

## American Anthropology in Micronesia, 1941–1997<sup>1</sup>

ROBERT C. KISTE<sup>2</sup> AND MAC MARSHALL<sup>3</sup>

**ABSTRACT:** Before the Second World War, relatively few American anthropologists had worked in the Pacific, and Micronesia was virtually unknown. After the war, the U.S. Navy sponsored the Coordinated Investigation of Micronesian Anthropology, the largest research project in the history of the discipline. Several CIMA participants became major figures, and they inspired substantial further work in the region. In this paper research trends in Micronesia during the past half century are discussed and suggestions for the future are offered.

CEREMONIES AT PEARL HARBOR on 7 December 1991 marked the fiftieth anniversary of Japan's attack on American military bases on the Hawaiian island of O'ahu, the incident that catapulted America's entry into World War II. Of those assembled at Pearl Harbor in 1991, only a very few would have known that the following day was also the silver anniversary of another significant, albeit unnoticed, event.

On Monday, 8 December 1941, and what in retrospect appears as an act of incredible optimism, George Peter Murdock anticipated that the United States would need basic information on Micronesia. He called together the staff of the Cross-Cultural Survey, Institute of Human Relations, Yale University, to begin gathering data on the islands administered by Japan as a League of Nations Mandated Territory. Unforeseen at the time, the Yale initiative was the beginning of the largest research effort in the history of American anthropology and a major program in applied anthropology.

Murdock's optimism was warranted. By the end of World War II, American forces controlled most of Micronesia. The United States recaptured the American territory of Guam and occupied the Micronesian islands

that had composed the Japanese Mandate. Of all the islands of Micronesia, only the Gilberts and Nauru were not under American control; at war's end, they reverted to the British sphere of authority.

Before the war, Micronesia was little known in the English-speaking world, but it had a long legacy of colonialism under Spain, Germany, and Japan. However, in 1943 Micronesia began to emerge from behind the "bamboo curtain" when the first of a half dozen handbooks on the islands appeared as products of the work at Yale. American anthropology had become involved in the region and was poised to enter the next period of engagement.

The history of American anthropology in Micronesia is a fascinating story in itself. In early 1999, the volume *American Anthropology in Micronesia: An Assessment* edited by the authors of this paper was published by University of Hawai'i Press. The idea to assess anthropology's involvement in the "tiny islands" began with Kiste's conversations at the XVII Pacific Science Congress in Honolulu in 1991. With the intention of producing a multiauthored volume, in 1993 Kiste and Marshall organized the University of Hawai'i's Center for Pacific Islands Studies (CPIS)'s annual conference, "American Anthropology in Micronesia." Reference was made to other subdisciplines, but the focus was on sociocultural anthropology, and the scope was limited to the American-administered islands of Guam and the U.S.

<sup>1</sup> Manuscript accepted 1 November 1999.

<sup>2</sup> University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822.

<sup>3</sup> University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242.

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the islands of the former Japanese Mandate.

#### THE CONTEXT

In the early 1940s, anthropology was still a relative newcomer on the American academic scene. The Society for Applied Anthropology was a fledgling organization, its inception predating the disaster at Pearl Harbor by only a few months. The American Anthropological Association was just over four decades old, and its Fellows numbered approximately 300. Although about a dozen and a half departments offered a doctorate in anthropology, six dominated the production of new Ph.D.s. Of the 106 doctorates awarded between 1939 and 1946, 87 (82%) came from Harvard, Columbia, Chicago, Pennsylvania, Yale, and the University of California, Berkeley. In 1999, there are 10,784 members of the American Anthropological Association, and 85 universities in the United States award a Ph.D. in anthropology.

In the late 1930s, the conceptual frameworks of cultural anthropology were largely derived from the Boasian paradigm of historical particularism. As George Stocking has noted, an American cultural anthropology had recently evolved from ethnology and was opposed to British "social anthropology" (1992:147–159). Reflecting its North American origins and history, most American anthropologists conducted field research among dislocated Native Americans living on reservations. Anthropology's agenda was largely that of salvage ethnography, the reconstruction of traditional cultures from the memories of aged informants.

