

No Pacific Studies, we're USP

Vijay Naidu

Introduction

The topic of this public lecture is an adaptation of the comedy title 'No Sex, We're British'. The absence of explicit sexual encounters in Bollywood movies led to the application of this phrase to Indian cinema: No Sex, We're Indian. If you like, this phraseology reveals what just about everybody does and enjoys—though some seek to deny either the performance or the enjoyment, perhaps out of a false sense of modesty or sheer hypocrisy. But why extend this notion to Pacific Studies and the University of the South Pacific (USP)? Well, it seems that USP *is* involved with and *is* doing Pacific Studies without openly laying claims to be doing it: indeed, one is tempted to say doing it in a rather circumspect, even surreptitious, way.

More seriously, the purpose of my talk this evening is to raise a few searching questions about the absence of systematic academic programmes in Pacific Studies at this University. As an institution located strategically at the 'hub of the South Pacific' it is seemingly ideally placed, speaking both geographically and culturally, to become a world renowned centre of Pacific Studies. Yet after almost thirty years of existence, we have still to develop such an academic programme. Indeed, in relation to teaching about Pacific societies, cultures, economies and politics in the undergraduate programmes, the institution has in my view gone backwards.

Meanwhile, over the last six years, it has dawned on us that USP can make a mark in academic circles internationally in Marine Studies and we are rushing to make up for the lost time. A similar awareness does not seem

to have occurred with respect to Pacific Studies. We should have achieved world fame, at least a decade ago. Why have we not fostered Pacific Studies as an academic programme when it was an obvious field for USP to take up? What is to be gained by taking up Pacific Studies? How can we make up for the lost time and achieve a name for ourselves as a centre of excellence in Pacific Studies? To answer these questions we need to ask a couple of other questions first: what is Pacific Studies and why should USP take it up?

Pacific Studies

Defined in a fairly simple and straightforward fashion, Pacific Studies is a multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary study of 'the Pacific', which translates into the teaching of courses and programmes leading to undergraduate and graduate qualifications in Pacific Studies. The way this area study is defined depends on how we perceive 'the Pacific'. In some eyes 'the Pacific' is seen very narrowly as the islands of Oceania, many although not all of which are incorporated in the South Pacific Commission region (now the South Pacific Community) without the former colonial powers. Indeed, the proliferation of regional organisations including USP has helped define the Region. Others would include certain rim-countries such as Australia and New Zealand. Still others may extend it to Japan and Hawai'i but not the Americas, China and the former USSR.

Eveli Hau'ofa, in his inaugural address in this Oceania Lecture Series, very magnanimously saw 'Oceania as comprising people with a common heritage and commitment . . . Oceania refers to a world of people connected to each other' (Hau'ofa 1997: 12). He maintained that the sea defines the common heritage of those of us in Oceania; and urged that we should realise a regional identity that is not exclusive but inclusive, like the Pacific Ocean, 'for the same water that washes and crashes on our shores also does the same to the coastlines of the whole Pacific rim from Antarctica, to New Zealand, Australia, South East and East Asia and right across to the Americas. The Pacific Ocean also merges into the Atlantic and the Indian Ocean to encircle the entire planet. As the sea is an open and ever flowing reality, so should our oceanic identity transcend all forms of insularity, to become one that is openly searching, inventive and welcoming' (17).

Thus from the very outset, the definitional issue of what is 'the Pacific' and therefore exactly what physical area does Pacific Studies cover becomes material. The other matter of relevance at the very beginning of any discussion about Pacific Studies is that of methodological approaches and in this regard, what constitute multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary studies.

