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Subramani is professor of literature at the University of the South Pacific in Fiji. His book, South Pacific Literature: From Myth to Fabulation is the first critical study of the origins and growth of literature in the Pacific Islands. The Fantasy Eaters, a book of fiction, and Altering Imagination, inspired by the military coups in Fiji in 1987, as well as The Indo-Fijian Experience and After Narrative: The Pursuit of Reality and Fiction, both edited volumes, have made Subramani’s voice one of Fiji’s most eloquent and insightful.

The interview presented here was recorded at the University of the South Pacific a few days after Subramani had given the keynote address at the SPACLALS conference held on 15 July 1999. He was chosen to be interviewed for The Contemporary Pacific because of a novel he had written in Fiji Hindi. The journal’s editors were curious about the motivations behind Subramani’s choice of language, knowing that in the past he had written solely in English. Was he, like Ngugi Wa Thiong’o, trying to make a statement about the importance of the vernacular languages, or perhaps suggesting that Pacific writers should shun the use of English, the colonizer’s language? What were his thoughts about the decision of Fiji’s government, following the military coups of 1987, to make the teaching of the Fijian, Hindi, and Rotuman languages compulsory in Fiji’s schools?

The interview is especially poignant, given the events of May 2000, when Fiji experienced another military coup. At the time this issue went to press, Subramani had left Fiji, but was hoping to return.

VH Subramani, I want to begin our interview by talking a little bit about Fiji’s military coup in 1987. Where were you when you first heard the news?

S I was acting vice chancellor of the university. I was in the administration building in my office, and there was somebody outside saying that the parliament building had been invaded by the military, and I thought it
was some sort of prank; then gradually it came through to me that there had been a military coup. Of course it was completely unexpected. Although I was expecting some trouble because of a series of events that had happened before, I never thought it would result in a military coup.

VH  How did you feel when you first heard the news?

S  Completely baffled. I had no idea how the political crisis was going to resolve itself. Having lived in Fiji all my life, in a reasonably tolerant environment, I was feeling optimistic. If there was a crisis of some sort, ultimately it would be resolved because we didn’t have a history of violent oppression of any sort. But it also seemed to me that with all the violent activity that was going on, like the looting and overt show of racial hatred, things could turn nasty at any moment. All the while I felt that ultimately there would be some sort of resolution, knowing the nature of society in Fiji. To me the coups were something like incidents in a movie, and you felt that at the end of the movie things would come right.

VH  A number of academics and workers, Indians particularly, left the country soon after the coup to settle elsewhere. But you chose to stay behind in Fiji. Why?

S  I think people were very shocked and confused. People were running away because they were afraid for their families, especially children. At the same time I don’t think it’s as simple as that. A lot of people were meaning to leave and the coup provided an opportunity to leave. People have always been leaving the islands, and those who were wavering found a justification to make the move in the crisis situation. And so a lot of the people left, some fifty thousand. Of course other people left for different reasons. There were those who didn’t want to be part of a country that was going to be oppressive, some form of military dictatorship seemed inevitable. I can understand that as well. Different people read history in different ways. The reason I stayed back was because all my writing, all my thinking had focused on Fiji, and here was a crisis, and somehow we would have to work it through. Gradually I discovered what my role was going to be, but there was no question of leaving Fiji. It’s a country that I was born in and if it’s in trouble, I would be the last person who would want to leave.

VH  A lot of people were very pessimistic and couldn’t see a happy ending, but you sensed that somehow things would sort themselves out. Why?
I felt that the nature of people here is very different; you know, we talk so much about the Pacific way of life, the Pacific way of thinking, and so forth. I think there’s something very real about that. I couldn’t imagine Fijian people becoming very oppressive. I could believe that a handful of people would be inclined toward oppressive measures and undemocratic practices. But there’s been no history in Fiji of extreme oppression of any ethnic group. Perhaps the closest to that would be the indenture system. I think the Fijian people have not been oppressed in any physical sense. There are difficulties between Fijians and Indians—they have different ways of perceiving the world. But there’s been no history of one oppressing the other. In fact, if you look at the whole history of Indian and Fijian relationships, there have been a lot of acts of goodwill. And when you look at the way Fijians have accommodated the Indian people in Fiji, I couldn’t believe that they could turn around and become the oppressors. When I was doing my own research for different kinds of writing, I found so many acts of goodwill among our people. Even in the middle of the 1987 coups there were acts of goodwill by Fijians. For example, during the burnings and lootings, when people were running in different directions, a gang of Fijians went to the marketplace and turned the vegetable stalls upside down. Some Fijians protected the Indians, getting them to hide in various places. So, if you begin to look at all the goodwill in this country, you’ll find many examples. But historians and politicians tend to highlight the negative aspects of Fijian and Indian relationship.

