

Scott, Claudia
 1985 "A Review of 'Fishers of Men,' " Chapter 2 Unpublished mss. SIL

Shaw, R. Daniel
 1985 *Cultural Factors in Bible Translation* Course Syllabus Fuller Theological Seminary

Stipe, Claude E.
 1980 "Anthropologists versus Missionaries: The Influence of Presuppositions" *Current Anthropology* 24:114-115.

Stoll, David
 1983a "Wycliffe Bible Translators: Not Telling the Whole Story" *The Other Side* February 1983: 20-25, 38-39

1983b *Fishers of Men or Founders of Empire?* London: Zed Press

Taylor, Robert B.
 1984 "The SIL/WBT in Anthropological Perspective" Kansas State University Unpublished - 13 pp.

Tippett, Allan R.
 1973 *Aspects of Pacific Ethnohistory* Pasadena: William Carey Library

Whiteman, Darrell L.
 1983 *Melanesians and Missionaries* Pasadena: William Carey Library

Yost, James A.
 1983 "We Have a Mandate" *The Other Side* February 1983 pp. 38-39

Announcement

WORKSHOP for ENTRY ORIENTATION COUNSELORS

Two workshops will be held during the summer of 1986 for those with field experience who use a local language and have the responsibility for developing, designing, or restructuring a language program but lack the linguistic and/or anthropological training that is necessary to develop a viable program. The objective is to help equip participants to assist new missionaries in getting started right. The first workshop will be held in Toronto in conjunction with the Toronto Institute of Linguistics from May 29-June 7, 1986. A second will be held in Fresno, California, in conjunction with the exit orientation program at the Link-Care Center from August 4-8, 1986. Although there will be some minor differences in detail, in substance the two workshops will be identical.

Interested readers may seek further information from the Toronto Institute of Linguistics, 25 Ballyconnor Road, Willowdale, ON M2M 4B3 (416-226-6380), or from Link-Care Center, 1734 West Shaw, Fresno, CA 93705 (209-439-5920).

Missionaries and Anthropologists: An Inquiry into Their Ambivalent Relationship

FRANK A. SALAMONE

Introduction

Despite the relatively recent intensive interest in the context and methodology of field research, the actual pattern of missionary/anthropologist interaction has been virtually neglected. (Cf. Salamone, 1979, for references.) In place of carefully crafted empirical hypotheses, there are, too frequently, found assertions of greater or lesser usefulness or reliability. Since most field anthropologists come into contact with missionaries (Salamone 1977), it is not surprising that anthropological opinions regarding missionaries are both copious and contradictory. Those assertions range from bitter attacks leveled at all missionaries (Gladwin in Salamone 1974) to statements praising one group while attacking another (Williams 1967). Most common is an ambivalence, which Powdermaker (1966:43) so eloquently expressed. (Cf. Salamone, 1977, for a more complete discussion and further references.)

In turn, there are not many missionary writings on anthropologists based on serious considerations of hard data. Nida (1966), however, provides a welcome exception in which he offers a useful critique of missionary-anthropologist relationships. He accuses anthropologists of being too ready to take and too loath to give. Personal experience has convinced me that many missionaries feel the truth of such a charge. They do not object so much to anthropology as to anthropologists who use their carefully cultivated networks, share their hospitality, and then not only fail to give missionaries credit, share their findings, or even thank them, but also take delight in mocking them at every opportunity.¹

Largely as a result of the self-examination taking place within anthropology (Jarvie 1975; Pelto and Pelto 1973; Salamone 1979; and others), anthropologists have begun to look more closely and carefully at the missionary-anthropologist relationship. Biedelman (1974) is correct in insisting

Frank A. Salamone is chair of the Social Sciences Department at Elizabeth Seton College, Rutherford, New York. He has authored or edited four books, including *Gods and Goods in Africa* and over 50 articles. Currently he is Associate Editor of the *African Studies Review*.

that anthropologists must study missionaries and other colonial societies in order to complete their repertoire of the world's societies. Condominas (1973) is even more correct when he argues that without understanding the colonial milieu in which most anthropological fieldwork has taken place, anthropology will never understand itself or those societies which it has studied. The theoretical and methodological consequences, therefore, are manifest. Failure to study groups such as missionaries and their influence on anthropological fieldwork would be disastrous.

