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intensive trade contacts. Several sites in Singapore are discussed in some
detail. Unfortunately the photographs accompanying Miksic's article are not
sharp. Finally, E. Edward McKinnon analyses the presence of Buddhism in
pre-Islamic East Kalimantan. He uses material from the museum in Kutei,
private collections and information derived from short visits to several sites.
The reader is struck by the potential richness of the subject, but at the same
time by the fact that so little good reliable work has been done and that so
much is left to an uncertain future of archaeologists without money and, 
even worse, of pillage.

The book covers a variety of subjects from archaeology to modern art and
makes excellent reading. Specialists in Southeast Asian art, in the broad sense
of the term 'art', will most certainly find information to interest them in these
essays in honour of Stanley J. O'Connor. The editor and authors have pro-
duced a valuable tribute to their colleague and teacher. It is a pity that the
illustrations are not always of a good quality, whereas O'Connor himself was
apparently very keen on illustrations in publications on art (p. 21). Unfor-
tunately, photographs are often still treated as a sideshow in publications on
art and material culture; no doubt this is often for financial reasons.

Robert C. Kiste and Mac Marshall (eds), American anthropology in
Micronesia; An assessment. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i

TOON VAN MEIJL

Micronesia is at once both large and small. It covers a vast ocean area of sev-
eral million square kilometers, but in terms of its total land area, the number
of languages and cultures present, and particularly the size of its population,
Micronesia is the smallest of the Pacific region's culture areas. For that reason,
too, the term Micronesia is rather apt. Conceptually, however, the notion of
Micronesia is problematic to the extent that it suggests a certain cohesiveness
that cannot be based on empirical reality. In spite of a linguistic connected-
ness and an historical interaction between the islands that did not regularly
include parts of Polynesia and Melanesia, the concept of Micronesia as a cul-
ture area is an abstraction derived from an anthropological endeavour to
structure the ethnographic record. Although the term Micronesia antedates
the presence of the United States in the region, its meaning has probably been
reinforced by the American influence in the region after the Second World
War. Micronesia was one of the major theatres of fighting in the western
Pacific during the war, which brought to light the strategic importance of the
area. In consequence, it induced a new colonial relationship between Micronesia and the United States which is also reflected in the development of American anthropology in the region over the past 55 years. Prior to 1940 most anthropologists working in the Pacific came from the three leading European powers, Great Britain, France and the Netherlands, plus Australia and New Zealand. After 1945 this situation changed radically, especially in Micronesia, where American security restrictions prevented non-Americans from conducting research. This also explains how American anthropology in Micronesia could expand as it did. It started with a large-scale economic survey initiated by the United States Commercial Company (USCC) and employing Douglas Oliver as director of the project. A few years later the Pacific Science Board of the National Research Council appointed George Peter Murdock as director of the Coordinated Investigation of Micronesian Anthropology (CIMA). Both projects aimed at collecting ethnographic data that would be useful for the administration of Micronesian peoples, but Oliver and Murdock also played prominent roles in the development of anthropology in the region and elsewhere.

At present American Micronesia, not including Nauru and Kiribati, is among the most thoroughly studied parts of the world; at least 78 dissertations have been based on research there. American anthropology in Micronesia aims at assessing the impact of that anthropology on the American colonial administration, on the development of the anthropological discipline at large, and, of course, on the Micronesian peoples themselves. Ten contributors discuss the development of the ethnographic understanding of Micronesia, the growth and development of Pacific anthropology in the United States, and, finally, the consequences of anthropological research in Micronesia for the development of anthropological theory and practice in the following fields: historical anthropology (David Hanlon), ecological anthropology (William Alkire), kinship and social organization (Mac Marshall), politics (Glenn Petersen), ethnic identity (Lin Poyer), psychological anthropology (Peter Black), art (Karen Nero), social problems (Francis Hezel), medical anthropology (Donald Rubinstein) and legal anthropology (Edward King). The book opens with a sketch of the geographical and historical context by Robert Kiste and Suzanne Falgout, while the final two chapters contain reviews of the social relations that existed among the different individuals and institutions involved in American anthropology in Micronesia (Mac Marshall) and of its general results over the past half century (Robert C. Kiste).

In view of the book's comprehensive design and the expertise of its contributors, it is evident that this book will be a landmark in the study of American anthropology in Micronesia. It provides an excellent overview of all the work that American anthropologists have done in the region, and to some extent
also of the influence that work has had on the development of the anthropological discipline at large. In this respect the impact of the work by Ward Goodenough, David Schneider and Melford Spiro on the anthropological study of kinship and social organization, psychological anthropology and the anthropology of religion deserves special mention.

The aim to provide a comprehensive overview is undoubtedly very useful for the student of American anthropology in Micronesia, but the disadvantage of this approach is the encyclopaedic set-up of some of the chapters. One contributor, for example, simply summarizes in chronological order the work of American anthropologists who have been active in his field of discussion, but he fails to draw out the main points or to analyse the shifting patterns in analytical perspective over the years. Another contributor examines the impact of American anthropology on the development of the anthropological discipline in his field mainly by referring to citations in textbooks, but almost without mentioning the subject of those references or the analytical issues that have had an impact beyond Micronesian anthropology. For similar reasons, I would contend that Marshall's more general assessment of the impact of American anthropology in Micronesia on the anthropological discipline as a whole, summarized in only seven pages, is no more than a preliminary overview and therefore constitutes a missed opportunity. By the same token I would argue that Kiste's outline of future directions for anthropological research in the region, filling less than three pages, remains rather undeveloped.

As in any collective volume, however, there are also exceptions in a positive sense. Karen Nero situates her analysis of Micronesian arts in a wider perspective on the anthropology of art, and discusses the influence of the work by Edwin Burrows on the development of a broader, more useful definition of art by including the performing arts. Francis Hezel's thematic discussion of the contribution of Micronesian anthropology to the understanding of social problems, such as juvenile delinquency, drinking, suicide, and child and spouse abuse, is also very useful. Although some other chapters could have benefited from a more analytical as opposed to encyclopaedic approach, to say this is not to deny the great value of the book for the history of American anthropology in Micronesia, and to some extent also for the history of American anthropology at large.


JOHN M. MIKSIC