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In the 1930s many American anthropologists came to the then still new Soviet Union for different reasons—among others, Leslie White and Jack Harris (Madden 1999). Some came because they thought there was a great experiment in socialism going on and they wanted to take part in it. Others, however, came for much less ideological reasons. Two of the latter were Roy Franklin Barton (1883-1947) and Archie Phinney (1903-1949).

In 1905, Barton had been part of the early cohort of military, government and educational/philanthropic workers who came from the United States to the Philippines. For the next two years he carried on fieldwork in northern Luzon, returning for another six months between 1910 and 1912, on the basis of which he produced the ethnography *Ifugao Law* in 1919 (Kroeber 1949; Vincent 1990:137-46). During the 1920s Barton lived in California, where he had contact with members of the Berkeley department of anthropology, and at the time he went to the Soviet Union was apparently trying to avoid a court order to pay alimony and child support in that state. Phinney was a Native American and an enrolled member of the Nez Percé tribe of Idaho, who had collected Nez Percé language texts under Boas’ supervision, although he had not been a student working for a degree (Phinney 1934). Barton was recommended to Boas by A. L. Kroeber, although Boas was familiar with his Philippine ethnography, and may have met him in New York on his way to Leningrad in 1930. In each case, their trips to the Soviet Union were mediated by Boas, who recommended them to Vladimir Bogoraz (Waldemar Bogoras), a participant in the Jesup North Pacific Expedition who had gone on to become a leading figure in Russian and Soviet anthropology. Bogoraz arranged the participation of each of the pair in programs of the Leningrad Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography. Barton, who arrived in the Soviet Union in June 1930, was given a position as Curator of the India and Indonesia sections; Phinney, who arrived in November 1932, was entered into the Aspirant (or Ph.D. equivalent) program, which included room and board, along with a stipend.

Phinney remained in the Soviet Union until June, 1937 when he returned to the United States to accept a job in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which he held until the day of his death in October 1949. Barton retained his position in the Leningrad Museum until 1940, when all U.S. passport holders were ordered out because of World War II, and instead of resettling in the United States traveled to the Philippines with the hope of undertaking further fieldwork in the Mountain Province of Luzon. Caught there by the Japanese invasion, he spent the next three and a half years in Baguio and Los Baños prison camps. After being freed in 1944, he returned to California, where he began making plans further fieldwork in the Mountain Province. Unfortunately, however, he was physically debilitated by his prison camp experience and died in 1947 after surgery for ulcerated leg veins and gall stones.

Letters from, to, and about these two men provide a window into the life of American anthropologists in Leningrad, and in the Soviet Union during the years of the Stalinist Great Terror after the assassination of Sergei Kirov on December 3, 1933. The letters of the duo are much more informative taken together than singly. Until after 1937, when the increasing rigors of the Great Terror made it dangerous to have correspondence with outside countries, Barton wrote chatty notes, with names and details about what he was doing and what was happening around him. Phinney wrote very cautious letters once he found “they ransack my letters” as he said in a December 1932 letter to Boas (not included here). The selections reproduced below are from the Boas Collection in the Library of the American Philosophical Society, and are reproduced with the Library’s permission.
Dear Professor Boas:

I have been here more than three weeks, lodged in this institute, which was formerly a theological seminary. Professor Bogoraz says “We took down the pictures of saints and put live heathen into it.”

I have two teachers in Russian, and have acquired more vocabulary than I know how to use. I find it hard to change to the Russian manner of saying things and am also bothered by Spanish or Malay, which it seems, I ought to be speaking to these foreigners! Everybody has been most kind to me. I have been astounded at the contrasts – I have visited several factories and have found them operating efficiently so far as I have been able to judge, and every one has a board displaying statistics showing greater output per man and lowered unit costs. On the other hand there are long lines of people waiting to buy any thing that may happen to be on sale. People have plenty of money and want to spend it – their trouble is to do so. Things cost four or five times as much as in America usually, and there aren’t often any for sale. I haven’t had any thing good to eat since I’ve been in Russia. Strange to say, I feel better than I ever did before in my life.

I would have gone to the Far East with the commissioner in charge of the work amongst the primitive folk of Northern Siberia if I had not to wait for galley proofs of my book. It would have been a long trip and I would have had a few days with perhaps twenty tribes. However, I shall probably be able to take the trip with him next summer.

