**Introduction**

A memorandum sent to Southern state offices on October 27, 1938, provided explicit feedback on an early collection of the early life histories, explaining that “while these sketches are remarkably good for field reports, a few show a tendency towards overwriting. The most effective stories are those simply told—where the characters speak for themselves, with small assistance from the interviewer.”[[1]](#footnote-1) This editorial directive of letting “the characters speak for themselves” constituted the ethos of life histories and set it apart from other types of documentary writing. Sociology produced numeric summaries and case studies from the researcher's point of view, while literature tended to construct composite characters emanating from stereotypes, Couch argued. In contrast, life histories were positioned as stories that better captured the interviewee's actual voice, and therefore more real, authentic, and accurate. However, the question of how to create these stories was very much up for debate as writers and editors grappled over how to write a short coherent, engaging story of a person's life that was in their own words.

In a little over one year, the SLHP would negotiate the final form of a life history. At the heart of this undertaking was a series of questions, including how to convey that the story told was authentic and real and in the interviews' own words. This led to questions such as how the writer and interviewee's subjectivity should factor into the life history leading to a set of decisions about content, structure, and modes of representations to formalize the method. As a result, Couch, SLHP editors, and writers negotiated a set of practices and strategies that they believed produced a more authentic, legitimate, and insightful form of documentation. They came to understand themselves as creating “human documents” through “word pictures” that documented people’s stories. To create these human documents, they used a series of strategies that were understood as observational and therefore objective rather than as making arguments or judgments about society. They were to be the empirical data that could be mined and put together to reveal new aspects of American society.

Our digitized collection of life histories serves as a rich data source for investigating the forms and functions of the written records produced by the SLHP.[[2]](#footnote-2) Computational methods are used to augment and assist in a close reading of individual life histories. In this layer, we use two text-analysis techniques to help identify patterns within the collection of life histories. Following the terminology in corpus linguistics, each life history will be referred to as a “document.” Topic models are used to identify “topics”—groups of words that tend to occur together within the same documents. Document clustering is used to find groups of documents that tend to use a similar collection of words. Together, these techniques allow us to organize the lexicon of words and collections of documents in semantically meaningful ways that help identify and understand how a close reading of an individual life history relates to large-scale patterns. Further details of these techniques and how they were applied to the collection are given in the methods section. Links to topics and clusters of interest are included throughout the layer.

In this layer, we analyze the form of the life histories as written documents. The socially constituted systems they produced involved a dynamic network of players: writers, interviewees, editors, directors, and the Washington FWP office. Each of these contributed their own influences over the form of the life histories. By investigating the draft, edited, and final written documents produced within these systems, we identify how the SLHP sought to position the interviewees as authentic and real. This was achieved by using strategies such as beginning with descriptions of the home space to set the scene of the interview, privileging of first-person and quotations, and implementing written dialect to represent stereotypical notions of Blackness. The strategies positioned the writer as present, and often explicitly welcomed, to bear witness to the person’s story. The writer acted as a scribe, documenting the person’s story in their own words and style of speech. These features were designed to convey to the reader that they were hearing an interviewee's actual voice, which gave the life history credibility. The SLHP hoped these features would motivate them to identify and empathize with people in life histories.

**Understanding through “Human Documents”**

As discussed in Layer 3, the SLHP was able to carve out a unique place in the ecosystem of documentary projects in the FWP by positioning the project as concerned with capturing the life histories of “typical” Southern workers from an array of occupational sectors, thereby distinguishing it from the Social-ethnic and Folklore projects. Unlike the Social-ethnic Studies, the SLHP was not interested in documenting people's stories from what they defined as ethnic communities, but instead “typical” Americans, which came to be understood as those individuals who SLHP administrators and staff could identify as either Black or White. Moreover, the SLHP was careful to distinguish itself from the Folklore project viewing folklore as concerned with capturing fading artifacts of culture passed down orally from generation to generation, indebted to concepts in anthropology. Instead, the SLHP repurposed the qualitative method of life histories from Sociology. Life histories had been used in Sociology, but only to document those deemed to deviant as a way for researchers to understand how such delinquency was produced.[[3]](#footnote-3) Couch felt that such a focus on deviance missed life histories' true potential to serve as "human documents."

