This is to certify that the
thesis entitled

WHEN WE SPEAK OUR LANGUAGES: IDEOLOGIES OF LANGUAGE LOSS AND REVITALIZATION

presented by

Adam Michael Haviland

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Masters degree in American Studies

Major Professor's Signature

6/21/2010

Date

WHEN WE SPEAK OUR LANGUAGES: IDEOLOGIES OF LANGUAGE LOSS AND REVITALIZATION

By

Adam Michael Haviland

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTERS OF ARTS

AMERICAN STUDIES

2010

ABSTRACT

WHEN WE SPEAK OUR LANGUAGES: IDEOLOGIES OF LANGUAGE LOSS AND REVITALIZATION

By

Adam Michael Haviland

Language Ideologies shape the way Native American communities respond to the continued loss of their heritage languages and efforts to revitalize them through language immersion programs and education. This Thesis examines and compares the ideologies of the dominant culture in regards to the assimilation of Native people through government boarding school education and English language Immersion, with current efforts to revitalize and maintain Native languages through immersion education by Native communities.

This work adds to the growing body of literature concerning the relationship between language ideologies and language revitalization by comparing the many heterogeneous ideologies which surround the way language is used as an expression of identity and culture, and how language is used to create conformity and express power. Central to this study is the affect that language ideologies have on language choice, and on the transmission of language across generations in Native communities.

This is dedicated to all of my elders and teachers who have guided me on this journey, and to the current and future caretakers of our Anishinaabek language.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

It is indeed mortifying for me to consider that outside of the proper names for lakes, streams, and places, our language is almost being entirely ignored by the incoming race, while other languages of foreign birth are entering largely into the English dialect; our children, who are being educated in the white man's schools, are forsaking and forgetting their mother tongue.

- Simon Pokagon (1899:35)

Over one hundred years ago, Native people recognized that their communities were changing, not just in terms of culture and life ways, but linguistically as well. The dominant American culture's ideologies of education and language as part of the process to civilize and assimilate Native people, was the driving force behind these changes. This thesis will examine and contrast language loss and revitalization through the ideologies behind the United States government's attempt to civilize Native peoples using the English language and Federal Indian boarding schools, in relationship to the ideologies behind current efforts by Native American communities to prevent further language loss by revitalizing their heritage languages through education and language immersion. While there are many ways to compare these ideologies, this work will focus on how language ideologies influence the relationship between communities and their heritage languages, and their effect on the success of Native language immersion programs in reaching their goals.

Language ideologies are defined as feelings or beliefs about a language and language choice that exist within

speech communities. These ideologies vary greatly across Indian country as well as within individual Native communities. These sometimes shared, yet often-divergent views concerning Native language use, directly affect language shift as well as language maintenance and revitalization efforts (Kroskirty and Field 2009: 4). Language ideologies within Native American communities reflect the multifaceted experiences of Native people in relationship to historical pressures of assimilation and the globalization of the dominant culture and language, with desires to maintain cultural identity while creating successful opportunities in a linguistically homogenized world.

While the decline and loss of Native American languages has been of great concern to linguists, anthropologists and Native American communities for many decades, there has been little progress toward reversing language shift. The ideologies surrounding the revitalization of Native American languages are varied and reflect the heterogeneous nature of Native experience in relation to assimilation and language loss. While this thesis focuses of the loss of Native American languages, the loss of indigenous languages is a global phenomenon.

Current estimates show that approximately 6,912 languages are spoken around the world. Many of them are in danger of being lost as globalization continues to impact marginalized and developing communities with the influence of dominant Western languages and cultures. In 2005 there were 344 languages that had fewer than 100 remaining speakers, and 204 had fewer than 10 remaining fluent speakers. These endangered languages account for approximately one tenth of the world's languages (Harrison 2007: 3-4, Dalby 2003:IX). Many of these are Native American languages spoken by only a handful of fluent speakers. For example, Truer estimates that that the number of fluent speakers of Ojibwa in the United States at less than 600, with many communities down to only a handful (Treuer 2009:4). For many other Native languages in North America, the situation is similar. There has been a great deal of work to revitalize and reinvigorate the use of these languages and expand their domains of use to reverse this trend.

Many Native American communities operate immersion-based education programs in the hope of successfully bringing back their languages, and in the process, renewing the connections to identity and traditional knowledge that

were disrupted through government boarding school education and forced assimilation. Language immersion and revitalization programs have shown promise in exposing potential speakers to Native languages; however, few have created and maintained new speakers who possess fluency. The development of these programs is often hampered by ideologies that were shaped during the boarding school era and the ideologies of the dominant culture toward Native language and identity. These ideologies continue to shape the relationship between language and identity, creating an atmosphere that continues to privilege the status of the dominant language at the expense of Native languages. Examining language ideologies gives an understanding of their role as agents of social and linguistic change, and offers alternatives to how ideologies shape communicative practices and influence language choice (Kroskirty and Field 2009:8). Little attention has been paid to these ideological relationships and their effect on the success of Native American language immersion programs or their relationship to intergenerational language transmission.

As more Native communities begin the process of heritage language renewal and continue to develop plans to bring them back, it is necessary to create a holistic view

that takes into account these ideologies, as well as historical and contemporary issues of language loss and Native language revitalization. Without our language, we lose the ability to connect with our cultures and the traditional knowledge contained within them. The importance of language as a marker and carrier of our identities cannot be overlooked. As N. Scott Momaday wrote, "Language is the context of our experience. We know who we have been, who we are, and where we can be in the dimension of words, of language" (1997:87). Developing an understand of the relationship between language ideologies and their effect on efforts to strengthen and revitalize native languages will help solidify the goals of native language immersion programs, and allow Native languages to remain spoken languages for the generations yet to come.

This thesis is comprised of four chapters. The first looks at the literature pertaining to language ideologies that encompasses both the efforts to eradicate Native language and culture, and the movement to revitalize them as spoken languages. Chapter two examines the role of language ideologies in the development of policies in dealing with Native people and the development of government boarding schools and using the English language

as a tool of assimilation. The third chapter looks at the movement to revitalize Native American languages and the ideologies that influence strategies to restore these languages, and the influence of ideologies on language choice. Finally, chapter four concludes by examining the effectiveness of language immersion, comparing the government boarding school program, with current efforts to revitalize Native languages and their effect on language choice and intergenerational language transmission.

Chapter One

Understanding the reasons behind language loss and the efforts needed to revitalize them is an ongoing process for many Native peoples. As communities struggle to maintain their cultures and identities within a dominant culture that traditionally views them as inferior, connecting language ideologies to the development and success of Native language immersion education is central to this thesis.

This chapter serves to review the literature pertaining to these ideologies, beginning with the development of Western language ideologies and their ideologies of indigenous language immersion practices and programs. It is important to examine the influence of Western language ideologies on language dominance and the relationship between language and identity in Native communities. The literature presented in this chapter highlights the development of these ideologies from the dominant culture and their use to legitimize the assimilation of Native people through language during the

boarding school era. It also examines the research pertaining to language loss and the creation and development of language immersion by Native communities and the ideologies that influence language choice.

The policy to remove Native people from the landscape through military force went hand in hand with efforts to assimilate and transform them from their savage state to one more in line with the ideologies of modernity and the values of Christian society. Thus, the war against Native people over domination of the land was fought on multiple fronts. Language played a substantial role in assimilation. Fredrick E. Hoxie's A final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920 (1984) is relevant to understanding how attitudes towards language and education impacted Native communities and outlines the ideologies of assimilation and their impact on the policies of the federal government. Hoxie presents how assimilation and education became the solution for solving the Indian problem that had plagued the United States political, moral and social quest to fulfill its manifest destiny. It would also allow for the growth of the nation as it moved west, "Once the tribes were brought into 'civilized' society, there would be no reason for them to 'usurp' vast tracts of

'undeveloped' land. And membership in a booming nation would be ample compensation for the disposition they had suffered" (Hoxie 1984:15). Progress would continue unabated and the savage would be brought out of darkness and into the light of civilization and Christianity. This process would be complete with the linguistic and cultural "purification" which assimilation accomplished. Only when traditional modes of subsistence were impossible would native people be able to enter into modernity and live a lifestyle modeled after the dominant cultures (Hoxie 1984:25). The rapid assimilation of Indians into American society was desirable and practical, and would exemplify the wisdom and virtue of the United States (Hoxie 1984:28-29).

The foundations and history of American Indian education are also explored in Jon Reyhner and Jeanne Eder's American Indian Education: A History (2004). Their work is important in understanding the development of Indian education and assimilation policy in the United States through the use of language and the lasting affects they brought about. They describe the assimilation of American Indians through education and the boarding school movement and emphasize many of the ideologies behind the

movement. They trace the beginning of Indian education with the development of missionary schools founded by the Jesuits and other Catholics, whose goals were to Christianize and civilize Native people and bring them into a more enlightened state. Children were often separated from the evil influences of their parents and assimilated into the language and religion of the dominant culture. As Reyhner and Eder explain,

> For most Indian students being taught by missionaries, parental influence far outweighed the influence of missionaries. Since this frustrated their efforts at conversion to Christianity and the European way of life, missionaries soon sought to separate Indian children from their parents by placing them in white homes or boarding schools (2004:16).