Fortunately, there are empirical exceptions to the common dearth of careful studies. Those exceptions show an appreciation of the importance of getting the record straight. Tonkinson (1974), Wolcott (1972), Biedelman (1974), and Salamone (1972, 1974a, 1974b, 1976a, 1977, and 1979) have offered missionary studies of varying degrees of thoroughness. Even those studies, unfortunately, have generally failed to offer testable, operational hypotheses predictive of general missionary/anthropologist relationships.

Boutilier, Hughes, and Tiffany (editors 1978) offer a hopeful beacon for future studies. They take great care throughout to look at the interaction between missionaries and the missionized. Implications for the study of culture change are clearly delimited. Stipe (1980) also exercises great care to look at the interaction inherent in missionary work, particularly between missionaries and anthropologists.

Although these recent studies offer guides to further research, they, too, unfortunately, do not spell out explicitly testable hypotheses. In fact, a survey (Salamone 1977) of a number of studies that mention missionary/anthropologist interactions revealed no testable hypotheses offered by any of these 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 conclusive, 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 entrée 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 coped with rationally. 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 field primarily to gather ethnographic data. Quite simply, missionaries and anthropologists seek to attain different goals.²

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. 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.

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, short of funds, idealistic, and works on a face-to-face level.

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 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 percent).³ It is possible, however, to refine that generalization and to specify which factors are related to such opposition. This enables 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 are two findings: first, 100 percent (11) of those anthropologists strongly committed to the use of fieldwork to test theory are opposed to the encouragement of missionary work, and second, 71 percent (34 of 48) of those who are committed to using fieldwork to test theory, but not so strongly as the first group, oppose missionary encouragement. Significantly, 79 percent (26 of 33) of those opposed to the use of fieldwork to test theory are 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 fieldwork is a key indicator of anthropological attitude toward missionaries. In conformity with that position is the fact that 17 of 20 (85 percent) of those anthropologists who feel there is no need to like one's infor-

mants are strongly opposed to missionary endeavors. The pattern of responses regarding the use of personal techniques and hostility to missionaries strongly support the contention that they are related.

Thus, hostility is associated with use of genealogies (44 of 59—75 percent), psychological testing (13 of 14—93 percent), sole use of participant observation (15 of 22—68 percent), and nonstructured interviewing (83 of 136—61 percent). An apparent contradiction to the thesis is found in the fact that 23 of 34 anthropologists (67 percent) 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.

The correlation between the relationship between personal field techniques and hostility to missionaries comes from examining the other side—those who support missionaries. All ten anthropologists who strongly support missionaries use structured interviewing, an objective technique. Thirty of the 47 people (64 percent) who are neutral regarding missionary endeavors use mostly structured interviewing in their fieldwork. Finally, the thesis is supported in a negative sense by noting the relationship between the opposition to objective techniques and hostility toward missionaries.

Forty-nine of 53 people (92 percent) who least use the ultra-objective techniques of mapping and census-taking strongly oppose missionary work, as do 85 of 112 anthropologists (76 percent) 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 are entrepreneurial types, those in the field for very practical reasons and who openly admit that such is the case. Ten of the 13 people (77 percent) who show greatest support for missionaries find fieldwork not enjoyable but profitable and/or challenging while 54 of 74 (71 percent) 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 out of 12) and greatest support comes from those who have spent the longest time (over five years) in the field (8 of 39 or 21 percent). All Asian anthropologists 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 substantiation 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. Eighty-four of 122 (69 percent) of anthropologists who study specific relationships in the field oppose

missionary endeavors as do 4 of 5 (80 percent) who study craft groups, 20 of 25 (80 percent) with industrial groups, 9 of 15 (60 percent) of those studying and gathering groups, 59 of 74 (70 percent) of those involved with agricultural groups, 28 of 42 (67 percent) with horticulturalists, and 18 of 27 (67 percent) who study other categories of people. Finally, 48 of 73 (66 percent) who study minority groups, 42 of 50 (84 percent) who study majority groups, 12 of 26 (46 percent), who study both groups and 25 of 35 (71 percent) 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 who study the oppression majority groups exercise on minority groups are least tolerant.

Finally, men are far more likely than women to have hostile feelings toward missionaries. When age is included, the picture becomes even sharper. Young people oppose missionaries significantly more frequently than any other category. Fifteen out of 17 anthropologists under 30 (88 percent) oppose missionaries.

In summary, all factors indicate that opposition to missionary endeavors tends 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. Attitudes toward the potential harm missionaries do, 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 percent) of anthropologists believe that missionaries have harmed cultures while only 17 percent 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 percent). Hostility decreases as the location moves from a "mixed" area (24 of 41—59 percent) to an urban area (10 of 27—37 percent).

