

Anthropology at the University of the South Pacific: From past dynamics to present perceptions

Kim Andreas Kessler^{1,2,3}

¹Institute of Social Anthropology,
University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

²School of Geography, University of Otago,
Dunedin, New Zealand

³School of Geography, Earth Science and
Environment, University of the South
Pacific, Laucala Campus, Suva, Fiji

Correspondence

Kim Andreas Kessler, School of
Geography, University of Otago, Dunedin,
New Zealand.

Email: info@kim-kessler.com

Abstract

The Pacific Island region is a key context in the history of anthropology. Yet, while much has been written about how anthropology of the Pacific Islands contributed to Anglo-American anthropology, the discipline's institutional history in the Pacific Islands has received very little attention. This paper is the first to explore the history of anthropology at the University of the South Pacific (USP). Research findings demonstrate that anthropology lacked practical meaning in an institution established to modernise Pacific Island states. Fieldwork conducted at USP suggests that current perceptions of anthropology held by academic staff are strongly linked to the discipline's classic era. I argue that the anti-colonial version of the Pacific Way from the 1970s onward, coupled with the hegemony of political economist and anti-culturalist approaches among the USP teaching staff in the 1980s, inhibited a meaningful engagement with the Writing Culture debate at USP. This may explain why there has been little influence by the discipline's postmodern transformation over the past thirty years on current perceptions of anthropology at USP.

KEYWORDS

history of anthropology, Pacific anthropology, Pacific history, Pacific Islands, University of the South Pacific (USP)

1 | INTRODUCTION

The Pacific Island region figures prominently in research investigating 'the history of anthropology'. In the eighteenth century, anthropological Enlightenment thinking coincided with European explorations

of Oceania. Pacific Islands therefore appear regularly in studies reflecting on the pre-history of the discipline of anthropology (e.g., Hallowell, 1965; Liebersohn, 2008; Thomas, 1997). In research exploring anthropology's academic institutionalisation and popularisation, the Pacific Islands are at centre stage: the British Torres Straits Expedition (1898), Malinowski's *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* (1922) and Margaret Mead's *Coming of Age in Samoa* (1928) have been extensively reviewed and are widely acknowledged as landmarks in anthropology's history (e.g., Eriksen, 2015; Firth, 2002; Herle and Rouse, 1998; Kuklick, 2008; Kuper, 2015; Stocking, 1983, 1996). However, while these prominent histories of anthropology feature the Pacific Island region, they are essentially about how anthropology of the Pacific Islands contributed to Anglo-American anthropology. In turn, the history of anthropology in the Pacific Islands—referring to the discipline of anthropology being based in the Pacific Island region—has hitherto received very little attention. This is symptomatic of the fact that the research field investigating the history of anthropology took shape with a focus on anthropology's Anglo-American centre. Anthropology's histories in the periphery have gained attention only relatively recently and are yet to be comprehensively studied (Bošković and Eriksen, 2010; Vokes, 2014).

This paper is the first to explore the history of anthropology at the University of the South Pacific (USP). As a key research institution and a major tertiary education provider owned by 12 Pacific Island countries (USP, 2020), USP is an ideal context to study the history of anthropology in the Pacific Island region. USP has hitherto not offered a degree, diploma or certificate in anthropology. When the University was founded in 1968, it was decided to establish a sociology department rather than an anthropology department (Howard, 1983b).

The first section of this paper explores why anthropology was not included as a discipline in the curriculum when USP was founded. The second and third sections investigate the status of the discipline of anthropology at USP in the 1970s and the 1980s. This time frame was specifically chosen because it represents a crucial period for decolonisation processes in both the Pacific Islands and the discipline of anthropology. The fourth section analyses how the USP community currently perceives anthropology as an academic discipline. Primary and secondary literature was analysed, and oral history interviews, semi-structured interviews and participant observation were conducted between 2014 and 2018 to investigate these research questions. The paper concludes by connecting anthropology's past (1960s to 1980s) to present perceptions of anthropology at USP. As such, it offers a long-term historical understanding of anthropology's dynamic history at USP, and how this history is reflected in anthropology's current status at this important regional University.

2 | THE BEGINNINGS

The history of anthropology at USP begins when the University was conceptualised not long after World War II. Initially, proposals to establish vocational training centres for the Pacific Islands from primary to university levels (see Derrick, 1950; Harlow, 1953) were not pursued further in the 1950s. However, in the 1960s, the establishment of a regional university in the South Pacific gained momentum when the New Zealand Government offered the buildings at its air force base at Laucala Bay in Suva, Fiji, for education purposes. Following up on these plans, the Governor of Fiji visited New Zealand in early 1965 and expressed the desire to launch a tertiary institution offering a range of training programs (Morris, 1966). In late 1965, a joint mission of the British and the New Zealand Governments,¹ led by Sir Charles Morris, visited the South Pacific to examine the region's higher education requirements (Morris, 1966). A year later, the Morris Report (1966)—the founding document of USP—was published. It was followed by the *Alexander Report* (1967), which discusses how the recommendations of the *Morris Report* should be implemented. Both reports provide valuable

insights to the initial relationship between anthropology and USP. However, they did not propose to establish a program in anthropology. Based on these key reports, I will now examine the issue of why anthropology was not included as a discipline in USP's first curriculum.

2.1 | Trained manpower

The British led mission of 1965 regarded establishing a university as a development project for Pacific Islands. Morris (1966, p. 20) states that the development of a region depends not merely on natural resources, but 'on the provision of trained manpower to produce and market the resources and to administer the territory'. Following the University's main aim to yield locally educated manpower, defined as 'advanced skills which are essential to the advancement of an economy' (Morris, 1966, p. 20), the committee derived two main principles for the planned University:

The first is that the whole field of higher education, whether in degree courses or diploma courses, the highest quality must be ensured in teaching and in student achievement. The second is that all courses of instruction, both for degrees and diplomas, must be so designed as to take well into account both the interests and aptitudes of the students of the Region and also the circumstances and needs of the countries concerned. (Morris, 1966, p. 24)

The committee subsequently suggested including the following subjects in the degree curriculum: Education, English, Linguistics, Economics, Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry, Biology and,

in addition certain other subjects should be included in the programme ... namely History, Sociology, Theology, and Home Science, [which] could initially be in charge of a Senior Lecturer who would act as Head of Department [under the Faculty of Arts]. (Morris, 1966, p. 46)

USP was initially conceptualised as a *teaching* institution, providing education for students in accordance with the needs of the region. These needs were defined in terms of Pacific Islands' economic development. Consequently, in developing the curriculum, planners preferred an 'investment approach' to a 'consumer approach'. The former aims at offering training in skills that directly promote economic growth, while the latter defines the goal of education as enrichment of an individual's personal life (Alexander, 1967). The 'investment approach' pursued explains why the social science disciplines were classified as an 'additional' field of studies. Anthropology, like other social sciences, was therefore marginalised even before the University opened in 1968. However, despite perceiving social science disciplines as of secondary importance, Morris (1966) suggested including sociology in the University curriculum.

2.2 | Modernising institution

Neither the Morris Report (1966) nor the Alexander Report (1967) outline explicitly the reasons for anthropology not being included as a discipline in the 1968 University curriculum. Examining the intended purpose of the University in further detail illuminates why sociology was preferred to anthropology. Morris (1966) regarded USP as a key institution for the development of the Pacific Island states (see above). Referring to the *Report of the Commission on Higher Education in Papua and New*

Guinea, Alexander (1967) underlined the conceptualisation of USP as a modernising institution and highlighted the founders' definition of development:

In order to produce the skilled men and women who can best assist growth in under-developed countries, education must play three major roles: 1. provision of skilled manpower for the developing community; 2. generation of a mental climate favourable to growth and change; 3. raising agricultural standards to produce a surplus for investment and at the same time a rising level of consumption within the community. (Currie, 1964 quoted in Alexander, 1967, p. 2)

It is evident that the founders of USP closely followed the logic of modernisation theories, perceiving modernisation as equivalent to Westernisation, and defining development as industrialisation (e.g., Potter et al., 2018; Rostow, 1960). In other words, USP was conceptualised as an institution that equips students with the necessary skills to work in other organisations derived from the West, such as businesses and government entities. Thus, the intrinsic University mission was to establish a modernising institution to develop the Pacific Islands toward the standards of Western industrialised countries. Comparing this aim to the focus of inquiry of anthropology and sociology reveals a significant reason for sociology, rather than anthropology, to be incorporated into the University curriculum.

