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Colonial Education” 11).

(4) Because my limited knowledge of Korean language, I cannot discuss the full force in the detailed nuances of Kim Chi Ha’s satire. According to Kim Shijong, Kim Chi Ha quite often uses puns, double meanings and homonyms that are untranslatable (173–184).

(5) According to Bruce Cumings, the name of the law itself connotes a sequence of events, which marked the beginning of Japanese modernization at the head of which the reign of the Emperor was perpetuated: “‘Yushin’ is the Korean pronunciation of the Japanese issin, used by the Meiji leaders in 1868” (363).

(6) Seoul National University historian, Professor Yi Tae-jin (이태진) demonstrates in his recent research that the signature of the then Korean emperor was forged by one of the Japanese translators who mediated the treaty (at Tokyo Korean YMCA, 10 November 2010).
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mechanism of projecting cannibalism within a community onto the outside as the core of colonial discourse. According to Hulme, “[b]oundaries of community” are created “by accusing those outside the boundary of the very practice [i.e., cannibalism qua sacrament] on which the integrity of that community is founded” (85).

The dialogue between Wariînga and the Voice internalizes the possibility that the self-decomposing nature of imperial capitalism is ingrained in the sacrament, but the fact that the author inscribes this image merely as a palimpsest makes the reader a final determinant. Nevertheless, in the subsequent narrative Wariînga rejects the Voice’s offer to sell her soul. Such a sequence of the novel can be read as an ambivalent allegory about the limits and possibilities of a theory: The clever visionaries such as the Voice can critically relativize the system to which they are parasitical, but the criticism that does not exceed the genuinely theoretical realm is not enough to change the situation in which one is subjugated. For Wariînga shoots the Rich Old Man in the end of the narrative even though “she knew with all her heart that the hardest struggles of her life’s journey lay ahead” (Devil 254).

Notes

(1) See, Gikandi (211), Mwangi (33) and Wise (134–140).

(2) Peter Hulme traces the trajectory in which around the discovery of the New World, the word “cannibal” came to be identified with the man-eating, especially in Chapter 1 and 2 of Colonial Encounters. Although I cannot fully discuss here, my argument is partly stimulated by Fredric Jameson’s infamous article, “Third World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism” (1986), in which he uses the trope of cannibalism and satire in order to contain the works of Lu Xun and Sembène Ousmane within “the national allegory.” In this article, Jameson draws his view on satire from the works of Robert C. Elliott (80, 84).

(3) Carol Sicherman offers the details of Ngugi’s colonial education when he believed “approvingly […] the advance of Christianity” at Alliance High School (“Ngugi’s
Indeed, cannibalism as trope has been used so as to critique “the accumulation of wealth” by the European authors such as Joseph Conrad and Karl Marx (Phillips 183). Yet Ngugi’s satire becomes full-fledged since part of *Devil on the Cross* connects cannibalism, as Oliver Lovesey notes, with “the Eucharist, the sacramental” (64). Not Christianity itself but the contract between the religion and its believers is overlapped with cannibalism via the system of capitalist exploitation. Because Wariĩnga felt drunk when she was listening to the thieves talking in the cave, she slept outside and has a dialogue with a “Voice.” This voice pinpoints a tradition of cannibalism at the sacrament:

Voice: That the eating of human flesh and the drinking of human blood is blessed on Earth and in Heaven? [...] Remember the Sacrament that you, Wariĩnga, used to eat at the Church of Holy Rosary in Nakuru? The priest, after giving you a piece of bread, would say: [...]  
Take, eat, this is my body.  
Do this until I return.  
Corpus Christi. Amen. [...]  
Wariĩnga: That’s the only religious ritual. It’s not a question of eating one another.

