

# **Conflicts and Regional Peacebuilding in the Pacific Island Countries: In Search of Good Governance**

**Yoko OGASHIWA**

Institute for Peace Science, Hiroshima University

## **1 Introduction**

Two coups broke out one after another in the Pacific Islands Countries in 2000, one in Fiji in May and the other in Solomon Islands in June. These incidents pushed the Pacific Islands Forum (hereafter the Forum), a regional organization established in 1971, to adopt the Biketawa Declaration at its annual meeting in October 2000, which defined the guiding principles and courses of actions to be taken by the Forum in case of political crises in the region. After adopting the Biketawa Declaration, the Forum shifted its stance from non-intervening to intervening in conflicts in the region<sup>1)</sup>.

The Forum got especially involved in the conflict in Solomon Islands, which was labeled as a "failing state" in Melanesia (Australian Strategic Policy Institute, 2003) where some academics claimed "Africanization" was proceeding (Reilly and Wainwright, 2005:125). Following the dispatch of the election observer mission in December 2001, it sent the eminent persons group to Solomon Islands in June 2002. By the request of the Solomon Islands government, regional military intervention was conducted in July 2003 by military and police personnel from Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Fiji, and Tonga. This was followed by establishing of Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands as a control body for regional intervention<sup>2)</sup>. The intervention of the Forum in the conflict in Solomon Islands attracted attention as the first case based on the Biketawa Declaration.

While directly intervening in the conflict, the Forum has tried to form good governance in the region as a part of regional peacebuilding, prior to adopting the Biketawa Declaration. In what ways has the Forum actually tried to form good

---

\*This article is based on the paper presented to the International Small Island Studies Association Conference, Islands of the World X, "Globalizing Islands: Culture, Peace, Resources and Sustainability," in Jeju, South Korea, 25-29 August 2008.

governance in the region? And, to what extent are these attempts of the Forum effective for regional peacebuilding? The purpose of this article is to examine the attempts of the Forum to form good governance and analyze their significances for regional peacebuilding in the Pacific Islands Countries.

First, this article considers the characteristics of the conflicts in the Pacific Islands Countries, followed by an overview of the Forum's engagement with good governance. Then, it moves on to explore how the Forum has attempted to form good governance in the region. In the last section, it discusses the effectiveness of the Forum's attempt for regional peacebuilding.

## **2. Characteristics of the Conflicts in the Pacific Islands Countries**

When we think about the conflicts in the Pacific Islands Countries, it is necessary to note two factors. The first factor is ethnicity.

The Pacific Islands Countries are quite diverse. They are divided into three sub-regions, namely Polynesia, Melanesia, and Micronesia. In each sub-region, there exist diversities at various levels, such as country, island, district, and village. For example, diverse languages are spoken in the Pacific Islands Countries. It is said that over 1200 indigenous languages are spoken in Melanesia, that is, about one-quarter of the world's languages are spoken there (Reilly and Wainwright, *op.cit.*: 127).

Most of the conflicts in the Pacific Islands Countries have occurred among the ethnic groups. In the case of Solomon Islands, conflict broke out between residents of Guadalcanal and settlers from Malaita. Also, in the case of Bougainville in Papua New Guinea, Bougainvilleans fought for independence from Papua New Guinea. Fiji is another typical example of the conflict between ethnic groups, namely indigenous Fijians and Indo-Fijians who are descendents of immigrant labourers.

However, we have to note that each ethnic group is not always internally homogenous. It is quite common that differences exist inside of the ethnic group. For instance, the Fijians are divided along a regional line; Polynesian-influenced eastern islands and Melanesian-influenced western regions. Along the line of a traditional social system, they are divided into several units from mataqali (land-owning unit), yavusa (clan comprising of a number of mataqali) to vanua (bigger social and political unit made up from a number of yavusa). The Indo-Fijians are also divided into various

sub-groups, such as Hindu, Muslim, Christianity, and Sikh.

Although there are differences within the ethnic group, people tend to be bound to it and committed to conflict. That is because of the second factor of the conflicts, namely political/economic disparities.

