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In the Part-European settlement of Kasava, Fiji, land is divided in each generation into parallel plots of ever-decreasing width but identical form. Kinship as division, I argue, is knowledge which is not representative of social relations and which therefore does not effectuate change. This is contrasted to an additive logic of kinship relations among urban Part-Europeans, a logic in which information is potentially infinite and thus always incomplete, and in which knowledge attaches to persons and changes through techniques of collective discovery.

Among the many legacies of Hocart's studies of Fiji are his reflections on the character of Fijian 'dualism' (1915; 1952; 1970: 262-90). At every level of social organization, Hocart observed, Fijians divided into halves, repeating each time a singular division of inner and outer or of land and sea. A chieftainship was internally divided into a 'noble state' and a 'border state', for example, and each of these was again divided according to the same logic.

Conceived before the notion of social structure, as a necessary abstraction from realities ultimately unknowable in their totality, had definitively conquered the study of ethnology (see Radcliffe-Brown 1952), Hocart's image of Fijian division is arrestingly concrete in its conception of a whole that was given and known from the start. Fijian chieftainships, clans or chiefs in this view did not extend or expand, but rather divided known entities (chiefs, chieftainships, villages, food, clans) according to an equally complete and known formula. Hocart's discovery of these given entities infinitely divided from within perhaps accounted for his ongoing frustration with the anthropological method of his day which 'has forced the customs of non-Europeans into the familiar categories of religion, state, family, medicine, and so on' (Radcliffe-Brown 1952: 25). When the work of dividing Fijian society into institutional parts had already been indigenously completed, the addition of further anthropological divisions seemed like analytical absurdity.

This article concerns the discontinuity between ways of thinking about 'family' and 'land' among members of a Part-European clan living in Fiji's capital city of Suva on the one hand, and among members of the same clan living in the rural settlement of Kasava, Vanua Levu, on the other. Although the subject of this article differs from Hocart's - the Whippy clan is not a Fijian clan - Hocart's analysis has resonances here, for from the point of view of people in Kasava, the Whippy clan, too, is an entity whose horizons are known from the start. The patches of freehold land which the Whippets of Kasava have divided in each successive generation are finite, bounded entities capable of infinite internal
have intermarried considerably with Fijians. Over half of all Part-Europeans live on scattered freehold estates settled by their ancestors on the island of Ovalau, in the Rewa and Savusavu regions, as well as in Bau, Serua and Ra. For the most part, they cut and dry copra there as they have done for generations (cf. Kelly 1966, Whippy 1977). The remaining half of the population lives in the cities where Part-Europeans have specialized since colonial times in the trades.

The members of the Whippy clan are descendants of David Whippy, an American seaman from Nantucket, Massachusetts, who arrived in Fiji somewhat by accident around 1822 (Brown 1886). As urban clan members routinely remarked with pride, the Whippy clan is one of the largest in Fiji and counts over 1,000 living kin. Clan members speak of themselves as a ‘clan’ or ‘family’ (using the English words and never Fijian kinship terms), headed by ‘uncles’ or ‘leaders’ who make decisions concerning the allocation of land and who represent the clan in negotiations with the government and in ceremonial contexts. The Whippy clan is internally subdivided into four subclans (referred to also as ‘clans’) which take their name from each of David Whippy Senior’s sons.

From the point of view of people in Kasavu whom I knew, the Whippys living in Suva were marginal figures: many were women now married into other urban families. Many had shown little interest in the clan until recently, orienting themselves more towards their professions or their personal connections in Suva and overseas. Perhaps most importantly, all were landless – they had no rights to a share of the scattered plots of land acquired by their founding ancestor throughout Fiji – although some now sought to acquire shares of this land through purchase from landless relations. Contact between rural and urban Whippys was confined primarily to contributions for ceremonial contexts. Some clan members in the cities contributed money, kerosene, or other store-bought items for mortuary rites, fundraising, or for the Kasavu school, or for presentations to Fijian chiefs with whom the clan maintained special ties. Funds were collected and relayed through several city persons, known as the ‘doors’ to Kasavu, who visited Kasavu on occasion. Urban clan members talked of their rural kin with a mixture of reverence for their perpetuation of dying family ways and pity for their lowly economic status.