(*Devil* 190; translation added)

As if to rebut the denial of Wariĩnga, the Voice subsequently adds, “[t]he Kimeendeeri class is only acting out the central symbolism of the Christian religion” (*Devil* 191). The sacrament is not a metaphor of, but the literal signifier of, man-eating. However, it is not exceptional to literally equate the sacrament with eating the body of Christ in order to criticize colonialism. For instance, Peter Hulme thinks the
ence to himself” (152). Yet when the phrase includes various connotations in the contexts in which it is used, it also offers a critique of the neocolonial, displacing the typical use of cannibalism, “a trope that embodies the fear of dissolution of identity and, conversely, […] a model of incorporation of difference” (Jáuregui 61). The last section of this paper confirms that Ngũgĩ’s satire culminates in the projection of cannibalism not only to the post-independence Kenya, but also all the forces that sustain its neocolonial situation.

In most cases, the phrase “the mouth that ate itself” links the logic of the capital with cannibalism and a command to silence in the neocolonial Kenya. For instance, it signifies for Mwaũra “loud mouths” or “wagging tongue” (Devil 48). For the matatũ drivers like him, the meaning also slides into “the mouth eating its prey,” as if their customers are the victims, because “our tongues are our hooks” (Devil 48). In a different context, Mũturi and Wangari are persuaded by Mwaũra not to protest against the competition of the thieves. When they reject this offer, Mwaũra threatens them, saying that “‘A person is eaten up by his own mouth. Mũturi and Wangari, because you know that what is done can never be undone, leave these people alone’” (Devil 159). The phrase here operates as coercion to speak.

On the other hand, Ngũgĩ attributes cannibalism as a metaphor of capitalist system to “the western bourgeois civilization” and its corollaries and overlaps it with Christianity or democracy. “Imagine anyone questioning the morality of man-eat-man in a state of man-eaters?” questions Ngũgĩ:

Imagine anyone questioning the ethic of eating human flesh when the western bourgeois civilization—God given, universal and final in its American form—has taught its worshippers that social cannibalism is the highest good? […] The fact is that the objects of social cannibalism will never accept the morality of man-eaters as the all-time universal morality, not even if it comes disguised in draperies marked Free World, Christian Democracy, Christian Civilization, Social Democracy and other mind-dazzling labels and platitudes. (Detained 120)
dered by the shifting consciousness of the gicaandi prayer, where he got frightened of witnessing the story that ensues. “Where shall I begin?” adds he, “[o]r should I stop involving myself in other people’s lives?” (Devil 215).

The notion of orality in Ngũgĩ’s writing changes through the revaluation of rumor and gossip, which Kim Chi Ha also exploits in “Groundless Rumours.” A destitute laborer, An Do, is arrested as soon as he lamented his situation, “What a bitch this world is!” (Cry 66). An Do is subsequently charged for absurd reasons such as “standing on the ground with his two feet, the crime of resting his body, the crime of tranquilizing his mind, the crime of attempting to stand up despite his poverty-stricken status,” and so on (Cry 67). Nevertheless, rumor in Ngũgĩ’s The River Between (1965) is undervalued as what dislocates the leadership of Waiyaki, the protagonist, as it makes known his secret relationship with his lover, Nyambura: “The rumours! Spreading like fire in a plain of dry grass. This talk about marrying Nyambra annoyed him” (122). On the other hand, rumour and gossip in Devil becomes a point of breaking at which Mũturi criticizes the neocolonial government that criminalizes the dissidents. He juxtaposes these rhetorics with moneymaking, rewriting the official version of a song sung by Nyakinyua dancers—“older women” who “sing the praises of the present leadership and its policies” (Sicherman Ngugi 226–7)—as follows: The official version, “The Haraambe you now see, / The Haraambe you now see / Is not for gossipers and rumour-mongers,” is rewritten as “The Harambe of money, / The Harambe of money / Is for the rich and their friends” (Devil 39). Rumor and gossip are here connected to a medium of satire.