The conflict in Bougainville provided an example. The Bougainvilleans were fragmented with 19 different language groups (Reilly, 2004:488). However, the situation has changed since the copper mining started in Bougainville in 1964. After Papua New Guinea gained independence in 1975, the copper of Bougainville became a major product which sustained the national economy. From the 1970s to the 1980s, it alone made up 44 per cent of exports of Papua New Guinea. While Bougainville made a substantial contribution to the national economy of Papua New Guinea, dissatisfaction with distribution of benefits of the mine amounted among the Bougainvilleans (McDougall, 2004:343-344). In 1989, a group of Bougainvilleans sabotaged the mine. The Papua New Guinea government dispatched the Defence Force to Bougainville and armed conflict broke out between the Defence Force and local secessionist forces named the Bougainville Revolutionary Army (BRA). Although it can not be said that BRA obtained support from a wide range of local people, its claim for independence from Papua New Guinea responded to the general feeling of the Bougainvilleans that they were economically exploited by the national government (*Ibid.*). Thus, the “pan-Bougainvillean identity” (Reilly, 2004:488) was generated.

However, it is necessary to note again that conflict is caused not only by political/economic disparities but also by ethnicity. While political/economic disparities will make a conflict more acute, there exists ethnicity on its basis. The conflict in Bougainville proved that political/economic disparities over copper mining were an important factor. At the same time, it should be pointed out that heterogeneity of Bougainvilleans in Papua New Guinea also influenced the conflict. Although the Bougainvilleans were ethnically linked to the people in Western Province of Solomon Islands, Bougainville was incorporated in the territory of Papua New Guinea, based upon boundaries from the colonial era. Therefore, the Bougainvilleans have been regarded by the others as well as themselves, as being distinctive from other ethnic groups in Papua New Guinea. Reilly quoted their visible skin color as looking like “jet black people”, as one index of distinctiveness of the Bougainvilleans (Reilly, 2004:

488). It plainly illustrated the ethnic factor in the conflict in Bougainville.

Therefore, it is difficult to think about the ethnic factor and political/economic disparities separately in the conflicts in the Pacific Island Countries. Both are closely intertwined. It is exactly in this respect that we can label conflicts in the Pacific Island Countries as “ethnic conflicts”.

### **3. The Pacific Islands Forum and Good Governance**

It was in the South Pacific Forum Vision Statement adopted at the annual meeting in 1995 that the Forum referred to good governance for the first time. Presenting a vision for further enhancement of regional cooperation of the Forum for the next 25 years, the statement mentioned good governance as a part of it (South Pacific Forum Secretariat, 1995).

Two years later, the Forum stated good governance as a part of regional security cooperation. At the annual meeting, the Forum adopted the Aitutaki Declaration on Regional Security Cooperation and specified good governance as one of the guiding principles governing security cooperation in the region, along with sustainable development and international cooperation including preventive diplomacy (South Pacific Forum Secretariat, 1997a). Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, the Biketawa Declaration was adopted at the Forum’s annual meeting in 2000 and “commitment to good governance” was listed in the declaration as one of the guiding principles in case of political crises in the region (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, 2000a). “Commitment to good governance” was also mentioned in the Nasonini Declaration on Regional Security adopted at the annual meeting in 2002, as “a key fundamental strategy for addressing some of the difficult and sensitive issues underlying the causes of tension and conflict in the region” (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, 2002a).

Then, how has the Forum defined good governance? It can be said that good governance for the Forum is composed of three elements; accountability, transparency, and effective participation by the public in decision-making (*Forum Review*, 2000:9). Noel Levi, Secretary-General of the Forum, stated at the meeting on governance for the parliamentarians in the Pacific region in 2000, that accountability was about “rights of citizens, or key broad-base community groups, to make public officials responsible for

government behaviour and responsive to the needs of citizens”. On transparency, he explained that it reduced uncertainty and helped inhibit corruption among public and elected officials. He further emphasized the notion that those who governed, and those who were governed, must have equal participation in the decision-making process (*Ibid.*).

Let us take a logging issue as an example to understand good governance in the concrete context of the Pacific Island Countries. In Melanesia, Southeast-Asian companies have operated large-scale commercial logging since the early 1980s. Rapid and large-scale deforestation, which was called a "green" goldrush" (Thistlethwaite and Davis, 1996:49), caused a lot of problems. One serious problem was corruption of politicians and public officers. Receiving bribes from logging companies, politicians and public officers favoured them with issuing logging licenses and leaving illegal operation untouched (Kabutaulaka, 2000:95; Connell, 1997: 102, 105-106). One symbolic incident was when Ted Diro, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Forestry of Papua New Guinea, was prosecuted for receiving bribes from a logging company and forced to resign in 1991.