So you stayed and became actively involved in speaking to different groups of people throughout the country. Has activism always been a part of your philosophy about how to intervene in a crisis?

No, it’s something that I was reluctantly drawn to. I always wanted to write, and that is a lonely business. I prefer to sit in my room and write. I was totally preoccupied with the written word, and of course, teaching. But gradually as things began to change for the worse in Fiji, one had to examine what one was doing. For me, writing fiction really did not matter after the military coups. What mattered was trying to do something about the problem we were in. It was an extension of teaching. Gradually I was dragged into the public sphere and then suddenly this became a big part of my life. The first time I was called upon to address a group was about six months after the military coups. It was a very important meeting for me, because here for the first time there was a group of people will-
ing to talk about what was happening at a time when such gatherings were prohibited. I was very happy to be invited to give the keynote address. I tried to give people some hope of leadership so they could do something positive to heal what was happening. That was how I became involved in public speaking; later on I became a member of the Citizens’ Constitution Forum, which I think played a very important role, not only in bringing thinking people of different ethnic groups together, but also in exploring a suitable constitution.

vH Are you hinting that literature is not as effective as a more direct, face-to-face encounter with people?

s Yes, I am. We are writing in the English language, and we are writing fiction. Thus we are doubly removed from reality and the common people. Literature always gets to the larger group of people secondhand. The spoken word has a much more direct impact. It travels faster. I am not suggesting that all literary work must stop in a crisis situation, but whatever we write in Fiji’s situation has to be translated. For all that you have created you have to find an appropriate language so that your ideas can be communicated effectively to a large group of people, who may not be highly educated. Some of the things we try to say in fiction about the world—such as how to know the world, how to construct the world, and so on—all these could be said in the language of the people, in their own terms. Sometimes writers are the only people who can say these things in a concrete way.

vH Are you saying that in fiction, one tends to aim for complexity and ambiguity. But in a public address, one aims for clarity so that one is not misunderstood?

s Yes. Literature aims for complexity because there are things you want to say that are subtle and complex, and Fiji is a very complex place to write about. All that complexity you can bring into your fiction and, for that matter, into your nonfiction writing. But when you’re addressing the public, you have to give them a résumé, you have to put it in a direct form, and you’ve got to simplify. But I think there’s also another dimension too. As you begin to address the public, as you begin to speak more and more to them, gradually you become more subtle, more complex, because people begin to accept you—they are with you. Your vocabulary, phraseology, and slowly your concepts begin to travel. It’s an interesting
process. What I say to various groups today is not as simple as what I was saying ten years ago when I started addressing the public. Gradually people get used to you, and they have a particular way of listening to you.

**VH** Did you feel that being Indo-Fijian was a handicap in being accepted by a multicultural Fiji?

**S** I didn’t speak to as many Fijians as I’d wanted, but I was never excluded because I was an Indo-Fijian. Over a period I think people gain a very good sense of what you are about. Of course some will question your motives. Why are you doing this? What is in it for you? And once they understand that you mean well, and you mean well for everyone, especially your country, and that you don’t have an ulterior political gain in all of this, people begin to recognize that. I think my teaching at the University of the South Pacific has helped a lot, because I teach not only Indo-Fijians, but many ethnic groups. And in my classes we discuss issues, including contemporary issues, quite openly. So you build up a reputation.

**VH** Were your speeches in Fiji Hindi or in English?

**S** I spoke in English, because I was always aware there would be other people. An added problem was that I didn’t have that kind of confidence in Hindi at that time. Now I am more confident in Hindi. I regret very much that the school system didn’t offer me Fijian.

**VH** By speaking in English you gave the appearance and perhaps the reality that it was for everybody. But now that you have written a novel in Fiji Hindi, does this give the impression that you are retreating into a more specific group of people at the expense of the larger multicultural group?