Nonetheless, before World War II, the Pacific Islands enjoyed a position of prominence in anthropology from the work of such figures as Raymond Firth, Bronislaw Malinowski, and Margaret Mead. However, for a variety of reasons, particularly a paucity of research funds, fieldwork outside the Americas was the exception rather than the rule. At the same time and given the small size of the profession, the number of American an-

thropologists who reached the Pacific was greater than is appreciated today. Eighteen American cultural anthropologists conducted research in the Pacific outside of Hawai'i. They were almost evenly divided between Polynesia and Melanesia, and only one had set foot in Micronesia. Foreshadowing things to come, an applied project for the U.S. Navy had taken Laura Thompson to Guam in the late 1930s.

In the decade before the war, salvage ethnography was in decline, and a "rising current of scientism in the late 1930s" began to challenge the Boasian program (Stocking 1992:142). There were three developments within the "scientizing trend," all more integrative in purpose and design than Boasian ethnology: a psychological focus evident in a culture-and-personality movement; a sociological line largely derived from the functionalism of British social anthropology; and a materialist orientation that led to cultural ecology and neoevolutionary concerns (Stocking 1992:135–142).

Other forces also shaped the transformation of anthropology. Social problems accompanying the Great Depression and issues concerning the governance and welfare of Native Americans heightened the social consciousness of many scholars, who called for a more relevant anthropology. The Bureau of Indian Affairs and other federal agencies began to employ applied anthropologists. Reflecting the concern with contemporary issues, anthropology began to shift toward the study of culture change, and the first studies of acculturation appeared in the early 1930s (Redfield et al. 1936, Bee 1974:94). On the other side of the Atlantic, Malinowski had begun to call for an anthropology of the "changing native" (1929, 1930).

The new interests in culture change and applied work helped prepare anthropologists to respond to the demands of the war effort. With the outbreak of hostilities, the military and other government agencies required anthropological expertise both at home and abroad. The Yale project was an early example, and an unprecedented number of anthropologists became engaged in a broad range of applied tasks.

## THE APPLICATION OF ANTHROPOLOGY

At the end of World War II, the U.S. Navy was given temporary administrative responsibility for the former Japanese Mandate. For strategic reasons, the United States was determined to retain control of the islands, and an acceptable solution was arrived at in 1947 when the islands became the U.S. Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (USTTPI) under the umbrella of the United Nations. The war's end also returned Guam to navy rule, but by 1951, the navy era ended, and the Department of Interior assumed responsibility for both the USTTPI and Guam. There was optimism on all sides about the usefulness of anthropology, and Harvard anthropologist Douglas Oliver joined Murdock in planning Micronesia's future. Under Oliver's supervision, the navy sponsored a survey of economic conditions in Micronesia (U.S. Commercial Company, or USCC) in which several anthropologists were involved. More important, Murdock and Oliver planned the cardinal event that shaped the direction of American anthropology in Micronesia for years to come.

With the assumption that knowledge of Micronesians and their cultures would make for good administration, the navy sponsored the Coordinated Investigation of Micronesian Anthropology (CIMA). In 1947–1948, 41 CIMA researchers were divided into teams and assigned throughout the USTTPI. Of these, 25 were cultural anthropologists, and the others were physical anthropologists, linguists, geographers, sociologists, physicians, and a botanist. There were precedents for such a research initiative; CIMA had its prototypes in the earlier work of the Bureau of American Ethnology and the Philippines Ethnological Survey.

Murdock has described CIMA as being the largest expeditionary survey in the history of modern anthropology (Richard 1957: 582), and the results of CIMA were formidable. Its final bibliography included 32 reports and over 100 articles and other publications on a wide range of anthropological topics.

CIMA had two important immediate offshoots. First, because of CIMA's success and

the desire for continued research, the navy funded the Scientific Investigation of Micronesia (SIM), a program of studies in the physical, biological, and life sciences. Between 1949 and 1951, nine anthropologists and twenty-two other researchers representing six disciplines conducted work in Micronesia.

Second, district anthropologists appointed in five of the USTTPI's six districts were supervised by the staff anthropologist attached to the Office of the High Commissioner. They interpreted the technical language of the CIMA reports, conducted research, provided advice, and eventually trained Micronesians to work as assistant anthropologists. In the decade of the 1950s, eleven Americans served as district anthropologists and six Micronesians worked as assistants. Homer Barnett, University of Oregon, was the first staff anthropologist appointed after the navy period, and he had three successors. Almost inevitably, there was some overlap in the personnel of CIMA, SIM, and the applied effort.