Lack of good governance, generated by the abuse of power by politicians and public officers as mentioned above, will bring about a non-confidence feeling from the people in their government. It will lead to a vacuum of governance in which government has no more control over law and order, and provoke conflict. Hence, the Forum has tried to form good governance in the region and strengthen regional peacebuilding.

Needless to say, good governance itself is not the Forum's own idea. It was first advocated by the World Bank in 1989, followed by United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the Asian Development Bank, other aid agencies and donor countries, as a so-called "political conditionality".

In particular, advocacy of good governance by European Union (EU) had a significant impact on the Forum. The Pacific Island Countries, as members of ACP (Africa, the Caribbean, and the Pacific) countries, have enjoyed special trade treatment offered by EU under the Lomé Convention. There was no doubt that fragile economies of the Pacific Island Countries have been sustained by the Lomé Convention since its inception in 1975. In 1995, the fourth version of the convention, which came into force

in 1990, was amended at the mid-term review to include good governance as particular aim of cooperation activities under the convention, along with the recognition and application of democratic principles and the consolidation of the rule of law (Arts and Byron, 1997: 83-84)<sup>3</sup>). This meant that the Pacific Island Countries were put under direct pressure to commit to good governance. In such circumstances, the Forum adopted and promoted the idea of good governance.

As illustrated above, good governance is originally an “exogenous idea” for the Forum<sup>4</sup>). How has the Forum tried to embody such an “exogenous idea” of good governance in the Pacific Island Countries as a part of regional peacebuilding? The next section will investigate the ways that the Forum has tried to form good governance in the region.

#### **4. Governance from the Top**

The Forum’s attempts to form good governance in the region have been conducted in two directions. One is the attempts to form “good governance from the top”, that is, to infiltrate good governance among the parliamentarians and public officers in the Pacific Island Countries.

The attempts for “good governance from the top” started with the adoption of the Eight Principles of Accountability as a part of the Forum Economic Action Plan at the first Forum Economic Ministers Meeting in July 1997. Two months later, Eight Principles of Accountability were officially endorsed at the Forum annual meeting. They were the principles of “’best practice’ for public accountability, based on concepts of openness with Government information and public scrutiny of the performance of Governments and public officials” (South Pacific Forum Secretariat, 1997b). The key points of Eight Principles of Accountability were: transparency in fiscal management of the economy; accountability of government for its financial resources and the way in which these have been used; and reinforcement of the tradition of the independent central banking system (South Pacific Forum Secretariat, 2001a). In July 1998, the Forum Economic Ministers Meeting endorsed the Code of Principles and Good Practices on Fiscal Transparency defined by the International Monetary Fund as a model to complement the Eight Principles of Accountability (South Pacific Forum Secretariat, 1998).

These attempts have also been carried out by establishing the Pacific Islands Speakers Forum<sup>5)</sup> comprised of the speakers of parliaments in the Forum member countries. The Pacific Islands Speakers Forum was set up in 2001 following the closure of parliaments during the coups in Fiji and Solomon Islands in 2000. It was a regional body “to discuss ways for Pacific Parliaments to keep improving the quality of governance within the framework of parliamentary democracy” (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, 2003a). At the inaugural meeting, Pacific Islands Speakers Forum adopted the Regional Action Plan for Forum Island Country Legislatures as “key principles of best practices to guide legislative development in all forum Island Countries” (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, 2001b).

However, the attempts to form “good governance from the top” based on the “exogenous idea” have been gradually changing. The first emergence of change was shown in the Forum Principles of Good Leadership adopted at the Forum annual meeting in 2003. The Forum Principles of Good Leadership, a model code for decision-makers on how to act while holding public office, were originated from the workshop on leadership codes in 2002, which was hosted by the Forum Secretariat, the UNDP and the Commonwealth Secretariat (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, 2002b). They were comprised of nine principles, such as “respect for the law and system of government”, “respect for people on whose behalf leaders exercise power” and “economy and efficiency”.

Although the Forum Principles of Good Leadership were fundamentally based on the “exogenous idea”, it was remarkable that “respect for cultural values, customs and traditions” was listed as one of the principles (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, 2003b). This was not included in the precedent Eight Principles of Accountability. The final communiqué of the Forum annual meeting described that the Forum Principles of Good Leadership took into account “both traditional Pacific values and Forum Leaders’ commitment to the principles contained in the Biketawa Declaration” (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, 2003c). In short, the Forum Principles of Good Leadership considered “traditional Pacific values”, while being fundamentally based on the “exogenous idea”.