In 1993, together with relations living in Australia and New Zealand, some prominent Whippys working in Suva organized the first ‘Descendants of David Whippy Reunion’ aimed at ‘discovering connections’ among unacquainted kin. The discovery of these connections meant an acquisition of new knowledge for the organizers: it represented a change. For example, Albert, the chairman of the reunion-organizing committee, was a well-known journalist and public relations consultant in Suva. Albert’s children lived and worked in Sydney where they were married to foreigners. Although he was personally close to many of his father’s kin, he said, he knew little about the Whippy clan and its history, and never thought much about being a Whippy. It was only at the first family reunion that he discovered that so many of the people whom he already knew by other means in town were related.

The objective was to extend personal networks, conceptualized in an idiom of genealogy. In the follow-up reunion planned for December 1996, organizers even hoped to attract ‘our white relatives’, descendents of their original ancestor’s kin from Nantucket, Massachusetts, who since the early 1800s had had no contact with the Fijian Whippys, but who the organizers insisted were ‘related’.

The family tree

Part-Europeans are the ‘mixed race’ descendants of Europeans who settled in Fiji from the early nineteenth century. At the last government census for which figures are available (1986) there were 10,297 Part-Europeans in Fiji, that is, approximately 2 per cent. of the total national population. They speak both English and Fijian with varying degrees of fluency, although both languages are patois of grammatical and vocabulary borrowings. Since the second generation, the ‘old families’ (those whose presence in Fiji dates to the mid-nineteenth century) have intermarried almost exclusively with one another, and have continued to do so to this day, although in the current generation Part-Europeans
Although the reunion project was principally a hobby for organizers and participants, the new knowledge it generated could also generate pecuniary benefits. As one prominent Whippy put it to me, ‘I know the connexions, I make it my business to know’. He went on to describe how, on the basis of his superior genealogical knowledge, he was able to demonstrate to a business associate that the associate should call him ‘uncle’, thus asserting a privilege of generational rank. For their part, the leadership, and most of the Whippys in Kasavu, refused to attend the reunion. If the purpose of the event made little sense to them, their confusion found expression in their vehement insistence that the event was literally misplaced: the Whippys were not from Suva but from Levuka, where David Whippy first landed and married, and from Waimani, where he died and was buried, the ‘uncles’ of the Kasavu Whippy clan insisted. Any Whippy gathering would have to take place in one of those locations.

A principal focus of the reunion was a collective effort to produce a complete Whippy family tree. The Whippys, like other members of the old families living in Suva, devoted great efforts to the creation of bilaterally-reckoned genealogies for their clan. The Whippy family tree was kept at the home of a woman born in Kasavu who had left Kasavu at a young age. When she proudly unrolled the graph paper covered with the names of husbands, wives and their children in tiny script, it stretched from one end of her living room to the other. The idea, she explained, was that each person who visited her might know a different piece of the family history, and might add it to the chart. The family tree conferred a sense of cumulative accomplishment upon its makers, as they congratulated themselves for collecting this information before it was ‘lost’ with the passing of the older generation.

In the family tree, therefore, knowledge was collective and cumulative: each person brought new knowledge, based on his or her own position in the family and life experience, and could literally fill in a different gap in the tree. There was a desire to know the connexions both present and past, a new-found curiosity about this project. Any singular point or name on the family tree entailed the possibility of seemingly infinite expansion through the addition of generations of ancestors and descendants. The quantity of information known, therefore, was a matter of productivity, not something given at the outset. It was also, if only implicitly, an outcome of choices made concerning which lines to research and which names to include – choices which in turn were experienced in the way they made all the more evident the gaps in what was known (cf. Strathern 1991). When I asked David, a middle-aged clan member who was busy making his own family tree, for example, why his tree was pruned to include only his own line, he explained that he simply did not know the ‘connexions’ for others, that he would rather not say anything about them for fear of making a mistake.

These information-gathering activities – the expansive possibilities, and also the limiting choices they demand – have a certain familiarity to social scientists, who have long taken the discovery and management of selective facts, from among the infinite depth and breadth of potential information, as a fundamental aspect of human experience. The genealogical model employed by urban Pacific Europeans has been a standard tool of such management in anthropologists’ own work, moreover. Indeed, the notion that potential information – the raw material of social knowledge – is infinite, and thus cumulatively gained or lost, is one of the implicit universals that render out conception of human differences intangible (e.g. Kant 1952). Yet, from the point of view of people in Kasavu, as we shall see, this effort to extend a network of kin across the globe is a strange project indeed. Information in their world is bounded, finite, within the boundaries.

