

See in Appendix 5

Although these recent studies offer guides to further research, they, too, unfortunately, do not spell out explicitly testable hypotheses. In fact, a survey^{(1) (approx. 1977)} of a number of studies that mention missionary/anthropologist interactions revealed no testable hypotheses offered by any of the authors (Asad, 1975; Biedelman, 1974; Chagnon, 1968; Condominas, 1973; Firth, 1975; Freilich, 1970; Jarvie, 1964; Kuper, 1973; Nida, 1966; Oberg, 1972; Pelto, 1970; Pelto and Pelto, 1973; Powdermaker, 1966; Salamone, 1974, 1976 ; Tonkinson, 1974; Wax, 1971 ; Williams, 1967; Wolcott, 1972). Their works, however, provided a basis for testable hypotheses which I (Salamone, 1977, 1979) have explored. So far as I could ascertain, my studies were the only ones to seek to spell out explicitly testable hypotheses. Although the findings could not be conclusivse, they were suggestive and encourage further research. In general, this work seeks to explore the proposition that competition for scarce resources is predictive of missionary/anthropologist hostility *and ambivalence.*

STATEMENT OF THEORY

Miller (1970) has suggested that goal-discrepancy accounts for missionary frustration and consequent problems. Such an approach offers an entree into understanding the

problems encountered by anthropologists and missionaries in field conditions. Anthropologists, first, often resemble missionaries . Neil Johnson (personal communication) has noted the similarity between the two professions. Members of both seek to spread the truth of their beliefs. Both are expatriates , marginal to their own cultural systems, and usually not integrated into their host's system either.

Second, anthropologists often cannot accomplish all they set out to do. The gap , furthermore, between reality and potentiality is often too great to be rationally coped with. In such cases, missionaries provide convenient scapegoats. Even the most helpful missionaries cannot devote total attention to young anthropologists. Even the most anthropologically sympathetic missionaries are not in the field² to gather ethnographic data. Quite simply, missionaries and anthropologists seek to attain different goals.

However helpful, goal-discrepancy, nevertheless, is but a methodological approach to the problem. A more general theoretical framework is provided by "action theory" as outlined by Joan Vincent (1978). Actors seek to manipulate the ^{existing} structure in order to attain desired goals.

2. I could have, for example, had no better hosts in Nigeria than the Dominican Fathers, especially Father Peter Ottilio. I, however, well remember my anger and frustration at not being brought along on every trip they took and not being informed of all their actions. Such feelings, of course, were irrational, albeit understandable.

Action theory does not neglect the issue of either relative power or access to it. Transactions, indeed, seek to maximize gains and minimize knowledge according to considerations of power and knowledge.

From the perspective of power, then, the concept of goal-discrepancy is derivable from action theory. It is but one specific possibility from the wider range of possibilities in which actors cannot attain their goals. Salamone and Swanson (1979) provide another example in their study of ethnicity as a specific subset of identity. More specifically, goal discrepancy concerns a gap between achieved and achievable, between ends and means.

Relationships between anthropologists and missionaries accord easily with such a framework, for they concern two categories of actors seeking to attain goals. At times those goals are incompatible. Never, however, are they perfectly compatible. A series of hypotheses are derivable from the general theory and its relationship with the specific matters under study; namely, missionary/ anthropologist relationships in the field.

HYPOTHESES

In general, it is hypothesized that the greater the power a missionary has in determining an anthropologist's success, the greater the hostility between them. Missionary power is measured in terms of superiority of language facility, resources, access to informants, and knowledge of the relevant socio-cultural resources and factors necessary to anthropological success. Anthropological success is defined as collection of data sufficient to complete a dissertation or monograph.

It is important, moreover, to note that "fundamentalist" missionaries and "fundamentalist" anthropologists are most likely to clash in the field. The category "fundamentalist missionary", note well, includes not only missionaries belonging to evangelical sects but also those individuals of more established churches, such as Roman Catholics or Anglicans, who personally are fundamentalist or charismatic in persuasion. Although such a coding is not "neat", it more accurately reflects reality. I personally had difficulties with only one missionary, a Roman Catholic. Upon later reflection it became clear that his somewhat fundamentalist interpretation of Catholicism was closer to evangelical churches than to the more urbane Catholicism held by his colleagues. We had perceived each other as rivals for the minds of the indigenous people.

Do these "fundamentalist" = close of = beyond those?

Such mutual antagonism is in conformity with the predicted outcome of a meeting between fundamentalist missionaries and fundamentalist anthropologists. I borrow the latter term from Neil Johnson (personal communication) who argues that most missionary/anthropologist hostility is attributable to similarities rather than differences. The fundamentalist anthropologist, like the fundamentalist missionary, believes he or she has sole possession and access to "THE TRUTH". Those who disagree or impede, consequently, are regarded as the enemy. Freilich's (1970) concept of the "romantic anthropologist" complements that of the "fundamentalist", for the romantic anthropologist tends to be young, work on a face-to-face level, short of funds, and idealistic.

Combining the two concepts leads to a final set of hypotheses in which missionary/anthropologist relationships are seen to be determined, on the whole, by the manner in which a number of personal factors facilitate or impede access to an anthropologist's self-defined goals in the field. Among those factors are: age, sex, language ability, practice of religion, financial security, previous experience, accompaniment of spouse and children, and location of study. The type of missionary encountered and his or her knowledge are also important variables.

It is important to note that many missionaries make use of anthropological knowledge. My own research has uncovered an eager readiness to cooperate with my investigation. Two examples will suffice to stand for the whole. The Maryknoll Fathers in Ossining, New York, require all their seminarians to spend a summer doing field research in the New York area under the direct guidance of anthropologists. The Protestant Fuller Theological Seminary has a curriculum heavily influenced by anthropologists and boasts well-trained anthropologists and linguists among its faculty members.

Such reality, however, is often lost among the day-to-day demands of fieldwork and the psychological reality of the rite de passage. It is held that for young anthropologists that psychological reality has greater bearing than the objective world, a point of great epistemological moment. (Cf. Salamone 1979 .) It is vital, therefore, that anthropologists continue to seek out factors and situations that contaminate the objectivity of the fieldwork upon which our science is built.

