Where 'Fiction and Reality' Come to the Fore: On Anthropophagy in Fiji.

Naoki Kasuga (Osaka University)

For Ethnographic Fictions Conference, Ithaca, April 27-29, 2006.

'How ethnography could not exist without the fictions that make it real': Where would this statement be most effectual? If we take the extreme stance that all reality is constructed, reality would not differ from fiction as 'something fashioned', and the above statement would simply be confirming an obvious relationship between ethnography and fiction. If we take the other extreme attitude that reality is reality and cannot be fabricated, reality would be the opposite of fiction as 'something made up' and it would be very difficult for reality and fiction to be connected. The above statement would then end up posing a tremendous problem for ethnography to somehow achieve the acrobatic task of linking the two.

That is to say, one position poses a simple question while the other poses a very difficult one, and neither can be said to be particularly meaningful. The optimum solution then would be somewhere in between 'reality is fiction' and 'reality is not fiction', and a point where reality and fiction appear in both conflict and harmony. The present article directs its argument towards this site where opposition and complementarity between reality and fiction effectively emerge.

1.

When the subtitle 'anthropophagy' is added to the title of reality and fiction, anthropologists would probably recall Walter Arens' work *The Man-Eating Myth*. As it is generally known, Arens dismissed anthropophagous customs reported from all over the world as fabricated stories. In terms of the second extreme stance mentioned above, he declared anthropophagy as fiction. Being a long time researcher in Fiji, which is a place renowned for anthropophagy, I can hardly accept this conclusion. I would first argue that anthropophagy in Fiji is real from the same extreme stance and then consider the difficulties of accepting it as reality from the viewpoint of the first extreme position.

It is impossible to dismiss anthropophagy in Fijian history as fiction or 'something made up'. There are plenty of reports about it by Wesleyan missionaries, captains and crews of trading ships, officers of British and American navies, and 'beachcombers'. These recorders were in contact with each other, so we can collate the

places, personal names and dates that appear in their records from first half to middle of the nineteenth century. Particularly notable are the diaries of the missionaries. They disclosed detailed accounts of the life and culture of Fijian people by living inside the villages for a long time from a few to more than ten years, learning the local language and keeping close interaction with them. In particular, Richard Lyth, who was originally a doctor, attempted a minute description of anthropophagy with sketches, distinguishing between observation and what he heard and putting them in order (Lyth 1836-44). Contents of records of Fijian daily life, kinship, ritual, myth and so on in their diaries are directly connected to various records from the colonial period to the present, and are valuable material for understanding the social and cultural transformations. We definitely do not find any reason for parts related to anthropophagy being consciously excluded. The authenticity of the records is also supported by archaeological materials. Needles and bowls made of human bones left after the flesh has been eaten, and wooden forks inserted with many human bones have been collected. In recent years, the accuracy of Lyth's records is being verified in minute detail (Clunie 1987)(Spennemann 1987). It is thus understandable that the author of *The Man-Eating Myth* could present 'only one jocular and irrelevant one[reference] to Fijians' (Spate 1988 337).

Anthropophagy in Fijiian history is not fictitious but real. However, this does not mean it was easily accepted as reality by those recording it. For example, two missionaries, who saw several tens of dead enemy bodies drawn by canoes arrive and then distributed in Rewa where they had been posted, each wrote in their diaries as follows: 'And oh! what scenes we have witnessed the recollection of them almost makes me shudder' (Jagger 31/10/39). 'How true is it that the dark places of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty' (Cargill 31/10/39). They indeed recognized what they witnessed as true, but could by no means overcome its incredibility and unacceptability. Only Lyth, who among the missionaries was outstandingly cool and calm, could write as follows by doing his utmost to contain his feelings: 'The result of my observations this week, is my full confirmation in the opinion that human flesh is very much relished by this people and that they have almost a passion for it.' (Lyth 22/2/1843)

It is perhaps not surprising that the missionaries found anthropophagy difficult to accept as reality. But we need to consider how it should be difficult. They well understood that anthropophagy was part of Fijian people's life and it was not that they disapproved ignoring the social context. Anthropophagy they witnessed was the result – and the cause – of the wars that occurred constantly among chiefdoms and their confederations. There were many other causes of war, but all had recovery of honor and display of power of the chief and kin group as their foremost aims. Stain on the

chief's honor meant disgrace of the god of the kin group and the angry god ordered the sacrifice of meat of the persons who dishonored his name. Thus, the paramount chief of Somosomo, who was reproached for his cannibalism by Lyth, responded 'that if they did not roast the slain and present them to their god they should be killed. Our god, says he, is an angry god.'(Lyth 28/6/1840) The dead body was skillfully cut with a bamboo knife and baked in a pit oven called *lovo.* A piece of the meat was taken to the temple and offered to god by the chief and priest, and the rest was eaten by these two. If there was a lot of meat, it was distributed to warriors, women and children, and sent to allied villages nearby.

