APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE TTPI

by

Leonard Mason

Applied anthropology is a very personal endeavor for those of us who get involved in it. Within this paper I will mention the names of a number of American anthropologists to illustrate one kind of applied activity or another. Many of these who have contributed significantly to the application of anthropology in non-academic problem areas are at least as well regarded within the discipline of academic anthropology. Others, however, are not as well-known for writing in professional journals because they have directed their primary efforts toward applying their anthropological training to the better understanding of Micronesian concerns in the present context of rapid social and cultural change.

As preface to my remarks, I must cite three definitions in order to clarify the limits I wish to set for the scope of this report. The first has to do with the formal discipline of anthropology which can have different meanings for different people. It may include archeology, linguistics, and physical anthropology as well as social and cultural anthropology. The second definition will distinguish the application of anthropological training and experience toward problem-solving in contemporary Micronesia from the conduct of basic research aimed

primarily at enhancing the investigator's scholarly status and advancing the development of the discipline. In applied anthropology, furthermore, the practitioner usually is employed or works on contract with a client, who may represent the U.S. territorial administration, a Micronesian community or other indigenous authority, or an American organization in the private sector. Finally, I am defining Micronesia (i. e. TTPI) in the common usage today to include the Marshalls, Carolines, and northern Marianas, which are now better known politically as the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Republic of Belau, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, and the Federated States of Micronesia (Kosrae, Ponape, Truk and Yap). By definition of the Conference "History of the U.S. Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands," the U.S. Territory of Guam is not included.

THE PERIOD OF WORLD WAR II (1941-1945)

On the day after the Pearl Harbor attack, the faculty and graduate student staff of the Cross-Cultural Survey (CCS), Institute of Human Relations, Yale University, was diverted by order of its director, anthropologist George Murdock, to the task of collecting and organizing all available materials on the Japanese Mandated Islands. These materials included German, Japanese and American publications from the mid-19th century to the present, which could serve as a possible aid to

intelligence and occupation forces of the U.S. in the eventual rollback of Japanese defenses in that part of the Pacific. As a doctoral candidate at Yale, I worked on that project, until Murdock and two other anthropologists from CCS, Clellan Ford and John Whiting, were recruited by U.S. Naval Intelligence to produce handbooks on the Marshalls, East and West Carolines, and Marianas to be based on CCS files as well as other documents from Navy sources, in anticipation of a U.S. military government when the islands had been secured (U.S. Navy Dept. 1944a, 1944b, 1944c, 1944d). This was my introduction to a career in research and applied anthropology in the Marshall Islands specifically and Micronesia generally.

U.S. NAVY ADMINISTRATION (1946-1951)

After the occupation by U.S. forces of major islands in the Marshalls, Marianas, and western Carolines in 1944, and the surrender of Japan in 1945, the U.S. Navy assumed responsibility for administering the island populations. The School of Naval Administration (SONA) was established at Stanford University in April 1946 under contract with the Hoover Institute. Directed by anthropologist Felix Keesing, SONA's mission was the training of naval officers assigned to administrative duty in the islands, in the history, geography, and anthropology of Micronesian peoples (U.S. Navy Dept. 1948). While other countries with

colonial territories, notably the Dutch in the East Indies and the British in Africa, had already accumulated much expertise in the application of anthropology to the administration of indigenous peoples, this was a relatively new challenge for the U.S. Navy Department. Guam and American Samoa had been ruled as U.S. naval stations since the turn of the century without appreciable anthropological input, although Laura Thompson (Guam) and Felix Keesing (Samoa) had researched those areas before the war on their own initiative (Thompson 1941; Keesing 1934).

About the same time that SONA was getting underway, the Navy Department contracted with the U.S. Commercial Company (USCC), a government-sponsored trading company in the postwar Pacific, to conduct an Economic Survey of Micronesia intended as a basis for development planning. The project was directed by Douglas Oliver, an anthropologist who was then director of USCC in Honolulu, and it involved the field researches of four anthropologists, an economist, a geographer, and some fifteen specialists in natural resources for the best part of 1946. Their reports appeared as separate volumes but were summarized with recommendations in Planning Micronesia's Future, edited by Oliver (1951). The anthropologists on the team were John Useem (Palau and Yap), William Bascom (Ponape), Edward Hall (Truk), and myself (Marshalls).