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 percent), and decreases as little ethnic differentiation (6 of 9—67 percent) minority status (44 of 68—65 percent), homogeneous group (21 of 36—58 percent), or both (6 of 26—23 percent), are studied.

Sixty-one percent of all males responding (96 of 157) believe that mis-

sionaries harm cultures while only 51 percent (21 of 41) women responding agree with that assessment. Furthermore, 29 percent (12 of 41) of the women and only 14 percent 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 percent, to 103 of 157—65 percent).

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 consequently tempered by the third or fourth expedition. The data support those ethnographic impressions. Seventy-six percent of anthropologists under 30 perceive missionaries as bringing harm to societies (13 of 17) while only 42 percent 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. They consistently support, or are at least neutral, on schools, hospitals, dispensaries, and other specific material works done by missionaries. These findings suggest strong ambivalence in missionary/anthropologist relationships as Powdermaker (1966) and Salamone (1977, 1979) have suggested.

Further analysis of the threads of ambivalence find interesting religious variables associated with an anthropologist's relationships with missionaries. Jews (14 of 17—82 percent) show greatest adherence to a negative assessment of missionary work, followed quite interestingly by anthropologists who label themselves "fundamentalist Protestants" (6 of 11—64 percent), those with no religious affiliation (53 of 85—62 percent), Roman Catholics (13 of 23—57 percent), Protestants (13 of 33—39 percent), and "others," mostly Anglicans (11 of 24—36 percent). No Muslims were in the sample, but the two 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 percent) and those having religious affiliation but not practicing their religion at all (21 of 33, 64 percent) are harshest in their judgment of missionaries, followed by those who practice religion irregularly (21 of 37—57 percent). As expected those who practice their religion regularly (21 of 43—48 percent) 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 percent) while only 40 of 167 (24 percent) believe that missionaries are 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 percent) were least impressed with mission knowledge while those who work with rural people (70 of 110—73 percent) and in urban areas (17 of 19—89 percent) 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 percent), and those studying industrial groups (16 of 20—80 percent), rated missionary knowledge most highly while the ratings diminished in the mixed range of occupations—hoe farming (27 of 38—71 percent), agriculture (51 of 72—72 percent), other (10 of 17—59 percent) and crafts (1 of 4—25 percent).

Two other ways exist to view 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 percent), a group in a homogeneous area (23 of 31—74 percent), a minority group (44 of 65—68 percent), both (13 of 21—62 percent), and groups with little ethnic differentiation (3 of 5—60 percent). The last is a bit of an anomaly, but the small number involved and the fact that only one person rates missionaries as 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 did members of any other groups (8 of 21—38 percent).

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 percent) as well as the most scorn (11 of 19—58 percent). The other areas range from high rankings in Oceania (20 of 22—91 percent), Asia (31 of 41—76 percent), "other" (5 of 7—71 percent) to lower ratings elsewhere—North America (25 of 43—58 percent) and West Africa (7 of 13—54 percent). Such findings are also in conformity with expectations.

Those in the field for a very brief time, two to six months (4 of 14—29 percent), and those there for the greatest time, over five years (13 of 26—50 percent), are most critical of missionary knowledge. Most approving are those who have been in the field from two to five years (22 of 27—82 percent). Least disapproving are those in the field from 7-12 months (4 of 31—12 percent). The findings follow expected patterns.

References correlate with the anthropologists' language skills: those with limited language ability (17 of 32 approve—53 percent), nonspeakers (15 of 18—79 percent), those who speak it excellently (64 of 88—73 percent), passably (12 of 14—86 percent), or as their native tongue (7 of 11—64 percent). 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 indigenous people or those who are more indigenous than people born in the area.⁴

Those under 30 (7 of 11—64 percent) and between 41-50 (23 of 37—61 percent) or 51-60 (15 of 23—64 percent) are least impressed with missionary knowledge while those most impressed are either between 31-40 (66 of 86—77 percent) or over 61 (8 of 11—73 percent). Those most critical fall between 41-50 (12 of 37—32 percent).