“The mouth that ate itself” : Cannibalism, Capitalism and Christianity

Ngũgĩ’s satire would not go beyond the mere application of that in Kim Chi Ha if the figuration of the mouth was not effectively used. The figuration is ambivalently deployed since it simultaneously makes satire effective and repression of speech a norm. Eileen Julien indicates that the proverbial phrase that recurs in the novel, “the mouth that ate itself” (Devil 8), “is the narrator’s and, we presume, Ngũgĩ’s refer-
ries of the colonial rule compete with confessing how they succeeded in collecting money by mimicking the methods of the colonizers. For instance, Gitutu wa Gataangûrû, whose father as a member of the native tribunals purged the Mau Mau and who was not interested in politics around the Emergency, states his principle: “Learn from the whites, and you’ll never go wrong […]”. The white man came to this country holding the Bible in his left hand and a gun in his right. He stole the people’s fertile lands. He stole the people’s cattle and goats under the cover of fines and taxes. He robbed people of the labour of their hands” (Devil 102). He subsequently brags about the way he made money purchasing after Uhuru the lands the Mau Mau had fought for (Devil 103). Gitutu’s testimony eloquently reveals that the ethos of colonial rule survives in the ruling class of a New Kenya.

The relics of colonial culture are not unrelated to the repression of speech that Ngũgĩ and Kim differently represent by personifying the mediating role of the frame narrator. Kim circumscribes his work by suggesting the narrator’s presence at the boundary between the frame of his poem and the people’s speech and thus the presence of a network alternative to the system of coercion. Both “Five Bandits” and each part of “Groundless Rumours” are concluded by the narrator’s indication that the satiric stories he narrated are spread by the people’s mouth (Cry 57, 71, 83, 88). Only in “Five Bandits” does the narrator reveal himself as a poet, carefully minimizing his role in mediation: “Such incidents have been occurring for a long time and are on everybody’s lips. I, a poor poet, merely attempt to pass the story on” (Cry 57). On the other hand, Ngũgĩ makes repression of speech internalized within the narrator. The role of the gicaandi prayer is to hearken to the various voices of those who ask him to transmit what is hidden. He listens to three voices: Wariinga’s mother who implores him to “tell the story of the child I loved so dearly” (Devil 7), the pleading cries of many people who ask him to “reveal what now lies concealed by darkness” and an anonymous voice that castigates him, saying that “[w]ho has told you that prophesy is yours alone, to keep to yourself?” (Devil 8). Pressed on by these voices, the gicaandi prayer is not just compelled to tell their narratives but is also an ambiguous witness involved in the incidents that he narrates. Chapter 10 is engen-
(Cumings 358). Third, the title of “Five Bandits” originally meant five ministers who in 1905 were forced to sign the Ulsa Treaty, around the time when Ito Hirobumi, then the Japanese resident-general, dominated the central power of Seoul with militant force (Cumings 143-5).  

As Ngũgĩ mentions, Kim Chi Ha in his poetry invokes these ministers as ghosts which the poet projects into “the business tycoons; top bureaucracies; national assemblymen; the top military brass; cabinet ministers” (Writers 114).

Ngũgĩ elaborates on the corresponding situation in Kenya. Regarding detention without trial, the author explains that it “is part of that colonial culture of fear. It was introduced to Kenya by this racist settler minority, by Jesus-is-thy-Saviour missionaries and their administrators” (Detained 44). He adds that although at “independence, the Emergency Powers (Colonial Defence) Order in Council (1939) was repealed as part of Kenyan law,” it “was incorporated in the Preservation of Public Security Act under which comes detention of persons and restrictions of their movements” (Detained 50–51). Likewise, then President Moi, who succeeded Jomo Kenyatta, the first president of Kenya, was “[a]t the height of the British colonial terror campaign against Mau Mau freedom fighters and the Kenyan people, 1954–1955, […] a colonial government appointee in the then settler run Kenya Legislative Council” (Barrel 17).

