

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Strangers to Relatives: The Adoption and Naming of Anthropologists in Native North America. Edited by Sergei Kan.

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/675742tm>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 25(3)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Erikson, Patricia Pierce

**Publication Date**

2001-06-01

**DOI**

10.17953

**Copyright Information**

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

**Strangers to Relatives: The Adoption and Naming of Anthropologists in Native North America.** Edited by Sergei Kan. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 2001. 270 pages. \$50.00 cloth; \$24.95 paper.

If you are looking for a text with a new twist on a classic anthropological topic, *Strangers to Relatives* might be for you. Discovering and sensitively depicting the diverse forms of family and personhood imagined and assumed around the globe has been one of anthropology's contributions to promoting tolerance. *Strangers to Relatives* is an unprecedented collection of essays that explores the variable notions of "relative," "name," and "person" from a different angle; here the focus is the adoption or naming of anthropologists by the communities that host their fieldwork. How are the identities of anthropologists and Native North American communities mutually transformed when these communities socialize strangers/anthropologists by adopting or naming them? How is the ethnographic enterprise altered by anthropological-informant relationships that have reached the level of fictive kin? Sergei Kan, professor of anthropology and Native American studies at Dartmouth College, penned two of the twelve essays in this volume: the editor's introduction and a chapter reflecting on his adoption into two Tlingit clans in southeastern Alaska. The volume was inspired by a panel organized by Kan and Thomas Buckley that explored this topic at the 1995 American Anthropological Association annual meeting.

One of the strengths of this collection is its geographic and temporal breadth. Essays touch upon anthropologists' experiences in Subarctic, Northwest Coast, Plateau, California, Plains, and Eastern Woodlands culture areas. Collectively, these essays characterize the phenomenon of adopting or naming anthropologists from the mid-nineteenth century through the end of the twentieth century. Elisabeth Tooker's informative essay on the Tonawanda Seneca adoption of Lewis Henry Morgan in 1845 locates the dynamic of Native American adoption of anthropologists in the earliest years of the discipline. In many ways, her essay launches this volume in an interesting direction.

It is Tooker's essay that first depicts an essential dimension to the relationships in question here: the historic need in Native American communities to promote crosscultural empathy and affiliation in order to weather the storms of assimilation policies and traditional land seizure (pp. 33–34). Her account of Lewis Henry Morgan's adoption by the Tonawanda Senecas contributes some fascinating insights into the motivations for the adoption by the parties involved. After college, Morgan reorganized a floundering Gordian Knot secret society into an "Indian society" called the Grand Order of the Iroquois. From this desire to play Indian came the desire to craft "authentic" rituals through direct interviews and fieldwork. Eventually, Morgan was elected the head of the order, choosing for himself the name Schenandoah. Tooker argues that Morgan sought adoption not to gather privileged information but to achieve his self-assigned role as successor to "vanishing" tribal peoples. In contrast, Tooker argues, Iroquois motivations for crosscultural understanding were heightened by involuntary land loss and a chronic imbalance in power relations.

The essays in *Strangers to Relatives* repeatedly raise these politically pragmatic motivations for tribal incorporation of anthropologists. For example, Michael Harkin offers a fascinating sociolinguistic analysis of the indigenous terms for white men in the contact era along the central British Columbia coast. Due to demographic decline and the suppression of the potlatch, many social titles were left unused from the 1880s to 1920s. Harkin argues that adopting and naming white men “rescued” them from a socially distant category of humanity and was meant to initiate reciprocal relations or even assert social control, despite radical inequality (p. 66). Harkin relates the cases of Franz Boas among the Kwakwaka’wakw and Thomas McIlwraith among the Nuxalks (Bella Coolas) to show how the naming of white men on the Northwest Coast generated “provisional and symbolic claim upon the named” under conditions where unequal power relations granted anthropologists an uncomfortable degree of access to secrets (p. 72).

