

Introduction



Gender, Genre, and Knowledge in the Welcoming Science

Anthropology, a new science, welcomed the stranger. As a science which accepted the psychic unity of mankind, anthropology was kinder to women, to those who came from distant disciplines, to members of minority groups.

—Margaret Mead, *The Golden Age of American Anthropology*

WITH ITS reputation in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century as a “welcoming science,” anthropology attracted a disproportionate number of women and Native American researchers into its ranks.¹ Margaret Mead, the most famous anthropologist of the twentieth century, suggested in 1960 that it was anthropology’s status as a “new science” that made her discipline more welcoming to women and minority groups than other sciences.²

Not only its newness but also its research methods contributed to anthropology’s relative openness to women and people of color; founded upon firsthand observation as the key mechanism for creating knowledge, and committed to constructing a complete account of human history, anthropology seemed to positively *require* women’s participation as it emerged in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Following on the successful public careers of such nineteenth-century anthropologists as Zelia Nuttall, Alice Fletcher, Erminnie Smith, and Matilda Coxe Stevenson, the increasing number of white women (and, to a lesser extent, women and men of color) who entered into higher education in the 1910s and 1920s swelled the ranks of the new science of an-

thropology.³ Scores of women earned credentials, conducted research, served in professional organizations, and shaped their developing discipline during the 1920s and 1930s, including not only Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead, the century's most widely read anthropologists, but also Elsie Clews Parsons, Gladys Reichard, Ella Cara Deloria, Ruth Underhill, Ruth Bunzel, Clara Lee Tanner, Zora Neale Hurston, Esther Schiff Goldfrank, Ann Axtell Morris, Erna Gunther, Hortense Powdermaker, and many others.⁴ During the same period, increasing numbers of men and women of color studied anthropology in universities and pursued anthropological field research, including Hurston and Deloria, as well as Edward Dozier (Tewa Pueblo), William Jones (Fox), Gladys Tantaquidgeon (Mohegan), Louis Eugene King, Arthur Huff Fauset, and others.⁵ These women and men of color often conducted their research among the Native American and African American communities with which they identified, using their insider status to access and make public enormous amounts of cultural material.

Yet the burgeoning “culture of professionalism” that developed rapidly in the early twentieth century wrought institutional transformations that rendered the lives of these researchers contradictory in many ways. Professionalism shaped scientific and social scientific fields during this period by heightening such values as specialization and insularity. Each field of study was conceived as a unique enterprise with “its special qualities and language, its special distinction as an activity of research and investigation” and consequently with a degree of imperviousness to critiques from outsiders.⁶ Amid a rising tide of professionalism, fields that had previously shared significant overlap and garnered significant involvement from amateurs—including the fields that became professional sociology, education, political science, linguistics, and anthropology—worked urgently to distinguish themselves from one another and to distinguish professional research from work undertaken by amateurs. The categories *amateur* and *professional* were in many ways mutually constitutive, insofar as “the immeasurably important phenomenon of professionalization” depended upon the material and discursive “marginalization of specific groups and interests.”⁷ Specifically, as Philippa Levine argues, “the elite conditions we now associate with professional standing” were generated by limiting “entry to these avenues of employment through more stringent training and qualification”—limitations that “provided both a sense of community and of status for those within.”⁸

These efforts can be seen through the lens of what Thomas Gieryn has called “boundary work,” that is, as the material and discursive labor of scien-

tists to distinguish between their practices—and the objective knowledge those practices seem to ensure—and some “less authoritative residual non-science.” Such distinctions reinforce the “link between ‘science’ and knowledge that is authoritative, credible, reliable, and trustworthy” and guard the power and prestige afforded to those who produce it.⁹ Consequently, the rich tradition of amateur scientific research came under reorganization across many fields in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as professional members of developing fields such as archaeology, geology, astronomy and other disciplines worked to solidify their control over research directives, their coordination of collective activities, and their authority to shape public perceptions of their field.¹⁰ In some cases, as in geology, amateur members were specifically excluded from national scientific organizations; in others, as in astronomy, the value of amateur scientists in supplying observational data to professional researchers resulted in a more complex organizational structure—“an interlocking, coordinated network of astronomical researchers” in which amateur contributions were controlled and used by professionals.¹¹ Interwar anthropologists likewise sought to define their discipline’s legitimate practices and practitioners more strictly in order to establish a firmly *scientific* identity for anthropology—an identity that was in many ways threatened by anthropology’s reputation as a welcoming science for women and for people of color. When prominent anthropologist Alfred Kroeber wrote to Elsie Clews Parsons that, “if ever Anthropology gets to be prevailingly a feminine science I expect to switch into something else,” he voiced a sentiment shared by many anthropologists who feared that a welcoming reputation imperiled the field’s scientific status.¹²

Consequently, although white women, Native American, and African American anthropologists earned doctorates in increasing numbers, published prolifically, and won research grants from the new social science research foundations that emerged in the 1920s and 1930s, their intellectual contributions were also marginalized from their discipline’s mainstream. Despite their adherence to new professional norms in earning credentials and receiving formal training, for instance, people of color and white women were largely excluded from the faculty positions where they could most readily influence the training of future professionals. As historian Margaret Rossiter points out, women faced substantial barriers in securing stable faculty positions; this generation of women anthropologists “built whole careers on little more than a series of temporary fellowships from the NRC and SSRC. In fact, there seems to have been a tendency . . . to give the fellowships to the women to ‘tide them over’ while the few jobs available went to the men.”¹³ Although a significant

cohort of Native American and African American intellectuals studied anthropology during these decades, several, like Zora Neale Hurston and Ella Cara Deloria, did so without earning a PhD. Even among those who completed all degree requirements, barriers to full professional participation continued. African American anthropologist Louis Eugene King, for instance, was not awarded his doctorate until 1951 for a dissertation completed in 1932 because Columbia University, home of the department of anthropology most open to women and people of color, required publication of the dissertation before the degree would be conferred. This requirement particularly penalized scholars who lacked the personal wealth and social networks upon which publication depended during this era.¹⁴ Although professionalization seemed to offer clearer paths into the discipline for white women and for people of color, it also masked ongoing discrimination based on gender and race that kept even many trained and credentialed scholars in positions of institutional marginality and insecurity.