## NEW DIRECTIONS

The 1960s marked a major turning point for Micronesia. For a variety of reasons, the initial optimism about a mutually beneficial cooperation between anthropology and administration waned, and the era of large organized anthropological ventures drew to a close. Most research became "anthropology for the sake of science," conducted by individuals and largely funded by the National Science Foundation and other federal agencies. The change in anthropological activity in Micronesia occurred with and partly as a consequence of a major shift in American policy. From the outset, the United States had provided little more than a caretaker administration, and its strategic interests were protected by the trusteeship arrangement. Early in the navy era, educational, health, and other innovations based on American models were introduced. However, budgets were minuscule, initiatives were small in scale, and results were few. The era has been characterized by some observers as one of "benign neglect." Nonetheless, the di-

rection of change had been charted, and the "Americanization" of Micronesia had begun.

In 1961, the United States was severely criticized by the United Nations for its neglect of the islands. In response, a massive agenda of development was launched. Programs initiated by President John Kennedy quickly expanded, and then ran amok during the Johnson administration when the USTTPI and other American territories in the Pacific and Caribbean were included in the "Great Society" initiative designed to eliminate poverty in America. During its heyday, over 160 federal programs were operating in the USTTPI. Annual territorial budgets soared to exceed \$110 million (16 times those of the late 1940s), with the federal programs costing another \$35 million (Kiste 1993: 71).

Many of the programs were inappropriate for small island communities, proved corrosive to Micronesian cultures, and undermined subsistence economies. Government employment and bureaucracy expanded by leaps and bounds, and unplanned urbanization proceeded at a rapid rate. In the process, little in the way of significant economic development occurred, and massive social and economic dependency was achieved. Criticism by the UN also precipitated movement in the political arena. By the early 1960s, Micronesians had taken to heart American notions about the virtues of democracy and self-determination. They lobbied for a territory-wide legislature, and the Congress of Micronesia (COM) was formed in 1965. As one of its first acts, the COM created its own Micronesian Political Status Commission in 1967.

Beginning in 1969, discussions with the United States proved to be the longest and most tortuous of all negotiations in the decolonization of the Pacific. The United States was determined to protect its strategic interests and encouraged existing divisions among Micronesians. In the end, the USTTPI became divided into four political entities. Forms of government were determined by plebiscites in each. The Northern Marianas opted for commonwealth status in 1975, and eventually the people of the Commonwealth

of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) became American citizens, and the CNMI became part of the United States.

In 1983, voters in the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), the Marshall Islands, and Palau each approved Compacts of Free Association with the United States. The compacts define a relationship in which the island states grant the United States certain strategic prerogatives in exchange for self-government, generous financial packages, and a number of support services. The people are citizens of their own countries, and although they do not enjoy American citizenship, they are allowed free access to enter and work in the United States. The compacts for the FSM and the Marshalls went into effect in 1986. A disagreement over a nuclear-free constitution delayed the implementation of Palau's compact until 1994, a quarter of a century after the future political status negotiations commenced in 1969.

Micronesians have been pleased to achieve self-government, but the new political statuses have had their disappointments and difficulties. The CNMI resents the fact that it has less autonomy than the freely associated states. The arrangement of free association has not been well understood in the international community, and the freely associated states have encountered difficulties in the management of their external affairs. Perhaps the greatest challenges to the FSM and the Marshalls are massive economic dependency and rapidly growing populations. Both have problems of governance. Further, major parts of the compacts have a duration of 15 years and are scheduled to expire in the year 2001. Concerned at the prospect that future financial arrangements may be less generous, both nations have begun negotiations for renewal. Palau is only 5 years into its compact agreement, but it is struggling with problems of economic development. In response to conditions at home and opportunities in America, increasing numbers of Micronesians have migrated to the United States. Indeed, one recent Ph.D. dissertation concerns the Marshallese community in Enid, Oklahoma (Allen 1997).

