

Between rhetoric and reality: A retrospective look at national development policy and planning in Solomon Islands in the 1980s and 90s.

Frederick Isom Rohorua

Doctoral Student

Te Aka Whanaketanga (*Development Studies*)

Te Pua Wānanga ki te Ao (*The School of Māori and Pacific Development*)

Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato (*University of Waikato*)

Private Bag 3105, Hamilton, New Zealand

[fir3@waikato.ac.nz]

Abstract

When Solomon Islands gained political independence from Great Britain in 1978, the majority of Solomon Islanders believed that this provided an opportunity to work towards the creation of a prosperous society. They also believed that central government and national leaders could, and should, take primary responsibility for social and economic development. At the same time, it was clear to the new government from the beginning that participation of indigenous Solomon Islanders in the private sector was critical for social and economic development. This paper examines the process of national development policy and planning in the 1980s and 90s in the Solomon Islands, showing how the initial optimism, fuelled by political rhetoric, became tempered over time as awareness of the realities of the Solomon Islands context increased and as this awareness began to be reflected in more realistic planning and planning forecasts.

Introduction

When Solomon Islands gained political independence in 1978, one of the expectations of all Solomon Islanders was that a prosperous Solomon Islands society would be created. As a result of British colonisation, Solomon Islands had become grafted onto the global market system and capitalist economy. Political independence was an unprecedented opportunity because, for the first time in the modern history of Solomon Islands, Solomon Islanders themselves were given responsibility for deciding their own future, especially regarding social and economic development. In this newly formed nation, responsibility for helping to bring about development was left essentially in the hands of national leaders and central government. This overwhelming responsibility was to occupy the minds of the leaders of the young nation throughout its first two-decades of political independence.

Solomon Islands: A brief overview

Solomon Islands territory is located between 5 and 13 degrees s.l., and 155.5 and 170.5 degrees e.l. (SI CDC, 1990, p. 2). It is one of the major island groups of Melanesia and was the largest of Britain's tropical dependences in Oceania (Boutilier, 1981, p. 264). The group is an island archipelago which consists of six large mountainous continental islands or island clusters of volcanic origin – Choiseul, Santa Isabel, Guadalcanal, Malaita, and San Cristobal (or Makira) (Boutilier, 1981, p. 264). Extending over 60,000 sq. km of sea, the scattered archipelago is oriented from the northwest to the southeast, and extends over 1,400 km from one extremity to the other with a total land area of 29,785 sq. km (Douglas & Douglas, 1994, pp. 582-283). Of the six major islands, Guadalcanal is the largest and is also where the nation's national

capitol, Honiara, is located. Solomon Islands is the second largest country in the South Pacific region in terms of land mass (after Papua New Guinea) and is third overall in terms of population, with approximately 400,000 people, PNG having approximately 4.5 million and Fiji approximately 800,000 (Lal & Fortune, 2000; Crocombe, 2001).

National development in Solomon Islands: From optimism to concern

Solomon Islands gained political independence from Britain on 7th July 1978. Leading up to that auspicious moment, the architects of the pre-independence *Solomon Islands National Development Plan 1975-1979* (SI NDP, 1975-79) noted that:

Most of the developed private sector is owned and controlled by non-Solomon Islanders; ... A sustained breakthrough into the developed sector by local enterprise depends on supplies of commercial know-how and financial capital which so far have been hard to obtain in combination (S.I. NDP, 1975 Vol.1, Ch. 6, p. 48).