August 26, 1930

Dear Professor Boas:

I have been in Russia more than two months, now, and have made quite a bit of progress in the Russian language. For more than a month I have been doing some research work at the Somatological Institute which is quite absorbing and which may turn out to be of some practical benefit to the country. This work will be in shape to leave with the Russians after two or three months more, and I should then like to go to Siberia with the fellowship we spoke of. I believe that I could most profitably make a cultural study of the Goldi or Oroki of the lower Amur region and at the same time look for Malay influence, which is supposed to have reached into Korea, on the lower Amur. So far as possible I should like to go with a free hand, since I have become acquainted with the chief of the work among the primitive folk, and he has offered me all possible assistance and to take me on one of his trips of inspection. At present, however, and tentatively, the above seems a very interesting and profitable field of study.

Dear Professor Boas:

Professor Bogoras tells me that you are back in New York. I hope you will not let the matter of the fellowship in the Guggenheim Foundation slip your memory; I am quite anxious to get it and have my plans all laid. I am beginning to be able to think in Russian instead of having to translate and to be able to figure out words from their roots and affixes.

I gave an illustrated lecture at the Institute Narodov Cevera on the pagans of the Philippines the other night. The pupils were tremendously interested in the Philippine folk and gathered around afterward to ask quite intelligent questions. My talk was interpreted by a Russian communist and she, two or three Americans and I inspected the dormitories. There are twenty two different tribes there; not much physical difference between them is apparent on casual looking at them. The students are allowed to marry and
there are four young babies. My interpretess was greatly put out at finding that the mothers were sleeping
with the babies and told the management to see the rayon soviet about it and get their help to procure
beds for the babies. What impressed me was the fact that these young people did not seem to be
conscious of any physical difference between themselves and us, or if conscious of it considered it an
unimportant detail. They talked as easily and amiably as if they had been Russians and said precisely the
same things as Russians would have said. One young lady, badly small-pocked, who had run away from
slavery in her tribe and thrown herself on the mercy of soviet officials could not say enough in praise of
the institution and will no doubt be a powerful influence when she goes back to her tribe. The students in
addition to maintenance get 20 r. a month for spending money.

Prof. Bogoras is an exceedingly hard worker. He told me I could come at any time between 11
o'clock and 1 – and I have gone several times at that hour and found him dictating. Other Russian
ethnographers are trying very hard to interpret primitive cultures according to Marx.

November 17, 1940

Dear Dr. Boas:

On this separate sheet, I will tell you something about the death of Professor Bogoras, as I do not
know whether you already know all that I am now able to write you. He was laid up with thrombo-
phlebitis in both legs for about three months during the winter. He fretted quite a bit about the Museum
of the History of Religion of which he was director and got permission, when he had become better, to
go to it. This gave his legs a turn for the worse. He then thought that if he could get down south, to his
brother, a physician in the Ukraine, he would recover, and started there by train, with a trained nurse in
attendance. He died on the way. As I remember this was in April.

The Academy of Sciences turned out to meet the body and escort it to the Kazansky Cathedral, which
now houses his Museum. It was brought back in a little car hitched to the rear of a passenger train. From
the station it was loaded on a caisson drawn by a truck. We marched behind it with two or three brass
bands, about 1000 in numbers.

The body lay in state for four or five days – had to be reembalmed during this time. From about 11
o'clock till 5, there was a guard of honor which was changed every 10 minutes. There was also an
imposing exhibit of his works. The funeral proper occurred on the fourth or fifth day, with long speeches
by akademiks and a few professors. These were all of the same type, as, indeed, all speeches in that
country are. They praised devotion to his energy, his organizing ability, his mind for detail, his devotion
to his science, but all condemned his “mistakes” – these were that he opposed giving an ignorant class
absolute power, against perpetuating the old feudal system with merely the exchange of party men for the
feudal lords and officials. They had to talk that way whatever they thought about the matter.

In a way, it was perhaps better that he died when he did. The next years would have pained him at the
least and “they” might have caught him in the way many other good men have been caught. He was never
forgiven for having opposed the Bolsheviks during the Revolution – he was a Menshevik, you know.
And, sometimes, this exasperation would get the better of him. True, his energy and keen mind and his
organizing and teaching ability had won a high place for him. But the years that followed took many men
of great qualities, especially in the social sciences. They are not producing replacements for those they
have killed or worked to death, either.