In July 1947 the Japanese Mandated Islands formally became the U.S. Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (administered on behalf of the United Nations) and the Navy Military Government was renamed Civil Administration but continued under Navy control until 1951.

From 1947 to 1949, forty-two anthropologists, linguists, and geographers from twenty-one universities and museums in the U.S. conducted individual and team projects in the islands as part of the Coordinated Investigation of Micronesian Anthropology (CIMA). This program was organized by the Pacific Science Board (National Academy of Science-National Research Council) with financial assistance from the Office of Naval Research. Overall direction was provided by George Murdock, working with Harold Coolidge of the Pacific Science Board. The findings which emerged from this activity, while not properly of an applied nature, did result in some voluntary comments and recommendations by CIMA participants at the invitation of the Navy administration. Publication of research studies and dissertations was arranged individually by the researchers (Pacific Scientific Information Center 1963).

Another spin-off of Navy interest in recruiting civilian professional aid for its administration of the islands was the creation in 1947 by the Trust Territory High Commissioner (HICOM), who was also Commander-in-Chief Pacific (CINPAC), of an Advisory Committee on Education on Guam and the TTPI which was composed of Hawaii-based educators. Meetings of this group were held twice a year, once in the TTPI and once in Honolulu, when the committee met with Navy education administrators to discuss current problems in the Navy's elementary school program for Micronesians. Anthropologists on that committee were Kenneth Emory from the Bishop Museum and myself.

In 1948 the High Commissioner required a study of the plight of the Bikini Marshallese, then living on Rongerik Atoll after resettlement from Bikini in 1946 to enable U.S. testing of atomic weapons. At his invitation, I spent two weeks on Rongerik and recommended immediate removal of the community to a more suitable site (Mason 1948, 1950). The islanders were temporarily moved to Kwajalein and later that same year they chose Kili Island from several possible options in the Marshalls. In 1949 I was able to visit Kili briefly and reported favorably on their resettlement at that time.

Probably the most important development for applied anthropology during the Navy period was the establishment of a cadre of anthropologically trained men at the HICOM staff level and at five district centers in the Carolines and Marshalls. The first-named post was filled by Philip Drucker, then a Lt. Cdr. USNR. District anthropologists were Thomas Gladwin (Truk) who came out of the CIMA program, John L. Fischer (who followed Gladwin in Truk, and later went to Ponape), Frank Mahoney (who succeeded Fischer in Truk), John E. Tobin (Marshalls), Harry Uyehara (Palau), Shigeru Kaneshiro (who followed Uyehara in Palau), and Francis Mahoney (Yap). Their duties were a mix of short-term field studies of specific problems and service as intermediaries between the administration and island communities (Richard 1957, (vol.3):578-579).

In 1949 as an extension of CIMA and again financed by a grant for basic research from the Office of Naval Research, Scientific

Investigations in Micronesia (SIM) was launched by the Pacific Science Board. The central focus of SIM was the Coral Atoll Project, conducted in consecutive years in five Pacific atolls. Three of these were in American Micronesia and the others were sited in the British Gilberts and in French Polynesia. Investigative teams were made up predominantly from the natural sciences in order to insure a broad approach to coral atoll ecology. Anthropologist Edwin Burrows, who had taken part in CIMA on Ifaluk Atoll in the western Carolines, returned there for SIM, and I worked with the team assigned to Arno Atoll in the Marshalls. The researches were reported in professional journals with no obligation to Navy sponsorship (Pacific Scientific Information Center 1964).

In preparation for the planned transfer of responsibility for the Trust Territory administration from the Navy to the Department of the Interior in 1951, a Management Survey team was sent to Micronesia in 1950 to collect data for use in developing Interior's first budget proposal to the U.S. Congress for the islands' administration. The team consisted of specialists in finance, public works, personnel, and human services. I spent a month with this team, having the responsibility for health, education, and economic affairs. All district centers were visited in this attempt to assess the scope of the Navy's program and to plan for the take-over by Interior (Taylor, et al 1951).