The missionaries clearly depicted how indispensable war and anthropophagy were in this society. The Fijians played mock wars and anthropophagous rituals from childhood. When they grew into youths they became 'warriors' by participating in actual battle and killing the enemy with clubs. They went through four days of severe ritual and were reborn with a new name. After that they took pride in how many enemies they killed and ate. All men had to die as warriors and their bodies were buried wearing the war costume and holding a club. Judgment awaited the spirit of the dead in the other world, and cowards who had not experienced killing were given the punishment of striking at human feces everlastingly. (Lawry 1849 199).

The missionaries also understood the values and emotions behind the incredible acts of cruelty. For instance, they knew that the teasing of those who were going to be eaten, and the display of superiority by the eaters were expressions of the absolute power relations between them. The Fijians expressed the relationship between god and man, chief and commoner by the relationship between 'eating' and 'being eaten', as it can be gathered from their respectful salutation 'Eat me' (Waterhouse 1866 338). Anthropophagy was not an act of taking in the *mana* of the other into oneself, but above all else an act of constructing a relationship between superior and inferior (Williams 1931 45,104). The same could be said for the game in which people of all ages and sex abused the dead bodies. Although the missionaries detested it, they were well aware of the excitement aroused in the festivals and feasts together with the surrounding villages when they were released from the tensions of war. Even though attacking the enemy unawares in the dark and foul play were normal practice in Fijian warfare, the missionaries evidently knew that this was based on the spirit of 'warriors' who competed in defying the enemy and getting their dead bodies without losing their own life.

More importantly, the missionaries praised the strong friendship, sincerity and simplicity of the Fijians. They were concerned that the hedonistic white sailors and non-anthropophagous but materialistic Tongans would influence the heathens of local society in adverse ways. John Hunt, who proselytized in Somosomo together with Lyth,

wrote as follows regarding why such characteristics were found at the same time as inconceivable acts of cruelty.

> But there are such contradictions in their character, that it is a very difficult thing to form a just idea of what they really are.(Rowe 1859 125)

In other words, they found the reality difficult to accept not simply because of the shock of unparalleled atrocity of the act but because they could not understand 'what they really are'. The incomprehensible aspects of the Fijians described as contradiction by Hunt were also mentioned by other missionaries. Williams, for example, writes that a Fijian 'can love truly, and hate deeply; he can sympathize with thorough sincerity, and feign with consummate skill; his fidelity and loyalty are strong and enduring, while his revenge never dies, but waits to avail itself of circumstances, or of the blackest treachery, to accomplish its purpose.'(1931 107) Waterhouse describes such puzzling character of Fijians as 'thoroughly two-faced'. (1868:299) Their descriptions often turned complex when it came to the nature of the Fijians in general. The writers knew the subtleties of the Fijian emotions and depicted each aspect but could not seem to find words to summarize them. They left open-ended questions when faced with the whole: 'Why does this happen? Must it be like this?' It can be said that Hunt's words frankly represented this kind of situation faced by the missionaries who struggled with acceptance of reality.

Anthropophagy in Fiji has been included in various discussions among anthropologists. Sahlins sees it as a part of the structure of 'the exchange of raw women against cooked men'(1983), Toren presents it as an aspect of violence born from 'conflict' between the 'principle of hierarchy' and 'balanced reciprocity'(1990 237), and Thomas considers it as 'the European appropriation of indigenous things'(1991 163-7). None of the explanations, however, answer the missionaries' questions. Anthropologists live among the Fijians and accumulate knowledge through interaction in the local language just as the missionaries did, but they do not link anthropophagy with the question of 'what they really are'. They simply stick to discussing anthropophagy within a theme acceptable to the community of anthropologists and have no intention of understanding the anthropophagous Fijians in their entirety. I do not mean to criticize, but the difference between the missionaries and the anthropologists is worth investigating.

The first thing that comes to mind is that whereas the missionaries problemitized the whole truth, anthropologists try to approach and give an account of the truth from a particular angle and seek a partial truth. What exactly then is 'the whole' as far as such partial truth is concerned? This subject cannot be avoided if we

are to discuss the relationship between ethnography and fiction. As it is well known, Clifford, a representative theorist who sheds light on 'ethnographic fiction', argues that 'Ethnographic truths are thus partial.'(1986 7) He uncovers the fictional characteristic of ethnography which conforms to various restrictions and constructs truth by using exclusion and rhetoric. Thornton supports this argument and analyzes how previous ethnographies fictitiously created part-whole relations of the societies under study (Thornton 1988).