FACTORS INVOLVED IN MISSIONARY/ANTHROPOLOGIST
HOSTILITY

Encouragement of Missionaries

In general, anthropologists oppose missionary endeavors (138 of 202 or 68 per cent).³ It is possible, however, to refine that generalization and specify which factors are related to such opposition and enable us to predict the type of relationship between missionaries and anthropologists in given situations.

In conformity with the prediction that hostility is associated with power over an anthropologist's attainment of goals is the finding that 100 per cent (11) of those anthropologists strongly committed to the use of fieldwork to test theory are opposed to the encouragement of missionary work and 71 per cent (34 of 48) in the next category, those who are committed to using fieldwork to test theory but not so strongly as the first group, oppose missionary encouragement. Significantly, 79 per cent (26 Of 33) of those opposed to the use of fieldwork to test theory are

*Tables 7
63 7*

3. Questionnaires were sent to field anthropologists listed in the American Anthropological Association's Guide to Departments . To locate those not listed advertisements were placed in a number of professional journals. I began a newsletter to obtain further advice and participation. Personal contact with colleagues followed. Finally, I sent a long letter to the AAA Fellows Newsletter (March, 1976), responding to various aspects of criticism and seeking further participation. This survey cannot report all the findings or list all the tables, issues, or computer pages.

also opposed to the encouragement of missionary endeavors. Members of both categories, those committed to one position or the other, are more vulnerable to missionary power than anthropologists who display flexibility in the field.

The theme of dependence and hostility is supported when the personal nature of fieldwork is taken into account. In general, intensity of feeling toward field work is a key indicator of anthropological attitude toward missionaries. In conformity with that position is the fact that 17 Of 20 (85 per cent) of those anthropologists who feel there is no need to like one's informants are strongly opposed to missionary endeavors. The pattern of responses regarding the use of personal techniques and hostility to missionaries strongly supports the contention that they are related.

Thus, hostility is associated with use of geneologies (44 of 59,75 per cent), psychological testing (13 of 14, 93 per cent), sole use of participant observation (15 of 22, 68 per cent), and non-structured interviewing (83 of 136, 61 per cent). An apparent contradiction to the thesis is found in the fact that 23 of 34^(67 per cent) anthropologists who engage in a significant amount of archival work strongly oppose missionary endeavors. From personal experience, I can attest that such a contradiction is only apparent. First, missionaries control access to a significant amount of data of interest to anthropologists. Second, an anthropologist is likely to have the same experience I did in finding a note in the records ordering that he be kept out of the archives.

Needs clarification w. Aug. to compare p

Support for the relationship between personal field techniques and hostility to missionaries comes from examining the other side; namely, support for missionaries. All ten anthropologists who strongly support missionaries use structured interviewing, an object^{ive} technique. Thirty of the 47 people (64 per cent) who are neutral regarding missionary endeavors use mostly structured interviewing in their field work. Finally, the thesis is supported in a negative sense by noting the relationship between the opposition to objective techniques and hostility toward missionaries.

← 49 of 53^{92 percent} people who least use the ultra objective techniques of mapping and census taking strongly oppose missionary work, as do 85 of 112 (76 per cent) anthropologists who do not use questionnaires.

In conformity with Freilich's "romantic" anthropologist and Johnson's "fundamentalist" one is the finding that those anthropologists who best get along with ~~missionaries~~ ^{missionaries} ~~anthropologists~~ are entrepreneurial types, those in ~~the field~~ ^{The Field} for very practical reasons and who openly admit that such is the case. 10 of the 13 people (77 per cent) who show greatest support for missionaries find fieldwork not enjoyable but profitable and/or challenging while 54 of 74 (73 per cent) who find it enjoyable oppose missionary endeavors. Further in line with the

insights of Freilich and Johnson is the fact that greatest opposition to missionary endeavors comes from those anthropologists in the field from 7-12 months (¹² ~~26~~ of ¹² ~~59~~, ¹⁰⁰ per cent) and greatest support comes from those who have spent the longest time in the field^{over 6 years} (8 of 39, 21%). The fact that those with no real language skills (~~8 of 10, 80 per cent~~) strongly support missionaries while ~~only~~ 11 of 15 (73 per cent) who use their own language support them is further verification of the hypotheses offered, for those with poor language facilities who admit such are those more likely to be engaged in "objective" research while those with fluent language skills tend to be engaged in more subjective research. ~~4 of 5~~ ^{All} Asian anthropologists (^{6 of 6, 100 percent} ~~80 per cent~~) report hostile relations with missionaries. I believe such would be the case with other indigenous anthropologists. The literature of former colonial peoples makes my conviction even stronger. (Cf. Owusu, 1978 ; Asad, 1975; and numerous others.)

Further support is derived from the study of three more field variables: the study of specific relationships, occupation of the group under study, and the status of the group(s) under study. 84 of 122 (69 per cent) of anthropologists who study specific relationships in the field oppose missionary endeavors as do 4 of 5 (80 per cent)

who study craft groups, 20 of 25 (80 per cent) with industrial groups, 9 of 15 (60 per cent) of hunting and gathering groups, 59 of 74 (70 per cent) of agricultural groups, 28 of 42 (67 per cent) with horticulturalists, and 18 of 27 (67 per cent) who study other categories of people.

Finally, 48 of 73 (66 per cent) who study minority groups, 42 of 50 (84 per cent), 12 of 26 (46 per cent), and 25 of 35 (71 per cent) who study isolated groups oppose missionary endeavors. Interestingly, those forced

to see both sides of an issue, those who study majority and minority groups are more tolerant of missionaries while those study the oppression majority groups exercise on minority groups are least tolerant (42 of 50, 84 per cent, oppose them)

Finally, men are far more likely than women to have hostile feelings toward missionaries (109 of 159, 69 per cent of men as opposed to 27 of 43, 63 per cent). When age is included the picture becomes even sharper. Young people oppose missionaries significantly more frequently than any other category. Men under thirty oppose missionaries in the following manner, 15 of 17, or 88 per cent.