U.S. INTERIOR ADMINISTRATION (1951-1961)

The first decade of Interior Department administration, while more truly a civilian administration compared with the Navy's prior Civil Administration, saw a continuation of many of the same policies in health, education, economic, and political development of Micronesians. Interior's budget for TTPI operations was a very modest one which permitted no significant efforts to change the general postwar life-style of islanders. Years later, critics who assessed this first period of Interior's administration from the vantage point of the 1960s and 1970s were prone to charging the TTPI government with deliberately maintaining an "anthropological zoo."

It is true that Interior did continue the staff and district anthropologist slots initiated by the Navy following the heyday of the CIMA program, but by the end of the 1950s all of these posts were either abolished for reasons of economy during the Eisenhower administration or were not refilled when incumbents left to continue their own careers elsewhere. It is also true that during this period the influence of the anthropologists on administrative policies waned perceptibly as the administrators themselves became more familiar with Micronesian customs and attitudes and decided they no longer needed advice from the anthropologists.

The first civilian Staff Anthropologist was Homer Barnett (on leave from the University of Oregon) who served in 1951-1953. He was followed by Saul Riesenberg (University of Hawaii) for one year after which Allan Smith (Washington State University) took over for two years. John deYoung, another anthropologist who earlier had done research in Thailand, followed Smith in 1956 and remained longer than any of the others, during which time the role of the post changed from that of anthropologist to program officer and close adviser to the High Commissioner. At the district level, a few new names cropped up — Richard Emerick in Ponape, Robert Solenberger briefly in Saipan, and Robert McKnight in Palau until he moved to TTPI headquarters in Saipan as Community Development Officer. DeYoung edited a series of Anthropological Working Papers from 1957 to 1961 with contributions written by anthropologists and their Micronesian assistants in the districts. In one volume on Land Tenure Patterns (1958), he noted that only one of the American authors still remained in the TTPI.

Under Barnett's direction, annual conferences were held with the district anthropologists. The main intent was to prepare, district by district, studies of the effect of acculturation on the islanders and the impact of government programs on their cultures. Duties of the district anthropologists continued to be both administrative and research-oriented, but the primary emphasis was on the former. As Field Trip Officers visiting the outlying islands, they were concerned with such matters as land claims, adjudication of minor disputes, community

court actions, and translation of directives from the government. Some years later, Barnett wrote about the problems facing anthropologists who work for administrators in a colonial context (1956). Another book, by a former district anthropologist assisted by his wife, became a useful introduction to traditional and modern customs of islanders in the Truk and Ponape districts where they had lived (Fischer 1957) and was used in briefing newly recruited TTPI employees from the U.S. mainland.

CONSULTANTS AND ACTIVISTS (1961-present)

After the demise of applied anthropology in the TTPI administration, the year 1961 marks the start of the Kennedy presidency and the acceleration of U.S. interest and financial aid in Micronesia. Field research continued at a brisk pace with new sources of funding from the National Science Foundation and other government and private organizations. Students of the older generation of anthropologists began to appear in the islands. Primary interest was retained in basic research in traditional cultures, but some investigations concentrated on changes accompanying modernization and carried implications for the resolution of problems affecting cultural stability and mental health in Micronesia. Some in this new generation of researchers, though generally lacking in formal client relationships, were aroused by perceived inequities in U.S. administration of the TTPI and they published or lobbied on behalf of their Micronesian study communities.

A five-year Study of Displaced Populations in the Pacific was launched in 1962 by Homer Barnett and his graduate students at the University of Oregon with National Science Foundation funding. Four communities in the TTPI were studied (there were others located elsewhere in the Pacific). These were Kili Island (the former Bikinians), Ujelang Atoll (resettled from Enewetak Atoll), Kapingamarangi colonists on Ponape Island, and the Lib Marshallese who had been relocated on Ebeye in Kwajalein Atoll. Publications on the first three were produced by Robert Kiste (1974, 1976) and Michael Lieber (1968).