Reyhner and Eder show that the promotion of the English language was an important milestone in the development of the Indian education philosophy, "The instruction of the Indians in the vernacular is not only of no use to them, but is detrimental to the cause of their education and civilization, and no school will be permitted

on the reservation in which the English language is not exclusively taught…" (Reyhner and Eder 2004:77). The government, in an effort to enforce this policy, threatened mission schools with the removal of funding if they taught Native children in their traditional languages. While missionaries advocated for the use of Native languages in education, the majority of policy makers upheld the ideology of the English language as superior to Native languages. While not every child went to boarding schools, the English only policy and the ideologies behind it affected generations of Native people and continues to influence language attitudes in respect in Native language revitalization.

Understanding the development of Western language ideologies and their relation to the notion of the superiority of Anglo-Saxon civilization and language provides an understanding of their influence on language loss, and their continued effect on the discourse of Native language revitalization. Richard Bauman and Charles L. Briggs in Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality (2003), trace the development of language ideologies and the concept of modernity. Drawing from John Locke, Bauman and Briggs lay out their ideas

concerning the purification of language and its role in creating modernity and social order. As they explain, Locke's ideas about reforming language and its role as put forth in his Essays, are essentially that language can be made to conform to modernity and its ideologies through a purification that separates it from ties to social positions and differences between human beings in general (Bauman and Briggs 2003:31). Through the ideas of Foucault, they explain how Locke, in his desire to modernize language, did more than change the ideologies concerning language and thinking

> We can say that Locke created a powerful set of practices of purification that constructed a new form of govern mentality, a meta-discursive regime that drew on assertions regarding the nature of language in regulating linguistic conduct and imbuing some ways of speaking and writing with authority while rendering other modes a powerful source of stigma and exclusion (Bauman and Briggs 2003:32).

Inferior dialects and languages, those used by the poor,

women, and those classified as "others" were excluded from modernity, paving the way for one form of language to dominate the discourse market and maintain itself as a measure of social class, wealth and power (Bauman and Briggs 2003:44). Locke's ideologies were reflected in the policies and programs of the United States regarding Native peoples and their languages, and American Anglo-Saxon notions of civilization and language.

Pierre Bourdieu, in Language and Symbolic Power, (1991) explains how the formation of a standard language is part of creating a nation, and further allows for the production of ideologies that cement particular ways of thinking and social dominance. Language also serves as linguistic capital and a measure of distinction. Education in the dominant language serves as a method to assimilate "others" into the dominant culture through discourse and the ideologies that a part of language dominance. Education and the development of a common language also have the effect of changing ways of thinking and being, creating a homogeneous concept of identity (Bourdieu 1991:49). Indian boarding schools, as places where the efforts toward assimilation were made, and were important in the process to erase Native culture and language and ending Native

resistance to the dominance culture. As Hoxie and Reyhner explain, education and language became essential in reaching the ultimate goals of assimilation. For Bourdieu, language functions as a form of symbolic power, with the ability to proscribe differences in status through linguistic markers. Native languages become associated with notions of inferiority and carry the stigma of being backward, primitive and obsolete, helping to hinder their use and transmission across generations. The discourse of language dominance, defines the social status and visibility of an individual or community, and limits the ability of individuals to function within the dominant culture based on their knowledge of the dominant language thus, "Speakers lacking the legitimate competence are de facto excluded from the social domains in which this competence is required, or are condemned to silence" (Bourdieu 1991:55). The power exerted on Native languages through the imposition of English as the language needed to secure a place in the dominant culture, was one way in which the power and social value of Native languages was eroded. As English became the official language of education, it eventually moved into other domains within Native communities, at the same time Native languages

loosing their distinction and power as markers of identity.

The power language ideologies express through education and institutions is examined by Norman Fairclough in Language and Power Sec ed. (2001). Fairclough describes the role that ideologies play in the relationship to Language, power and social relations, "…the exercise of power, in modern society, is increasingly achieved through ideology, a more particularly through the ideological workings of language" (Fairclough 2001:2). Language ideologies are linked with the relationship to social, political and economic values that uphold the power of the dominant culture and which are often exercised through force, coercion and manufactured consent (Fairclough 2001:3). The language ideologies and methodologies of the dominant culture in the case of the U.S. boarding school movement are an example of this power relationship. While he does not use the boarding school movement specifically, its use of force and cohesion to assimilate Native children was part of an ideology of power exercised over Native communities using language. He cites the main reason for the analysis of discourse is to understand the relationship between language ideologies and positions of power that are taken for granted and legitimized in society, and as a

method to raise conscious awareness of them (Fairclough 2001:33).

The important of this cannot be overlooked in relation to the development of language immersion and maintenance programs, as often they are located within the dominant cultures social and educational institutions. Relationships in power and language discourse, while often supportive of linguistic minority rights on the surface, may as part of unconscious tendency continue to favor and give power to the dominant language. Thus, Language can carry power in hidden and indirect ways as exercised in discourse (Fairclough 2001:46). The language ideologies of the dominant culture to make English the standardized language function to assimilate and to unify, making it an important part of the process toward modernity and a focal point of the movement to resist globalization and the loss of Native languages.

Native languages become marginalized through an uneven balance of power that is increasing as the pressure of dominant Western languages on minority languages increases through exposure to ideologies that influence or dominate language choice that Bourdieu and Fairclough outline. With this realization comes the understanding of how language

creates and defines a community and its social, cultural, political and spiritual identity. Understanding the ideologies behind language loss requires a familiarity with the historical relationships between minority languages and the dominant culture, and the ideologies and methodologies of successful language revitalization and maintenance.

Andrew Dalby, in Language in Danger: The Loss of Linguistic Diversity and the Threat to Our future (2003), describes how language loss has many facets. Languages are fluid systems that over time change, merge with other languages or are replaced, yet languages are disappearing today through the process of the globalization of English and with it the spread of the dominant culture. The threat that language loss poses at its current rate involves the loss of distinct cultures as well as the knowledge that is unique to each, "The cessation of current use of any language is an event that is potentially dangerous to the shared knowledge and future abilities of our species, and an event that may be accompanied by the disappearance of a culture" (Dalby 2003:x).

Language is uniquely tied to culture as the method through witch identity is transmitted across generations. In the case of Native North American languages, their

decline and loss is connected as previously described through contact with European powers and their quest to destroy Native language and culture through assimilation and education. The damage done through these systems is a primary reason for the continued loss of Native languages. Boarding schools play a huge role in language choice in Native communities limiting their use as a result of historical trauma (Dalby 2003:161). He also highlights the Native American Language acts of 1990 and 1992 as a reversal of a century long policy of eradicating Native languages on behalf of the federal government.

Yet while they support these languages on paper, support of Native language requirements often fall short or are ignored. Support for bilingual education and funding is a contested political issue influenced by public fears over the decline of English (Dalby 2003:162). Dalby also sights that fact that most children come from families where the primary language spoken is English, not the Native language and that while many communities support Language education it is often taught as a foreign language. The agency of language maintenance is removed from families and located outside of traditional methods of language learning. Thus as Dalby states, "What the change in policy has done,

ironically, is to relieve parents of any doubts they may have over failing to teach their traditional language to their children. There is now no need, they feel: the school will do it" (Dalby 2003:163). This ideology is an important aspect of language recovery efforts and a roadblock to expanding language use beyond the confines of mainstream education and dominant language ideologies.

K. David Harrison also looks at language loss in, When Languages Die: The Extinction of the Worlds Languages and the Erosion of Human Knowledge, (2007). He echoes Dalby and other linguists as to the importance of saving endangered languages and looks at the processes involved in language loss and their effects on culture and Knowledge. As languages lose their speakers to the pressure to assimilate, they become isolated within certain confines of community life and no longer capable of producing new speakers,

> Once a language becomes moribund, it continues to decline as its use becomes restricted. It may be spoken only in the home, or only among elders, or at ceremonial events. As they fall silent, elderly speakers become invisible, lacking any

> linguistic difference that would set them apart from the people surrounding them. At the same time, they begin to forget (Harrison 2007:8).

This is the place where many Native languages stand, where speaking the language is restricted to certain times and places and to a limited number of individuals who often have little opportunity to pass on the language.