Historical background to Pacific Studies as an area study

In an article entitled 'Studying in the Pacific', Ron Crocombe pointed out that Pacific Studies has been the preoccupation of specialist centres and institutes of Pacific Studies in Pacific rim-countries: Australia, New Zealand, Hawai'i, the Americas, the Soviet Union and China, as well as Europe (1987). Moreover, some centres for research and teaching in Pacific Studies are now half a century old. Especially prominent are the Research School of Pacific (and Asian) Studies at the Australian National University (ANU) and the Pacific Islands Studies Program at the University of Hawai'i (UH). At both ANU and UH Pacific Studies has been taught at the graduate level. This allowed for a greater emphasis on research activities in the region. Relative to Pacific Islanders, fairly large numbers of Australians and Americans have specialised in the study of the Pacific, with many of the former studying Papua New Guinea and the latter concentrating on Micronesia. The University of Hawai'i has been offering the MA in Pacific Islands Studies since 1950. Terence Wesley-Smith, of the University of Hawai'i, observed recently:

If the ratio of University students and researchers to residents is anything to go by, Pacific Islanders are among the most studied people on earth. At the Manoa campus of the University of Hawai'i alone, more than thirty regional specialists devote much of their time and energy to Pacific Islands-related research and teaching. Some fifty courses, with annual enrollments of more than two thousand, focus exclusively on the region or parts of it. At the Australian National University, at least forty faculty members and a similar number of postgraduate students pursue Pacific Islands research interests. (1995: 115)

Furthermore, there exist well-established journals and voluminous other literature on the Pacific Islands and Island societies, all of which also define Pacific Studies as a discrete study area.

Justification for Pacific Studies

According to Wesley-Smith, there are three rationales or categories of explanation for Pacific Studies: pragmatic reasons (or the metropolitan countries' need to know more about the places they were dealing with); the perception of island societies as laboratories for studying the human condition; and a more politicised environment demanding the empowerment of indigenous islanders.

With the possible exception of Britain, all the imperialist states that formerly colonised the Pacific have established centres of Pacific Studies (Crocombe 1987: 120–121). Both the United States and Australia, after the 'Pacific War' in the Second World War, deliberately enhanced research and teaching about the islands. American and Australian colonial policies, strategies and diplomatic relations were informed by the advice given by academics. There were instances of colonial administrators becoming academics and academics opting for a career in colonial administration. Universities were recipients of government and private foundation grants, with a mandate to seek to understand Pacific island societies so that islanders could be influenced in ways required by the colonial powers. In this regard, in 1946 the Australian government established ANU in Canberra as an academic think-tank, amongst other things to inform and advise the government about its colonial and foreign policies. Likewise, the South Pacific Commission was created by the colonial powers to keep them abreast of developments in the islands and also to have a shaping influence on the island nations' socioeconomic, cultural and technological transformation. Two instances will demonstrate what I am talking about.

- At various times in the past couple of decades, the Republic of Kiribati and the Kingdom of Tonga made moves towards following independent foreign policy in relation to fisheries agreements with the Soviet Union, and there were stirrings by Vanuatu in relation to Cuba and Libya. Among the shrill voices decrying such attempts were those of Australian, American and New Zealand academics specialising in Pacific studies.

- When the Royal Fiji Military Forces overthrew the legitimately elected government of Fiji in 1987, Australian, New Zealand, American and British academics were summoned by the officials of their respective governments responsible for foreign and/or island affairs. The responses of those governments, at that time and subsequently, were informed by our university counterparts in those countries.

So for the very pragmatic reason of wishing to influence and control island people, centres of Pacific Studies were established in the postwar period. The same rationale also influenced a proliferation of such centres in the rim countries during the more than forty years of cold war. This process was further fuelled by a range of factors: the wars in Korea and Vietnam; policies of strategic denial; nuclear armaments testing including the refinement of ICBMs; anti-colonial movements; and the nuclear free and independent Pacific movement. With respect to the American nuclear tests, scientists—including those working at universities—engaged in experiments with human guinea-pigs in Micronesia.

The second rationale for Pacific Studies is that the relatively much smaller and diverse human communities provide a laboratory for the study of the human condition and its transformation. This reasoning has been articulated by a number of American scholars, including Douglas Oliver. In this view, the microcosmic world of islanders provides manageable sets of information and data to study and thence to make perhaps wider generalisations about humanity as a whole. Thus, two decades ago Oliver declared: 'I suggest that because of their wide diversities, small-scale dimensions, and relative isolation, the Pacific Islands can provide excellent—in some ways unique—laboratory-like opportunities for gaining deeper understandings of Human Biology, Political Science, etc.' (re-quoted in Wesley-Smith 1995: 121).

