REVIEWS


JOHN BARKER
*University of British Columbia*

The “unstable images” examined in Brenda Johnson Clay’s new book have to do with the “representation of human differences and separations” generated in colonial discourses (p.1). More specifically, they are the products of five Methodist missionaries and two anthropologists who visited or resided in New Ireland between 1876 and the mid-1930s and wrote about their experiences, in some cases many years later. *Unstable Images* pursues the now familiar strategy of postcolonial studies by examining these texts for signs of the discursive framing of the native “other” in opposition to the Western “self”, not only through the play of stereotypes but also secreted within descriptions of landscapes, encounters, bodies, spatial arrangements and mundane activities. Clay argues that the images of natives produced in such writings are not merely or, in some cases, mainly “colonial exercises of hegemonic control” (p.15). Drawing upon Roy Wagner’s *The Invention of Culture* (1975/1980), she sees such images as creations that emerge out of a tension between conventional understandings and the challenges experienced by the writers in the context of intercultural encounters which form a kind of “resistance”. A rounded understanding of colonial discourses, then, requires close attention to the writer’s actual experience as much as the expectations of his or her audience. The texts provide glimpses of “past interactions and practices” and, through them, evidence of indigenous push back against colonialist assumptions (p.18).

At least, I think that’s what Clay is saying. The Introduction ranges widely through the postcolonial literature as well as anthropological writings on colonialism and cultural change. While interesting, the discussion never quite settles on a clear description of Clay’s own assumptions and strategy.

Those not fond of postcolonial theorising will turn with some relief to the substantive chapters of the study which, while not entirely free of jargon, focus on the writers’ words and on the fascinating early contact and colonial periods in New Ireland’s history. The sequence of the authors’ residence in the region, if not always the texts, parallels that of successive colonial regimes. Chapter 1 concerns the writings and the person of the Reverend George Brown who pioneered the Methodist Mission to New Guinea in 1875 at the beginning of a distinguished career as a self-taught natural scientist, ethnologist, artefact collector and administrator. Perhaps because so much has been written about this famous missionary, Clay gives a cursory treatment of local history, dwelling mostly on two texts, an autobiography (1908) and Brown’s ethnological magnum opus, *Melanesians and Polynesians* (1910). Chapter 2 moves
into the German period, dealing more with the actual experiences of Methodist missionaries during a period of consolidation, as revealed by correspondence, reports and unpublished autobiographies of two missionaries who, unlike Brown, actually lived in New Ireland: George Pearson and D. Thomas Reddin. The next chapter takes the story into the Australian occupation, with an intimate focus on the routine activities of a district missionary, Ira Mann, as recorded in his daily journal. Chapter 4 makes perhaps the most original contribution. Moving into the Mandate period, Clay examines how Malinowskian functionalism encouraged starkly opposed assessments of the cultural health of indigenous New Ireland societies. In Lesu, Hortense Powdermaker found a fully functioning traditional society scarcely touched by colonial agencies. Yet, to the north and the south, William C. Groves and the Methodist Gilbert Platten declared societies to be in an advanced state of breakdown, advocating a shift in educational strategies to restore them to functional balance. The final two chapters concern colonial representations of exchanges with New Ireland peoples and the longterm missionary impact upon the islanders.

Clay’s commentaries on the texts and the history of missionary and anthropological interventions in New Ireland are for the most part interesting, insightful and convincing. Taken as a whole, however, Unstable Images suffers from several flaws in conception and execution. First, Clay does not explain why she has selected these particular texts as opposed to a broader sampling. The concentration upon Methodist missionaries allows her to review the early history and impact of the mission to New Ireland, devoting a whole chapter specifically to the subject. The Introduction, however, gives no indication of this theme; instead, she writes more broadly of “colonial discourses”. Second, although texts are identified as the main subject of the study, Clay provides few details on their structure and contents, instead commenting on those passages that interest her. Her comments are interesting, but without more information on the texts, her interpretations sometimes seem arbitrary and heavy-handed. Finally, although Clay is mainly interested in the ways in which experiences influenced colonial perceptions, she periodically uses the same texts to comment on the actual historical impact of colonists, thus conflating two different types of analysis. In Chapter 6, for instance, she draws upon her fieldwork in 1970-71 and 1979-80 to assess the impact of the first 60 years of missionary representations (that is, between 1875 and 1935) of indigenous ideas and practices. The question of whether this handful of texts can be taken as representative of how missionaries actually thought and acted (let alone the role of islander teachers, who were the primary evangelists) is barely considered. The question of how the islanders may have been exposed to, or internalised, such representations receives even less attention.