**S** The reason is more complex. I have been trying to advocate in the last five years or so the importance of Fiji’s languages. We made a submission to the constitutional review committee on the importance of languages in the process of nation building. And we have been trying to establish the teaching of vernacular languages at the university. Fortunately the university has gradually seen the importance of vernacular languages. Now we are able to offer degree-level courses, and students can do a degree in Fijian or Hindi or other Pacific languages. I think my Hindi novel should be seen in that context, of rethinking local languages and their value, as well as several other issues that are more directly related to my own writing. I have been writing in English, but about people who speak only
Hindi. I have written a lot about rural people, who don’t understand or speak English. For me, fiction has always been an artificial creation, but more so when you are writing in a language that your characters don’t speak. We can “indigenize” the English language, but we can only go so far. When I started working on this novel I realized there were many things that aren’t translatable. I think the writing of this novel is part of that philosophy of trying to promote the vernacular languages, not only in Fiji, but also in the Pacific. For me, if we have more people writing in the vernacular languages, ultimately we will see another kind of intellectual life, not only in Fiji, but in Oceania as a whole. By writing the novel in Fiji Hindi, I was trying to demonstrate first of all that it can be done, and done well. What I have done should be seen in that context, not as withdrawing into narrow linguistic chauvinism. I see myself as leading by example.

vH If someone asked you what your new novel is about, what would you say to them?

s It’s about people who have been marginalized, not only in literature, but also from history. People who are also politically marginalized. I felt that one of the ways we could include people who have been marginalized in history books, political life, and from literature, is to write about them in their own language, and allow their own voices to speak. This novel is about the subaltern, allowing the subaltern to speak; and to speak in their own language. The novel is about a subaltern who wants to tell his story, a story about rediscovering Fiji. He is a type of old-style traveler that I knew in my childhood, one who would avoid cars and buses and preferred to walk. He is a great walker. He walks from village to village and from town to city. This is all part of the process of discovery, a discovery of Fiji as his home, his place—a discovery of who he is.

vH What are the advantages of walking over riding the bus?

s For one thing, you meet a lot of people along the way, and as a “traveler” you are readily invited into people’s homes. This character is very fond of going to people’s homes and staying for the night. Sometimes he goes for the night but stays four or five nights, and sometimes he stays for weeks and becomes a part of the household, sharing its secrets. I found this strategy for storytelling a major advantage. A person who walks is treated in a different way from a person who catches a bus. People see him walking and he’s regarded as a stranger, a person who probably requires
hospitality, so he’s shown kindness. I think it’s an optimistic novel; the character feels very good about the people he meets and how he’s been treated. I would describe it as a comic epic novel.

VH So does he get invited by people from different ethnic backgrounds and classes?

S Yes. The novel tells the story of his travels, but there are some years of his life that he doesn’t tell—seven years of his travel to various islands that he regards as a separate adventure. He says he’ll probably narrate that as a different saga. He stays in Fijian villages, and he travels to various islands. He goes to Rotuma too. Then he returns and makes a crucial journey to the western side of Vitilevu.

VH Why the western side?

S He’s a character who says he’s searching for a king. He goes toward the west in search of his king.

VH Why does he need a king?

S People he meets tell him that he has traveled so much, but hasn’t found his king. It just occurs to him like that. It’s something intuitive. He believes that if he finds his king and speaks to him, everything will be alright with the world.

VH Is it “king” in the sense of a “chief,” or is it a metaphorical king, or is it all those things?

S I think it’s all those things. He himself is not very sure what it is. But he becomes obsessed with the idea that he must walk to his king because that would make things better for him and the land.

VH When you walk you seem to be more in control of where your feet are going to take you, as opposed to being in a bus driven by somebody else and just rushing headlong to your destination.

S Walking also allows you to digress, to be distracted, to be more random. The narrative itself has constant digression, stories within a story. He’s going in one direction and suddenly takes off in another direction. So it’s not a straight journey to where he wants to go. He’s constantly diverting, the narrative is a series of diversions.
Walking seems to be a wonderful metaphor for a journey that one takes in order to discover one’s self as well as discover what one’s place is all about and whether people inhabit that place. But it seems to me that you’re trying to say something important in terms of looking for a king. Do you have any idea what the king is? Are we all looking for a king or a queen?