Forum’s consideration to “traditional Pacific values” in the attempts to form “good governance from the top” was more obviously shown in the statement given by

Greg Urwin, Secretary-General of the Forum, at Forum Presiding Officers' Conference in 2004. He mentioned that the Forum leaders received a review of the Forum and its activities, conducted by the eminent persons group, and directed the goals listed in a review, including good governance, should be pursued in the context of the protection and development of the region's cultural identity. Then, he stated that governance was not a foreign value foisted on them from overseas and emphasized as follows:

There is a lot that we can, and should, learn from our traditional communities in the matter of exercise of proper authority- how else could these communities have developed such an intricate set of cultural and social guidelines, well before the introduction of literacy or the other aspects of society we recognize as modern (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, 2004a).

At the same time, Urwin asked the speakers and officers of parliaments, as "champions of governance" who would help create an environment in which governance would flourish, to observe good governance based on the "exogenous idea", such as accountability (*Ibid.*). Nevertheless, it should be noted that the Forum was trying to redefine good governance in relation to "traditional Pacific values", as illustrated that Urwin called for "good Pacific governance" in the statement (*Ibid.*).

One reason of Forum's redefinition on good governance was reaction to good governance based on the "exogenous idea", among the political leaders in the Pacific Island Countries. For instance, Berenado Vunibobo, Finance Minister of Fiji who attended the Forum Economic Ministers Meeting in 1997 where Eight Principles of Accountability was adopted, criticized good governance as "fashion" by saying:

At one time you hear the international system talk about human resources and development and after a while something else emerges as the major thing and the major thing in recent years is good governance (*Islands Business*, 1997:35).

The Forum had to consider "traditional Pacific values" in order to appease reaction against good governance based on the "exogenous idea", among the political leaders at whom attempts for "good governance from the top" were targeted.

Second, and more importantly, there emerged the idea of re-examining and re-evaluating "traditional Pacific values" in the context of good governance during the argument over good governance. This point will be more precisely discussed in the last section.

It should be pointed out here again that Forum's attempts for "good governance from the top", which originated in the "exogenous idea", are to head toward a new direction of reinterpreting good governance from the perspective of "traditional Pacific values".

## **5. Governance from the Bottom**

As well as the attempts for "good governance from the top", the Forum has carried out attempts for "good governance from the bottom" in order to form good governance in the region. That was the attempts to facilitate "civil society" to participate in decision-making process of regionalism.

It was in the Forum Secretariat and Non-Government Organisations Policy Consultation Framework adopted in 2000 that the Forum made the initial attempts for "good governance from the bottom". Prior to this, the Forum referred to the necessity of cooperation with "civil society" in the South Pacific Forum Vision Statement in 1995, Review of the Forum Economic Action Plan and final communiqué of the Forum annual meeting in 1999 (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, 2002c). In the Forum Secretariat and Non-Government Organisations Policy Consultation Framework, the Forum officially regarded Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) as consultation partners in the decision-making process of regionalism.

Forum Secretariat and Non-Government Organisations Policy Consultation Framework divided NGOs into two groups, that is, "civil society" and "business sector", and established separate annual dialogue meetings to discuss policy issues. Criteria for participation in the meetings included "being a legally constituted NGO with a Pacific focus and a membership drawn from Forum members, working in key area of Secretariat activities and also actively engaged with member governments or development partners" (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, 2000b). Those NGOs were provided information on policy issues by the Forum through information technologies and were encouraged to attend appropriate and specific sector Forum meetings as observers (*Ibid.*).

Attempts for "good governance from the bottom" were further strengthened by replacing Forum Secretariat and Non-Government Organisations Policy Consultation Framework with Framework for Engagement with Pacific Regional Non-State Actors

in 2002. Newly defining “Non-State Actors” as consultation partners, Framework for Engagement with Pacific Regional Non-State Actors expanded room for “civil society” to participate in decision-making process of regionalism by several mechanisms, such as establishing biennial consultation meetings, granting observership at meetings of Forum constituencies and high level regional meetings, and admitting participation at focal groups to develop background paper for formulating policy and Working Group of Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific<sup>7)</sup> (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, 2002c).