Despite these problems, Unstable Images is well worth careful study as an experimental attempt at examining the “margins” of colonial texts, to use Bronwen Douglas’ useful phrase (p.18): simultaneously revealing colonialist assumptions and the faint imprints of indigenous agency.

AUGUST IBRUM KITUAI  
*University of Papua New Guinea*

Papua New Guinea’s colonial history spanned 91 years from November 1884 to September 1975. Possession was initially claimed by Great Britain and Germany, with Britain claiming the southern area that later came to be called Papua, and Germany the northern area which was called New Guinea. Australia took over the British colony in 1906 and the German territory during the First World War. While Papua remained a colony, New Guinea was a mandated territory under the League of Nations. During and after the Second World War, the distinction became largely academic; the territories were merged in 1971 and then became independent as Papua New Guinea in 1975.

Denoon’s *A Trial Separation* begins its witty and lively narrative of Papua New Guinea’s colonial experience at about 1958, during the period when colonialism was no longer fashionable and the movement toward independence had gained momentum in Africa and Asia as well as in the Pacific in Samoa and Nauru. Sadly, however, this was not the case in Papua New Guinea where the Australians continued to believe that they would be in control for the long haul. Thus, by 1958, pre-Second World War colonial policy and practice were still very much a part of colonial life. The nature of this rule was such that all Papua New Guineans were “natives” whose daily lives were controlled by an array of “Native Regulations which were simpler and more oppressive than the laws governing Australians” (p.10). These Regulations included many restrictions, or “dos” and “don’ts”. For instance, “natives” were not allowed to drink alcohol, communities living within close proximity to townships and other government centres could not sing and dance beyond nine o’clock, and remote villagers were not allowed to travel more than 25 miles from their usual place of residence without permission. The enforcement of an extension of this last Regulation made it difficult for Papua New Guineans to travel to Australia. So when Miss Tessie Lavau of Iokea Village in Kerema District of Papua lodged her application for a visa to visit her white friends in 1958, she endured agonising official scrutiny before she was finally allowed to travel, and then only for three months. Lavau’s travel to Australia, Denoon writes, was therefore a rarity, and most other Papua New Guineans, living in isolated villages far removed from the enclaves of the main government centres of Port Moresby, Lae and Rabaul had no knowledge of the machinery of Government in Port Moresby, let alone Australia.

While the 1950s were a dark period in Papua New Guinea’s post-War history, a time of benevolent paternalism and “gradual change”, the 1960s saw the beginnings of rudimentary change that set in motion the process of decolonisation that continued unabated until Papua New Guinea achieved political independence in 1975.

Divided into three parts, and drawing on oral history, archival records, personal papers and little-used official colonial documents, Denoon retraces Papua New Guinea’s journey to nationhood from the 1960s, and the 29 years since independence,
by examining in lucid and fascinating detail the contributions of the major players—
Australian governments, the United Nations, individuals and groups from both Papua
New Guinea and Australia, and Papua New Guinea leaders.

The humble beginning of Papua New Guinean involvement in the political process,
according to Denoon, began when leaders were given political education so that they
could familiarise themselves with participatory democracy. The Local Government
Councils that Australia introduced between 1949 and 1950 had born some fruit, and
by 1960 Papua New Guineans had begun to grasp basic democratic processes. This
was followed by the establishment in 1962 of the Legislative Council and in 1964
of the House of Assembly, which was perhaps the biggest contributor to the learning
process. This in effect, writes Denoon, was “the dawn of democracy” (p.37). For
the newly initiated, however, the going was tough. Numerically they outnumbered
the expatriates (38 to 26), but their performance in the proceedings left much to be
desired. Illiteracy, poor education and the apparent deficiency in understanding the
labyrinth of participatory democratic processes contributed to this state of affairs for
the majority during the lifetime of the first House of Assembly. But these early teething
problems seem to have disappeared after the 1968 elections, and with considerable
effort Papua New Guinean leaders took the bull by the horns, so to speak, and made
it their own by the time of the third House of Assembly elections in 1972.