The laboratory explanation is associated with the not insignificant impact that islands and islanders have had on European thinking in the last three centuries. In the natural sciences certain fundamentals were changed as a consequence of the findings of early European explorers. European philosophy, art and literature were affected by the debate about 'noble and ignoble savages'. Pacific materials have had major impacts on the discipline of Anthropology. Sir Raymond Firth, Bronislaw Malinowski, Margaret Mead, Peter Worsley, Adrian Mayer, the Keesings, Chandra Jayawardena,

Ian Hogbin, Jean Guiart, Irving Goldman, John Derek Freeman, Ben Finney, Cyril Belshaw, Marshall Sahlins and Charles Valentine—the list goes on and on of researchers who have been prominent anthropologists with their scholarship firmly grounded on empirical studies of Pacific communities. They have contributed enormously to anthropological materials as well as to the development of the theoretical and methodological dimensions of this discipline.

USP's Pacific Languages Unit, which is in the Emalus Campus, is located there because of the rich variety of languages and dialects in Vanuatu. The laboratory explanation provides a rationale for this location: per head of population the ni-Vanuatu have the greatest variety of languages (perhaps 105) in the University region (which does not include Papua New Guinea and Irian Jaya, where the multiplicity of languages is even more remarkable).

Global interconnectedness between the islands and the metropolitan countries, using a microstudy of a lab-like situation in an island, was investigated by Lynne McInnes and John Connell (1988). Their study showed that the 840 people living in four villages on the island of Vatulele in Fiji are heavily reliant on modern goods that can be purchased from the local store only with money. Money was considered essential for survival. Food dependency was manifest, with a well marked transition away from a diet based on 'locally produced foods to one increasingly composed of imported goods' (117). They calculated that 38% of the store-bought goods had been processed elsewhere in Fiji, particularly in Suva, and '[w]ell over half the goods sold in the Vatulele store originated entirely outside Fiji' (119). Of the 82 items, 48 originated from 12 countries. These 48 items are disaggregated by country of origin as follows: 'Australia (10), New Zealand (8), Japan (5), China (10), Hong Kong (2), South Korea (2), France (2), United Kingdom (2), West Germany (4), Canada (2) and USA (1)'. McInnes and Connell observed: 'a considerable diversity for a society at the centre of the South Pacific and relatively isolated from major world trading routes' (119). They noted that no items came from any of the other island states in the South Pacific.

On the basis of their microcosmic study of the shop, McInnes and Connell made two observations tending towards generalisation. First, they pointed to the fact that the Vatulele store is similar to a shop in the Caribbean island of Martinique, where the products sold 'form a startling microcosm

of the world system, an astonishing testimony to the history of colonialism and the more recent organisation of international commerce' (Price, quoted in McInnes and Connell 1988: 119). Second, 'Islanders are increasingly incorporated [in the global trading system] as consumers rather than producers . . . The store, an incursion from another world, has incorporated the island into that other world more effectively than either production or migration' (120).

Wesley-Smith's third category of explanation for Pacific Studies is a more recent and radical islander-centred rationale. It has to do with the empowerment of islanders in their efforts to resolve a multitude of social, economic and political—even psychological—problems. Perspectives about the nature of the problems and possible solutions to them are based on a critique of previous colonial and postcolonial policies and practices. Island-centredness in history and in the appreciation of cultures that have survived and flowered over millennia, islanders' strategies for national resource management and conservation, indigenous knowledge about seasons, climate and medicines, their intellectual property rights and the indigenisation of scholarship, and generally, the identification with things indigenous—such are the foci that characterise this rationale for Pacific Studies.