Ward Goodenough (University of Pennsylvania) who had participated in CIMA in the 1940s later wrote a book, Cooperation in Change, which drew upon his experiences in Truk and the other islands in the Pacific for a searching analysis of the process of social and cultural change to be used in training Americans for employment overseas (1963). The U.S. Peace Corps program was introduced to Micronesia in 1966 and Goodenough, Frank Mahoney, and John Tobin were contracted by the Corps to administer the area briefings in orientation sessions for PC Volunteers which were conducted in Florida and in Hawaii. They recruited other anthropologists with Micronesian experience to assist as lecturers. In 1967 Frank Mahoney, then studying at Stanford for his doctorate, was employed as a consultant with a team from the Stanford Research Institute to prepare a study on planning for education and manpower in Micronesia requested by the TTPI administration (Platt and Sorensen 1967).

As part of a training program in field methods for community development planning, the University of Hawaii's Anthropology Department in 1967 and 1968 enrolled Micronesian employees of the TTPI for course credit along with Hawaii graduate students in projects in Majuro (Marshall Islands) and Moen (Truk) with financial support shared by the University (Graduate Division), East-West Center (Institute for Technical Interchange), and the TTPI administration. Micronesians and Americans were paired to work together on specific research problems suggested by the local communities. Reports of the research in each project were published by the Anthropology Department and copies were distributed widely in Majuro and Moen for local consumption (Mason 1967; Boggs 1969).

In 1973 the U.S. Air Force was challenged in court by the Marshallese of Enewetak (then living on Ujelang) in regard to a plan to conduct Pacific Cratering Experiments (PACE) on Enewetak to compare TNT blasts with nuclear weapon testing in 1947-1958 on that atoll. Robert Kiste, who had researched the Enewetak resettlement at Ujelang in 1964, was asked by the Air Force to be an intermediary in public hearings. He opposed the plan itself and later in Honolulu testified with John Tobin (who had researched the Enewetak resettlement as his doctoral dissertation at the University of California, Berkeley) and myself. PACE was cancelled in the face of public opposition (Kiste 1976).

Also in 1973, the Society for Applied Anthropology convened an "Across Generations" symposium at its annual meeting held in Tucson, Arizona. Several "classic cases" of applied anthropology in various

parts of the world were selected for review, each by a young applied scholar and an older applied anthropologist who had been directly involved. The intent was to critique the record toward a more standardized case reporting of such situations. The TTPI was one of seven cases examined. Roger Gale, then editor of the Friends of Micronesia Newsletter which aggressively supported the Micronesian struggle for self-determination vis-a-vis the United States, criticized the activities of applied anthropologists in the TTPI since World War II. I responded from my own knowledge and experience of that period. Both statements were later reprinted by permission in the newsletter of the Association for Anthropology in Micronesia (1973).

The personal policies of those in applied anthropology have at times led them along widely divergent paths in their relationships with Micronesians and with fellow anthropologists. Thomas Gladwin, a CIMA participant and the first TTPI district anthropologist, pioneered in studying Micronesian personality (Gladwin and Sarason 1953) and later applied his interest in cognitive processes to an excellent analysis of traditional navigation in Puluwat (1970). In the 1970s, however, he redirected his energies in Micronesia to become an active supporter and adviser for independence movements in Truk and Palau. He criticized American modernization policies in favor of safeguarding traditional values and subsistence economics, and in due time he came to deny his identification with applied anthropology as being the handmaiden of modernization.

At the other end of the spectrum, one may cite Felix Moos (University of Kansas) who in the course of his career in East Asian studies had formed close ties with officials in the U.S. Defense and State Departments. In the early 1970s, he was active in advising U.S. negotiators on future status issues with Micronesians. He also directed a program of graduate research at the University of Kansas assisted by a grant from the Defense Department to study the effects of rapid acculturation in U.S. Pacific territories, including Palau and the Marshalls where American strategic interests had been defined. His philosophy of "big power" relationships with the insular Pacific is well expressed in a book authored by a group of Kansas academicians and financed by private foundations in the U.S. and Japan, in which the benefits of closer links in economic and foreign policy matters between Japan and the U.S. and Micronesia and Papua New Guinea are explored (Goodman and Moos 1981).