[Julie]Averkieva [who had studied with Boas] has two children and third husband. Seems well satisfied
at last. Concentration on work is not her forte.
Boas letter of introduction for Phinney

December 31, 1931

Dear Sir:

Will you be good enough to give a few minutes of your time next week to a young Nez Percé Indian, Archie Phinney, who has been studying anthropology with me but who is more interested in the practical problems confronting the Indians and intelligently so. Through my relations to the anthropological work of the Academy of Sciences in Leningrad it has so happened that he has received an invitation to study the problems relating to Siberian natives which are in many regions quite analogous to our Indian problems. I feel that an acquaintance with the humane spirit with which the problem is being taken up there and the actual working out of these plans can only be of help to Phinney and might make him particularly useful after his return.

Phinney to Boas

Nov. 13, 1932

Dear Prof Boas,

I arrived in Leningrad safe and sound several days ago. The trip was pleasant enough, but, as you said, I had no opportunity to do much work en route. When I arrived here the representatives of the Museum were very friendly to me. Despite the fact that I had been expected several days no arrangements had been made so far as living quarters and board are to be had here. Matters here cannot be done with dispatch yet they prefer to do it later than beforehand. Consequently I find myself temporarily housed, unable to unpack my baggage, expecting momentarily, for almost a week now, to move to permanent quarters. On the other hand they (Mr. Matorin and others of the Academy) are most gracious about entertaining me. After these preliminaries are over I will point out to them that I must go into seclusion for a few months to do my own work, to read general Russian ethnographic material, and to acquaint myself better with the Russian language under the tutelage of a grammarian (most people here seem to understand little about the grammar). They hold innumerable meetings – student meetings, faculty meetings. I’ve been to half a dozen already, and they talk for hours about plans. Later on, perhaps, I can participate intelligently in this sort of thing so I will make arrangements to become adjusted in my own way.

I gathered at once that I must make my approach to Russian ethnography through two permanent positions – Morgan and Marx. I seem to have plunged suddenly into the functioning and practical aspects of this new methodology. I suppose I shall continue to see Russian life confusedly until I get my proletarian glasses.

Boas to Phinney

July 17, 1933

Dear Archie,

You wrote to me the other day that you were not well. I hope that you are all right again. You must let me know how you are and what you are doing. I hope that your experiences in Leningrad are really helpful to you. I do not know whether you have heard that John Collier is now Commissioner of Indian Affairs. There is no doubt that he means well. I am not sure what he will do in a responsible administration position. I think it would make for a good plan for you to write to him regarding your views and include [your] plans for the Nez Percé and tell him what you know of the Russian methods of handling the Siberian native problem, if that is to the point.
Phinney to Boas

August 8, 1933

Dear Prof. Boas,

I was very happy to receive your letter – a splendid letter. There is nothing alarming about the state of my health, only that my nerves were worn ragged during the past months partly from overwork and partly from lack of patience. I feel better now days.

I am not optimistic about the value of the Russian method as a thing applicable to the US Indian reservations. My study so far has been somewhat limited to those larger groups that were already in a good position to accept full autonomy. The Russian policy is sound enough and effective here but devised to operate within the range of a new set of economic relationships – economic relationships which on one hand the Indian Bureau isn’t likely to consider for Indian tribes and on the other are not at once attainable by a moribund reservation group. I will find out, however, what if anything has actually been done to deal with natives who live under the least favorable circumstances. I get, from what I read and from what is constantly told to me, too many facts about the phenomenal development of native groups that were from the beginning rather well constituted socially and economically and not enough facts about the social rehabilitations or regeneration of tribes that haven’t achieved an economic status consistent with the soviet industrialization plans.

July 6, 1934

Dear Prof Boas,

I had no opportunity to reply to your previous letter that came early in June. Soon after checking over and returning the text proofs [for the Nez Percé Texts] to Augustin I came away from Leningrad to make some studies of Altaiian National Minorities. I have been here a few weeks and have seen some very interesting things in connection with the socialization program of the Soviet government. I visited the Oirot Mongol groups which are generally more retarded than American Indians but which are doing pretty well now. They are at least working out their own welfare with minimum assistance from outsiders.