Harrison cites many reasons why communities abandon languages. Many languages are threatened by the globalization of dominant languages while continued urbanization separates speakers and favors the use of dominant languages. Some individuals may stop speaking their Native languages as they seek to better their lives by assimilating, withholding their native languages to enable their children to have better access to the dominant language and its benefits. With over half of the world's languages spoken by a fewer than 5000 speakers, globalization, urbanization and assimilation threaten language diversity and their future as spoken languages (Harrison 2007:14). The loss of language diminishes the world's knowledge base, "Much-if not most of what humankind knows about the natural world lies completely outside of

science textbooks, libraries, and databases, existing only in unwritten languages in people's memories" (Harrison 2007:16). Harrison furthers the understanding that language holds traditional knowledge that is unique and offers alternative ways of viewing the world and relating to it.

Understanding the factors that contribute to language loss, historically and today, however, is not enough to stop the continual shift toward the dominant language in Native communities. As Joshua A. Fishman explains in Can Threatened Languages be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective (2001),

> Prognostications foretelling disaster are not enough. What the smaller and weaker languages (and peoples and cultures) of the world need are not generalized predictions of dire and even terminal illness but, rather, the development of therapeutic understandings and approaches that can be adjusted so as to tackle essentially the same illness in patient after patient (Fishman 2001:1).

This volume, edited by Fishman, brings together the works

of various contributors involved in revitalizing threatened languages and as a follow up to his 1991 work, Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to threatened Languages.

Fishman puts forth that the loss of language, through social and linguistic change, results in the loss of specific "knowing" that are encoded in language. The result is that what is left is not the same culture. (Fishman 2001:4). This is a belief that many language activists and some Native people hold; that losing the language is equal to the death of culture and identity. He also identifies the mode of all language shifts currently underway as being through the "globalization of pan-Western Culture" and "Pop-consumer culture" (Fishman 2001:6).

In this compilation, many of the authors utilize Fishman's Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS), as a methodology to access the status of a threatened language in respect to its intergenerational transmission and the subsequent level of effort needed to revitalize and maintain it i.e., (Hornberger and King, 171). While a widely used and important aspect in developing methodologies to combat language loss, it does not always take into account all aspects that influence the process.

P.O. Riagain however, in "Irish Language Production and Reproduction 1981-1996," shows that this model is difficult to apply to Irish language loss and maintenance (Riagain 2001:195). He states, "There is nothing in Fishman's model to indicate how variables of an economic, social or spatial nature are to be incorporated for either analytical or prescriptive purposes" (Riagain 2001:212). These aspects are important and have a direct impact on efforts to revitalize and maintain threatened languages. He paraphrases Bourdieu in describing language as "…systems of social interaction which reproduce the system of social differences" (Riagain 2001:212). He further concluded that the role of the state in economics and education also greatly affects language policies and their consequences on maintenance objectives (Riagain 2001:213). Thus, while Fishman's GIDS is important in creating language maintenance strategies it is also important to include economic, political and social factors that influence language loss and revitalization and community ideologies that affect relationships between language and identity.

While the fate of many Native languages looks bleak, there is also optimism. Anna Ash, Jessie Little Doe Fermino and Ken Hale write in their article in The Green Book of

Language Revitalization in Practice, (2001), that many local language communities are taking charge of revitalizing their languages in spite of the forecasts of their impending doom (Ash, Fermino and Hale 2001:20). One example they site is Wampanoag, a language no longer spoken but one where there is a great deal of written material available. While it is difficult to reconstruct the phonology of a language with no remaining speakers, with the proper research, materials and the help of linguists and the community, the Wampanoag Reclamation project began (Ash, Fermino and Hale 2001:31). Though still being developed, this project shows that even after a language has lost its speakers, hope exists as long as there are dedicated individuals who share a common ideology regarding the language's importance and the community will to undertake its revitalization.

Behind efforts to revitalize Native languages are ideologies that are influenced by historical, political and social relationships between the dominant culture and language and those of native communities and individuals. Paul K. Kroskrity and Margaret in Native American Language Ideologies: Beliefs, Practices and Struggles in Indian Country (2009), bring together the works of many

researchers regarding language ideologies and language immersion efforts. Examining language ideologies in Native communities and the structure and use of languages within these communities, is important in understanding how they are woven together with language loss and revitalization, "…a speech community's language ideology is a conscious, or secondary, rationalization about language and its use" (Field and Kroskrity 2009:5). Language ideologies are also understood as a plural concept, involving multiple variables and concepts (Field and Kroskrity 2009:6). Thus, within Native communities these multiple ideologies affect the process of reclaiming and maintaining languages because of their heterogeneity, "…American Indian language ideologies not only are historically very different from each other but today, even within a single community, are typically complex, heterogeneous, contradictory, and even contentious" (Field and Kroskrity 2009:7). Kroskrity and Field underscore the importance of realizing the complexity of language ideologies and resisting the tendency to homogenize them into one universal paradigm.

Jennifer F. Reynolds in "Shaming the Shift Generation: Intersecting Ideologies of Family and Linguistic Revitalization in Guatemala" (2009), also writes in this

work on the role of language ideologies that are imbedded within the generations that suffered through boarding school, and their belief that fluency in the Native language will cause their children to fail. Reynolds also examines the ideology prevalent in some Latin American communities where language shift is taking place that states that children will pick it up on their own without assistance (Reynolds 2009:226). She emphasizes the need to examine the interplay of ideologies of family, multiple languages and nation and their role in "mediating and mystifying social relations and structural inequalities" (Reynolds 2009:235). Language ideologies like these and others, which are based on historical relationships to language, education and the state, are not concrete and therefore can change over time or be challenged by others. Christopher Loether in "Language Revitalization and the Manipulation of Language Ideologies: A Shoshoni Case Study" (2009), explains how language ideologies can be manipulated to help the language revitalization process, "Those language ideologies that are clearly the product of colonial and hegemonic forces can be changed through education, but the general Anglo-American society needs to be educated as well"(Loether 2009:253).

The utilitarian ideology of language can also be changed by giving it symbolic capital and prestige in the speech community and given more domains where it can be used" (Loether 2009:253). Constructing alternative ideologies and new methodologies to renewing languages allows for them to succeed and compete against dominant ideologies that value English as the only language able to navigate in the language market. It also gives language speakers and learners the opportunity to create new places for declining languages to thrive.

Western ideologies of language and culture have influenced the development of American society in such a way as to place the English language and Euro-American culture at the top of a socio-linguistic, racial and economic hierarchy. Indigenous peoples and their languages fall to the bottom of this classification and are assimilated or exterminated. Through these ideologies, Native cultures and their languages were also viewed as an impediment to the development of Western civilization and the possession of Indian lands, creating the need to establish policies and methodologies for dealing with "The Indian Problem" that included the problem of language. These ideologies continue to influence current views and

relationships between Native communities and their traditional languages, reinforcing the dominance of English as the language of political and economic power, and on generational language transmission. United State federal boarding schools, with their emphasis on the English language and the removal of Indian children from their traditional culture, blocked the transmission of both language and identity. The assimilation experience destroyed for many their connections to language and culture that had lasting effects as Native people deal with the historical trauma associated with American Indian education. Connecting historical, socio-economic, political and economic pressures faced by Native communities and the influence of the dominant cultures language ideologies, sets the stage for understanding the replacement of Native languages with English and the success or failure of Native American language revitalization.

Chapter Two

The Indians must conform to "the white man's ways," peacefully if they will, forcefully if they must. They must adjust themselves to their environment, and conform their mode of living substantially to our civilization. This civilization may not be the best possible, but it is the best the Indians can get. They cannot escape it, and must either conform to it or be crushed by it.

-Thomas J. Morgan (1880:75)

The newly formed American nation sought to establish itself within the world as a dominant power, Leaders like Thomas Jefferson relied on the ideology of Anglo-Saxon superiority, as they looked west toward Indian country. Indians were recognized for their prior rights to the land, but they were also seen as competitors who could be excluded, removed or eliminated on the basis that they existed in a lower state of being, lacking the morals and ethics of a civilized Christian culture. Though Jefferson felt that Indians were capable of becoming as civilized as any white, for Jefferson and others Indians represented the past, their culture and way of life a scientific curiosity which upheld a vision of cultural progression and hierarchy. This progression toward a civilized society required either assimilation or extinction on the part of the Indian and his way of life (Wallace 1999: 11). Indian and White relations were based on an ideology of removing, assimilating and erasing Indian identity from the land and history, making room for the inevitable dominance of American culture and civilization.

The discourse of civilizing and assimilating Indian went hand in hand with the dominant cultures desire to claim lands and settle them according the right of

discovery and the doctrine of manifest destiny. Many believed that through exposure to civilized religion and culture, the Indian like the early Anglo-Saxons, would be brought out of darkness and into a modern society based on agriculture and the ownership of land (Wallace, 1999: 77).

Removal, by choice or force, was seen as the speediest method to acquire lands and facilitate settlement. However, as Americans moved westward, they continued to face resistance from Indian nations who fought militarily and politically against these ideologies and the expansion of Western cultural superiority. Although assimilation did occur in many forms and at many levels Native people often led it as they sought to adapt to the changes taking place around them, while maintaining their cultural and economic needs. For many Americans this process was not fast enough, or complete enough, to satisfy the needs of a land hungry nation. Indian removal was deemed a necessary course to solidify American expansion, and remained the favored ideology that influenced the Indian policy of the early Republic.