Over a half century has passed since

American anthropologists became involved in Micronesia. Those who pioneered the work of the 1940s could not have imagined the Micronesia of today. The past three decades in particular have witnessed phenomenal changes of enormous magnitude in all sectors of society and culture. The subject matter of anthropology of 50 years ago has also been radically altered. Indeed, the discipline itself has been transformed. Like Micronesia, anthropology, both pure and applied, has grown much more complex and has experienced a population explosion of its own. With its proliferation into numerous subdisciplines and specializations, as the chapters in *American Anthropology in Micronesia* reflect, the anthropology of today would not be recognized by those who launched its involvement in the region a half century ago. In retrospect, judging from the entire range of anthropological work in Micronesia, the CIMA project had the greatest overall impact on the discipline.

#### CONSEQUENCES OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROJECTS IN MICRONESIA

World War II was arguably *the* pivotal event in modern Pacific history. The war also strongly affected American anthropology via anthropologists' involvement in the war effort itself, and via their organization of and participation in the various postwar programs in applied and academic anthropology in Micronesia mentioned above (the USCC survey, CIMA, SIM, and the USTTPI applied anthropology venture). These programs generated a great deal of new knowledge and helped launch the careers of a host of scholars who have left an indelible mark on Pacific anthropology. Several of these scholars also have made major theoretical and other contributions to anthropology as a discipline.

The U.S. Commercial Company survey, directed by Douglas Oliver immediately after the war (Oliver 1951), gathered otherwise unavailable information on the impact of the war on Micronesian peoples, with a particular focus on their economic situation. Among the three anthropologists and one sociologist

who conducted the survey was Leonard Mason, who had worked for Murdock's Cross-Cultural Survey in Washington during the war. Mason subsequently was involved in both CIMA and SIM. He is one of the deans of Micronesian anthropology, having founded the Pacific Islands Studies Program at the University of Hawai'i (since 1986, the Center for Pacific Islands Studies), having taught or influenced younger anthropologists and Pacific Islands leaders, and having made significant contributions to applied anthropology, cultural ecology, and studies of Micronesian arts. Mason directed the Pacific Islands Studies Program for nearly 15 years, while also serving as chair of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Hawai'i, before he was succeeded as director by Norman Meller, who led the program for much of the following decade. A political scientist who became interested in Micronesia as a consequence of his war experiences, Meller has played an important role in the region. Glenn Petersen (1999:182–187) discussed his accomplishments and their relevance for political anthropology in some detail.

It was the CIMA project that transformed the anthropology of Micronesia and brought it into the mainstream of American anthropological research. Conceived and implemented primarily by Murdock at Yale and Oliver at Harvard, CIMA spawned at least four academic "lineages" that have had a major impact on postwar anthropology in the Pacific. The key persons were Homer G. Barnett, Murdock (and his student, Ward H. Goodenough), David M. Schneider, and Alexander Spoehr. These men have been among the major figures in postwar American anthropology. Murdock and Spoehr were president of the American Anthropological Association; Murdock, Goodenough, and Barnett all served as president of the Society for Applied Anthropology; and Schneider was a founder and president of the Society for Cultural Anthropology. Goodenough, Spoehr, and Murdock all were elected to the National Academy of Sciences, and Schneider and Goodenough were Fellows of the American Academy of Arts and

Sciences. All (Barnett, Goodenough, Murdock, Oliver, Schneider, and Spoehr) chaired their university departments. Collectively through 1997, the academic lineages of Barnett, Murdock, Schneider, and Spoehr have produced 83 "descendants" who have completed Ph.D.s based on fieldwork in Oceania; 26 of these doctorates were done in Micronesia.

Yet another very influential CIMA researcher has been Melford Spiro, who does not fall within the above four lineages. Spiro (like Murdock and Goodenough) was president of the American Ethnological Society and also president of the Society for Psychological Anthropology. A Fellow of the National Academy of Sciences and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and founder and chair of his university department at the University of California, San Diego, Spiro—along with Schneider and Goodenough—has made a profound mark on anthropological theory.

Goodenough, Schneider, and Spiro are the CIMA researchers who have been most prominent in the wider discipline. All three have made fundamental contributions to anthropological theory, especially via their writings on kinship and social organization, psychological anthropology, and the anthropology of religion. Goodenough played a central role in the development of cognitive anthropology and has written extensively on language and linguistics and on the applications of anthropology. Schneider was a leading proponent of symbolic anthropology, helped revitalize the culture concept, and wrote pathbreaking books concerning the study of kinship in contemporary Western societies. Spiro is best known for his creativity in psychological anthropology, but he has contributed equally significant works in the anthropology of religion and in kinship and family studies.