**Kinship within the boundaries**

In marriage, as in all aspects of social life, the Whippys outside the cities repeat a given and inward-looking pattern. To think of the Whippys is to think also of the Simpsons, for as a Whippy would joke whenever he or she encountered a Simpson, ‘if no Whippy, no Simpson’, prompting the invariable retort that ‘if no Simpson, no Whippy’! The relationship traces back to a commercial partnership between patrilineal ancestors, when David Whippy and his friend William Simpson, a carpenter and ship builder from Poplar, England, joined in a plethera of small business ventures ranging from sugar mills to cargo. There are many stories about the friends’ common exploits and about the complementary relations each maintained with alternative Fijian chieftainships. Each clan constitutes the most likely source of marriage partners for the other. Some phrased this to me as a ‘tabu against marrying outside the family’, while others simply said that it ‘closes the circle’, or ‘renews the link’, or ‘blood looks for its own’. As one clan ‘leader’ explained to me:

> Those two families, they complete each other. They always intermarry. You always see a Simpson and a Whippy together. It’s best to marry tavele. It’s good. I meet a married couple, and I’m related to both of them that way.

Simpsons and Whippys call one another by the Fijian term tavele, indicating that they are closely related and ideal marriage partners, and the joking, teasing character of the relationship between any Whippy and Simpson is similar to the tavele relationship among Fijians. People in Kasavu did not speak of this relationship in an idiom of exchange or reciprocity, however, as did their Fijian neighbours. Marriages, likewise, were not marked by any imperative exchange of mats or whale’s teeth. There was no pattern of exchange to the marriages beyond a prohibition against marriage within the Whippy clan. Although marriages were arranged in a minority of cases, an arranged marriage denoted the weakness of a man who could not ‘talk to a girl properly’, rather than an opportunity for expanding relationships between clans. If ‘blood finds its own’, then blood did not serve as a particularly salient idiom for elaborating group relationships. Indeed, by Fijian standards, the Whippy and Simpson clans were hardly clans at all, for they had no ritual obligations towards one another and did not constitute salient groupings for the purpose of exchange (cf. Hocart 1952).

Rather than a medium for connexions, marriage between Whippys and Simpsons was most often discussed as a matter of the division of land. The two actions that were said to have founded the Whippy and Simpson clans – a partition of estates among David Whippy and William Simpson and the marriage of David Whippy’s daughters to William Simpson’s sons – were conceptualized in singular terms, as both land and people divided according to a shared logic. Since then, the inheritance that defined both land and people had followed the same pattern or form (cf. Crocombe & Marssets 1987).
The Kasuva Whippys, then, were not so much members of a group as a shared geometry, dictated by a series of divided parcels acquired by their ancestor. That marriage, for example, should be conceptualized as a spatial quality of land is reflected in the following account, given to me by one elder, of how the Part-Europeans acquired their land:

In those days, a Part-European would steal his wife from a Fijian chief. He couldn't just come calling at the chief's house, or he would get a hell of a lashing. And when the chief would finally hear that his daughter was safe and had been taken as a wife and would be cared for, he would say, "meka?" [good] and 'from here, to here, to there'. And that land would be given, for the future generations of children they would produce.

The settlement of Kasuva is located on a rectangular plot of freehold land once owned by their ancestor and known as Lovonisikeci, two miles by one mile in area bordering the sea (fig. 1). In formal speeches and casual conversations around the kava bowl, men and women of all ages talked at length about the land, recounting how it was acquired and how it has been divided, and in private conversations they whispered about the many conflicts concerning its current division. This talk often addressed divisions among kin, but it also emphasized the form of the place — its shape and boundaries and its internal partition — as people made their points concerning these divisions by tracing the partitions in the rectangular shape of Kasuva in the sand.