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

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 five years—there still remain a significant number of people with regard for such knowledge. Not surprisingly, then, most anthropologists have used such sources in their work (115 of 165—70 percent). They have done so whether working in rural (77 of 110—70 percent), urban (16 of 22—73 percent), or "mixed" (22 of 33—67 percent) areas. It is a clear sign of ambivalence, then, to note that only 86 of 156 (55 percent) gave credit to missionaries. It is even clearer when it is noted that 56 of 156 (36 percent) 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 percent of whom gave credit to missionaries. Basically, there was increasing credit given with age reaching a high of 73 percent (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 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. However, when those 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 percent) 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 anthropologists (49 percent) 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 percent), Roman Catholics (52 of 63—83 percent), Orthodox Catholics (3 of 4—75 percent) Protestants (36 of 50—72 percent), and "others" (2 of 3—67 percent) 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 percent) or Roman Catholic missionaries (36 of 62—58 percent) 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 percent). Baptists and Fundamentalists (15 of 38—39 percent) were rated as "ignorant" in their knowledge of the groups in their areas. Twenty-five of 36 (69 percent) admit that, nevertheless, such missionaries had influenced their studies.

In spite of their admission, however, 18 of 35 (51 percent) 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 percent) anthropologists stated that no missionary influence from their

contacts with Protestant missionaries is shown in their works but over 50 percent of them dedicated their works to or mentioned missionaries in their dedications (26 of 51).

Generally cordial relationships are shown in the fact that 42 of 56 (75 percent) of the anthropologists who worked in Roman Catholic areas and 2 of 3 (67 percent) 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 percent). It is in those isolated areas that anthropologists most frequently find either interdenominational (12 of 14—85 percent) or Baptist/Fundamentalist (20 of 37—57 percent) 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 percent) anthropologists working in Fundamentalist areas were between 31-40 years of age, 24 of 38 (75 percent) had no religious affiliation, 32 of 38 (84 percent) were married, 4 of 8 divorced people (50 percent) worked in those areas, 26 of the 39 responding (57 percent) brought their spouses with them at least on one of their trips, 5 of 15 anthropologists (33 percent) studying hunting and gathering groups did so in Fundamentalist areas, all five of these anthropologists use missionary sources "heavily," and 22 of 38 (57 percent) were in the field over two years (10 of the 38—32 percent—were in the field over five 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 from the questionnaire were gathered on Muslim, Hindu, or other missionaries not in the Western tradition.

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 situa-

tions, moreover, are indicative of more hostility than others. In general, those situations are ones in which an unequal distribution of power exists in favor of the missionary.

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 reveals patterns that support the major hypothesis: 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 they are so much alike, have the greatest problems in the field.

The data clearly support the contention that power and similarity are at the root of missionary/anthropologist conflict. Alternatively, they also strongly suggest that good relations, or at least more mature ones, occur between more secure anthropologists and missionaries. There is no question that such findings have implications for the relationship between identity and power.

Specifically, anthropologists who are male, young, new to fieldwork, have poor language ability, ambivalent about their own religious beliefs, committed to qualitative research to test a theory, who feel hostile toward their informants and who have scarce resources at their command are most likely to have problems with missionaries. Such anthropologists perfectly match the image of the "romantic" or "fundamentalist" anthropologist as outlined by Freilich and Johnson. When such an anthropologist works in an isolated area and meets up with a fundamentalist missionary, then it is not difficult to predict serious trouble. The field situation has indeed become something quite sacred, a *rite de passage*. Not surprisingly, those less committed to qualitative field research usually did not oppose missionaries and worked more closely with them in order to achieve specific research aims. Those who took an openly transactional rather than romantic stance were more likely to have less emotional or ambivalent relationships.

It is, moreover, important to reflect that our model of the romantic anthropologist fits those who are least secure in the profession. They are people just finishing their Ph.D.'s or fighting for tenure, promotion, and respectability in an uncertain market. Similarly, they are people who tend to have strong feelings regarding theory testing, who are less sure about their identities, and consequently are more concerned with both the cost of re-

search and the extent of missionary knowledge. To admit they are in awe such knowledge threatens their fragile self-identities as "real" anthropologists and, moreover, would reveal the power missionaries exerted on their research. Furthermore, the setting in which those young anthropologists work lends weight to the basic hypothesis, for it takes place rural areas where typical occupations are hunting and gathering, horticulture or agriculture.

Conversely, those anthropologists most sure of themselves tend not be concerned with loss of identity through contact with missionaries, for they *know* who they are. Such anthropologists have very clear goals in mind and are exact in knowing how missionaries can aid them. Interestingly, but supportive of the basic contention of this work, those with no religion at all get on quite well with missionaries, significantly better than those who fail to practice their religion while keeping a religious identity.

Similarly, age and experience enable anthropologists to become more realistic on their evaluation and acknowledgment of missionary aid. To the missionary is no longer viewed as an all-knowing but stubborn individual who keeps the researcher from attaining his goal of truth and fame.