But, even if we give up looking for the whole truth, take refuge in partiality and refer to this partiality as 'fragment' or 'position', it would be difficult, as Strathern points out, to get rid of 'the shadowy presence'(1992 95) of a lost perspective, that is to say, of an unproblematic holism. In fact, since avoiding part-whole relations in ethnography is more difficult than imagined, recent arguments have even suggested exploring the prospect of ethnography by critically considering the nature of holism, instead of rejecting holism all together (Rumsey 2004). In other words, anthropologists cannot be justified in simply dealing with partial truth and, if they want so, the relationship of their project with the whole must be explored.

→→'Partial Organization' by R.Munro p.261 を参照し引用すること。

But do ethnographies really just talk about partial truth in the first place? Was not an anthropologist's fieldwork supposed to be an endeavor to question the implicit trust in the preexisting whole truth and remind us of the presence of a different whole truth? Was not ethnography supposed to be written to manifest a new whole truth? The missionaries' records present us with these serious questions.

2.

Anthropophagy in Fiji disappeared with the increase in Christian conversion in the 'new era' [*na ngauna vou*] of establishment of Pax Britannica by British colonialism. It became part of the 'dark age' before the advent of 'light' [*thina*] of Christianity, and was transformed into a symbol of the age of ignorance when people did not know the 'true God'. The Fijians who had become devout Christians seemed to be obedient to their chiefs who sat in the special seat in church, and good subjects of the colonial government to which those chiefs promised allegiance. It is not difficult to imagine that when the Fijians created some disturbances in the peace and order it recalled the image of 'cannibals' in the minds of those related to the church and government. However, if the Fijians themselves unashamedly re-represent themselves as cannibals, that would require another kind of explanation. I present below such examples in the colonial and post-colonial periods.

Let me first begin with a great movement which was born from

disillusionment in the ‘new era’ which was supposed to have brought about wealth and prosperity. Apolosi Nawai, the leader of the movement, declared as follows: Why were the white men rich and the Fijians still poor? It is because the white men have hidden the truth and taught lies. The source of secret of their wealth and power which they continue to hide is the ‘company’. The Fijians must establish their own company, that is to say, Viti Kanbani. This movement swept over the whole of Fiji by 1915 and Apolosi traveled collecting funds to set up the company with followers gathered from all over the country. He was protected by the twin gods worshipped in the main island of Viti Levu, and it came to be believed that these twin gods were none other than the Christian God. The movement was supposed to make ‘true Christianity’[*lotu ndina*] blossom and Apolosi, the ‘true chief’, was supposed to save the Fijians by creating the ‘true Fiji’.

The incident in question occurred in May 1915 while he was visiting an island called Yangueta in the Yasawa islands. A warrant was issued for his arrest for fraud, and a white man called Inspector Young came to the island at dusk with his men. Apolosi and his followers sat in a circle on a beach where they had collected copra and waited for Young and his men. Apolosi stood alone in the center, talked incessantly and seemed to be stirring up excitement in the group. When Young came to arrest him, Apolosi said in English, ‘Stand up. Boys.’ Several tens of them stood up together, put their shoulders together and protected Apolosi who stood in the middle. Many of them had their faces blackened across the eyes as warriors in the old days did. There was a commotion when Young started to read out the warrant written on a green piece of paper, and voices were heard telling him to read it in Fijian. When the two accompanying Fijians summarized the content in Fijian, one of the group grabbed the warrant, tore it and threw it away. Apolosi’s elder brother Kini, who was one of the central figures in the movement, was also present. He held a lantern, approached the Fijian sergeant and said in a loud voice, ‘Why did you bring these White men here? You wanna be baked with them?’

Apolosi said in an excited manner that he would never be taken alive. He was most forcible in his manner and repeatedly struck his left hand with his clenched fist. ‘I am the Savior of the Fijians,’ he said, ‘If you attempt to take me, something serious should happen.’ The constables tried to go near Apolosi but were pushed back, and more and more Fijians gathered on the beach. Young who sensed the odd atmosphere did not go ahead with the arrest and returned to the steamer which was at anchor. Then Apolosi and his followers let out the Fijian shout of victory ‘Kai kaila!’ and danced the war dance, beating empty biscuit tins until morning. The first of the arrests which Apolosi was to face many times later thus ended in failure (CSO 4652/1915).