In sum, all factors indicate that opposition to missionary endeavors does tend to be strongly associated with perceived competition for scarce resources. The young "romantic" or "fundamentalist" male anthropologist is far more likely to use those types of field techniques most likely to bring him into competition with missionaries for use of scarce resources, namely, people. When location of research, occupation, and so forth, are considered, the

relationship between competition and hostility becomes very clear. Consideration of attitudes toward missionary harm, missionary knowledge, and the religious tradition of the missionary makes the connection even more patent.

Attitudes Toward Missionary Harm

The majority (110 of 188, 59 per cent) of anthropologists believe that missionaries have harmed cultures while only 17 per cent believe that they have not. That broad statement can be broken down to reveal some interesting facts. The more isolated, or rural, the group studied, the harsher the judgment on missionaries (76 of 120, 63 per cent). Hostility decreases as the location moves from a "mixed" area (24 of 41, 59 per cent) to an urban area (10 of 27, 37 per cent).

Lending support to the basic hypothesis is the fact that hostility toward missionaries also decreases as a researcher moves away from studying isolated groups and moves toward more complex situations. Thus greatest hostility is shown in cases where anthropologists study majority groups (36 of 51, 70 per cent), and decreases as little ethnic differentiation (6 of 9, 67 per cent), minority status (44 of 68, 65 per cent), homogenous group (21 of 36, 58 per cent), or both (6 of 26, 23 per cent) are studied.

(5 of 26, ca 20% strongly support them, only 12 of 26 oppose them)

61 per cent of all males responding (96 of 157) believe that missionaries harm cultures while only 51 per cent (21 of 41) women responding agree with that assessment. Furthermore, 29 per cent (12 of 41) of the women and only 14 per cent of the men (22 of 157) disagree with the conclusion. A practical consequence with epistemological implications is that women are more likely than men to gather data from missionary sources (37 of 41, 90 per cent, to 103 of 157, 65 per cent).

As anticipated, age is associated with evaluation of missionary harm. In general, evaluation of missionary harm is associated with younger anthropologists. Any anthropologist who has been in the field more than one time most likely would agree with my own experience in which my early harsh judgments were ~~quite~~ ^{consequently} tempered by the third or fourth expedition. The data support those ethnographic impressions. 76 per cent of anthropologists under 30 perceive missionaries as bringing harm to societies (13 of 17) while only 42 per cent of those over age 61 condemn missionaries (5 of 12).

Interestingly, in light of the overall condemnation of missionary work, no segment of the anthropological community condemned any specific missionary work. There was consistent support, or at least neutrality, on schools, hospitals, dispensaries, and other specific material works by missionaries. The findings suggest strong ambivalence in missionary/anthropologist relationships as Podermaker(1966), and Salamone (1977,1979) have suggested.

Some teasing out of the threads of ambivalence find interesting religious variables associated with an anthropologist's relationships with missionaries. Jews (14 of 17, 82 per cent) show greatest adherence to a negative assessment of missionary work, followed quite interestingly by anthropologists who label themselves "fundamentalist protestants" (6 of 11, 64 per cent), those with no religious affiliation (53 of 85, 62 per cent), Roman Catholics (13 of 23, 57 per cent), Protestants (13 of 33, 39 per cent), and "others", mostly Anglicans, (11 of 24, 36 per cent). No Muslims were in the sample, but the 2 Hindus strongly agreed with the assessment that missionaries harmed cultures.

Finally, practice of religion is significantly associated with hostility toward missionary work. Those with no religious affiliation at all (50 of 78, 64 per cent) and those with religious affiliation but who do not practice their religion at all (21 of 33, 64 per cent) are harshest in their judgment of missionaries, followed by those who practice religion irregularly (21 of 37, 57 per cent). As expected those who practice their religion regularly (21 of 43, 48 per cent) are less severe in their judgment. It is worthy of note that 16 of the 33 ^(48 percent) who have a religious affiliation but do not practice it are not simply opposed to missionaries but strongly agree that they bring harm.

Missionary Knowledge

It is revealing to examine anthropological evaluations of missionary knowledge and then to compare them with their acknowledgments of their use of such sources. In general, such examination sustains the basic premise of this work: that the greater the use of missionary sources the greater the hostility exhibited toward missionary work.

In general, most anthropologists state that missionary knowledge of a group whom they studied is at least adequate (118 of 167, 71 per cent) while only 40 of 167 (24 per cent) term ~~them~~ ^{missionaries} ignorant. When location is related to evaluation of missionary knowledge, it is clear that there is a significant difference in such evaluation depending on where the research is carried out. People working in mixed areas (16 of 31, 52 per cent) were least impressed with mission knowledge while ^{those who worked in it} rural people (70 of 110, 73 per cent) and in urban areas (17 of 19, 89 per cent) were more impressed.

Related to location is occupation. The same type of evaluation according to relative isolation or its lack is revealed. Specifically, anthropologists studying very isolated groups, hunters and gatherers (12 of 15, 80 per cent), and those studying industrial groups (16 of 20, 80 per cent), rated missionary knowledge most highly while the ratings diminished in the mixed range of occupations - hoe ^{farming} (27 of 38, 71 per cent), agriculture (51 of 72, 72 per cent), other (10 of 17, 59 per cent), craft (1 of 4, 25 per cent).

There are two other ways of viewing the same question, the question of the relationship of the relative isolation of the missionary contact and evaluation of mission knowledge. The first is to ascertain the relationship between the status of the group studied and such evaluation. The second is to examine evaluations in respect to the area of the world in which contacts were made.

In the first instance the relationship noted in the preceding sections holds; namely, people in isolated and very heterogeneous areas rate missionary knowledge highly while those in mixed situations are less impressed with their knowledge. The scale goes from high approval from those who study only a majority group (31 of 40, 78 per cent), a group in a homogenous area (23 of 31, 74 per cent), a minority group (44 of 65, 68 per cent), both (13 of 21, 62 per cent), and groups with little ethnic differentiation (3 of 5, 60 per cent). The last is a bit of an anomaly, but the small number involved and the fact that only one person rates missionaries ignorant helps explain its not being ranked after homogeneous groups. In conformity with the findings is the fact that those who worked with both majority and minority groups rated missionaries as ignorant more than members of any other groups (8 of 21, 38 per cent).