The SLHP's investment was less about proving that life histories were more or less scientific than other methods but rather a better way to understand and communicate the human condition. It was grounded in literature and documentary strategies rather than social science and written for a non-academic audience. Human-centric documents in the form of accessible, well-written stories were better positioned for understanding American communities, economic structures, and everyday life, they argued. In this way, Couch argued, life histories could reveal the “more significant aspects of the whole life experience, including memories of ancestry, written *from the standpoint of the individual himself*.”[[4]](#footnote-4) Ideally, readers would respond as Georgia FWP State Director Samuel Tupper did to Annie Rose's life history of Fannie Hopkins, "You have given the story a very human quality, and after reading it, I felt that I really had seen the woman."[[5]](#footnote-5)

Understanding people meant visiting, talking, and listening to individuals who, through their words, created in aggregate a more holistic picture of an aspect of society such as the economy, education, and political beliefs. Numerical summaries could never get at this complexity, for they obscured and removed the kind of evidence that, to the SLHP, was more legitimate, the actual words of people. The indexical approach mirrored the truth claims of photography. Like a photographer, the writer had to frame the scene and then recorded the light with their pen rather than a shutter. The image they created was to be, as SLHP administrators consistently repeated, a "word picture." Despite the strong belief in the necessity of creating a “word picture,” SLHP administrators did not have a clear understanding of the particular conventions involved other than the importance of demonstrating authenticity, which became the central concern behind discussions over the form of the life history.

**Instructions to Writers**

Because Couch and the other SLHP administrators did not have a clear understanding of the specific conventions and structure of life histories, the instructions given to the writers were both vague and contradictory. Writers were given a rough outline of topics to cover, including family, education, income, attitudes towards work and life, religion and morals, medical needs, diet, and the use of their time. The topic models indicate writers did use it as a guide. Many of the topics center on particular professions, one of the dominant subjects in the questions. For example, Topic 1 focuses on factories, Topic 3 on mills and barber shops, Topic 5 on insurance offices, Topic 14 on education, and Topic 15 on the law. These topics emerge because individual life histories tend to spend a significant portion of the interview discussing topics related to occupations and local industries. However, the instructions that accompanied this outline stated, “it is not desired that each life history or story follow this outline in a rigid manner… [the writer] may follow the whole outline or limit himself to a part of it.” [[6]](#footnote-6) As suggested by a lack of topics related to other questions, such as religion and morals, writers would also follow their interests.

When it came to the point of view, "it is immaterial whether the stories are written in the first, second or third person.” [[7]](#footnote-7) Additionally, the instructions stated to avoid generalities and the expression of judgment. Instead, the writer "must try to discover the real feelings of the person consulted and must record this feeling regardless of his own attitude toward it." Above all, the writer strives for "accuracy, human interest, social importance, [and] literary excellence.”[[8]](#footnote-8) These instructions left significant room for interpretation, and as a result, writers initially sent in a wide variety of stories, many of which Couch deemed inadequate. Therefore, he looked to a few writers such as Ida Moore to create models that could be emulated and began, in conversation with writers and editors, to narrow the possibilities and formalize the composition of a life history.
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Figure #: The life history of Mary Rumbley conducted by Ida Moore.

Moore’s life history of Mary Rumbley, a White woman and former mill worker from Burlington, North Caroline (Figure #), became the primary example.[[9]](#footnote-9) While there are several life histories that share little in common with the conventions from Rumbley’s life history, text analysis methods that read the entire SLHP collection at scale reveal common trends that most of the stories used to create the genre of the life history, including setting the scene of the encounter between the writer and interviewee followed by significant use of block quotes to center the words of the interviewee. Together, these strategies were designed to realize a “method of writing life histories from the viewpoint of the person concerned” that fulfilled the goal of “life histories as a method of revealing people,” which Couch called for.[[10]](#footnote-10)

**No Space Like Home**

How to open a life history was an immediate challenge. While some of the life histories opened with the interviewee's words, others began with a description of the writer and how they came to share space with the interviewee. Given that writers were documenting another person's life history, not themselves, one might think that including the writer in the story would have been frowned upon. After all, these were to be word pictures from the interviewee's words. However, editors believed that by indicating that the writer and interviewee(s) were occupying the same space in which the interviewer was a mere recorder of information, the life histories could better solidify their claims to accuracy and authenticity and, therefore, as a way of knowing.[[11]](#footnote-11)

The writers indicated their presence while simultaneously cueing the reader into the interviewee's lived experience by setting the scene of the interview. As Assistant Regional Director Walter Cutter wrote to Bernice Harris:

We are trying to portray the lives of real people for other real people to read and consider. To do this, the person concerned should speak as much as possible, and the description of places, i.e., grounds, houses, rooms, and furnishing, should usually be restricted to that amount which will be sufficient to 'set' the scene and be absorbed naturally into the plan of the story. When there are two or three pages of description, before a single voice is heard, something of the vitality of the story as a human experience is lost.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Accordingly, writers began to dedicate the first few paragraphs to describe how they came to be in the interviewee's presence. It was not uncommon for a life history to start with a writer walking up to a home, greeting an interviewee on a porch who then invites them inside or finds the person and walks through the porch to the interior. Once inside, the writers described the conditions often in the form of an inventory of rooms and their objects. They list features on the exterior such as the porch and gardens and interior such as items in the home's living room and kitchen. Indicating welcomed access, proximity, and intimacy established that the writer was a reliable narrator and observer. Subsequently, once the initial scene of the interview was set in the introduction, the writers would quickly get out of the way of the interview, falling into the background to allow the interviewee's voice to dominate the remainder of the document. For example, this approach came to be seen in Moore’s life history of Rumbley. Moore recounts her initial encounter with Rumbley, describes the home space, and notes the physical appearance of Rumbley within the first two pages as a way to set the scene. She then only occasionally asks a question to maintain narrative clarity, allowing Rumbley’s story to take center stage.

