales. His Lordship said that I did not have the right to prevent the French from settling there, to which I replied that, even though we might not be able to prevent the French from settling there, we might perhaps be able to prevent the French from benefitting from privileges superior to ours. His Lordship asked for the number of French citizens currently residing on the islands. I was not in a position to give an exact number, since many might have arrived since my departure. He then asked me the number of English living there. I answered that, including the missionaries, there must be about fifty or sixty. His Lordship then inquired after the success of the missionaries and whether the natives had returned to their pagan customs. I answered that the missionaries had had great success and that none of the natives who had abandoned their pagan customs had reverted to its practices.

His Lordship then asked for the proportion of the inhabitants of Tahiti who had become truly religious. I answered that I estimated this to be a proportion of about a third of the population.

His Lordship said that he would study the question and that he would find a proper way to address it. I told His Lordship that Queen Pomaré was extremely upset by recent events and that she had demanded that those chieftains who had signed the document in question be tried for high treason.

His Lordship asked me when I expected to return. I answered that my leave of absence expired on the fourteenth of June but that, if I could be of more service by returning to my post immediately, I would be more than willing to do so. His Lordship replied: "We will see what ought to be done."

Despite all his efforts during his twelve months in England, George Pritchard did not succeed in interesting the Foreign Office in Tahiti.

When he absented himself from Tahiti for nearly two years, Pritchard did not think of the advantage he was affording to his rival, J. A. Moerenhout. He had hardly set sail when the French Consul hastily sought to profit from his absence by attempting to obtain a signed petition from the chiefs demanding that Tahiti be made a French Protectorate. The Regent, named Paraïta, and the chiefs Tati, Hilote and Paete acquiesced to Moerenhout's demands, signing the request he presented to them.

When the British battleship *Curaçao* passed through the island in September 1841, Queen Pomaré gave its captain, Jankis Jones, three letters protesting the chiefs' petition; one addressed to King Louis-Philippe, the second to the American Government, and the third to the English Government. These letters, sent in the care of the admiral in command of the English naval district on the coast of South America, did not reach their destinations until the end of 1842.

Matters might have rested there, had not Dupetit-Thouars, now promoted to Rear Admiral, returned to take possession of the Marquesas Islands.

Notified by the French Consul that the time was optimal for action Tahiti, he hurried to Papeete, arriving on August 27, 1842. The following month, after he had thoroughly acquainted himself with the situation, the Admiral sent the native authorities a “Declaration” which stated that the treaties with France had in several instances been broken, that French nationals had often been victims of hostile treatment, and demanded 10,000 Spanish piastres as a guarantee that such incidents would not be repeated, in default of which the landing corps would occupy a diverse group of strategic points and, should this occupation meet the slightest resistance, prepare to take even stronger measures.

“At the same time,” the missive continued, “to prove to the Queen and high chiefs how painful such severity toward them would be for me, I authorize them to submit to me, within twenty-four hours, every service of accommodation capable of appeasing the righteous resentment of my nation—so strongly roused against them—and to bring a sincere reconciliation between two peoples greatly sympathetic to one another yet unfortunately forced into strife.”

The purpose of the offer of reconciliation was to allow the Regent and three high chiefs Utami, Hitoti, and Tati to present a new request for the French Protectorate. English writers never mention that, in an assembly of the people, this proposal was submitted and adopted without objection, which made a strong impression on the Queen. Pomaré, who was then living on the neighboring island of Moorea, signed the request—no doubt with reluctance but without force. On September 9th, Dupetit-Thouars added his signature and bestowed upon Tahiti the provisionary title of Protectorate of France, since only the King of France could make the declaration official.

When officially notified, the acting British Consul, Mr. Wilson, and the American Consul, Mr. Blackner, wrote to acknowledge receipt of Dupetit-Thouars’ communications on the 12th and 19th of September, respectively. They declared themselves happy to see the difficulties between France and the local authorities resolved without conflict.

For their part, the ministers of the Protestant mission sent a declaration to the Admiral stating that they considered it their imperative duty to exhort the people of the islands to practice peaceful and constant obedience to the powers that be, an obedience commanded by divine authority.

Lastly, the British subjects of Tahiti, numbering about thirty, declared in writing that they were happy to see an end to the disorders and abuses that had until then reigned in the port and that they were pleased to read in the Admiral’s proclamation that acts and rulings would be drawn up and desired measures taken to assure the protection of property and the administration of justice.

Admiral Dupetit-Thouars left Tahiti shortly afterwards, on his way to the Marquesas.

CHAPTER FOUR
 GEORGE PRITCHARD'S SECOND SOJOURN IN TAHITI (1843-1844)

His leave of absence ended, George Pritchard left England on August 11, 1842, aboard a ship carrying not only merchandise for his business but also gifts from the British Government to Queen Pomaré, including, among others, a carriage and a piece of living-room furniture. "Lady Trowbridge and several distinguished persons in Great Britain had added various articles of worth which were agreed to be expressions of sympathy and affectionate attention." (George Pritchard, *Queen Pomaré and her Country*, p.43) The ship rounded the Cape of Good Hope and reached Sydney on December 7th, after a voyage of four months.

There, the passengers learned of the establishment of the French Protectorate in the Society Islands, following a treaty with Admiral Dupetit-Thouars signed by the Queen on the preceding September 9th.

This information was a surprise to Pritchard, who hastened to confirm it with the Governor of New South Wales, Sir George Gipps.

The Governor, in a few words, brought his visitor up to date. At the end of October, he had received a letter from Mr. Wilson, whom Pritchard had left as Consul in his absence, a letter informing him that the Tahitian Government, being incapable of paying the 10,000 piastres demanded by Admiral Dupetit-Thouars to ensure compliance with previous treaties, had asked for the French Protectorate and that the Admiral had agreed, on condition of the King of France's approval.

Although the Society Islands did not fall under his jurisdiction, Sir George Gipps had told the commander of the English battleship *Favorite* that there was no reason to prevent his going to Tahiti to put together a report to be addressed to London, and he advised Captain Sullivan to refrain carefully from any behavior which might compromise the British Government or himself.

The *Favorite* had left Sydney at the beginning of November and had not yet returned. Sir George was of a mind to wait for her but George Pritchard was not of the same opinion. Upon his fervid insistence, the Governor asked Captain Toup Nicholas, commander of the *Vindictive* and recently arrived from China on his way to England, to go at once to Tahiti and there deposit the Consul, who swore that the protection of British interests urgently required his presence in Queen Pomaré's domain.

Doubtless, even if Pritchard was in such haste to resume his duties, he also knew that returning on a battleship would make the greatest impression on the island's native population.

Four days after the departure of the *Vindictive*, the *Favorite* arrived in Sydney's port. It was the Captain's observation that no trouble had followed the signing of the September 9, 1842 Treaty and that the Government was assured by a commission, composed of Mr. Moerenhout, French Consul, who had taken the title "Commissioner to the King of France"; Lt. Commander Foucher D'Aubigny, who was named Acting Commander of Tahiti; and Lt. Gabrielli de Carpegna, who was named Port Director of Papeete. Captain Sullivan also noted that he had been made the subject of the lavish attentions of the French authorities, who displayed no signs of hostility towards British subjects. There was no French

battleship in the vicinity. The Queen, however, was still at Moorea and Captain Sullivan had not been able to see her.

The American author Melville, although rabidly anti-French, makes a favorable comment in his book *Omoo* (“Chapter XXXII: Proceedings of the French at Tahiti”): “During my stay upon the island, so far as I could tell, there was little to denote that any change had taken place in its government. Such laws as they had were administered the same as ever, and everywhere the same tranquility reigned.”

Anxious to avoid contact with the provisional government, Pritchard had Toup Nicholas deposit him not in Papeete but in Papara, on Tahiti’s southern coast, where he landed on the 24th of February.

Pritchard explains his motives for landing at Papara by claiming that the *Vindictive* did not have time to enter Papeete’s harbor that day. The battleship left the day after, along with the British Consul, who had re-boarded after visiting Queen Pomaré.

Circumstances were no longer what they were at the time of the departure of the *Favorite*. On January 14th, the day after the *Favorite* left for Sydney, another British naval ship, the *Talbot*, had entered the port of Papeete. The ship had been sent on the orders of Admiral Thomas, commander of the naval division station on the South American coast, after he had learned of the signing of the September 9th Treaty.

Sir Thomas Thompson, the *Talbot*’s commander, had from the first adopted an attitude that contrasted completely with that of the *Favorite*’s Captain Sullivan. He refused to recognize or salute the French flag of protectorate¹⁹ and would only receive Captain D’Aubigny and Lt. Carpegna in their capacity as officers from *La Reine Blanche*, a ship that had quitted the island five months previously.

When officially notified by Sir Thomas Thompson of his arrival, the Queen hurried back from Moorea on a boat from which had been hoisted the old Tahitian flag, to which the *Talbot* gave a twenty-one gun salute.

This noisy demonstration made Pomaré feel that she could count on the benevolent support of the commander of the *Talbot* and, in the presence of Acting Consul Wilson and several native chiefs, she told Sir Thomas that she had signed the treaty with Dupetit-Thouars because she was about to be confined and wished to avoid having the Admiral take her kingdom by force.

Sir Thomas Thompson promised the Queen that he would intervene in her favor and, when he left Tahiti on February 15, 1843, he took with him a letter from her to Admiral Thomas.

Ten days later, when Pritchard landed at Papara, he contacted Pomaré, who had left Papeete to live in the country, and urged the Queen to resist French authority with all the power she possessed. As Commander Thompson had already encouraged such an attitude, the Queen willingly agreed with the British Consul and readily attached her signature to the following letter, drawn up for her by the Consul:

My Dear Sister Victoria, Queen of Great Britain,

Good health to you! I have already sent you a letter concerning my truly difficult position.

I write Your Majesty once again on the subject of my troubles and your officers, couriers of dispatches destined to Your Majesty's Government, will carry this to Great Britain.

May you still continue to aid me, dear Queen. This is the request I make of you: take what measures you desire so that peace may be returned to my kingdom.

Here is my wish: that the King of France would remove the individual who has caused all my troubles. Here is the name of this individual: J. A. Moerenhout, Consul of France. This man, by means of money and other reprehensible intrigues, has turned the hearts of my chief subjects against their sovereign in such a manner that they have become traitors to their Queen. This man does not observe the laws of my country, but acts only according to his own wishes and his general conduct reveals his evil nature.

This man is not a Frenchman but comes from a certain country near France. He is a very wicked man, a troublemaker, and I expect nothing good so long as he remains here. I am completely convinced that, as soon as the King of France learns of his true nature, he will remove him immediately.

Dear friend and sister, make known to the King of France the conduct of this man in a manner that will have him removed. Do not allow this man to remain any longer in my domain, dear friend.

Your health, Queen Victoria, in all Your reign.

George Pritchard attached the Queen's letter to the report he was sending to London, and entrusted it to a merchant, Samuel Hill, about to leave for England. For further assurance, Commander Toup Nicholas delivered a copy to the officer on the *Vindictive*, who was to carry his own report to the Admiral in command of the naval division, on a schooner specially chartered for that purpose. A third copy of all these documents was sent on a passenger ship headed for Valparaiso.

Upon receipt of the papers destined for him, Admiral Thomas soon sent the *Basilisk* to Tahiti to order Commander Toup Nicholas to prolong his stay on the island, to aid the Queen with his services, to protect British subjects, and lastly not to recognize until further notice either the treaty made by the Tahitian Government with France or the authority of the provisional government. To account for these orders to the Admiralty, however, he believed he should mention that, after a conversation with Commander Lavaud, just come from Tahiti on the ship *L'Allier*, it would seem that an strong informal alliance prevailed in Tahiti between the English and the French, each side trying to avoid any discussion while waiting for the decision of their governments.

In a letter to the Foreign Office, dated July 10th, Pritchard himself is obliged to recognize that all is peaceful in Tahiti.

Admiral Thomas's successor did not deem it necessary to keep the *Vindictive* in Tahiti, and on August 6, 1843, it weighed anchor and set sail for Valparaiso. When he arrived, Toup Nicholas was given the disagreeable surprise of learning that the British Government had not opposed the September 9th Treaty and that the French Government had ratified the agreement.