The Solomon Islands had been a British Protectorate since 1893. The establishment of colonial administration in 1896 through the arrival of an acting Resident Commissioner and, more particularly, its development before and after World War II, primarily through plantation agriculture by large foreign companies, had contributed to the exclusion of indigenous Solomon Islanders from the developed sector (Bennett, 1987). Non-Solomon Islanders controlled the economy at independence. Although they included a few European traders who had remained after the war, the majority were Chinese general merchants from Hong Kong, many of whom were descendants of Chinese migrants who came to Solomon Islands after the war and initially worked as cooks, carpenters and mechanics. These people had helped to rebuild the devastated economy (Bennett, 1987). By the time of political independence from Britain in 1978, the descendants of these Chinese migrants, together with Chinese migrants who arrived later, had already established themselves in the wholesale and retail sectors. They had played, and would continue to play, a significant role in the market economy of independent Solomon Islands. As the country stood at the threshold of political independence, it was this situation that motivated the architects of the *Solomon Islands National Development Plan 1975 – 1979* to call for a substantial breakthrough of indigenous Solomon Islanders into the developed sector. Only then would independence be economically as well as politically meaningful to indigenous people. There was, however, a further issue that was of very considerable significance, particularly in view of the fact that the majority of Solomon Islanders lived – and continue to live – in rural areas. As noted in the *Solomon Islands National Development Plan 1975 – 1979*:

No commercial activity has been deliberately located away from Honiara so far, except for those which could not be located in Honiara anyway. . . . There is a widespread assumption that all manufacturing and processing activities will take place in Honiara; continuance of this trend would run against the government's overall objectives (S.I. NDP, 1975, Vol.1, Ch. 3, p. 19).

Thus in 1975, at a time when Solomon Islands had, in preparation for full independence, a Governing Council headed by a Chief Minister, the government of the day recognized that only by encouraging indigenous Solomon Islanders to engage

in private sector activities would it be possible to disperse economic development to the rural areas and thus enhance the socio-economic development of the majority of Solomon Islanders. Clearly, government recognized the need for:

a deliberate slanting of economic development into operations which can be owned, wholly or partly, by Solomon Islanders as individuals or groups; special credit arrangements to assist local companies and co-operatives to develop and expand; [improvement of] commercial law so that local firms can comply with it; and the closure of some forms of activity to non-Solomon Islanders (S.I. NDP, 1975, Vol.2, Part 1, Section 2, p. 2).

On the whole, government was optimistic about the future and committed to ensuring that the indigenous population took advantage of opportunities to reap maximum benefit from the nation's resources. As indigenous leaders stood at the threshold of the assumption of leadership from the British colonial administrators, all of this seemed possible. In an overly optimistic tone, government, through the development planners, stated that one of its major objectives was "to build a national economic structure which extends local ownership and control to all key areas of the economy" (S.I. NDP, 1975, Vol.2, Part 2, Section 2, p. 7). It seems unlikely that those involved at the time were fully aware of the enormous undertaking such a commitment involved. In hindsight, the *Solomon Islands National Development Plan 1975 – 1979* was accurate in diagnosing the problems that needed to be addressed but, so far as actual planning for change was concerned, overly optimistic about the possibilities. Overall, the document expresses, through the rhetoric of political independence, the excitement and enthusiasm of a youthful nation.

Even so, there *were* attempts to determine what measures were necessary for bringing about the desired changes. One of these was to be 'affirmative action' in the form of direct assistance by way of incentive schemes for Solomon Islanders (S.I. NDP, 1975, Vol.2, Part 2, Section 2, p. 7). It is, for example, noted in the National Development Plan (Section 14: Business and Credit) that one of the government's aims was to expand business activity by (indigenous) Solomon Islanders, whether as a group or as individuals (S.I. NDP, 1975, Vol.2, Part 2, Section 14, p. 28). Some of the principle methods of achieving this intended expansion were:

- Licensing of businesses in selected sectors so as to remove imbalances and ensure openings for local enterprise.
- Reservation for local enterprise of service industry openings in any major new commercial development e.g. mining.
- Commercial activity by local councils where services or production are needed but local individual or group enterprise is not forthcoming.
- Introduction of tax incentives for localization of jobs and ownership, decentralization, pricing policies and use of locally produced inputs (S.I. NDP, 1975, Vol.2, Part 2, Section 14, p. 28).