In this way, Moore and her fellow writers drew on the cultural and social values and beliefs of certain spaces in early 20th-century culture, especially the domestic sphere, to make claims to intimacy while making social and economic class signals. By the 1930s, the home was understood as a private space where an invitation was required to enter. It was also a feminized space associated with female labor as well as intimacy.[[13]](#footnote-13) Attuned to the home's cultural and social connotations, writers were encouraged to conduct interviews inside people’s houses. The ability to enter the home—a place associated with the personal and private—indicated that the writer was getting one step closer to the person's interior world. Moreover, describing the home was a way to signal race and class to an imagined audience understand as possessing White middle-class sensibilities, a point that will be discussed in more detail below.

There was also a practical side. One benefit to the home was that people might be more at ease. A primary way of organizing who to interview was by occupation. Asking a mill worker questions about their job in front of their manager was a recipe for disaster. As Virginia Writers’ Project director Eudora Richardson wrote to writer Mary S. Venable, “Under no circumstances should you call on people in the place of employment or approach the officials of an industry. In every case, you should reach the men and women in their homes.”[[14]](#footnote-14) Together with these cultural and practical reasons, conducting the interviews in people’s homes demonstrated authenticity, access, and intimacy through admittance to the interior space of the home.

Given women's claims (or relegation) to the domestic sphere and therefore to access this space, a writer in a women's body became an asset rather than a hindrance. As demonstrated in Layer 3, White women writers were not only hired but produced a significant amount of life histories, often interviewing people from the communities they knew well. It was not only ideas about intimacy, access, and space that shaped their hiring but a trait that they believed lent truthfulness to the life history. Sharing space, particularly domestic space, bolstered claims that the writer could access a more authentic and informative life history.

**Point of View and Proximity**

While setting the scene was seen as an important move to signal the interview's authenticity and cue the reader into notions of race and class, it was not initially clear how to establish the writer's presence while making sure they didn't take over the whole frame. Central to establishing the writer's presence was the question of whose point of view the opening scene should be from.[[15]](#footnote-15) As writers and editors worked together to standardize the form, they settled on the use of first-person when setting the scene, as is the case with Rumbley’s life history. Moore writes, “*I* went to see Mary the other morning, a brisk October morning it was, and Mary was dropping a piece of coal on the fire when *I* opened the door in response to her ‘Come in.”’[emphasis ours]. This initial scene is from Moore's point of view as she describes her initial encounter with Rumbley, which began the interview.

By using “I” to represent the writer at the beginning of the life history, the writer proved they were actually inhabiting the space with the person they were interviewing, in turn, lending authenticity to the story that followed. Often, they even went to great lengths to prove that they were not only allowed in the space but welcomed. Therefore, the use of first-person narrative worked to convey the intimacy between the writer and interviewee as well as the reader and the interviewee. By setting the scene and using first-person, the reader is asked to identify with the writer through the use of "I" and join them in bearing witness to the interviewee's life history. These conventions relied on the spatial and affective intimacy of the home, similar to how anthropological discourse dominant at the time signaled a sense of *being there* and *occupying space* with the community being studied as a source of authority and authenticity. *[[16]](#footnote-16)* Therefore, by setting the scene, the writer often made the reader feel like they were now in the room with the interviewee. Together, the writer and reader could listen to the interviewee recount their life history.

**Description, Not Opinion**

Because the writer was setting the scene to introduce the person recounting their life history, editors and writers also negotiated how present the writer should be in this initial prose. Writers and editors struggled over which authorial voice and perspective to privilege in the life histories. Therefore, a key part of editing the life histories was finding a balance between setting the scene and making sure the writer’s presence did not dominate the scene by introducing the writer’s feelings and judgments.

Since the writer was supposed to be positioned as an observer simply documenting the interviewee's life, their attitudes and beliefs were not supposed to emerge. A strategy became a focus on description. The lists of features, reproduced in the topic models and document clusters, reveal the approach. Topic 6 serves as a particularly good example of this language, with all of its strongest associated words focusing on common areas and objects within a house: “kitchen," "yard," "living [room]," and “porch." The words indicate a focus on describing items at the location of the interview.