Indeed, the history of Lovonisikeci was a pattern of division legally performed, and the passing of generations was etched in the divisions marked out in the land. Originally, the Whippys emphasized, Lovonisikeci was a square block of land two miles by two miles, later divided by the colonial government into a rectangular plot of two miles by one mile (Fiji Land Claims Commission 1880). The settlement of Lovonisikeci, also, was an act of initial partition. The brothers Samuel and Peter Whippy, Jacob Andrews (described, alternatively, as David Whippy's adopted son, or as his granule), divided the land into three rectangular shares, each facing on the sea and stretching inland towards the bush (fig. 1). Samuel took the 'bottom end', Peter took the 'upper end' and David Whippy's adopted son, Jacob Andrews, was given the middle portion. In each generation, these internal plots were further divided in transactions of actual or approximated inheritance. To sell one's land to someone 'outside the family', all agreed, would be an unpardonable affront to one's kin.15

In each successive generation, the land was divided by tracing lines parallel to those the brothers drew in the first act of partition.16 These divisions created a series of parallel plots of an even length and of successively decreasing widths so that at the time of my fieldwork each plot constituted only a long thin strip of land not much wider than the dirt road that cut through Kasuva, but stretching from the beach to the bush for the entire mile that once constituted the width of the original estate (see fig. 2).17 The width and arrangement of parallel plots reflected the number of generations since the first act of partition and also the relationship among land-holders, since categorical brothers held proximate plots, while those belonging to separate subclans owned plots in separate parts of the original estate. The titular registration of these divisions was only achieved with considerable hardship. A group of siblings might work their land in common for an entire generation before saving enough money from copra sales to pay the surveyor's fee, and the magnitude of such fees eclipsed the amount of funds accumulated for funerals, marriages, fund-raising for the church or school, or the construction of new houses. This pattern of division was an unchallenged and irreversible generational process. People took my suggestion that the partition of land might proceed according to some other logic — a horizontal or diagonal partitioning of plots, for example — or that the thin strips might be recombined through purchase or some collective arrangement, as absurd.

When asked about inheritance matters, everyone in Kasuva insisted on a series
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**Figure 1.** Early survey map of Lovonisikeci Estate, Cakaudrove Province, Vava'u levu. Courtesy of Government of Fiji Lands Department.

**Figure 2.** Survey map of a portion of Lovonisikeci Estate, CT 4321, lots 1-4. Property of John Whippy, Walter Whippy, Bertie Whippy and Eric Whippy. Courtesy of Government of Fiji Lands Department.
of rules concerning how land was to be divided. The mandate that land stay 'in
the family' dictated that daughters should not share in their brothers' inher-
tances. Matthew Whippy, a leader of the Samuel Clan, spoke for most when he
told me that his sons would inherit equal shares in his land, while his daughters
could return to Kasavu to settle or draw an income from the land if at any point
they had nowhere else to go. In any case, his daughter's children would have no
rights in Kasavu, he insisted. In practice, however, at the time of my fieldwork,
the actual distribution of shares defied these rules almost as often as it reflected
them. Land was willed to daughters or wives in about one fourth of cases, and in
considerably more cases Whippy women and their husbands and children lived
on or drew income from the estate even if it was not the case that they had
'nowhere to go.' Likewise, it often happened that one or more brothers did not
receive a share in their father's land, while a landowner sometimes willed land to
the children of others with whom he or her spouse, had a personal
affinity. Although I was repeatedly told that only those present in Kasavu were
entitled to take a share from the land, in practice, in a substantial minority of
cases, copra was cut on behalf of brothers (and sisters) living temporarily in the
cities and the proceeds were sent to them.14 Formal and informal 'adoption'
of kin was pervasive and, as in the case of the original grant of land to Jacob
Andrews, was largely synonymous with inheritance such that an insistence that
only sons should inherit land became something of a tautology.

On the surface, this emphasis on residence and land ownership as an arbiter of
kindship affiliation conforms with common observations concerning the function
of residence and inheritance as a limiting device on otherwise infinitely
expandable groups (e.g. Feinberg 1981; Tiffany 1975). However, to look at land
as a solution to a 'problem' of how to define groups would be to analyse the
situation backwards in this case, for what captured the collective imagination
were not groups and their relations but rather land and its divisions (cf. Myers
1986). The spatial blocks of land, rather than subclan groupings, served as the
locus for all social activity in Kasavu. For example, the 'bottom' third of
Leonisketi and the people living on it were further divided into the 'bottom
cred' and 'Na Yala Lutuvakatini' (after the names of the latter portion's two
homesteads). Each of these parcels had its own cemetery and its people had
separate leaders, made common presentations at funerals and other exchanges15
and generally supported one another in the politics of village life. The math-
ematical calculation of fractions of land was a commonplace element of conversa-
tional rhetoric. Everyone knew the number of feet and chains of each parcel and
divided fractions of past or present quantities with lightning speed. The
reference numbers of each certificate of title, likewise, were known to all and at
times the owners and the land merged in conversation into references to these
numbers alone.