Furthermore, the Forum propelled attempts for “good governance from the bottom” by inviting “civil society” to the consultations on development of the Pacific Plan, which was an action plan for implementing future goals for strengthening regional cooperation and integration of the Forum. Eleven “Non-State Actors” were invited to the consultations and they discussed the issue with the Forum Secretariat (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, 2004b). In addition, a “civil society” representative was employed as a liaison with “civil society” organizations at the Pacific Plan Office at the Forum Secretariat in 2005 although the job was under contract for just six months. It was the first case that the appointment of a “civil society” representative had ever been made by the Forum (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, 2005).

The Forum’s attempts were further elaborated with the adoption of the Policy on Consultative Status and Accreditation between the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and Pacific Regional Non-State Actors in 2007. Under the Policy, the Forum set up the Consultative Status Committee, comprised of representatives of the past, present and future Forum Chairs plus a representative of the Forum Secretariat, and made consultative status of “Non-State Actors” more accurate (*Policy on Consultative Status and Accreditation between the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and Pacific Regional Non-State Actors*).

Of course, just as the attempts for “good governance from the top” were, the attempts for “good governance from the bottom” are originally based on the “exogenous idea” advocated by aid donors. In particular, it can be said that the Cotonou Agreement adopted in 2000 between EU and the ACP countries, of which the Pacific Island Countries were members, directly influenced the Forum’s attempts for “good governance from the bottom”. The Cotonou Agreement required the Pacific Island

Countries to consult “Non-State Actors” in the development of policy, especially that relating to EU assistance, and using their services in the implementation of subsequent programmes (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, 2002c).

What are, then, “Non-State Actors” that are mandated to propel attempts for “good governance from the bottom” along with the Forum?

For example, the Pacific Conference of Churches and South Pacific & Oceanic Council of Trade Unions have been involved in not only their specific concerns but also broader issues like development, gender, and nuclear issues in the region. Likewise, Pacific Concerns Resource Centre, which was originally established as a secretariat of the Nuclear Free & Independent Pacific Movement, has expanded its interest to wider issues including human rights and good governance, and sustainable human development. It can be also stated that the Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific International has been engaged in development issues along with good governance and democracy, and the Fiji Women’s Crisis Centre, which specializes in gender issues. As well as regional “Non-State Actors”, regional branches of global NGOs, like Greenpeace and the World Wide Fund for Nature, are also mandated to propel attempts for “good governance from the bottom” along with the Forum.

Thus, substantial foundation to support Forum’s attempts for “good governance from the bottom” has existed in the region. However, it should be reminded that these “Non-State Actors” are the ones that meet what the “exogenous idea” requires. They are recognized by the Forum as having satisfied its criteria of “Non-State Actors”, such as being “organized and led in a democratic and transparent manner”, based on the “exogenous idea” advocated by aid donors. In other words, “Non-State Actors”, as partners to propel attempts for “good governance from the bottom”, are elaborately selected by the Forum according to the “exogenous idea”.

## **6. Arguments over Good Governance and Regional Peacebuilding**

As a part of regional peacebuilding, the Forum has tried to form good governance in the region “from the top” and “from the bottom”. To what extent are these attempts effective for regional peacebuilding? We could draw the answer in the argument over good governance, as partly mentioned in the previous section.

One interesting argument is presented by Hilda Lini<sup>8)</sup> from Vanuatu, who

served as the Pacific Concerns Resource Centre director from 2001 to 2004. Lini claims that the constitution and the laws are promoting the Western models of governance without basing on existing systems and calls for either an integration of Western and traditional systems of governance or a new model based on both (*Pacific Magazine*, 2001:8). According to her, governance in the indigenous concept is linked to a belief system that supervises and monitors peaceful co-existence of everyone and everything that share the multi-dimensional natural world that they live in. The leader takes responsibility to compensate for breaches of the peace on behalf of his community members. She calls “indigenous governance” as “Melanesian System of Democracy”, which is free for participation to all members of the community and open in its decisions. She further emphasizes that the use of “indigenous models of governance”, as foundation for governments in the Pacific Island Countries, should be seriously considered while borrowing only certain aspects of foreign systems of governance that contribute to upholding the collective ownership of peaceful co-existence (Lini, 2003).