Moore makes precisely this move in Rumbley’s life history, noting,

Above her mantel there hangs a framed family record. It is a picture containing garlands of roses, an open hook, and two centrally placed ovals bearing the words Father, Mother… The room in which we sat had not been difficult to straighten. It contained an iron bed, an old Singer sewing machine, a small walnut table and the two rocking chairs before the fire. Sweeping must have been the most difficult job she had to perform because the floor was old and splintery. Many bright colored pictures, most of them calendars, were nailed to the dingy gray walls.

Many others followed suit, such as writer Ina Hawkes, who described approaching Fannie Busbin’s farm in Georgia: “A little farther around the house I saw a large supper song vine covering the arbor and loaded with supper songs. There were many trees in the yards and the pear and pecan trees were full of fruit, but the apple and peach tree, had just about stopped bearing fruit for the season, I picked a handful of scupper-nongs and continued on around the house.”[[17]](#footnote-17) Setting the scene situated the writer as a keen observer and therefore able to indexically document what they saw and heard.

Another feature of the writing that editors homed in on was words that they deemed too judgmental or opinionated. An aim was for the reader to draw their own conclusions from the interviews; reducing language that suggested an opinion or judgment, often in the form of adjectives, was a priority. The use of words such as "disreputable" or "forlorn” was frowned upon, for they were seen as introducing opinions and judgments that disrupted the writer's position as an intimate but nonetheless objective observer and got in the way of the interviewee’s ability to tell their story on their terms. Couch's ongoing frustrations with the Alabama FWP's life histories and their leadership led to direct and explicit instructions about using opinions. Couch wrote a letter to Alabama State Director Myrtle Miles offering feedback on the life histories sent to him in Chapel Hill. Frustrated by the inclusion of opinions through the expression of the writer's feelings, he wrote,

The terms ‘disreputable’ and ‘forlorn’ are emotive terms expressing feeling, and as used in this sentence they express the feeling of the author. Now it happens that one of the first principles of this work is that the author is to keep his feelings out of the stories. His task is to try to get the people on paper as they see themselves; to them to their own story in their own words as much as possible, and to suppress his own feelings and attitudes.[[18]](#footnote-18)

The writer, according to Couch, was to leave their feelings and, therefore opinions, out of the story. The writer was a vehicle, like a camera, for documenting another person’s life history by which the reader could then draw conclusions. To drive the point home, he continued:

This kind of statement should not be made. The author should give his description and let the reader draw his conclusions as to whether the place described is a slum or not. In the next sentence I have to object to the ‘rude’ shack ‘crouched low’. These terms are terribly hackneyed. The author will find that if he will talk to the people living in such a community, they will give him out of their own mouths description fresh, interesting, vivid, and far more to the point than anything he can get by ‘crouching’ and ‘sprawling’.[[19]](#footnote-19)

Looking at the text analysis also reveals the emphasis on reducing the writer's opinions when setting the scene. The clustering of primarily nouns and verbs in the theme visualizer further indicates how adjectives were less prevalent. Consider, for example, Topic 14, which focuses on teaching and education. The most prominent words in the topic include nouns describing the people and places involved in the education domain: “teacher”, “college”, “service”, “book”, and “service”. The other most strongly associated words with the topic include active verbs such as “teach”, “become”, “study”, and “attend”. None of the top 20 words associated with the topic are adjectives or adverbs. Similarly, Topic 10 centers on farming. It is most associated with nouns such as “acre”, “crop”, “tobacco”, “mule”, and “horse”; as with the education topic, affective adjectives and adverbs describing farm-life are not prominent in the topic. Similar patterns appear across the other topics identified by both topic models.

Editors also sought to reduce literary flourishes that they understood as challenging the observational stance of the writer. Citing Jack Kytle’s life history of Bob Curtis, Couch wrote, “The general introduction on page 1 gives information that is needed, and it conveys this information very well, but for our purpose such passages as this would be better if the information were given without the use of figures of speech. We wish to avoid the appearance of attempting to be literary.”[[20]](#footnote-20) Using literary techniques risked centering the writer's voice and authority by establishing their writing style in the document. By instead focusing on lists of features on the exterior and material culture on the interior, the life histories drew focus on the interviewee. Writers could then convey “authentic” messages about class and lifestyle, from which the reader could draw a picture in their mind of the person's living conditions and thereby develop their own judgments.

Along with attention to language, overuse of language also risked undermining the writer's position as simply an observer reporting the facts who enabled the interviewee to speak for themselves. Often editors cut down the opening section. Editors constantly charged writers with "overwriting." They worried that the writers were either too focused on themselves, and thereby shifting the authorial voice, or where writers were demonstrating knowledge about the interviewees’ thoughts and feels. For example, an editorial report on life histories from a North Carolina Mill Village stated, “While these sketches are remarkably good for field reports, a few show a tendency towards overwriting. The most effective stories are those simply told.”[[21]](#footnote-21) The report went on to add that “the other sketches, where the research worker is neither described nor introduced, are better.”[[22]](#footnote-22) As a constant theme with most of the strategies used by the SLHP writers, the writing should focus on creating word pictures to convey a message of authenticity to readers of the interview.