Of the Papua New Guinea leaders who emerged during this time (and there were
several) and who contributed meaningfully to the process until the end, Denoon singles
out Michael Somare, the leader of the PANGU Party, as the most outstanding. He was
a born leader, “a natural conciliator, preferring to build a consensus on a compromise
rather than insist on opposition and confront opponents. With these skills and a low-
key manner, he build a multi-party coalition party into a surprising majority, and held
together an awkward amalgam of nationalists and separatists, radicals and managers”
(p.102). Together “[w]ith great skill and some luck, they brought their country united
to independence with new institutions, a new public service, a guaranteed income
and a home-made constitution” (p.171) on 16 September 1975.

How has decolonisation been managed over the past three decades?

Denoon is forthright and measured in discussing this phase of Papua New Guinea’s
decolonsed history. Her achievements in the 30 years since independence have been
few and far between, interspersed with long lists of glaring failures in governance,
economic management and political wizardry. The lack of sustained political stability
has been one of the more serious and consistent contributors to Papua New Guinea’s
poor performances. While the fathers of our Constitution—Father John Momis and
John Kaputin—meant well in incorporating the vote-of-no-confidence provision into
the final document, it has in reality worked against us, so much so that no coalition
government (no one political party has ever achieved a majority to govern in its own
right) has survived the fixed five-year parliamentary term except for the current Somare
government which took office in 2002. Of the coalition governments formed before
2002, the worst was that of Prime Minister Bill Skate and the best was that of Prime
Minister Mekere Morauta. His government, however brief, brought back to Parliament
respect and dignity, and arrested the plundering of state assets by those who had gone
before him when “his Cabinet began to roll back tides of political appointments and
clouds of mismanagement” (p.173). And that was achieved, as Denoon points out,
despite the fact that 16 former ministers from Skate’s government were in his Cabinet! Without that intervention, Papua New Guinea might well have become a “failed state” as recently suggested by informed commentators.

Denoon notes that Papua New Guinea’s independence has had its band of well-wishers and critics. Over the years, critics have become more vociferous and vitriolic. Gough Whitlam, the Prime Minister of Australia in 1972, has been blamed for having rushed the country into independence. And critics have gnashed their teeth and attacked every conceivable aspect of Papua New Guinean governments’ performances, or lack thereof, particularly during the more than ten years of the Bougainville conflict and the two turbulent years under Prime Minister Skate. But Denoon remains unmoved and philosophical. Whitlam, he says, actually did more for Papua New Guinea in the Opposition than he did as Prime Minister when he was executing a path already mapped out for the country by the Liberal-Country Party Coalition and its predecessors. As for Papua New Guinea, Denoon argues, critics simply cannot attempt to compare her experiences to those of other third world countries in Africa and Asia, or even the Pacific, as no one model of good governance existed then or now in those countries to serve as examples for all; Papua New Guinea’s circumstances must therefore be accepted as being unique and separate.

Finally, Chapter 13, “The Continuing Connection”, is troubling. Denoon makes a bold attempt to explain why he views Papua New Guinea’s achievement of independence in 1975 as only “a trial separation” so that he now envisages a future Papua New Guinea in a new relationship with Australia, the nature of which is not explained. He dismisses all likely possibilities—associated status, Pacific community, neo-colonialism, re-colonisation, and integration. He insists that, “one political act could not undo ancient geography or modern history” (p.197). The island of New Guinea separated from the continent of Australia 8,000 years ago, and there were opportunities in the past for Australia and Papua New Guinea to forge a relationship other than independence. But Australia has always insisted on being separate and distinct. Independence in 1975 was permanent and irrevocable. That was how some Papua New Guineans wished it in 1975; it is the wish of the majority now.

_A Trial Separation_ is the most recent and significant analysis of Papua New Guinea’s independence and her tortuous 30 year journey since then.


HUGH LARACY
_University of Auckland_

As the founding director of the Center for Pacific Studies at the University of Hawai‘i, Bob Kiste has exerted a powerful influence on the development of social research and teaching concerning the Pacific Islands. In building up an institution of international standing and by providing opportunities for many other scholars, especially anthropologists and historians, to advance their enquiries and to air their
findings, he has had an impact on the field that bears comparison with the pioneering
achievements of J.W. Davidson and Patrick O’Reilly. Hence this book of essays, which
includes a useful biography of Kiste himself, is appropriately dedicated.