Despite the marginalization that women and writers of color encountered in anthropology, this book demonstrates that many harnessed anthropological discourse to speak to public and professional audiences in a range of genres and fora. Studying the writing and rhetorical practices of these anthropologists, I investigate how their participation in an emergent scientific field gave writers such as Gladys Reichard, Ella Cara Deloria, and Zora Neale Hurston access to epistemic and rhetorical resources that they used for a host of rhetorical ends. Speaking as anthropologists, these writers were able to deploy anthropological concepts such as fieldwork and firsthand observation as rhetorical resources to ground their claims of expertise as well as their claims on their audiences' attention. At the same time, the inventive rhetorical practices these writers developed also undermined several foundational assumptions of emergent anthropological practice, such as the association between objectivity and distance. Because these writers spoke not only as anthropologists, but also from specific gendered and raced embodiments and identities, they created texts that simultaneously advanced and critiqued anthropological knowledge. In this way, the writers included in this study developed an alternative anthropological discourse that differed significantly from the deeply colonial practice that constituted nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century anthropology.

Contemporary anthropologists have increasingly recognized over the past thirty years that the discipline of anthropology emerged bearing deep entanglements with colonialism.¹⁵ In the U.S. context that this book examines, institutions of colonial governance were particularly focused on the indigenous communities across the continent whose removal through genocide and forced

relocation was viewed as crucial to the interests of nation building. Institutions such as the U.S. Department of the Interior and the Bureau of American Ethnology, along with allied epistemic techniques of surveillance and control, were important in creating the contexts of encounter where American anthropology took place.

The raced and gendered dimensions of this context of encounter appear vividly in the cover image, a 1916 photograph of Piegan leader Mountain Chief speaking into a recording device operated by ethnomusicologist Frances Densmore, one of the many researchers employed by the Bureau of American Ethnology. The staged setting of this photograph—a parlorlike studio in which two participants sit in straight-backed chairs around a phonographic cone—diverges from the scene of immersive participant observation that came to predominate in twentieth century anthropology. Yet the image foregrounds the *dependence* of anthropological knowledge production on human relationships marked by physical proximity and shaped by pervasive relations of power. The context of colonialism so clearly evoked in the cover image continued to characterize anthropological research, even as professional anthropologists developed writing and research practices that aimed to obscure or excise these contexts from their scientific publications. Such power-inflected relationships are precisely what this book sets out to investigate, through a study of anthropology's genres that treats this and other moments of encounter as rhetorical occasions, whether represented in or omitted from anthropological texts.

Scholars in Native American studies have critiqued the specific role anthropological knowledge-making practices have played in American settler colonialism, reminding us that American anthropology was founded upon the intellectual, governmental, and material domination and exploitation of indigenous communities throughout North America. Vine Deloria Jr. has critiqued the intrusion of anthropologists into the lives of Native Americans, satirizing anthropologists as an especially persistent and disruptive “tribe” and inverting the discourses of power that anthropologists have long levied to portray indigenous people as objects of knowledge rather than sovereign subjects. Anthropology's successful bid for scientific status in the early twentieth century depended upon identifying their own unique province of knowledge, distinct from the also-emerging disciplines of economics, sociology, psychology, and political science; consequently, claiming Native American communities for anthropology's intellectual jurisdiction helped to solidify the discipline's tenuous scientific status.

Despite institutional and intellectual variations across British, French, and

German traditions, similar practices linked colonialism with anthropology's emergence in these nation-states in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as well.¹⁶ French anthropologists, for instance, developed an emphasis on fieldwork much later in comparison to other anthropological traditions,¹⁷ and German anthropologists appeared to their British counterparts to enjoy an enviable access to state resources, as German universities competed with one another and with other major European cities “to develop the largest institutions, the most extensive collections, and the leading publications” in anthropology.¹⁸ No other tradition was as committed as American anthropologists were to a four-field approach that understood physical anthropology, archaeology, linguistics, and social/cultural anthropology as indispensably allied subdisciplines.¹⁹

Despite such distinctions, the era of colonial expansion that coincided with anthropology's establishment as a discipline provided substantial commonalities among these traditions. The practicalities of colonial administration served to underwrite anthropological research across several national contexts. For instance, the nineteenth-century British tradition of armchair anthropology depended heavily on access to the fieldworkers whom Sir James Frazer, Britain's foremost “anthropologist of the study,” referred to as “men on the spot”—that is, the colonial administrators, missionaries, traders, and adventurers whose observations provided theoreticians with the material out of which they built their elaborate evolutionary schemes and syntheses.²⁰ Beginning in the early twentieth century, relations between colonial administration and British anthropology would become even more extensive and formalized; for instance, both Oxford and Cambridge began offering diplomas in anthropology that were specifically marketed toward “colonial civil servants,”²¹ and Bronislaw Malinowski “insisted that colonial officials would be more effective rulers if they were trained by anthropologists to be sensitive to indigenous cultural patterns.”²² In France, although important figures such as Marcel Mauss had critiqued French colonial policy and argued for limiting ethnologists' involvement in colonial administration in the 1910s, administrative and intellectual shifts after World War I meant that “the practical need to rely on colonial figures [for ethnographic data] was less problematic to academics” than it had previously been, and France too developed extensive and intertwining lines of influence between colonial administration and academic anthropology.²³