Anthropological rating of missionary knowledge reveals some interesting relationships when viewed in terms of geographic area. The greatest respect for it comes from East and South Africa (11 of 11), the Middle East (2 of 2), and Europe (1 of 1). The least admiration comes from South America (8 of 19, 42 per cent) as well as the most scorn (11 of 19, 58 per cent). The other areas range from high rankings in Oceania (20 of 22, 91 per cent), Asia (31 of 41, 76 per cent), "other" (5 of 7, 71 per cent) to lower ratings elsewhere - North America (25 of 43, 58 per cent), and West Africa (7 of 13, 54 per cent). Such findings are also in conformity with expectations.

Those in the field for a very brief time, 2-6 months, and those there for the greatest time, over 5 years, are most critical of missionary knowledge. Most approving are those who have been in the field from 2-5 years (22 of 27, 82 per cent). Least disapproving are those in the field from 7-12 months (4 of 31, 12 per cent). The findings follow expected patterns.

Similarly, those with limited language skills rank missionary knowledge more strictly (17 of 32 approve, 53 percent) than those who speak it not at all (15 of 18, 79 per cent), excellently (64 of 88, 73 per cent), passably (12 of 14, 86 per cent), or as their native tongue (7 of 11, 64 per cent). In brief, those with limited experience and those with a great deal tend to be harsher on missionaries than others. Those with a great deal of experience tend to be either indigeneous people or those

(4 of 14, 29%)
(18 of 26, 50%)

who are more indigeneous than people born in the area.⁴

Those under thirty (7 of 11, 64 per cent) and between 41-50 (23 of 37, 61 per cent) or 51-60 (15 of 23, 64 per cent) are least impressed with missionary knowledge while those most impressed are either between 31-40 (66 of 86, 77 per cent) or over 61 (8-11, 73 per cent). Those most critical fall between 41-50 (12 of 37, 32 per cent).

Finally, a greater percentage of woman approve of missionaries (23 of 32, 72 per cent) than do men (96 of 136, 70 per cent) and a lesser per cent term them "ignorant" (6 of 32, 19 per cent as opposed to 34 of 136, 25 per cent).

Sufficient data have been presented to establish the fact that most anthropologists have respect for missionary knowledge of the people among whom they are working. Given the exceptions to that statement - those over 61, those in the field over 5 years - there still remain a significant number of people with regard for such knowledge. Not

surprisingly, then, most anthropologists have used such
4. The issue is discussed in a paper in preparation on field work techniques. I discussed it in Salamone (1979). The phenomenon is known among missionaries as Father John Rich (personal communication) has made clear. Father Rich, a Maryknoll missionary, supervises a Missionary Renewal Program in which anthropology has a favorable position. My data, furthermore, strongly support the contention, but to go into detail would take us too far astray.

sources in their work (115 of 165, 70 per cent). They have done so whether working in rural (77 of 110, 70 per cent), urban (16 of 22, 73 per cent), or "mixed" (22 of 33, 67 per cent) areas. It is a clear sign of ambivalence, then, to note that only 86 of 156, 55 per cent, gave credit to missionaries. It is even more clear when it is noted that 56 of 156 ^(36%) maintain that they never received any information from missionary sources, a statement clearly at odds with all preceding data. The worst offenders, as anticipated, are those anthropologists under 30 (3 of 11) only 27 per cent of whom gave credit to missionaries. Basically, there was increasing credit given with age reaching a high of 73 per cent (8 of 11) for those over 61. The fact that that group rated missionary knowledge most severely did not deter it from having the intellectual honesty to acknowledge its sources.

The Religious Tradition of the Missionary

It is clear that the greatest problems occur between those missionaries and anthropologists who are "fundamental" in orientation. By "fundamentalist" I include all those who believe that they are in possession of "The Truth" and that those who disagree with them are not only wrong but

also wrong-headed and evil. Such a definition easily encompasses not only a certain type of missionary but also a certain type of anthropologist.

As Neil Johnson (personal communication) so cogently observes, "Missionaries and anthropologists often disagree not because they are so different but because they are so similar." Such anthropologists have trouble virtually with anyone with whom they come into contact but when such anthropologists, who believe that anthropology is a religious experience and holds the key to the truth regarding the salvation of mankind, come into contact with fundamentalist missionaries, then competition for scarce resources is not only at a premium but may take on the dimensions of a crusade.

A majority of anthropologists (126 of 174, 73 per cent) report cordial relationships with missionaries. When that figure is analyzed , however , hints as to which types of missionary are easier to work with emerge. Thus, 19 of 39 ^(49%) anthropologists who work with those whom they label either Baptist or Fundamentalist do not have open and cordial relationships with them. Conversely, anthropologists who work with Interdenominationalists (13 of 15, 87 per cent), Roman Catholics (52 of 63, 83 per cent), Orthodox Catholics (3 of 4, 75 per cent) Protestants (36 of 50, 72 per cent), and "others" (26 of 3, 67 per cent)

enjoy open and cordial relationships.

Some further insight into field relationships is granted when a series of other associations is explored. Those anthropologists working in areas where Orthodox (3 of 4, 75 per cent) or Roman Catholic missionaries (26 of 62, 58%) are present are most likely to use such sources. Those working among Interdenominational missionaries are least likely to use them as sources (7 of 14, 50 per cent). Baptists and Fundamentalists (15 of 38, 39 per cent) were rated as "ignorant" in their knowledge of the groups in their areas. 25 of 36 (69 per cent) admit that, nevertheless, such missionaries had influenced their studies. In spite of their admission, however, 18 of 35 (51 per cent) failed to give them any credit whatsoever in their published writings. a fact in line with Nida's (1966) complaint that anthropologists routinely use missionary contacts to aid their research and then fail to demonstrate the barest rudiments of common scholarly decency or civility. In contrast, 27 of 51 (53 per cent) anthropologists stated that no missionary influence from their contacts with Protestant missionaries is shown in their works but over 50 per cent of them dedicated their works or mentioned missionaries in their dedications (26 of 51).