From what I’ve said it would seem like a very serious novel, but it’s not. And this is an important discovery for me, the comic potential that’s within oneself. When I was writing in English, the comic elements didn’t find significant expression. With this novel I’ve discovered the comic mode, and it’s beginning to have an influence on my recent writing in English. I myself find the novel funny. That doesn’t happen to me often. The protagonist in the novel is a comic character. His name is Fijilal. In a way he’s a kind of Everyman.

When you were reading your work the other day, within a few seconds everyone was laughing, particularly those who understood Fiji Hindi. How does the comic mode allow you to connect better with your readers or listeners?

I think the comic mode has so many possibilities. I think the whole novel could be performed quite readily. There are chapters I can more or less recite. That helps in performance. The novel has possibilities as radio drama. It would make a very good radio serial. Because of the comic possibilities people will see it as a kind of series of jokes or comic skits. It is in a language that the majority of people here in Fiji speak, so people will find it easy to relate to the characters and situation. Not only Indo-Fijians. There are Fijians in the novel who speak Fiji Hindi. I suppose the comic mode has particular possibilities for radio, television, even cinema.

Through the comic mode, you can have the audience laughing and yet at the same time they’re hurting too, perhaps because they know they’re laughing at themselves. Is that the sort of thing you’re doing in this novel?

Yes. There are theoretical ideas like that. A lot of things about literature. Discussion of the subaltern, the marginalized. Intertextuality. The whole novel in the end is about language in the broadest sense.

Is the comic mode the norm for the subaltern or the mode of the oppressed in every culture? Is this the mode of people who are marginal-
ized, living at the fringes of society, who wish to critique the power structure? What you are doing in this novel is similar to what goes on among Fijians, who often like to joke and tease each other; the same is true of Rotumans and other Polynesians. So, I think if you make this into a movie, or translate it into other languages, other ethnic groups will identify with your view of critiquing the status quo or formal institutions or even pompous people.

A lot of things that we don’t write about when using the English language come naturally with the use of the vernacular language by the subaltern. Because it is the subaltern’s story told in the subaltern’s own language, it offers a lot of freedom to go into that culture. We can joke about defecation, for example. Rural people are constantly looking for places to defecate. They’re also preoccupied with eating, and sexuality. These things are spoken about very freely. I find that some of these things are difficult to write about so freely in the English language; at least I found it very difficult. In the vernacular, and with local characters, these things come naturally, humorously. The marginalized (subaltern) instinctively understands the laughter that is associated with bodily functions.

Why do you think that those in power, no matter what ethnic group or society they are from, have a tendency to appear uncomfortable about these preoccupations, whether it’s defecation or eating or bodily functions. They give the impression that they’re above such lowly pursuits, so they sometimes speak a different kind of language, for example, one that separates them from the common folk.

I think a lot of class consciousness is involved. Our middle class, like middle classes elsewhere, aim for respectability, and so defecation and obsessions about eating and sexuality are not part of the respectable world. If you’re eating you must eat discreetly, and you mustn’t talk openly about sex. And you don’t talk while you’re eating either. But with the rural people, the bodily functions are a source of amusement, not shame. The children of rural folk who are educated begin to show embarrassment about such matters because they want to move up in society. They are a suitable subject for satire.

Thus bodily functions, sexuality, and earthy humor are prevalent in Fiji Hindi, but not formal Hindi.

I’ll use an example to illustrate that. When I was asked to read to an Indian audience during the recent Indian writers’ evening, I skipped some
of the vulgarity in my novel, because all the other readings were in sober formal Hindi. When I read to a wider, mixed audience, I read without censoring any of the cruder jokes.

vh How then do you bring these two disparate worlds together?

s Perhaps through the novel form, by writing in the vernacular. That’s one way, and that’s the way I know at the moment. In Indian culture, sexuality is very much part of religion, and so there’s no division between the religious and the sexual and the physical. But with westernization and colonialism these divisions have become more marked. The same happened in the Pacific too. In the precontact Pacific various aspects of life were integrated. Performance had all aspects of art. I think that’s a very good example of how something that was integrated became fragmented through western education. Today, writing is categorized into genres. Poets are writing poetry, novelists are writing novels, and dramatists are creating drama. By maintaining these various categories we are consolidating what colonialism started. I think we should find more ways of bringing the art forms together.

vh Do you have any other ideas on how we might do that?