British, continental, and American anthropology also had in common an investment in mapping and collecting projects that shared both institutional and epistemic underpinnings with colonialism. Major efforts to map colonized territories, such as the Torres Straits Expedition of 1898, led by British an-

thropologists A. C. Haddon and W. H. R. Rivers, were sponsored by colonial states seeking to secure or extend their domination over subjugated populations, and helped simultaneously to build anthropological careers.²⁴ At the same time, widespread intellectual investment in the belief that modernity naturally and inevitably supplanted premodern societies and practices contributed urgency to the ambitious projects of collection that enabled anthropologists to fill museums and the pages of their journals. Many researchers in the British and American traditions in particular believed that the “most favorable moment for ethnographical work is from ten to thirty years after a people has been brought under the influence of official and missionary” institutions, a period that was, as Rivers explained, a sufficient length of time to render colonized people “more docile,” yet not so long that their own social institutions would be completely eroded.²⁵

Anthropological collection of both cultural knowledge and material artifacts resulted in the alienation of thousands of cultural objects, linguistic materials, and sacred stories from the communities to which they belonged.²⁶ Anthropological museums in continental Europe enjoyed strong state support in the late nineteenth century, housing in France significant collections of physical specimens used for anthropological instruction and public display; in Germany, where museums served as the primary institutional settings for anthropology, massive collections of material cultural artifacts were intended to foster cosmopolitanism and comparative ethnological studies, as “libraries of ‘mankind.’”²⁷ In the early twentieth century, the nation-states in which anthropology developed viewed anthropology not only as a technique “to understand and help control people, but . . . [also] as a measure of imperialistic competition.”²⁸ In many ways, anthropology both depended upon and cemented those “new forms of power, work, and knowledge” that characterized the spread of colonialism throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries,²⁹ resulting in a knowledge-making practice that would be characterized as a “science of other men in another time.”³⁰ These historical entanglements with colonial domination continue to influence anthropology’s contemporary practice; as a discipline, anthropology “descends from and is still struggling with techniques of observation and control” that constitute a long-lasting legacy of colonialism.³¹

The consequences of anthropological authority for indigenous communities’ own sovereignty have been severe. Over time, Vine Deloria Jr. writes, “anthropologists have succeeded in burying Indian communities so completely beneath the mass of irrelevant information that the total impact of the scholarly community on Indian people has become one of simple authority.”³² Consequently,

Native American communities have had to contend repeatedly with anthropologist “experts” whose publications, testimonies, institutional positions, and authority as scientists have controlled public discourse, shaped legal decisions, and influenced popular images of what a Native American is and is not. The struggle among indigenous communities to wrest rhetorical sovereignty from anthropologists and other “Indian experts” is ongoing.³³

This study suggests that anthropology’s development as a discipline founded upon epistemic domination was not inevitable; instead, white women and scholars of color worked within American anthropological discourse to develop other grounds for anthropological knowledge in the early twentieth century. As anthropology emerged, women and anthropologists of color articulated an alternative scientific practice, which they promoted in publications targeting both professional and public audiences. While mainstream anthropologists were articulating their authority over indigenous peoples as a mechanism for generating scientific status, other epistemic practices—ways of making knowledge that did not depend upon domination—were also being articulated in anthropological texts. Offering a counterstory to the disciplining that accompanies professionalization, many anthropologists—including white women such as Gladys Reichard, Ruth Underhill, and Ann Axtell Morris, Native writers such as Ella Cara Deloria and D’Arcy McNickle, and African American writers such as Zora Neale Hurston and Louis Eugene King—created anthropological arguments that attempted to question the discourses of insularity, objectivity, and gender neutrality that scientific professionalization enforced, and that the racialized and gendered identities of these writers undermined.

Counterstories of Scientific Practice

The counterstory I tell in this book is not one I anticipated uncovering when I began investigating anthropological discourse in 2005. As a graduate student in a rhetoric and composition program, I was looking for insight into the relationship between personal experiences and forms of public expression that become knowledge; my advisor suggested I take a graduate seminar in the anthropology department to learn how contemporary anthropologists approached this issue in their own writing. The innovative texts I was introduced to by the professor of anthropology who continued to work with me on my dissertation project—texts such as Renato Rosaldo’s *Culture and Truth*, Ruth Behar’s *The Vulnerable Observer*, Orin Starn’s *Nightwatch*—taught me that contemporary anthropologists were, indeed, undertaking the intricate work of theorizing the relationships between subjectivity and objectivity, between

representation and self-representation, between experience and knowledge that animated my studies in rhetoric and composition.

Thus, in my first foray into the historical study of American anthropology, I was looking only for background, hoping to characterize the (objectivist, positivist, imperialist) tradition of anthropological writing in order to cast the ethnographic experiments of the 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s in high relief. I was not searching overtly for texts authored by women anthropologists or by people of color. Yet I kept coming across books—on the shelves in the library, or more typically stored off-campus but logged in the online catalog with intriguing titles such as *Autobiography of a Papago Woman* or *Dezba, Woman of the Desert*—that deviated significantly from the narrative of anthropology's professionalization that I had gleaned from late-twentieth-century anthropological texts. These odd books constructed knowledge in ways that looked very different from classic ethnographies like Malinowski's *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. They were sometimes autobiographical, sometimes fictional, sometimes fragmented. They were self-reflexive in ways I had not anticipated. Like the experimental ethnographic texts of the 1990s, these books existed on the borders between other, more recognizable genres. And many were written by women and people of color, people who had training as anthropologists but who were missing from histories of the field, histories that often read as a litany of forefathers: John Wesley Powell and Lewis Henry Morgan, Franz Boas, Alfred Kroeber, Edward Sapir, Robert Lowie, Robert Redfield, and so on. The postmodern anthropologists who were crafting reflexive, multivocal, and public-oriented texts in their efforts to devise more humane forms of representation and knowledge production seemed to be echoing the strategies I saw in use among early-twentieth-century anthropologists whose deviant textual practices had been subjected to historical erasure. What explanations—intersections between gender, race, genre, and scientific professionalization—could make sense of this odd echo and could recover these earlier alternatives to the practice of anthropology as the exercise of domination?