As if to highlight the subjectivity that may colour even scholarly writing, and
more pragmatically to provide an organising theme, the editor, a former colleague
of Kiste’s at Hawai’i, has enjoined his 15 contributors “to reflect on the places that
have been important to them in their personal and professional lives”. With such a
large and disparate clutch of writers, the quality and substance of the essays varies
markedly. Those writing in the light of a solid record of scholarly research about the
places and activities that are directly related to that research have produced the most
informative essays. At the other end of the spectrum there are a couple of essays
which are nostalgic indulgences or effusions of subjectivity expressed in strained
language, which the editor excuses as lucubrations of creative art, that have little to
say about anything other than the authors’ own sensibilities. For this reviewer these
latter sparked the response, “So what?”

This is not to say that there is not something of other than self-referential interest
embedded in most of the essays, but it is a matter of degree. Of those in which the use
of the first person singular does not challenge objective description and comment, the
most notable are the essays by Kerry Howe, Francis X. Hezel, Eugene Ogan, Clive
Moore, Hank Nelson, Mark Mosko and Ben Finney.

Howe reflects on places and events associated with Captain Cook. He offers a
salutary reminder that historical analysis should explore complexity and congruence
rather than yield to binary simplicities (“two worlds”), or be drawn into the “reification
of indigenous culture” (pp.50-51). Then there are essays about going into (or being
seduced by?) societies other than one’s own. Hezel, the author of magisterial works on
Micronesia, writes about his “awakening to the intricacies and subtleties of local life”
on Chuuk (p.106). Moore, with refreshing matter-of-factness, deals with the Rakwana
people of the Solomons. While conceding the financial costs of his association with
them, he concludes with the proposition (sadly, one not appreciated by all fieldworkers)
that “what I provide in return for being part of a Malaitan family can never equal
what I have gained in terms of career and personal fulfilment” (p.136). For his part
Mosko, all of whose fieldwork since 1974 has been done at Maifa in Mekeo, writes
less about social interactions than with his entering into the villagers’ thoughts and
beliefs: “my mind … has been changed by Maifa” (p.185).

Historical description laced with first-hand observation and mature assessment
mark the pieces by Ogan and Nelson. The first discusses ways in which the Nasioi
people of Bougainville have changed. In June 2000 he was comforted to find that
even after (or because of?) 20 years of still unresolved difficulty, they were more self-
reliant than when he first visited them in 1962. Nelson presents the history of Rabaul
as one shaped by volcanic eruptions and war. In the light of their wartime atrocities
in New Guinea and beyond, it is arguable, though, whether Gordon Thomas’s hostile
view of the Japanese should be dismissed as “prejudice” (p.167).

Passing on, David Hanlon engages in some intellectual prestidigitation to argue
that in Pohnpei—and, indeed, for Oceania—it should be allowed that “local accounts
of the past” be accepted as history on a par with scholarly studies (p.201). If that is so, why bother with the latter? It is part of the scholarly exercise to consider such sources in striving for a fuller understanding of the past, but not to capitulate to them. Sadly, the neo-Cartesian relativist fallacy “I believe it was, therefore it was”, is taking root in a discipline that should aim to distinguish between objective and subjective views of the past, not conflate them.

Finally, among the choicer offerings, there is Ben Finney’s chapter. As an account of his involvement with the revival of Polynesian voyaging, it is probably the most substantial piece in the book. His dismissal of Andrew Sharp, though, is debatable. There is now no need to labour the point that Sharp was wrong in attributing too little skill to Polynesians. But that does not thereby validate the uncritical and misconceived construction of Polynesian maritime mastery against which he was reacting, and which on the basis of belief rather than knowledge had for too long been the orthodox view. In bringing stringent logic and argument to bear on the topic, Sharp made a major contribution to knowledge, thus preparing the way for Finney et al.—even if his conclusions were wrong.

There is, then, much of interest in this book, together with much of lesser value. Regardless of taste and quality, though, its cost is also likely to deter readers.


WILLIAM ARENS
Stony Brook University

It cannot be easy to be both anthropologist and native. The former always exoticises the native to some extent or another, and, in doing so, romanticises the self. (Much has been said about the first but not enough about the second.) The native scholar’s more recent, and more daunting task, since so few want to hear the result, has been to rationalise and recapture the collective self from distant time and space.

Gananath Obeyesekere has been the elegant practitioner of this delicate art for some time now. He continues to display his deftness in Cannibal Talk. He is able to maintain his balance between his two often-opposing personae by adopting an existing distinction between cannibalism as “the fantasy the other is going to eat us” (p.14) and anthropophagy as an actual practice which may take place in all societies under conditions of stress and or as a feature of rituals. This sacred context he suggests is often associated with that other anthropological bugaboo, human sacrifice.