At the time USP was founded in the late 1960s, anthropology was often defined and perceived as the study of 'traditional societies'. It is commonly agreed that Bronislaw Malinowski's *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* (1922), a product of his in-depth fieldwork in the Trobriand Islands, initiated the era of modern anthropology, also referred to as the classic phase of anthropology (Barnard, 2010; Stocking, 1978). Margaret Mead's ethnography *Coming of Age in Samoa* (1928) became the most widely read anthropological monograph, representing anthropology across disciplinary boundaries (Howard, 1983a). Both classic ethnographies focus on 'traditional societies', broadly defined in opposition to 'modern societies' of the Western developed world. Raymond Firth, one of Malinowski's students, collected vast ethnographic material in Solomon Islands resulting in the publication *History and Traditions of Tikopia* (1961), among other research works. Also working in Solomon Islands, Roger Keesing wrote a dissertation titled *Kwaio Marriage and Society* (1965). His father, Felix Keesing, among his many other publications, authored *Native Peoples of the Pacific World* (1946), and Te Rangi Hiroa (also known as Sir Peter Buck) published predominantly on material cultures of 'traditional' Pacific societies (e.g., Buck, 1941, 1944).

These are just a few examples of influential anthropological studies published on the region. However, they provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that, regardless of different schools of thought within anthropology, the discipline was largely perceived as the study of 'traditional societies'. That the persistent discourse of the crisis of anthropology is to a significant extent based on the argument that anthropology's existence is at risk because traditional societies are being modernised, underlines anthropology's historical and contemporary identification as the study of 'traditional societies'. For example, Jebens (2011), who participated in the 'crisis talk', outlines that due to the (anticipated) disappearance of 'traditional societies' the entire history of anthropology can be conceived as a history of crisis.

Sociology, in contrast, was developed as a result of the French Revolution in the late eighteenth century (Nisbet, 1943). On this basis, the discipline was regarded as a valuable contributor to the spread of democracy. Sociological research was seen as an essential social science during the reconstruction of Europe after World War II, and in understanding the Industrial Revolution (Platt, 2010).

While sociology's focus of inquiry emerged in response to the challenges of modernity and the discipline aimed to understand social units of the so-called modern Western world, anthropologists

were seen as experts of 'traditional societies'. For a modernising institution aiming at developing Pacific Islands in compliance with Western ideals, sociology was the preferred discipline for the 1968 University curriculum. Notably, the USP Programme Planning Seminar envisaged the future of sociology graduates as administrators and industrial managers (USP, 1968b). Howard (1983a, pp. 71–72) states that sociology 'achieved hegemony over anthropology in many countries around the world during the 1960s and 1970s'. In the Pacific Island region, USP's initial curriculum planning was no exception.

2.3 | Colonial name

Conducting a *Preliminary Survey of Anthropology and Sociology in the South Pacific*, Howard (1983a) puts forth the assumption that the preference given to sociology possibly reflects the wish to ban the title 'anthropology', which is often closely associated with colonialism. Neither the *Morris Report* (1966) nor the *Alexander Report* (1967) highlights any such reason influencing curriculum decision making. Comparing USP to the University of Papua New Guinea (UPNG) allows further examination of Howard's assumption.

UPNG opened in 1965 with the aim of improving the availability of trained manpower. An emphasis was set on equipping graduates with skills that support industrial and commercial development (Currie, 1964; Lynch, 1988). Similar to USP, UPNG was conceptualised as a modernising institution. Yet, the striking difference is that UPNG included anthropology in its curriculum when it was founded (Brash, 1988). This comparative perspective weakens the 'trained manpower' and the 'modernising institution' arguments employed for not incorporating anthropology in USP's curriculum.

At this point it must be considered what distinguishes UPNG from USP. When USP was founded, the British planned to withdraw from the Pacific region in order to join the European Economic Community (Cassidy, 2001), and some Pacific Island states had become independent prior to the University's foundation. When the joint mission of the British and the New Zealand Governments visited the Pacific in 1965, Western Samoa was an independent state. In the same year, the Cook Islands gained the status of a state in free association with New Zealand. Tonga had never been colonised by Western powers, while Nauru achieved independence from Australia just five days before USP opened (Aikman, 1988). In contrast, UPNG was established by the Australian colonial power, which had full control over the territory which the University was intended to cover (Crocombe et al., 1988).

This comparison suggests that the name 'anthropology' was deliberately excluded from USP, while it was incorporated in an institution founded by and for a colonial power. The similarities and differences between USP and UPNG reveal that the argument to exclude the name of a discipline associated with colonialism was, in relation to the above outlined arguments of 'manpower' and 'modernising institution', the strongest motive against anthropology's incorporation into the curriculum of USP.

Social anthropologist John Harré joined USP's School of Social Development in 1969 as a founding member of the academic staff. His experience underlines the above argument:

The decision to use the term 'sociology' was significantly related to the assumption that 'anthropology' could be conceived as a colonial concept ... We [the founding staff] made the assumption that the word 'anthropology' may have a negative connotation to our students at a time when the ten countries we served were in the process of emerging from colonial status and had in the past been subject to anthropological research by expatriate scholars. (John Harré, interview, 2019)

In addition, anti-colonial discourses from the African continent, which often included a strong anti-anthropology stance (see e.g., Jegede, 2015), influenced USP during its early years. For example, the late Barbara Hau'ofa² notes that:

anti-colonialists [at USP] were very determined that it should not be like Africa. Africa at that time was reacting strongly against anthropology. Why should you people be coming here thinking of us as specimens? That sort of thing. And so [at USP] they just refused to have anything called anthropology. (Barbara Hau'ofa, interview, 2014)

The comparison between USP and UPNG and evidence from the interviews both lead to the conclusion that the name 'anthropology' was deliberately excluded from USP's curriculum due to its association with colonialism.

2.4 | Research

As outlined above, USP was primarily conceptualised as a teaching institution. Research played a subordinate role in the planning of the University and is only minimally discussed in the *Morris Report* (1966) and the *Alexander Report* (1967). The former consists of 83 pages, of which research matters are discussed on only two pages. However, these marginal discussions target anthropology to a significant extent and provide instructive insights to anthropology's role during the foundation of the University.

Morris states that there are bright prospects for anthropological research:

There are ... great opportunities in this region for basic research in social sciences. The variety of races and cultures to be found in the South Pacific provides a promising background for the study of man as an individual and also as a member of a social unit. There are rich fields for research into languages and language structure, art forms, social anthropology, music, history, to mention but a few. (Morris, 1966, pp. 51–52)

While the Chairman of the mission to establish a tertiary institution highlights, in particular, the positive future of anthropology in conducting valuable research in and for the Pacific region, Alexander (1967, p. 17) only partially agrees. He claims that 'in social anthropology, the whole field of study of social change is clearly of great importance' and adds in brackets:

The Pacific appears to be a happy hunting ground for Cultural Anthropologists, primarily concerned with primitive societies. Important as such studies are in the broad context of human development, one could wish that some of this effort could be diverted to problems of more immediate practical importance. (Alexander, 1967, p. 17)

Alexander's definition of anthropology as the study of 'traditional societies' re-emphasises the above argument that anthropology's field of inquiry strongly worked against the *raison d'être* of the University when it was founded. However, these arguments reveal that the Pacific Island region was considered as an area of high potential for anthropological research, and the founders of the University perceived anthropology as a central discipline to the understanding of development processes. While the University itself is a crucial institution for the latter, it is still emphasised that anthropology is not suitable for USP: as a

discipline accused of lacking practical meaning, anthropology did not suit an institution aimed at contributing directly to the development of the Pacific Island region.