It has been difficult traveling here. I have just returned to the base from a twenty day trip in the mountains. I covered several hundred kilometers by foot, horseback and row boat. I am returning to Leningrad very soon and I expect to make some definite plans for the coming year. I may, if I wish, remain in the Academy of Sciences another year. I hesitate to do that only because of my health. It is a terrible climate and I haven’t stood up very well against it.

September 6, 1934

Dear Prof. Boas:

I received your letter a few days ago and I was glad to learn about the possible opportunity for me to get a position in the Indian Service. There seems to be a good chance for something to come of it. Recently I have received two letters from Collier suggesting that I make formal application for a position. I have done this. It seems that nothing can be done until new appropriations are available next year.

I have written to Collier stating in a general way some of my ideas about the proposed Indian program, and explaining in what way I could make myself useful. I am very anxious to get into this work – it has been my goal for many years, and now through your help I am at last being considered. But such matters are always complicated by the Civil Service Commission. Perhaps Collier will see that my application goes through. He seems to be favorably impressed as a result of your recommendation.
I am getting along well. I have just returned from Moscow where I spent two months doing some special work in Moscow University. At the present time I am getting my material in shape for a complete report on the National Minorities Policies of the Soviet Government. The reports you had concerning my difficulties — losing my money and American passport were true but I was never particularly worried about it. I received a new passport in the course of time. I shall let you know what develops in connection with my application for appointment in the Indian Bureau.

Julia Averkieva sends her greetings to you. She has a very young daughter now.

January 18, 1935

Dear Prof Boas:

It has been quite a long time since my last letter to you. Everything has gone along smoothly here. I have been very busy, between times when I’m not laid up with the grippe, writing up my views on the national minority Caucasus to observe development there.

April 26, 1935

Dear Prof Boas:

It has been quite a long time since I’ve written to you. Everything is going along in good shape with me. The seemingly endless winter is finishing, and with it my work in the Acad. of Sciences. I’m preparing to take a little trip south to see the Kabardian nationality in the Caucasus.

November 7, 1935

Dear Prof. Boas:

I have received your letter of Sept. 9. There is nothing new as yet to tell you about. My work here is going along very well. In general my contacts here have so broadened on all fronts that I now feel myself fully in the swing of Soviet life.

I haven’t heard anything from Washington. It seems, as you say, that the lack of money is the real issue there. I hope something definite develops by next summer, for I have decided, regardless of that situation, to return next summer or fall, and to visit my people in the reservation. Then I can present myself personally in Washington and if nothing comes of it I will at least learn fully what the situation is and be able to make other plans. As it is I’m not worried or disheartened about the development so far, realizing the advantage of having your support in trying to get into that work.

The grammar came through to me all right and I have already done considerable work on it. The grammar in itself is wholly inadequate but it contains much useful material. Before the year is over I’m sure that I will be able to show you many things about the Nez Percé language of great interest to you, which Cataldo himself never fathomed. Otherwise I am continuing my work and studies along the line of the National Minorities policy here.

Recommended Readings


The last quarter of the nineteenth century witnessed increased anthropological activity in the United States, and with it, the burgeoning interest of women in science. Women’s involvement in anthropology coincided with the move to professionalize American science. To assert the legitimacy of scientific pursuits and restrict access to specialized forms of scientific knowledge, scientists created a model of scientific investigation that was rigorous, rational and impersonal. Philadelphia anthropologist Daniel Garrison Brinton explained that scientific truth “deals with the actual world about us, its objective realities and present activities... The only conditions which it enjoins are that the imperfections of the senses shall be corrected... and that their observations shall be interpreted by the laws of logical induction (Brinton 1895: 3). Consequently, the sciences became incompatible with the Victorian cultural construction of female identity, which dictated that women were the opposite of science: delicate, irrational and emotional. A woman could be a dilettante at best, for her mental constitution instilled her with characteristics that could only contaminate her attempts at objective observation and reduce her conclusions to unreliable musings (cf. Rossiter 1982).