The same news officially reached Papeete around this time. Pritchard feigned mistrust and swore that the current rumors were only a French ploy. But the English cruiser, the *Dublin*, which landed at Papeete on September 30th, brought official confirmation of the news.

On November 1, 1843, Dupetit-Thouars arrived from the Marquesas and formally notified the Tahitian Government of King Louis-Philippe's ratification of the September 9, 1842 Treaty.

In hopes of putting an end to Pritchard's unyielding resistance to all French activity, the Admiral judged it favorable to specially inform him of the following:

La Reine Blanche, November 1, 1843

Monsieur Consul,

I have the honor of informing you that the request of the Protectorate of France, made by Her Majesty Queen Pomaré and all the high chiefs of the islands, and transmitted by myself, has been favorably received by His Majesty King Louis-Philippe of France and by His Government, which has also ratified the Treaty of September 9, 1842: it follows that this treaty, which lacked only the King's ratification, is now definitive and irrevocable.

In consequence of this ratification (see Article 5 in the request for Protectorate), the administration of the Whites in the Society Islands and all matters with foreign governments are, and remain exclusively, the province of the protectorate government, under the direction of the Royal Commission at Queen Pomaré's side. They will not be permitted to mix in politics nor interfere with the interior administration of the country.

It is a great satisfaction, Monsieur Consul, to see that unanimous adherence to the Protectorate prevails, and not only from the English residents in Papeete, for there came to me a letter of felicitation from Her British Majesty, and from the principle members of the English mission established in these islands, a spontaneous expression of their adherence. We will dutifully respect their freedom of religion, their persons and the security of their property.

The British Consul thought it his duty to respond by addressing the following letter to Dupetit-Thouars:

British Consulate, November 3, 1843

In reference to the letter which I had the honor of receiving from you yesterday, permit me to remark that Queen Pomaré has assured me many times that Her Majesty had never voluntarily requested the protection of France. She says that when the document, which Moerenhout had already presented to four chiefs, was submitted to Her Majesty to sign—if the payment of 10,000 piastres was not effected within twenty-four hours—she passed the entire night in weeping and only signed the document *in extremis* to avoid the commencement of hostilities.

Perhaps you have not been informed of the fact that only a small minority of the chiefs, not the whole group, requested French protection and, moreover, that they were considered traitors by Her Majesty and by most of the population.

It is possible that the King of France could have ratified the treaty under the impression that Queen Pomaré and her chiefs had truly desired the Protectorate but you do not know, sir, that I, as British Consul, cannot recognize this treaty, since my Government would not have authorized me to do so.

You note that it is with the utmost satisfaction that you certify the unanimous adherence of the British residents. I can assure you that it is entirely wrong to suppose that there exists anything remotely approaching what one might call unanimous adherence to the Protectorate, several of the most respectable British residents having been and still being absolutely opposed to it.^a

As for the congratulatory letter from the acting British Consul: its worth may be appreciated by the well-known fact that he is almost always drunk and that he was always ready to please those persons who could procure wine or alcohol for him.^b Moreover, he has written a letter of apology to the British Government for having let himself go so completely that he could write to you as he did.

Lastly, it is impossible that you could mistake the content of the letter that you received from the English missionaries. They have simply assured you that they would not interfere in political matters, confining themselves to the preaching of the Gospel and teaching the natives that they must “submit themselves to the powers that be.”

The Admiral did not think it appropriate to engage in an argument with George Pritchard but, having seen that Queen Pomaré raised a certain flag from her house, and that she took pains to raise and lower it at the same time as the flag of the English ship *Dublin*, he asked Pomaré to stop using that device.

The Queen refused and, digging up the past, declared that she only signed the Treaty of September 9th to avoid great misery for her people.

Dupetit-Thouars made known to Pomaré that, if she did not definitively renounce the litigious flag, he would no longer consider her ruler of the land and people of the Society Islands and would claim the archipelago in the name of the King of France. This was done on November 6th after the Queen’s refusal and a vain attempt at reconciliation from the Admiral.

^a It could be that many British subjects were of this opinion, but no more than thirty of them signed the letter addressed to Dupetit-Thouars in September 1842.

^b Wilson’s intemperance is confirmed by an American writer, Herman Melville, in his book, *Omoo*. Does one have to take our word for it? Here is the translation of the passage where he questionably views George Pritchard’s temporary replacement:

Pritchard, the missionary Consul, was absent and in England. His job was temporarily occupied by a certain Wilson, an educated white, born on the island and son of an old missionary of the same name, who was still living.

Wilson the younger was extremely unpopular, as much among the natives as the foreigners. He was considered dissipated and devoid of principles, a classification confirmed by his later conduct. Pritchard’s choice of replacement in his consular duties had been met with general disapproval throughout the land.

On November 7th, George Pritchard wrote a vehement complaint to the Admiral in the following form:

Having been officially notified by Queen Pomaré that you have stripped Her Majesty of sovereignty over these islands, I have the honor to inform you that my time as British Consul must now be ended. Thus, I have lowered my flag; the British Government has not certified me to act as Consul in a French colony.

This being said, I must, for the sake of my government and my fellow British residents, make the most solemn of protests against your actions in seizing the states of an independent sovereign that have benefited from the friendly protection of Great Britain for nearly half a century and received from that nation repeated assurances that Her Majesty Queen Victoria would always be disposed to grant any request which Queen Pomaré might be brought to make and would always be happy to accord the protection of her good offices to Queen Pomaré, should a difference arise between her and another power.

As for you; sir, you could not be ignorant of the fact that these islands are indebted to Great Britain alone for their civilization and their religious progress.

From this moment on, I shall hold you personally responsible to the British Government for any losses or damages suffered by British subjects or their property as a result of your actions.

On November 8th, Captain Bruat was installed as Governor of Papeete. A prominent figure among his staff was the former French Consul, J. A. Moerenhout, who had been appointed Director of Civil Affairs.

Two days later, Admiral Dupetit-Thouars left Papeete for Valparaiso.

It was only with the greatest pains that Lord Aberdeen, at the beginning of 1843, succeeded in calming British public opinion after it had been gravely incensed by the announcement of the signing of the September 9th Treaty between Queen Pomaré and Admiral Dupetit-Thouars, and the placement of Tahiti and its dependents under the French Protectorate.

The French Minister of Foreign Affairs had been obliged to give formal assurance, first in a letter to the British Government addressed April 6, 1843, then through a public declaration, that the English Protestant missionaries would receive the full protection of the French authorities.

The British Government contented itself with this declaration. As Mr. Addington, Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs writes to Sir John Barrow, his colleague in the Admiralty, in July 1843:

Although Her Majesty's Government had not recognized France's right to either establish a protectorate in the Society Islands or to assure the exercise of it, the Government nevertheless has no intention of contesting this right.... Since learning of France's assumption of sovereign rights, Her Majesty's Government has never raised objections relative to the legality of this act. All that it we have done has been to insist that the British subjects in these islands go unmolested and to obtain formal assurance from

the French that Protestant and Catholic missionaries would be accorded equal protection. Her Majesty's Consul at Tahiti has received orders to keep close watch on the French authorities regarding their treatment of the Protestant missionaries.... In the current state of affairs, it is Lord Aberdeen's opinion that Her Majesty's battleships should make visits to the Society Islands, as well as to the Sandwich Islands, more frequently than they have done in the past.

The orders mentioned in this letter were sent to Pritchard on July 12, 1843. They implied that the British Consul was to remain in a position of complete neutrality. On the contrary, since his return, Pritchard had actually taken a stance in the conflict. When Lord Aberdeen learned of this in September 1843, from the report Pritchard had sent from Tahiti six months before, he was greatly displeased and addressed the following letter to his representative at once:

Foreign Office, September 1843

Sir,

I have received your dispatch, dated last March 13, in which you inform me of your arrival in Tahiti on Her Majesty's battleship, the *Vindictive*, and in which you expose the hasty actions of Captain Toup Nicholas and yourself in regard to Queen Pomaré and her chiefs soon after your arrival.

It would have been much more appropriate on your part, as Her British Majesty's Consul, had you directed a complete and circumstantiated account of all these actions to the Admiralty and myself, instead of referring to Captain Toup Nicholas's interpretation.

So that you may be immediately enlightened as to the attitude of Her Majesty's Government regarding the conduct of Captain Toup Nicholas, I have included a copy of the letter I sent to the Admiralty on this subject. Thus, you will be able to understand, without having to examine the procedure of the commanders of British or French naval units, that the most serious inconveniences can result from the fact that a British officer takes it upon himself to prophesize the attitude that his government will take and that conduct of this kind towards a foreign power can threaten the peaceful relations existing between Great Britain and that power.

Her Majesty's Government does not approve of France's recent actions in Tahiti. On the contrary, we consider these actions to be unjust and oppressive and sincerely deplore the humiliation and suffering inflicted upon Queen Pomaré. Moreover, we desire to do all in our power to alleviate her misfortunes. Unfortunately, the letter with which French Protectorate was solicited was signed through her own volition and intention, as well as the later agreement that followed it.^c

^c It would seem that Lord Aberdeen accepts the view taken by the French Government of this matter, which is expounded in a letter from M. Guizot to our Ambassador to London, dated September 11, 1843: "As regards Queen Pomaré's motives in demanding the Protectorate of the King instead of simply according us the satisfaction that was due, as well as the influence that the malcontents and threats of the island's chiefs could have had on her, we have not made much inquiry. It is enough for us that all that has passed was as proper on the surface as it was at base. If later on, Queen Pomaré and maybe even a few of the chiefs who appealed to us, yielding to foreign pressures, seem as if they want to go back on their agreement, there can definitely be no claim that our policy should be subject to similar whims."

Her Majesty's Government firmly intends to guard the rights of the British Protestant missionaries and assure them of their complete freedom and right to the unrestricted exercise of their religious ministry.

Furthermore, Her Majesty's Government intends, at the appropriate time, to intercede with the French Government on behalf of the Queen of Tahiti with a view toward obtaining for her protection from the kind of severe treatment as she seems to have undergone at the hands of several French authorities. At the present time however, it would doubtless be wise of her to submit to the trying circumstances in which her fears and the intrigues of several of her corrupt chiefs have placed her.

As for the French authorities: You will constantly observe the utmost courtesy and circumspection in your attitude towards them and you will refrain from any act or word which could be misinterpreted as a desire to offend.

When George Pritchard received this letter, he thought it wise to communicate its contents in confidence to the London Missionary Society, but he made the very bad mistake of abridging and modifying the text. Mr. Guizot revealed this fact to the British Government in August 1844.

So that Mr. Miller, the British Consul General in the Pacific, would be up to date on the instructions addressed to his subordinate, the Foreign Office described them to him in a letter dated the 28th of September along with orders to personally ensure that they were carried out.

Additionally, in a letter addressed to Pritchard on September 29, 1843, Lord Aberdeen did not conceal his surprise in finding radical differences in the contents of Pritchard's and Captain Toup Nicholas's reports, and asked him to write a special report explaining himself.

The two letters from Lord Aberdeen reached Pritchard on January 8, 1844, aboard the small English battleship *Basilisk*, sent from Honolulu for this purpose as well as to ask Captain Tucker of the *Dublin* to recognize the French Protectorate.

In notifying Governor Bruat of the orders he had received, Tucker informed him that he had named George Pritchard as British Consul in the Society Islands but Bruat remarked that, since the French Government had not issued an exequatur to authorize this position, the local authorities could only ignore the nomination.

Pritchard, far from being upset by Lord Aberdeen's reproaches, answered calmly that it was to his great regret that he had misinterpreted his instructions and, very cleverly using the 1843 incidents in Tahiti to his advantage, he sent an aggressive report of the circumstances preceding and accompanying the declaration of annexation by Admiral Dupetit-Thouars.

It is not irrelevant to note that Mr. Miller, who had succeeded Captain Charlton in 1843 as British Consul General in the Pacific, and under whose orders Pritchard found himself, had decided not to protest the establishment of the French Protectorate in Tahiti.