The Indian problem, however, was not be solved by removal, and wars to force compliance or extermination were costly, both in money and in lives. It also tarnished the

legitimacy of Americans who professed to hold the values inherent in civilization so high. A solution was sought which would facilitate the assimilation of American Indians and education became the focal point of these efforts. The 1868 Peace Commission outlined the goals the federal government hoped to accomplish through its policies toward Indians. One was to remove the causes of conflict between Indians and whites. The other was to secure frontier settlements and the expansion of railroads west toward the Pacific. It was also concerned with removing the threat to these endeavors by bring civilization to the Indians (Report to the President by the Indian Peace Commissioners 1868:1). The report cites one reason for the failure of Indian policy to secure westward expansion and peace with Indian tribes as a lack of the of education, "…we should remember that for two and a half centuries he has been driven back from civilization, where his passions might have been subjected to the influences of education and softened by the lessons of Christian charity" (Report to the President by the Indian Peace Commissioners 1868:2). Christian charity and the desire to educate and assimilate Indians however were superseded by the desire to acquire and control Indian lands and resources. The rhetoric of

Indian policy while supportive of peaceful relations, firmly held onto the ideologies of cultural, political and economic superiority,

> We do not contest the ever-ready argument that civilization must not be arrested in its progress by a handful of savages. We earnestly desire the speedy settlement of all our territories. None are more anxious than we to see their agricultural and mineral wealth developed by an industrious, thrifty and enlightened population. And we fully recognize the fact that the Indian must not stand in the way of this result (Report of the Indian Peace Commissioners Report to the President by the Indian Peace Commissioners 1868:3).

The policy of removal not only failed to solve the Indian problem, in the minds of officials and reformers it only created more. Education and creating uniformity of language was seen as a better way to assimilate American Indians and reach the goals of U.S. Indian policy. English only education was adopted in the government's assimilation

policies, and the push to eradicate Native languages rather than foster them began in earnest in the 1880ds with the ideology that language was the key to solving the Indian problem. The Destruction of Indian cultures and languages was the ideal method of securing peace and civilizing Indians. The shift from savagery to civilization would be quickly facilitated through the force and agency of the English language and education, unifying Indian people into one homogeneous mass that could join the dominant culture as productive citizens,

> Through sameness of language is produced sameness of sentiment and thought; customs and habits are molded and assimilation in the same way, and thus in the process of time the differences producing trouble would have been gradually obliterated. By civilizing one tribe others would have followed… in the difference of language today lays two-thirds of our troubles (Report to the President by the Indian Peace Commissioner 1868:4).

Federal Indian policy was influenced greatly by the efforts of social reform groups, including The Friends of the Indians, whose work on promoting Indian rights and

developing reform that focused on facilitating Indian assimilation into American society. Education was central to the goal of assimilating Indians and bringing them into civilization and citizenship (Prucha 1973: 1-6). The practical management of Indian affairs consisted of education, assimilation, and the settlement of Indian land that Americans saw as lying in waste and standing in the way of developing the country. The most beneficial and rational object of Indian policy according to Secretary of the Interior Schurz was to homogenize "the habits, occupations, and interests of the Indians with that of the 'Development of the Country.' This would be accomplished by educating Indian children and to make them land owners. Their surplus lands, those not needed for cultivation, would be sold for settlement" (Schurz 1973[1881]: 25). Native people were thus to be boiled down into a single mass, one which could be easily dealt with and manipulated to make assimilation an easier task.

By changing the social dynamics of tribal culture and life ways through education and the English language, it was believed Native people would finally enjoy the benefits which civilization offered. As Richard Henry Pratt, superintendent of Carlisle saw it, "The government believed

that if they were brought among our people, placed in good schools, and thought our language and our industries by going out among our people, in a little while their children could be made just as competent as the white children" (Pratt 1964: 221). The Indian would not vanish but be absorbed into the cultural homogeny of America. Education and the English language would solve what open warfare and removal could not. Using the English language to wipe out Native languages became the focal point around which various ideologies of dominance could gather, creating a methodology of forced language immersion that would speed assimilation, satisfying the needs of land hungry whites and reformers concerned with Native peoples progress toward their inevitable destiny.

The ideologies behind English language immersion affected the policies of assimilation in many ways. First, it was seen as a way to speed the process of assimilation and bring about the disposition of Indian land opening them for settlement. It would have economic advantages, freeing the government of its obligations through treaties to provide for Indians by making them self-sufficient (Adams 1997:19). Education, along with allotment, would reduce the need for Indians to require reservation lands and would

acculturate them into a life that would destroy the Indian and keep the man (Adams 1997:21). American ideologies behind educating Indians assumed once Native identity was destroyed and replaced with one conforming to the social, cultural and religious ideals of the dominant culture, American Indians would vanish along with the problems they posed as a military threat and an economic drain.

The promotion of education and Christianity among Native people was not new. Early missionary work, however, concentrated on civilizing the Indian through the gospels and the moral authority of the church. These schools were also placed near or within communities where traditional cultural and language could influence maintain Native Identity. The government's assimilation ideology was based on complete absorption into the dominant culture through the English language and a disciplined educational régime that forced students to cast off tribal identities and learn skills that would enable them to become useful citizens, but at the bottom of the nation's social and cultural hierarchy. William Strong, an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court from 1870 to 1880 along with others, was a great supporter of the civilizing power of Christian ideals and the English language,

> I am delirious to promote the Christianization and civilization of all the Indians in this country, and I am one of those who think it desirable that the Indians should be dispersed or diffused throughout our population; that they should not be preserved on reservations, if it is possible to avoid it; that they should not be encouraged to live in bodies; that they should not maintain their own languages and habits, but be brought into contact with the better portion of our communities scattered throughout the land, where they might be brought under good influences, and ultimately be Americanized (Strong 1973[1885]:39).

The boarding school program began as an experiment, showcasing the affect that education and English language immersion had on assimilation. Richard Pratt, founder of the government boarding school program, saw education and immersion in the English language and American culture as the nucleus of successful assimilation. The first boarding schools developed out of a strict regimental program that

modeled the military prison system. The Hampton institute, which began in 1887 and lasted until 1923, had as its first students' children from Florida and Kansas whose parents were prisoners of war (Pratt 1964:195 and Reyhner 1992:44-49). From this Carlisle, which lasted form 1879 to 1918, was also established relying on immersion in the English language and removing Native children from their homes and families to force assimilation. Pratt used the first students of these schools as examples of the transformative power that education and assimilation had on the Indian, speaking before the government Pratt advocated assimilation through education and immersion, showing American officials and tribal leaders that Indians needed the opportunities education provided, "They must surely see that being divided into so many languages, and living in small tribal groups away from these opportunities, was a great disadvantage to them; that eventually in some way the Indians must become a very part of the people of the country" (Pratt 1964:221-222). By 1902, the Burro of Indian Affairs ran twenty-five boarding schools in fifteen states and served close to 10,000 students (Reyhner1992:46). Pratt's boarding school experiment became the standard from which other Indian boarding schools would be modeled after

and last as a method of American Indian education until the 1923 when educational reforms began placing Indian children in mainstream public school (Reyhner 1992:49). In some places, boarding schools continued to function as there were no other alternatives for educating Native children. The boarding school program ran for more than 50 years, but its legacy of trauma continues to affect language choice and attitudes in Native communities, revealing the complex relationship between dominant culture ideologies of language and Native views regarding heritage language.

Educating Indian children through boarding schools and the English language became the quickest way to assimilate Native people into the dominant culture. With Native people on reservations, keeping their children at boarding schools as "hostages for good behavior" quelled Indian resistance and kept them in line (Reyhner, 2004:71). It was thought that teaching Indian languages would be a detriment to the goals of education, as J. D, C. Adkins, Commissioner of Indian Affairs from 1855-1888 stated, "…it will prejudice the youthful pupil as well as his untutored and uncivilized or semi-civilized parent against the English language and to some extent at least, against the government schools in which the English language exclusively has always been

taught" (Adkins 1973[1887]:203). The Removal of Native children from their languages through English language immersion distanced them from their parents and communities. It was believed that education through Indian languages handicapped their ability to learn English (Reyhner 2004: 76). Despite the fact that missionaries had been teaching Indian students in their Native languages for many years, the Indian office strengthened its policy of forced assimilation by banning and suppressing traditional customs and ceremonies along with languages. Education and the English language became a requirement for Native people who sought any recognition by the dominant culture as capable individuals. Indian education for children became compulsory. As the Reverend Lyman Abbott stated, "The right of government to interfere between parent and child must indeed be exercised with the greatest caution; the parental right is the most sacred of all rights; but the barbaric father has no right to keep his child in barbarism" (Abbott 1973[1888]212). Forced education and immersion in the English language and culture became the standard practice in the assimilation of Native children.