The story of Apolosi is accompanied by the image of war till today. This is

because this movement, which tried to recover the original strength of the Fijians, evokes the power of the great chief's invulnerability and his power over life and death. But it seldom accompanies the image of anthropophagy, and there are hardly any instances where it has appeared so directly. As I have already mentioned, there is no concept of taking in the other person's *mana* in Fijian anthropophagy. As long as the movement claims to be 'Christian', it would be difficult to bring in anthropophagy which is a symbol of the pre-Christian era. In fact, in the case of the Tuka movement, which is similar to the Viti Kanbani movement, the *mana* of the leader Navosavakandua is recounted as an astonishing power that prevented the death of a man who was baked in a *lovo* for three days. Navosavakandua called himself a Christian and displayed the power over life and death in the form of inverting anthropophagy (Kaplan 1995 115), and the same legend is related as an account of Apolosi's power in the western and middle regions of Viti Levu, which consider him to be the successor of Navosavakandua. Viti Kanbani was even more closely related to church organization than Tuka, and the activists considered themselves to be devout Christians. Linking 'strength' and 'truth' with anthropophagy would not match their self image.

The connection between the movement and anthropophagy is difficult to find even in the light of the New Testament and Old Testament of the Bible in which the Fijians have faith. There are several images of war and savior in these scriptures and it is possible to overlap Apolosi's powerful personality, unexpected fearful words and deeds and even kindness with the characters of the Bible (these are also the images of the previous great chiefs). The Bible became a source of reference of the various messages which Apolosi continued to send from Rotuma, his place of exile, and is always quoted when looking back to the execution of his orders today. But the image of anthropophagy cannot be found in the Bible and the meaning of 'flesh' is completely different.

How then did the link with anthropophagy come about? Firstly, we should consider the fact that it occurred under extremely tense circumstances. The followers faced Apolosi's first arrest and had to fight the constables in a situation where they had no idea about the future of the movement or treatment after arrest. We should also take into account the fact that the Viti Kanbani movement declared that the teachings of the white missionaries were lies and was founded on the ultimate separation from the old church. However, unpredictable critical situation and rejection of teachings of the existing church *per se* do not readily bring about association with anthropophagy. The mismatch with their self image still remains unresolved. As I can find any reason apart from what Edward Tylor refers to as 'survival' in his *Primitive Culture*, I had better go on to the next example.

The second incident occurred in Suva on 4th September 1987, seventeen years after Fiji gained independence. Four months before this, just after a coalition government of ethnic Fijians and Indo-Fijians was inaugurated, there was a coup d'etat by the military advocating the assertion of sovereignty of the indigenous people. Timothi Bavandra who was made to resign from his post of Prime Minister, eventually took the governor-general, who was the great chief of Fiji, to court. For the Taukei activists at the forefront of the coup d'etat supporters, this court case was disrespect against the great chief and an insult to 'the Fijian people'.

On that day, a dozen of Taukei men gathered in the square in front of the Government Buildings and dug a *lovo*, while their supporters kept watch. They painted their faces as warriors, wore grass skirts on their naked bodies, armed themselves with spears and clubs and started chanting and dancing around a pit. The atmosphere was probably filled with tension and excitement, as Bavadra's young spokesman, an Indo-Fijian, who came to see what was happening was chased by them, captured in the hotel where he tried to escape and attacked with clubs and spears in front of the guests. Taukei's spokesman, Meli Vesikula, who was questioned about this incident stressed that the performance around the *lovo* was by no means a show and said as follows: 'We will put people in the *lovo* if our high chief ever reaches courts.'(Fiji Sun 5/9/1987) It seemed that he wanted to say the violent incident was a result of their anger about the fact that the *lovo* was taken as a show. It was a demonstration that they had 'reached the end of their tether'(Fiji Times 5/9/1987) and meant business. There was no direct reference to anthropophagy, but there is no doubt that signs of it were amply attached to the words and deeds of the group.

I had read a brief account of this incident in Deryck Scarr's book (1988 125) and had immediately forgotten about it. But in August 1992, I came across it again in an unexpected way. I was doing research on Apolosi and was staying in Matathawalevu island next to Yangueta island where he had narrowly escaped his first arrest. I was made to wait for over a week for a motor boat that went around the surrounding islands to arrive while I was a guest of the chief's kin group. The boat belonged to a person of the kin group and according to promise it should have come to me a long time ago as I had paid the fee for 40 gallons of benzene. I managed to come to this island thanks to a man called Epeli whom I met in the National Archives of Fiji in Suva. He sent me under his sister-in-law's care to his aged father, who was the chief of Matathawalevu and an ex-activist of Viti Kanbani. I had finished collecting the legends regarding Apolosi and was waiting earnestly for the arrival of the boat.

Just as people stopped coming around to take a look at a foreigner out of curiosity, I felt deep gratitude towards kindness shown by Mesu who was one of Epeli's brothers. He was a middle aged man of few words, but when he sensed that I

was bored or irritated he casually talked to me. It was he who invited me to the kava session every night, and I had sat with him around a kava bowl that night too. Usually men gathered one by one but that night no one had yet turned up and it was getting later and later into the night. We felt the intoxication of the kava and said a few words to each other now and again. Each time Mesu heard a sound far away, he told me whether or not it was that of a motor boat.