CHAPTER FIVE

GEORGE PRITCHARD IS ARRESTED ON THE ORDERS OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER D'AUBIGNY
(MARCH 3, 1844)

GEORGE PRITCHARD DEPARTS FOR ENGLAND (MARCH 13, 1844)

In February 1844, reports reached England that George Pritchard was on the verge of being assigned to a post away from Tahiti. Enraged by this news, the London Missionary Society immediately contacted Lord Aberdeen, but he would not reveal his intentions. An allusion made by Guizot during a parliamentary debate as to the origins of this measure convinced the Society to intervene once more with the business of the Foreign Office, by means of a letter, written March 20, 1844:

The profound knowledge that Mr. Pritchard possess of the language, habits, and dress of the Tahitian people; his long held possession of the confidence and esteem of the Queen and the indigenous government; his deference and cheerful disposition regarding the Protestant missions established in those islands, together with his perfect integrity and his great and pure morals make his dismissal by Her Majesty's Government a decision that is truly and profoundly deplorable.

Lord Aberdeen's response, which is not known to us, did not seem to please the London Missionary Society, which sent him another letter on April 6th:

The Directors are sincerely delighted to learn that at the same time You relieve Mr. Pritchard of his consular duties in Tahiti, Your Lordship also affirms that You has absolutely no intention of dismissing him completely, and in being nominated for the same position in the Samoan Islands, he is given proof of Your Lordship's confidence and finds himself placed in a location where he may render great services to civilization and religion, as well as to the progress of British commerce.

Although we appreciate the just consideration and intentions of Your Lordship in giving him this new employment, the Directors cannot prevent themselves from viewing the removal of Mr. Pritchard from Tahiti, especially at this time, as a source of profound regret and serious anxiety. They have additionally the certainty that the friends of the Christian Protestant mission in all countries shared these feelings upon hearing news of this decision.

Though Mr. Pritchard's change of assignment is most certainly not considered by Her Majesty's Government to be act of censure, it is seen as such by the rest of the world, by those that it fills with delight, as well as those who learn of it with regret, and these last (who make up a group both numerous and influential) will not fail to believe that injustice has been done to the Consul, as well as the missionaries and inhabitants of Tahiti.

Having accepted this inevitable, yet deeply regrettable measure, the Directors of the London Missionary Society place their confidence in the courteous assurance that Your Lordship has given them, that in choosing Mr. Pritchard's successor in Tahiti, You will bring the greatest attention to the qualities of his character as well as other qualities so necessary in these times for the protection of the Protestant missionaries who operate in those islands.

The Directors hope also that Your Lordship will not fail to hold the French Government to the effective execution of the assurance they gave of ending Mr.

Moerenhout's ability to occupy a position or to exercise his authority in Tahiti, remembering that this man, by his past disloyalty to the natives, by his hatred of the British missionaries for their honorable resistance to his nefarious influence, has betrayed the Tahitians by being the one most responsible for the forced introduction of Roman Catholicism [the Society uses the derogative term "Papism"] into their land and the loss of their national independence.

Unsurprisingly, Lord Aberdeen hardly appreciated this letter, and had Mr. Addington address the following response on April 16, 1844 to the directors of the London Missionary Society:

Lord Aberdeen believes that he has failed to properly explicate the decision of Her Majesty's Government, a decision reached after ripened consideration and in conformity with the interests of the public ... As regards Mr. Pritchard's change of position, I am burdened with the task of rectifying the error you have fallen into. Mr. Pritchard has most certainly not been transferred as a result of demands from the French Government. The French Government learned of his transfer, which was favorably decided upon by Her Majesty's Government in the hope of restoring tranquility to Tahiti and maintaining good relations with its French authorities, only when our Government had notified them of it.

It is likely that Mr. Addington is alluding to another of the London Missionary Society's letters, for their April 6th communication makes no mention of George Pritchard's displacement being a result of demands from the French Government.

Meanwhile, Lord Aberdeen had officially notified George Pritchard of his transfer to the Samoan Islands in a letter dated April 10, 1844:

Because of events that have occurred concerning the French authorities in Tahiti since Queen Pomaré's transfer of a part of her sovereign rights to France, and in the best interests of conserving the "amicable relationship" between Great Britain and France that is so desirable, Her Majesty's Government has deemed it appropriate to provide, as a replacement for you in your position as Consul, someone who has not been involved in any of the events in the Society Islands of the past two years.

I must therefore inform you that Her Majesty's Government has deemed it necessary to recommend to Her Majesty that you be relieved of all future consular functions in Tahiti.

That being said, it must be made clear that it is not Her intention to condemn your conduct during your time as Her Majesty's Consul in Tahiti. I must also inform you of Her Majesty's decision, in removing you from Tahiti, to name you Consul in Samoa, where you will remain from now on. You will continue to benefit in this situation from the same annuity that you have previously been allocated, that being the amount 300 pounds per year.

Upon receiving this dispatch, you will make all necessary arrangements to convey yourself, as swiftly as possible, to Samoa, where you will establish your household from this time on.

In the meantime, you would do well to consider yourself to be under the jurisdiction of Her Majesty's Consul in the Sandwich Islands and the Islands of the Pacific.

On April 30, 1844, Mr. Miller, the Consul in Honolulu, was asked to convey himself to Tahiti and there appoint a new consul, of whom the choice was left to him. A second letter sent on the same day notified Pritchard of the imminent arrival of Mr. Miller, to whom he was instructed to provide all necessary services as well as the Consular archives.

George Pritchard never received the Secretary of State's dispatches. While Lord Aberdeen was signing them, the former British Consul had already been gone from Tahiti for several weeks, headed for Europe.

Since November 7, 1843, when he had notified Admiral Dupetit-Thouars that he would lower his flag and cease all consular duties due to his lack of authorization to operate within a French colony, George Pritchard had remained on the island as a private citizen.

In the meantime, he had remained in close contact with the Queen, sheltering Pomaré and her children at the Consulate after Admiral Dupetit-Thouars' November 6, 1843 announcement of the outright attachment of the ancient kingdom of Tahiti to France.

Time passed and, convinced that the royal family would not be safe with him, Pritchard advised the Queen on the 23rd of November to take refuge aboard the *Basilisk*, a ship armed with six cannons and manned by the only thirty men-at-arms to be found in Papeete's port. But, after a few days, Pomaré returned to the Consulate. Two months later, Pomaré became freshly alarmed by Pritchard's warnings and, on the night of January 30, 1844, sought refuge aboard the *Basilisk* once more. This time, Governor Bruat wrote to Lieutenant Hunt, the ship's commander, opposing this arrangement, at which point the Queen returned to land and strengthened relations with her former subjects.

Governor Bruat feared that since the commander of the *Basilisk* had admitted Pomaré aboard his ship, the population would believe that the British Government had decided to support the ex-sovereign against France; had not Pomaré once declared, in a proclamation addressed to the chiefs and inhabitants of Tahiti—certainly instigated, if not expressly dictated by George Pritchard himself—that England would never abandon them?

The spread of the news that Queen Pomare had boarded the *Basilisk* caused excitement and unrest had to break out all across the island. The former British Consul worked to encourage this mood to the point that public precautionary measures were necessary. Four native chiefs were imprisoned aboard the battleship *Embuscade* and eight others were declared rebels.

Before resorting to the use of force, Governor Bruat tried to negotiate with the natives of the southern coast, who displayed a hostility that increased daily. In spite of the meeting, which brought together various influential persons—most notably the Rev. Henry's son, a captain of a merchant ship, and the Rev. Orsmond—the parleys accomplished nothing. A visit from the Governor himself fared no better.

While Commander Bruat was gone, all Papeete became overcome with anxiety and the tension in the air was almost visible. Fearing “incidents” and possibly an attack, Lt. Cmdr. D’Aubigny, acting governor of the island, thought it wise to sign a proclamation on March 2, 1844, placing Papeete under martial law until the Governor’s return.

On the morning of the 3rd, D’Aubigny was enraged to learn that a French sentinel had been attacked the night before, so he published a second proclamation: “A French sentinel was attacked on the night of March 2nd. In retaliation, I have arrested one George Pritchard, the sole motivator and daily instigator of the agitation among the natives. His property shall answer for all damages suffered by our establishment at the hands of the rebels and, if French blood should be spilt, each drop shall fall on his head.”

It is interesting to note that Captain Belcher, commander of the *Sulphur*, made a similar threat, when he was in the Sandwich Islands, toward an American preacher named Bingham in 1837.

As a result of this proclamation, George Pritchard was arrested and locked in one of the blockhouses built along the outskirts of the main town.

William Pritchard, in his book *Polynesian Reminiscences*, states that his father’s arrest took place in the afternoon of March 3rd, just as he was boarding a longboat headed for the *Cormorant*, on official business with its Captain Gordon who had arrived in Tahiti a few days earlier: “In my mother’s presence, as she stood on the verandah, he was apprehended by a group of gendarmes and led unceremoniously through the mud and rain to a blockhouse that had been hastily prepared to house him. No reasons was given, either to my father or to Captain Gordon, to justify this arrest and no motive discovered. ‘*Inter arma silent leges.*’”

Fearing that the French authorities might seize the consulate’s archives, Mr. Pritchard had them taken aboard the *Cormorant* immediately and complained in a letter of the brutalities that the sailors would have committed on his person.

Captain Gordon, for his part, sent two protestations, written in even, measured terms; one to D’Aubigny, the other to Governor Bruat.

The former replied irritably to the commander of the *Cormorant*, saying that his business did not allow him either to think of going back on his decision or to agree to the hardly suitable terms proposed in the letter and, moreover, that he would answer only to his superiors, as their opinions were the only ones he respected. The next day, March 5th, he refused to read a second letter from Gordon.

When he returned to Papeete on March 7th, Governor Bruat took a tone that was not perceptively different from D’Aubigny’s:

Papeete, March 8th

Commander,

When I arrived yesterday, I was too busy with other things to answer your letters; nevertheless, I have been spared a moment of freedom to acknowledge the receipt of your three missives. I do not know your motives in remaining here and I do not know if you have been instructed to do so.

Upon your arrival, you declared to me that you had only to make several slight repairs and that you would be able to leave in a week.

The arrival of your ship has helped spread the rumor that English battleships would arrive to aid the rebels. I have seen all the proof and evidence of the events that have necessitated the implementation of martial law in Papeete.

I have then the honor to ask you to continue on your voyage, as I consider your presence here to be detrimental to the peace.

As for Mr. Pritchard, I have sufficient proof of his guilt and shall send it to my government, which shall then inform yours of it.

Mr. Pritchard is here only as an ordinary citizen who has been warned many times not to involve himself in any way with local affairs; however, I do not wish at all to prevent the exercise of his duties in the Caroline Islands [Dupetit-Thouars is mistaken—Pritchard was never assigned to that archipelago] and Samoa, of which you say he is Consul; therefore, the day that you are to set sail, Pritchard shall be released and you will carry him to his destination, where he will be much more useful than he is here.

Enclosed, you will find the letter you addressed to the acting commander of the Society Islands, which he has not judged appropriate to open based upon the hardly agreeable expressions contained in the one previous. I approve of Commander D'Aubigny's decision.

Captain Gordon, who had learned Mr. Miller's opinion of George Pritchard during the *Cormorant's* passage to the Sandwich Islands, fortunately managed to maintain his calm. He sensed that, even if the French authorities had acted too forcefully, Pritchard was far from blameless. In consequence, he replied on March 9th that he expected to leave in a few days and agreed to take the former Consul aboard.

Upon some reflection, Bruat realized that D'Aubigny had acted too hastily, and gave the order that George Pritchard was to be transferred to the *Meurthre* and, with much tact, addressed a letter to the English Commander in more measured tones:

Papeete, March 10, 1944

Captain,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, and also of the one you addressed to M. D'Aubigny, as well as the certified copy of Mr. Pritchard's appointment as Consul for the Society Islands and Tonga.

You have no cause for alarm on behalf of English residents; my ships and the merchant ships will offer them refuge if, unfortunately, there should be any further disturbance of the peace.

It was when I had the honor to visit you aboard your ship, not when you came to see me with Captain Hunt, that you told me you were to leave at the end of the week.