To its credit, the book collectively demonstrates that political motivation alone is not sufficient cause to explain the widespread adoption of anthropologists in Native North America. As Kan points out, turning strangers into relatives—making them human—is an essential process of some longevity in societies where kinship is the “central idiom of social relations” (p. 3). This collection suggests that, given the centrality of kinship in Native American communities, some may choose to adopt out of pity a field researcher who may be living alone and at a great distance from any kin. Some of these transformations are very private and personal, while others are public and official. Anne Straus reminds readers that it is important to distinguish informal adoptions from formal tribal adoptions that confer enrollment and the legal and moral rights and responsibilities of tribal citizenship (p. 176). This volume clearly conveys that just as concepts of personhood vary cross-culturally, so do anthropologists’ experiences with “becoming more human” from the perspective of the host community.

Ann Fienup-Riordan’s essay teases out the complexity of naming among the Yup’ik in southwestern Alaska. She points out that while some Yup’ik names are hereditary and convey an essence of those deceased, other names are “calling” or teasing names forged through shared social experience. Hence, a person might acquire a multiplicity of names. From the Yup’ik perspective, becoming a “real [named] person” involves a transformation that both enfolded Fienup-Riordan into a regenerative cycle of humanity and acknowledged her unique life history as an anthropologist among them.

Some adoptions of anthropologists seem to arise from situations in which the anthropologist’s passion for the research project is matched by the commitment of various individuals, families, or tribal organizations to “set[ting] the record straight” (p. 170). Familial or individual tribal support for an anthropologist’s work can lead to genuinely affectionate relationships born of long-term, even lifelong, working relationships. Increasingly the agency of “informants” or the place of “indigenous ethnographers” in the history of anthropology is receiving the attention it deserves (p. 10); these essays, too, acknowledge the agency of Native American actors in moments of ethnographic encounter. As Harkin notes, this agency can be infused with humor, despite the “deadly serious” conditions (p. 74).

This volume seems to have missed, however, the opportunity to disrupt the essentialized categories of profession (white anthropologist/author) and ethnic-group-as-subject/“fictive kin” (Native American). Although contributions by Native American anthropologists were solicited, the editor notes that none were submitted (p. 15). Nonetheless, the authors in the collection implicitly and explicitly position themselves variously with respect to the heightened critique of the ethnographic enterprise. Overall, this volume maintains that there is a more positive and undertreated aspect of the ethnographic enterprise: complex anthropologist-Native American community relationships that include adoption and naming.

It is intriguing to imagine a followup conference panel (and later edited volume) among adopted/named and “unadopted” anthropologists and their community hosts that discuss creative ways to “level” the unequal playing field that, in part, generates the naming/adoption phenomenon. The testimonies in *Strangers to Relatives* collectively illustrate that adoption and naming sometimes broaden and sometimes limit access to cultural information. What happens to the research design process of an ethnographer-as-relative? Raymond Fogelson’s “Commentary” challenges us all when he observes that many of the issues raised by “human subjects” research are relevant to the ethnographic enterprise (p. 244). Is the material generated by the ethnographic encounter intellectual property? Where is the information deposited and who controls its disclosure? This reader would have liked further development of these issues.

This is an impressive collection of essays by a formidable group of ethnographers. Reflecting upon the opportunities and dilemmas they have experienced, these authors are sure to inspire further reflection. Some questions that might arise are: How do universities receive ethnographer “relatives” who work collaboratively with tribes? What are some of the challenges and obstacles to this model? Will the widespread emergence of tribally controlled historic-preservation offices, archaeological excavations, archives, and so forth alter the nature of the working relationship such that Native American motivations for naming and adopting anthropologists are changing as well?

I highly recommend this text for those teaching Native American studies and anthropology courses. It would work particularly well in those courses focused on the history or methodology of North American anthropology or the history of the relationship between Native American communities and non-Native anthropologists (especially paired with Thomas Biolsi and Larry J. Zimmerman’s *Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria Jr. and the Critique of Anthropology* [1997]). For different reasons, it would serve as fascinating reading for crosscultural comparisons of family and kinship systems.

*Patricia Pierce Erikson*

SALT Institute for Documentary Field Studies