'A day will come when we will drink tea here and have lunch in Lautoka.' This was one of Apolosi's predictions which the men discussed while drinking kava. Apolosi's prediction had come true since the motor boat had made it possible for one to have breakfast on the island and get to the port of Lautoka before lunch. On the afternoon of the same day, I suddenly linked this prediction with the record of Kini's words in Yangueta. When I put together the fact that an old woman of the island had talked about Navosavakandua and Apolosi as the same person, it dawned on me that *lovo* was a device to represent *mana* that determined life and death rather than signifying anthropophagy. This discovery was sufficient to resolve the self-questioning of the anthropologist who was asking himself what he had been doing all day. Before I knew it, I was telling Mesu about the new interpretation while waiting for the boat.

Mesu turned his face towards me and said, 'Naoki, Epeli demonstrated *lovo* in front of Sukuna.' Sukuna was the name of the great chief who stood as a bronze statue in the square of the Government Buildings. It was clear which incident these words referred to, and I tried to recall the passage from Scarr's book. Mesu looked down, made a tutting sound with his tongue and shook his head as he scooped the kava with a cup and poured it into a bowl. Fijians sometimes do this, but it was the first time I had seen him do it. Although he did not usually talk about politics, he had finally expressed his stance by this gesture. How bitter he must have felt when he did this. I was ashamed of myself and my interpretation. For Mesu tutting and shaking his head, the interpretation I offered probably had as much significance as Sahlins' interpretation of anthropophagy to missionaries questioning 'what they really are'.

If my memory is correct, it was then that Mesu lifted his face up and turned his gaze on the lamp hanging from the ceiling. His eyes were hazy, large and seemed to be slightly covered in tears. He seemed to be staring at something, absent minded or dreaming. I am not sure whether I sensed that Mesu was recollecting something and went after him, or it was just my imagination in the first place. In any case, frame by frame of the history related to anthropophagy came to my mind one after another. Pre-Christian times when war was an everyday affair, days of wild excitement with the Viti Kanbani movement, situation when the Bavandra side and the Taukei side changed political stances, began to appear and move accompanied by scenes, just like photographs and models in a museum. There were great chiefs daringly carrying out

anthropophagy, and missionaries convicting them; constables trying to arrest Apolosi, and Kini and others threatening them; and Bavandra's spokesman, and armed Taukei men chasing him.

I still did not know how to understand anthropophagy, rather it seemed now almost impossible, but I was completely overpowered by these images. While I was overwhelmed, I was struck by a strange sensation. It was a feeling of ambiguity about whether the images before me belonged to me, to Mesu or perhaps even to Epeli, and awareness of the incongruity of this sensation (if it happened to me now I would probably think that they belonged to the missionaries or to Kini). It was not that I felt pity for Mesu, nor did I sympathize with Epeli by any means. It would not have occurred to me to understand these two men or reconcile with them. If I was asked what I understood about Mesu or Epeli, I would have surely answered that I still don't understand anything. Nevertheless, I could not help acknowledging the impression that the images that came to my mind were linked to those of Mesu and Epeli. Or rather, I had no choice but to accept the feeling that my images were the images that Mesu had in mind at that moment and could have been the images that were hidden in Epeli's heart, even though I knew it was bizzare. I was deeply moved, in spite of the fact that explanations of the various acts inducing anthropophagy had failed and I had lost the meaning of staying in this island. This sensation did not spring outwards from inside me; it was something that spread from all over a room or house into all directions silently seeping through my very being.

3.

So where exactly am I trying to go in this article? Let me at least analyze what happened that night. The appearance of the images related to anthropophagy indicates that several strands of time started to overflow and run their own course. I was unable to know which time had the prerogative, including the present flow of time in which I sat around the kava bowl. Nor could I discern whether this flow had originated from me and was meant for me or it was coming from Mesu and Epeli. It was definitely not an experience of unity with them. Rather, Mesu, Epeli and I were each connected to several strands of time without being mutually translatable, and this connection was so entangled that they became indistinguishable, making the three of us and our time exist simultaneously in chaos and inseparable from each other.