The research completed by American anthropologists in Micronesia since the war, as discussed in *American Anthropology in Micronesia: An Assessment*, illustrates "the interpretive manner in which natural science is actually practiced" (Roscoe 1995:497). Roscoe concluded that the hermeneutic methods

of the natural sciences can be successfully applied to the study of human culture and society, and he calls this "normal science." The accumulation of research in Micronesia over the past half century provides numerous instances where successive scholars have built upon one another's work, and the CIMA project was the launching pad for this endeavor. This normal science research tradition in Micronesia has most affected anthropological theory in the areas of psychological anthropology, cognitive anthropology, kinship and social organization, and the anthropology of religion. Peter Black argues that research in Micronesia has been central to the development of psychological anthropology via studies "where cognitive anthropology, psychology, and linguistics overlap, especially in studies of emotion" (1999:229) and through the rise of ethnopsychology, which developed out of the cognitive turn in cultural anthropology, much of which "played itself out in Micronesia" (1999:239). Moreover, Black credits Goodenough and Thomas Gladwin (another CIMA researcher who studied under Murdock) with clearing a space for the rise of cognitive anthropology, notably through their writings on the Caroline Islanders' indigenous navigation system.

The foundation for normal science in studies of kinship and social organization in Micronesia was laid by Schneider and Goodenough. Both were advocates for emic analysis, but Schneider concentrated on the symbols and meanings encoded in kinship systems while Goodenough gave primary attention to their formal, logical (cognitive) properties. Of course, the influential writings of these two men on kinship subjects have reverberated far beyond Micronesia.

Spiro's contributions to the anthropology of religion are legion; they began with his Ifaluk research as part of CIMA and have expanded into studies in Asia and into a series of more general publications on the topic. Goodenough has also sustained a long-standing interest and publication record in this area, drawing primarily on his Chuuk material. Although religion was not a major focus of his writing, Schneider sought to ex-

tend the kind of analysis he advocated for kinship to religion (Schneider 1969).

Our ethnographic data base for Micronesia has been greatly increased by the numerous studies that have been conducted over the past 50 years. This work is of special importance precisely because it allows for the pursuit of normal science as discussed above. As contemporary sociocultural anthropology has begun to reorient toward more practical concerns, driven at least in part by a limited number of academic positions, the applied anthropology program of the 1950s and 1960s in Micronesia has provided some important lessons. Barnett's *Anthropology in Administration* (1956) illustrated applied anthropology in colonial settings, and Goodenough's *Cooperation in Change* (1963) has been read widely outside the discipline and captured an important shift in ways of applying anthropology in a postcolonial world. Both books draw heavily on the authors' CIMA-sponsored Micronesia fieldwork.

#### RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

An issue raised by David Hanlon (1999:53–79) is whether the very idea of Micronesia is anything but a figment of the anthropological imagination. Although there may be some truth to this idea, there are several ways in which Micronesia coheres. Ward Goodenough noted at the 1993 CPIS conference, for example, that there is a linguistic connectedness among most of the region's languages (those that are Nuclear Micronesian), and that many of the islands were linked via interisland voyaging (see also Rehg 1995). But beyond Goodenough's comments, several contributors to *American Anthropology in Micronesia: An Assessment* support the position that there are certain major uniformities in the region.

Concerning the ways that Micronesians have adapted to their environments, William Alkire (1999:86) posited that "a universal conceptual unity inalienably ties people (kin groups) to land (their estates)" and went on to mention a number of attributes that are common if not universal to Micronesian sys-

tems of land tenure. Marshall (1999:107–143) argued for "partial connections" among Micronesian societies, consisting of a set of social and cultural themes drawn from a pool of common ideas whose elements are combined and recombined in different ways across the region. He examined these connections as they have been reported for seven major topics in kinship and social organization: (1) siblingship; (2) systems of kinship and descent; (3) adoption, fosterage, and ritual kinship; (4) the links among kinship, land, and food; (5) marriage systems and practices; (6) incest taboos; and (7) post-marital residence rules. Glenn Petersen (1999:166) discussed "shared Micronesian political patterns" and "some very fundamental similarities in Micronesian sociopolitical organization," and Karen Nero (1999:255–257) suggested that Micronesian art forms have a distinctive character all their own when contrasted with other parts of the Pacific. Taken together, these findings support at least a limited viability of the culture area concept for understanding the region known as Micronesia, even through there is clearly important variation, particularly when the three westernmost island groups are compared with the rest of the area.