2.5 | Coexistence

In 1969, the School of Social Development (retitled 'School of Social and Economic Development' in 1970) offered a three-year Bachelor's degree with majors in geography, history, sociology and economics as traditional (mostly social science) disciplines, and South Pacific studies, development administration and rural development as interdisciplinary options (USP, 1968a). The first Reader in Sociology was John Harré, a social anthropologist, who was trained by Raymond Firth (Wanhalla, 2013) and received his doctorate from the London School of Economics in 1963 (USP, 1968a). Considering the above outlined reasons why the founders of USP did not include anthropology as part of the degree courses, this appointment is surprising. McCall (1982) notes that, for the most part, only anthropologists worked in the Pacific and in small-scale societies. And, given sociology's study focus on core countries (Howard, 1983a), it is likely that a lack of suitable sociologists for the position contributed to the appointment of an anthropologist.

Trained anthropologists have been employed at the Sociology Department since USP's establishment. Eight of 17 staff members who taught sociology between 1969 and 1981 had 'a professional background in anthropology' (McCall, 1982, p. 36). Anthropologist Grant McCall was Head of the Sociology Department in 1981 (Howard, 1983; McCall, 1982). Epeli Hau'ofa, who received his doctorate in anthropology from the Australian National University, was appointed by the Sociology Department in 1983 (USP, 1983b). Hau'ofa contributed to teaching for over a decade. Other anthropologists employed in Sociology between the 1990s and 2018 include Michael Monsell-Davis, Robert Norton, Lynda Newland and Jacqueline Ryle. While not comprehensive, this list demonstrates that the history of anthropology at USP cannot be perceived as non-existent, but rather as a co-existence of anthropology and sociology operating under the name of the latter.

In the following section, I will further consider this juxtaposition within the Sociology Department with a focus on the 1980s and in relation to the wider USP context of the 1970s.

3 | THE 1970s

Over the first decade of USP's existence, the 'Pacific Way' emerged as a prominent term. Originally articulated by Fiji's Prime Minister Ratu Sir Kamisese Mara at the UN General Assembly in October 1970, the Pacific Way was thereafter largely shaped by Ron Crocombe (Lawson, 2010). Crocombe (1976, p. 2) defined the Pacific Way as a term with 'no single precise meaning' that can embrace any activity originating within the Pacific. For Crocombe (1976), the Pacific Way obtains its greatest meaning by uniting Pacific Islanders as opposed to others. Its core function is 'to separate the Pacific from the non-Pacific' (Crocombe, 1976, p. 7). As opposed to Ratu Mara's vision, Crocombe's articulation of the Pacific Way took an anti-colonial stance (see also Lawson, 2010).

The South Pacific Creative Arts Society (SPCAS) and the Institute of Pacific Studies (IPS) were integral parts of this anti-colonial articulation of the Pacific Way. The latter was founded by Ron Crocombe himself (Tuimaleali'ifano, 2010) and his wife, Marjorie, was editor of the journal *Mana*, issued by SPCAS (Crocombe, 1976). As I will demonstrate in the following section, both SPCAS and IPS aimed to 'free' Oceanian minds from Western hegemony by decolonising writings about the Pacific Island region. Despite applying differing strategies, their collective endeavour separated



Pacific Island scholars from ‘Western anthropologists’. I define ‘Western anthropologists’ as scholars who, prior to studying Pacific Island societies, have no significant personal or consanguine relationship to Pacific Island peoples.

3.1 | Pacific Way of writing

The opening of USP in 1968 increasingly enabled Pacific Islanders to share their knowledge and experience. Due to the regional character of the University, the 1970s can be seen as ‘a kind of microcosm of the Pacific at large’ (Hau'ofa, 1993, p. 81).

Within this microcosm, Western hegemony and associated experiences of racial discrimination and estrangement from traditional Pacific Island cultures were a unifying theme among the newly founded USP community (Keown, 2005; Sharrad, 2003). This uniting environment, in combination with opportunities for Pacific Islanders to further their education in literary skills at a tertiary institution, resulted in a ‘Pacific Way of writing’ led by Albert Wendt. The Samoan writer published an impressive collection of books³ and taught students in creative writing (Hereniko, 1993). Wendt's main theme in the 1970s was the decolonisation of Pacific Islanders’ minds:

Any real understanding of ourselves and our existing cultures calls for an attempt to understand colonialism and what it did and is still doing to us ... Without it we will continue to be exploited by vampires of all colours, creeds, fangs. (Our home-grown species are often more rapacious.) Without it the tragic mimicry, abasement, and humiliation will continue, and we will remain the often grotesque colonial caricatures we were transformed into ... (Wendt, 1976b, pp. 50–51)

Albert Wendt aimed at decolonising the minds of Pacific Islanders through the tool of writing. However, this approach was not unproblematic. Wendt, as well as his student, Vilsoni Hereniko, critically reflected on the tool with which they were working. Referring to a friend who once told him that ‘the missionaries came with the Bible in one hand and the chisel in the other’ (Wendt, 1976b, p. 31), Wendt asks:

Can the pen be a chisel? We, Third World writers, may well ask. Couldn't we use pens to draw the genitals back on our pagans? Give the truth back to our converted, castrated civilisations? (Wendt, 1976b, p. 31)

Hereniko answers his teacher's question pessimistically, claiming that once Pacific Islanders learn how to read and write, their minds can never be decolonised (CPIS, 2018; Thaman, 2003). For the Pacific Way authors, using ‘writing’ as a tool to decolonise Pacific Islanders’ minds was problematic in two ways. First, it was the same device that missionaries and Western powers had applied to colonise the Pacific Islands. Second, they doubted whether writing was an appropriate tool to revive Pacific Island traditions, of which the tool itself had never been a part. How then can writing, introduced by the West, serve to decolonise Pacific minds?

An analysis of the literary genres that Wendt and other Pacific Way authors favoured provides an answer to this question. In 1972, the Pacific Way of writing was fostered by the foundation of the South Pacific Creative Arts Society (SPCAS) at USP, which the following year started its own journal titled *The Mana Annual of Creative Writing*.⁴ As the title indicates, the writings largely shared an artistic quality. During the 1970s the journal consisted of a great number of stories and poems written



by a diversity of writers such as Wendt, Konai Helu Thaman, Subramani and Marjorie Crocombe. Thaman's poem *Island Fire* is one of many writings expressing the alienation of 'traditional culture':

Embers
Of a once blazing
Fire
Sleep through an
Endless night
Fraught with the din of
Billiard balls
Hollywood violence
Rock 'n roll music
And the slow turning of
Foreign text book pages
The embers wait
Perhaps never to be
Rekindled by
Dry coconut leaves
... kerosene is easier!
(Thaman, 1973, p. 6)

The first issue of the *Mana Annual of Creative Writing* (1973) highlights that the 'standards and overall relevance of literature to any region can only be assessed in relation to the literary standards established by the region itself' (Arvidson, 1973, p. 6). To defuse problems attached to the tool of writing, Pacific Way authors chose fictional writing and poetry to redefine writing about the Pacific in Pacific terms. This was in conscious opposition to formal reports written by missionaries or colonial officials and scientific descriptions by anthropologists.