Although I do not think you spread the rumors about the approach of British ships to assist the rebels, I do, however, believe, as it is said by the Indians [Polynesians being called by this name at that time] everywhere on the island, that the arrival of your ship gave substance to these rumors and I am very glad to be convinced by your departure that your government is innocent of these maneuvers. I am even more certain of this as, besides the dispatch I received from Admiral Thomas, I have read the circular addressed by your government to the missionaries, in which it formally states that it has no right to intervene and that it will not.

It is quite deplorable, sir, that this document, which the officers of Her British Majesty must have known of, has not received the publicity they owed it as the agents of a friendly government.

Concerning Mr. Pritchard: he has remained here only in the capacity of an ordinary citizen since lowering his flag. I have a letter from him in which he perfectly understands that he has no right to enter into affairs of state. As I have received proof of him acting in opposition to what he himself wrote, it has been necessary to hold him.

He has been granted enough time to go to the only place where he can legally be Consul.

I am very glad to know that, in leaving, you consent to take Mr. Pritchard with you. However, I allow his departure under one condition: that you not permit him to disembark anywhere in the Society Islands. I beg of you to reply and confirm your agreement in this matter.

Please believe, sir, that my greatest desire is to maintain good relations between our two governments. Nothing less than the necessity of establishing the uncontested authority of His Majesty, the King of France has caused me to adopt the measures I have taken, and it is this necessity that will not allow me acquiesce to the demand [to restore Mr. Pritchard to liberty] set forth in the last paragraph of your letter to me.

Following a renewed correspondence, courteous on both sides, Bruat and Gordon agreed that an English officer would come and fetch Pritchard on the morning of the 13th, as the *Cormorant* was to weigh anchor at eleven o'clock on the same day.

But, on that very day, a sudden coolness arose between the two men.

On the day of Pritchard's arrest, Queen Pomaré had left the *Basilisk* for the *Cormorant*, and Bruat, fearing that Gordon's silence on the matter might indicate a plan to take her with him when he left, sent him a letter demanding an explanation:

Commander,

I regret that, having received my letter at half past five, you did not inform me until this morning of your departure. Before answering your letter, I wish to know as soon as possible if it is your plan to take Queen Pomaré with you. Whatever the case, if your ship anchors at Moorea, I will consider it an act of hostility and hold you responsible for any events that your presence there may occasion, as this island is currently at peace.

Did the English captain ever intend to drop Queen Pomaré off at the neighboring island of Moorea, or did Bruat's letter force him to give up any plans of that nature? There is no way to tell. What

is certain is that Gordon declared that he had no intention of taking Queen Pomaré with him, and that her planned visit to Moorea was to be brief and not likely to disturb the island's peace.

On March 13, 1844, the Queen was once more taken aboard the *Basilisk* and Pritchard aboard the *Cormorant*.

William Pritchard, in his *Polynesian Reminiscences*, writes: "Thanks to the insistence of Captain Gordon, my mother was allowed to meet my father at sea [aboard the *Cormorant*], on the condition that they were only to say their farewells, and not to make any arrangements concerning my father's property or any other matters."

Two or three of Mr. Pritchard's children went aboard the *Cormorant* with him. As for Mrs. Pritchard, she booked passage toward the end of April 1844 aboard an American brig, and arrived in Valparaiso with the rest of her family on May 31st, where she boarded a ship for England.

Captain Gordon, with admirable diplomacy, abandoned the visit to Moorea entirely in order to avoid any suspicions or complications. He went on to the Australian island of Raivavae for supplies and then continued on to Valparaiso, arriving there on April 18, 1844.

There, George Pritchard found his old friend Toup Nicholas, who was preparing to return to England and more than happy to receive the former consul aboard the *Vindictive*.

The vessel set sail on May 1st and, at the end of July, Pritchard arrived in London.

GEORGE PRITCHARD'S CAPTIVITY IN PAPEETE

The conditions under which George Pritchard endured his arrest at Papeete have been made the subject of an exposé included by his son, W. T. Pritchard, in his book, *Polynesian Reminiscences*:

The place where my father was taken, commonly referred to as a "block-house," was a building 20 feet tall and measuring about 15 by 20 feet. Instead of doors or windows, it had openings spaced about 2 feet apart—just big enough to allow for the barrel of a cannon. A floor of planking halfway up divided the building into two parts, one above and one below. A ladder gave access to the ground floor through an opening that allowed the passage of only one man at a time. The ground floor was bare, damp earth. As the building was set on the side of a hill, it practically became a mire when the torrential rains fell, as they were doing at that time. My father climbed up the ladder, which, after the last soldier had followed, was lifted and dropped into the lower level through a trap door, after which my father was ordered to descend into his lodgings. As he stepped off the last rung, he sank in mud up to his ankles. A mattress, a blanket and a bolster were the sole conveniences at his disposal.

My father asked the officer in charge to offer my mother some small reassurance by informing her of his whereabouts. But military law has no consideration for the feelings of a wife. For sixteen hours my father remained locked in his cell without food or water or any way of changing out of his wet clothes. My mother had no idea what had

become of him; for all she knew, he could have been hung or shot. After these sixteen hours, she learned of his whereabouts and immediately sent him food and clothing. The guards examined everything, even the dishes, to see if they carried a secret message from wife to husband. They gave him a small cake, a little water and a change of clothes, along with a sheet of paper bearing the signature of the Commander and these words: "A French sentinel was attacked on the night of March 2nd. In retaliation, I have arrested one George Pritchard, the sole motivator and daily instigator of the agitation among the natives. His property shall answer for all damages suffered by our establishment at the hands of the rebels and, if French blood should be spilt, each drop shall fall on his head." No sentinel had been attacked but that was no matter. Instead of urging the natives to attack the French, my father had used all of his influence to prevent such a conflict, knowing full well that if the Tahitians provoked the French to take to their battleships, France could send enough men to sink the island itself.

After this, my mother was allowed to send food at 8 o'clock in the morning and 4 o'clock in the afternoon. The moment the servant who brought the food was sighted, a soldier advanced to meet him before he could get within fifty yards of the prison in order to prevent any communication with my father. He was completely isolated; the only man who entered the cell was the soldier who passed him his food through the trap door. The third day after his arrest, my father suffered a serious bout of dysentery.

He asked that the Commander permit Dr. Johnson, our family physician, to visit him. In response, the Commander told him that he deeply regretted that the exigencies of my father's confinement permitted him to grant this request only under certain conditions, namely that Dr. Johnson present himself at the blockhouse accompanied by Latour, the interpreter; that he be let in through the top level, the trap door opened and the prisoner allowed ten minutes of conversation with him; the doctor would not be permitted to descend into the sick man's actual prison. Dr. Johnson would be allowed to speak with the prisoner at eight o'clock in the morning and at four in the afternoon each day and his medicine would be administered at those times.

As soon as Dr. Johnson saw the place where my father was imprisoned, he declared it a dungeon unfit even for a dog and requested that a French doctor be sent for. Whereupon a Mr. La Stoiqie presented himself and declared the dungeon to be a fitting and acceptable place for the prisoner! Nevertheless, Dr. Johnson went to the commander to say that an immediate change of location was absolutely necessary if my father's life was to be saved.

Meanwhile, his dysentery had become further aggravated by fever. My father was so weak that the fatigue resulting from climbing the ladder and supporting himself at its top rung to permit the doctor to take his pulse left him in such a trembling state of exhaustion that it was completely impossible for him to give an exact account of his symptoms. It was agreed that my father would be allowed to ascend to the upper level and rest there for the ten minutes allotted so that the doctor might examine him. Conversation on any subject besides those of fever or dysentery was forbidden. Medications was taken from the papers the doctor had wrapped them in and the papers minutely examined to see if any writing might bear a secret message, after which the medications were replaced.

On the 8th of the month, Dr. Johnson at last convinced the Commander that it would cost my father his life if he were to remain in the blockhouse for any longer than three days. That night, my father was awakened by a man descending the ladder with a

lantern, followed by an officer who informed him that he had received orders to transfer the prisoner aboard the frigate *La Meurtre*. In the middle of the night, a guard escorted my father from the blockhouse to the shore, where an armed boat awaited him. All conversation was whispered and the officer did not relax his tight grip on my father's arm until his prisoner was ushered onto the boat amid the bayonets of the marines.

Once aboard the frigate, my father was led to a spot on the main bridge, barricaded from all contact with the rest of the ship. It seemed a palace compared to the place from which he had just been delivered, even while in the throes of fever from the damp midnight air. In the blockhouse, in addition to the vermin and various filth, the guards would spit so much upon the floor of the upper room that saliva would fall through the planking onto my father's head and face as he sat or lay on his mattress below.

Captain Gordon of the *H.M.S. Cormorant* demanded that my father be freed. After a spirited and rather ugly exchange of letters, the Governor consented to transfer him to the *Cormorant*, as long as Captain Gordon guaranteed my father would have no contact with anyone ashore. Thanks to Captain Gordon's insistence, my mother was allowed to meet my father at sea on the condition that they were only to say their farewells, and not make any arrangements concerning my father's property or any other matters.

On the 13th of March, the *Cormorant* left Papeete and travelled well out to sea to await the arrival of a French ship. After just enough delay to try the patience of the British Captain, my father was taken aboard to see my mother and the *Cormorant* sailed for Valparaiso. Thus, the French rid themselves of my father.

W. T. Pritchard's story presents its facts in a deliberately prejudiced manner. However, it is difficult to hold this against him, as he is Pritchard's son. In reality, Commander D'Aubigny had issued the following instructions to ensure that the former British Consul be given the most humane treatment, even special privileges:

The chief of the department will treat him with courtesy and kindness. The soldiers are to perform any services necessary for him, sweep his room, make his bed and keep everything clean. The prisoner should have light from 5 o'clock in the morning to five in the evening. The light will be extinguished at the sounding of the evening guns. At eight in the morning he may receive a basket containing meat, clothes, toiletries, books and so on. At four, a second basket will be sent and the first returned. No outsiders or family members are to communicate with him. The baskets shall be examined by clerks in the presence of the acting commander. All letters addressed to the prisoner must pass through the hands and inspection of the acting commander who, after having read them and judged that they contain nothing harmful, will let them be received. If those hours set for communication with the prisoner prove suitable, they shall remain the same; if not, they may be changed. Other dispositions may be taken up with the acting commander. The sergeant on duty shall not suffer any person to approach the guardhouse; those who approach it shall be sent back. It is expressly commanded that the prison sergeant shall not permit the person in charge of the baskets to go into the interior or talk with the prisoner through the bars. A specially appointed soldier shall go to the prisoner each day at eight in the morning and four in the afternoon to hear any requests he might make regarding his treatment.

One can see that, if at first George Pritchard was severely, even rudely, treated, it was not long before he benefitted from a much more liberal authority. After five days of *carcere duro*, he was transferred aboard the *Meurtre* on Commander Bruat's orders, where he dined at the captain's table and was allowed daily visits from his family.

CHAPTER SIX

MR. MILLER, THE CONSUL GENERAL OF ENGLAND, VISITS TAHITI (AUGUST 1844)
 THE BRITISH AND FRENCH GOVERNMENTS AGREE TO SEND ADMIRALS SEYMOUR AND HAMELIN TO
 PAPEETE TO DETERMINE THE EXTENT OF THE DAMAGE SUFFERED BY GEORGE PRITCHARD DURING
 HIS ARREST AND FORCED DEPARTURE FROM THE ISLAND (1845)

George Pritchard's arrest had not been a great surprise to his superior. Shortly before the incident, Mr. Miller had informed the Foreign Office that he thought it would be prudent to appoint "a person who is calm, sensible and informed" as Consul in Tahiti.

Elsewhere, in a letter dated February 7, 1844, while informing the Governor of French Colonies in Oceania of his promotion to Consul General, Mr. Miller adds:

I have noted the correspondence between you and Captain Tucker on the subject of George Pritchard. After careful examination of the arguments which you present against the man, whom you consider to be unqualified to maintain the good relations between the local authorities and British residents that we desire, I am going to use the powers that have recently devolved upon me to designate another "gentleman" to his position as British Consul to the Society Islands, one who will, by reason of his character, know how to fulfill his duties to my satisfaction, in a manner that is both impartial and conciliating.