The works of Haunani-Kay Trask, Amelia Rokotuivuna, Epeli Hau'ofa, Albert Wendt, Konai Helu-Thaman, Teresia Teaiwa, Vilsoni Hereniko, Asesela Ravuvu, Lilikala Kame'eleihiwa, Tupeni Baba, Ropate Qalo, Morgan Tuimaleali'ifano, Joeli Veitayaki, Malama Meleisea, Te'o Fairbairn, Uentabo Neemia, Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, Pio Manoa and Simione Durutalo exemplify the trend. Alternative perspectives from islanders who, though not 'indigenous', are native-born or naturalised citizens of island states include Ron Crocombe, Subramani, Vanessa Griffen, Arlene Griffen, Claire Slatter, Brij Lal, Atu Bain, Jay Narayan, William Sutherland, Rajesh Chandra, Jenny Bryant, Wadan Narsey, Ganesh Chand and Paddy Nunn. To this group may be added Bill Aalbersberg, Grey Fry, Richard Bedford, Robbie Robertson, John Connell, Randy Thaman, Bill Clarke, Howard Van Trease, Eric Waddell, Nii-K Plange, John Lynch, Paul Geraghty, Mike Davis, Penelope Schoeffel and many others who have a deep commitment to the region.

These scholars, while being island-centred, have different perspectives on issues that face societies and cultures in Oceania, which is the basis for current and potential debates amongst them.

Pacific Studies at USP

Background

With these rationales for Pacific Studies in mind, let us now look at what happened to Pacific Studies at USP. The founding fathers and mothers of USP had envisaged a regional institution predicated on the cooperation of colonial powers and the emergent island states. This institution was to provide for human resource development needs of island governments by providing regionally relevant but internationally recognised qualifications. USP has an excellent track record in this regard.

USP as originally conceived was based upon three schools (i.e. discipline clusters—humanities, social sciences and natural sciences) on Laucala Campus, which were to be in the tradition of the red-brick universities established in the UK in the 1960s. Interdisciplinary approaches to the teaching of courses and to research were seen to be not only appropriate but also the most efficient mode of utilising the limited resources available to the fledgling institution.

Awareness of the South Pacific region, particularly the University region, was implicit in the founding documents. The appointment of a Professor of Pacific Studies right at the very outset was an explicit manifestation of USP's commitment to Pacific Studies. Professor Ron Crocombe was appointed in this capacity in the School of Social and Economic Development. USP was programmed to pursue Pacific Studies. From the very beginning, courses in Pacific History, Pacific land tenure systems, Pacific societies and cultures, Pacific politics and economics were taught. At the Preliminary II level (which later became the Foundation Year, the de facto first year of a 4-year degree) a number of the courses taught were built on a strong Pacific content.

By the mid-1970s in the Foundation Programme, a compulsory multidisciplinary course applied introductory principles of disciplines such as Geography, History, Archaeology, Anthropology, Economics, Political Science and Sociology to the study of pre-contact Pacific island geomorphology, climate, natural resources and socioeconomic and political organisation as well as religion and arts. Howard Van Trease, the current Director of University Extension, took a leading role in devising this course. All the students who came to USP from Form 6 or equivalent programmes

and who constituted a clear majority of our students, were required to take this course, 'Man in the Pacific'. Obviously, had the course remained on our books we would have changed its title, probably to 'People in the Pacific' or 'Man and Woman in the Pacific'. For Foundation Science students, a course entitled 'Pacific Societies and Cultures' was taught by the School of Social and Economic Development (SSED).

At this time, USP recruited a new Vice-Chancellor, a Trinidadian, Dr James Maraj,¹ who was a strong advocate of regionalism and a 'University of the South Pacific rather than a University *in* the South Pacific'. He was convinced that all USP students must take introductory Pacific Studies courses in the first year, before they specialised in their other two subject areas. 'I am sure,' he said, 'that this will significantly improve the quality of our students' work, their motivation, and help the university achieve a Pacific identity' (1975: 9). Incidentally, he also recognised marine science and administration in small island states as likely areas in which USP could develop an international reputation (11). Maraj saw our work in distance education through our centres in each of the member countries as providing for USP's regional character.

To promote a distinctive Pacific atmosphere in USP he advocated, besides the formal courses in Pacific Studies, an Academic Festival on Pacific Cultures and Traditions, where the notion of the 'Pacific Way' would be rigorously examined (15). He proposed a Pacific Cultural Centre, which was to become a repository for valuable works of art and artefacts. He was also committed to increasing the number of 'artists in residence', i.e. painters, sculptors, musicians, dancers, writers 'or advocates of other art forms'. He hoped that 'as the Pacific Man is a religious man', an Ecumenical Centre could be established on campus. This was to contribute to our spiritual development. He also advocated the commemoration of national days, with the fanfare of flag raising etc., for each of the member countries. This too was to contribute to the growing regional awareness.