The opposition between anthropological texts and the Pacific Way of writing is of particular interest. While Malinowski (1944), for example, defined 'culture' in a scientific manner as the satisfaction of physical and psychological needs of individuals, Wendt (1976a, p. 52) pictured the concept metaphorically as a tree which is 'forever growing new branches, foliage, roots'. Margaret Mead (1928) portrayed Samoan culture in the tradition of positivist science to prove the importance of the cultural environment on human behaviour. Tongan writer Konai Helu Thaman expressed her understanding of culture by writing poems and Epeli Hau'ofa reflected on Pacific societies by writing a collection of short stories titled *Tales of the Tikongs* (1983).

Starting in the early 1970s, these examples underline the significant difference in the culture of writing between Pacific Islanders and Western anthropologists. Scholars and students following the Pacific Way qualitatively distinguished *their* writing from Western administrative and scientific writing about the Pacific. Decolonising the tool itself, it could then be employed as a means to liberate Pacific minds from Western hegemony.

3.2 | The Institute of Pacific Studies (IPS)

The Institute of Pacific Studies (IPS) was established in 1976 and initially led by its founding father, Ron Crocombe (USP, 1986). Morgan Tuimaleali'ifano, who studied at the Institute in the 1980s and was Head of School of Social Sciences between 2009 and 2014, explains Crocombe's founding vision:

It didn't really matter to him [Ron Crocombe] what discipline would be of use to Pacific Islanders studying themselves ... What was of prime concern was studying the locals within their localities. If they were comfortable in history, it was history, if they were comfortable in a combination of history and anthropology, so be it, if it was in geography, so be it. (Morgan Tuimaleali'ifano, interview, 2014)

In contrast to the Pacific Way of writing, the followers of which opposed anthropology by developing a different writing style, IPS deliberately kept the door open for students interested in anthropology. As Tuimaleali'ifano explains, this multidisciplinary strategy was employed to attract Pacific Islanders with no or little formal education, but valuable and extensive knowledge about the past and the present of Pacific Island societies:

It was a way of attracting them in, of accommodating their needs without the scholarly intimidations of passing through hoops and academic requirements and all the admission. Many of them were elderly people, who had been civil servants, had been teachers, bureaucrats, administrators, district officers, have worked out in the villages as *Turaga ni Koro* [Village Headman], had helped out with running offices, they themselves had been district officers and commissioners. And so many of them lacked the formal education, but they were recruited because they were found to have a good idea of what administration was and also able to speak English, but also to speak the local languages. So, they were the mediators between these different worlds. (Morgan Tuimaleali'ifano, interview, 2014)

Following the principle formulated by Morris (1966), the establishment of IPS took into consideration the skills and interests of the Pacific Island students and gave preference to student-centred learning and a practical approach, regarding the existence of disciplines as secondary. As a consequence, similar to the Sociology Department, the discipline of anthropology operated at USP under the name 'Pacific Studies'. Morgan Tuimaleali'ifano's personal experience exemplifies this function:

My interest was on migration and resettlement of other Pacific Islanders in other Pacific Islands. It was the story about acculturation, how outsiders are seen by the insiders settled ... So, it was mostly a cultural study. And I guess that found a home inside anthropology ... There were so many studies of relocating communities at that time in the 1960s, in the 1970s, and that came out of the Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania, so many conferences and so many studies were discussed in meetings and gatherings of mainly anthropologists. (Morgan Tuimaleali'ifano, interview, 2014)

IPS developed as a major publisher for Oceania by Oceanians (USP, 1993). Headed by Ron Crocombe, IPS strongly fostered Pacific Islanders to publish *their* stories (McCall, 1982; Tuimaleali'ifano, 2010). By December 1978, almost 200 Pacific Islanders had published through IPS (USP, 1978). Two years later, this number had increased to over 300 (USP, 1980). Tuimaleali'ifano (interview, 2014) estimates that 'no other institute in the world has been able to publish such a significant number of materials by locals'.

Similar to SPCAS, IPS aimed to decolonise writings about the Pacific region by promoting Pacific Island voices. In contrast, however, IPS followed a different strategy. A witness of that time describes Crocombe's interest as follows: 'I do not think Ron Crocombe ever did any creative writing himself, he was into analysis' (Scholar 4, interview, 2014). While the Pacific Way writers of SPCAS deliberately defined 'writing' in their own (artistic) terms, IPS predominantly published books in compliance with

Western standards of scientific writing, but aimed to counterbalance the quantity of Eurocentric publications, which at that time largely dominated the representation of Oceania in written form.

The approach pursued by IPS had direct consequences for Western anthropologists and a significant effect on the status of Western academics over the following decades. According to a number of (former) USP staff members who witnessed the emergence and consolidation of IPS, Crocombe's approach was highly 'protective' (Scholar 4, interview, 2014) and 'paternalistic':

He [Ron Crocombe] had a rather paternalistic approach to Pacific Islanders in the sense that European people were bad, and all Pacific Islanders were good, to put it crudely. It was that kind of postcolonial narrative. (Scholar 7, interview, 2014)

This narrative was manifested in the selection criteria for IPS publications for an extended period of time. Linda Crowl, who was Publications Fellow at IPS in the 1990s, remained true to Crocombe's vision and mission of strictly promoting Pacific Islander writing. One scholar, who had conducted PhD fieldwork in Fiji, requested to publish with IPS in order to ensure local access to the research findings:

I wanted so much to give something back to Fiji and so I said that I would very much like my PhD to be published with IPS, but [was told that] this was unfortunately impossible, because it was only for Pacific Islanders. (Scholar 7, interview, 2014)

Although certain non-Pacific Islander academics, such as David Routledge and Howard Van Trease, had published with IPS, this was not a generally available option. A number of interview participants stated that they had witnessed a systematic exclusion of Western academics from publishing with IPS. This matches with IPS' self-defined aims. In combination, it demonstrates that in the context of the decolonisation of writing about the Pacific, and in order to 'free' Oceanian minds, IPS systematically undermined Western academics' influence at USP. This affected Western anthropologists in particular, given that it was anthropologists who produced a great number of accounts that, from Pacific Islander perspectives, have often been declared as 'insensitive' (Konai H. Thaman, interview, 2014) and 'insulting' (Hau'ofa, 1975, p. 285). Thus, at USP, IPS was a key driver toward inverting power relations between Western anthropologists and Pacific Island academics.

It is not the intention here to victimise Western anthropologists or other Western academics. Whether the approach of IPS was the right choice to liberate Oceania from Eurocentric accounts is a question of its own. The key argument here is that the anti-colonial articulation of the Pacific Way—of which SPCAS and IPS were leading institutions—created a divide between Pacific Island scholars and Western anthropologists both in terms of quality of writing and publishing possibilities.

4 | THE 1980s

I will now turn my focus to the Sociology Department. I will demonstrate that, in the 1980s, the Department experienced a shift of influence from anthropology to neo-Marxist sociology. Subsequently, I will examine the USP context surrounding the time when the Writing Culture debate gained momentum within anthropology in the second half of the 1980s. While there have been other epistemological shifts within anthropology over the past decades, the Writing Culture debate was crucial for the postmodern transformation of anthropology and efforts to decolonise ethnographic writing (Barnard, 2010; McGee and Warms, 2012). I will argue that the Writing Culture debate did not find fertile ground at USP.



4.1 | Neo-Marxists vs. Culturalists

In the 1970s, the Sociology Department was strongly anthropology oriented. This can be largely attributed to social anthropologist John Harré's appointment as USP's first Reader in Sociology (USP, 1968a). Harré became the Head of the School of Social and Economic Development (SSED) in 1974. His doctoral father, Raymond Firth, was External Assessor to the Sociology Department in the 1970s (McCall, 1982). Referring to the same decade, Harré (interview, 2019) states that 'there is no doubt that what we delivered to our students was social anthropology'.