These early-twentieth-century ethnographic experiments were compelling because my investigations into the role of the personal in academic writing had already introduced me to landmark ethnographic studies of teaching, learning, and literacy such as Shirley Brice Heath's *Ways with Words* (1983), Wendy Bishop's *Something Old, Something New* (1990), Ralph Cintron's *Angels' Town* (1997), Ira Shor's *When Students Have Power* (1996), Ellen Cushman's *The Struggle and the Tools* (1998), Julie Lindquist's *A Place to Stand* (2002), and David Seitz's *Who Can Afford Critical Consciousness?* (2004). These studies demonstrated the power

of ethnographic research to illuminate in rich detail the tensions, struggles, and negotiations underlying the routine practices of central interest to our field: how people teach and learn and participate in public discourse, in classrooms, neighborhoods, workplaces and elsewhere. Rhetoric and composition researchers' vigorous interest in ethnography—not as the colonial practice of anthropological history, but as an interpretive, generative, and rhetorical research process—continues in the first decades of the twenty-first century as scholars use ethnographic methods to research classroom and extracurricular spaces of literacy; to investigate writing practices in professions, institutions, and across national and cultural contexts; and to examine subjects such as rural literacies, spoken word poetry, the authorship practices of online poker players, and the spatial and social practices of coffeehouse writers.³⁴ These varied projects underscore what Brown and Dobrin call the “resilience of ethnographic inquiry” and confirm its relevance to the study of communicative action central to our discipline.³⁵

Although the innovative genres I recover in this book were short-lived, their authors marginalized and isolated from centers of institutional power, many of the ethnographic experiments I identify in the following chapters are likely to sound an echo for members of our discipline who engage with ethnography as a present research practice. The reflexive quality of contemporary ethnographies, for instance, finds echo in Ann Axtell Morris's field autobiographies. Morris deploys personal narrative to explain the intellectual motivations and personal attachments that propelled her into her archaeological field research, and in doing so opens up her research practice to readers' scrutiny. Julie Lindquist, in her powerful 2002 rhetorical ethnography of political discourse and class identification in a working-class bar, *A Place to Stand*, deploys a similar autobiographical maneuver, recounting her intellectual and personal history in order to foreground for her readers the role played by her attachments and identifications in her research practice. Multivocality—the creation within a text of distinct, sometimes contradictory voices, orchestrated rather than effaced by the ethnographer—is likewise a textual strategy that resonates across early and recent ethnographic experiments. The powerful multivocal quality of Zora Neale Hurston's *Mules and Men* resonates, for instance, with more recent ethnographies such as Ralph Cintron's *Angels' Town*, where Cintron interweaves his voice as ethnographer with the official discourse of documents of legality, with excerpts of dialogue from his conversations with research participants and friends, and with handwritten notes and others' retold stories.

These echoes should highlight the stakes of the institutional forces I trace

over the course of this book that kept these innovative textual practices from significantly redirecting the positivist, imperialist ethnographic tradition. Although mainstream ethnography “often replicated the oppressive effects, if not the material conditions, of colonization,”³⁶ this book aims to demonstrate the presence within that tradition of other possibilities enacted by writers who, without the benefit of postmodern theories of knowledge or recent critical vocabularies, nevertheless voiced in their ethnographic texts an insistence that ethnographers should, in Bruce Horner’s words, “acknowledge . . . their partiality, the effect of their work on the lives of those at the research site, and the rights of participants to have a say, and a hand, in the nature and direction of that work.”³⁷

Examining these forgotten discursive practices illuminates not only anthropology’s history, but broader tensions between gender, race, and access to rhetorical resources of scientific discourse as well. The science of anthropology contains a fundamental tension related to the profound availability of its primary method of knowledge production—that is, ethnographic observation. Observation is a technique that is inherently democratic; no special technical equipment is required to conduct ethnographic observation, and the material of observation does not require complex measurements or statistical maneuvers for its interpretation.³⁸ The availability of anthropology’s central knowledge-making operation was, in fact, emphasized in early efforts to recruit potential researchers; an early officer in the Anthropological Society of Washington, D.C., for instance, proclaimed that “any man, woman, or child” could be an anthropologist who had “sense and patience to observe and to honestly record the thing observed.”³⁹ The mundane availability of observation as a research method highlights the rhetorical nature of anthropology’s construction as a science; to establish their status as scientists in the early twentieth century context of professionalization, anthropologists had to build rigorous exclusions around a widely available method of knowledge production. This study analyzes the rhetorical work that was necessary to produce agreement around the notions of fieldwork and firsthand observation as elements of a rigorous scientific methodology. Constraining access to fieldwork as a rhetorical resource and access to the genre of the ethnographic monograph as a site for knowledge production shored up anthropology’s scientific status early in the twentieth century. These constraints, which worked to limit the availability of fieldwork and firsthand observation as knowledge-making practices, were collective rhetorical accomplishments with wide-ranging implications for the practice and public importance of this new science. These collective efforts

helped to generate what Levine, analyzing the relations among historians, archaeologists, and antiquarians, calls “the value-laden distinction[s]” that engendered professional standing for certain participants through the rigorously maintained exclusion of others.⁴⁰

Studying this case also helps me to demonstrate for scholars in genre studies, rhetoric of science, and feminist histories of rhetoric the extent to which professionalization of this scientific community was both enacted and contested through revisions to ethnographic genres. If we looked only at the monograph, the most privileged institutional genre of the period, we would uncover a narrative that mirrors that of most other professionalized sciences and social sciences: disciplinary boundaries were articulated and enforced as they were built into the discipline’s privileged textual forms. Earlier studies of genre change, such as Charles Bazerman’s *Shaping Written Knowledge* and Alan Gross, Joseph Harmon, and Michael Reidy’s *Communicating Science*, reveal how textual forms in scientific fields change over time in ways that reinforce scientific professionalization and strengthen boundaries between disciplinary insiders and outsiders. But by extending this investigation into the decades after the dominance of the monograph was established, we see that participants continued to redirect the aims and practices of their science, and they did so by adopting, adapting, and repurposing the rhetorical resources available in anthropological discourse. The short-lived genres I study in this project—field autobiographies, folklore collections, and ethnographic novels—might appear peripheral to the practice of anthropology, but the existence of these genres is revealing.