Other anthropologists in the 1970s and early 1980s were addressing various social problems in Micronesia either as part of their own research or on contract with some administrative agency. Daniel Hughes (Ohio State University) and Sherwood Lingenfelter (State University of New York at Brockport) edited a volume of essays on political development which included studies of local politics and reviews at the territorial level (1974). Francis Mahoney, onetime district anthropologist in Yap and district administrator in Palau, later undertook two assignments requested by the TTPI administration, one on alcohol abuse among

Micronesian youth (1974) and one on the U.S. program for the aging in Micronesia (1975), the latter as a staffer with the South Pacific Commission.

Michael Levin, after completing his doctoral research on Eauripik Atoll in the western Carolines (1976) continued his interest in population dynamics in Pacific communities and joined the U.S. Bureau of the Census, supervising census counts in Micronesia in 1980. Mark Borthwick earned his doctorate by studying the aging process on Lukunor Atoll in the Truk District (1977) and later presented a paper on that topic at a conference on U.S. Federal Programs in Micronesia convened on Ponape by the Micronesian Seminar. Other conferences sponsored by the Micronesian Seminar, which is directed by Father Francis X. Hezel S. J. of the Catholic Mission on Truk, have been held on social, economic, and political issues with invited participation by knowledgeable anthropologists in the Micronesian field. Currently, Donald Rubenstein (University of Hawaii) is involved in a longterm study of suicide among Micronesian youth and is working closely with Geoffrey White (East-West Center) and Father Hezel.

In the late 1970s, William Alexander (Upsala College) conducted research on Ebeye Island in the Marshalls, focusing on wage labor and culture change associated with the neighboring Pacific Missile Range facility on Kwajalein Island (1978). He submitted a report at the request of the Marshall Islands government, but then became unpopular with both the TTPI and the U.S. Army authority on Kwajalein by testifying

adversely during a U.S. Congressional hearing about disadvantaged Marshallese in the local labor situation. He has since spoken on behalf of the "Focus on Micronesia" Coalition of the Pacific Conference of Churches at hearings of the U.N. Trusteeship Council in New York regarding conditions in the U.S. trust area.

Mac Marshall, who did his doctoral research on Namoluk Atoll, Truk District, returned in 1976 to investigate cultural changes experienced by outer islanders who had migrated to the district center on Moen. His principal publication from this research was on alcohol abuse among youth (1979).

In 1980-1981, I contracted with an organization representing the U.S. Administration on Aging to write three monographs on the status of the elderly in Micronesian jurisdictions, which I later summarized in a journal article (1982).

At the annual meeting of the Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania (ASAO) in 1978 at Asilomar, California, I organized a symposium on The Role of Anthropology in Contemporary Micronesia, aimed at developing a dialogue between Micronesians and anthropologists (applied and otherwise). This lasted for two and a half days and involved between thirty and forty anthropologists in discussion of four principal topics — cultural conservation, social problems, relations with Micronesians and their government representatives, and relations with American organizations and government agencies. Arrangements were made for four articulate Micronesians to present their views on the subjects debated.

A principal conclusion of the symposium was that anthropologists, whether conducting applied or basic research, must become more involved in the search for solutions to current problems in the TTPI in collaboration with Micronesian communities and their political leadership (ASAO 1978).

Earlier, from 1971 to 1973, a group of concerned anthropologists in the U.S. had organized the Association for Anthropology in Micronesia with the primary aim of exchanging information and opinion about (1) the study of traditional Micronesian languages and cultures, (2) the investigation of social and cultural changes taking place at the moment, and (3) the application of such researches to the amelioration of contemporary problems in the region. Toward those ends, a newsletter was published (six issues were produced over two years) which encouraged the participation of Micronesian reporting and editorializing about current happenings in anthropology in the islands. The newsletter (and the Association) ceased operations in 1974 for lack of time and interest on the part of American anthropologists to maintain such a dialogue. The ASAO symposium at Asilomar in 1978 was an attempt to revive such an exchange.