s We need to integrate all the systems of knowledge we have in this part of the world. We will have to bring together the whole archives of Pacific knowledge systems through research and writing. I think vernacular languages are a very important part of it. I envisage some sort of forum where different languages can flow freely. I think there was a little bit of that at the spacial reading—while most of the readings were in standard English, there was a poet singing in pidgin; it’s such a pity to have Hindi writers and Fiji writers reading separately. I would like to see a seamless flow of languages. That would be very interesting, something unique. It would make Pacific literature different. In the same way, I think cultures could also flow like that. Then we would have a lot of integration happening and new cultural forms emerging.

vh It seems to me that the key to that is for different ethnic groups in Fiji to learn each other’s language and cultures; I think once they do that then we can move easily from Fijian to Hindi, for example.

s If you go to some of our schools now, it’s already happening. In the playground students switch from one language to another. They speak a pidgin variety of English that freely incorporates Fijian and Hindi. But it’s
not reinforced in the classroom, where English is still the dominant language. My feeling is that a lot of students who are marginalized, especially the dropouts, are unsuccessful in the school system because they are not able to compete in the English language. But if we had a classroom where the teacher and the students were competent in three languages, you’d have a very different story of success and failure, and a very different kind of school system. I think that is going to come about. Fiji is in the process of reexamining its education system, and already a number of us have been invited to give input into that project. One of the things we would like to see is the revamping of the whole curriculum so that parts of it would become democratic spaces in which students were given the freedom to express themselves in the language(s) they were confident in. Ultimately that will have to happen at the tertiary level as well. Already some of us are beginning to do that at the University of the South Pacific. For example, in my creative writing class, students are free to write in any language they want. Of course I don’t understand all the languages myself, but I can always find people who know. So, I discuss theoretical matters in English, and the students write in the language they are comfortable in. With a flexible degree system, students can take the creative writing class as a Fijian course, a Hindi course, or an English course. There are a lot of interdisciplinary possibilities that we haven’t explored fully. Cost effectiveness is involved in this too.

Imagine a situation in the classroom where students are able to switch to Fijian, English, Hindi, and possibly Rotuman; these can weave in and out of different knowledge systems and cultural nuances. It seems an ideal situation.

It’s not only ideal in a social sense; it also opens up new possibilities. Imagine what it would open up for drama, cinema, and novels, or whatever form of expression you think of. There’s a whole new communication possibility in that. I already see that happening in the playgrounds of the schools, fairs, and festivals. It is happening in the rural areas, among farmers. The only place it is not happening is in the school system. This has been one of my criticisms of the school system in Fiji and the Pacific. It doesn’t adequately reflect what’s in society itself. Our languages, our cultures are unnecessarily marginalized in this education system, because of this narrow definition of what knowledge is, what literature is, and what is worth learning.
What you are advocating will lead to more intermarriages between races because we would feel more comfortable being with someone from a different race. I’m thinking particularly of Indians and Fijians who haven’t really intermarried in large numbers.

Language does create a barrier. When you break the language barrier, then obviously the whole world of another culture opens up for you—we are less suspicious of each other. Let’s look at the way political life is conducted in Fiji. In political parties we have Fijians talking among themselves in Fijian, and Indians talking in Hindi or English, and so on. They’re not really communicating or working together. The 1997 constitution wants people to work together for a united country. The difficulty is that the politicians don’t know each other’s language. I’ve been saying that in the future when you are picking candidates it should be compulsory that they know English, Fijian, and Hindi, particularly for the open seats. Ideally one of the qualifications for the open seats should be that the candidate must know the three languages. I would like to see a language test for future politicians.

This whole language thing that you are advocating, that is, competency in three or four different languages, goes hand in hand with your own view of resisting globalism or one dominant culture imposing itself on others.

Yes, language expresses our difference. I think it is a space in which we can be ourselves, claim our own identity, and be different. I think globalism does provide a great challenge for all of us in Oceania and elsewhere. There is very little will in small island states to resist it, because globalism comes in the guise of employment, economic prosperity, and investment. Governments see in globalism easy prosperity and solutions to their many problems. They don’t want to see that with globalism comes a transnational culture. Our languages offer a place where we can actively resist the leveling effect of globalism.