In terms of narrative structure, Ngũgĩ applies the contests of robbery in “Five Bandits” in order to expose complicities with the colonial structures after independence. Kim Chi Ha describes the contest held at the center of Seoul at the will of those who “originally learned robbery from the same master [the Emperor Hirohito].” Each of these thieves “developed his potential in a different way” (Cry 41). The last thief in his speech brags about the deification of this master, which reveals his accumulation of capital: “Let’s export even though we starve, let’s increase production even though products go unsold. Let’s construct a bridge across the Strait of Korea with the bones of those who have starved to death, so we can worship the god of Japan!” (Cry 46)

In Devil on the Cross, the contest is grafted onto Chapter 4, where the beneficia-
Confronting the Neocolonial: Ngũgĩ’s Use of Kim Chi Ha’s Satire

In 1976, Ngũgĩ was invited to the Emergency International Conference on Korea, held in Tokyo on August 12–14. Ngũgĩ read “The South Korean People’s Struggle: Is the Struggle of All Oppressed Peoples” and wrote an article, “Repression in South Korea,” which appeared in The Weekly Review on September 13, 1976. These writings are instructive documents in that a link between the peoples under neocolonialism was glimpsed. The author writes: “He [Kim Chi Ha] is in prison but his voice is an inspiration to us in South Africa and Zimbabwe, to us in Palestine, to us in all countries under neo-colonialism” (Writers 118). In order to reexamine the possibility of “us” as an emergent subjectivity, I limit myself here to indicate formal similarities in the narratorial and narrative structure between Devil on the Cross, “Five Bandits,” and “Groundless Rumours.” Before this, I will review the historical background in which Ngũgĩ saw the connection between Korea and Kenya.

Ngũgĩ thought that the satire deployed by Kim Chi Ha would be effective for a critique of the neocolonial situation in Kenya in that they shared a perspective in which a history of colonialism is overlapped with the ongoing neocolonialism. For instance, the Yushin constitution proclaimed by then President Park Chung Hee, as Ngũgĩ emphasizes, banned all the criticism against the government, suppressed the protests of the masses and institutionalized incarceration without trial (Writers 109). A series of mechanisms were handed to the bureaucracy, police and army of Korea by Japan’s imperialism, which is confirmed at least in the three instances that follow. First, Park “joined the Kwantung Army in Manchuria” (Cumings 355): a fact that also designates the continuation of the violence of Japanese colonization. Second, the masses of students protested against the normalization treaty with Japan (Mun 113) which precedes Yushin and became a watershed for the American and Japanese bourgeois to re-colonize Korea, but Park then extended his ties “with the Japanese right wing—including former “class A” war criminals like the politician Kishi Nobusuke, the rich man Sasakawa Ryoichi, and many other not necessarily savory characters”
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forest” (*Devil* 40). So as to widen the audience as a participant of literature and politics, the novel incorporates cultural norms of both Christianity and Gikuyu orature that they can share, albeit critically.

Yet it is difficult to broaden the audience even though a writer carefully incorporates norms familiar to them. Importantly, Ngũgĩ’s view of the masses becomes approximate to that of Kim Chi Ha when he thinks they need to mediate themselves with the oral tradition and satire. When these authors pinpoint the prevalent view on the masses, they see the masses as historical agencies that mobilize themselves. Kim states in his essay “Satire or Suicide” that “the masses don’t know the poesy of a poet. The masses have their own poesy: lore. The path in which a poet equally meets the masses is a path in which he inherits satire and the spirit of lore” (*Nagai* 181). According to Kim Chi Ha, although “[t]he oppressors say the masses are base ugly, morally depraved, innately lazy, untrustworthy, ignorant and spiritless, inferior race” (“Declaration” 9–10), “I [Kim] have total confidence in the people. Given the opportunity they will find correct solutions to their problems” (“Declaration” 10). Similarly, Ngũgĩ writes that “[t]he discomfiture with the masses so evident among the ruling political circles is present in most African novels even at their most radical and critical” (*Writers* 24). For Ngũgĩ, the unbridgeable difference between the intellectual and the masses was still alive when he wrote in 1973 that “[w]e must join the proletarian and the poor peasant struggles” (*Writers* 78). The binary of the intellectuals and the masses is subsequently transformed through his experience at the theatre where he collaborated with the peasants and workers. The author reflects on overcoming the gap within, saying that his “involvement with the people of Kamiriithú had given me the sense of a new being and it had made me transcend the alienation to which I had been condemned by years of colonial education” (*Detained* 98). The experience of his contact with the masses was necessary for him to overcome an inner guilt that the colonial education hammered into him.
tion which moves him to pour derision and ridicule on society’s failings” (*Homecoming* 55). Here satire is an individualistic effort that is not far from “Swiftian satire [that] attempts to foster critical discernment and to cultivate in its readers the art of disbelief” (Suarez S.J. 127): satire that assumes the cynical nobility of a detached manner.