Lini’s argument has much in common with the idea of re-evaluating “traditional Pacific values” which was referred in section 4. It can be said that most people including Lini herself, who advocate re-evaluating “traditional Pacific values”, are so-called “modern elites” with a higher-educational background and “traditional Pacific values” advocated by them are ideal rather than currently exercised. Nevertheless, an important point here is that these arguments highlight the attempts to form good governance so far have overlooked “indigenous governance”. As already examined, these arguments have moved the Forum’s attempts for “good governance from the top” to redefine good governance in relation to “traditional Pacific values”.

On the other hand, Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop<sup>9)</sup>, who has been involved in women’s NGO activities in Samoa, presents an argument from different angle to Lini’s. The focus of Fairbairn-Dunlop’s argument is situated in the marginalization of traditional community and authority rather than re-evaluation of “traditional Pacific values”. She is concerned that the governance agenda may lead to greater centralization of government, by de-emphasising the role of community-based groupings and customary authorities and replacing them with organisations which are linked to government (Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2004). Referring to the establishment of the Samoa Umbrella Group for NGOs in 1998 with support from UNDP, as the “official voice for

Samoa's NGOs", Fairbairn-Dunlop points out that the NGOs are divided into two distinct groups, that is, voluntary, unpaid, independent, and community-based "traditional" NGOs, and "professional" NGOs, whose staff and programs may be funded by donors, but which do not exhibit strong community networks (Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2000:107).

As she claims, community-based groupings and customary authorities, which are not consistent with the "exogenous idea" advocated by aid donors, such as "accountability" and "transparency", are excluded from the attempts to form good governance. Only "Non-State Actors", which are consistent with the "exogenous idea", are selected, institutionalized, and facilitated by the Forum to participate in decision-making process of regionalism as "civil society".

Levi, Secretary-General of the Forum, stated in 2003 that "civil society" was often a "bridge" between government and the people for a more participative regime in which all stakeholders were committed (Forum Secretariat, 2003d). Fairbairn-Dunlop's argument presents an important question whether "civil society" represents majority of population in the Pacific Islands Countries, who are living in traditional communities, and plays a role of the "bridge" between government and people for a more participative regime.

Although Fairbairn-Dunlop puts the focus on a different point, both she and Lini assert that "traditional systems" have been overlooked in the attempts to form good governance. As Lini calls for, how can be actually "indigenous governance", as "traditional Pacific values", incorporated in the Forum's attempts to form good governance? Also, as Fairbairn-Dunlop argues, how can be voice of community-based groupings and customary authorities heard in these attempts? These are the important agendas for the Forum to form good governance in the region.

In addressing these agendas, the Forum has to bear in its mind that conflicts in the Pacific Islands Countries are essentially "ethnic conflicts". What is required for the Forum is a challenging task of considering "traditional systems" in the attempts to form good governance in the region, and at the same time, preventing nepotism and ethnocentrism. In this sense, innovating "open and flexible traditional systems" in conformity with present context is indispensable. Emergence of more effective regional peacebuilding depends on this point.

## Notes

- <sup>1)</sup> On the process of adoption of Biketawa Declaration, see (Ogashiwa, 2003).
- <sup>2)</sup> On Forum's intervention in the conflict in Solomon Islands, see (Ogashiwa, 2004).
- <sup>3)</sup> Good governance was mentioned as "political dimension" in the Cotonou Agreement signed in 2000 as a successor of fourth version of the Lomé Convention.
- <sup>4)</sup> Using the metaphor, Peter Larmour called "transferred" institutions to the Pacific Island Countries, like democracy and public sector reform, as "foreign flower" (Larmour, 2005 ).
- <sup>5)</sup> It changed the name to Forum Presiding Officers Conference in 2002, and then, to Forum Presiding Officers and Clarks Conference in 2005.
- <sup>6)</sup> Headed by Julius Chan, former Prime Minister of Papua New Guinea, the eminent persons group presented Pacific Vision as Forum's future goals for strengthening regional cooperation and integration, and Pacific Plan as an action plan for implementing Pacific Vision.
- <sup>7)</sup> Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific is composed of Forum Secretariat, Secretariat of the Pacific Community (formerly South Pacific Commission), Forum Fisheries Agency, South Pacific Regional Environmental Programme, University of the South Pacific, Fiji School of Medicine, Pacific Islands Development Programme, South Pacific Applied Geosciences Commission, South Pacific Tourism Organisation, and South Pacific Board for Educational Assessment.
- <sup>8)</sup> Hilda Lini was the first women's programme officer at the Secretariat of the Pacific Community in New Caledonia, after having been involved in independence movement of Vanuatu, and nuclear free and independent movement. After returning to Vanuatu, she had been a member of parliament until 1998 and taken several ministerial posts like Minister of Justice. She is a sister of Vanuatu's first Prime Minister Walter Lini and present Prime Minister Ham Lini.
- <sup>9)</sup> Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop has worked with women's NGOs, including the National Council of Women in Samoa. She also served as the heads of Samoa Continuing Education Centre of the University of the South Pacific and Pacific Studies Programme of Victoria University in New Zealand.