In another letter dated the same day, Mr. Miller addresses some words of censure to his subordinate:

I have made note of your November 25, 1843 communication to Admiral Thomas, along with the attached papers concerning the action of France in the Society Islands and the conduct you saw fit to adopt in that situation.

Regarding your attitude, I must say that, from the moment that Queen Pomaré and the principal chiefs signed the Treaty of September 9, 1842 with Admiral Dupetit-Thouars, and conferred the Protectorate of France upon the Society Islands, it must have been clear to all British residents that it was their duty to avoid any behavior that might hinder or embarrass the peaceful establishment of the new administration; to maintain perfect neutrality, until Her Majesty's Government made its decisions known.

I regret to say that, in consequence, I cannot entirely approve of the tone of your answer to the French admiral or of the terms of your protest against his actions, correspondences dated the 1st and 7th of November, respectively.

For fear that your message to the British residents, also dated November 7th, might lead them to act in a manner contrary to the wishes of the British Government—such as have been expressed to you previously in a September 25th letter from the Duke of Aberdeen—and in the interests of Queen Pomaré, I encourage you to take the first opportunity to order them to carefully abstain from any lack of respect or show of resistance to the authorities established in the islands under the Queen and from taking part directly or indirectly in arguments or differences that may arise between the French and the natives.

You will be doing greater service to the interests of the unfortunately situated Queen Pomaré by recommending that she avoid all behavior that might increase the irritation of the French and add to her own difficulties.

The Consul General seemed in no hurry to get to Papeete after the departure of George Pritchard. He did not arrive there until August 10, 1844.

Once there, Commander Bruat proved unwilling to discuss the matter of George Pritchard's arrest—which was under question by both of the governments concerned—with Mr. Miller. He restricted himself to expressing regret that the incident had occurred and pointing out that the frequent and often over-prolonged stays of British battleships in their harbor could only lead to difficulties ashore, as the English naval officers' attitudes tended to be provoking.

Gradually, the conciliatory feelings that the Consul General had demonstrated towards the French were completely reversed. Mild reports sent to the Foreign Office on the 23rd and 28th of August were followed by a September 17th catalogue of unfavorable statements regarding the French: France's grievances were unfounded; the Brothers Caret and Laval were unquestionably in violation of local laws when they landed in Tahiti; excepting the ships' officers and troops, there were no more than seven or eight Frenchman on the island; and so on.

In October, Miller left for the Îles Sous-le-Vent, which he inspected in detail, and did not fail to pay a visit to Queen Pomaré. The Consul General, who by then must have concluded his inquiry into the circumstances of George Pritchard's arrest, remained on in Tahiti for no discernible reason. Despite his feelings to the contrary, Miller maintained good relations with the French naval officers. This can be seen by his attendance of a January 7th reception given in his honor by Rear Admiral Hamelin, who had arrived from France aboard the *Virginie* on December 24, 1844.

On February 10, 1845, the *Talbot* arrived in Papeete, dispatched on the orders of Admiral Thomas, who had instructed its captain, Sir Thomas Thompson, to join Consul General Miller in his investigation of the circumstances surrounding George Pritchard's arrest. The Governor refused to let anyone come ashore, so after waiting for five days in the harbor, the *Talbot* set sail for Honolulu, this time with Mr. Miller aboard.

The French Government, though it had agreed to grant George Pritchard compensation for "damages he might have suffered under the circumstances," further specified that it would not be able to rely solely on the statements of Pritchard himself as evidence of these damages.

Lord Aberdeen and Guizot agreed to give Admirals Seymour and Hamelin, both of whom were located in the Pacific, the task of finding a basis for compensation.

Admiral Seymour arrived in Tahiti on August 11, 1845, where Admiral Hamelin had been waiting for nearly a month. The two officers began their investigation at once but were soon frustrated in their attempts by the most frustrating difficulty. In his report to the Foreign Office, dated January 8, 1846, Admiral Seymour writes: "Mr. Pritchard seemed to have kept his accounts and managed his affairs with much irregularity, and his son's being charged with the management of his commercial business over the past few months has caused his papers to fall into even worse condition." As a result, Admiral Seymour estimated that it was impossible to claim more than 11,000 francs for the material and

moral damages suffered by the former Consul to Tahiti. This was a far cry from the figure of 100,000 francs that George Pritchard had estimated.

The French Foreign Office consented to advance some of these monies to the former British Consul, to be counted toward his pending indemnity settlement, but it does not seem as if the French Government ever paid this advance, whatever sum it may have been.²⁰

We have noted above that Captain D'Aubigny had initiated the regrettable arrest of Pritchard under the influence of emotional stress caused by the uprising of the Tahitian populace. On the strength of rumors started by his enemies, to which types of campaigns the Tahitians were very sensitive, the populace was led to believe that Queen Pomaré's taking refuge aboard the *Basilisk* with her children was proof of the most fiendish designs on her person on the part of the French authority.

A military demonstration, which took place under the personal command of Governor Bruat on the southern coast of the island had somewhat quieted the discontent, and people were beginning to think that the situation was improving. But, on March 22, 1844, eight days after the former Consul had left aboard the *Cormorant*, news reached the capital that the fort of Taravao, which was in the midst of construction upon a strip of land bearing the same name, had been attacked unawares the night before by a group of about 400 rebels. Two of our compatriots were killed in the affair, while seven others were wounded.

The subsequent bombarding of Mahaena, an outflanking by the police, and the capture of densely concentrated enemy camps in April, left fifteen of our own dead, two of whom were officers, and about fifty wounded. Although the rebels had been routed from their camps, leaving behind 200 of their dead, it was not enough to completely stop the uprising. In June, two new expeditions, one against Hapape and the other against Faa, left five dead and nine wounded, and three dead and seventeen wounded, respectively. In the same month, a group of rebels who had succeeded in penetrating through Papeete's defenses set fire to the Catholic mission.

Following this period of unrest came a lull of twenty-one months, during which each side remained stationary. But, in March of 1846, taking advantage of the departure of a large contingent of troops for the Îles Sous-le-Vent, the rebels launched a sudden attack on the capital, which was subsequently repulsed.

Governor Bruat, resolving to put an end to the unrest, undertook a series of maneuvers that proved very costly. In May, a battle on the northern coast of Papenoo that successfully routed our enemies left three dead and thirteen wounded. Another one toward the end of May at Punauia, across from Moorea, resulted in even more severe losses. A battalion officer, a midshipman, and four sailors were killed while four officers and eleven men were wounded. The rebels held out long enough to flee into the mountains, where they took refuge in a point above Papeete that was practically inaccessible. It was not until December 1846 that they were dislodged, when a special column of footmen made the treacherous ascent under the guidance of a phaeton^d hunter from Rapa Island.

^d Phaetons are a type of waterfowl that live mainly in tropical areas, commonly known as "straw-tails." (Larousse)

This time, the rebellion was finally quelled. We have only traced its general outlines here, to show the grave consequences of the plots against France in Oceania.

Unfortunate as it is to say, there can be no doubt that a great part of the responsibility for these events lies with George Pritchard. In his short book, *Queen Pomaré and Her Country*, Pritchard rightly observes that “no blow had been struck before she was expelled,” but forgets to mention that his counsel of resistance to the French authorities is what caused the natives to revolt. Of course, the former British Consul could not have foreseen that the motley resistance he led against us would end in a bloody and drawn-out conflict. But, given the situation, this conflict was practically inevitable and could only prove fatal to the natives whose armies could never have succeeded in defeating our own.

Additionally, the fact of Britain’s refusing to take possession of the Society Islands or even establish it as a protectorate should have convinced George Pritchard to stop his stubborn pursuit of a policy his government could not and would not fail to disavow. When Lord Aberdeen was apprised of the events preceding Pritchard’s arrest, not only did he do nothing regarding the English Cabinet’s proposition to send Pritchard back to Tahiti, he also reduced the man’s consular duties to the Samoan Islands.

CHAPTER SEVEN
PRITCHARD IN THE SAMOAN ISLANDS (1845-1856)
PRITCHARD IN ENGLAND (1856-1883)

George Pritchard was very surprised when he presented himself at the Foreign Office at the beginning of August 1844 and learned that, even before the incidents in Tahiti that March, of which he had been the main actor, the Minister of Foreign Affairs had decided to remove him from the island.

He did, however, find the British Government very eager for him to hasten to his new post. A group going by the name of the “Holies” had become very powerful in the United Kingdom at that time, and was using his presence in England to gain more support for its campaign against France, and thus creating a formidable obstacle to Lord Aberdeen’s hopes of conciliation between the two nations. Consequently, Pritchard received orders to sail for the Samoan Islands as soon as possible.

We have not been able to learn the exact date of his departure. We know that he passed through Barbados on February 8, 1845 and awaited new passage in Peru. On June 2nd, when Admiral Hamelin arrived with the *Virginie*, the *Heroine* and the *Triumphant*, Pritchard was still there. Admiral Seymour, also there, made an attempt to collect from the Admiral the compensation that the French Government had promised Pritchard. But, Admiral Hamelin refused him, since he lacked any documents relative to this claim. Admiral Hamelin also told Admiral Seymour that the *Daphne*, on which Pritchard was to sail, would make a short stop at Moorea to land a purser of the English Navy destined for the *Salamander*, then stationed in the Society Islands, and that any knowledge of Pritchard’s presence could lead to troublesome consequences. Admiral Seymour assured Admiral Hamelin that Pritchard’s presence aboard the *Daphne* would be kept a secret during their stop at Moorea.

This promise was faithfully kept. At the end of July 1845, George Pritchard arrived at Apia, accompanied by his wife and children—all except William, who remained in England to complete his studies.

“The unfortunate British Consul was landed from the *Daphne* in the most undignified manner,” writes Mr. Lucett, a merchant who had lived in the Pacific for many years, in his book, *Rovings in the Pacific*:²¹

Firstly, he was sent ashore in a dinghy piloted by two native boys. Then, he was painfully occupied with the task of moving his goods and landing the boat himself. When he had left the *Daphne*, he had been informed that the commander of the ship had ordered Pritchard to be saluted with a salvo from their guns, heralding the arrival of a consul. He received the salute, which was his only presentation to the native chiefs and the only ceremony given his installation as a representative of British authority. Mr. Pritchard was not at first able to secure a roof over his head, or a plot of land on which to build one and, had it not been for the several months of hospitality he received from his American counterpart, he would have suffered some very difficult times.

In fact, the Consul had to await the arrival of the *Dido* in January 1848 before being presented to the native chiefs by its Commander Maxwell.

Lucett, when he visited Samoa, found Pritchard in a sorry state of health: “Mr. Pritchard is like a fish out of water, the moral suffering he has undergone has profoundly affected him; he is thin as a rail, his face has paled and furrowed with wrinkles deep enough to put a finger into... he is like an autumn tree suddenly attacked by frost.”

It would be understandable to ask if Lucett was not exaggerating slightly. That Pritchard had suffered from his failure at Tahiti and the collapse of a dream he cherished for twenty years is only natural, but did his bitter disillusionment have the result described by Mr. Lucett (who had, incidentally, a very antagonistic view of France)? It is unlikely, and these imaginative similes can only serve to make us smile.

The Samoan Islands are comprised of three principal islands: Savaii, Upolu and Tutuila, along with several others of less importance. Discovered on May 3, 1768 by our fellow Frenchman, Bougainville, the islands were the site of the massacre of Captain Fleuriot de Langle and some of his companions.²² The famous English navigator, Captain Cook, and after him the Russian Admiral Kotzebue, both visited the islands, but after Kotzebue the islands saw European ships only when they passed by accident, so much did sailors fear the natives' ferocity.

It was only in 1830 that John Williams²³ made the first attempt to bring Christianity to the islands. Considering Samoa's terrible reputation, the missionary must have been tremendously courageous to land there. However, to his great surprise he was “received with open arms by the chiefs and the populace” and he was able to bring several Polynesian catechists and their families ashore.