This was an impressive undertaking. In retrospect, however, it is evident that one major problem was that government stability – as is also the case in the neighboring Melanesian countries of Vanuatu and Papua New Guinea – could not be assured. Furthermore, the National Development Plan left government and development planners open to the charge of advocating discriminatory practices. Even so, for any

country in the embryonic stages of nation building, policies of the kind to which reference has been made may be necessary and, hence, justifiable. The economic prescriptions in the NDP would, it was hoped, lay the foundations of, and, presumably, create the ideal catalyst for social and economic development in the 'birth' and 'growth' of a new nation. The intention was that by 1978 (the year of political independence), a substantial part of the private sector would be owned and operated by indigenous Solomon Islanders (S.I. NDP, 1975, Vol.2, Part 2, Section 14, p. 28). Whether government and the development planners really believed that their prescriptions could be implemented within this timeframe is open to question. In the event, as we now know, the timeframe proved to be unrealistic and the strategies themselves now appear to be ill adapted to the political and social circumstances of the time.

Disappointment

In June 1977, when a review of the National Development Plan (1975-79) was carried out, it was noted that:

Most of the developed commercial sector is owned and controlled by non-Solomon Islanders. The [non-commercial] sector is owned by nationals, but is subject to considerable influence by the developed sector (June Review, 1977, p. 2).

Even so, it was decided then that no major alterations would be made to the NDP. In the *Foreword* of the NDP review, the then Chief Minister, Peter Kenilorea - now Sir Peter Kenilorea - who took over after the first Chief Minister, Solomon Mamaloni, resigned, wrote: "The Plan covers a five year period and it is not the intention of this Government to replace it with a totally new one before that period expires. To do so would not only be costly but also most unrealistic" (June Review, 1977, Foreword). As signalled in the review, in the Area of Business and Credit at least, efforts to assist indigenous people to venture into business would continue over the next three years:

The Business Advisory division will continue to encourage indigenous business ventures where the experience and expertise promises a reasonable chance of success. However, much of its efforts will be in continuing to help raising the level of management and accounting skills of existing businesses, particularly the larger ones that make the most significant contribution to the indigenous business sector (June Review, 1977, p. 21).

The tone is less optimistic than that of the NDP itself. Nevertheless, some optimism remained. If deficiencies in the areas of management and accounting skills were identified and addressed, all might still be well. Although the report notes the absence of indigenous business enterprise, it does not identify the underlying causes. Instead, the Chief Minister noted that there had been "[insufficient] time to assess and realize the effects of programs implemented at the beginning of the period" (Foreword, June Review, 1977).

Renewed optimism

By 1980, when the next National Development Plan was produced, the first Solomon Islands Prime Minister, Peter Kenilorea, was in office. He had this to say in his Foreword to the new National Development Plan:

Since we became a fully independent nation on 7 July 1978 this is the first opportunity we have had to shape the overall direction of our own development. This is our greatest challenge and all of us, from politicians in the national legislature and civil servants in the government to the rural gardener and fisherman, must try to make the fullest use of this opportunity. From a national planning point of view, this is the very first time that we, in our own right, have made the decisions about the activities we intend to do for our overall benefit both as a people and as a nation. This plan, therefore, is our First National Development Plan (NDP 1980-84, 1980, Vol.1, Foreword).

In similar vein, he went on to stress that:

The previous plan – NDP 1975-79 was drawn up during a transitional period and it has certain programs and projects which will continue into this new plan period. But, apart from this, if we are to connect our new plan to the previous one by adopting substantially the same philosophy and aims, we will have done so little in our need for effective and positive decolonization: which is to free ourselves from those aspects of our colonial past that hinder our progress and development as an independent and forward-going people (NDP 1980-84, 1980, Vol.1, Foreword).

Those aspects of the “colonial past that hinder . . . progress and development” were not made explicit. However, it was evident from the context that reference was being made to the economic dominance of non-indigenous people and that the intention was to encourage indigenous Solomon Islanders to play a more active role in both the private and public sectors.