## References

- Arts, Karin and Byron, Jessica (1997) The Mid-Term Review of the Lome IV Convention: Heralding the Future? *Third World Quarterly* 18 (1).
- Australian Strategic Policy Institute (2003) *Our Failing Neighbour: Australia and the Future of Solomon Islands*. Barton, ACT : Australian Strategic Policy Institute.
- Connell, John (1997) *Papua New Guinea: The Struggle for Development*. London: Routledge.
- Fairbairn-Dunlop, Peggy (1997) Women NGOs within the New Governance Agenda: Are They Still Based on *Alofa*? In Elise Huffer and Asofou So'o (eds.) *Governance in Samoa: Pulega i Samoa*. Canberra: Asia Pacific Press and Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, the University of the South Pacific.
- (2004) *Civil Society Participation in the Pacific* (Time to Talk: Program Ten Opinion). Radio Australia ([http://abc.net.au/timetotalk/english/opinion/TimeToTalkOpinion\\_440071.htm](http://abc.net.au/timetotalk/english/opinion/TimeToTalkOpinion_440071.htm)) (Internet, 7<sup>th</sup> July 2005),

- Forum Review* (2000) Good Governance and the Region (First Quarter)
- Islands Business* (1997) The Economy's New Stress Buster (August)
- Kabutaulaka, Tarcisius Tara(2000) Rumble in the Jungle: Land, Culture and (un)sustainable Logging in Solomon Islands. In Anthony Hooper (ed.) *Culture and Sustainable Development in the Pacific*. Canberra: Asia Pacific Press.
- Larmour, Peter (2005) *Foreign Flowers: Institutional Transfer and Good Governance in the Pacific Islands*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Lini, Hilda (2003) *The Indigenous Concept of Good Governance* (Time to Talk: Program One Opinion). Radio Australia ([http://abc.net.au/timetotalk/english/opinion/TimeToTalkOpinion\\_425873.htm](http://abc.net.au/timetotalk/english/opinion/TimeToTalkOpinion_425873.htm)) (Internet, 30<sup>th</sup> June 2005).
- McDougall, Derek (2004) Conflicts in the Southwest Pacific: The Relevance of New Security Perspectives. *Contemporary Security Policy* 25 (2)
- Ogashiwa, Yoko (2003) Chiiki, Kokka, Ethnicity: Taiheiyou Tosho Forum no Chiiki Funso eno Taiou (in Japanese)[Region, State and Ethnicity: Responses of the Pacific Islands Forum to Regional Conflicts] in Matori Yamamoto, Knichi Sudo, and Shuji Yoshida (eds.) *National Integration and Localism in Oceania* (JCAS Area Studies Research Report 6).
- (2004) Taiheiyou Tosho Forum no Chiiki Funso eno Kanyo: Solomon Shoto ni okeru Heiwa Kochiku kara Buryoku Kainyu Kettei made (in Japanese)[The Commitment of the Pacific Islands Forum to Regional Conflicts: From Peace Building to the Decision of Military Intervention in Solomon Islands. *Hiroshima Peace Science* 26
- Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (2000a) *Press Statement 5200: "Biketawa Declaration"*. (<http://www.forumsec.org.fj/news/2000/oct06.htm>) (Internet, 1<sup>st</sup> November 2000,).
- (2000b) *Press Statement 5800: Forum Secretariat Announces NGO Policy*. (<http://www.forumsec.org.fj/news/2000/Nov02.htm>) (Internet, 29<sup>th</sup> November 2000).
- (2001a) *Press Statement 5701: Transparency International Regional Meeting: Statement by Mr.W. Noel Levi, CBE Secretary General, Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat on "The Forum Eight Principles of Accountability; Progress to Date"*. (<http://www.forumsec.org.fj/news/2001/Jul05.htm>) (Internet, 17<sup>th</sup> February 2004).
- (2001b) *Twenty-Second Pacific Islands Forum: Forum Communique*. ([http://www.forumsec.org/resource/main/files/2001Communique-Nauru\\_16-18\\_Aug.pdf](http://www.forumsec.org/resource/main/files/2001Communique-Nauru_16-18_Aug.pdf)) (Internet, 10<sup>th</sup> October 2006).
- (2002a) *Nasonini Declaration on Regional Security*. (<http://www.forumsec.org.fj/docs/fc2002.htm>) (Internet, 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2002).
- (2002b) *Press Statement 1902: Leadership Code Workshop*. 2004, ( <http://www.forumsec.org.fj/news/2002/March03.htm>) (Internet, 22<sup>nd</sup> January).
- (2002c) *Framework for Engagement with Pacific Regional Non-State Actors*. ([http://www.forumsec.org.fj/docsGen\\_Docs/ngo%20pol.pdf](http://www.forumsec.org.fj/docsGen_Docs/ngo%20pol.pdf)) (Internet, 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2005).
- (2003a) *Press Statement 98/03: Speakers Meet on New Secretariat*. (<http://www.forumsec.org.fj/news/2003/Oct/Oct%2002.htm>) (Internet, 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2003).
- (2003b) *Forum Principles of Good Leadership*. (<http://www.forumsec.org.fj/docs/Communique/2003%20Communique.pdf>) (Internet, 10<sup>th</sup> October 2006).
- (2003c) *Twenty-Fourth Pacific Islands Forum: Forum Communique*. (<http://www.forumsec.org.fj/docs/Communique/2003%20Communique.pdf>) (Internet, 10<sup>th</sup> October