The Pacific Week, which was celebrated until a year ago, had its origins in James Maraj's ideas. In his inaugural lecture in this series of public lectures, Hau'ofa spoke about its strengths and weaknesses. The substitution of the Pacific Week with the University Day has not resolved the issue of serious and ongoing discussions about regionalism and what it means for island people.

Thus in the mid- to late 1970s, there was a fervour in the University community, led by the Vice-Chancellor himself, about matters relating to Pacific identity, regionalism and Pacific Studies. The Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific movement, which has roots on Laucala Campus, also reinforced the sense of wider regional awareness and identity. However, an examination of the current situation at USP indicates that the vision of the founders of the institution and at least one former Vice-Chancellor has not borne fruit in institutional terms.

The current situation

A quick survey conducted by colleagues two years ago revealed that only 20 per cent of the courses taught at USP were clearly entitled to indicate a specific Pacific Studies orientation. A number of these were specialist language courses. For the last six years a vast majority of our students have come via Fiji Form 7 and/or through the distance mode. Neither entry route has a specific Pacific Studies orientation. A great number of our students are enrolled in 'technocratic' subjects such as Business Studies, Accounting and Financial Management, Computer Science or Information Technology and do not take courses concerned with Pacific Studies. The Institute of Pacific Studies (IPS), which was established in the mid-70s, was one of Maraj's babies and has been preoccupied with the publication of the works of Pacific writers (not necessarily academics). Staff at IPS continued to teach the introductory 'Pacific Societies and Cultures' course—though to an ever-decreasing number of Foundation Science students as it has not been a compulsory subject for more than a decade now. IPS teaches short-term courses to visiting students from a number of North American universities and has association with researchers in Pacific Studies from many leading overseas institutions. It is not involved in any significant way in the teaching of formal degree courses at USP.²

Thus in aggregate terms, a good 70 to 80 per cent of our students do not get any exposure to Pacific Studies. At the postgraduate level, there is a healthier situation with respect to island-oriented courses and research activities, as the South Pacific becomes the theatre of most of our research activities.

To find out why Pacific Studies has not become a central academic programme of the University, one needs to talk to the first Professor of

Pacific Studies. I must confess that I have not been able to do so in preparation, as the time available to me to prepare this talk on Pacific Studies has been rather short.

However, explanations may be found at three levels: that of Professor Crocombe's own thinking as seen in his writings on the subject of Pacific Studies; in the institutional arrangement within USP; and in the interest of academic staff and students. In his address at the inauguration of the Centre of Pacific Studies at the University of Auckland, twelve years ago, Crocombe advised:

Don't make degrees in Pacific Studies the main thrust of your initiative. There will be few jobs for those with such a degree, and in many cases they will be marginal. Concentrate more on getting relevant Pacific components into the training of the widest possible range of students—particularly those who are likely to exert influence, such as journalists, educators, lawyers, economists and administrators . . . In other words, selected and relevant Pacific area courses taken by a broad cross-section of Auckland University students will do much more good for the Pacific and the public you serve, than will a handful of students incarcerated in a marginalised programme which does not reach beyond Pacific studies. Interesting, high quality courses in various aspects of the Pacific, mainly taught by specialists in the respective department, and offered as options should be the first priority of your Centre . . . Success will be measured in its spread and penetration, not in its encapsulation. (1987: 127)

It seems likely, therefore, that the former Professor of Pacific Studies was never especially keen to promote degree(s) in Pacific Studies and that he obviously preferred a multidisciplinary to an interdisciplinary approach to Pacific Studies. His reliance on academic specialists in the departments may have also contributed to the lack of movement in this regard.