Generally cordial relationships are shown in the fact that 42 of 56 (75 per cent) of the anthropologists who worked in Roman Catholic areas and 2 of 3 (67 per cent) of those in Orthodox areas credited them with aid. Roman Catholic missionaries, in fact, seem able to get along with anthropologists of any or no religious affiliation.

In isolated areas among homogeneous peoples anthropologists are most likely to use both missionaries and their converts as sources of information (17 of 29, 62 per cent). It is in those isolated areas that anthropologists most frequently find either Interdenominational (12 of 14, 85 per cent) or Baptist/Fundamentalist (20 of 37, 57 per cent) missionaries. Given the following facts it is easy to discover reasons why the typical model of missionary/anthropologist hostility is that of the fundamentalist missionary and anthropologist: 19 of 39 (49 %) anthropologists working in Fundamentalist areas were between 31-40, 24 of 38 (75 per cent) had no religious affiliation, 32 of 38 (84 per cent) are married, 4 of 8 (50 per cent) ^{divorced people} worked in those areas, 26 of the 39 responding (57 per cent) brought their spouses with them at least on one of their trips, 5 of 15^(33%) anthropologists studying hunting and gathering groups do so in Fundamentalist areas, all five of these anthropologists use missionary sources "heavily", and 22 of 38 (57 per cent) were in the field over two years (10 of the 38, 32 per cent, were in the field over 5 years.

Finally, it is necessary to point out again that not all "fundamentalist" missionaries are Baptist or Fundamentalist. There are many so labeled who are not "fundamentalist" in a pejorative sense just as there are missionaries who are Catholic, Protestant, or Orthodox who are indeed "fundamentalists". I met Catholic, Protestant and Muslim missionaries who in fact were fundamentalists. (Cf. Salamone 1980.) It is unfortunate that no data were gathered on Muslim, Hindu, or other missionaries not in the Western tradition from the questionnaire.

Similarly, not all "fundamentalist" or "romantic" anthropologists are young. The data on missionaries who work with Baptists/Fundamentalists demonstrate that. In conformity with other data they show that older anthropologists working in isolated areas can also be "fundamentalistic" in their orientation.

CONCLUSIONS

The basic theoretical position of this paper has been that derived from action theory. Missionaries and anthropologists are actors striving to achieve goals fundamental to their self-identities. No matter

how congenial the individual actors the very structure of the situation in which they interact virtually guarantees that there will be some conflict. Some situations, moreover, are indicative of more hostility than others. In general, those situations are ones in which an unequal distribution of power in favor of the missionary exists.

It is argued, furthermore, that the "theory" of goal discrepancy is but a methodological derivative from action theory. Action theory's emphasis on transactions and the consequent manipulation of the structure in order to derive power, however power is situationally defined, lend it a greater power than any methodological position, however useful such a position may be.

In order to test hypotheses derived from an action theory perspective four areas of missionary/anthropologist interactions were examined: 1) encouragement of missionaries, 2) attitudes toward missionary harm, 3) missionary knowledge, and 4) the religious tradition of the missionary. Examination of those four areas clearly reveal patterns that support the major hypothesis, namely...that the greater the power a missionary has in determining an anthropologist's success, the greater the hostility between them. A corollary of that hypothesis is that "fundamentalist" missionaries and "fundamentalist" anthropologists, because so much alike, have greatest problems in the field.

*no does not follow.
or non-fundamentalist missionary + non-fundamentalist anthropologist
→ perspective as w*

TABLE A (CONTINUED)
ENCOURAGEMENT OF MISSIONARIES

| | FAVOR | OPPOSED | OTHER |
|-------------------|-------|---------|--------|
| OCCUPATION | | | |
| Craft | 0 | 4-80% | 1-20% |
| Industrial | 2-8% | 20-80% | 3-12% |
| Hunting/Gathering | 0 | 9-60% | 6-40% |
| Agriculture | 3-4% | 59-70% | 22-26% |
| Horticulture | 6-14% | 28-67% | 8-19% |
| Other | 0 | 18-67% | 9-33% |
| STATUS | | | |
| Minority | 5-7% | 48-66% | 20-23% |
| Majority | 0 | 42-84% | 8-16% |
| Both | 5-19% | 12-46% | 9-35% |
| Isolated | 2-6% | 25-71% | 8-23% |
| SEX | | | |
| Male | 12-8% | 109-69% | 38-23% |
| Female | 3-8% | 29-67% | 11-25% |
| AGE | | | |
| Under 30 | 1-6% | 15-88% | 1-6% |
| 31-40 | 5-5% | 70-73% | 21-22% |
| 41-50 | 4-7% | 39-71% | 12-22% |
| 51-60 | 0 | 11-50% | 11-50% |
| 61 + | 5-42% | 3-25% | 4-33% |

TABLE B

| | | MISSIONARY HARM | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--------|---------|
| | | YES | NO | OTHER |
| OVERALL | | 110-59% | 32-17% | 42-24% |
| LOCATION | Rural | 76-63% | 21-18% | 23-19% |
| | Mixed | 24-59% | 7-17% | 10-24% |
| | Urban | 10-37% | 4-15% | 13-58% |
| STATUS OF GROUP | Majority | 36-70% | 8-16% | 7-14% |
| | Little Ethnic Difference | 6-67% | 1-11% | 2-22% |
| | Minority | 44-65% | 12-18% | 12-18%* |
| | Homogeneous | 21-58% | 9-25% | 6-17% |
| | Both | 6-23% | 4-15% | 16-52% |
| SEX | Male | 96-61% | 22-14% | 61-25% |
| | Female | 21-51% | 12-29% | 10-20% |
| AGE | Under 30 | 13-76% | 1-6% | 3-18% |
| | 31-40 | 57-61% | 13-14% | 23-25% |
| | 41-50 | 30-56% | 13-24% | 10-20% |
| | 51-60 | 11-48% | 4-17% | 8-35% |
| | 61+ | 5-42% | 3-25% | 4-23% |