In particular, the emergence of these alternative anthropological genres in the 1920s and 1930s underscores the unfinished nature of scientific professionalization. The work that writers undertake in these alternative genres reveals the instability and unsettled quality of anthropological methods, aims, and audiences, despite the rigorous constraints embedded in ethnographic monographs during this period. I contend that these genres served as sites where the marginalized white women and people of color who wrote them continued to reshape and revise those methods, aims, and audiences that were ostensibly settled by the solidification of the monograph as the discipline’s primary location for knowledge production. Writers of ethnographic novels, for instance, sought to create accurate knowledge about Native American education policies that would move public audiences to action; in this way writers countered the discourse of insularity that separated professional knowledge from public policy debates. Similarly, writers of color repurposed the resources of anthropological discourse to craft, in their folklore collections, accounts of African American

and Dakota communities that contested the damaging abstractions that were typical of anthropological discourse, while white women anthropologists wrote field autobiographies that contested the discourse of gender neutrality and instead reinscribed gendered embodiment into their acts of knowledge production. In a range of anthropological genres, practitioners simultaneously deployed the professional discourse of anthropology and questioned whether that discourse could accommodate knowledge produced out of relations of reciprocity rather than relations of domination.

That the writers in this study deployed anthropological discourse for such divergent ends illustrates the high stakes that motivate a community seeking scientific status. Although writing in alternative genres such as folklore collections and ethnographic novels, these writers made use of specialized discursive and rhetorical resources to claim status for their arguments *as knowledge*. Rather than rejecting scientific discourse, the writers in this study deployed anthropological discourse to diverse ends in fictional, autobiographical, and other mixed-genre texts. Because science in the early twentieth century enjoyed enormous epistemic privilege and social prestige—benefits that arguably continue to characterize scientific communities and discourses—establishing their knowledge practices as *scientific* was something anthropologists approached with considerable urgency. For instance, Franz Boas worried publicly about the fate of any science in which “the lay members largely outnumber the scientific contributors. . . . The greater the public interest in a science, and the less technical knowledge it appears to require, the greater is the danger that meetings may assume the character of popular lectures. Anthropology is one of the sciences in which this danger is ever imminent.”⁴¹ As a science, anthropology could compete with other disciplines for resources being allocated by new philanthropic foundations, such as the Carnegie Institution of Washington and the Rockefeller Foundation, and by organizations such as the Social Science Research Council and the National Research Council.⁴² Perhaps as important as access to these material resources was access to the epistemic status that a scientific discipline in the early twentieth century enjoyed. As participants in the broader community of scientists, anthropologists could argue for the objectivity and public usefulness of their intellectual program, as indeed Boas and other leaders in the field did repeatedly during the 1920s and 1930s.

Gaining status as a science enabled anthropologists to benefit from the ascriptions of disinterestedness, objectivity, and rationality that scientific communities enjoy. In fact, the apparent rationality and objectivity promised by scientific discourse have historically masked the gendered and racial assump-

tions that have frequently underpinned scientific practice. Many feminist science scholars have investigated the gendered culture of science, demonstrating that “gender inequalities have been built into the production and structure of [scientific] knowledge.”⁴³ The fundamentally gendered and racialized culture of science worked against even the antiracist and profeminist work of some early anthropologists. Indeed, Boas and many of his students explicitly pursued an antiracist agenda in their research, discounting the social evolutionist theories that held sway in the early twentieth century and seeking to lend scientific support to concepts such as cultural relativism and the greater importance of environmental factors (rather than “racial” or inherent factors) on qualities such as intelligence, creativity, and productivity.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, as feminist science scholars demonstrate, scientific discourse systematically constitutes its objects of knowledge *as objects*, subject to the scientist’s superior control and understanding; consequently, scientific knowledge practices and institutions still perpetuate gendered and racist social formations and help to secure the material and epistemic privileges enjoyed by white, male, Euro-American elites.⁴⁵ Ultimately, this study underscores the enormous power of scientific discourse—its power for the communities trying to claim it, and its power over the communities that found themselves claimed as objects of scientific knowledge.

The implications of scientific authority in the case of anthropology extend particularly to the sovereignty of Native American communities, who continue to engage in the work of defining their own realities and futures against an expert discourse that has long wrested rhetorical and legal control from indigenous communities.⁴⁶ This study of anthropological discourse—its establishment as a professional science as well as the implicit critiques articulated by women and anthropologists of color throughout the 1920s and 1930s—underscores the link between knowledge production, professionalization, and the exercise of domination. In this case, gaining status as a professional science depended significantly upon gaining public authority over Native American artifacts, legal decisions, histories, and policies.⁴⁷ Study of the discourse of anthropology—a discourse overtly positioned in the early twentieth century as the authoritative discourse over Native American lives—reminds us that “despite the standard appeals to method and disinterestedness, professionalism is a *moral* matter inescapably, a matter of unequal relations and the anxieties they produce.”⁴⁸

In this way, this study of alternative anthropological writing produced by women and people of color in the early twentieth century also contributes to scholarly examinations of Native American rhetorical practices. The processes that authorized anthropological discourse to speak publicly about and

for indigenous communities exercised domination in part through stripping those communities of what Scott Lyons calls “rhetorical sovereignty.” Lyons identifies rhetorical sovereignty as “the inherent right and ability of *peoples* to determine their own communicative needs and desires . . . , to decide for themselves the goals, modes, styles, and languages of public discourse.”⁴⁹ Rhetorical techniques of contestation and continuation exercised by indigenous communities—what Malea Powell, following Gerald Vizenor, calls “rhetorics of survivance”—pose a significant and still understudied response to practices of scientific racism and intellectual domination that so frequently characterized anthropological discourse. Survivance, according to Vizenor, “is an active sense of presence over absence, deracination, and oblivion; survivance is the continuance of stories, not a mere reaction.”⁵⁰