More recently, the American Anthropological Association (AAA) established a committee, consisting of Ward Goodenough (chair), Mark Borthwick, and myself, in response to a membership resolution adopted at the annual meeting of AAA in December 1982 to "review ... the probable effects of termination [of U.S. trusteeship] and implementation of the Compact [of Free Association] on the people and cultural systems of

Micronesia" (AAA 1983). The report, submitted by the committee to the AAA in September 1983, dealt at length with the changes which had taken place in the Trust islands, the strategic relations between Micronesian political entities and the U.S. government, and Micronesian concerns about their own identity and self-respect. While recognizing U.S. self-interest in the region as part of its defense planning in Asia and the Pacific, the report did place primary emphasis on this country's responsibility under the trusteeship agreement to promote the well-being of Micronesians and urged that this should be a continuing obligation during implementation of the Compact.

In March 1984, at the annual meeting of the Association for Social Anthropology (ASAO) on Molokai, Hawaii, a group of seventeen anthropologists with research experience in the TTPI met on an ad hoc basis to discuss the report. Opinions reportedly varied widely — from a position that anthropologists should not become involved in a matter so obviously political to charges that the report did not adequately convey the observations and perceptions of those experienced in Micronesia in regard to the U.S. government's failure to meet its responsibility under the trust. Although no formal action by ASAO was sought by the group, a letter signed by all present was sent to the AAA president recommending that the report be tabled. No further action on the entire matter has been reported to date.

At the same ASAO meeting, an all-day working session was co-chaired by Daniel Hughes (Ohio State University) and Stanley Laughlin (OSU Law School) on Emerging Legal Systems in Pacific Societies. The morning was taken up entirely with papers on Micronesia presented by anthropologists, other social scientists, and legal practitioners. The theme which developed was the blending of indigenous and introduced elements, which was proposed as the sub-title of a symposium on the same topic at the next ASAO meeting in 1985 and intended for publication in the ASAO monograph series (ASAO 1984).

REFLECTIONS ON THE CHANGING ROLE OF ANTHROPOLOGISTS

Some general comments about the working conditions faced by applied anthropologists may be in order at this point. Their relationships with more academically inclined members of the discipline present one kind of problem. Frankly, applied anthropology has never been well regarded in the profession and it usually adds little to the status of the individual within the discipline. Most anthropologists do not want to get involved, although nowadays some are seeking employment outside as jobs become increasingly difficult to locate in the academic setting. The more critical challenge, however, is the applied anthropologist's relationship with the client whether this be a government agency or other vested interest. The preparation of report material can be extremely

demanding. Academic language has to be avoided and brevity is required. There is constant pressure to complete research in a short space of time. An investigation that would ordinarily occupy an academic anthropologist for a year may have to be completed in a month or less. Sensitive material may have to be presented orally in closed sessions with the client, and this raises certain ethical questions if one wants to maintain credibility among his or her more academic colleagues.

The whole question of neutrality or impartiality is a constant problem. Micronesians suspect the investigator who works for the TTPI administration, and American officials question research findings when they obviously favor a Micronesian point of view. Some applied anthropologists have lost their effectiveness as intermediaries when they were perceived to be biased toward one side or the other. This problem is compounded today by the fact that there is no "Micronesian" clientele (if there ever was one!). Now one deals with Palauans or Marshallese or Ponapeans. But even this categorization is no longer realistic, for there are sharp differences which prevail within each ethnic group or political entity. Here is where the applied anthropologist begins to question the possibility of maintaining any objectivity when he or she gets caught up in the maelstrom of local politics.

Another change in the past decade presents a new challenge. Since TTPI administrative functions have been transferred to the several self-governing Micronesian entities, localization policies have reduced the numbers of Americans in office. When Americans dominated the island

administration, the anthropologist could at least deal with them in the framework of American social and political norms. Now it is necessary to relate to Micronesian incumbents who may resent or reject advice about island cultures and social traditions which are their own heritage, and which no anthropologist could ever claim to represent no matter how long he or she had studied the local customs. Many younger Micronesians have prepared themselves in education overseas to be lawyers, doctors, planners, and educators and have thereby reduced the need to hire expatriates in those professions. The pressure is increasing to require anthropologists doing research in the islands to include in their programs (and their budgets) opportunities for local people to acquire the expertise needed to study their own cultures.

The question that now concerns us is this — what should be the role of anthropologists conducting research in Micronesia? And here I include both the academic and the applied practioner. As part of my own philosophy while I continue to work in Micronesia, I will quote two paragraphs I wrote back in 1973, but first recognizing that Micronesians make the decisions today about their own destiny in terms of their own cultural values except as they compromise those ideals in order to gain what they may perceive as benefits through involvement in economic and political worlds of which Micronesia is only a very small part.