John Williams returned to Samoa in October 1832. While he previously had only visited Savaii and Upolu, this time he saw a greater number of its islands, most notably Tutuila. There, his schooner was met by another boat bearing an Englishman named William Gray, who told the new arrival that he had been living on the island for three years and provided him with much valuable information. No European missionaries were assigned to the islands until the following year.

Samoa was far from unknown to George Pritchard. Not only was it placed under his jurisdiction by the same 1837 act that had invested him with the title of British Consul in Papeete, but he had also visited the islands in 1839 aboard the brig the *Camden*. After his voyage, he had urged his government to appoint a vice-consul or even a consul to the archipelago, who would have jurisdiction over both Samoa and Tonga. He felt that should be a British representative present to maintain order among the European adventurers who were settling on the islands. On Upolu alone he had found 150. At Manua, he counted eight. On another island he found fifteen deserters from the London ship, *Achilles*. George Pritchard suggested a certain William Cunningham for the post, a man who had settled in Samoa after living for several years in the Cook Islands.

The date of this suggestion is not known, but it was some time before 1841, when we first find evidence that Pritchard's suggestion had been carried out. On August 21st of the same year, while Pritchard was in England, Paraita, the Tahitian Regent, addresses Cunningham as the Consul of Samoa in a letter complaining of French activity in the Society Islands.

Despite all the efforts of the English missionaries and native catechists, and after fifteen years of Christianization, the Samoan people remained quite savage. Though John Williams claims that they were never given to cannibalism, it seems more likely that they only renounced this barbaric practice by 1830. The Tahitians, on the other hand, had already abandoned cannibalism a long time before Wallis discovered their island in 1767.

Whatever the case may be, when George Pritchard came to Samoa as British Consul the natives were still mostly pagan and continued to war amongst themselves in the most ferocious manner. Three years later when his son, W.T. Pritchard, returned from England, he witnessed a scene that he set down in *Polynesian Reminiscences*, which we think interesting enough to reproduce here in order to give an idea of the impression the natives made on a newcomer:

Guided by moonlight shining in a cloudless sky, we heard the monotonous sounds of conch shells and the dry report of musketry, mingled with the sharp yells and raucous cries of the natives. At dawn, as we approached the harbor, we asked for the cause of the commotion. The pilot related it to us in detail; during the night, a group of warriors had attacked a village and a battle had followed. As we skirted the reef and approached the harbor, we saw at some distance a group of eighteen canoes coming in from the east, their sails billowing by the rise of the trade winds—to me, a very novel and pretty sight. Shortly after we dropped anchor, the canoes circled the sheltered part of the harbor. At the prow of each vessel stood a warrior, dark face and oiled body gleaming in the morning sun. They shouted as they flourished their clubs over their heads, dancing, jumping and making the most extraordinary bodily contortions. At the feet of each lay the head of a man he had killed, and each courageous warrior added to the tales of his prowess and daring the genealogy of the enemy whose head he brandished as a trophy. The canoes, each powered by about a dozen paddles, moved slowly around the harbor and among the ships, exhibiting their bloody prizes to the crowd of natives gathered on the beach as well as to the astonished troops clustered on the bridge of the ship.

The colony of Europeans on the island was composed of members of the Catholic and Protestant missions, the latter founded in 1845 by several merchants and a strong group of more or less educated adventurers.

The salary of 300 pounds a year allotted to Pritchard by the British Government was not enough for him to live on and raise his large family, so he made use of his ability to enter into commerce.

His consular duties left him with a great deal of leisure time. British ships rarely landed at Samoa and, lacking any powers for enforcement, his American colleague and himself had only the feeblest authority over the people in their jurisdiction, people who were, for the most part, difficult to live with and frequently in conflict with the native chiefs.

From time to time, it was nevertheless necessary to attempt to settle differences between the Europeans and the natives, or to obtain respect from the local chiefs for the persons and property of the former; these interventions were often dangerous on account of the natives' duplicity and cruelty.

Relations with the captains and sailors of visiting ships were only barely amicable. M. T. Troud, who was later to become the British Vice-Consul in Samoa, gives an example of this in his book, *Island Memories*:

The Old Gentleman [George Pritchard] was obliged on one occasion to demonstrate his authority to the captain of a whaling vessel anchored in the harbor when the man, over the course of his visit to the Consul's office, acted very crudely, calling George Pritchard an "old blockhead" or some other epithet of that nature, and adding that he was glad the Consul was in uniform, otherwise he would have cudged him.

Pritchard, who had learned the art of boxing when he was a young man before his "conversion," immediately took off his coat and, in spite of having not exercised in many years, administered to the astonished skipper a thrashing such as the old sea dog, himself an excellent boxer, had probably never undergone before.

George Pritchard himself was not able to escape personal difficulties with the natives. A few of the horses and mares that he had introduced to the islands damaged crops and frightened the local children, who had never before seen the animals. A few of the animals were killed by some local youths, leading to complaints from the Consul and demands for the reparation of damages.

Perhaps George Pritchard's manner was not one that facilitated his relations with others. It is a fact remarked upon by Captain Blake, commander of the *Juno*, a ship that came to Samoa in 1847 to investigate the damages suffered by British subjects at the hands of the natives, that Pritchard was tyrannical and sometimes violent towards the latter. Even Blake himself could not avoid a dispute with the Consul.

It was in December 1856 that George Pritchard, entrusting his affairs to his son William, left Samoa for England. He was never to return to the Pacific again.

Pritchard was named a district agent of the London Missionary Society in 1865, his territory covering Scotland and Ireland. He held this post until 1872, when he was made director of the mission school at Blackheath. In June 1877, he finally retired. There are no notable facts that mark this period of his life.

George Pritchard died at Hove, near Brighton, on May 6, 1883, at the age of eighty-six years and nine months.²⁴

The deceased, who had been attended during his last moments by his daughter, Elizabeth (then Mrs. Randall) was buried in the cemetery at Hove on May 12, 1883.²⁵

Following the death of his first wife on November 4, 1871 in Glasgow, he had remarried one Miss Charlotte Anne Nichols, a native of the Isle of Wight. Born on March 21, 1828, the second Mrs. Pritchard, who had retired to Kackacy near London, died on June 29, 1901 and was buried at Hove in the same tomb as her husband.

APPENDIX I
THE WORKS OF GEORGE PRITCHARD

George Pritchard published two books; one entitled *The Missionary's Reward, or the Success of the Gospel in the South Seas* (one volume, illustrated by John Snow, Edit London, 1844), the other, *Queen Pomaré and Her Country* (one short volume, 96 pages, Elliot Stock, Edited 62 Paternoster Row /F. C. / S. d. 1878, Preface by Rev. Dr. Allen).

The first is a small book of 210 pages. It is a work written purely for religious edification, containing no allusions to political events in Tahiti. The author of the "Preface" mentions these incidents only briefly.

The second book, *Queen Pomaré and Her Country* was written after the death of the Queen, "to satisfy a wish expressed by various friends of the latter." A brief biography of Pomaré Vahiné, the work reports on the incidents occurring in Tahiti from 1838 to 1844 with a marked restraint.

Besides these, George Pritchard left a collection of unedited memoirs and manuscript notes, which remain in his descendants' possession.

Mrs. Darlaston has sent us a typed copy of a work drawn up by her grandfather, which has never before been printed. The work consists of 272 pages, followed by a nineteen-page index of references, all single-spaced. It is divided into seven chapters and bears the title: *The Aggressions of the French at Tahiti and Other Islands of the Pacific, by George Pritchard, the Britannic Majestic Consul to the Georgian, Society, Samoan and Friendly Islands*

APPENDIX II
GEORGE PRITCHARD'S DESCENDANTS

George Pritchard had nine children by his first wife, Eliza Aillen; five sons and four daughters, all born in Tahiti.

I. The eldest son, ALLEN GEORGE PRITCHARD, born October 1, 1825, settled as a merchant in Samoa, where his father had opened a store to augment the meager salary given him by the British Government. He died there in 1895.

Around the year 1850, he married Adelina Baker, the daughter of one of Pritchard's compatriots and a native woman. From this marriage were born five children. Two sons, George, born July 1851; and John, born January 1, 1859, who died a bachelor at a young age. A third son, William Frank Pritchard, born in New Zealand on December 12, 1865, returned to live in Samoa, where he married a native woman by whom he had three sons and three daughters. Their descendants live near Apia. His fourth son, also born in New Zealand, had by his Samoan wife three sons and two daughters who currently live in Tutuila, aside from a married daughter on the island of Savaii. Lastly, his daughter, Eliza Sarah, born on November 25, 1852, married a Mr. Campbell and settled in Auckland, where their descendants live to this day.

By a second wife, whose name is unknown to us, Allen G. Pritchard had a son whose children live in Upolu.

II. ELIZA SARAH, born in 1827, married the Rev. Joseph Taylor, a missionary in India. Three sons were born of this marriage; Joseph and George, themselves missionaries in India, and Birdwood van Someren Taylor, a missionary in China.

III. WILLIAM THOMAS PRITCHARD, born in Tahiti in 1829,^c lived on the island until he was ten years old. Sent to school in England, he showed a pugnacious nature at an early age, writing a long letter to Viscount Palmerston when he was seventeen to elucidate the situation in which the British subjects in Tahiti found themselves and also to submit a plan for the defense of the Tahitian people and their queen against the French.

Young Pritchard was not charged with the mission that he proposed for the Pacific. However, his letter produced quite an effect on the English Government. It may be seen as one of the reasons that caused the London Cabinet to force Paris to admit the neutrality of the Îles Sous-le-Vent, formalized in the Convention of June 19, 1847.

In 1848, W. T. Pritchard returned to his family in Samoa, where they had lived for the past three years, but his adventurous spirit soon spurred him to seek his fortune in California, where the ongoing gold rush was attracting young men from all around the world. Finding only disappointment there, he returned to Samoa, where he established himself as a planter and merchant. Desiring to enlarge his business, he attempted to organize a commercial liaison with the neighboring archipelagos. Commodore Erskine, of the *Havannah*, encountered him in New Hebrides in September 1851, in the company of two Europeans and two natives.

^c The death certificate of W. T. Pritchard says that he died on November 11, 1907, at the age of seventy-eight. He was therefore born in 1829, after the month of August. In fact, the Rev. Steward, chaplain of the American battleship *Vincennes*, who visited the Pritchard household in Papeete on August 19, 1829, noted the presence of only two children at that time (Steward. *A Visit to the South Seas*. Edit. abridged, p.247)

In December 1856, his father, who was returning to England, made him temporary British Consul to Samoa, later obtaining for him the newly created post of Consul to Fiji.²⁶ Though his certificate is dated September 28, 1857, W.T. Pritchard could not take up his post until the following year. On November 3, 1858, he left without authorization for England, leaving the consulate in the hands of a certain M. R. S. Swanston. At Sydney, he boarded the steamer *Australian*, landed at Suez, travelled to Alexandria by land, went to Malta, then to Marseilles. After crossing France, he at last arrived in London.

Her British Majesty's representative had left his job so impulsively because he believed that the moment had come for England to take possession of the archipelago and that his physical presence in London would prove more useful than even the best of reports.

A few recent events had convinced him that the United States would soon take possession of Fiji. The American Consul, John B. Williams, had hurried to Captain Magruder when he passed on an American battleship, with a request for an indemnity of 5,001 dollars and 38 cents; the value of the merchandise and possessions stolen by natives when his house burned down on July 4, 1849. Before he sailed on, the American captain was obliged to appoint a commission composed of the Rev. John Calvert and Mr. David Whippy, Vice-Agent for the United States, to make an investigation and to hand over a report.

Two years later, the village of Levuka, where John B. Williams and several other Europeans lived, was burned to the ground under circumstances that remain a mystery. The American Consul did not hesitate to hold the native chief Thakombau responsible, who in turn refused to make good his losses.

It was not until September 1855 that an American battleship reappeared in the archipelago, the *John Adams*, followed a month later by the *Saint Mary*, which had been transferred to the command of one Captain Bailey.

The commander of the *Saint Mary*, Captain Boutwell, made threats, but his colleague, who was his superior in rank, advised him to restrain himself until after the investigation. A committee composed of two officers from the *John Adams* met aboard the ship and determined the amount of the indemnity to be met by Thakombau to consist of 45,000 dollars.