It would be easy to dismiss this as my imagination. But at least that night I – and the 'I' who is writing this now – could not have been a privileged existence compared to any of the strands of time that overflowed, or compared to Mesu and Epeli who could have been predominantly related to these strands of time. Rather I

existed through this flow of time and these two people. Mesu, Epeli and myself, and the numerous strands of time we each possibly pictured were conjoined in the form of 'and...and...and...' without any of them being either separated or united, and I existed precisely in the core of that very conjunction. It seemed that Mesu, Epeli and I were neither equal nor unequal, neither congeneric nor antagonistic. We could not understand let alone relate to each other, but resonated by just being with each other. In addition to the three of us, it could have been possible for the missionaries, Apolosi and other personalities to be linked through the overflowing strands of time.

The term that befits this kind of 'and...and...and...' conjunction is neither Clifford's 'the model of collage'(1988 146) nor Strathern's 'the cutting/extention'(1991 118), but 'rhizome' proposed by Deleuze and Guattari(1987). I will clarify the meaning of this term by comparing it to a 'tree'. Tree implies structure, system and organization in the same way as the root, and represents the tendency towards (re-/over-) codification, modeling and concentricity. It promotes the awareness to seek meaning and interpretation, fixes a particular order and at the same time guarantees a unified subject. It is a force that includes both the subject and object in the whole system and territorializes even the unconscious. The goal of tree logic 'is to describe a de facto state, to maintain balance in intersubjective relations, or to explore an unconscious that is already there from the start, lurking in the dark recesses of memory and language.'(ibid.,p.12)

A rhizome is a principle of asignifying rupture which constantly attempts to take flight from the territorialization of arborescent systems. Whereas a tree fixes a locus and allots points, a rhizome connects one arbitrary point to another, linking one system to another by an external logic that cannot be reduced to anything and de-systemizes both. It is a line that is constantly drawn from one point to another, escaping codification, rejecting meaning, and creating a flow that allows neither genetic axis nor deep structure to come anywhere near it. Nevertheless, what is linked and generated is not just a collection of part-objects or a mass of deterritorialized segments, but a living block and a connecting of stems. The rhizome is the very principle that endlessly repeats rupture, emergence and transformation, without being reduced to the One or the multiple. While the tree is characterized by the verb 'to be', the rhizome is the conjunction, 'and...and...and...'.

If I had a rhizomatous conjunction with Mesu and others and the various flows of time, it was probably because the tree logic of anthropophagy had collapsed. When my self-congratulatory anthropological interpretation was shattered by Mesu's words and gestures, I started to wander outside the academic community. I left Sahlins' side and moved towards the missionaries, entering the realm of questioning 'what they really are'. What happened to me was the loss of paranoia of meaning and

interpretation, and the liberation from the spell of structures and codes. As a result, I was connected, without understanding anything, to the words, actions, subjects, scenery, flow of time of anthropophagy that were objects of arborization and the human agents who reacted to them. Or rather, I clearly sensed that I was connected. When I look back now, the strange sense of being moved that gripped me did not come from 'me' or 'them'. It seems to have been a flash of the moment in which a line was drawn between these, or a bright afterimage of the line that passed away.

My introspection is becoming rapidly barren since a rhizomatous conjunction hates being identified and immediately flies away from the image that is drawn. But what I want to propose here is that whether or not the conjunction was a mirage, it seems to appear due to a strong will to know 'what they(we) really are'. It is extremely difficult to capture the whole truth, whatever it strictly means. But, the strong will to overcome this difficulty is surely what makes impossible relationships emerge and lines of 'and...and...and...' run. To consider the validity of this intuition, let us turn back once again to the incidents regarding anthropophagy.

It would be difficult to discover rhizome lines in the life of the missionaries who questioned 'what they really are'. This is precisely because they were armed with particularly strong tree logic and incessantly territorialized the anarchic characteristics of the Fijians. The missionaries, after all, explained the Fijians in terms of the transcendental signifier called God and integrated them into their arborescent systems. Hunt, for example, deplores contradictions in Fijian character, but immediately adds.

> The contradictions in their character are partly to be attributed to custom, and partly to that fickleness of disposition which is the characteristic of men who have no education, no good example, no knowledge of God or His word, and consequently, no fixed principle of action; and who, in addition to all this, are under the government of the god of this world.(Ibid.,pp.125-6)

But what about Kini? He also seemed to have achieved the answer to 'what we really are' by the transcendental signifier in the form of Apolosi's *mana*. But, in reality he grafted anthropophagy, which was an anti-church symbol, on to the Fijians, who were supposed to be devout Christians. When the arrest of Apolosi=Christ drew close and the Biblical image became very apparent, he brought in anthropophagy that was totally unrelated to the Bible. I would like to suggest that Kini's words and actions were a result of his pursuit of the whole truth in a contrastive way to the missionaries. This can be supported more than anything else by the decisive difference between *mana* and the God of the missionaries. *Mana* is characterized by its inherently unpredictable and inexplicable nature, and is a power that always leaves scope to defy

the believer's interpretation.