While the form of the life histories tried to assert claims of neutral observation, racialized logics still permeated. Writers' and editors' editorial decisions were not evenly applied. One area where racialized decision-making becomes pronounced is the set of interviews with people working in agriculture or related service sectors, particularly how they used adjectives when setting the scene and describing the home. Document clusters 5-8 contain life histories related to agricultural work.[[23]](#footnote-23) The interviews in clusters 5, 6, and 7 are predominantly from White interviewees, with no more than 19% of the interviews taken from Black interviewees. The most strongly associated words for these clusters are concrete nouns describing household objects, such as “bedroom”, “kitchen”, “yard”, “stove”, and “porch”.

In contrast, Document Cluster 8 consists of a nearly even split between White and Black interviewees (48% vs. 52%). The most strongly associated words in this include words such as “dirty” and “dingy”. The use of disparaging adjectives used to describe White and Black homes' interior extends to the exterior, but primarily with Black interviewees. Writers regularly set the stage by describing the homes as "dilapidated"[[24]](#footnote-24) and “rickety” steps or pillars[[25]](#footnote-25), immediately situating the interviewee as residing in poverty. The descriptions framed the interviewee as unable to maintain and take care of their home, which risked playing into problematic racialized stereotypes. As a result, editorial decisions when setting the scene were applied through racialized and classed gazes.

**Shifting Authorial Voice through Block Quotes**

Following the setting of the scene, the reader joins the writer to listen to the life history. To suggest that the words are exactly those of the interviewee, they are in the form of a series of block quotes. Often, the block quotes are uninterrupted. Because the writer does not disrupt the interviewee, the story seemingly flows from the interviewee as a whole, from start to finish. As a result, the reader feels like they are listening to an unmediated and complete life history.

Using first-person narratives in the life histories furthered claims to documenting an authentic story. While Edwin Bjorkman wrote to George Andrews (admin), Mary Northrop, Sidney Jones, Harriet Corley, and W.O. Saunders that accurately documenting the life history did "not mean that the stories necessarily must be told in the first person," it was often the case.[[26]](#footnote-26) By suggesting that the document exactly recounts the interviewee's words in first person block quotes, the life histories drew on the power of autobiography and biography.[[27]](#footnote-27) The writer figuratively (and physically) sets the scene like a biographer to introduce the main character, the interviewee. The person inhabiting the first-person point of view then switches to the interviewee as they recount their life story in an autobiography style. This narrative strategy seeks to eliminate the possibility that the reader is reading anything but the person’s narration of their own story in their own words through quote after quote after quote.

While block quotes denote authenticity, the reality behind how the quotes were obtained is quite murky given that writers did not have recording equipment, instead relying on their notes and memory. This situation created such difficulty that many writers balked at the long block quotes when reading Rumbley’s story as the example they were supposed to follow. For example, after reading the life history aloud to his writers, Chalmers Murray, a district supervisor in South Carolina, explained that “Several of the workers objected to the long dialogue-or rather the long monologue - saying that it would have been utterly impossible for the author to remember page after page of conversation. I told them that they were not to take too literally the directions about giving a verbatim account of the interview. This cannot be done unless one took stenographic notes or used a dictaphone. If the person interviewed does not speak out of character in the story or is not grossly misquoted, there is little to worry about, in my opinion. Probably nothing in the way of an interview would ever be published if verbatim recording were required.”[[28]](#footnote-28) Therefore, block quotes became a strategy to convince the reader that the writer indexically documented the interviewee's exact words and that the interviewee was literally speaking for themselves, despite the liberties that were taken in creating such quotations. The extensive use of block quotes presented editors and writers with another challenge concerning exactly how to represent the voice of interviewees.

**Dialect as Authenticity**

Writers used dialect to bolster claims that the life history was the *actual* voice of the interviewee. Dialect is a common narrative device to situate a person within a particular geography or positionality, such as a social class, ethnicity, race, and gender. Using dialect to represent how a person spoke was designed to persuade the reader that the story was accurately recorded, a powerful technique when combined with block quotes.[[29]](#footnote-29)

With the use of written dialect, the SLHP entered a complicated realm. On the one hand, writing all the interviews in “standard English” could make them easier to read for one of their major audiences, the White middle- and upper-class readers who supported the literary market. On the other hand, claims to authenticity and accuracy could be bolstered, administrators argued, if the life histories read like how people spoke. At a minimum, leaders like Alsberg thought dialect would make the stories a bit more dynamic and therefore engage potential readers. He wrote, “They might be useful for our racial group and folklore work in other parts of the country. I think a little more of the flavor of the local dialect will make the stories more readable, and that there should be considerably more contrast, light and dark, in the telling.”[[30]](#footnote-30)
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Figure #: Moore used dialect to capture the speech style of Mary Rumbley. She paired her sentence structures, which often were grammatically incorrect according to “standard” English, with dialect to capture her speech style.