The division of quantities of land in Kasavu was also a division of quantities of
money. Before brothers could muster the necessary costs of legal division, they
took turns cutting the copra from the land, sharing equally in its returns.16 Copra
is a crop to which humans add very little. Trees planted many generations ago
bear fruit virtually without tending, and one collects the nuts from the ground
once they have fallen from the tree. The quantity of nuts harvested is given, not
a function of the addition of human energy or ingenuity, and it is largely uniform
from one month to the next. Indeed, the only element of human influence on
the yield of the crops mentioned to me was that the trees must be evenly spaced,
eight feet apart. Yet even this was a matter in which the present generation took
no additional action for, like the initial divisions of land, the even rows of trees
had been laid out generations before.

This uniformity in turn was what made division intelligible. The limited but
standard cash income that copra planting from these divided parcels yielded was,
in its monetary form, a divisible and measurable quantity that correlated with the
divisions in the land. Little wonder, then, that the Whipps' new varieties of
coconut, or government admonitions to switch to more lucrative cash crops
aimed at increasing their yield, with uninterest and even suspicion. The few who
attempted to produce a variable quantity of wealth by planting profitable kava
plants for sale in the market, for example, became the victims of sorcery or awoke
to find their plants dug up from the soil. Any effort to accumulate resources of
food or money would immediately be met with requests that could not be
refused (kererē), and people went to considerable lengths to convince others
that they had no such resources to share.

The egalitarian character of political life, also, was a source of considerable
debate and strife. The leadership of the Whippy clan was a matter of constant
contention and uncertainty, and clan members often pointed to the absence of a
given source of authority among brothers as a fundamental difference between
themselves and their Fijian neighbours.16 The only clear differences in rank were
generational, where generations were evidenced in past or future acts of division.
I was told that the constant disputes among brothers over perceived inequalities
in status or resources occurred in each generation, and were understood as
inevitable until land could be formally divided.

Whatever conflicts there were, however, occurred within fixed parameters.
The source of such conflicts was always the same. The disputants, likewise, were
always persons arranged side by side as equals by virtue of past or future acts of
division. Most of all, it was inconceivable that such disputes might alter the form
or pattern of generational division. The latter was utterly beyond these disputes,
not available for contest.

This was because there was no given truth in Kasavu, no fixed point in daily
conflicts, but the boundaries of the land. The conflicts among those placed side
by side within the finite and bounded land were never available as sources or
arbiters of collective truth because all positions were equal, coexisting within the
boundaries. Unlike societies in which some distinguish themselves through
discursive prowess, for example, in Kasavu it was impossible to win a dispute;
that is, to change the discursive landscape by convincing others of the truth of
one's claim and the falsity of their own. Unlike elsewhere in Fiji, even the
Christian church offered no outside source of truth which might stop interpre-
tations (Miyazaki 1997). Indeed, the church too had divided into separate
congregations according to the major divisions of land and in the absence of
permanent ordained ministers the same clan leaders served as lay preachers.
Holding onto the truth of one's claim in the face of parallel challenges, therefore,
was as futile as attempting to hold onto resources in the face of others' demands.

In contrast to the fluidity of the truth in daily conflicts, the divisions of land
and the outcomes these produced were concrete and preordained. The bound-
aries of the land existed independently of the perceptual faculties of any person
(Gell 1983), and these served as their own points of reference so that space had a
definite shape irrespective of the persons located there. People in Kasau I knew did not, for example, imagine their spatial world as forming outwardly extending concentric circles around the self (e.g. Munn 1996: 453-54), nor did they show any particular interest in the orientation of persons relative to these divisions (e.g. Danziger 1996). Division was understood as fixed in outside arbitrers such as government registers of land titles, rather than in human experience.