In the face of such de facto sex-exclusion from scientific pursuits, a few female ethnologists, and Alice Cunningham Fletcher in particular, rose to prominence in the anthropological community. Fletcher’s successes, in part, were due to her manipulation of gendered and scientific identities, which allowed her to forge investigational niches in the realm of ethnological study. Fletcher utilized the rhetoric of Victorian femininity — which conflated the female character with religiosity, sympathy, emotionality and moral authority — to create a small space for herself in the anthropological community. Already forty when she commenced ethnographic work, Fletcher’s labors were an easy outgrowth of her previous involvement in women’s clubs and benevolent reform. The following documents provide examples of the unique way in which Fletcher forged a scientific identity that granted her access to Native American cultural institutions and thereby to the burgeoning science of anthropology. They trace the evolution of her anthropological investigations from the “woman question” to the “Indian question” and from explicitly feminine topics to more nebulous gendered realms of moral reform coupled with scientific investigation.1

1 Although Fletcher’s representation of Native Americans and her vision of their future—as embodied in the Dawes Act, which she played a role in framing—are today politically and ideologically questionable, her writings reflect attitudes common in the late nineteenth century, when many sympathetic reformers felt that the only way to "save" the Native American from extermination by civilization was to "Americanize" them.
Setting out in 1881 for the Plains reservations, Fletcher argued that her femininity equipped her with special skills for particular kinds of investigative work. Her sex granted her access to studies that men, by the very nature of Victorian sexual spheres, could not broach.

Maj. J. W. Powell [Director, Bureau of Ethnology], [BAE 8/10/81]

Dear Sir,
I am about [to travel] for the far West to devote myself to the investigation of the life of Indian women ...

I wish to get at Indian women’s lives from the inside, and as the segregation of the sexes is marked among barbarous people, I trust that being a woman I may be able to observe and record facts and conditions that are unknown or obscure owing to the separateness of the male and female life.

The following excerpts from Alice Fletcher’s field journals trace her changing interest from Native American women to the assimilation of Native Americans into white, Christian civilization. Through her experiences and encounters, Fletcher turned increasingly to her feminine sympathy in an effort to understand the “thoughts” and “aspirations” of her travel companions. Her sympathy, in turn, led her to adopt a maternalistic posture in which Native Americans became children in need of socialization by their white mother. Thus the field, for Fletcher, became a space of Victorian domesticity.

September 24, 1881
The talk about the campfire was serious, the future struggles of the Indians. Five years ago the Omahas lived in a village, mud lodges. Now Wajapa, [Omaha Indian, informant and travel companion] has a fine farm. Two years he since changed to citizen’s dress, has sent daughter east to Miss Read’s school. Indians think him hard hearted to send away a little girl. He says “No, I look to the future. I shall sleep easy when I die if my children are prepared to meet the struggle that is coming when they must cope with the white settlers.” His mind is alert and of a statesmen-like character, tho he is rather restless, made so by the uncertainty of Indian tenure of land. Indians love their land as no white man realizes, and will not part from it for any cause if possible to prevent it ...

September 30, 1881
... After dinner a council held. ... Each speaker shook hands with all before he spoke. I spoke after the general talk.
... They seem glad a Christian woman has come. The tales of oppression were pitiful. They showed us bills sent in by traders to swindle them out of money. They are children as faced toward us, know nothing of the power of law and organization. Their implicit faith in a white man they think friendly is very plaintive.

Oct. 5, 1881
... [Buffalo-chip has] a queer childish consciousness. He wears the scalp lock. This morning he took a stick and with queer mumblings, he raised it to and fro. This was to gain better weather. It is a strange thing to sit opposite and witness veritable, heathen performances. One realizes the power and gift of spiritual life by the blessed Lord. I needed to see all this to realize the verity of “I am the way, the truth and the life.” The darkness and paucity of their mental life is pitiful ...

This A. M. I have been teaching Wajapa more arithmetic, addition by object lessons in plums, trying to make the figures a verity to him. One feels so sorry for them, so longs to broaden and deepen and brighten their life ...

10
Oct. 18, 1881. [At Rosebud Agency, Dakota Territory]

... Nothing can describe the lack of cleanliness and order of Rosebud Agency. Cattle are slaughtered on the hills here, and then the bones left here to bleach – bones and debris are about every house and one must be careful not to step into worse filth. ... It is too bad that no one can help them or will try persistently. The Missionary is hampered by the agent and others are too busy making money. No one tells them how to place their houses...

... Now how can Indians do better, hemmed in as they are at the agency deprived of their native life--poor enough but having its compensation--and not fully introduced to our ways, they are stranded between two modes of life ...