TABLE B (CONTINUED)

| | | MISSIONARY HARM | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--------|---------|
| | | YES | NO | OTHER |
| RELIGION | | | | |
| | Jewish | 14-82% | 0 | 3-18% |
| | Fund. Prot. | 7-64% | 3-27% | 1-9% |
| | No Affiliation | 53-62% | 11-13% | 21-25% |
| | Roman Catholic | 13-57% | 4-17% | 6-26% |
| | Protestant | 13-39% | 13-39% | 7-22% |
| | Others | 11-36% | 3-13% | 10-42%* |
| | Hindus | 2-100% | 0 | 0 |
| PRACTICE OF RELIGION | | | | |
| | No affiliation | 50-64% | 11-14% | 17-22% |
| | Affil., no practice | 21-64% | 6-18% | 6-18%* |
| | Irregular practice | 21-57% | 5-14% | 11-30%* |
| | Regular practice | 21-48% | 12-28% | 10-23%* |

*Rounding Error

TABLE C
MISSIONARY KNOWLEDGE

| | ADEQUATE OR BETTER | "IGNORANT" | OTHER |
|--------------------------|--------------------|------------|-------|
| OVERALL | 118-71% | 40-24% | 9-5% |
| LOCATION | | | |
| "Mixed" | 16-52% | 14-45% | 1-3% |
| Rural | 70-73% | 25-23% | 5-4% |
| Urban | 17-89% | 1-5% | 1-5%* |
| OCCUPATION | | | |
| Hunting and Gathering | 12-80% | 3-20% | 0 |
| Horticulture | 27-71% | 11-29% | 0 |
| Agriculture | 51-72% | 16-22% | 5-6% |
| Other | 10-59% | 6-35% | 1-6% |
| Craft | 1-25% | 2-50% | 1-25% |
| Industrial | 16-80% | 2-10% | 2-10% |
| GROUP STATUS | | | |
| Majority | 31-78% | 6-15% | 3-7% |
| Homogeneous | 23-74% | 8-26% | 0 |
| Minority | 44-68% | 16-25% | 5-7% |
| Both | 13-62% | 8-38% | 0 |
| Little Ethnic Difference | 3-60% | 1-20% | 1-20% |
| SEX | | | |
| Female | 23-72% | 6-19% | 3-9% |
| Male | 96-70% | 34-25% | 6-5% |

TABLE C (CONTINUED)
MISSIONARY KNOWLEDGE

| | ADEQUATE OR BETTER | "IGNORANT" | OTHER |
|--------------------|--------------------|------------|-------|
| GEOGRAPHICAL AREA | | | |
| East/South Africa | 11-100% | 0 | 0 |
| Middle East | 2-100% | 0 | 0 |
| Europe | 1-100% | 0 | 0 |
| Oceania | 20-91% | 2-9% | 0 |
| Asia | 31-76% | 7-17% | 3-7% |
| "Other" | 5-71% | 2-29% | 0 |
| North America | 25-58% | 12-28% | 6-14% |
| South America | 8-42% | 11-58% | 0 |
| West Africa | 7-54% | 6-46% | 0 |
| TIME IN FIELD | | | |
| Less than 2 months | 2-100% | 0 | 0 |
| 2-6 months | 9-64% | 4-29% | 1-7% |
| 7-12 months | 27-80% | 4-12% | 3-8% |
| 13 months-2 years | 47-73% | 14-22% | 3-5% |
| 2-5 years | 22-82% | 5-18% | 0 |
| 5 Years +. | 12-46% | 13-50% | 1-4% |

TABLE C (CONTINUED)

| | MISSIONARY KNOWLEDGE ADEQUATE OR BETTER | "IGNORANT" | OTHER |
|--|--|------------|-------|
| LANGUAGE SKILLS | | | |
| None | 15-79% | 3-16% | 1-5% |
| Limited | 17-53% | 13-41% | 2-6% |
| Adequate | 12-86% | 2-14% | 0 |
| Excellent | 64-73% | 19-27% | 0 |
| Native Tongue | 7-64% | 3-27% | 1-9% |
| AGE | | | |
| Under 30 | 7-64% | 2-18% | 2-18% |
| 31-40 | 66-77% | 16-19% | 4-4% |
| 41-50 | 23-61% | 12-32% | 2-5% |
| 51-60 | 15-64% | 7-30% | 1-6% |
| 61 + | 8-73% | 3-27% | 0 |
| RELIGIOUS TRADITION OF MISSIONARY | | | |
| Baptist/Fundamentalist | 20-54% | 15-39 | 3-8%* |
| Interdenominational | 8-57% | 4-29% | 2-14% |
| Roman Catholic | 52-84% | 9-15% | 1-2%* |
| Orthodox Catholic | 1-33% | 2-67% | 0 |
| Protestant | 38-77% | 8-16% | 3-6%* |
| " Others" | 0 | 2-100% | 0 |
| *Rounding error | | | |

TABLE 4
RELIGIOUS TRADITION OF MISSIONARY

| OVERALL | RELATIONSHIP | RELIGIOUS TRADITION OF MISSIONARY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|--------|----------------------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | Bap/Fund. | Interdenom. | RC | Orth. | Prot. | Other | |
| | Cordial -126-73% | | | | | | | |
| | Non-Cordial -40-23% | SPOUSE IN FIELD | Yes 31-84% | 9- 67% | 46- ^{74%} | 4-100% | 35-69% | 2-67% |
| | Other - 4% | | No 0- | 0- | 2- ^{34%} 0 | | 5- 9% | 0 |
| | | Not married | 6-16% | 6- 33% | 14- ^{20%} 0 | | 11-22% | 1-33% |

| | CORDIAL | NON-CORDIAL | OTHER |
|------------------------|---------|-------------|-------|
| Baptist/Fundamentalist | 20-51% | 18-46% | 1-3% |
| Interdenominational | 13-87% | 2-13% | 0 |
| Roman Catholic | 52-83% | 10-16% | 1-1% |
| Orthodox Catholics | 3-75% | 1-25% | 0 |
| Protestants | 36-72% | 10-20% | 4-8% |
| "Others" | 2-67% | 0 | 1-33% |

| MISSIONARY AFFILIATION | ANTHROPOLOGIST'S TIME IN FIELD | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------|----------|
| | 2-6 months | 7-12 months | 13 months-2 years | 2-5 years | 5 years+ |
| Interdenominational | 1-7% | 0 | 5-33% | 4-27% | 5-33% |
| Baptist/Fundamentalist | 1-3% | 2-5% | 13-34% | 10-26% | 12-32% |
| Protestant | 0 | 2-5% | 13-8% | 31-78% | 4-10%* |
| Roman Catholic | 2-3% | 1-1% | 19-31% | 22-36% | 17-28%* |
| Orthodox | 1-25% | 0 | 2-50% | 1-25% | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 2-67% | 1-33% | 0 |