Yet although division emerged – for myself as I sought the truth about Kasau as much as for those living there – as a solution to the endless succession of alternative truths, it was not an outcome of that context. Rather, division was an inevitable generational repetition independent of the identity and ambitions of those living on the land. This grounding of space in its own parameters would contradict a common anthropological assumption that ‘people in all societies… order space into different spheres which convey a moral focus for acts and things associated with them’ (Beidelman 1986: 49). Spatial organization did not express or reflect (cf. Durkheim 1957) social realities. The divisions did not, for example, correspond to parts of a cosmology, nor did space serve as a ‘metaphor’ for personal or social relations. Division was not so much a shared basis of egalitarian politics as a given set of independent and outside principles, an exercise in the internal relational possibilities of a limited set of numerical and arithmetical rules which correlated with, and verified, the reproduction of generations. Division paralleled social life, just as each plot of divided land lay parallel to the next.

This fixed relationship of quantification is most palpable in the Whippys’ constitution of ‘truth’ or ‘reality’. One day, Matthew Whippy suggested that he show me something ‘real’. We walked along the beach until we reached a rocky point known as Qaranipaka at the end of the Lovonisiki estate. Matthew struggled onto the rock, then, standing solemnly, announced this to be the place where Tui Caka, the high chief, had sailed along the coast and from his cutter had pointed out the boundaries of Lovonisiki to his ancestor. Raising his arm to emulate the chief, he pointed them out once again: ‘From Qaranipaka to the mouth of the Kasau river, and two miles inland. So you see, this is real [dina]. There’s no question about it.’

I asked how he knew the story to be true. As it turned out, Matthew had learned this story twenty years earlier, when he had visited the National Archives in Suva and obtained a copy of the Land Claims Commission records concerning Lovonisiki. The story was included in the record of evidence presented by his ancestors to the Commission. In reading the documented account, Matthew recognized its veracity, for it retracted the shape of the land that was so familiar to him and mentioned the name of the rock that he had known all his life.

The ‘real’ for Matthew was manifest in the identity of the physical and documentary geometry of the land, in the relational verification of fixed correspondences. It was something quite different from the real as outside grounding, whose vanishing has been widely celebrated and lamented (Baudrillard 1981; Strathern 1992). In Kasau, as we saw, one could not hold onto one’s interpretations of disputes in the face of the equally true claims of equally situated kin in exactly the same way as one could not accumulate or hold onto wealth in the face of the demands of categorical brothers because there was no outside grounding for either kind of claim. Instead, like the recreational ‘reading’ of the Qu’ran among religious adherents (Baker 1992), for example, reality was encountered in the quotidian reconfirmation of what was already known. Each official land survey performed in the course of division reconfirmed the true dimensions of the whole through the re-measurement of the part. Even when, as in Matthew’s case, facts were obtained from sources outside of Kasau, the truth was found not in the discovery or management of additional information that shifted one’s point of view, but in its correlation with and reconfirmation of what was given from the start. In this sense, division is an exercise in verification, a rehearsal of the given truth, as much as a principle of kinship or ownership.

We now might better understand the Whippys’ insistence that things do not change in Kasau. On the one hand, disputes did not change things because they could not be won, that is, they could not change what knowledge was already given. On the other hand, although the passing of time was marked by division nothing was added or taken away, in the endless repetition of this process, from the prefigured whole. Division, rather, verified what was always given and completely known. Everyone, everything was a fraction of a whole that existed in the past but still existed because nothing had been taken away. The past and the present were linked not only in the metaphorical terms of memory (Munn 1995), therefore, but in the spatial form of areas of land in turn locked into a fixed numerical relationship of identity to the replication of generations. Although one could not ‘go back’ in time to the point at which the Whippy clan was one estate and one ancestral figure, as the Suva Whippys sought to reassemble their family tree, it was not necessary to do so, for the entire estate was still there, in the same field. In both the divisions of land and the disputes among those who took the resulting shares, therefore, no new perspective, no changed position, could be individually or collectively attained.

The limits of models

As noted above, the correspondences that division rehearsed had a concrete form: the parallel tracts of land, generated according to European notions of ownership as the separation of one interest from another, but divorced from notions of alienability or profitability, of property as a means to social ends, served as the concrete conditions of egalitarianism, social and epistemological.