In 1974, a personal chair titled 'Professor of Social Anthropology' was established for John Harré (USP, 1974; John Harré, interview, 2019). According to Harré (interview, 2019), 'it [now] no longer seemed problematic to use the disciplinary designation of "social anthropology"'. Here, the notion of *social* anthropology, as opposed to *cultural* anthropology, is of relevance. Following Raymond Firth's tradition, and focusing on 'society' rather than 'culture', Harré (interview, 2019) notes that social anthropologists 'were more comfortable in pursuing academic links with sociologists'. By establishing a professorial chair in social anthropology, USP for the first time formally recognised the title 'anthropology' in 1974. This re-emphasises anthropology's strong influence at the Sociology Department in the 1970s.

This pattern changed in the early 1980s. The Sociology Department was 'increasingly adopting political economy and Marxist perspectives' (Naidu, 1993, p. 44). Andre Gunder Frank's appointment as External Assessor in the 1980s (McCall, 1982) underlines this shift.⁵ The hegemony of sociology over anthropology in the 1980s becomes probably most evident by analysing the contents of the courses offered by the Sociology Department. In 1973, the course SE122, titled *A Survey of Social Theory*, aimed to equip students with theoretical knowledge about culture and society and emphasised a range of classic anthropologists such as Bronislaw Malinowski, Alfred Reginald Radcliffe-Brown, Margaret Mead and Raymond Firth (USP, 1973). Ten years later the course was offered under the title *Sociological Theory and Methodology* with the aim to show:

both what philosophical and methodological problems face sociologists in their attempts to be scientific, and how sociological theory has been developed in the work of key sociologists. (USP, 1983a, p. 234)

SE120 was advertised as the *Study of Society* in 1970. It required students to read about kinship systems (USP, 1969). In the following decade, the same course promised to approach the same theme 'as viewed by sociologists, together with a preliminary understanding of sociological approaches, methods, and concepts' (USP, 1983a, p. 234). In the early 1970s, SE321 was titled *Family and Marriage* (USP, 1974) and temporarily taught by social anthropologist Harré. It was renamed *Political Sociology* in the 1980s (USP, 1983a).

According to Randy Thaman (interview, 2014), one of USP's longest serving academic staff members, Michael C. Howard was a driving force for this changing pattern at the Sociology Department. Howard started lecturing at USP in 1982 (Howard, 1991). Although trained in anthropology, he was sharply critical of anthropologists who fitted into a 'conservative framework' by advocating Pacific Island traditions (Howard, 1983a). Referring to the Mead-Freeman controversy, Howard wrote:

Freeman, who at a very early stage in his career came to view himself virtually as a Samoan, has been a vocal defender of Samoan traditions and of the position of the chiefly elite. He has developed ties with members of this elite and encouraged and defended many of their goals. (Howard, 1983a, pp. 95–96)

Following a strong neo-Marxist approach and applying the 'class' concept, Howard (1983b) perceived anthropologists, who focus on the concept of 'traditional culture', as ideal allies for the Pacific Island bourgeoisie (mostly chiefly families), who emerged in the context of Pacific Island states' independence and sought to retain their power by reassuring Pacific traditions.

Such neo-Marxist views became dominant in the Sociology Department and marginalised anthropology during the 1980s. Over the course of the decade, the Department employed strong neo-Marxist scholars: the expatriates Michael C. Howard, Nii-K Plange and Ron Witton, and Fijians Simione Durutalo, Jay Narayan and Vijay Naidu, were all appointed by the Sociology Department in the 1980s.⁶

Looking at the history of anthropology in a broader context, 'peasant studies', headed by Eric Wolf, introduced a sociological and political economist perspective to anthropology in the late 1950s (Znoj, 2012). The Marxist influence at USP could therefore also be interpreted as a Marxianisation of anthropology, rather than a disappearance of the discipline. However, since neo-Marxist sociologists outnumbered trained anthropologists in the Sociology Department, and because they directly attacked the discipline of anthropology, the influence of anthropologists was marginalised. While in the 1970s anthropology was actively taught within the Sociology Department, neo-Marxist sociology became dominant in the 1980s.

4.2 | Deconstructing authority

In the second half of the 1980s, the Writing Culture debate dominated the discipline of anthropology. This was a result of the post-war independence of many developing countries and the linguistic turn that had increasingly influenced anthropology since the early 1970s. Clifford Geertz's *The Interpretation of Cultures*, published in 1973, was a crucial publication for the linguistic turn of anthropology and fostered the epistemological shift from modernism to postmodernism.

The debate peaked with the publication of the essay collection *Writing Culture* (1986), edited by historian James Clifford and anthropologist George Marcus. Focusing on 'the making of ethnographic texts' (Clifford and Marcus, 1986, p. vii), the essays of *Writing Culture* (1986) analyse in depth how anthropologists convert their experiences and knowledge gathered during fieldwork into a written text. The *Writing Culture* (1986) authors sharply criticise the conventions of classic ethnographies that portray the anthropologist as omniscient and therefore capable of writing a final account. Also, they criticise that classic ethnographers write as if they had no influence on the society studied and claim to be objective. The *Writing Culture* (1986) contributors argue that the opposite is the case, and assert that classic ethnographers apply rhetorical devices in order to cover subjectivity, incompleteness and attached power inequalities that are real in the 'field' (e.g., Pratt, 1986; Rosaldo, 1986). Based on this criticism, representatives of the Writing Culture movement aimed to deconstruct the authority of the anthropologist. They advocated for multivocality in ethnographic texts (e.g., Pratt, 1986) and fostered an understanding of truth as partial (Clifford, 1986a).

Considering that the arguments of *Writing Culture* (1986) have been strongly debated through to the present time (e.g., Jebens and Kohl, 2011), and given the extensive number of ethnographic texts that have emerged over the past three decades, it is difficult to assess the Writing Culture debate's influence on ethnographic writing. However, from a general reader's point of view of ethnographic texts, it is fair to state that, since the 1980s, anthropologists started to follow the critique that emerged from the Writing Culture movement by reflecting on the authority they exercise over the people they represent in their texts.

In relation to Pacific anthropology, Jacqueline Ryle's ethnography *My God, My Land: Interwoven Paths of Christianity and Tradition in Fiji* (2010) is a case in point:

In my research I was touched by many of the things that people shared with me ... They are fragments, stories that continue to unfold outside the confines of this book, stories of which there are so many others that for lack of space or simply because I have not heard them, are not included here ... I consciously make extensive use of quotations, endeavouring to give people as much voice as possible and emphasise the multiple and different voices I recorded, and to create methodological transparency in my ethnography. At the same time I am aware that however honestly and genuinely I, as a *palagi* (European) academic, may wish to write about Fiji, I remain an intrinsic part of a long history of intervention, colonisation, and representation. (Ryle, 2010, p. xxxiv)

The publication of *Writing Culture* (1986) prompted anthropologists to pursue a critical reflection on the power relations in which they are entangled, and the authority that they exercise(d) to different degrees over the researched society. The Writing Culture movement of the 1980s broke with classic conventions of ethnographic writing, which developed in the context of colonialism. In this sense, the movement actively decolonised the discipline of anthropology.

How was the Writing Culture movement within the discipline of anthropology recognised at USP, an institution which emerged in the context of decolonisation of Pacific Island states? The status of anthropology at the time USP was founded in 1968, and subsequently throughout the 1970s and 1980s, suggests that the Writing Culture movement did not find fertile ground. As Crapanzano (2011) points out, the Writing Culture debate of the 1980s was a monologue among Western anthropologists, rather than a dialogue between Western anthropologists and their 'indigenous' (in the context of Oceania, 'Pacific Islander') colleagues. USP was no exception. Looking at the courses taught at the University from 1986 onward reveals that lecturers and students at the School of Social and Economic Development (SSED) scarcely participated in the Writing Culture debate (see USP Calendars 1986–2000).