TABLE 4 (Continued)
RELIGIOUS TRADITION OF MISSIONARY

| MISSIONARY AFFILIATION | STATUS OF GROUP | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------|----------|-------|--------------------------|----------|
| | Minority | Majority | Both | Little Ethnic Difference | Isolated |
| Interdenominational | 8=57% | 2=14% | 0 | 0 | 4=29% |
| Baptist/Fundamentalist | 13=35% | 6=16% | 9=24% | 2=5% | 7=19%* |
| Protestant | 17=34% | 17=34% | 9=18% | 1=2% | 6=12% |
| Roman Catholic | 27=44% | 13=21% | 5=8% | 2=3% | 14=23%* |
| Orthodox | 0 | 2=50% | 1=25% | 0 | 1=25% |
| Other | 1=33% | 0 | 2=67% | 0 | 0 |

| MISSIONARY AFFILIATION | SEX OF ANTHROPOLOGIST | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|---------|
| | Male | Female |
| Interdenominational | 11- 73% | 4- 27% |
| Baptist/Fundamentalist | 32- 82% | 7- 18% |
| Protestant | 42- 82% | 9- 18% |
| Roman Catholic | 51-81% | 12- 19% |
| Orthodox | 4-100% | 0 |
| Other | 2-67% | 1-33% |

| OVERALL | MISSIONARIES PROVIDE SOURCES USED IN ANTHROPOLOGICAL WORK | |
|-------------------------------|---|---------------|
| | Yes | No |
| | 115-70% | 50-30% |
| Orthodox | 3-75% | 1-25% |
| Roman Catholic | 36-58% | 27-42% |
| Interdenominational | 7-50% | 7-50% |
| <i>Baptist/Fundamentalist</i> | <i>23-59%</i> | <i>16-41%</i> |
| <i>Protestant</i> | <i>34-69%</i> | <i>15-31%</i> |

TABLE 4-(CONTINUED)
RELIGIOUS TRADITION OF MISSIONARY

| MISSION INFLUENCE OVER GROUP | | | |
|------------------------------|--------|--------------------|-------|
| | YES | NO(OR VERY LITTLE) | OTHER |
| Interdenominational | 8-57% | 5-36% | 1-7% |
| Baptist/Fundamental | 25-56% | 10-26% | 3-8% |
| Protestant | 29-58% | 20-40% | 1-2% |
| Roman Catholic | 36-57% | 21-33% | 6-10% |
| Orthodox | 2-67% | 0 | 1-33% |
| Other | 0 | 2-100% | 0 |

| MISSION CREDITED FOR INFORMATION | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|--------|
| | YES | NO |
| Interdenominational | 9-69% | 4-31% |
| Baptist/Fundamental | 17-49% | 18-51% |
| Protestant | 24-51% | 23-49% |
| Roman Catholic | 42-75% | 14-25% |
| Orthodox | 3-100% | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 2-100% |

TABLE - 5
MISCELLANEOUS

| USE OF MISSIONARY SOURCES | | |
|---------------------------|--------|--------|
| | YES | NO |
| AREA: Rural | 77-70% | 33-30% |
| Urban | 16-73% | 6-27% |
| Mixed | 22-67% | 11-33% |
| CREDIT TO MISSIONARIES | | |
| OVERALL | 86-55% | 70-45% |
| AGE: Under 30 | 3-27% | 8-73% |
| 31-40 | 44-55% | 36-45% |
| 41-50 | 19-53% | 17-47% |
| 51-60 | 12-67% | 6-33% |
| 61+ | 8-73% | 3-27% |