In the book's final chapter, Kiste (1999:454) provided a table that gives the number of doctorates earned in sociocultural anthropology based on fieldwork in Micronesia by decade and gender from 1949 to 1997, and it reveals several interesting things. A total of 78 such dissertations was completed during that period, with another 20 in anthropology's three other major subfields (archaeology, anthropological linguistics, and physical anthropology). The dissertations reflect the sources of funding, the transformation of Micronesia since the 1960s, and a gender shift that is altering the character of the larger American academic scene.

Concerning the funding for research, American anthropology's involvement in Micronesia may be divided roughly into three periods. First, the U.S. Navy was the primary source of funds during the USCC, CIMA, and SIM years. The second period was marked by the generous outlay of federal

funds for scientific research that followed the immediate post-Sputnik years and development initiatives that shaped much of the transformation of Micronesia. The last covers more recent years that have witnessed a marked decline in federal support for scientific research and social programs.

The first two sociocultural dissertations (Goodenough's and Schneider's) were completed in 1949, with 11 more done in the 1950s. All but two of this latter group were derived from CIMA, SIM, or USTPI applied anthropology. Nine more doctorates were produced in the 1960s, seven of which were by researchers connected to the work of the 1940s and 1950s. Three were the last of the district anthropologists and four were students of CIMA participants. It is striking that only one of the twenty-two such dissertations awarded between 1949 and 1969 was to a woman: Ann Fischer in 1957.

The increased federal funding of the post-Sputnik era launched an explosion of research in the islands that began in the 1960s but was most evident in the 34 dissertations completed in the 1970s. The availability of federal funding began to decline late in the same decade, and the number of new doctorates decreased accordingly. The 17 dissertations of the 1980s were exactly one-half of those of the previous decade. Only five Ph.D.s were awarded between 1990 and 1997.

In recent years, the number of female students at all levels of tertiary education in America has increased, and the research explosion of the seventies helped to bring the first significant number of women researchers to Micronesia. More than a decade elapsed between Ann Fischer's Ph.D. in 1957 and Nancy Pollock's in 1970. Nine of the thirty-four dissertations of the 1970s were by women, and in the 1980s, women accounted for eight of seventeen. Although several more are in progress, no males are represented among the five dissertations completed during 1990–1997.

Kiste (1999:455–457) also identified a shift over the period examined from a situation in which most dissertations focused on traditional ethnographic concerns or topics

of mostly academic interest to one in which a majority have concentrated on sociocultural change. Many in this latter group have been concerned with political change or matters related to urban or peri-urban life, reflecting the growing urbanization of Micronesia's population. Ironically, and not by any conscious design, the transformation of Micronesia became a favored topic of anthropological research and was largely funded by federal sources.

After more than a half century of American involvement in Micronesia, the region has become one of the most studied of all world areas. Nevertheless, a number of research topics have been neglected. First, the impact of Micronesia's largest "industry"—Western-style formal education—has been relatively ignored. In similar fashion, legal anthropology has received very little attention despite a plethora of topics that might be explored, ranging from the introduction of Western-style jurisprudence and courts to studies of the legal relationships that the United States has with the new Micronesian political entities. Medical anthropology has been greatly underrepresented, particularly given its rapid growth within the broader discipline and the health problems that face Micronesians today. Many chronic disease conditions have become leading causes of morbidity and mortality, even as significant infectious disease problems remain. Equally pressing are problems of primary health care and delivery, medical supplies, and general public health. Given the importance of such concerns that have accompanied urbanization and an increased involvement in a cash economy, studies of the role played by imported foods in chronic diseases are long overdue. Numerous topics related to the visual and performing arts await investigation, and the same is true of contemporary religious life, particularly the indigenization of Christianity and the proliferation of Protestant denominations and other faiths.