"I believe it is essential to keep in mind that each anthropologist is first a human being, with his own family culture, his own beliefs about his obligations to his country and to humanity, his own experience

with anthropological training in the graduate schools attended, his own abilities to relate to other people be they Micronesian or American in a field work situation, and his own evaluation of his responsibilities as an anthropologist. What performance he will produce in the field (or what he might be expected to produce) cannot be dictated by the fact of his profession as anthropologist or of his nationality as American. It is a complex thing which must be worked out by each individual according to the conditions under which he is working and how he responds at the time.

"Generalizations about appropriate behavior for anthropologists in Micronesia may be verbalized ..., but the final performance will emerge for better or for worse from the uniqueness of each anthropologist, from the individual person that he is. [Guidelines may be established], but I believe that the result in the field will be determined inevitably as a personal choice. We can only hope that the choice will be based on common sense and an awareness of all the circumstances, toward a performance which will reflect well on the integrity of the field worker and the dignity of the "Micronesian community" (1973:30-31).

REFERENCES

Alexander, William J. 1978. Wage labor, urbanization and culture change in the Marshall Islands: The Ebeye case. Ph.D. dissertation, New School for Social Research.

American Anthropological Association, Anthropology Newsletter. 1983. "Appointments made to implement 1982 legislation." Vol. 24, No. 5 (May), p. 1. (The text of the resolution appeared in the October 1983 issue, p. 16.)

Association for Anthropology in Micronesia, Newsletter. 1973. "Anthropological colonialism in Micronesia" by Roger Gale; "The anthropological presence in America Micronesia" by Leonard Mason. Col. 2, No. 1 (Spring). Honolulu.

Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania, Newsletter. 1978. "Report on symposium: the role of anthropology in contemporary Micronesia." No. 26 (Spring), pp. 1-4.

Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania, Newsletter. 1984. "Proposed symposium: Emerging legal systems ..." No. 51 (Summer), pp. 4-5.

Barnett, Homer F. 1956. Anthropology in Administration. Evanston, Illinois: Row-Peterson and Co.

Boggs, Stephen (ed.). 1969. The Truk Report: A Report on Field Training in Truk. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Dept. of Anthropology.

Borthwick, Mark. 1977. Aging and social change on Lukunor Atoll, Micronesia. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa.

Borthwick, Mark. 1979. "Cultural factors affecting the Truk District Aging Program." Conference on U.S. Federal Programs in Micronesia, Kolonia, Ponape, March 12-14, 1979. Truk: Micronesian Seminar.

deYoung, John E. (ed.). 1958. Land Tenure Patterns in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Vol. 1. Guam: Office of the High Commissioner, TTPI.

Fischer, John L. (with the assistance of Ann M. Fischer). 1957. The Eastern Carolines. Behavior Science Monograph. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files.

Gladwin, Thomas. 1970. East Is a Big Bird: Navigation and Logic on Puluwat Atoll. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gladwin, Thomas and Seymour Sarason. 1953. Truk: Man in Paradise. Viking Fund Publication in Anthropolgy, No. 20. New York: Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research.

Goodenough, Ward H. 1963. Cooperation in Change. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Goodman, Grant K. and Felix Moos (eds.). 1981. The United States and Japan in the Western Pacific: Micronesia and Papua New Guinea. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Hughes, Daniel T. and Sherwood G. Lingenfelter (eds.). 1974. Political Development in Micronesia. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Levin, Michael J. 1976. Eauripik population structure. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.

Lieber, Michael D. 1968. Porakiet: A Kapingamarangi Colony on Ponape. Eugene: University of Oregon, Dept. of Anthropology.

Keesing, Felix M. 1934. Modern Samoa: Its Government and Changing Life. London: Allen and Unwin.

Kiste, Robert C. 1974. The Bikinians: A Study of Forced Migration. Menlo Park, California: Cummings Publishing Co.