REFERENCES CITED

- ^{Editor}
Asad, Talal. 1975. ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE COLONIAL ENCOUNTER. London: Ithaca Press.
- Boutilier, James A., Daniel T. Hughes, and Sharon W. Tiffany. Editors. 1978. MISSION, CHURCH, AND SECT IN OCEANIA. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Biedelman, T.O. 1974. Social Theory and the Study of Christian Missions in Africa. AFRICA 44: 235-249.
- Chagnon, Napoleon A. 1968. YANOMAMO, THE PIERCE PEOPLE. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Condominas, Georges. 1973. Ethnics and Comfort: An Ethnographer's View of His Profession. ANNUAL REPORT 1972. pp. 1-17. Washington: American Anthropological Association.
- Firth, Raymond. 1975. An Appraisal of Modern Social Anthropology. IN ANNUAL REVIEW OF ANTHROPOLOGY, Vol. 4. Bernard J. Siegal, editor, pp. 1-26.
- Freilich, Morris. Editor. ¹⁹⁷⁰ MARGINAL NATIVES. New York: Harper and Row.
- Jarvie, I.C. 1964. THE REVOLUTION IN ANTHROPOLOGY. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- _____. 1975. Epistle to the Anthropologists. AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST 77: 253-266.
- Kuper, Adam. 1973. ANTHROPOLOGISTS AND ANTHROPOLOGY. THE BRITISH SCHOOL 1922-1972. London: Allen Lane.
- Miller, Elmer S. ¹⁹⁷² THE CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY: AGENT OF SECULARIZATION. PRACTICAL ANTHROPOLOGY 17: 14-22.
- Nida, Eugene. 1966. Missionaries and Anthropologists. PRACTICAL ANTHROPOLOGY 13: 273-277.
- Oberg, Kalvero. 1972. Contrasts in Fieldwork. IN CROSSING CULTURAL BOUNDARIES. Solon Kimball and James B. Watson, Editors. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing House.
- Owusu, Maxwell. 1978. Ethnography of Africa: The Usefulness of the Useless. AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST 80: 310-334.
- Pelto, Pertti J. 1970. ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH: THE STRUCTURE OF INQUIRY. New York: Harper and Row.
- Pelto, Pertti, and Gretel H. Pelto. 1973. Ethnography: The Fieldwork Enterprise. IN HANDBOOK OF SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY. John Honigsmann, Editor. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Powdermaker, Hortense. 1966. STRANGER AND FRIEND: THE WAY OF AN ANTHROPOLOGIST. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Salamone, Frank A. 1972. Structural Factors in Dukawa Conversion. PRACTICAL ANTHROPOLOGY 19: 219-225.
- _____. ^{1974a} GODS AND GOODS IN AFRICA. New Haven: HRAFlex.
- _____. 1974b. Learning What It Is TO BE a Christian. CAHIERS D'ETUDE AFRICAINES 14: 565-573.
- _____. 1976 a. Religious Change in a Small Emirate. IN A. Bharati, Editor. THE REALM OF THE EXTRAHUMAN: ACTORS AND AUDIENCES. The Hague: Mouton, 123-138.
- _____. 1976b. Religion as Play. JOURNAL OF RELIGION IN AFRICA 8: 201-211. Reprinted in David F. Lancy and B. Allen Tindale, Editors. THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL STUDY OF PLAY. Cornwall, N.Y.: Leisure Press.
- _____. 1977. Anthropologists and Missionaries: Competition or Cooperation? HUMAN ORGANIZATION 36: 407-412.
- _____. 1978. Early Expatriate Society in Northern Nigeria. AFRICAN STUDIES REVIEW 21: 39-54.
- _____. 1979. Epistemological Implications of Fieldwork and Their Consequences. AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST 81: 146-160.
- _____. 1980. Competitive Conversion and Its Implications for Modernization. ANTHROPOS. and Charles Swanson. 1979. Identity and Ethnicity. ETHNIC GROUPS 2: 167-183.
- Stipe, Claude E. In press. Anthropologist versus Missionaries: The Influence of Presuppositions. CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY.
- Tonkinson, Robert. 1974. THE JIGALONG MOB. Menlo Park: Cummings.
- Vincent, Joan. 1978. Political Anthropology: Manipulative Strategies. ANNUAL REVIEW OF ANTHROPOLOGY 7: 175-194.
- Wax, Rosalie. 1971. DOING FIELDWORK. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Williams, F.R. 1967. FIELD METHODS IN THE STUDY OF CULTURE. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Wolcott, Harry F. 1972. Too True To Be Good: The Subculture of American Missionaries in Urban Africa. PRACTICAL ANTHROPOLOGY 19: 241-258.

References

- Amaladoss, M. 1989. Mission in the 1990s'. *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* **13**, 8-10.
- Amaladoss, M. 1990. *Making all things new: dialogue, pluralism and evangelization in Asia*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Book.
- Ballhatchet, K. 1978. Missionaries, empires and society: the Jesuit mission in Calcutta 1834-1846. *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* **VII**, 18-34.
- Barnes, M. 1989. *Christian identity and religious pluralism: religions in conversation*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Bayly, S. 1989. *Saints, goddesses and kings: Muslims and Christians in South Indian society 1700-1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beidelman, T. O. 1982. *Colonial evangelism: a socio-historical study of an East African mission at the grassroots*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Bosch, D. J. 1991. *Transforming mission: paradigm shifts in theology of mission*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.
- Bouillard, C. and P. M. Murphy n.d. *A study of the Catholic elite groups in Bangladesh* (mimeo, 1974-76 c.).
- Burrows, W. R. 1985. Tensions in the Catholic magisterium about missions and other religions. *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* **9**, 2-4.
- Burrows, W.R. (ed) 1993. *Redemption and Dialogue*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.
- Caplan, L. 1987. *Class and culture in urban India: fundamentalism in a Christian community*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Comaroff, Jean and John, 1991. *Of revelation and revolution: Christianity, colonialism and consciousness in South Africa I*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Deliège R. 1990. A comparison between the Hindu and Christian Paraiyars of South India. *Indian Missiological Review* (April), 53-64.
- Fagan, J., 1979. *A People set apart: The Muchi Untouchables* (mimeo).
- Fernandes, W. (ed.) 1986. *Inequality, its bases and search for solutions*. Delhi: Indian Social Institute.
- Fernandes, W. 1981. *Caste and conversion movements in India: religion and human rights*. Delhi: Indian Social Institute.
- Forrester, D. 1977. The depressed classes and conversion to Christianity. In *Religion in South Asia: religious conversion and revival movements in South Asia in medieval and modern times* (ed.) G. A. Oddie. Delhi: Manohar Book Service.
- Forrester, D. 1980. *Caste and Christianity: attitudes and policies on caste of Anglo-Saxon Protestant missions in India*. London: Curzon Press.
- Fuller, C. 1976. Kerala Christians and the caste system. *Man* (N. S.) **11**, 23-70.
- Ghose, M. M. 1898. *Jasohrer Katalik Mandalir Itihas* (The History of the Catholic Church in Jessore). In A. Marietti *Khristio Sabhar Sadharan Itihas* (General History of the Christian Church from the Seventeenth to the Nineteenth Century). Calcutta: Catholic Orphan Press.
- Gray, R. 1990. *Black Christians and white missionaries*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Guha, R. (ed.) 1982 - 9. *Subaltern Studies: writings in South Asian history and society I - IV*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Hartmann, A. 1978. The Augustinian mission in Bengal. *Analect Augustiniana* **41**, 159-213.
- Hefner, R. W. (ed.) 1993. *Conversion to Christianity: historical and anthropological perspectives on a great transformation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hogg, W. R. 1985. Vatican II's *Ad Gentes*: a twenty-year retrospective. *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* **9**, 146-54.
- Huber, M. T. 1988. *The bishop's progress: a historical ethnography of Catholic missionary experience on the Sepic Frontier*. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Inden, R. 1990. *Imagining India*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Indan Missiological Review* **Jan.** 1983 (issue on religious conversion in India).
- James, W. and D. H. Johnson (eds.) 1988. *Vernacular Christianity: essays in the social anthropology of religion presented to Godfrey Lienhardt* [JASO]. Oxford: Oxford University Press.