The historical review conducted in this paper provides three substantiated arguments as to why the Writing Culture movement within anthropology scarcely touched the USP community. The first and most evident explanation is that, in the 1980s, sociology achieved hegemony over anthropology at SSED. *Writing Culture* (1986) provided a reflection of anthropology *for* anthropologists. Thus, the essay collection, and other books linked to the Writing Culture debate, such as, for example, Johannes Fabian's *Time and the Other* (1983), were scarcely discussed within the neo-Marxist sociology dominating SSED. Beyond SSED, the Writing Culture debate seems to have been of little relevance to an applied-oriented University with a strong emphasis on teaching rather than research and publications.

Moving back to the 1970s reveals two more historically founded reasons why Pacific Island academics from USP did not participate in the Writing Culture debate. First, the Pacific Way created a divide between Western anthropologists and Pacific Island academics working at USP. While IPS decolonised the literature of Oceania by publishing texts written by Pacific Islanders, SPCAS aimed to liberate Pacific literature from Western hegemony by creating an artistic Pacific Way of writing in opposition to scientific accounts produced by classic ethnographers. Joining both streams together, it can be concluded that this version of the Pacific Way was defined in opposition to Western anthropology. Consequently, although the representatives of the Pacific Way and the advocates of the Writing Culture movement both aimed at the decolonisation of writing, Pacific Island scholars did not follow the Writing Culture debate, which was initiated by Western academics. In short, a 'Pacification'—id est a Pacific version—of literature and historiography paradoxically inhibited a meaningful engagement with the Writing Culture debate at USP.

Second, there is a gap between theory and practice. While the Pacific Way actively decolonised Oceanian literature *in practice* in the 1970s, the Writing Culture movement initiated the decolonisation

of ethnographic texts *in theory* only more than a decade later. Therefore, in the context of USP, the Writing Culture movement was rather late.

Arguably, Pacific Island anthropologists could bridge the divide between their Western anthropology colleagues and their Pacific Island relatives. However, empirical evidence from USP rejects this argument and rather underlines the 'outdatedness' of the theoretical Writing Culture debate at USP. For example, Rusiate Nayacakalou, the first Melanesian to receive a PhD (Crocombe et al., 1988), notably in anthropology, was never employed at USP. He became manager of the Native Land Trust Board in Fiji in 1969 and died sadly young in 1972 (Tomlinson, 2006). Another Pacific Island anthropologist, Asesela Ravuvu, joined USP in 1976 as a lecturer in Pacific Studies and was later promoted to Professor and Director of IPS (USP, 1993). Therefore, Ravuvu represented an institute rather than the discipline of anthropology at USP, and he was part of the anti-colonial articulation of the Pacific Way, which divided Pacific Island scholars and Western anthropologists (see above).

In addition, Epeli Hau'ofa was one of the most influential scholars in social sciences at USP in the 1980s and the following years (Gregory Fry, interview, 2014). The Oceanian writer was trained in anthropology at McGill University in Canada, from where he received his Master's degree and held a position as a tutor in anthropology at UPNG. In 1975, while writing his PhD in anthropology at the Australian National University, Hau'ofa reflected on the construction of ethnographic texts:

When we [anthropologists] produce our articles and monographs and they [the informants] and their children or grandchildren read them, they often cannot see themselves or they see themselves being distorted and misrepresented. In many cases our field of discourse, and our special social scientific language, preclude any comprehension of what we [anthropologists] are talking about. (Hau'ofa, 1975, p. 284)

To avoid the described misrepresentation and alienation of Pacific Islanders, Hau'ofa contributed to the Pacific Way of writing as he started to engage in creative and fiction writing in the second half of the 1970s. This resulted in the publication of his *Tales of the Tikongs* (1983). In 1987, he published the novel *Kisses in the Nederends*. Ten years later, Hau'ofa became the founding director of the Oceania Centre at USP. The Centre enabled Pacific Island students to reflect on the cultural realities of Pacific Island people through the arts of music, dance, painting and creative writing (Barbara Hau'ofa, interview, 2014).

This brief academic biography demonstrates Hau'ofa's relationship with the Writing Culture movement. In the 1970s, the Oceanian writer defined himself as an anthropologist and, as such, actively engaged in the decolonisation of the discipline. By publishing the essay *Anthropology and Pacific Islanders* (1975), Hau'ofa actively contributed to an early stage of the Writing Culture debate. By the time the Writing Culture movement reached its peak in the second half of the 1980s, Hau'ofa was already committed to converting his criticisms into practice. For example, while Clifford (1986b) in theory defined ethnographies as allegories, and therefore as constructed rather than objective and scientific, Hau'ofa was already 'a step ahead' by publishing fictional writing. Hau'ofa's widow Barbara explains:

He certainly was not very much into the postmodern theoretical stuff, Foucault and Derrida for example—it just didn't grab him ... He saw himself as a lapsed anthropologist. He left the church, so to speak. (Barbara Hau'ofa, interview, 2014)

Epeli Hau'ofa, a highly influential scholar in the 1980s and 1990s at USP, and notably a trained anthropologist, to a significant extent implemented *in practice* what the Writing Culture debate was discussing in theory in the 1980s and 1990s. But, without defining himself as an anthropologist, and without further



participating in the theoretical discourse of the Writing Culture debate, Hau'ofa's work did not decolonise the discipline of anthropology in any meaningful way at USP.

5 | PRESENT PERCEPTIONS

With this long-term historical background, I will now examine current perceptions of anthropology at USP. I have analysed these perceptions between 2014 and 2018 on the basis of participant observation conducted at USP, and semi-structured interviews undertaken with academic staff teaching social science disciplines at USP.

Participant observation, conducted as a social science student and junior academic staff member at USP, revealed that the vast majority of students (including those studying sociology) are unaware of what anthropology is referring to—terminologically and as a field of study. Also, I discerned a significant unfamiliarity with the discipline among administrative and academic staff. This can be explained by the fact that the University has to date not offered a study program in anthropology.

Lecturers of social science disciplines have been chosen to examine current perceptions of anthropology in addition to the widespread unawareness. Semi-structured interviews, supplemented by participant observation, have been conducted to gain a more profound understanding of how anthropology is perceived at USP today. The interviews revealed that there is a strong association of anthropology with the 'classic era' of the discipline. When asked what do you think of when you hear the term 'anthropology', an academic staff member explained:

What comes to my mind is the study of societies ... And so, they've over the years—just tradition—have originally focused on social organisation, kinship relationships, land tenure relationships, ceremonies, and things like this, right. I mean that's my understanding of it ... My basic feeling is that it would have been people like Malinowski and Fortune, and Firth and Margaret Mead of course. (Scholar 5, interview, 2014)

Although Scholar 5 also referred to more contemporary anthropologists, the scholar's associations for anthropology are largely dominated by classic anthropologists. Other scholars pictured anthropology in a similar vein. Asking what comes to mind when hearing the term 'anthropology', Scholar 8 stated:

Margaret Mead, because I am a Samoan. I like her work. I think she is right. And the whole cultural relativism that she kind of represents and what she did for women. I don't know, but I think that will always remain as a legacy. (Scholar 8, interview, 2014)

This connection of anthropology to classic ethnographers of the colonial era is related to a picture of anthropology as an exploitative discipline. Scholar 2 associated anthropology with:

Mainly European scholars, who are studying other cultures and who come into the Pacific with a particular island or tribe in mind and they make that island the source of their career. I sometimes wonder what usefulness these people are for local communities. (Scholar 2, interview, 2014)

While Scholar 2 regards anthropology as an exploitative social science, in the sense that anthropologists use the knowledge gained for their own purposes, other academic staff directly link anthropology to the colonial era. This scholar, for example, stated:

Well the conventional image is a native and his wife and his children and an anthropologist. A local family comprised of a tribal person, his family and an anthropologist studying them. So that was a very common image of an anthropologist and it was also associated with colonialism. (Scholar 3, interview, 2014)

This academic staff member declared the idea of 'anthropology as a colonial discipline' as an image of the past. However, that the scholar's description of anthropology sets out with the picture of a colonial study and does not go any further underlines that the notion of 'anthropology as a colonial discipline' is highly contemporary.