On the contrary, the satire that Ngũgĩ learned from Kim Chi Ha does not presuppose the limit of Europe and Christianity within which it is contained. Ngũgĩ’s satire changes when it undertakes, on the one hand, a critical perspective on the association of Christianity with imperial capitalism and, on the other hand, a collective agency as the subject, not as the object, of satire. First, he strategically appropriates the Christian mores (Ezenwa-Ohaeto 90; Goodwin 8). According to Ngũgĩ, “the Bible is […] a body of knowledge you can assume you are sharing with your audience and that’s why I use the Bible quite a lot, or biblical sayings, not because I share in any belief in the Bible, or in the sanctity of the Bible” (*Speaks* 210). Of course, Ngũgĩ’s satire differs from that of Kim Chi Ha since the neocolonial situation in Kenya is different from Korea in terms of the role of Christianity. The Catholic priests in Korea were involved in the anti-government movement and Kim Chi Ha was a Catholic poet (“Declaration” 10), but the counterparts in Kenya were collaborators who forced confessions on the dissidents. “The ‘confession’ and its corollary, ‘Father, forgive us for our sins’,” writes Ngũgĩ, “becomes a cleansing ritual for all the past and current repressive deeds of such a neo-colonial regime” (*Detained* 14).

Ngũgĩ’s return to Gikũyũ orature does not simply mean a reversion against the English language. He needed to broaden the audience despite a large illiteracy rate. Indeed, he comments that “even on the eve of independence, the masses of African people could not read or write” and that “poverty and illiteracy do severely limit access to knowledge and information” (*Decolonizing* 67, 83). Especially, the illiteracy rate of women in Kenya was over 40% even in 1990s (Kiluva-Ndunda 74). Despite the inequality of gendered education, Ngũgĩ’s use of the Gikũyũ orature functions as a memorization of women in the Mau Mau. For instance, Wangari in *Devil* testifies to the fact that “these legs carried many bullets and many guns to our fighters in the
Discourse on Satire and Ngũgĩ’s intervention

In the academic discourse after the 1960s, theorists of satire have assumed a linear sequence of history by which the satire in its original form is viewed with an anthropological gaze. The remnants of such origins, critics argue, can still be detected in the margins of the civilized world. Robert C. Elliot wrote, “[a]s conscious belief in magic drops away, the role of the satirist changes.” According to Elliott, the “mantic function [of the satirists] is preempted by the priest, and interest in his poetic utterance is on aesthetic value rather than on magical potency” (260). George A. Test does not contradict the thesis of Elliott to the extent that he borders the historical origin of satire within the cultural sphere of Europe: “Such communal satire [which could operate as a protest] was deeply imbedded in society through the Middle Ages and into the early modern period in Western Europe and its colonial outposts as well as in Eastern Europe and Russia” (71). These ancient histories suppressed in Europe, according to Test, are nowadays detected in the rituals of “the Ashanti people of Africa” or the Native Americans in “Chiapas area of the southern Mexico” (72, 76). In a different vein, as Mikhail Bakhtin enumerates characteristics of the menippean satire whose origin can be located in the Greco-Roman literature, he assigns “the deep internal integrity of this genre” to “the epoch of preparation and formation of a new world religion: Christianity.” According to Bakhtin, “the genre of the menippea” flourished “in the history of the development of European novelistic prose” (119). These commentaries presuppose that satire had been a genre that originated in European literature and Christian culture, whose ritual form and magical nature were subsequently suppressed but are existent in “primitive” cultures.