The native chief, who was incapable of paying such a sum, had not yet settled his debt by the 1858 arrival of W. T. Pritchard. It was not discharged until 1870, when it was paid by the Polynesian Co. Ltd., Melbourne and Fiji in exchange for certain advantages conceded by Thakombau.

The British missionaries²⁷ shared Pritchard's fear that the eventual arrival of an American battleship might deprive England of a beneficial possession. Pritchard put pressure upon Thakombau, who consented to yield his sovereign rights in return for the payment of his \$45,000 debt to the United States and the right to maintain his power. He also consented to cede 200,000 acres of land to Queen Victoria.

Pritchard presented still other points in favor of annexation; Fiji would prove to be of real importance commercially and politically. The archipelago, he declared, was situated on the grand route between Australia and Panama and, with its spacious harbors, would be capable of sheltering an imposing fleet and serve as a base of operations for the naval strength of any foreign powers against England in the South Seas or Australia. The project of creating a line of navigation for steamships would increase the advantage of having the Fiji Islands.^f

^f K. L. P. Martin, *Missionaries and Annexation in the Pacific*. London, Humphrey Milford 1924, p.49-50.

Lastly, Pritchard alluded to the ambitions of Germany, which were beginning to manifest themselves in that part of the world.

The Foreign Office received him rather coolly. It reproached him, with good reason, for having left his post without permission. Also, under pressure from public opinion, which still viewed colonial expansion as a source of expense without appreciable return, the Ministry was not in favor of new acquisitions overseas. The Foreign Minister maintained a prudent reserve, despite the favorable opinion of the Admiralty, and the wishes of the Manchester Association of Raw Materials, to whom W. T. Pritchard had sent some beautiful samples of cotton. The Consul was advised to return home. He sailed for Sydney in July 1859, where he boarded the battleship *Cordelia*. By the first of November, he was once more at his post.

The following month, Colonel Smythe was charged with surveying Fiji, but difficulties in communication kept him from arriving at the island until July 1860.

In the meantime, Pritchard had not been idle. With a tenacity and stubbornness rivaling that of his father in Tahiti, he attempted to force the hand of the British Government. He orchestrated the meeting of a council of twenty-one chiefs on December 14, 1859, where they renewed their previous offer to yield the sovereignty. On December 15th, Pritchard signed what he named “a general treaty signed by the twenty-one chiefs and myself.” Complete jurisdiction over all British subjects was ceded to Queen Victoria; all contracts, adding up to no more than 500 pounds sterling, made between British subjects and natives, were valid only if a copy of the contract had been formally submitted to the consular archives and examined before a tribunal convened by the Consul.

W. T. Pritchard, made further preparations for British annexation. On December 31st, he wrote an account of the meeting that had taken place on the 14th, in which the chiefs had unanimously requested him to assume emergency directorship of their political and commercial transactions. In fact, Pritchard became the veritable ruler of the archipelago. “We hereby delegate,” read the document signed at the aforementioned conference:

...cede and remit to Thomas William Pritchard, who shall be fully invested with all supreme rights without reserve, authority and power to govern Fiji in conformance with the general and natural principles of justice and humanity; to make, to direct and to decree all the laws and regulations which he might deem necessary, adequate and opportune to this effect; to convoke, to summon and to unite us and our chiefs, one and all, separately or together, to appear and present ourselves at his office.

The act was to remain valid until Britain gave its answer to the offer of sovereignty.

Smythe signed his report on May 1, 1861. Martin summarizes Smythe’s conclusions in the following excerpt:

As a whole, he rejected Pritchard’s conclusions. Firstly, Thakombau, as the most influential chief in the Fiji Islands, already had the right to claim the title of *Tui Viti*, or the King of the Fijis, and secondly, he could not, as they were not in his possession, transfer 200,000 acres of land to Her Majesty. Lastly, the direct line from Sydney to Panama did not touch Fiji but passed to the south of the whole of the Pacific Islands. Few naval advantages stood to be gained from the possession of Fiji and serious difficulties could be predicted in the raising of cotton there. Smythe concluded with the suggestion that the British Government not accept the offer of sovereignty over Fiji but that they reinforce

the power of the Consul over those in his jurisdiction, a population composed mainly of deserters, and give him the means of securing their persons in the case of necessity.^g

Failure did not discourage W. T. Pritchard. At his insistence, and under the pressure of opinion in Australia and the rapidly growing numbers of British settlers in the region, measures were taken in London. The authorities in England decided to send a commission composed of Lt. Col. Kempt at the head, Messrs. Rolleston and Isaacs, along with a secretary, Mr. Norton. It set sail for Sydney on June 16, 1862, on the corvette *Miranda*, headed to Fiji. Its operation was surprisingly brief. On July 11th, two weeks after its arrival, Chief Thakombau was officially notified aboard the *Miranda* that England refused to accept the transfer of the archipelago. Shortly afterward, the British Government notified W. T. Pritchard that it would withdraw his commission as Consul.

In his book, *Polynesian Reminiscences*, W. T. Pritchard accuses his superiors of failing to give him proper instructions. He had believed he was doing well in acting as he had. Perhaps the first time, but certainly not after his return in 1859. During his stay in London, he had been in direct contact with the Foreign Office and he knew exactly how to conduct himself in the role which he was to play in Fiji, yet he cleverly obscures the fact of his retirement by telling a few amusing stories in which he humorously shows the small amount of attention that the Foreign Office accorded to the distant regions where he lived.

Despite all this, he speaks truthfully when he accuses the Wesleyan missionaries of conspiring against his plans for Fiji. He gives two reasons for the hostility of the preachers. The first seems rather secondary; he was being reproved for saying that Catholic missions would have the same consideration as Protestant missions, and in particular that they would have the right to teach their doctrines. If W. T. Pritchard were to say that a Catholic had as much right as anyone to his own opinions and to express them freely, a pastor would have cried out: "You say that! You, whose father's treatment in Tahiti is known by everyone!" To which Pritchard would answer by asserting his liberal opinions and the excellent relations, both official and private, that he had always maintained with officers of the French Navy and Catholic missionaries wherever in the Pacific he happened to meet them.

It is very likely that the Wesleyans opposed Pritchard for the first reason that he posited. However, it seemed to him that disagreement on that matter would not suffice as reason enough for the British to throw away, on two occasions, the chance to take easy possession of the Fiji Islands.

The second motive he gives is more serious. Pritchard admits to having thoughtlessly repeated to the preachers a remark made by the Duke of Newcastle: "[If Fiji were annexed] What will the Wesleyan missionaries do when they see a Bishop [Anglican] accompanying the Governor? For the Church always goes where the State does." This would have caused an immediate reversal in their tolerance of annexation in Fiji and the missionaries possessed a great influence in the leading circles of London, and were in a position to make them act in accordance with their plans.

It is not impossible that the missionaries, seeing the danger of an American intervention—which was delayed on account of the Civil War—had preferred the *status quo ante* to English intervention in the islands. Whatever shape it took, this intervention could only diminish their freedom of action and lessen their influence over the natives.

The annexation of Fiji was, nevertheless, inevitable. However, our current project does not concern a review of the succession of events that led to it in 1874.

When annexation finally was proclaimed, W. T. Pritchard had been absent from the islands for almost twelve years. Having no desire to stay on after his consular commission was rescinded, he sent his two daughters from his first marriage to a Samoan woman, accompanied by one of his sisters, Mary

^g Martin, *Op. cit.*, p.58.

Greenwood, who was living with him, aboard the schooner *Anita*. Pritchard and his second wife left on February 13th aboard the *Chettah*, leaving the consulate in the temporary care of Mr. Owen, an English merchant.

When he arrived at Lifuka, the principal island of the Hapai cluster in the Tongan archipelago, where the *Anita* was supposed to have arrived before him, W. T. Pritchard learned that there had been no news of the ship. Mr. Unshelm, a friend of his, put a schooner called the *Kehrwieder* at his disposal, and Pritchard immediately undertook a search. At Mangaone, Pritchard found the *Anita* stranded upon the reefs; her mast gone, full of water, cargo still aboard. A three-month search of the neighboring islands proved fruitless.

Having lost all hope of finding his sister and children, W. T. Pritchard decided to continue his voyage to Europe. He and his wife left from Samoa in August aboard the *Cesar Godeffroy*, which landed them in Cornwall the following November.

After some time in England, W. T. Pritchard sailed for Mexico.

Dr. Seeman, an intimate friend, declares in his preface to *Polynesian Reminiscences* that the English Consul was the victim of his country's ingratitude:

During my stay in those islands, I have had frequent occasion to note the tact, zeal and activity that Mr. Pritchard brought to his official position; how he daily spared no trouble for the good of the white settlers who solicited his help or made appeals to his love of justice and how he passed his nights writing his letters or in translating documents so that no obstacle could arise to trouble his work the following day. He was the first to draw up a Code of Laws for a group of 200 islands deprived of all legislation and these Laws were so admirably adapted to the primitive conditions of the society in Fiji that every sensible man submitted to them with full accord. A copy of this code exists in the library of the British Museum.²⁸

“Mr. Pritchard,” concludes Dr. Seeman, “was certainly the right man in the right place. It is painful to note that his tact, zeal and activity came to nothing and that a coterie formed against him was powerful enough and lasted long enough to bring about his recall.”²⁹

W. T. Pritchard seems to have led an obscure life in Mexico, where he combined the professions of insurance agent and journalist. He died on November 1, 1907 at the age of seventy-eight and was buried in the English cemetery in Tlaxpana.³⁰

Through his second marriage to Ellen Fanny Glower, W. T. Pritchard had two sons, William Berthold Seeman Pritchard, a captain abroad and Arthur William Pritchard, an insurance agent presently living in Southampton.

IV. ALEXANDER BRADFORD PRITCHARD, born in 1831. He lived in Brisbane, where he married a local girl. His descendants live there today; Alexander Hobson, Eliza Emily, George Henry, Sydney, Arthur, Walter, and Ethel.

V. MARTHA JOHANNA PRITCHARD, born 1832. Married to Mr. James Pattison of Birmingham, by whom she had twelve children: Jane (Mrs. Parsons), Frederick, Elizabeth (Mrs. Fidgin), William, George, Amy (Mrs. Barker), Fanny, Lasinia (Mrs. Beaseley), Minnie (Mrs. Petrie), Emily (Mrs. Cockford), Arthur and Grace (Mrs. Lilley).

VI. ELISABETH CHARLOTTE PRITCHARD, born 1834, was married in 1867 to Mr. John Randall of Birmingham. She had two daughters, Edith Mary (Mrs. Darlaston) and Ada Lillian. It is Elizabeth Randall who was present during George Pritchard's last moments.

VII. JAMES BERNARD PRITCHARD, born 1835. No information regarding him has been collected. His trail disappears in Australia around the year 1869.

VIII. MARY GREENWOOD PRITCHARD, born 1837. She went with her brother to Fiji. Departing in 1863, she was shipwrecked along with W. T. Pritchard's two daughters from his first marriage.

IX. EMILY SPENCER PRITCHARD, born 1839. She married M. T. Langlands of Melbourne. Her daughter, Eliza Janet Langlands (Mrs. Howe), lives in Birmingham.

NOTES FROM THE TEXT

¹ Consecutive riots against the 1815 law on corn; agitation of the Spencean Philanthropists, 1816; the “Blanketeers” of Manchester’s march on London, 1816; the Pentrich Revolution, 1817; violent repression of the Manchester Protests, 1819; the Cato Street Conspiracy, 1820.

² A. Siegfried. E. G. Wakefield. Paris 1904 — O’Connor, Irma. *Edward Gibbon Wakefield*. — London, Selwyn and Blount, 1929. — Harrop, J. A., M.A. Ph. D. *The Amazing Career of Edw. Gibbon Wakefield* — London Allen and Unwin, 1928.

³ Lord John Russel. *Recollections and Suggestions* (1875), page 203. Cited by Professor Scott in *Terre Napoléon*, vol. 1 “1910 and 1911”, p. 277.