Thomas J. Morgan, Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1889, believed that an education that stressed the English

language, along with land reform and allotment would see the Indians progress toward the ideologies of a civilized culture. The image of the Indian, as an uncivilized menace to western civilization remained on the minds of many and threatened the development of lands and resources that the government still sought. Education reduced this threat, turning Indians from enemies of civilization to its friends (Morgan 1973[1892]:251). Morgan also demanded compulsory education as part of this process, as many parents refused to send their children to boarding schools. Morgan advocated withholding rations and supplies and even sending troops, as an expression of the power of the government will to force education on Native communities (Morgan 1973 [1892]:255). Language an education became an expression of power and a weapon in the fight to secure national interests, supporting the ideologies of Native American inferiority and American cultural supremacy.

Assimilation advocates like Henry Pratt and Commissioner of Indian Affairs Thomas Morgan saw the need to establish a method for extinguishing Native culture and language through education and relied on English language immersion to carry this out. Indian education was most effective when children were removed from the influences of

their families and communities and forced into a system of cultural and linguistic immersion. An important tool in this was the 1896 Browning ruling. The Browning ruling allowed the Indian Office to dictate how long a student was to remain in the boarding school system regardless of the wishes of the parents and without their knowledge (Shillinger 2008:81). This ruling allowed the government to dictate the type and duration of schooling that would allow for the speedy assimilation of Native children. The ideology of removal reflects many aspects of the dominant cultures desire to erase Native identity. Removal from the land disrupted traditional life ways and subsistence patterns and allowed Indian lands to be opened for settlement; likewise removal of children from their communities disrupted families and destabilized communities and allowed the boarding school program to mold them into accepting dominant culture ideologies and language.

The immersion process was central to the program of assimilation and the ideologies behind Indian boarding schools. The primary purpose of the boarding schools was as an agent of assimilation, teaching academics was a secondary goal (Shillinger 2008:19). By focusing assimilation efforts on Native children through the use of

language, Native language and identity could be replaced at a young age, remaking the Indian into a product of American progress. The methods used in this immersion setting fostered an environment that was not conducive to learning or success in the dominant culture and made it impossible more many students to return to their home communities having lost the ability to speak their Native language (Vuckovic 2008:13). Forced exposure to the English language and American culture through immersion broke down the crucial connections to family and identity. Native people became lost between traditional identities and a dominant culture that neither respected nor accepted them as equals (Prucha 1973: 10). The success of the boarding school program at destroying Native languages was not in its ability to assimilate, but in its ability to disrupt the transmission of language and culture across generations, changing attitudes and beliefs toward Native languages that focused on their inferiority. While boarding schools did not affect every child in the same way, the process of English language immersion directed through the boarding schools program of assimilation forced many to give up their languages. Some never fully acquired their heritage language, and others out of fear and shame chose to forget

them.

While the ideologies behind immersion education and assimilation were meant to bring Native people into American culture, they did little to create opportunities for Native people to exist within that culture. Racial and cultural stereotypes prevalent in the dominant culture kept Native people from succeeding as full members with any rights or citizenship. They were often placed at the very bottom of social, political and economic hierarchies. Restrictions by policy makers and reservation officials made it difficult for Indians to escape the poverty of reservations and many continued to be dependent on the federal government for support. The quality of education often varied between schools and the negative methods used to teach children; beatings, withholding food and separation from family, created an atmosphere of fear that continues to haunt Native people and their relationships to language and education (Chalcraft 2004:26). Boarding schools and the ideologies of assimilation through immersion in the English language made it possible for the government to continue to manipulate Native people and remove them from land and resources. The full effect of the ideologies of assimilation and the belief in the

superiority of the English language over Native languages would be felt as multiple generations experienced boarding school education. Dominant culture ideologies toward Native languages became part of Native peoples ideological views and facilitated The disruption of generational transmission of Native language, eroding the linguistic foundation of many communities. As more children learned the English language, Native languages lost were pushed aside as the language of the home and community, leading to the moribund status that many Native languages hold today, and the efforts to revitalize and maintain them as spoken languages.

Chapter Three

Sometime in the distant future, I will have great-great-grandchildren, and I think about what their world will be like if the Dakotah language is dead. I am working hard to help revitalize the Dakotah language, but I also worry about what I am not accomplishing. There is no Dakotah word for how many times I have wanted to give up the effort. Then, I speak with an elder, and I remember why giving up would dishonor those elders who struggled to save their language and culture when these things were outlawed in days past.

- Tammy Eastman DeCoteau (2009:46)

The boarding school era's legacy of cultural and linguistic destruction continues to be felt, and transferred across generations. Multiple generations were affected by federal policies and influenced by the ideologies of language and power that espoused. While some generations still the maintain the ability to use their first language, the generations that followed were raised in an atmosphere that withheld their Native language, out of fear, and out of a desire to make education and success in the dominant culture easier than it was for them. Native languages and voices were silenced to protect children from the shame and abuse suffered by their parents, and to enable them to learn English without the hindrance and stigma of a having Native language for their first language. The intergenerational transmission of Native language did not end completely, but was disrupted enough to make gaining fluency difficult. It also passed along the message that Native languages were inferior and part of a shameful past.

The discourse of language revitalization contains

multiple ideologies that span varied views of language, power and culture. When a language dies, the cultural and historical identity of a community becomes fragmented and lost. Language connects us to our elders and gives deeper meaning to oral histories and cultural knowledge. For many Native people, reclaiming their Native language allows for a renewed recognition of Native identity and culture, "The ability to maintain a heritage language as a robust, vibrant language, and thus the socio-cultural foundation for familial and communal wellbeing, is fundamental to tribal sovereignty, self-determination and cultural survival" (McCarty and Romero 2005:16). Native languages also give individuals and communities a way to resist the homogenizing power of globalization. Native communities, and the issue of language revitalization, are associated with a complex array of ideologies, some of which support Native languages, others which limit the languages or attempts at revitalization, and some that consciously or subconsciously reject heritage language learning in favor the dominant culture's language. These ideologies play an important role in the direction and ultimate goals of Native language revitalization programs.

As English became the dominant language of the home,

it also continued to dominate as the language of education and success. In 1998, Krauss reported that of the 300 originally languages spoken in North America, 210 were still being used. Yet of those 210, only 34 were being naturally acquired as the language of the home. The remaining, 84% have no new speakers to pass them on. According to his estimates, the loss of these languages in the next 60 years will be greater than the loss of Native languages experienced since European contact (Lomawaima and McCarty 2006:135). These numbers reflect the impact of language loss that is part of the global trend in indigenous language loss. While mainstream education and tribally controlled schools have replaced boarding schools, the ideologies that led to their creation are still maintained in dominant culture discourse on language rights and English only initiatives. They also remain as a legacy of the assimilation era, within the ideologies that govern current Native American education and language revitalization.

Beginning in the 1960s and 1970s, Native communities began exercising educational control of their schools, slowly replacing longstanding policies that kept Native culture and language out of the classroom, exercising the

new political and social will brought out through the civil rights movement (Lomawaima and McCarty 2006:116) The process is ongoing, as Native communities continue to create hope and meaning through their revitalization efforts (Wetzel 2006:79). Rock Point, a Navajo community in northern Arizona began using their language in education in 1967, when English was still a relatively foreign language in their community, and intergenerational transmission was still strong. Children were taught, mathematics, science and social science in Navajo and English, and became literate in both languages. Rock point students outperformed their peers who attended Bureau of Indian Affairs schools where English dominated education was the norm. And parents for the first time became active in their children's education and for the first time. Rock Point and other Native schools show that bilingual education and the inclusion of Native languages in education enhances student performance and success proving that speaking a Native language does not hinder educational success (Lomawaima and McCarty 2006:122). The Hualapai tribe of New Mexico, also have demonstrated successful bilingual language education, developing community support trough public dialogue and enlisted the help of Academic linguists to

create material and curriculum that supported Native language use. These efforts were part of an ideology of reverse brainwashing, helping to change the way people viewed their Native language after years of being told they could not speak it by a dominant culture that devalued Native language and identity (Lomawaima and McCarty 2006:127-128). What these communities had in common at the time was children whose first language was their Native language, and education that fostered Native language use could build upon this foundation.

For many communities today, the primary language of the home has become English, and bilingual education programs are not able to facilitate language fluency, Teaching reading and writing, but not speaking. They became places of cultural enrichment but not language learning (Dementi-Leonard and Gilmore 1999:43). It communities with more advanced stages of language loss, creating effective language learning environments was difficult through bilingual education, since this type of education has it origins in teaching English to foreign language speakers, rather than promoting Native language fluency. Bilingual education was the first step in developing language revitalization programs, but because the focus remains on

the dominant language, heritage language learning remains limited, creating language learners that can understand their Native languages but not speak them (Kipp 2000: 3). While bilingual education can support communities that continue to have strong use of the language among children, it does not bring back languages that have lost speakers through language shift.