By concrete, I mean that it did not point to a further, greater, more complex reality beyond itself, as metaphors do (Wagner 1986). Land was not of a different order of magnitude from knowledge about land as, for the Suva Whippys for example, clan genealogy was of a different order from the family tree. As a result, land did not reflect any particular perspective (cf. Strathern 1991). The apparent irrationality of these divisions, from the point of view of urban clan members, then, might be understood as an exercise in the preservation of concreteness.

Rather than seek to interpret the division of land as a representation of social relations, therefore, it seems more fruitful to understand division as one example of knowledge in conditions where reality is concretely prefigured. What difference does it make that the ‘facts’ in Kasau are fractions of chains of land rather than a given and closed cosmology, for example (Harrison 1989)? Since academic analysis calls for outside interpretation rather than division, I will violate the logic described to this point with an addition.

The first formal definition of number is attributed to the nineteenth-century German mathematician Frege. In Frege’s view, although number did not have a spatial location, not could it even be imagined, it nevertheless was not simply an
attribute of other objects but an independent object of its own (1983: 134). If
number was an object, Frege argued, it was also a special relationship, one of equiva-
ience between entities that fall under that number. Equinumerosity, he noted,
was a one-to-one correlation among elements in a set: a waiter who wished to
place as many knives as plates on a table could ensure that this was done by
placing one knife to the right of each plate such that plates and knives correlated
in a one-to-one positional relationship, for example (1983: 141). Crucial to
Frege's definition was the understanding that the form of such a numerical
relationship remained constant throughout: if the waiter were to begin in
midcourse to place a knife to both the right and left of the plate it would no
longer be possible to speak of a singular number of plates and knives. As real
objects, Frege also argued, arithmetic truths existed a priori (1983: 159), even
though they were also the objects of analysis. Number, in this view, then, might
be understood as a relationship which takes a concrete, objectified form.

In the twentieth century, the discovery of new kinds of number altogether led
to an abandonment of Frege's conception of number as relational object in
favor of a number of number as representation. In its old-fashioned quality,
therefore, Frege's conception aptly captures the logic of the curious practice of
division in Kasavu that results in strips of land no wider than a road
but a mile in length. In the product of parallel instances of a singular form, what
the Whippys generated was pure commensurability, what Frege called number;
that is, a literal analytical relationship that exists a priori even though it is also
the object of their analytical practices. Like Frege's conception of number, division
worked, as an analytical device, only because Loveniseki was an object whose
boundaries were concretely defined. It would be impossible, for example, to
divide a 'society' or a group in this way, for the rules of arithmetic would not
apply to something that is not prefigured as a finite quantity with its own given
rules of analysis.

The relationship of each part to each whole in Kasavu, in other words, could
be known perfectly (not simply modelled) in numerical form – as a quantity of
acres, a number of chains – and that relationship is an 'object', something a priori
and fixed. Division was an a priori analytical form which proceeded according to
a series of one-to-one correlations (boundaries) and which was deductive (rather
than additive) in character, since the raw materials of information (quantity) and
the method of analysis (arithmetic division) were given. Divided land was a finite
object, not a resource for further growth. This is why it could not transform itself
into wealth, despite the urgings of urban kin. It did not increase over time, but
rather was partitioned away while also remaining concretely whole. It was incon-
ceptible, for example, that the Whippys collectively might 'amount' to more (or
less) land, wealth or prestige in present-day Fiji than did their ancestor David
Whippy individually one hundred and fifty years ago.

Such a literally cartographic conception of space is bound to provoke a sense
of incredulity among late modern social scientists not unlike the expectation
expressed by the Suva Whippys over the Kasavu Whippys' irrational and self-
defeating practices. The finity of life in Kasavu is difficult to reconcile with the
contributions made by twentieth-century ethnographies of space to the decon-
struction of the assumption 'that space is static and to be contrasted with the
dynamism of time; that spatial boundaries are always fixed, relatively enduring
forms marked off on the ground' (Munn 1996: 465). Likewise, kinship, in this

NOTES

1. The personal names in this article are pseudonyms. References to specific individuals
have been omitted from the account where pseudonyms would not adequately protect anonymity.