Kiste, Robert C. 1976. "The people of Enewetak Atoll vs. the U.S. Department of Defense." In Ethics and Anthropology: Dilemmas in Fieldwork. Michael A. Rynkiewich and James P. Spradley 9eds.). New York: John Wiley and Sons. pp. 61-80.

Mahoney, Francis B. 1974. "Social and cultural factors relating to the cause and control of alcohol abuse among Micronesian youth." Prepared for the Government of the TTPI under contract with James R. Leonard Associates, Washington, D.C.

Mahoney, Francis B. 1975. Report on the Aging Program in Micronesia: An Examination of the Operations of the Office on Aging, Trust Territory of the Pacific. Noumea, New Caledonia: South Pacific Commission.

Marshall, Mac. 1979. Weekend Warriors: Alcohol in a Micronesian Culture. Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing Co.

Mason, Leonard. 1948. "Rongerik report." Typescript. Prepared at the request of the High Commissioner, TTPI.

Mason, Leonard. 1950. "The Bikinians: A transplant population." Human Organization, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Spring), pp. 5-15.

Mason, Leonard. (ed.). 1967. The Laura Report: A Field Report of Training and Research in Majuro Atoll, Marshall Islands. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Dept. of Anthropology.

Mason, Leonard. 1973. "The anthropological presence in American Micronesia." Association for Anthropology in Micronesia Newsletter, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Spring), pp. 19-31.

Mason, Leonard. 1982. "Growing old in changing Micronesia." Pacific Studies, Vol. 6, No. 1 (Fall), pp. 1-25.

Oliver, Douglas L. (ed.). 1951. Planning Micronesia's Future: A Summary of the United States Commercial Company's Economic Survey of Micronesia. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Pacific Scientific Information Center, Bishop Museum. 1963. CIMA Bibliography. Honolulu.

Pacific Scientific Information Center. 1964. SIM Bibliography. Honolulu.

Platt, William J. and Philip H. Sorensen. 1967. Planning for Education and Manpower in Micronesia. Menlo Park, California: Stanford Research Institute.

Richard, Dorothy E. 1957. United States Naval Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. 3 vols. Washington, D.C.: Office of Naval Operations.

Taylor, Theodore W. et al. 1951. Management Survey of the Government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. 2 vols. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Territories.

Thompson, Laura. 1941. Guam and Its People: A Study of Culture Change and Colonial Education. San Francisco: American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations.

U. S. Navy Dept. 1944a. The Marshall Islands. Military Government Handbook (OpNav 50E-1). Washington, D. C.: Office of Naval Operations.

U. S. Navy Dept. 1944b. The East Caroline Islands. Civil Affairs Handbook Handbook (OpNav 50E-5). Washington, D. C.: Office of Naval Operations.

U. S. Navy Dept. 1944c. The West Caroline Islands. Civil Affairs Handbook Handbook (OpNav 50E-7). Washington, D. C.: Office of Naval Operations.

U. S. Navy Dept. 1944d. The Mandated Mariana Islands. Civil Affairs Handbook Handbook (OpNav 50E-8). Washington, D. C.: Office of Naval Operations.

U. S. Navy Dept. 1948. Handbook on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands: A Handbook for Use in Training and Administration. Washington, D. C.: Office of Naval Operations.

ADDENDUM

After the above article had been completed, I received a copy of a new publication which reports recent researches in health and social problems in contemporary Micronesia. Edited by Catherine Lutz (State University of New York, Binghamton), the collection includes articles by anthropologists, among others, who have conducted fieldwork in the islands. The anthropologists are William J. Alexander (Upsala College), Leslie and Mac Marshall (University of Iowa), Donald H. Rubenstein (East-West Center), Glenn Petersen (Baruch College, City University of New York), and Richard A. Marksbury (Tulane University). The publication was sponsored by Cultural Survival, a non-profit organization concerned with human rights issues among ethnic minorities and indigenous peoples throughout the world, as a timely commentary on the Micronesian situation just when status negotiations between the U. S. government and Micronesian entities are entering a final stage of review by the U. S. Congress.

(Lutz, Catherine, ed. Micronesia as Strategic Colony: The Impact of U. S. Policy on Micronesian Health and Culture. Occasional Paper, No. 12. Cambridge (Mass.): Cultural Survival, Inc. June 1984.)