The scholars interviewed certainly have a more informed opinion about anthropology than what is portrayed here. However, the interview and participant observation results suggest that the stereotype of 'anthropology as a colonial study' is widespread among academic staff teaching social sciences at USP. That some USP scholars deliberately conceal their academic background in anthropology is symptomatic of this reality:

Within USP I would define myself more as an ethnographer, sometimes as a sociologist, but I guess this is very much related to particular views that kind of, you know, people may have in mind when talking about anthropologists in this particular context. (Scholar 6, interview, 2014)

The research findings with regard to how the current USP community perceives anthropology as an academic discipline are twofold. First, there is a widespread unawareness of the discipline of anthropology. Considering that USP has hitherto not offered a degree, diploma or certificate in anthropology, this is not surprising. Second, the notion of anthropology as an exploitative colonial discipline connected to the classic era of anthropology is common among academic staff working in the field of social sciences at USP. In light of the extensive history of classic anthropology during the colonial time in the Pacific region, this can be seen as a logical consequence. But it is more than that. The outdated image of anthropology at USP demonstrates that anthropologists have been so far largely incapable of decolonising the discipline in the minds of USP community members.

6 | CONCLUSION

This paper has explored for the first time anthropology's past and present status at USP. To date, USP has not offered a degree, diploma or certificate in anthropology. Despite the formal absence of a study program in anthropology throughout USP's history, this paper has highlighted that anthropological content was actively taught as part of Sociology in the 1970s, and that anthropologists have been repeatedly employed in Sociology from the time the University opened until today.

I have identified three key reasons why anthropology was not included in USP's curriculum when the University was founded. First, USP was conceptualised as a development institution in the late 1960s, with the aim of contributing directly to the economic development and industrialisation of USP member states. Consequently, anthropology and other social science disciplines had been marginalised prior to USP's opening in 1968. Second, in the curriculum planning, sociology, perceived as the study of modern industrial societies, was the preferred discipline to anthropology, which was regarded as the study of traditional societies. Third, in the context of the (anticipated) independence of USP member states, the name 'anthropology', strongly associated with the colonial era, was deliberately



excluded from the USP curriculum. In sum, anthropology lacked practical meaning in an institution that directly aimed to contribute to the modernisation of Pacific Island states.

The field research that I conducted between 2014 and 2018 suggests that there is a widespread lack of awareness of the discipline of anthropology at USP. An outdated image of anthropology linked to the discipline's classic era is common among academic staff teaching social science subjects at USP. In exploring the history of anthropology at USP, I have argued that, from the 1970s onward, a 'Pacification' of literature and historiography was creating a divide between Pacific Island academics and Western anthropologists. This divide, coupled with the hegemony of political economist and anti-culturalist approaches among the USP teaching staff in the 1980s, inhibited a meaningful engagement with the Writing Culture debate at the University. This may explain why current perceptions of anthropology at USP continue to be strongly influenced by anthropology's history during colonial times, rather than the discipline's postmodern transformation over the past thirty years.

Thus far, research on the institutional and regional history of anthropology in the Pacific Island region has been all too rare. This paper has hopefully provided a strong motivation for future research. This paper has set the emphasis on investigating the period from the 1960s to the 1980s and the present at USP. There is particular scope for future research to explore in more detail anthropology's history at USP from the 1990s onward.

Looking into the future of anthropology and USP, this paper did not discuss whether USP should offer a study program in anthropology. However, the research findings presented here provide some guidance for such a discussion: reflections on anthropology's future at USP should not be based on the question of how to develop anthropology, but rather focus on how anthropology can contribute to the development of the Pacific Island region and its people.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank all interview participants for sharing their time, knowledge and experiences. I am grateful to Sargam Goundar and Heinzpeter Znoj for discussions that helped in shaping this research. My thanks to Richard Vokes, Tony Binns and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful feedback on earlier versions of this paper.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ The Australian Government was later invited to join the mission (Morris, 1966).
- ² Sadly, Barbara Hau'ofa passed away in 2017 while this research was in progress.
- ³ See Sharrad (2003) for a detailed review.
- ⁴ Subsequently retitled *Mana: A South Pacific Journal of Language and Literature*.
- ⁵ Andre Gunder Frank's academic work was significantly shaped by the ideas of Karl Marx.
- ⁶ See Howard (1983a) for a detailed overview.

REFERENCES

- Aikman, C.M. (1988) Establishment: 1968–74. In: Crocombe, R. & Meleisea, M. (Eds.) *Pacific Universities: Achievements, Problems, Prospects*. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, pp. 3–52.
- Alexander, N. (1967) *Report on the University of the South Pacific*. Suva: Government Press.
- Arvidson, K.O. (1973) Aspects of writing on the South Pacific. *Mana Annual*, 1(1), 5–9.
- Barnard, A. (2010) *History and Theory in Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bošković, A. & Eriksen, T.H. (2010) Introduction: Other people's anthropologies. In: Bošković, A. (Ed.) *Other People's Anthropologies: Ethnographic Practice on the Margins*. New York: Berghahn Books, pp. 1–19.
- Brash, E. (1988) Universitas Cenderawasih. In: Crocombe, R. & Meleisea, M. (Eds.) *Pacific Universities: Achievements, Problems, Prospects*. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, pp. 167–175.