Ngũgĩ expressed satire in terms that do not contradict such academic discourses when he was still under the influence of Christianity via his colonial education. (3) Certainly, the South African authors used satire in order to represent the nightmare of the apartheid regime (Brink 189–194). In the early 1970s, Ngũgĩ suggested that the satirist would beckon “us to assume his standards and share the moral indigna-
Man. The gicaandí player narrates the two parts, scattering the phrases and parables that are both based in Gikuyū orature and the Bible.

Ngugi plainly reveals the three sources that inspired him to write Devil on the Cross. The first is the Faustian motif in Western literature, which the author supposes “was universal and […] rooted in the lores of the peasantry” (Decolonizing 81). Second is “[t]he image of Idakho [a human-shaped rock] fused with images of those maneating ogres in Gikuyū orature.” Third, he emphasizes the satire of Kim Chi Ha’s works: “I had seen, particularly in the Five Bandits and Groundless Rumours, how effectively he had exploited the oral forms and images to confront the South Korean neo-colonial realities” (Decolonizing 81). When the literary traditions of the West and the non-West are simultaneously reflected in the terrain of oral literature, the cannibalistic motif of the Gikuyū orature is connected to Kim Chi Ha’s satire against the neocolonial exploitation in Korea.

Critics ascribe the novel’s newness to the author’s debt to the oral literature; others like Barbara Harlow attribute it to the satire that Ngugi learned from Kim Chi Ha (126). However, the intersection of these two issues has never been seriously examined. I argue first that Ngugi’s vision of satire was transformed by the need for a critique on neocolonialism via Kim Chi Ha’s satire that is grounded in the oral literature of the masses. In addition, since satire becomes effective when it is based on a grammar specific to a regional history and situation, Ngugi arranges it in line with the cannibalistic image in the Gikuyū orature, as well as with a critique against the neocolonial Kenya, and especially against the complicity between Christianity and capitalism.

As will be discussed below, satire and cannibalism have been precisely associated around a border between Europe and its other. While satire has been recognized as a genuine social criticism only within European literature, cannibalism has been projected onto the other of Europe. I also demonstrate that Ngugi’s Devil on the Cross displaces this formal relation that predicates satire and cannibalism by overlapping the complicity between Christianity, capitalism and cannibalism.
“Satire, or Cannibalism”:
Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o’s Critique of Neocolonialism in *Devil on the Cross*

Yutaka Yoshida

Oral Literature and Satire

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o embarked on a critique of neocolonialism around the late 1970s. Especially in his novel, *Devil on the Cross* (1982), which Ngũgĩ wrote in Gikũyũ while he was detained without trial, the author articulated the complex entanglement between the neocolonial policy and the opposition to it.

The first part of the novel begins with the protagonist Wariĩnga’s story. She is a girl who is about to commit suicide because she is overwhelmed by the dizziness of the streets in Nairobi and because she got pregnant twice without marrying her boyfriend or the Rich Old Man. Taking a matatũ (taxi) by chance, she meets the driver Mwaũra and the passengers such as Mũturi and Wangari, both of whom remembers the historical significance of the Mau Mau; Gatuĩria, a musicologist who studied in the U.S.; and Mwieri wa Mũkiraaį, an economist of “democratic” principles. The passengers confess the details of their lives and attitudes toward the post-independence Kenya en route from Nairobi to Ilmorog where thieves’ competition will be held in a cave. After the competition, the workers and the peasants demonstrate outside, but they are soon dispersed by the policemen.

In the second part, Wariĩnga becomes a car mechanic and gets married to Gatuĩria, although she later finds out that the father of her fiancée is the Rich Old