Dialect is a prominent feature in life histories. For example, Topic 13 and Topic 16 aggregate around two different geographies. Topic 13 includes interviews by a plethora of writers in Alabama and South Carolina. Topic 16 focuses on interviews conducted by Robert McKinney in New Orleans.[[31]](#footnote-31) For each of these topics, the most prominent words are all forms of dialect. For example, “git”, “jest”, “reckon”, “hit”, “wuz”, “git”, “wid”, and “fer” being amongst the most dominant terms.

Assigned to the New Orleans office, McKinney was among, if not the first, Black writer hired as a part of FWP in Louisiana but was not a member of the black unit.[[32]](#footnote-32) The graduate of Xavier University joined an integrated unit with Hazel Breaux, Caroline Durieux, and others.[[33]](#footnote-33) His access to Black communities in New Orleans was seen as an asset by state director Lyle Saxon.[[34]](#footnote-34) The efforts to capture slight distinctions in ways of speaking are indicated by the slight differences in the use of dialect. For example, McKinney works to capture the dropping of "g" in the back of verbs such as "morning” and “living” and “a” in “again”. The careful attention to certain kinds of linguistic features suggests the use of dialect by a local writer attuned to and documenting the nuances of local speech. To a reader from the community, the nuances of dialect could further signal, particularly to a reader from the same community, that the voice, and therefore story they are reading, is accurate. However, the challenge with using dialect was that the intended audience was not the person interviewed nor often even a member of the community from which the interviewee resided but primarily White middle class reading publics, academics, and bureaucrats.

The text analysis brings the racialized use of dialect in stark contrast. The challenge, then, is that written dialect can undermine people's voices because of how written English functions socially and culturally. "Standard" English is unquestioned and seen as normal, whereas dialect, signaled through the spelling of words, is often linked to a series of assumptions about difference, which are often shaped by race and class. Effort to respell a word to reflect how a person pronounced a word is often interpreted as a misspelling in text and therefore associated with being uneducated, or, at minimum, difference from the norm.[[35]](#footnote-35)

An even stronger dialect signal can be found in the document clustering model that does not remove dialect terms. The last eight clusters, 25-32, are all dominated by the usage of dialect. Looking at the proportion of Black interviewees in these clusters shows that the dialect was used to indicate race and class. Clusters 28-32 all consist of at least 57% of Black interviews. Interestingly, the use of dialect does not show strong clustering by specific location or writer. The example of McKinney's work clustering further demonstrates how attention to local speech patterns was obfuscated in favor of a more general, standardized "southern" dialect, most commonly applied to Black interviewees' voice. Given the racist ideologies bolstered by a culture of segregation that situated Black citizens as less than their White counterparts, dialect could also function as a strategy that furthered racist and white supremacist ideologies.

In the life histories, dialect was not applied evenly. Dialect is so prominent in the life histories of Black interviewees that, if not removed, almost all of the Black interviews will be group together based on dialect. The fact that the dialect words cluster and become the most significant “topics” of Black interviewees illuminates how these text analysis methods can limit our analysis at best and replicate racialized and racist ways of knowing at worst. Primarily defining and exploring Black interviews by dialect risks recreating the same process as the SLHP in a computational and digital form. While the topic offers insight into the interviews and racialized formal strategies, one risk is only computational reading with the grain and not against it. Because writers used dialect to mark race, a risk is that topic modeling and document clustering reinscribes the racialized logic of SLHP. A risk is reproducing a form of computational color blindness, a problematic racist ideology in and of itself. As a result, the models were adjusted (see Methods) to reveal subjects in the interviews beyond just dialect. To explore, see the topic models and document clusters where dialect is removed.

**Obscuring the Role of the Writer**

Like the introduction, where the writer set the scene, editors were concerned about the writer's presence throughout the rest of the story as the interviewee recounted their life history through mainly block quotes. As Tennessee State Director William H. McDaniel wrote to Couch, “You will notice that we are not writing the life histories in any prescribed form. Usually, the type of story dictates the best manner in which to tell it. We have told this in the first person, though the third person has been used in most of the others. We are keeping the interviewer out of them all as much as possible since his presence in most cases has no constructive significance.”[[36]](#footnote-36)

Disrupting the voice of the interviewee was deeply frowned upon. Constantly frustrated by the life histories coming from Alabama, Couch did not temper his criticism. Getting specific, he wrote,

In this paragraph how does the author know that Nora is embarrassed by being in the same classes with children…how does he know Beatrice has ‘accepted her father’s philosophy of life. She is interested only in finding a man,’ etc. The author should be extremely careful how he makes statements like these. If Nora and Beatrice said things which made him come to these conclusions, he should repeat in his story what Nora and Beatrice said and let the reader draw conclusions. If he drew his conclusions from statements made by Bob or Christine, he should quote them.[[37]](#footnote-37)

In other words, the writer should make sure to position such judgments as emanating from the interviewee by including them in the block quotes. They should not be in the words of the writer.