Immersion education became the dominant method in language revitalization programs for Native languages, after previous efforts to maintain and expand the domains of Native languages use and reverse the shift to English as the dominant language in Native communities had not shown success. Immersion as a method of language revitalization began with the Hawaiian and Maori languages in the 1980ds. These language revitalization programs are based on a total immersion approach, teaching children by creating language nests, places where only Hawaiian and Maori are spoken and geared toward creating a new generation of fluent speakers (Warner 2001:136). The language nest approach seeks to recreate an environment where Native language and culture are transmitted the same way that they are in the home, creating an extended network where children interact through their Native language (Wilson and Kamana 2001:151).

The goals of creating total language immersion were also to develop a high level of language proficiency in comprehension and communication in these languages, and to create a strong foundation of cultural values, empowering individuals to become responsible community members with the skills and knowledge attained through education (Warner 2001:139). While it began as a pilot program beginning with preschool, it has developed into a K-12 program and children have reached the High school level. However increasing the domains of language use, outside of classroom immersion environments continues to be a problem (Warner 2001:140-141). language nest immersion, however, has increased the use of Hawaiian language use in the home, encouraging many young parents to expand their knowledge and use of the language and raise their children in the language (Wilson and Kamana 2001:153). Increasing the use of Native languages in the home environment is an often difficult undertaking but one of the most important in reestablishing a new generation of Native language speakers.

Full immersion language revitalization has been shown to be the best way to create a new generation of fluent speakers for endangered languages (Hinton and Hale 2001:8).

Because of the success of Hawaiian and Maori language immersion and language nests, which focus on creating safe places for natural language transmission. Many Native American communities are implementing language immersion programs. Native language immersion programs vary, some focus on literacy and maintenance while others are focused on preservation and revitalization. The direction that language programs take depends largely on the ideological forces and the state of language loss in Native communities (Kroskrity and Field 2009, 18). Native American language revitalization is tasked with teaching heritage languages as a second language as English has become the dominant language in many communities (Hinton and Hale 2001: 179). Some revitalization centers on informal languages classes, where speakers and non-speakers can gather in an environment where the language can be documented. However, they are not places where someone can learn a language, which requires intensive exposure and practice using the language in speech and conversation (Hinton 2001:179-180). Bilingual education in Native languages is another way to teach Native languages, and as stated earlier, have shown some success including Native language use in the classroom. But Bilingual education has not slowed language

shift in these communities (Hinton and Hale 2001:180). Immersion education has become the dominant form of language revitalization in the United States, beginning in preschool and some continuing into higher grades. These immersion schools provide exposure to the language and create a place for using the language in a setting that encourages communication. There are also after school programs and immersion summer programs aimed at both children and adults, and weekly classes for families. While these types of language learning are not as intensive as complete immersion they involve a family component that is important in moving language use outside of the classroom (Hinton and Hale 2001:182-183). These methods of language learning and immersion are part of the efforts that many communities are now using to increase Native language use and create new speakers. Language revitalization, however, must contend with multiple ideologies and methodologies and differing levels of language loss, from the complete loss of fluent speakers, to languages that are still spoken in the home but loosing ground to dominant languages (Hinton and Hale, 2001: 5). Language revitalization is a complex and difficult process for many communities because they lack adequate resources, have small populations and few

speakers remaining who are able to pass on their languages. Language renewal also involves coming to terms with and bringing together these multiple ideologies and variables to create programs that effectively and quickly stabilize language loss and work toward the goal of increasing the number of fluent language speakers.

While language immersion exposes learners to their languages and raises the status of Native languages within Native communities and in the dominant culture, it is often not enough to create fluent speakers. Creating opportunities to use the language, outside of language immersion classrooms and programs, remains a difficult task. People lack the time and devotion to become involved with the language outside of the immersion setting (Rinehart N.D.:18). Language immersion must compete with the realities of daily life, which for most Native people, are dominated by the English language. The dominance of English in everyday life, overrides the need of Native languages on a daily basis (Anderson 2009: 61). In speaking about Arapahoe language shift, Anderson goes on to explain that, "Implicitly or explicitly, a counter ideology responds that traditional Arapaho discursive practices are simply too slow to keep up with the pace and volume of what

modern governance, technology, education, economic planning, and mass popular culture impose or require" (Anderson 2009: 62). Native children are increasingly exposed to the dominant popular culture in ways that past generations have not been. Native language and culture competes in this contested space that exist at multiple levels of social, educational and economic life. Native revitalization programs are often based on dominant culture educational models that continue to enforce the dominance of English language and cultural norms, and widen the distance between language and identity (Anderson 2009: 66). Thus, as an aspect of everyday life, native languages remain excluded from domains of use by lack of time, and the inability of potential speakers to find use for them outside of specific instances. Dominant culture ideologies that reinforce the need to use and keep English as necessary for competence in education and economic activities hampers the use of Native languages beyond the domains classroom or immersion setting.

Some ideologies inherent in the discourse of language dominance maintain the separation of heritage language from domains that remain dominated by English. Challenging the ideologies that reinforce English as the language of

dominance is important in reclaiming the language in other aspects of life. The conflicting nature of Native American communities in relation to ideologies of language and culture is an important part of understanding the ideologies of language immersion practices and their success or failure to produce desired results. Native communities are culturally enclosed sub-communities within the dominant culture, creating the possibility that a language community can exist and thrive through its cultural distinctiveness. English, however is the main language of many reservations and Native communities, which causes the first language of these communities to be put aside even though there exist opportunities to use it. Thus a conflict of culture is created between native languages and the dominant language through social distance (White 2006:95). Native languages in English language dominated Native communities suffer from a lack of social status associated with their non-dominant or subordinate relationship to English as the language of economics, politics and community. Increasing the status of Native languages gives motivation for their use as the communicative language of the community, and status is enhanced by creating economic, academic and social

components to language learning and use (White 2006:96). Native language immersion programs have been slow to promote these areas as a way language can be used in everyday life.

language is viewed to be the essence of identity and culture. With the death of language a culture loses depth and subtlety, and without the language the stories, songs and history of a people become lost (Granberg 2002:13). The desire to recover native languages stems from a desire to understand identity through the medium of language and to grasp certain beliefs and ideas which are not easily expressed in English, or which lose meaning when translated (Granberg 2002:14). Identity and life are held within words, passed between generations. Native languages when viewed from within this ideology echo the views of linguists who see language as holding a wealth of knowledge that is an important to preserve for the whole of humanity. For Native people language has deeper and more personal meanings that involve not just recovering language and identity but a process of healing and renewal. Native spirituality is closely tied to language and its ability to reflect the relationship between human kind, the natural world and the spirit world. Keeping Native languages alive

is seen as a way to keep traditional culture and spirituality alive as well (Granberg 2002:25).

Yet it is difficult to overcome the "ideology of contempt" which pervades the dominant society's views that every nation should have a standard language, and that subordinate languages and groups should not be promoted. This is often expressed in the views of many Native people in regard to their heritage language. With so few able to speak threatened native languages, a pervasive attitude that language loss is inevitable prevents some fluent speakers from attempting to pass languages on or engaging others with it (Loether 2009: 245). The linguistic distance that many feel regarding their first languages, keeps learners from their languages and continues the process of language shift as fluent speakers pass away. Anton Truer, a language activist who reclaimed his heritage language, views language loss from the opposite perspective,

> The grammar, syntax, and structure of the language are complete. The oral tradition and history of the Ojibwe are still with us. Yet in many areas fluency rates have plummeted to unprecedented and unsustainable levels.

> Especially in the United States, most speakers are more than forty-five years of age. In some places, the fluency is as low as one percent. As the population of fluent speakers ages and eventually leaves, there is no doubt that the Ojibwe language will loose its carriers. We are not loosing our language. Our language is losing us (Treuer 2001:5).

Ideologies centering on language and identity are often conflicting, and relate to the desire to reclaim Native languages, and the fear of not being able too. Some relate to the fear and anxiety that comes from trying to connect to their heritage language, especially as it relates to questioning one's authenticity and identity as Native, "In reality, many people are afraid of the traditional language. It is alien, unknown, and difficult to learn. It can be a constant reminder of a deficiency and a nagging threat to one own cultural competence" (Dauenhauer 1998:65). In the desire to reclaim Native languages there are also feelings of doubt, and questions as to how relevant Native

languages are in today's world. Darnell Kipp of the Piegan Institute, who has been involved in the revitalization of Blackfoot, expresses what many feel who are hoping to bring back their languages, "Although, tribal language revitalization programs possess a reality imbedded in all of us there is a deep and haunting question lurking in the shadows of the movement. The question is when a tribe's language is irrevocably gone will it matter" (Kipp 2009:1). With the dominant language in most communities being English, the importance of native languages becomes one of desire but not need. David Truer an author and translator, however, explains the connection between language and identity and its loss as being closely related to the idea of identity, "at some point (and no one is too anxious to identity exactly), a culture ceases to be a culture and becomes an ethnicity- that is, it changes from a life system that develops its own terms into one that borrows, almost completely, someone else's" (Treuer 2008: BO1). Mary Daniels, a fluent Potawatomi speaker, shares a similar view as to the importance of language in creating or losing identity, "Language is what keeps people together. If

it dies off, it's the end of the Potawatomi" (Wetzel 2006:65). Language is a measure of identity, yet because English has become the language of the home, and in many cases the first language, its ability to mark identity has lessened. Native people live in a linguistic world that legitimizes the language of heritage as an identifier of identity and authenticity, while reinforcing the ideologies that limit its ability to compete in other areas of life. The desire to hold onto traditional identity, while maintaining success in the dominant culture creates this ideological linguistic duality.