The Prime Minister’s remarks signalled that political independence was to be the beginning of a process of political, social and economic development for Solomon Islanders. However, although the previous NDP (1975-79) had specific provisions relating to the engagement of indigenous Solomon Islanders in the private sector, the 1980-84 NDP did not. This was, at least in part, because there was “little detailed statistical information available on the nature and scale of Solomon Islander industrial and commercial activity (NDP 1980-84, 1980, Vol.1, Ch. 5, p. 102). Also, the emphasis was now on rural development, as indicated in the Foreword by the Prime Minister:

In this plan we intend to do much more for our people. We intend to bring development to areas of the greatest need and where development will be acceptable to the people. . . . The basic [objective] (sic) of this plan is to promote effective rural development which will provide the opportunity for as many of our people as is possible to share in the benefits of our country’s development (NDP 1980-84, 1980 Vol.1, Foreword).

What this meant in practice was that Government would play a much greater role in the political, social and economic development of the new nation Solomon Islands.

This National Development strategy was to have been given coded expression in the country's National Development Plan 1985-89 which stipulated, under the heading of Social and Economic Progress, that "Government will continue to actively participate in strategic areas of the economy" (NDP 1985-89, 1985, Part 1, Ch. 3, p.18).

The 1985-89 National Development Plan (NDP) placed greater emphasis than did the earlier ones on indigenous business entrepreneurship:

The development of indigenous entrepreneurship will be encouraged and fostered whilst genuine foreign investment with significant local participation and employment in production activities will be encouraged and supported (NDP 1985-89, 1985, Part 1, Ch. 3, p. 18).

In summarizing the existing situation (in 1985), the planners noted that:

19.4 The Government initiated its support of business development in the mid 1970s with emphasis on trade stores which were the predominant type of business. In recent years the scope of the assistance has expanded to include petrol depots, transport business and other types of ventures ... [including] agricultural, fisheries and forestry ... (NDP 1985-89, 1985, Part 2, Ch. 19, p. 140).

Immediately after that summary, however, a number of constraints are identified:

19.5 A major constraint on both co-operative and general business development is the poor road system and inter-island shipping services, which restrict inward and outward the distribution of goods.

19.6 Inexperience in running business, including, limited management and financial skill, is also a key restraint.

19.7 The limited size of local markets and the cost and difficulties in exporting tend to increase the difficulties of developing new business (NDP 1985-89 1985, Part 2, Ch. 19, p. 140).

These acknowledged constraints related directly to Government's policy on commerce in general and indigenous business entrepreneurship in particular and were, therefore, extremely significant. There was, however, no reference to constraints of another type – constraints relating to the traditional social structures, norms and values that inevitably influence indigenous entrepreneurs and their business activities. After all, capitalist activity in general, and business entrepreneurship in particular, are relatively new to Solomon Islands, and Solomon Islanders' reaction to them will inevitably be influenced by their cultural expectations. Thus, the following strategies for promoting indigenous business enterprises and cooperatives, comprehensive though they appear to be, might not prove adequate unless there is a significant culture shift:

19.8 The primary strategy will be to promote indigenous business enterprises and co-operatives by providing potential investors with the requisite financial resources, knowledge and skills, and by actively seeking Solomon Island participation in foreign investment ventures.

19.9 A complementary strategy of the Government will be to provide an effective advisory and accounting extension service for those Solomon Islanders owned businesses and co-operative societies which cannot afford the services of private chartered accountants. ...

19.10 The Government will also organize and provide training courses and seminars, and disseminate information on business and management practice through all forms of media, including specialized publications such as booklets. Greater use will also be made of the radio as a means of keeping people informed of commercial affairs (NDP 1985-89, 1985, Part 2, Ch. 19, p. 141).

As with all things that relate to society and people generally, a National Development Plan has to be understood within a certain socio-historical and cultural context. In other words, a National Development Plan is not value-neutral. It is inevitably underpinned by a particular philosophical position. In Solomon Islands, the underlying rationale is that economic prosperity depends on economic growth and economic growth depend on entrepreneurial activity within a capitalist economic structure. This paper does not examine this assumption. Nor does it attempt to analyse in any detail the effectiveness of Solomon Islands National Development Plans (including the National Development Plan for 1990-94) although both of these are very much to the fore in the research in which I am currently engaged.