Editorial notes across the life histories indicate a significant amount of time was spent removing the writer and putting the interviewee in the forefront. The way that the life histories were written—specifically the use of block quotes and dialect—were intended to suggest that the reader was listening to the interviewee's story in their exact words. They were simply telling their story with the writer as a scribe. As a result, one could read the topics they focus on or address as an indicator of the features of social life that the interviewees found important. For example, the topic models and document clusters focus on areas such as education, employment, foodways, and the law. However, another way to read these themes is as an indicator of the intentionality of the decisions made for the subjects of the life histories. Several themes map onto the questions and themes that writers were told to explore in the instructions.

Yet, the life history form obscured the role of questionnaires and conversation in shaping the interviewee's story as the writer omitted the specific questions that they asked the interviewee. For example, certain writers used questionnaires modeled from the instructions that explicitly asked about areas such as food and education. In contrast, certain writers pursued their own themes, such as Rose Shepard, who asked questions that allowed White interviewees in Jacksonville to obscure the horrors of chattel slavery through lost cause romanticism and celebrate settler colonialism. Many of these interviews are contained in Document Cluster 14 (with dialect) or Document Cluster 32 (without dialect). Rather than represent that back and forth through dialogue or why, the writers used block quotes that obfuscated the role such prompts had in shaping the story. The aim was to reify their claims that the story was original to the interviewee and not biased or shaped by the writer. By not indicating the role of conversation and questions in shaping the interviewee's story through block quotes, the form obscured the writer and FWP's authorial influence at large.

All of these strategies were in the service of producing a life history that created a word picture focused on the interviewee. Through setting the scene, the reader entered space with the interviewee. Through block quotes, the reader heard directly, and ideally without interruption, from the interviewee. Dialect made the sounds of the physical interview come to life through the written word. How to end the life history became the final challenge.

**Closing a Life History**

How to close a life history was quickly solidified, as revealed by the unit's most prolific writers. Some writers, particularly Bernice Harris, ended the life history with the words of the interviewee. [[38]](#footnote-38) While occasionally there was a short description to close the scene followed by a quote from the interviewee, the more common approach was to use block quotes until the end. The authorial voice remained with the interviewee, who literally had the last word.

When writers shifted their authorial voice back to themselves by returning to their presence in the scene, editors worked to minimize and remove their presence. This often came in the form of a few sentences where the writer described leaving the location. Like a play, they were exiting the scene. The approach recentered the writer and disrupted the interviewee's voice, and therefore risked undermining the work of the life history. If the pages of block quotes were meant to lull the reader into a sense that they were next to the interviewer reading the exact words, and therefore an unadulterated story of the person's life, then a reminder of the presence of the writer risked reminding the reader that a layer of interpretation sat between them and the interviewee. A return to the writer also risked recentering them at the main character, thereby hatching doubts about who the story was really about: was the life history a story about a writer meeting and interviewing a person or a document of the interviewee’s story? The SLHP editors made it clear that the goal was the latter.

To assert the claim that the reader was listening to the person in their own words, revisers edited the interviews to let the interviewee have the last word. For example, the edits of Gertha Couric's interview "A Day on the Farm" were mostly minor except for the final marks. The editor marked out the final paragraph that brought the interview back to Couric. She had written, "Soon after this Gorman came for me, thus ending a day with the two little ladies, who for fifty years, have held down a ‘man-sized’ job without complaint."[[39]](#footnote-39) The edits appear to actually be Couch himself, who with the same penmanship wrote, "Excellent WC." Even if not Couch, the document demonstrates his approval of the interview as exemplary, which a review of notes on other life histories and his comments in his papers reveals was uncommon. However, the ending that returned to Couric needed to be cut.

Another example further highlights the importance of the interviewee’s voice as the last one the reader heard. In an interview called “Life in a Shrimping and Oyster Shucking Camp," the writer Ila B. Prine ends with a three-paragraph description of the camp. The last line then reads, “Amid such surroundings, these people were very cheerful, and were delighted to have visitors.”[[40]](#footnote-40) Couch was anything but delighted and commented in the document that this approach was a "Bad ending."[[41]](#footnote-41) As both examples demonstrate, SLHP editors and writers agreed that the interview should end with the authorial voice of the interviewee.

[Insert Image]

Figure #: A Day At Mary Rumbley’s House also exemplified the desired closing. With only one sentence, Moore is present again and indicates to the reader her departure. Mary then has the final word.