Thus the Viti Kanbani movement became an endeavor to continue the search for 'what we really are' in Apolosi's words, and had no choice but to become a movement that relentlessly marveled and glorified whatever manifested in whatever manner. The solution of company and the interpretation of twin gods as the Christian God should have enshrined further meaning beyond the imagination. In other words, the whole truth was not in the state of 'to be' but constantly in the process of being uprooted. Kini's words and actions emerged from such a chain of marvel linked by 'and...and...and...', and can be understood as a part of a line that continues to be drawn escaping arborization. Even if he was Apolosi's elder brother and not Apolosi himself, it is clear that he took a central and conscious part in the creation of the narrative of 'what we really are' in Viti Kanbani.

The Fijian attitude of pursuing the whole truth while asking 'what we really are' can be seen unchanged even today after Apolosi's death and the virtual disappearance of the movement. When I think about it, perhaps Epeli and Mesu shared this attitude beyond differences in political stance. Taukei men who danced around the *lovo* linked the image of the old warrior with the image of the Fijian as the true Christian, just as Kini did. An instance of 'and...and...and...', or a line, had emerged by the will that tenaciously pursued the whole truth. They did not make either one of the two into a symbol or vestige of the other. Nor did they make them into incompatible dichotomies. They completely rejected such facile association and called for 'the true Fijian' to exist solely outside reality by just linking the two with 'and...and...and...'. Was this not the same thing as what Mesu was trying to tell me as he tutted and shook his head while he was scooping the kava with a cup and pouring it into the bowl? The whole truth that manifests the sacred power of the Fijians definitely exists somewhere, but there is no way of finding it in the preexisting life, state politics or church. It would certainly not be found by imitating anthropophagy. Surely that was what Mesu was trying to tell me.

Leaving aside my account of Mesu and Epeli, I would like to present what I think about anthropophagy when I look back at the history of Fiji. Perhaps anthropophagy was a device for resisting the arborization of various social systems and consciousness, and the construction of chiefdom and state as territories. If I were to present a rather wild argument, I would say that anthropophagy had betrayed the internal order of chiefdom in the past and had the power to show people *mana* that no one could possess. Even in a systemized and institutionalized form, anthropophagy still evokes the terror of 'angry god' beyond system. It reminds the observer and the practitioner that a line that goes 'and...and...and...' may possibly run wild. Unlike Levi-Strauss' claim in *Tristes Tropiques* that contrasts it with anthropemy,

anthropophagy is by no means a way of eradicating a menacing power. Rather, it ensures this kind of power by the very continuation of consumption of human flesh.

Conclusion

Now, how far has this article succeeded in approaching the site where reality and fiction emerge in both opposition and harmony, as I mentioned at the beginning of this article? In the first section, I quoted the missionaries' records and argued that they went beyond the partial truth and problemitized the whole truth. Anthropologists who are stoic empiricists have tended to avoid confronting this problem by hiding under the umbrella of 'context' and 'modeling' in the past and more recently 'position' and 'partial truth'. There is even a tendency to defend the fictional nature of ethnography by arguing that the whole is unknowable. But what is important is that we should rethink the significance of problemitizing the whole truth, not whether or not the whole is unknowable.

The decipherment of the whole truth is often attempted by depending on transcendental signifiers such as God, *mana*, ego, Idea, or substance. Even if such privileged signifiers are fiction, as post-structuralists point out, they function in various ways. Whereas God for the missionaries tried to fit the whole world into a great tree, *mana* for the Viti Kanbani activists displayed self deviancy as its characteristic and stated the truth in the chain of wonder of 'and...and...and...'. *Mana* created decodified and deterritorialized social spheres one after another like rhizomes by connecting impossible relationships. The project of arborization distinguishes reality from fiction by looking at logical, causal and legal connections and is inclined to aim at the construction of the world as reality itself. But rhizomization is an endeavor to realize the virtual beyond the actual (the hidden truth in the case of *mana*) on the horizon beyond both reality and fiction. Although the tree and rhizome are in contradistinction, we should not forget that both problematize the whole truth. In the face of the vague, imminent and difficult question 'what they(we) really are', one is fixed on the distinction between reality and fiction, and the other tries to break the very distinction between reality and fiction and capture the truth *en puissance.*

I do not intend to present a definitive judgment in favor of either tree or rhizome, so I would like to end this article by recalling the indivisible relationship between the two that Deleuze and Guattari continues to stress. Territorialization by a tree creates a rhizome line that runs, but when the mesh of overcoding is put on the newly created connections, it is again territorialized. But further lines of flight will no doubt be drawn on the territory and create rhizomatous conjunctions. In this sense, anthropophagy in Fiji can be depicted as events where arborization and rhizomization

are woven together. After all, it was once an eerie sign that emphasized the chief's transcendence and implied destruction while being at the heart of society. It was also an underground means to prove the authenticity of Fijians after their conversion to Christianity, in spite of being a symbol of anti-Christianity. It thus represents the inconsistent and neither too close nor too remote relationship between the tree and rhizome in a remarkably condensed way.