Still other topics present themselves as candidates for future research. Growing migration from the freely associated states to Guam, Hawai'i, and mainland United States destinations has raised a host of questions

about the maintenance of language and ethnicity. Guam and Saipan both now have highly diverse, polyglot populations made up of people from many parts of Asia, North America, and Micronesia and provide ideal venues for the study of interethnic relations. Gender issues have only begun to be explored, and a tremendous amount of work remains to be done in this vibrant area.

American anthropology in Micronesia since the war has reflected the vagaries of funding sources, changes in the discipline, growth in the number of women who have entered the profession, and shifts in the application of anthropological knowledge to the solution of everyday problems. Although it is always difficult to predict the future, available portents suggest the continued viability of anthropological research in this fascinating area, as new scholars join the ranks and, importantly, as Micronesians themselves begin to obtain graduate training in anthropology and closely related disciplines.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- ALKIRE, W. H. 1999. Cultural ecology and ecological anthropology in Micronesia. Pages 81–105 in R. Kiste and M. Marshall, eds. *American anthropology in Micronesia: An assessment*. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu.
- ALLEN, L. A. 1997. Enid "Atoll": A Marshallese migrant community in the mid-western United States. Ph.D. diss., University of Iowa, Iowa City.
- BARNETT, H. G. 1956. *Anthropology in administration*. Row, Peterson & Company, Evanston, Illinois.
- BEE, R. I. 1974. *Patterns and processes: An introduction to anthropological strategies for the study of change*. The Free Press, New York.
- BLACK, P. W. 1999. Psychological anthropology and its discontents: Science and rhetoric in postwar Micronesia. Pages 225–253 in R. Kiste and M. Marshall, eds. *American anthropology in Micronesia: An assessment*. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu.
- GOODENOUGH, W. H. 1963. *Cooperation in change: An anthropological approach to community development*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York.
- HANLON, D. 1999. Magellan's chroniclers? American anthropology's history in Micronesia. Pages 53–79 in R. Kiste and M. Marshall, eds. *American anthropology in Micronesia: An assessment*. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu.
- KISTE, R. C. 1993. New political statuses in American Micronesia. Pages 67–80 in V. S. Lockwood, T. G. Harding, and B. J. Wallace, eds. *Contemporary Pacific societies: Studies in development and change*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- . 1999. A half century in retrospect. Pages 433–467 in R. Kiste and M. Marshall, eds. *American anthropology in Micronesia: An assessment*. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu.
- MALINOWSKI, B. 1929. Practical anthropology. *Africa* 2 (1): 22–38.
- . 1930. The rationalization of anthropology and administration. *Africa* 3 (4): 405–430.
- MARSHALL, M. 1999. "Partial connections": Kinship and social organization in Micronesia. Pages 107–143 in R. Kiste and M. Marshall, eds. *American anthropology in Micronesia: An assessment*. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu.
- NERO, K. 1999. Missed opportunities: American anthropological studies of Micronesian arts. Pages 255–299 in R. Kiste and M. Marshall, eds. *American anthropology in Micronesia: An assessment*. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu.
- OLIVER, D. L. 1951. *Planning Micronesia's future: A summary of the United States Commercial Company's economic survey of Micronesia, 1946*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- PETERSEN, G. 1999. Politics in postwar Micronesia. Pages 145–195 in R. Kiste and M. Marshall, eds. *American anthropology in Micronesia: An assessment*. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu.
- REDFIELD, R., R. LINTON, and M. J. HERSKOVITS. 1936. Memorandum for the study

- of acculturation. *Am. Anthropol.* 38 (1): 149–152.
- REHG, K. I. 1995. The significance of linguistic interaction spheres in reconstructing Micronesian prehistory. *Oceanic Linguistics* 34 (2): 305–326.
- RICHARD, D. E. 1957. US Naval administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. 3 vols. Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Washington, D.C.
- ROSCOE, P. B. 1995. The perils of “positivism” in cultural anthropology. *Am. Anthropol.* 97 (3): 492–504.
- SCHNEIDER, D. M. 1969. Kinship, nationality and religion in American culture: Toward a definition of kinship. Pages 116–125 in R. F. Spencer, ed. *Forms of symbolic action*. Proc. Am. Ethnol. Soc., University of Washington Press, Seattle.
- STOCKING, G. W. 1992. *The ethnographer's magic and other essays in the history of anthropology*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.