Obeyesekere is succinct in stating the initial part of his argument: “I unabashedly join those who deny ‘cannibalism’”, but the second half of his equation: “I have no problem with affirming ‘forms of anthropophagy’” (p.15) takes some explaining as he notes that in some instances the two concepts may be conflated. Nonetheless, in making this argument, Obeyesekere keeps a foot in both of his relevant camps by
offering up the *cri de coeur* of the native, who asks to be understood, joined to the subtle intellectual argument of the scholar, who seeks to explain. What follows, which reads very much like the series of lectures they were, now converted into essays, is a *tour de force*.

Obeyesekere begins his cannibal voyage not in the expected subtitled South Seas, but in the Caribbean Sea. This is a reasonable jumping off point as the area is classically associated with the emergence of the cannibal as an explicit feature of European consciousness. The compelling imagery emerges from the “discoveries” of Columbus, who not only bequeathed us the word *cannibal*, from the local term *Carib*, but also the New World slave trade. In reviewing the material for these islands as well as the South American mainland, the author considers the more recent work of the French historian Frank Lestringent. In *Cannibals* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), this latter-day Montaigne not only accepts all the lurid tales told about the colonised peoples of the world but actually suggests that to deny them their cannibal savagery is a misrepresentation of the Other. Lestringent’s lurid attempt to hold dear the cannibal is added to by a bizarre suggestion that those who would question the veracity of the cannibal label, such as this reviewer, and now I assume Obeyesekere, are somehow in league with those who would deny the Holocaust. Rationality has never been a prevalent feature of the cannibal discourse.

As a testimony to his patience, Obeyesekere treats this witless argument with respect and serious analysis. He does so by reviewing the same published material as Lestringent and shows that there are no more objective grounds for accepting the existence of cannibals than there is reason to accept the similarly reported existence of people with tails, no heads or one foot. Thus, Obeyesekere uses the same “ethnographic” evidence as Lestringent in reaching a contrary and saner conclusion. Having warmed up with something of a lightweight, Obeyesekere moves to the promised South Pacific where he earlier “made his bones” as a contending native intellectual during his dispute with a true heavyweight, Marshall Sahlins. (Perhaps only a light heavyweight, as it was Sahlins who first concocted the anti-cannibal/anti-Holocaust connection.)

In an earlier publication, Sahlins had argued that the cannibals of Hawai’i respectfully ate Captain Cook as they thought him a deity. Obeyesekere had already challenged the apotheosis argument as a stereotypical European view of the Other, which then often results in a clichéd literary theme. In the present text, Obeyesekere takes on the trickier sacramental issue and context, as there are no fantastic creatures lurking in these islands other than the sanctimonious cannibal. The texts also indicate that there was clearly some confused and confusing talk of cannibalism on the part of both the British and Hawaiians. Each side questioned the other on the subject and tested their counterparts with the offering of human remains. As a result, both feared the other as The Other. Obeyesekere argues that in this context of first contact, linguistic confusion, shipboard dramas and parody, there is no more reason to assume that the astounded Hawaiians were cannibals than were the British. Indeed, it was these Europeans who were on the shores of Polynesia asking for the bones of Captain Cook. However, this dubious scenario is not the one that comes down to us in the present. The victors not only write history but also the ethnography, and
eventually compile the Human Relations Area Files, which enshrine the Hawaiians into the cannibal hall of fame. Obeyesekere then moves further into the South Seas and thus deeper into the land of imagined human cooking pots as he considers the exciting cases of the Māori and Fijians, cannibals all to some, and perhaps merely anthropophagists to the author. As such, the ground gets even more complicated for the author in the next few essays.