- 2006).
- (2003d) *Press Statement 110/03: Visit of the Forum Review Eminent Persons Group.* (<http://www.forumsec.org.fj/news/2003/Nov/Nov%2006.htm>) (Internet, 12<sup>th</sup> October 2006).
- (2004a) *Press Statement 27-04: Statement by the Forum Secretary General, Mr Greg Urwin at the 4<sup>th</sup> Forum Presiding Officers' Conference.* ([http://www.forumsec.org.fj/news/2004/Apr/Apr\\_26.htm](http://www.forumsec.org.fj/news/2004/Apr/Apr_26.htm)) (Internet, 9<sup>th</sup> July 2004).
- (2004b) *Press Statement 83-04: Secretary General Welcomes Inputs from Regional Non-State Actors in the Design of the Pacific Plan.* ([http://www.forumsec.org.fj/news/2004/October/Oct\\_13.htm](http://www.forumsec.org.fj/news/2004/October/Oct_13.htm)) (Internet, 24<sup>th</sup> November 2004).
- (2005) *Press Statement 19/05: Opening Address by Greg Urwin, Secretary General, Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat at the Third Multi-Stakeholders Workshop for the Pacific Islands Association of Non-Governmental Organisations (PIANGO) on Strengthening Civil Society in the Pacific.* (<http://www.forumsec.org.fj/news/2005/April/02.htm>) (Internet, 25<sup>th</sup> May 2005).
- Pacific Magazine* (2001) Hilda Lini, Freedom Fighter: A Believer in People Oriented Governance (July)
- Policy on Consultative Status and Accreditation between the Pacific Islands Forum (PIF) and Pacific Regional Non-State Actors (PRNSA)* (2007) ([http://www.piango.org/docs\\_RegMtsg/CSO/CSO2007\\_Forum\\_communique.pdf](http://www.piango.org/docs_RegMtsg/CSO/CSO2007_Forum_communique.pdf)) (Internet, 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2008).
- Reilly, Benjamin (2004) State Functioning and state Failure in the South Pacific. *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 58 (4).
- Reilly, Benjamin and Wainwright, Elsin (2005) The South Pacific. In Simon Chesterman, Michael Ignatieff and Ramesh Thakur (eds.) *Making States Work: State Failure and the Crisis of Governance*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- South Pacific Forum Secretariat (1995) South Pacific Forum Vision Statement.
- (1997a) Aitutaki Declaration on Regional Security Cooperation.
- (1997b) *Forum Economic Ministers Meeting Action Plan.*
- (1998) *Forum Economic Action Plan:1998 Review.*
- Thistlethwaite, Bob and Davis, Derrin (1996) *Pacific 2010: A Sustainable Future for Melanesia? Natural Resources, Population and Development*. Canberra: National Centre for Development Studies, Australian National University.