Studying writings by Native American anthropologists extends the study of “rhetorics of survivance” into the realm of professional discourse, examining how writers’ gendered and raced identities reposition professional discourse. Through this framework, we can see the scholarly and popular writings of a figure like Ella Cara Deloria as not merely a reaction to the abstracted, isolated portrayals of her community that circulated in scientific and popular discourse, but also as a strategy of survivance, an active effort to respeak Dakota realities using the full range of discursive tools at her disposal. At the same time, in speaking scientifically from a deeply invested position, Deloria implicitly challenges the neutrality and objectivity that scientific discourse attaches to itself, repositioning scientific discourse and Dakota representations simultaneously.

Changing Genres, Changing Communities

This study uses the concept of genre to understand these discursive negotiations for several reasons. As scholars have thoroughly reformulated our field’s understanding of genre over the past few decades, they have moved beyond classificatory schemes that label familiar categories such as mystery, comedy, drama, and so on, and instead have articulated genres as flexible, productive sites for achieving social and rhetorical actions.⁵¹ In these formulations, genres are understood not as ossified forms but as flexible “constellations of regulated, improvisational strategies” that writers and speakers adapt to their varying rhetorical needs.⁵² In contrast to prior formulations that portrayed genres as primarily formal conventions or sets of rules, scholars now emphasize the combination of constraints and creativity that genres embody for both writers and readers, viewing “both constraint and choice [as] necessary and therefore positive components of genre.”⁵³ These reformulations position genre at the

intersection between shared social norms and individual communicative actions, and consequently at the center of social life. As genres are taken up by the writers and readers who use them, they enable participants in groups as institutionalized as professional biologists and as dispersed as teenage authors of Harry Potter fan fiction to define community boundaries, reinforce shared values, coordinate collective activity, and accomplish all manner of social action.

Genres offer an especially useful mechanism for investigating discourse within a specific academic discipline because genres are often used by participants to regulate boundaries and to enact and enforce community norms. Because they lie at the intersection between shared social norms and individual, unique utterances, genres play a crucial role in the *disciplining* process that accompanies professionalization. This disciplining happens in multiple ways: by shaping the subject positions writers and readers may adopt, by shaping the rhetorical and epistemic practices writers may deploy, and by shaping the values writers and readers are assumed to share.⁵⁴ As genres “locate or position individuals within the power relations of institutional activity,”⁵⁵ they also serve to normalize and reproduce those relations and to stabilize the worldviews they imply—for instance, by constructing some people as knowers while positioning others as consumers or objects of knowledge and by authorizing certain versions of reality at the expense of other versions.⁵⁶ Because genres are ideological structures that both reflect and shape social relations through the actions they are used to accomplish, investigating the genres of a specific professional community offers scholars further insight into the connections between rhetorical activity and relations of power.⁵⁷

The case of American anthropology underscores the normalizing function of genre. Across the first decades of the twentieth century, the anthropological community’s methods for generating knowledge; practices for producing trained practitioners; and rhetorical strategies for garnering agreement, generating research problems, and allocating institutional resources were all in flux. During this period of fluctuation, the most privileged anthropological genre, the ethnographic monograph, served as a site where participants in this community articulated and reinforced those values, methods, and practices they wanted their fellow anthropologists to adopt. By cementing shared values such as objectivity and scientific rationality, writers of ethnographic monographs used this key genre to regulate and discipline the kind of knowledge their community created. Professional anthropologists made the monograph genre increasingly rigid, permitting a narrowing range of arguments and methods for

knowledge production in order to differentiate between legitimate anthropologists and mere adventurers and amateurs. Genres constitute subjects as participants or nonparticipants of particular discourse communities; typically, “to do business within a specific community, we occupy the subject position offered by the genre or genres at hand.”⁵⁸ Disciplinary communities thus use genres not only to produce knowledge or generate agreement, but also to determine—and to reinforce—distinctions between community insiders and outsiders. Appropriate production of a privileged genre, like the ethnographic monograph, can become a key criterion for admission, a device for admitting or denying entrance to potential practitioners. Indeed, the development of anthropology over the early twentieth century suggests that this function of genre can be a crucial component of a field’s professionalization and establishment in the academy.

The epistemic component of genres makes this framework particularly useful for the study of scientific genres within a discipline undergoing such changes—changes that can be otherwise difficult to reconstruct in historical retrospect. Taking up a genre means taking up the forms of knowledge and the subject positions that genre organizes and makes available. The genres a discipline uses to generate appropriate, methodologically sound knowledge also function as mechanisms for *disciplining* the knowledge that members of the community create. For instance, by privileging the ethnographic monograph as the primary site for anthropological knowledge production, the professionalizing community of early American anthropology was able to categorize alternative knowledge-making practices—located in genres that differed from the monograph—as peripheral to the discipline, or outside its boundaries altogether. In this way, disciplinary communities can minimize the influence of alternative practices and critiques, which, if located in atypical genres, can be dismissed as unrelated to the discipline’s central concerns. Consequently, examining the genres produced by anthropologists lets us see how epistemic practices were negotiated over these decades of institutional transformation.