The findings are both predictable from action theory and explained by it. Actors, in this case missionaries and anthropologists, seek to attain their goals. When those goals are either compatible or mutually supportive, little difficulty ensues. However, when they are not, problems follow. Competition for scarce resources, reflected in that ambivalence Powdermaker (1966) noted, becomes marked. The "fundamentalist" anthropologist typifies the situation of competition and power struggle; the "mature" anthropologist exemplifies the other. Both, however, are situationally determined.

Finally, a number of suggestions emerge from the research. Theoretically, the relationship between action and identity theory demands further explication. It is clear that the sociological concept of power is related to the psychological one of identity. Further research must explore that relationship.

Methodologically, it is necessary to gather more qualitative data on missionary/anthropologist encounters. Detailed studies of such encounters and of those of a similar nature, of "transforms," in the field would be helpful. Among those relationships are those of colonial officer/anthropologist, expatriate society, and other (Cf. Salamone 1978). Such studies are needed to control for epistemological bias in fieldwork as well as to expand the number of societies open to anthropological investigation. Additionally, they provide theoretical insight (Biedelman, 1974; Salamone, 1978 and 1979).

It is necessary, moreover, to get missionaries' evaluations of anthropologists. I have already begun this research. Preliminary research shows similar ambivalence. Many seminaries have begun to require anthropological knowledge and training for their recruits. Many missionaries open

boast of having helped famous anthropologists. At the same time, they admit to feeling pique at being misquoted, neglected, or having fun poked at them. As one trained missionary-anthropologist told me, "Our goals are different, so we are going to train our own people in anthropology."

One final implication emerges from this research—that of training future anthropologists. It is an implication we neglect at our own peril. The days when anthropology can send "baby anthropologists" to the field with few resources and little practical preparation have passed. It is no longer glamorous, if it ever was, to send people to faraway lands with little money, no transportation, and little conception of what obstacles they will face. Equally reprehensible is the poor language facility of most anthropologists, a defect freely admitted.

The study has implications for changing anthropological training programs and for controlling for conflict situations. Such changes will demand courage and innovation in a time of economic uncertainty. They will demand openness and flexibility, and no doubt some will oppose needed changes on the grounds that they survived their *rite de passage*. As a survivor myself, at great personal and psychological cost, I can state that I have tried the old way and espouse the new more passionately because of it.

Notes

1. Such behavior was sadly in evidence at the American Anthropological Association's 1980 convention in Cincinnati in which a renowned anthropologist drew laughs through mocking missionaries in East Africa.

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.

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 study cannot report all the findings or list all the tables in over 2000 computer pages.

4. The issue is discussed in a paper in preparation on fieldwork 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.

References Cited

- Asad, Talal, ed.
 1975 *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter* London: Ithaca Press
 Boutillier, James A., Daniel T. Hughes, and Sharon W. Tiffany, eds.
 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 Fierce People* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston
 Condominas, Georges
 1973 "Ethics and Comfort: An Ethnographer's View of His Profession" *Annual Report 1972* Washington: American Anthropological Association 1-17
 Firth, Raymond
 1975 "An Appraisal of Modern Social Anthropology" *Annual Review of Anthropology* 4:1-26
 Freilich, Morris
 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
 1970 "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, eds. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing House
 Owusu, Maxwell
 1978 "Ethnography of Africa: the Usefulness of the Useless" *American Anthropologist* 80:310-334
 Peltó, Pertti J.
 1970 *Anthropological Research: The Structure of Inquiry*. New York: Harper and Row
 Peltó, Pertti, and Gretel H. Peltó
 1973 "Ethnography: The Fieldwork Enterprise" in *Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology* John Honigmann, ed. 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
 1976a "Religious Change in a Small Emirate" in *The Realm of the Extrahuman: Actors and Audiences*, A. Bharati, ed. The Hague: Mouton 123-138
 1976b "Religion as Play" *Journal of Religion in Africa* 8:201-211
 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* 75:383-404
 Salamone, Frank A. and Charles Swanson
 1979 "Identity and Ethnicity" *Ethnic Groups* 2:167-183
 Stipe, Claude
 1980 "Anthropologists versus Missionaries: The Influence of Presuppositions" *Current Anthropology* 21:165-179
 Tonkinson, Robert
 1974 *The Jigalong Mob* Menlo Park: Cummings
 Vincent, Joan
 1978 "Political Anthropology: Manipulative Strategies" *Annual Review of Anthropology* 7:175-194