Shift in Policy

In the immediate change-over of Government from Billy Hilly to Solomon Mamaloni in late 1994, a Solomon Star editorial (23 November) had this to say in connection with the National Development Plan for 1990-94:

Running a business is a serious business. Now the Mamaloni government intends to expand the area in which indigenous Solomon Islanders can participate in business. Under its policies, strategies and program of action, it is the government's policy to "encourage more indigenous people to participate in various investments". It will reserve certain business to be taken only by indigenous Solomon Islanders. And it is the time for Solomon Islanders to work at it. But before we can dive into the unknown seas, there are certain questions we must ask ourselves. How many Solomon Islanders are prepared to try, take the risk and do something better for themselves and their families? How many Solomon Islanders will say that there is no capital to start the business? . . . Opportunities are always around, but many Solomon Islanders do not want to take the challenge . . . (Solomon Star, Wednesday 23 November 1994, p. 4).

The implication is that indigenous people are neither sufficiently enterprising, nor sufficiently willing to commit themselves to hard work, to take up the government's challenge. This is simply a reiteration of the commonly held misconception that

indigenous people are lazy and averse to risk-taking (Alatas, 1977). In this regard, Paul Gardner (1989) noted that in Melanesia generally “entrepreneurs arose in surprisingly large numbers, [but] capable Melanesian managers have been notably lacking” (p. 119). A more plausible explanation though for the under-representation of indigenous Solomon Islanders in business is that they lack, for perfectly understandable cultural and historical reasons, a clear understanding of what business actually involves. For indigenous Solomon Islanders, going into business is like diving into an unknown sea. Herein lies the dilemma facing indigenous Solomon Islanders in relation to social and economic development in general and private business enterprise in particular although some indigenous Solomon Islanders have successfully engaged in business enterprise. One example, noted by Fairburn (1988, p. 5), is Warren Paia, from the Western Province “who controls real estate, stationery, and computer businesses”. People such as Warren Paia are, however, the exception. As Fairbairn (1988) says of the handful of leading indigenous business entrepreneurs in the Pacific Islands region; they are “stars in a dull firmament” (p. 5). For many others, the temptations and the risks are simply too great. As a Solomon Star editorial observes:

Some who claim to have the skills and the know-how were successful in securing large sums of money from banks but because of their reckless spendings, they ended up in bankruptcy. Many did not want to seek sound advice. They wanted to start big (Solomon Star, Wednesday 23 November 1994, p. 4).

The consequences of this sort of business failure resonate throughout Solomon Islands. Where indigenous Solomon Islanders fail in business, the blame is placed squarely upon their own shoulders. Where they do not rise to the challenge of establishing new business enterprises, they are accused of not being sufficiently entrepreneurial. Little wonder, then, that Mamaloni’s government, which was in power at the time, noted in the Solomon Islands Trade Directory 1995 that “[specific] areas of economic activity are no longer reserved exclusively for Solomon Islanders, although foreign investors will generally have to justify their investment . . .” (SI Trade Directory, 1995, p. 65).

This apparent change of policy did not augur well for the future chances of indigenous Solomon Islanders who are brave enough to attempt to plunge into the unknown sea of business entrepreneurship. Although foreign investors were, apparently, expected to ‘justify their investment’, there was no indication of what type of justification would be considered acceptable. This was of particular concern in view of the fact that it was widely known – though rarely acknowledged – that some politicians and their cronies are involved, with the support of unscrupulous foreign investors, in a range of illicit business activities. The much publicized forestry issue and public officers’ scandal in 1996 proved to be just the tip of the iceberg although even now much of that iceberg appears to have remained submerged.¹ In retrospect, it appears that the continued dominance of the private sector by foreign investors was even more problematic than it appeared at the time when the first Solomon Islands National Development plan was penned. What we have not seen to date is any real evidence of the ‘positive decolonization’ process envisaged by the pioneering political leaders of the modern nation Solomon Islands.