People resist difference because they feel threatened, they feel they’re being excluded, because others are speaking their own languages, and so they’re out of it. But if they can also speak the language, there is no feeling of being excluded. Are there models like that in the world today that you know about?
A lot of this sort of exclusion happens in our multiethnic schools, to which students and teachers bring their own languages. A greater tolerance of difference is needed, whether in the staffroom or the playground. When groups start conversations in their own language, others naturally feel excluded. Exclusion leads to suspicion and antagonism. For Fiji the ideal is a multilingual school system.

The Indian subcontinent provides a rough model of functioning multilingual communities that I have some experience of. In the south, for instance, it is not unusual to find people switching from Tamil or Telugu to English, Hindi, or Urdu. People are naturally multilingual. One of the ways to be invited to a home is to speak the language.

In Fiji we have this misconception that if students devote too much time to vernacular languages, their English and other subjects will suffer. We have to get away from that attitude. Imagine the cultural richness of a classroom in which subjects are studied in two or three languages.

I am reminded that when I was a student here, I learnt dances from Samoa, Tonga, Fiji, Niue, and other places, so it seems to me that prior to this there have been some forays into this type of thinking. We were saying we wanted to learn about other cultures, but it seems to me that language is the ultimate because language is more than learning a dance, which is so much easier. I suspect that having some previous models, though not as perfect as they could have been, will make the idea of learning other people’s languages easier for students to embrace.

I think we’ve got to make local languages attractive to our students—they should know that there is employment, that you could be a language specialist, translator, actor, director, even filmmaker. There was a dance performance the other day during one of the reading sessions. A Fijian girl was dancing to Fijian music, but she was borrowing a lot of movements from other dance forms; there were influences from Indian dance as well as other Pacific dance movements. She was creating something very new, although it was still Fijian. There are immense creative possibilities in interculturalism.

So you’re interpreting language in its broadest sense.

I don’t think we should reduce language to just spoken or written. For too long we have given lower status to the spoken, and that is why we have taken this attitude that the Pacific had no literature until we started writing in English. I think we should get away from that and look at lan-
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guage in its diversity and complexity. There is also a language of the art forms that we should be aware of.

vH So how do you see your own work, and the way it will develop in the future? Do you see yourself continuing to write in English as well as in Fiji Hindi?

s I write in English; that is the language in which I feel most comfortable. I will continue to write in English, but I think, having written this novel in Fiji Hindi, it will have a lot of impact on what I will do in English. I don’t think I will write in the same way anymore. Let us see what the reaction is to this Hindi novel.

vH Give me an example of how writing in Fiji Hindi will influence your writing in English.

s I’d probably begin to enjoy more freedom in terms of imagination. I wouldn’t be afraid to use more vernacular and different kinds of linguistic structures, for example. I’d probably move toward a lighter and more humorous type of writing than the fiction I’ve written in the past.

vH Then it’s possible to think in Fiji Hindi and write in English?

s I think mostly in English. When I began the novel I was thinking in English, writing in Fiji Hindi. As Hindi came back to me, it took over the creative process. I can now remain in that language for a long time without switching to English.

vH So when you write in Fiji Hindi you think in Fiji Hindi?

s Yes. I used to write in Hindi when I was in high school. I had given that up for a very long time and now I’ve gone back to it. For me it has been a kind of rediscovery of that language. As I said, it was like going back to a language archive in your head. The novel is a rediscovery of the language that was spoken in the 1930s and 1940s.

vH So you still see value in Pacific writers writing in English?

s Many of us who are bilingual have made a habit of writing in English. I hope there will be a new generation of writers who will use their options more freely. Some of us had the potential to write either in the vernacular or English. We opted for English. As bilingualism becomes established through the school system, the newer bilingual writers will probably write bilingually. I envision an exciting possibility for people who can write in two languages. That would redefine the new literatures.
Are the younger writers heading in that direction?

Not just yet. However, I see a whole industry waiting there—the whole entertainment industry, for example. I think that’s an opportunity for growth for Fiji that we haven’t really exploited. It’s a huge industry: radio plays, lyrics, script writing for television. The multilingual medium could have a great impact. I think we’ll have a situation in which there’s great audience participation. At the moment when you watch television, Hindi, Fijian, and English programs appear separately. There will be a time in the future when programs will not be divided that way; instead there will be a spontaneous flow of multilingual programs.

What a vision. I hope both of us will still be around when that happens.

* * *

The editors would like to thank Professor Steve Derné for his suggestions regarding the timeliness of this interview.