⁴ The Congregational Church was founded in the second half of the sixteenth century under the reign of Queen Elizabeth (1558-1603). Today, it consists of about a million members in England, Scotland, and Ireland.

⁵ The archives of the London Missionary Society mention, in a log dated April 19, 1824, the name of a Miss Miller, described as “the intended wife of Mr. Pritchard.” Maybe this woman was frightened of leaving for a faraway land, and this induced the new pastor to choose a different companion.

⁶ R. Lovett. *The History of the London Missionary Society (1795-1895)*, vol. 2

⁷ George Whitefield (1714-1770), was at first an associate of John Wesley. He broke with him in 1741.

⁸ Charles Wesley (1708-1788) and John Wesley (1703-1791); the latter founded the Methodist Church.

⁹ In actuality, the *Duff* only carried four ordained pastors, the others were nothing but simple catechists who were all members of the working class.

¹⁰ M. K. L. P. Martin, in his book *Missionaries and Annexation in the Pacific*, writes that he does not believe the missionaries were always opposed to the trafficking of arms and munitions. He even accuses them of having served as intermediaries in these transactions.

¹¹ *The Bounty* was sent to Tahiti by the English Government to gather breadfruit trees and transport them to the West Indies, where the plants were unknown. By reason of various circumstances, the ship had to spend several months in one of the island’s harbors. A few days before it was to return to sea, her crew mutinied at the instigation of its first mate, a man named Christian; he had Captain Bligh, along with eighteen men who remained loyal to him, set afloat in a small boat and returned to Tahiti, intending to settle there. But, not feeling safe there, most of the mutineers set off with some indigent women and took refuge on the isolated island of Pitcairn. For many years no one knew what had become of them.

The last living mutineer, Adams, had become the patriarch of the small colony, in which he kept order and piety. After his death at the beginning of 1830, the inhabitants of Pitcairn were urged by Captain Beechey, commander of the battleship *Blossom*, to leave Pitcairn. They eventually agreed.

Captain Bligh managed to conduct his frail vessel and his passengers to Timor and returned to England via Jakarta.

The mutiny of *The Bounty* generated quite a body of literature. One can find a list of works published on the subject in the second edition of our *Essay on the Bibliography of the Pacific* and in the book that Professor Mackaness of the University of Sydney (N. S. W.) has dedicated to Admiral Bligh. We will confine ourselves here to noting only those works that have been translated or written in French:

Bligh. *Narration of the Removal from the Ship The Bounty, belonging to the King of England and commanded by G. Bligh, including the subsequent voyage of this officer and some of his crew; from Tonga, in the South Seas, to Timor, in the Spice Islands*. Translated by D. Lescallier, Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1790.

Bligh. *Voyage to the South Seas, undertaken to introduce the breadfruit tree to the West Indies, by Lieutenant Bligh, with an account of the revolt aboard his ship*. Translated by L. Soules. Paris, Garnery, Buisson, Desenne, 1792.

Dorsenne, Jean. *The Rebellions of the "Bounty"*. 1 vol., 256 p. French Edition, 1936.

Hall, J. N. and Nordhoff. *The Mutineers of the "Bounty"*. Translated from the English for the *Nouvelle Revue Critique*, Paris 1935.

Hennequin. *The Rebellion of the English Ship. The Colony of the Rebels*. 1835.

Jaccoliot. *The Crime of Pitcairn*. Paris, Maurice Dreyfous, 1878.

Soulié de Morant. *The Rebel Crew*. Paris, Marpon, 1928.

Vidil, C. *History of the Sailors of the "Bounty" and Pitcairn Island*. Historical collection. Paris, 1932.

¹² Captain Charlton was named British Consul to the Pacific with a residence in Honolulu in 1824. He made a rather long sojourn to Tahiti in 1826 in order to settle several affairs and, in leaving, designated a certain Mr. Elley to occupy the post of Vice-Consul in Papeete, but Mr. Elley resigned in 1827 when he left for Huahine in the Îles Sous-le-Vent.

Charlton made a second trip to Tahiti in 1834.

¹³ The British residents of Tahiti to Lord Melbourne.

Tahiti, February 25, 1836

My Lord,

We, the undersigned, subjects of His Majesty the King of Great Britain and Ireland, residents of the islands Tahiti and Moorea, take the liberty to address Your Lordship in consequence of the recent arrival and reception of a consul from the United States of America, which has occasioned a special meeting of the Queen, Governors and Chiefs for the purpose of considering the expediency of requesting His Majesty's Government to lay before the King the prayer that His Majesty will be graciously pleased to appoint a consul for this island and dependencies.

We beg leave to represent to Your Lordship that since the departure of Captain Charlton from Tahiti, the Rev. George Pritchard was been acting here in the capacity of British consular agent, without fees or emolument, and that he has already expended a considerable sum for the relief of British Seamen in distress, which sum is still due to him; and that nevertheless he is ever ready to relieve those of his Majesty's subjects who may need his assistance and personal exertions. It was the hope of all the most respectable white residents in this island that the appointment of Mr. Pritchard as consular agent would soon be followed by an official nomination, but the hope has hitherto been disappointed, and we daily feel the want of that protecting authority which he needs to give weight to his acts. The lives and property of British subjects now partly protected by the good feeling of the natives may from one moment to the other be endangered by runaway seamen and other bad characters; and it is our opinion that British ships are

forsaking these islands in consequence of the want of efficient protection and consular assistance.

From his thorough knowledge of the Tahitian language, Mr. Pritchard is particularly qualified to treat with the natives; from his active habits he has ever shewn himself a most zealous agent, from his great influence with the Queen and local government, and with the people in general, and possessing their confidence in a singular degree, he is always appealed to by the white residents in cases of necessity and all feel unqualified confidence in him.

In praying that Mr. Pritchard may be clothed with official authority to act in his consular capacity we do not conceive that his being a missionary disqualifies him for the nomination, being aware that a great number of distinguished clergymen act as magistrates in England and that he has gratuitously fulfilled the duties of Consul for these last two years, without in the slightest degree neglecting any of the arduous duties of a teacher and minister. Father of a large and young family, he can ill afford the pecuniary advances which he is, from time to time, compelled to make to distressed British seamen nor can he better afford the hospitalities which are ever expected from public functionaries in foreign ports, and which notwithstanding his scanty means, he cheerfully offers.

In conclusion, we beg leave to observe to Your Lordship that there are often cases of contention between British subjects which require official intervention which will not admit of the long delay of an application to His Majesty's Consul resident at the Sandwich Islands, who has only been at these islands once during the last ten years (and then on a special account) in His Majesty's ship *Challenger* and as there is now an American Consul here and not a regularly authorized British Consul present we cannot expect the interests of British subjects to be duly represented in case of a difference between British and Americans, which are so many more reasons for our unanimously seconding the prayer of the Queen and chiefs in recommending Mr. Pritchard who has ever been to us a zealous and equitable advocate and a gentleman deserving in all respects the consideration of this community.

[Followed by twenty-four signatures]

¹⁴ *The Beagle*, carrying a scientific mission to which Darwin belonged, was sent to Tahiti at the end of its mission to settle an incident concerning the sacking of *The Truro*, a British merchant ship. It was Pritchard who was given the indemnity accorded by Queen Pomaré to deliver to the complainant.

¹⁵ According to a January 15, 1838 report made by J. A. Moerenhout to the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Washington; the *Imogene*, after having passed Cape Horn and stopped in Valparaiso, then in the Sandwich Islands, arrived in Papeete on November 13, 1837.

Moerenhout used the occasion to tell the government he represented that it would be in their interest, from time to time, to send a battleship on site for the reasons of the increase of American interests and the necessity of bringing the unruly crews of whaling ships to their senses.

¹⁶ Though the use of money spread rather rapidly, the small amount that had been introduced to Tahiti quickly became insufficient for regular needs. Marc Wilks defended George Pritchard from the accusation that he brought with him 2,500 pounds sterling in copper pieces with the view to put all the silver currency he found on the island into his own coffers, and to later refuse to put them back into circulation. According to Wilks, Pritchard only brought with him the equivalent of 20 pounds sterling in "sous." After the establishment of their Protectorate, French authorities were opposed to the use of these

coins, and the Consul consequently advised the natives to bring them to him, promising to exchange them for silver pieces—Who knows what we should believe?

¹⁷ A long-term captain, Mauruc arrived in the Pacific in 1829 where he ensured more or less regular service between Chili and divers islands in Oceania, with a schooner of which he was proprietor.

¹⁸ This politician and English diplomat showed himself to be favorable to Catholics especially at the time of their political emancipation (1828-1829) and during his time as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1835).

¹⁹ This flag, given to the Protectorate by Dupetit-Thouars, consisted of the old Tahitian flag with the French tricolor in the top left corner (near the shaft).

²⁰ In his *Polynesian Reminiscences*, W. T. Pritchard indicates that in 1845 his father collected from the Government an advance of 1,000 pounds sterling, or 25,000 gold francs, and that at the end of 1846, he received a second sum of the same size from the Foreign Office. It has often been written that King Louis-Philippe I had paid from his personal funds at least a part of the indemnity that the French Government had consented to remit to George Pritchard, but this assertion is untrue. In his *Memoirs to Serve as the History of My Time*, Guizot reports that the French King had offered to personally defray the expense in question, but that the Cabinet and Guizot could not have accepted this proposal.

²¹ Lucett. *Rovings in the Pacific, by a merchant long resident at Tahiti*. vol. 2, in-12

²² Captain Langle was commanding one of two ships on an expedition headed for La Perouse. In 1833, a monument was transported to Samoa aboard the sloop *Savorgnan de Brazza* and erected over the tomb of our unfortunate compatriots. Captain Langle's remains were returned to France around 1890.

²³ John Williams was one of the most active participants in the evangelization of the Pacific, mainly in the Society Islands, the Îles Sous-le-Vent, the Cook Islands and Samoa. He died in 1839 in the New Hebrides, massacred by natives on the island of Erromango. His remains were returned to Samoa much later, and interred at Apia.

²⁴ [No note corresponding to this number could be found in the text]

²⁵ Tomb N° M.C.I. Thanks to the kindness of M. L. R. George, the Hove Cemetery conservator, who provided us with this information. We were able to obtain a reproduction of his monument, which bears the following inscriptions: "In loving memory of the Rev. George Pritchard Missionary and H. B. M. Consul at Tahiti and Samoa—South Sea—Born at Birmingham Aug. 1st 1796, died at Hove, May 6th 1883—'Having served his generation by the will of God he fell on Sleep'—Act. 13-36-XX."

²⁶ At that time, there was a group of about 200 British subjects living in Fiji, most of whom were sailors who had deserted. Trade between the archipelago and Australia had vastly increased, with entrance costing as much as 43,000 pounds sterling. The United States had entrusted their consular representation to a clever merchant, John B. Williams, whose plans Pritchard was to act in opposition to.

²⁷ In 1830, the London Missionary Society had made their first attempt to evangelize the archipelago through the use of indigenous catechists, but they later lent their aid to the Wesleyan missionaries, who made rapid progress. By 1859, a third of the native population had been converted.

Catholic missionaries also installed themselves in Fiji, but significantly later (1844).

²⁸ We have made note of two of his articles, published in the "Memoirs" section of an issue of *Anthropological Matters* concerning the Samoans of the South Seas. His major work, to which we have often referred, is titled: *Polynesian Reminiscences or Life in the South Pacific Islands*. Foreword by Dr. Seemann, 1 vol. ill. In-8, xii-428 pages. London, Chapman and Hall, 1862.

²⁹ Though not even remotely equal, as Dr. Seeman allows himself to admit, to the masterful work that is Ellis's *Polynesian Researches*, W. T. Pritchard's book *Polynesian Reminiscences* is not without merit.

³⁰ For these details we are indebted to the kindness of the Consul General of Her British Majesty to Mexico who, at the request of our *Chargé d'Affaires ad interim* in that same town, willingly carried out research in the archives of the British Society of Mexico. We wish to express here our deep gratitude to

our benevolent informants. At the time of his death, W. T. Pritchard was residing at 3, Calle de Bucarelli, N° 1207, Mexico City.