This brings me to the institutional arrangement. As I indicated earlier, the concept of the Schools was to encourage interdisciplinary cooperation. However, by the early 1980s the word *department* increasingly replaced the term *discipline* and it was only a matter of time before what sociologists call 'boundary maintenance' set in. Barriers emerged between departments and

empire building by HODs impaired cooperation between them. Given this process, interdepartmental cooperation in relation to Pacific Studies as an area-study was replaced by a traditional approach to what a world-class department in a discipline should have. USP departments began essentially, within their limited resources, to reproduce what Heads of Departments were used to. Obviously, Pacific Studies as an area study had not featured very largely in the institutions that had nurtured them.

The other institutional factor was that in spite of Vice-Chancellor James Maraj's exhortations to the contrary, the establishment of the Institute of Pacific Studies meant a marginalisation of Pacific Studies. In the eyes of the rest of the University, IPS activities centred on publications and the annual Pacific Week. The fact that an Institute could only teach credit courses that were approved via relevant Schools' Boards of Studies meant that any initiative from IPS without departmental support in the Schools was likely to receive indifferent and even negative response.

Because IPS did not have the critical mass of staff to teach Pacific Studies courses, cooperation with pertinent departments in the Schools was pivotal to the development of Pacific Studies. Perhaps because IPS had enough on its plate, perhaps because the departments were not interested, perhaps because of personalities and a lack of direction from the University itself, Pacific Studies increasingly took a back seat.

Interest in Pacific Studies among staff and students seems to be present only at the level of oral discourse—something to talk about but not to entrench formally in the academic programmes à la James Maraj. Students generally are not interested in pursuing humanities and social science courses that do not seem to have an immediate utilitarian value in the labour market. I believe that even within the narrow (and perhaps misguided) perception of what will get them a job, we can teach Pacific area subjects to our students and ultimately have better graduates, *if there is clear direction about Pacific Studies*.

However, I am aware that in Fiji at least there is an acute shortage of qualified persons with majors in English and other languages, Education, History, Geography, Psychology, Anthropology, Political Science and Sociology. I am also aware that persons with these subjects are handling responsibilities in a range of specialist areas because they are highly intelligent and versatile persons who have learnt on the job and through specialist post-degree training. Last week [April 1997] at the Fiji History

Teachers' Association annual meeting, I was informed that there is a shortage of history teachers. When vacant positions are advertised graduates in commercial studies and accounting feature prominently amongst the applicants.

All is not lost. Let me say that a Pacific Studies minor or second major could be possible in conjunction with a major in a specialist discipline area. For instance, Economics and Pacific Studies would be a good combination. A menu of department-based Pacific Studies courses can be easily prepared, together with a few Pacific Studies cementing courses. This approach would very quickly provide a whole range of options in Pacific Studies, without major resource demands. The acceptance by Senate of an introductory Pacific Studies course,³ which I hope will be made compulsory for all students, is an initial step along a road we selected twenty years ago, from which we strayed.

Pacific Studies is an unavoidable commitment of USP. Even though the University has not made any significant concerted effort to gain from its comparative advantage, it has by its location been caught in a relationship with this subject area. The 20 per cent of the current courses that explicitly state a Pacific context are found largely in the humanities and the social sciences. With respect to natural sciences, biology, especially marine biology, is prominent. Natural product analysis in chemistry also has a Pacific orientation.

USP can gain an international reputation as a centre of academic excellence for Pacific Studies because it is in the middle of this vast laboratory of island environments, peoples and cultures. By making the problems and prospects of small island and archipelagic states a central preoccupation, the University can very quickly gain preeminence.

Currently USP has databases on Pacific Island populations, economies and marine information.

Comparative studies of island states in the contemporary period of intense globalisation, in liaison with universities such as those of the West Indies, Guam, Singapore, Mauritius and so on, would provide the basis for policies and strategies that would assist Pacific Island countries cope with the tidal wave of globalisation.

With the emergence of regional trade blocs, it has become more urgent than ever before for Pacific island countries to cooperate. Dr Sandra Tarte in her lecture a few weeks ago showed how major gains had been made in

fisheries deals with DWFNs (Distant Water Fishing Nations) as a consequence of regional cooperation.⁴ Many more benefits would accrue to island governments if they worked together in areas such as trade, aid, foreign relations, regional security, marine surveillance, higher education and human resource development.