Historical study of a community’s genres creates an opportunity for scholars to engage in a practice I identify as rhetorical archaeology. In the knowledge-making practices they organize and make available to writers, genres “encode” epistemic traditions and “bear the imprints of scientific cultures”—imprints that genres concretize and thus make visible to historical researchers.⁵⁹ Carol Berkenkotter describes the genres a profession develops and discards as material traces of prior epistemic negotiations: “written genres, like pottery shards, bones, and rock strata, are material artifacts providing valuable information on how disciplines/professions that were initially undifferentiated

established themselves as discrete knowledge-producing communities (specializations) with distinctive affiliations and forums.”⁶⁰ Reconstructing these negotiations through historical genre study allows us to denaturalize the forms of knowledge production that, ultimately, won out in a particular professional community. By locating in discarded (or transmuted) genres the historical traces of alternative epistemic practices, we can uncover submerged disciplinary tensions and locate other grounds of knowledge.

These alternative visions of anthropological practice are possible because, even as genres reinforce shared norms, they serve also as locations for discursive and epistemic innovations. Because an individual text never *perfectly* enacts shared norms, shaped as each text is by the unique and unrepeatable rhetorical context in which it occurs, genres exist in a state of perpetual flux and revision as well.⁶¹ Furthermore, the rhetorical and physical mobility of writers and readers, who shift across professional, personal, and public contexts, ensures that the genres used within a single community are repeatedly juxtaposed against those that circulate elsewhere. This prevents any particular genre from existing in isolation or exercising a totalizing effect on those who use it and opens up genres to continuous renegotiation.⁶² Furthermore, as “constellations of regulated, improvisational strategies,” genres permit writers to combine, overlay, evoke, adapt, and borrow rhetorical strategies *across* genres to achieve innovative effects.⁶³

Genre analysis thus allows us to see both the enactment of community norms and the ways that writers negotiate and contest those norms. For instance, the women who wrote field autobiographies in the 1930s shared certain scientific values with their professional colleagues, such as the value of firsthand observation in ethnographic fieldwork, or the value of stratigraphy for dating archaeological specimens. Yet they also wrote about their gendered experiences in the field in ways that raised questions about the shared value of gender neutrality, and they drew from the genre of autobiography—reaching outside the boundaries of the monograph genre—in order to represent their gendered embodiment in relation to their fieldwork practice. This study recognizes the role of genre in reinforcing community norms, yet also demonstrates that genres can sometimes be taken up differently in ways that question or revise shared community values. Anthropological writings by white women and scholars of color reveal the extended, uneven accomplishment of professionalization in anthropology. These writers wrestled with the limitations of anthropological discourse for the range of rhetorical purposes they brought to their scientific work.

Such negotiations of genre, like the genres themselves, are deeply inflected by relations of power. Consequently, this study responds to the power-inflected questions Aviva Freedman and Peter Medway have posed for genre scholars: “How do some genres come to be valorized? In whose interest is such valorization? What kinds of social organization are put in place or kept in place by such valorization? . . . What opportunities do the relationships reflected in and structured by a genre afford for humane creative action or, alternatively, for the domination of others?”⁶⁴ To address these questions, this book examines the monographs, field autobiographies, folklore collections, and ethnographic novels anthropologists wrote in the early twentieth century, and finds that these genres—as configurations of rhetorical strategies and as sites for rhetorical action—substantially shaped relationships among anthropological rhetors, their audiences, their objects of knowledge, and the discipline of anthropology they enacted.

Portraying Space, Enacting Power

The centrality of spatial portrayals to the practice of anthropology offers insight for rhetorical scholars who seek to understand spatial dimensions of rhetorical practice. As a number of eminent anthropologists have noted, anthropological discourse is unique among scholarly fields in its reliance upon *being there*.⁶⁵ The phrase “being there” evokes the double sense in which spatial portrayals function epistemically in anthropology: both being *somewhere* in particular and being somewhere *not here* more specifically. Making knowledge in anthropology originates in *occupying space* within a particular community, recording firsthand observations and idiosyncratic experiences in the form of field notes, and translating these notes into textual products such as monographs and articles. Although this process culminates, as in other academic disciplines, by securing the agreement of other anthropologists through processes of peer review and publication, the fundamentally unrepeatable nature of ethnographic field research demands that anthropological writers perpetually confront what Clifford Geertz has called “the oddity of constructing texts ostensibly scientific out of experiences broadly biographical.”⁶⁶

Furthermore, the spatial distinction between “there” and “here” organizes the foundational difference between Other and Self, that privileged dichotomy upon which so much anthropological knowledge-making is premised.⁶⁷ Anthropologists write out of a tradition that “privileges direct observation and links it to a radical separation between ‘home’ and the ‘field.’”⁶⁸ Anthropologist James Clifford, too, argues that travel *away* from one’s home is a constitutive act

that generates ethnographic authority.⁶⁹ Such spatial distinctions organize and generate the cultural difference that anthropology both enacts and seeks to explain. Although critical inquiry into these foundational logics has reshaped the conditions of knowledge production for contemporary anthropologists, nevertheless, “in many methodological, organizational, and professional aspects the discipline retains the shape it received when it emerged from—if partly in opposition to—early twentieth century colonial circumstances,” including its reliance upon travel to sites both spatially distant and socially distinct in order to generate ethnographic knowledge.⁷⁰ Ruth Behar foregrounds the inversions and contradictions of ethnographic knowledge-making when she writes that anthropologists’ “uncertainty and dependency on our subjects in the field is shifted into a position of authority back home when we stand at the podium, reading our ethnographic writing aloud to other stressed-out ethnographers at academic conferences held in Hiltons where the chandeliers dangle by a thread and the air-conditioning chills us to the bone.”⁷¹ Behar and many other contemporary anthropologists have attempted to work against the power differentials that enable anthropologists to go *there* to create knowledge that they speak about *here* almost exclusively to other anthropologists.