What does anthropophagy in Fiji teach us? We learn that we should not consider the problem of ethnographic reality and fiction just within the context of arborization where interpretation and explanations dominate but also see them in the light of the process of interweaving rhizomes and trees. How do reality and fiction become two things that must be distinguished and how do they continue to be distinguished? How do the connections by 'and...and...and...' that are neither reality nor fiction appear and create chains? How do the two meet and how do they part? We should confront, pursue and discuss these issues from the perspective of both 'I' and 'they', as well as "I 'and' they". There is no doubt that anthropologists will continue to be involved in this process in fieldwork. On the one hand, there is a simultaneous emergence of reality and fiction, and on the other hand, there is a leaping attempt to go beyond the distinctions between the two. Our ethnographic writing takes place right above and alongside the fissure that runs in between.

Works Cited

Arens, Walter 1979 The Man-Eating Myth: Anthropology and Anthropophagy. New York.

Cargill, Albert 1835-40 The Journal of Albert Cargill, Manuscript, Sydney, Mitchell Library.

Clifford, James 1986 Introduction: Partial Truths. In Clifford, J. and G.E.Marcus (eds),

Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. pp.1-26. Berkeley: University

of California Press.

1988 The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art.

Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Clunie, Fergus 1977 Fijian Weapons and Warfare, Suva, Fiji Museum.

1987 Roko tui Dreketi's Human Skull Yaqona Cup?, Domodomo 5-1&2: 50-52.

Colonial Secretary's Office (CSO) n.d. Minute Papers [administative correspondence

between
colonial officials]. National Archives of Fiji, Suva, Fiji.
Cross, William 1837-42 The Journal of William Cross, Manuscript, Sydney, Mitchell Library.
Deleuze, G. and F.Guattari 1987 A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia.
B.Massumi trans. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Hunt, John 1838-48 The Journal of John Hunt, Manuscript, Sydney, Mitchell Library.
Jaggar, Thomas 1988 The Journal of Thomas James Jaggar Feejee 1838-45, Auckland,
Solent Publishing.
Kaplan, Martha 1995 Neither Cargo Nor Cult: Ritual Politics and the Colonal Imagination in Fiji.
London: Duke University Press.
Lawry,Walter 1849 Friendly & Feejee Islands: Missionary Visit, London, Rev.Elijah Hoole Ltd.
Lévi-Strauss,C. 1962 Tristes Tropiques. Paris, Plon.
Lyth, Richard 1836-44 The Journal of Richard Lyth, Manuscript, Sydney, Mitchell Library.
Rowe G.S. 1859 The Life of John Hunt, London, Hayman,Christy & Lilly.
Rumsey, Alan 2004 Ethnographic Macro-Tropes and Anthropological Theory.
Anthropological Theory 4(3): 267-298.
Sahlins, Marshall 1983 Row Women, Cooked Men, and Other "Great Things" of the Fiji Islands.
In P.Brown and D.Tusin(eds.), The Ethnography of Cannibalism. Society for Psychological Anthropology, pp.72-93.
Scarr, Deryck 1988 Fiji: The Politics of Illusion. Kensington: New South Wales University Press.
Spate, O.H.K. 1988 Paradise Found and Lost. London: Routledge.
Spennemann, Dirk 1987 The Analysis of Butchering Marks on Human Bones and the Historical
Record, Domodomo 5-1&2: 29-6.
Strathern, Marilyn 1991 Partial Connections. Maryland: Rowman& Littlefield Publishers.
1992 Parts and Wholes: Refiguring Relationships in a Post-Pural World.
In A.Kuper (ed), Conceptualizing Society. pp.75-104. London: Routledge.
Thomas, Nicholas 1991 Entangled Objects. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Thornton, Robert 1988 The Rhetoric of Ethnographic Holism. Cultural Anthropology 3:285-303.
Toren, Christina 1990 Making Sense of Hierarchy: Cognition as Social Process in Fiji.

London:
The Athlone Press.
Waterhouse, Rev.Joseph 1868 King and People of Fiji, London, Wesleyan Conference.
Williams, Thomas 1931 The Journal of Thomas Williams: Missionary in Fiji,1840-1853.
G.C.Henderson（ed）, Sydney, Angus & Robertson Ltd..
1982 Fiji and the Fijians, vol.2, Suva, Fiji Museum.［Originally Published 1858］.