Conclusion

In hindsight, it is now clear that the magnitude of the task that successive Solomon Islands leaders would have to tackle in attempting to encourage the economic development of indigenous Solomon Islanders was not fully appreciated at the time of independence. The early optimism was initially replaced by caution, and that caution has, in turn, been replaced by cynicism as it has become increasingly evident that development planning can be hijacked by those in power in order to serve their own interests and those of their collaborators (indigenous and non-indigenous). The economic and development process in the Solomon Islands in the 1980s and 1990s was eventually punctuated by the outbreak of ethnic conflict in December 1998. To what extent that conflict was actually attributable to the perceived failure of the development process itself is something that is worthy of serious consideration.

Endnotes

1. In an investigation in May 1996, it was revealed through an internal investigation in the Ministry of Finance initiated by the Honourable Prime Minister as care-taker Minister of Finance (the Honourable Minister of Finance was sick and hospitalised in Brisbane, Australia) that public servants had siphoned off \$10 million from the public purse. Consequently, 35 public officers were suspended although some were later re-instated. Sources: Solomon Star Wednesday 17 April 1996, p. 6; Solomon Star Wednesday 8 May 1996, pp. 1 & 4; Solomon Star Friday 24 May 1996, pp. 2, 6 & 8; Solomon Star Wednesday 29 May 1996, pp. 1-2, 4 & 6; Solomon Star Friday 31 May 1996, p. 4; Solomon Star Friday 7 June 1996, pp. 1 & 4; Solomon Star Tuesday 11 June 1996, p. 6; Solomon Star Thursday 13 June 1996, pp. 2 & 4; Solomon Star Friday 21 June 1996, p. 6; Solomon Star Wednesday 26 June 1996, p. 6; Solomon Star Friday 28 June 1996, pp. 1-2; Solomon Star Wednesday 18 September 1996, pp. 2 & 6; Solomon Star Friday 18 October 1996, p. 6; Solomon Star Wednesday 30 October 1996, pp. 6 & 8.

References

- Alatas, H. S. (1977) *Myth of the Lazy Native: A Study of the Image of the Malays, Filipinos and Javanese from the 16th to the 20th Century and Its Function in the Ideology of Colonial Capitalism*. London: F. Cass.
- Baumol, W. J. (1968) Entrepreneurship in economic theory. *American Economic Review*, 58 (2): 64-71.
- Bennett, J. A. (1987) *Wealth of the Solomons: A History of a Pacific Archipelago, 1800 - 1978*. Pacific Islands Monograph Series No.3, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Boutilier, J. (1981) Solomon Islands. In R.D. Craig & F.P. King (eds) *Historical Dictionary of Oceania*. Westport & London: Greenwood Press.
- Central Planning Office (1977) *A Review of the Solomon Islands National Development Plan (1975 to 1979)*. Honiara, Solomon Islands: Central Planning Office.
- Central Planning Office (1980) *Solomon Islands National Development Plan 1980 - 1984*, Volumes 1, 2 & 3. Honiara, Solomon Islands: Central Planning Office.
- Craig, R. D & King, F. P. (eds) (1981) *Historical Dictionary of Oceania*. Westport & London: Greenwood Press.
- Crocombe, R. (2001) *The South Pacific*. Suva, Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific.
- Douglas, N. & Douglas, N. (eds) (1994) *Pacific Islands Yearbook* (17th Edn). Suva, Fiji:

- Fiji Times.
- Dubsky, R. (1986) *The Organization of Development Planning in the South Pacific*. Working Paper series, Pacific Islands Studies Programme, Centre for Asian & Pacific Studies, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu.
- Fairbairn, T. I. J. (ed) (1988) *Island Entrepreneurs: Problems and Performances in the Pacific*. Honolulu: East-west Centre, PIDP.
- Fernando, N. (1986) *Development Analysis in the South Pacific*. Suva, Fiji: ISAS, University of the South Pacific.
- Gardner, P. F. (1989) *New Enterprises in the South Pacific: the Indonesian and Melanesian Experiences*. Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press.
- Gegeo, D. W. (1994) *Kastom and Bisnis: Towards Integrating Cultural Knowledge into Rural Development in Solomon Islands*. PhD thesis, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu.
- Gilder, G. (1986) *The Spirit of Enterprise*. Harmondsworth & Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Herlihy, J. M. (1981) *Always We Are Last: A Study of Planning, Development and Disadvantage in Melanesia*. PhD thesis, Australian National University, Canberra.
- Kabutaulaka, T. T. (1995) *Thinking Underdevelopment: Natives, Scholarship and Development Thinking in the Pacific Islands*. Paper presented at Centre for Pacific Studies Conference, Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Kilby, P. (ed) (1971) *Entrepreneurship and Economic Development*. New York: Free Press.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961) *The Achieving Society*. Princeton: Van Nostrand.
- Ministry of Economic Planning (1985) *Solomon Islands National Development Plan 1985 - 1989*. Honiara, Solomon Islands: Ministry of Economic Planning.
- Office of the Chief Minister (1975) *Solomon Islands National Development Plan 1975 - 1979*, Volumes 1, 2 & 3. Honiara, Solomon Islands: Office of the Chief Minister.
- Parsons, T. (1962) *Toward a General Theory of Action*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Pollard, S. J. & Qalo, R. R. (1993) *Development Sustained by Enterprise: Toward Policies for Economic Stimulation*. Paper prepared for South Pacific Conference of Leaders, Tahiti, June 24-26, Honolulu: East-West Centre, PIDP.
- Poras, J. & Saunders, M. (eds) (1995) *Solomon Islands Trade Directory 1995 Special 21st Edition*. Honiara: B.J.S. Agencies Ltd.
- Rizer, J. P. (1984) *Solomon Islands Business Survey*. Honolulu: East-West Centre, PIDP.
- Rostow, W. W. (1960) *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. London & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1949) *The Theory of Economic Development*. Translated by Redvers Opie. Cambridge, MASS.: Harvard University Press.
- Solomon Islands Curriculum Development Centre (1990) *A Social Studies Atlas of Solomon Islands: An Insight into the Infrastructure of a Developing Nation*. Honiara, Solomon Islands: S.I. CDC.
- Solomon Star* Friday 18 October 1996, p. 6.
- Solomon Star* Friday 21 June 1996, p. 6.
- Solomon Star* Friday 28 June 1996, pp. 1-2.
- Solomon Star* Friday 31 May 1996, p. 4.
- Solomon Star* Friday 7 June 1996, pp. 1 & 4.
- Solomon Star* Thursday 13 June 1996, pp. 2 & 4.
- Solomon Star* Tuesday 11 June 1996, p. 6.
- Solomon Star* Wednesday 17 April 1996, p. 6.
- Solomon Star* Wednesday 18 September 1996, pp. 2 & 6.

- Solomon Star* Wednesday 23 November 1994, p. 4.
Solomon Star Wednesday 26 June 1996, p. 6.
Solomon Star Wednesday 29 May 1996, pp. 1-2, 4 & 6.
Solomon Star Wednesday 30 October 1996, pp. 6 & 8.
Solomon Star Wednesday 8 May 1996, pp. 1 & 4.
Solomon Star Friday 24 May 1996, pp. 2, 6 & 8.
Solomon Telekom (1995) *Solomon Islands Telephone Directory 1995*. Boroko, Port Moresby: Edward H. O'Brien (PNG) Pty. Ltd.
Soltow, J. H. (1968) The entrepreneur in economic history. *American Economic Review*, 58 (2): 84-92.
Thirlwall, A. P. (1994) *Growth and Development with Special Reference to Developing Economies* (5th Edn). Basingstoke & London: Macmillan Press.
Todaro, M. P. (1994) *Economic development* (5th Edn). New York & London: Longman.
Weber, M. (1930) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Translated by Talcott Parsons, London: Unwin University Press.
Weber, M. (1976) (orig.1920) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Introduction by Anthony Giddens, London: George Allen & Unwin.