*These Are Our Lives*, the only book published of the life histories during the era, further asserts the final form of the life history as ending with the interviewee's voice. With a few exceptions, life histories quickly moved into block quotes indicating the authorial shift to the interviewee and did not switch back to the writer. They end in the room with the interviewee to convey their authenticity through the intimacy of not only being in the room with the interviewee but hearing their voice last. The first and only book published of life histories offers insight into the form the SLHP settled on and the reader's understanding of the success of centering the interviewee's story.

**An Argument Published: *These Are Our Lives***

Throughout 1938 and 1939, the SLHP formalized the form of a life history. In a few paragraphs, the writer sets the scene. With the writer in the interviewee's physical presence, the writer turned the authorial voice over the interviewee, who told their story. The shift in authorial voice was indicated by the use of first-person and block quotes. In one block quote after another, the interviewee often began with the beginning of their life and moved to the present, uninterrupted. The reader was positioned as having joined the writer to bear witness to the exact words, literally quoted, from the interviewee. The life history then ended with the interviewee getting the last word. The form was designed to make sure the life histories came from the viewpoint of the person telling their story, an important shift in perspective that allowed individuals to speak and be heard.

Each document was a single person’s life history, but they weren’t designed to read in isolation. Couch argued that building, selecting, and organizing life histories into a collection was a critical way that the life histories produced knowledge. “Until after a large amount of material has been collected and studied, it is not possible to know what is most important, most typical, or how stories should be classified and published in order to give the most faithful representation,” wrote Couch.[[42]](#footnote-42) The technology of the book, therefore, became a strategy for how life histories created knowledge.

How the life histories were organized and therefore read became another defining feature. The life histories were intended to be read in aggregate. The insights they revealed were designed to be produced through repetition, by reading one story after another to paint a "word picture" through "human documents” of society. As Couch wrote in the Preface to *These Are Our Lives* (TAOL), “The idea is to get life histories which are readable and faithful representations of living persons, and which, taken together, will give a fair picture of the structure and working of society.”[[43]](#footnote-43)

As a result, the SLHP directly entered debates about sociological knowledge. The book's form was also an implicit critique of prominent Sociologists, who believed that quantitative data was at the heart of producing a fair picture of society. As a part of their efforts to fortify their claims to a science, prominent sociologists amplified calls to prioritize quantitative analysis. For example, the case method advocates argued that the qualitative data that comprised a case study, such as life histories, should be turned into quantitative data. Quantitative methods could then be used to identify and classify patterns in social behavior that could identify social types and social laws. [[44]](#footnote-44) These methods were seen as more objective and less biased. Much of this work was driven by sociologists invested in social work, particularly the study of deviance that led to the field of criminology. TAOL joined growing critiques that quantitative data was the way to glean insights about social conditions. Rather, the process of reading individual stories in aggregate - one after another - allowed the reader also to identify patterns. Qualitative data in the form of life histories, in other words, could shed light on social structures and society. Accordingly, the SLHP planned a series of books on topics such as mill village life and oil workers, though TAOL was the only book published.

While reviewers were not always as enamored by the book, they were generally convinced of the method. They were persuaded by the form’s claims to being the authentic, accurate voice of the people interviewed. As a reviewer in the *Arkansas Democrat* wrote, “‘These Are Our Lives’ is a new adventure in literature...Here are true stories of whites and negroes of sharecroppers, farm laborers, landowners, mill and factory workers, persons engaged in service occupations, persons on relief. These are their own stories because they are related in their own language, a language so faithfully transcribed that as you read you feel you are listening as the subjects narrate their experiences, their successes and failures, their hopes and ambitions, their fears and sorrows.”[[45]](#footnote-45) The United Kingdom-based *Sunday Mirror* Magazine Section wrote:

Today, Americans are meeting Americans as never before in the history of the country. These United States have had their internal troubles, their bitter sectional differences—but today the farmer knows his security depends on the well-being of industrial centers; the mill worker knows that his food supply depends on the success of the planter.

One way that Americans have been able to learn who their neighbors are, how they get along, is by the factual reporting of the life histories of living, average Americans.

One of the outstanding examples of such reporting is the recent publication of the Federal Writers’ Project book, “These Are Our Lives,” presenting the stories of Southern Americans in their own words, written from the standpoint of the individuals themselves.[[46]](#footnote-46)

As the *Sunday Mirror’s* review of TAOL demonstrates, the conventions ultimately used to shape the life histories position the content as the interviewee's true words. The form, in aggregate, could then shed light on social truths about society. "The method of writing life histories from the viewpoint of the person concerned in a new device," wrote Couch. It will depend for its final justification on whether the mass of readers is enabled to gain such insight into the lives of other people as will lead to fresh appreciation and understanding. If this purpose is realized, the validity of the method is vindicated."[[47]](#footnote-47) The SLHP may not have been often validated by their sociology colleagues in Chapel Hill or Chicago, but their primary audience read with appreciation and understanding.
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