2. The only demographic study to include Part-Europeans as a separate category, conducted in
1966, found that over 50 per cent. of Part-Europeans married other Part-Europeans, while over 20
per cent. married Europeans and 25 per cent. married Fijians (Kelly 1966: 9). Many Part-
Europeans also trace their ancestry to newcomers Europeans, Tongans, Samoans and other Polynesians.

3. Over 83 per cent. of the land in Fiji is held in 'native trust' – allocated to specific Fijian clans,
inalienable, and administered by the government. This is the result of a colonial policy, discussed
extensively elsewhere (e.g. France 1969), to limit the alienation of Fijian land. As part of this policy,
the Land Claims Commission was established immediately after Cession to investigate the validity of
every European title. On the Commission's recommendation, the Governor in Council issued
Crowns Grants to Europeans in only a minority of cases. For example, of the ten claims submitted
to the Land Claims Commission by the heirs of David Whippy, only five of these ultimately
were endorsed by the colonial administration. Except for a short period during the administration of
Governor Im Thurn (1905-8), the sale of Fijian land has been prohibited by law since then and
of land one generation ago. At the time of my fieldwork, each of these portions had been further subdivided informally into four or five shares by tracing the future line of division with a piece of wire. Those living there hoped to register their divisions and obtain separate legal titles in the near future as some of the people sharing in these informally subdivided portions already wished to divide these again.

Typically, one in Kasavu either lived and planted on their father's land along with their wives and children, or moved to the towns for a period of time to work as wage labourers.

When the Whippys participated in exchange with Fijians, they represented spatial groupings such as 'Whippy kovai' or 'bottom end' as if these were Fijian matoples—kindship groupings organized for the purposes of exchange.

At the time of fieldwork, the land was divided into plots of approximately twenty-five acres yielding five to six tons of copra each year on which the Whippys sold for around F$350 ($166) a ton. They cut copra at times determined by the need to harvest the crop. Each plot was owned in common among several brothers, brothers took turns harvesting the copra in alternating months, thus sharing the annual income of the land evenly. There were also larger quantities of kava on their land for sale in the market at Savusavu. In addition, to copra, the Whippys planted cassava and other root crops and fished for subsistence. A handful of people also drew some cash from other sources such as contributions from relatives overseas, or wages from serving as the settlement pre-school teacher or for government disability assistance, or wages from working on a government job.

Although many said that deference should be given to the oldest member of each generation, there was considerable debate about who was in fact the oldest.

The identity of land and documents has a history for the Whippys and other Part-Europeans that traces back to their early ancestors' eagerness to obtain deeds and other documents of ownership. This eagerness, in turn, was the result of experiences shared by other Part-Europeans with similar histories, and it is these experiences that are significant in the context of the present-day situation.

In their interactions with Fijians, the Whippys often demonstrated an awareness of the Fijian culture and language, indicating a desire to bridge the gap between their own culture and that of the Fijians. This awareness was particularly evident in their use of Fijian words and phrases, as well as in their use of Fijian musical styles in their own performances.

The practice of marrying within the same clan or tribe was widespread among the Whippys, indicating a strong sense of community and kinship. This practice was also common among the Fijians, who also emphasized the importance of maintaining ties with their own communities.

The practice of land division was a complex and multi-layered affair, with various factors influencing the way in which land was divided among the Whippys. These factors included factors such as kinship, tradition, and individual circumstances, as well as the desire to maintain a certain level of control over their land.

The practice of land division among the Whippys was an important aspect of their social organization, and it played a significant role in maintaining social cohesion and stability. The practice of land division was also an important aspect of their cultural identity, as it was a reflection of their unique history and experiences.

The practice of land division was also a reflection of the broader social and economic changes that were taking place in the area, as the Whippys and other Part-Europeans were making efforts to assert their place in the broader social and economic landscape.
Division dans les lignes de démarcation

Résumé
Dans la colonie partiellement européenne de Kavau à Fidji, à chaque génération la terre est divisée en parcelles dont la surface est continuellement déraisonnable mais dont la forme reste identique. La parenté continue comme division est à mon avis une forme de connaissance qui n’est pas représentative des relations sociales et donc n’affecte pas de changement. Cela contraste avec une logique additive de relations de parenté dans les populations urbaines partiellement européennes, logique selon laquelle l’information est potentiellement infinie et donc toujours incomplète, et où la connaissance s’attache aux personnes et aux changements au moyen de techniques de démarcation et de division.
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