The heterogeneous mix of ideologies in Native American's relationship to both dominant and heritage languages, play a central role in the effectiveness of language immersion and revitalization strategies. As we look to the future of Native American languages, it is important to ask questions and to examine what role these languages and ideologies will play in determining how we define ourselves. The discourse of language, power and place determines not just our relationships to language and identity, but speaks to what we may become in the future. What we are asking our children to do, through language

immersion, will have lasing impacts on Native communities for generations to come. It is therefore imperative that we examine the ideologies behind our own languages choices and why preserving these languages is important. The driving ideological forces behind language revitalization are in response to historical and political legacies and the desire to reclaim a part of our lost linguistic and cultural heritage, while simultaneously seeking a way to exist in a dominant culture that maintains its power over language. Our grandparents and parents were forced to give up their languages, and in the process they withheld it from us. It is therefore our obligation to make sure that our children have the ability to choose their Native language to use in defining their identity, and that we as teachers, parents and learners, take active roles in reclaiming Native languages and creating a future where our children can speak them.

Chapter 4

A Battle now rages to keep Ojibwe alive. At stake is the future of not only the language, but the knowledge contained within the language, the unique Ojibwe world view and way of thinking, the Anishinaabe connection to the past, to the earth, and to the future

- Anton Treuer (2001:5).

Comparing the ideologies that shape the relationship between language and Identity, and give languages power and place in the construction of nations and communities is important to understanding their role as agents of language loss and revitalization. Language ideologies are products of social views regarding class and race, enabling one dialect and its speakers to become the marker and bridge to economic and prosperity. Language ideologies have been used to rationalize and legitimize social hierarchies and linguistic Darwinism, marginalizing inferior languages and cultures while exemplifying the language and culture of the powerful.

The goals of the U.S. Governments assimilation program for Native Americans were founded upon ideologies of language, race and social progress. Government run Indian boarding schools functioned to assimilate Native people into American culture through strict English only language education. This process was aimed at Native children, placing them in an immersion environment that stripped away their identities, and destroyed their connections through language to their communities. The many native languages and cultures in America threatened the power of the United

States in creating a unified Nation, held together by common beliefs and a common language. Using English as a common language for Native peoples would help them inter into American culture and participate as equals with Whites. As Anderson explains, "….English speech competency and literacy in particular were to link individual citizens to the larger spatiotemporal orientation of universal democratic governance and participation in a market economy (2009: 55). Boarding schools and government policies geared toward eradicating Native American language and culture existed within a clearly defined ideology that placed American culture and language as the agents of progress and civilization. The many Native languages and cultures in America threatened the power of the United States in creating a unified nation, held together by common beliefs and a common language. In the quest to secure westward expansion and resources, Native people had to be brought under control and assimilated.

The English language, and an Education in American cultural and economic values was believed to be able to transform Native people from savages into productive citizens. The Assimilation program through boarding schools and English language immersion was founded on an ideology

of Native linguistic and cultural inferiority, and had the support of the government, Indian reformers and Native people, who at the time believed the best way to survive was to acquire American culture and language. The boarding school program was a unified effort to assimilate Native people through language immersion that was able to disrupt the flow of language and culture across generations, and over time, replace Native languages with English across multiple domains in Native communities.

As agents of assimilation, however, they failed to bring about the changes that the founders of this program desired. Their desire to Americanize Native people was tied to their belief in upward mobility through English language learning and cultural homogenization (Warner 1999:72). Native students had few opportunities to apply the manual training learned at government schools. A lack of jobs and opportunities forced them to return to living and speaking as their communities did, yet unable to feel fully part of either their Native or American culture.(Spack, 2002: 23). Despite the their best intentions, Native people continued to live in poverty, and remained at the bottom of the political and social hierarchies which defined American culture and the views of progress (Vuckovic, 2008:93-94).

Their lasting affect on native culture was the destruction of language transmission and a legacy of fear and shame associated with Native language use.

Native communities are currently in a war to revitalize their languages, using language immersion strategies to counteract language shift and renew the domains where these languages used to flourish. These immersion strategies are not uniform across Indian country, and reflect the heterogeneous needs and experiences related to the history of language loss, and the direction communities chose to take regarding their heritage language. Native language immersion programs are located within an educational setting that has the dual responsibility of Native language education and meeting state and federal educational guidelines that require English language proficiency as a measure of academic success. Government policies support language immersion efforts, but they continue to remain under funded and underdeveloped. Language immersion and revitalization has at its foundation, multiple ideologies that are often at odds with the goals of creating fluent speakers. These ideologies are as well, a reflection of the experiences, fears and desires many Native people have surrounding their

heritage languages. The complexity and nature of language loss and revitalization is related to this mixture of multiple immersion strategies and the many Ideologies that effect them.

The ideologies behind the movement to restore Native languages show not only the influence of how the dominant cultures views Native culture and language, they also show how native people view the dominant language and its relationship to social, economic and educational success (Kroskirty and Field: 2009:11). Local language ideologies play a part in how languages are viewed as well as their place within the value system of the community. Various communities thus employ different strategies and motivations with regard to language preservation and these ideologies often do not represent the community as a whole (Kroskirty and Field: 2009:18). Examining the last twenty years of language revitalization efforts in native communities, shows the changes in the way that language education is carried out. Yet despite the development of immersion programs, language los continues to move at an alarming rate.

The Language choice within the home has been sited by Hinton as the most effective agent in successful language

revitalization efforts (2001:8) Reversing language shift is about enhancing the vitality of a language, with parents using it in the home with their children (Spolsky, 2003: 555). Beginning the immersion process in the home, when a child is at the critical stage of language learning, creates a path for a fluent Native language speaker, and reinforces its use among parents and family members who may only have marginal use of the language. As Leanne Hinton points out, "the immersion classroom is not sufficient in itself to turn around language death: it is essential that the families play active roles as well. Students whose families are unwilling or unable to reinforce the language at home do not fare well as students whose families actively use their language (Hinton and Hale 2001:9). School based language immersion has its place as a method to increase awareness and status of Native languages and to challenge the popular notions that bilingual education hinders learning and success in the dominant culture. They are also the next step in maintaining language fluency and use after home-based language immersion takes root, and in expanding the domains of language use (Fishman, 2001:14). Current Native language immersion programs must teach language as a second language, as most children enter these

programs already fluent in their home language of English. Immersion as an ideology and a methodology is sound when located where it will have the greatest impact and where it will have the greatest influence. Language socialization begins when children as adults pass on essential cultural knowledge through a range of linguistic behaviors. This is an overlooked aspect of language revitalization which is beginning to be addressed, but is still relatively lacking in many language renewal efforts (Gomez de Garcia, Axelrod and Lanchler 2009:119). Language revitalization must begin reconnecting the intergenerational transmission of language and identity, transforming the status of the language by changing ideological presumptions that influence language choice.

Boarding school immersion and assimilation, and Native language immersion and revitalization are similar in their ultimate goals. Each use language, to an attempt redefine and remake Native people. While boarding schools ultimate purpose was total assimilation, language revitalization seeks to reclaim identity and language. The focus of both immersion programs is to change the linguistic balance of power through educating children in the desired language. Boarding schools were able to disrupt the intergenerational

transmission of language in the home. Language revitalization concentrates on immersion education as the place of language revival. And while this affects the status and prestige of Native languages, it has not shown to expand language back into the family and home, which is the best place for natural language immersion to take place. Comparing the ideologies and methodology of the boarding School movement with those of Native language revitalization efforts, shows that while immersion language education is important in transforming language communities and influencing language shift, they alone are not enough to cause the loss or revitalization.

Convincing individuals and families to undertake this requires shifting the ideological focus of language revitalization away from schools and programs and placing personal responsibility for language maintenance on those willing to take up the challenge. Marketing Native languages as viable alternatives and creating places for the language to be spoken, outside of immersion environments, is another avenue to successful revitalization. Marketing languages as a resource, is a paradigm that looks at the costs, in time and energy, and the benefits of language revitalization as a way to plan

language strategies to their maximum effect. Seeing language as a product and a resource that future speakers will want to incorporate into their lives is a way to raise its status (Nickolson 1997: 207). It may be that the willingness to participate in full-scale language revitalization will occur only when the status is raised or when the language reaches such a critical level that complacency will be replaced with the necessary urgency required to bring them back as a defining part of a community's identity.