USP can not only create an understanding of the specificity of the problems of island communities in the present context of trade globalisation, but also foster regionalism among the students. Increasingly, nearly all meetings between and among countries in the South Pacific are attended by our alumni representing their respective countries.⁵ Their experience at USP has had a lasting impact on them. This facilitates discussions between them very considerably. Without trying very hard, USP has nurtured such rapport amongst our graduates. What would happen if a more conscious and systematic development of regionalism takes place? Pacific Studies is the way to go.

When colleagues were informed that only 20 per cent of our undergraduate courses clearly indicated in their course prescriptions that they were teaching about the Pacific, a number expressed surprise. They declared in their defence that although their course descriptions in the *University Calendar* did not make it explicit, they really did teach a considerable amount of Pacific material. I say to them that if they are doing it, then they must come out in the open about it and let us all do Pacific Studies together in a focused and systematic way. Above all, it is nothing about which to be shamefaced or falsely coy. I am sure that we, and the region we serve, will all have a most stimulating, satisfying and productive experience. Indeed, we may even find ourselves enjoying it!

Notes

1 We record with regret the untimely passing away of Professor James Maraj in Brisbane on 3 April 1999. Although not initially intended as such, Naidu's comments stand as a fitting memorial tribute to USP's second Vice-Chancellor. [Ed.]

2 It should be noted, though, that IPS personnel have coordinated the new interdisciplinary course UU104 Pacific Worlds: An Introduction to Pacific Studies, which commenced in 1998. [Ed.]

3 See note 2.

4 Tarte's lecture is published in this issue.

5 In this regard, I am pleased to say that a former classmate and good friend of mine, the Honourable Mr David Sitai, the Foreign Minister of Solomon Islands, is here in Fiji attending the MSG (Melanesian Spearhead Group) meeting.

References

- Crocombe, R G 1987, 'Studying the Pacific', in *Class and Culture in the South Pacific*, eds A Hooper et al., Centre for Pacific Studies, University of Auckland and Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, Auckland and Suva, pp. 115–138.
- Hau'ofa, E 1993, 'Our Sea of Islands', in *A New Oceania: Rediscovering our sea of islands*, eds E Waddell, V Naidu and E Hau'ofa, SSED, USP, in association with Beake House, Suva, pp. 2–16.
- 1993, 'A beginning', in *A New Oceania: Rediscovering our sea of islands*, eds E Waddell, V Naidu and E Hau'ofa, SSED, USP in association with Beake House, Suva, pp.126–139.
- 1997, 'The ocean in us', presented as an Oceania Lecture at the University of the South Pacific, Suva, 12 March, 21pp. Subsequently published in *Dreadlocks in Oceania*, 1, 1997: 124–48; and *The Contemporary Pacific* 10(2), 1998: 392–410.
- Howard, M 1983, 'Social scientist in paradise', *Journal of Pacific Studies*, 9: 1–8.
All the articles in the special issue are relevant material for Pacific Studies.
- Maraj, J A 1975, 'Statement to the University of the South Pacific', mimeo, 22 pp.
- McInnes, L and Connell, J 1988, 'The world system in a Fijian store', *South Pacific Forum*, 4(2): 116–21.
- Meleisea, M 1987, 'Ideology in Pacific Studies. A personal view', in *Class and Culture in the South Pacific*, eds A Hooper et al., Centre for Pacific Studies, University of Auckland and Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, Auckland and Suva, pp. 140–52.
- Naidu, V 1993, 'Whose sea of islands?', in *Our Sea of Islands:Rediscovering our sea of islands*, eds E Waddell, V Naidu and E Hau'ofa, SSED, USP, Suva, pp. 49–55.
- Tarte, S 1997, 'Regional strategies: The Pacific islands and Japan', Oceania Lecture presented at USP, Suva, 9 April. Reprinted in this volume, pp. 159–72.
- Trask, H-K 1987, 'Hawai'i: Colonization and decolonization', in *Class and Culture in the South Pacific*, eds A Hooper et al., Centre for Pacific Studies, University of Auckland and Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, Auckland and Suva, pp. 154–75.
- Wesley-Smith, T 1995, 'Rethinking Pacific Islands Studies', *Pacific Studies*, 18(2): 115–37.