Fletcher’s sympathy for the plight of Native Americans was potentially a severe bar to her scientific objectivity according to the professionalized model of scientific investigation. Yet she embraced this emotional capacity as a boon – a principally feminine skill that provided her with an understanding of Native American thoughts and emotions unavailable to less sympathetic male peers. After J. W. Powell failed to respond to her first request for information, Fletcher attempted to demonstrate that her sex provided anthropology with hitherto unavailable information.

Maj. J. W. Powell

Sir:

It was quite a disappointment not to receive the promised letter indicating points you would think it well for me to particularly observe in Indian home life. ...

For nearly three months I have been living, nearly all the time, with Indians, in their teepees, or log-houses. I have been introduced into Indian homes by Indians and have conformed as far as possible to Indian life. The inside view has been open to me and I have tried to see it from the Indian standpoint, to get at the Indian way of thinking. Much valuable information I have already secured, but my work is still of course in its beginning. I have been looking at the various Societies among the Indian women

Within only a few months of her first trip, Fletcher began utilizing ethnographic information for the moral uplift of Native Americans. In December, Fletcher implored her staunchly Christian friend to raise funds for the education of Omaha children. She combined her sympathy, Christianity and scientific pursuits to bolster her authority regarding contemporary Native American issues.

My Dear Mrs. Happ [?],

Is it not odd that the long silence between us should be broken by my speaking to you from among the Indians? Here I am far away in miles and farther still in circumstances. My study of the life, customs and words [and] thoughts of Indian women is full of interest and instruction. ... Living among a people who are still to a considerable degree in the practice of primitive habits, one begins to realize something of the slow growth of civilization and of the life giving power of Christianity. These can not be so clearly apprehended in the midst of the stir of mind and spirit in the East.

I have been visiting and living among the Indians for some time past. I was introduced by Indians, have traveled with them, Indian fashion, and, as far as possible, accepting for myself their life. I need not dilate on the difficulties and hardships I have encountered. It was needful that I should do this in order to accomplish my scientific work. Their life and customs have thus been opened to me, and as I have formed many friends among them, much of their thought and aspiration has been revealed. The present needs of the Indians appealed strongly to me... If you will tell your church of the story in this letter and beg of them some help, you will win many grateful prayers and thoughts with in the Western wilds.
Some few weeks since, I was up among the Yanktons. Their Reservation is on the East side of the Missouri river... The tribe numbers some 2000. To the efforts of the Missionaries is due much of the advancement they have made. Many of the Indians are now living in houses, cultivating the land, attending church regularly, and sending their children to school. ...

Within only a few years, Fletcher was actively and eloquently combining ethnography and benevolent reform. Victorian gender distinctions held that women could serve as the moral bastions of the household, and indirectly, of society. By overtly conflating her femininity with morality, Fletcher portrayed herself as a humble protector and bearer of civilized morality in the face of the degenerate barbarism of the Native American reservation. In this way, Fletcher combined feminine reform efforts with scientific knowledge gathered in the field, camouflaging her entrance into scientific discourse behind the rhetoric of the expansion of Christian civilization into the untamed West.

Dr. J. E. Rhoads, [ACF 4/7/1887]
President, Indian Rights Association.

Dear Sir:

... I began a paper which was to set forth as succinctly as possible the history of the allotment of lands to the Omahas, and to present a picture of the people at the time this work took place. It was also my intention to show the difficulties that must attend to the reconstructive period in a tribe...

I met men whom five years ago I feared must live and die Indians, but who were now pushing out into better modes of living and thinking. Although I saw thriftlessness in places yet, manliness was astir; the old reservation stagnation was gone. Men talked of their future as if it were in their power to make it prosperous. Plans of building new houses, improving farms, and questions of how to make the law effective on the reservation were discussed with me by many Indians during my short stay. The disintegrating process at work all over the reservation has made the incoming of new life possible, and education was telling as never before. Even the feast and dance where the non-progressive Omahas met and resolved that they be and remain Indians, show the movement of ideas in their very midst. Troublous as were the times, hope was in the air. Many Indians were setting an example of good order and individual enterprise to men who knew far more than these Aborigines.