Recent scholarship in rhetoric has drawn attention to the subtlety with which space works rhetorically, shaping attitudes, influencing actions, and inducing identification, often without arousing audience awareness of its effects. Recognizing that “rhetorical practices create and maintain the space of their own operation,” scholars have increasingly subjected such spaces to investigation.⁷² Sites such as the Civil Rights Memorial or the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, for instance, locate, generate, and shape collective memories, collective identities, and persuasive accounts of a shared past, while other material environments, such as urban spaces, commercial buildings, and museums impact rhetorical performances and shape social practices in powerful ways.⁷³ Discursive portrayals of spaces also function rhetorically in powerful ways. For instance, portrayals of spaces such as classrooms and parlors circulate arguments about the bodies and practices that are and are not appropriate within these settings.⁷⁴ Chronotopes, or normative orientations to space and time, support implicit claims that are difficult to contest because they remain largely unspoken.⁷⁵ The concept of “rhetorical space” has emerged to foreground the interaction between the discursive and material dimensions of the spatial. Rhetorical spaces include the material environments where marginalized rhetors have endeavored to position their bodies to speak—parlors, classrooms, pulpits, stages, and so on—and, at

the same time, the discursive realms that these rhetors have struggled to access and influence.⁷⁶

In the case of anthropology, the field as a gendered site for research can offer insight into the power of spaces as simultaneously material and discursive resources in rhetorical practice. Fieldwork was viewed as particularly dangerous for women—an antidomestic arena in which anthropologists were expected to forego familiar comforts in order to more truly immerse themselves in the lives of those Others they studied.⁷⁷ Gaining physical access to the spaces of fieldwork was a crucial mechanism for garnering authority; both material resources (funding for travel, food, equipment, and payment to informants) and discursive performances (such as petitions for funds and follow-up reports) were required to support that access. And women's bodies, when women were present, often disrupted the ostensibly gender-free practice of field research. After the Laboratory of Anthropology, a Santa Fe-based field school for training in fieldwork techniques, was initiated in 1927, Elsie Clews Parsons was outraged to find that Alfred Kroeber, Alfred Kidder, and Edward Sapir had selected no women students for the field school in 1929. Parsons wrote angrily to ask Kroeber why he had "become so anti-feminist in regard to the Santa Fe Laboratory fellowships."⁷⁸ Sapir and Kidder felt equally attacked by this charge, and Sapir responded to Parsons to explain that "the share that women are taking in scientific work, particularly in field work, is just a bit more of a problem, it seems to me, than some are willing to admit."⁷⁹ In particular, including (unmarried, graduate-student) women in "mixed" groups during the extended excursions for field training organized by the Laboratory of Anthropology could lead to "highly disturbing and embarrassing problems," Sapir insisted. This language voices deep anxieties surrounding the intrusion of women's bodies, suggesting that the routine of fieldwork as a practice for initiating men into a professional community was significantly disrupted by women's extensive involvement in the discipline during the 1920s and 1930s.

Alongside these questions of embodied access to space, discursive portrayals of space in anthropological texts often function as resources for establishing who does and does not inhabit the same worlds, by distinguishing *then* and *there* from *here* and *now*. My study of anthropological discourse analyzes textual portrayals of space precisely because textual representations and material realities are mutually dependent. Through spatial representations, American anthropologists grounded knowledge claims and institutionalized their authority over the Native American communities they frequently studied.⁸⁰ These

textual practices had material consequences, both within the discipline of anthropology and among the Native American communities upon whom that discipline depended.

My approach considers how material spaces are deployed discursively in arguments about who belongs to a community, who belongs in a particular space, and what practices are appropriate there. Tracing what I identify as “spatial-rhetorical practices” and examining how these practices are deployed across anthropological genres, I demonstrate that spatial portrayals served both to objectify indigenous peoples, serving the ends of professionalization, and to provide writers in this study with rhetorical tools for contestation and response. Because space is “not a thing but rather a set of relations between things,” those relations are subject to revision.⁸¹ Consequently, writers of field autobiographies, folklore collections, and ethnographic novels were able to revise relations between the subjects, objects, and ends of anthropological knowledge-making by revising anthropological genres. The writers in this study exploit the rhetorical resources available in alternative genres, including resources for spatial representations, in ways that challenge dominant discourses of objectivity, gender neutrality, and professional insularity. Furthermore, because embodiment shapes spatial experiences in significant ways, these writers use their embodied experiences as white women, as African American women, as Sioux women, as Salish men, and so on, to critique and revise dominant practices. These spatial strategies were enacted through genres, which organized differential access to rhetorical and epistemic resources for the anthropologists who adopted them.

In what follows, I investigate how anthropologists gained access to the powerful, privileged realm of science in the early twentieth century, and how—in response to this successful bid for scientific status—women and writers of color sought to renegotiate their own status within professional anthropology. As I examine these negotiations, the spatial concepts of access and position allow me to keep considerations of power firmly in view. Gaining access to privileged material and intellectual resources allows a writer to gain a position of power, and denying access—by using racialized and gendered identity markers to distinguish between those capable of observing truly and writing scientifically and those incapable, for instance—allows some members of a community to retain positions of privilege for themselves and not others. Although professional anthropologists denied rhetorical agency and power to the communities upon which they built their science, some writers located within alternative genres the epistemic and rhetorical resources that enabled them to articulate a different

science, founded on relations of exchange and reciprocity rather than relations of domination.

Ultimately, this book examines how professionalization is both enacted through genre-based constraints and contested through genre-based rhetorical innovations. This investigation reveals the workings of power and discourse within a community making a bid for scientific status. My goal in this project is not merely to critique how anthropologists turned their field into a science in the early twentieth century; as Susan Wells argues in her investigation of nineteenth-century women physicians, it is generally unproductive to criticize people whose work is already done. Indeed, anthropology has produced copious criticism of its own historical practices as the discipline has struggled with its colonial legacy in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Instead, I examine the alternative forms of knowledge production invented by writers who tried, in their ethnographic novels, field autobiographies, and folklore collections, to enact a vision of anthropological science that rested on an alternative set of relationships. Examining genres that were ephemeral and emergent tells a story of ongoing negotiation of professional practice by participants in the discipline who sought other grounds for—and other uses for—scientific knowledge.