- Buck, P.H. (1941) Pan-pipes in Polynesia. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 50(200), 173–184.
- Buck, P.H. (1944) *Arts and Crafts of the Cook Islands*. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum.
- Cassity, E.A. (2001) *Spheres of Influence and Academic Networks: A History of Official Australian Aid to the University of the South Pacific (USP), 1960–1990*. PhD thesis, Columbia University.
- Clifford, J. (1986a) Introduction: Partial truth. In: Clifford, J. & Marcus, G.E. (Eds.) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. London: University of California Press, pp. 1–26.
- Clifford, J. (1986b) On ethnographic allegory. In: Clifford, J. & Marcus, G.E. (Eds.) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. London: University of California Press, pp. 98–121.
- Clifford, J. & Marcus, G.E. (Eds.) (1986) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. London: University of California Press.
- CPIS (Center for Pacific Islands Studies). (2018) *Pacific Studies 2000: Pre-Conference Discussion*. Available at: <http://www.hawaii.edu/cpis/conference/preconfdisc.html> Accessed 15 October 2018.
- Crapanzano, V. (2011) The end – the ends – of anthropology. In: Jebens, H. & Kohl, K.H. (Eds.) *The End of Anthropology?*. Wantage: Sean Kingston Publishing, pp. 113–138.
- Crocombe, R. (1976) *The Pacific Way: An Emerging Identity*. Suva: Lotu Pasifika Publications.
- Crocombe, R., Baba, T. & Meleisea, M. (1988) The development of higher education in the Pacific Islands. In: Crocombe, R. & Meleisea, M. (Eds.) *Pacific Universities: Achievements, Problems, Prospects*. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, pp. 20–29.
- Currie, G. (1964) *Report of the Commission on Higher Education in Papua and New Guinea*. Canberra: AGPS.
- Derrick, R.A. (1950) *Report on Project S.1: Vocational Training*. Noumea: South Pacific Commission.
- Eriksen, T.H. (2015) *Small Places, Large Issues: An Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropology*. London: Pluto.
- Fabian, J. (1983) *Time and the Other*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Firth, R. (1961) *History and Traditions of Tikopia*. Wellington: The Polynesian Society.
- Firth, R. (2002) *Man and Culture: An Evaluation of the Work of Bronislaw Malinowski*. New York: Routledge.
- Geertz, C. (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hallowell, A.I. (1965) The history of anthropology as an anthropological problem. *Journal of the History of Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1), 24–38.
- Harlow, F.J. (1953) *Report on Project S.20: Central Vocational Training Institution*. Noumea: South Pacific Commission.
- Hau'ofa, E. (1975) Anthropology and Pacific Islanders. *Oceania*, 45(4), 283–289.
- Hau'ofa, E. (1983) *Tales of the Tikongs*. Auckland: Longman Paul.
- Hau'ofa, E. (1987) *Kisses in the Nederends*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Hau'ofa, E. (1993) A beautiful cemetery. In: USP (Ed.) *A Garland of Achievement*. Suva: USP, pp. 81–82.
- Hereniko, V. (1993) The students. In: USP (Ed.) *A Garland of Achievement*. Suva: The University of the South Pacific, p. 86.
- Herle, A. & Rouse, S. (Eds.) (1998) *Cambridge and the Torres Strait. Centenary Essays on the 1998 Anthropological Expedition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Howard, M.C. (1983a) A preliminary survey of anthropology and sociology in the South Pacific. *Journal of Pacific Studies*, 9(1), 70–132.
- Howard, M.C. (1983b) Social scientists in paradise. *Journal of Pacific Studies*, 9(1), 1–8.
- Howard, M.C. (1991) *Fiji: Race and Politics in an Island State*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Jebens, H. (2011) The crisis of anthropology. In: Jebens, H. & Kohl, K.H. (Eds.) *The End of Anthropology?*. Wantage: Sean Kingston Publishing, pp. 13–35.
- Jebens, H. & Kohl, K.H. (Eds.) (2011) *The End of Anthropology?*. Wantage: Sean Kingston Publishing.
- Jegade, A.S. (2015) From gateway to gatekeeper: Anthropology: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. In: Nkwi, P.N. (Ed.) *The Anthropology of Africa: Challenges for the 21st Century*. Bamenda: Langaa RPCIG. pp. 3–12.
- Keesing, F.M. (1946) *Native Peoples of the Pacific World*. New York: Macmillan.
- Keesing, R. (1965) *Kwaio Marriage and Society*. PhD thesis, Harvard University.
- Keown, M. (2005) *Postcolonial Pacific Writing: Representations of the Body*. London: Routledge.
- Kuklick, H. (Ed.) (2008) *A New History of Anthropology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kuper, A. (2015) *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The British School in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Routledge.
- Lawson, S. (2010) 'The Pacific Way' as postcolonial discourse: Towards a reassessment. *The Journal of Pacific History*, 45(3), 297–314.



- Liebersohn, H. (2008) Anthropology before anthropology. In: Kuklick, H. (Ed.) *A New History of Anthropology*. Malden: Blackwell, pp. 17–31.
- Lynch, J. (1988) The Papua New Guinea system. In: Crocombe, R. & Meleisea, M. (Eds.) *Pacific Universities: Achievements, Problems, Prospects*. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, pp. 176–187.
- Malinowski, B. (1922) *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Malinowski, B. (1944) *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- McCall, G. (1982) Anthropology in the Pacific. *Australian Anthropological Society Newsletter*, 14, 30–43.
- McGee, R.J. & Warms, R.L. (2012) *Anthropological Theory. An Introductory History*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mead, M. (1928) *Coming of Age in Samoa*. New York: Morrow Quill.
- Morris, C. (1966) *Report of the Higher Education Mission to the South Pacific*. London: Ministry of Overseas Development.
- Naidu, V. (1993) School of social and economic development. *A Garland of Achievement*. Suva: USP, pp. 43–45.
- Nisbet, R.A. (1943) The French Revolution and the rise of sociology in France. *American Journal of Sociology*, 49(2), 156–164.
- Platt, J. (2010) Sociology. In: Backhouse, R.E. & Fontaine, P. (Eds.) *The History of Social Sciences since 1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 102–135.
- Potter, R., Binns, T., Elliott, J.A., Nel, E. & Smith, D.W. (2018) *Geographies of Development: An Introduction to Development Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Pratt, M.L. (1986) Fieldwork in common places. In: Clifford, J. & Marcus, G.E. (Eds.) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. London: University of California Press, pp. 27–50.
- Rosaldo, R. (1986) From the door of his tent: The fieldworker and the inquisitor. In: Clifford, J. & Marcus, G.E. (Eds.) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. London: University of California Press, pp. 77–97.
- Rostow, W.W. (1960) *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ryle, J. (2010) *My God, My Land: Interwoven Paths of Christianity and Tradition in Fiji*. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Sharrad, P. (2003) *Albert Wendt and Pacific Literature: Circling the Void*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Stocking, G.W. (1978) Die Geschichtlichkeit der Wilden und die Geschichte der Ethnologie. *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 4(4), 520–535.
- Stocking, G.W. (1983) The ethnographer's magic: Fieldwork in British anthropology from Tylor to Malinowski. In: Stocking, G.W. (Ed.) *Observers Observed: Essays on Ethnographic Fieldwork*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, pp. 70–120.
- Stocking, G.W. (1996) *After Tylor: British Social Anthropology 1888–1951*. London: Athlone.
- Thaman, K.H. (1973) Island fire. *Mana Annual of Creative Writing*, 1(1), 6.
- Thaman, K.H. (2003) Decolonizing Pacific studies: Indigenous perspectives, knowledge, and wisdom in higher education. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 15(1), 1–17.
- Thomas, N. (1997) *In Oceania: Visions, Artifacts, Histories*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Tomlinson, M. (2006) Reflexivity, tradition, and power: The work of R. R. Nayacakalou. *Ethnos*, 71(4), 489–506.
- Tuimaleali'ifano, M., (2010) 'Papa Ron' Crocombe, 1929–2009. *The Journal of Pacific History*, 45(3), 371–374.
- USP (1968a) *Handbook 1969*. Suva: The University of the South Pacific.
- USP (1968b) *Programme Planning Seminar: Report of a General Discussion Held on Monday, 27 May 1968*. Suva: The University of the South Pacific.
- USP (1969) *Calendar 1970*. Suva: The University of the South Pacific.
- USP (1973) *Calendar 1973*. Suva: The University of the South Pacific.
- USP (1974) *Calendar 1974*. Suva: The University of the South Pacific.
- USP (1978) *Calendar 1979*. Suva: The University of the South Pacific.
- USP (1980) *Calendar 1981*. Suva: The University of the South Pacific.
- USP (1983a) *Calendar 1983*. Suva: The University of the South Pacific.
- USP (1983b) *Calendar 1984*. Suva: The University of the South Pacific.
- USP (1986) *Calendar 1986: Volume 1*. Suva: The University of the South Pacific.
- USP (Ed.) (1993) *A Garland of Achievement*. Suva: USP.
- USP (2020) *Handbook and Calendar 2020*. Suva: The University of the South Pacific.
- Vokes, R. (2014) The many histories of anthropology. *History and Anthropology*, 25(1), 123–136.

- Wanhalla, A. (2013) *Matters of the Heart: A History of Interracial Marriage in New Zealand*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Wendt, A. (1976a) *Inside Us the Dead: Poems 1961–1974*. Auckland: Longman Paul.
- Wendt, A. (1976b) Towards a new Oceania. *Mana Review*, 1(1), 49–60.
- Znoj, H. (2012) Geschichte der Ethnologie. In: Beer, B. & Fischer, H. (Eds.) *Ethnologie: Einführung und Überblick*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, pp. 33–52.

How to cite this article: Kessler KA. Anthropology at the University of the South Pacific: From past dynamics to present perceptions. *Aust J Anthropol*. 2021;00:1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1111/taja.12388>