... I was at work on the paper, setting forth this sociological picture when vague rumors and strange stories came to me, and I began to discern that it was not so much the consideration of the Omaha tribe and their struggles into civil life that is occupying the minds of some persons, as an estimate of my character and motives in working for this people. When I apprehended this state of affairs, I ceased to write. I do not care to take the time and thought of people for any self vindication. What I have done for the Omaha Indians, I have done from the sense of justice and human sympathy. I did not work for any public recognition or approbation, I never thought I was doing anything remarkable, or of any particular importance, except to those little ones whom I found in need of a friend, and when by God’s grace I was able to help. That which I did in the solitude of my own heart, has found its way to the public ear. I never sought any man’s recognition or endorsement. My work for the Indians has rested between my Maker and myself, and there I am content to let it stand.

These documents, of course, serve primarily to raise a number of further questions. To what extent did Fletcher consciously manipulate her scientific identity? Or, in other words, did she internalize the Victorian conception of science as a primarily masculine pursuit? Some of her statements indicate that she indeed felt that her work was necessarily inferior to that of men. Fletcher wrote to F. W. Putnam,
director of Harvard’s Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, “I am sometimes tempted when I think of the Museum and of what I could possibly do there, to wish that I never did wish, to be a man? I am aware that being a woman I am debarred from helping you as I otherwise could — but the bar is a fact” (in Mark 1988: 243). And in what ways did Fletcher’s overtly “feminine” scientific self-identity bar her from other, more traditionally “masculine” areas of anthropology? Perhaps less speculative, what role did F. W. Putnam, Fletcher’s informal teacher, long-time mentor and friend, play in her scientific successes? Judith Modell has noted the importance of male mentorial relationships for women students in Franz Boas’ Columbia department in the 1920s (Modell 1974). Does Fletcher’s experience indicate that this may represent continuity with the late nineteenth century?

Additionally, did other prominent women anthropologists utilize such tools to gain access to anthropological investigation? By way of contrast, Matilda Coxe Stevenson, the only female ethnologist at the Bureau of American Ethnology in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, reacted quite differently to the Victorian sex-exclusion of female scientists and strove to observe exaggerated professional standards of research and publication. In 1914, she informed an interested journalist of her method of investigation:

... I would be glad to have my process of work published for the benefit of future students, and the collection of anthropologic truth. Every word recorded by me is vouched for by at least three well informed men or women or both, neither one knowing that I have studied with another. When my information comes through three who agree that the matter is correct, I feel that the material may be recorded for publication with perfect safety. This is a very slow way of study but it is the only sure way with not only an unlettered people but people who are cunning and prone to deceive rather than have the truth of their lives go out to the world. I regret to say that there is much hurried work done in the field. ... Such truth is to be learned only through the most intimate relations with the Indians after one has one their entire confidence. Make an Indian man or woman attached to you, believe in your superiority, and you can do what you will with him. There must be an exchange of confidences... (MCS to Watkins: 6/15/14).

In 1900, as Stevenson strove to complete her seminal work on the Zuni Indians, she outlined her attitudes toward anthropological publication to J. W. Powell:

...My desire that the work should be thorough and classic must be my excuse and apology. I think you, who have a far deeper knowledge of American aboriginal life than most men, must agree with me that preparing a number of separate or isolated papers is one thing and writing a comparatively complete and connected history of an aboriginal people whose thoughts are not our thoughts, weaving all the threads into an intelligent and satisfactory whole for the civilized student, is quite another. There are two schools of authors — those whose aim is to so present facts that their work will be classic, who labor with facts, and others eager to publish something, anything that they may be ahead of others, or see their work in print, being satisfied with a superficial exposition of a subject so that it brings praise or notoriety even though the bubble bursts after a time and vanishes into nothing... It is my wish to erect a foundation upon which students may build. I feel that I can do the most for science in this way. I make no claim that my paper on Zuni will exhaust the subject. On the contrary, it but opens the subject but I think and hope it may open wide the gates for other students to pass the more rapidly over the many, many parts which I have left unexplored (MCS 9/15/00).

In contrast to Fletcher, Stevenson approached Victorian sex restrictions more aggressively. She eschewed feminine entrapments such as benevolent reform and sought scientific access and recognition strictly on the basis of her labors. An in-depth comparison of these divergent methods of female access to
accepted Victorian definitions of scientific identity, and the successes and failures of such methods—warrants further investigation.
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