The numerous relevant European texts now include references to more than the sacrificial eating of one godlike sea captain. For these distant isles there are “eye witness” accounts of the wholesale consumption of common sailors, scores of dutiful missionaries and hordes of hated local enemies. This butcher shop context leads Obeyesekere to both raise and lower the tenor of his argument. In the first instance, he again draws our attention to the pantomime and parody that must characterise the confusion of first contact. As the native intellectual he now asks us to entertain a greater degree of literary sophistication on the part of the indigenous actors as they adopt irony and satire in recounting their local cannibalism for their enthralled visitors. In making this claim, Obeyesekere draws attention to Swift’s *Modest Proposal* as a parallel instance of a literary device, and intimates that just as there are native Shakespeares in the bush, there are native Swifts on the beaches. However, in this instance the script flows from the mouths of the South Pacific natives to and through the pen of the British visitor. According to Obeyesekere, the resulting literature should be interpreted as more a theatre of the absurd than actual history and ethnography. In making his argument, Obeyesekere refers to one cannibal text in which the natives recount the killing and consumption of hundreds of enemy fellow islanders in one giant homicidal banquet. In other instances the locals told their credulous scribbling listener about using some human bones as tobacco pipes, others as musical instruments, and dried fingers for pothooks.

Now with a more concrete argument, Obeyesekere simply suggests those accounts of man-eating, even from the mouths of natives, have to be treated with great caution. He suggests that for a variety of reasons some groups such as the Māori and Fijians may now take some joy in their savage historical imagery as an indication of the most advanced mental state of neo-colonialism. Other accounts by non-native observers, which have entered the cannibal canon, also have to be dismissed. In one of his rare explicit encounters with an anthropological colleague Obeyesekere points out that a missionary text A.P. Vayda injudiciously used as a purported eyewitness account of Māori cannibalism was written by the author when he was 70 while recounting something he claimed to have seen 64 years earlier when he was a lad of five or six years old. In another instance, a classic text on the Māori is shown to have been lost, then reappeared later in emended form with “borrowings” from other sources. Although as indicated, Obeyesekere adopts a more simple argument here—“the license to fabricate”—his analysis displays all the complex and time-consuming efforts involved in tracking down and examining manuscripts in order to eventually demonstrate their unreliability. In one case he notes that it took him two months poring over one rare manuscript before he was able to contextualise properly the cannibal situation described and to deconstruct the other relevant material. In contrast, the pro-cannibal claimant merely has to uncritically cite in passing another
of these eyewitness accounts by an adventurer, missionary or colonial civil servant as evidence for cannibalism. If that text is also found wanting, as Obeyesekere and others continuously discover, the pro-cannibal forces simply refer to another. Unfortunately, there are enough of these at hand to exhaust a lifetime of scholarship.

The chapter immediately preceding the conclusion is a revision of Obeyesekere’s Huxley Memorial Lecture and covers a fair amount of historical and ethnographic ground combined with a concern for some seemingly disparate topics having to do with the body, its treatment, and mistreatment. The result is nonetheless interesting and eventually coherent as he links up time and space by moving from the 19th century Africa of explorers, to the Solomon Islands of first contactors, and then the medieval and modern European world of executioners and outraged mobs. The last concern is called for as Obeyesekere posits an unconscious link in the Western imagination between cannibalism, human sacrifice, both real and imagined, and beheading and quartering. At this point, from a psychoanalytic perspective the author also explains both the general Western, as well as any particular author’s, fascinating fear of cannibalism. In doing so Obeyesekere adopts Freud’s discussion of “free floating and psychic anxieties” linked with his own concern for “the paranoid imagination”. Together these contexts conjured up the mythical monsters which continually surrounded isolated Westerners in native worlds. In a brief concluding chapter which glances at, and briefly considers both the Western and non-Western worlds’ collection of bones and skulls, Obeyesekere elegantly explains that his strategy has been “the unconstruction of a text to reveal its genealogy followed by the restoration of its multiple meanings and its ethical implications” (p.267).

I will try to be as succinct in my own concluding remarks on this truly admirable book as I have only one logical quibble. That misgiving has to do with why Obeyesekere rejects the literary evidence for cannibalism but accepts that for anthropophagy, especially as the material is often derived from the same or similar sources. Otherwise this work conveys the knowledge and wisdom of a well-spent academic lifetime. What Obeyesekere offers here is another opportunity for fellow academics to follow a more complicated path towards an understanding of other times, places and peoples. In adopting this course, scholars would distinguish themselves intellectually and morally from their predecessors in the form of explorers, conquistadors and the shipwrecked, and then the missionaries and colonial administrators. In the process, colleagues would then have to take issue with self-satisfying European stereotypes and fantasies about the Other.

I would like to think that this outcome is still possible. However, while in the midst of composing this review, I was contacted by the editors of a distinguished encyclopedia of the social sciences and invited to compose their entry on cannibalism. In their instructions they informed me to be sure to indicate that cannibalism was common among native peoples of the world.
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