The multiple ideologies surrounding Native language revitalization and education reflect experiences and traumas, as well as hopes and dreams. When we look to the future of Native languages and our communities, we must ask important questions that are overwhelming in their implications. While language Boarding school immersion education and assimilation, and Native language revitalization through language immersion are far different in their underlying ideologies, they are still about changing the language and culture of a community, beginning with its children. Thus in some ways they resemble each other in term of desired outcomes. What happens to our communities if we loose our languages? What happens to the

linguistic structure of Native communities if we revive them is another matter. Will there be another linguistic gap between generations, affecting the cohesiveness of community identity? Other important question concerns definitions of identity. Will language exclude rather than bring together communities?

It has been said that when we lose our language we will no longer be Native Americans, but descendents of them. Right now our languages are strong, living in our elders and waiting for the next few generations to take responsibility for it. It becomes a choice, for individuals, families and communities to decide that the language is important, and that the sacrifices and hard work need to see our languages revitalized is worth the effort. While blame on language shift and language loss has traditionally been placed on government policies, and particularly the boarding school program, few have sought to look at how individual language choices and language ideologies affect language loss and shift. The fight to save our languages, while influenced by history and the influences of the dominant culture, is a battle over ideologies and the need to change certain beliefs about Native languages, their place and their role in defining

our identities and creating our futures.

Literature Cited

Abbott, Lyman
1973{1888) "Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohawk Conference of the Friends of the Indian." In Americanizing the American Indians: Writings of the "Friends of the Indians" 1880-1900. F. P. Prucha, Ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Adams, David Wallace
1995 Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School experience, 1875-1928. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

Adkins, J. D. C.
1973 The English Language in Indian Schools. From Report of September 21, 1887, In House Executive Document No 1, part 5, Vol. II, 50 Congress, 1 Session. In Americanizing the American Indians: Writings of the "Friends of the Indians" 1880-1900. Paul Prucha, ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Anderson, Jeffery D.
2009 Contradictions across Space-Time and Language Ideologies in Northern Arapahoe Language Shift. In Native American Language Ideologies: Beliefs, Practices, and Struggles in Indian Country. Paul V. Kroskrity and Margaret C. Field. ed. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Ash, Anna. Jessie Little Doe Fermino and Ken Hale
2001 Diversity in Local Language Maintenance and Restoration: A reason for Optimism. In The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice. Leanne Hinton and Ken Hale ed. London: Academic Press.

Bauman, Richard, and Charles Briggs
2003 Voices Of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre
1991 Language and Symbolic Power. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Dalby, Andrew
2003 Language In Danger: The Loss of Linguistic Diversity and the Threat to Our Future. New York: Columbia University Press.

Daunenhauer, Nora Marks and Richard Dauenhauer
1998 Technical, Emotional and Ideological Issues in Reversing Language Shift: Examples From Southeast Alaska. In Endangered Languages: Current Issues and Future Prospects. L. A. Grenoble and L. J. Whaley. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DeCoteau, Tammy Eastman
2009 Who Will Teach my Great-Great-Grandchildren Dakotah? Tribal Collage Journal, 15, 3:46.

Dementi-Leonard, Beth and Perry Gilmore
1999 Language Revitalization and Identity in Social Context: A community Based Athabascan Language Revitalization Project in Western Interior Alaska. In Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 30, 1:37-55.

Chalcraft, Edwin L.
2004 Assimilation's Agent: My Life as a Superintendent In the Indian Boarding School System. Cary C. Collins ed. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Fairclough, Norman
2001 Language and Power (2cd ed). New York: Pearson Education Limited.

Fishman, Joshua A.
2001 Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective. Buffalo: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Granberg, Kimberly A.
2002 Eurocentric Education Unhinged: Challenges Posed by the Elders and Teachings of the Anishinaabe. In An imperfect World: Resonance from the Nation's Violence. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the National Association of African American Studies, the National Association of Hispanic and Latino Studies, the National Association of Native American Studies and the International Association of Asian Studies, Houston, February 11-16.

Gomez de Garcia, Jule, Melissa Axelrod and Jordan Lanchler
2009 English is the Dead Language: Native Perspectives on Bilingualism. In Native American Language Ideologies: Beliefs, Practices, and Struggles in Indian Country. P. V. Kroskirty and Margaret C. Field. ed Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Harrison, K. David
2007 When Languages Die: The extinction of the Worlds Languages and the Erosion of Human Knowledge. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hinton, Leanne and Ken Hale
2001 The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice. London: Academic Press.

Hornberger, N. H. and K. A. King
2001 Reversing Quechua Language Shift in South America. In Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, revisited: A 21st Century Perspective. Joshua Fishman, Ed. Buffalo: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Hoxie, Fredrick E.
1984 A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1900. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

King, Jeanette
2001 Te Kohanga Reo: Maori Language Revitalization. In The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice. Kenneth Hale And Leanne Hinton, ed. New York: Academic Press.

Kipp, Darnell
2000 Encouragement, Guidance, Lessons Learned for Native Language Activists Developing their own Tribal Language Programs. Saint Paul: Grotto Foundation Inc.

2009 "Encouragement, Guidance and Lessons Learned: 21 Years in the Trenches of Indigenous Language Revitalization." In Indigenous Language Revitalization: Encouragement, Guidance and Lessons Learned. Jon Reyhner and L. Lockard eds. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University. Pp. 1-9.

Kroskrity, Paul V. and Margaret C. Field. eds.
2009 Native American Language Ideologies: Beliefs, Practices, and Struggles in Indian Country. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Loether, Christopher
2009 "Language Revitalization and the Manipulation of Language Ideologies." In Native American Language Ideologies: Beliefs, Practices, and Struggles in Indian Country. Paul V. Kroskirty and Margaret C. Field. Eds. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Lomawaima, K. Tsianina and Teresa L. McCarty
2006 To Remain an Indian: Lessons in Democracy From a Century of American Indian Education. New York: Teachers College Press.

McCarty, Teresa L.
2003 "Revitalizing Indigenous Languages in Homogenizing times." Comparative Education 39,2:147-163.

McCarty Teresa L. and Mary Eunice Romero
2005 Investigating Heritage Language Loss and Revitalization among American Indians. Show and Tell: A Magazine of ASU's College of Education. Tucson: Arizona State University Collage of Education.

Momaday, N. Scott
1997 The Man Made of Words. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.

Morgan, Thomas J.
1973 From Report of October 1, 1880, In House Executive Document No. 1, part 5, vol. II, 51 Congress, 1st session. In Americanizing the American Indians: Writings of the "Friends of the Indians" 1880-1900. F. P. Prucha, Ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

1973[1892]"Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohawk Conference of the Friends of the Indian." In Americanizing the American Indians: Writings of the "Friends of the Indians" 1880-1900. F. P. Prucha, Ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Nicholson, Rangi
1997 "Marketing the Maori Language" In Teaching Indigenous Languages. Jon Reyhner ed. Flagg Staff: Northern Arizona University. http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/TIL.html

Pratt, Richard Henry
1964 Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian. R. M. Utley, Ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Pokagon, Simon
1899 Ogimawkwe Mitigwaki (Queen of the Woods). Hartford: C. H. Engle.

Prucha, Francis Paul
1973 Americanizing the American Indians: Writings of the "Friends of the Indians" 1880-1900. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Reyhner, Jon and Jeanne Eder
1992 Teaching American Indian Students. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

2004 American Indian Education: A History. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Report to the president by the Indian Peace Commission
1868 United States of America Department of Indian Affairs, Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office. Transcribed by Carolyn Simms, Furnam University Department of History. http//facweb.furnam.edu/~beson/docs/peace.htm.

Reynolds, Jennifer F.
2009 "Shaming the Shift Generation: Intersecting Ideologies of Family and Linguistic Revitalization in Guatemala," In Native American Language Ideologies: Beliefs, Practices, and Struggles in Indian Country. Kroskrity, Paul V. and Margaret C. Field. Ed. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Reinhart, Mellissa A.
N.d. The Agency of Language Ideologies in Miami Indian Recovery. In Ethnographic Contributions to the Study of Endangered Languages. Tania Granadillo and Heidi Orcutt-Gachiri, eds. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Riagian, Padriag O.
2001 "Irish Language Production and Reproduction: 1981-1986." In Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective. Joshua Fishman ed. Buffalo: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Shillinger, Sarah
2008 A Case Study of the American Indian Boarding School Movement: An Oral History of Saint Joseph's Indian Industrial School. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellon Press.

Schurz, Carl
1973 Present Aspects of the Indian Problem. North American Review, CXXXIII (July 1881). In Americanizing the American Indians: Writings of the "Friends of the Indians" 1880-1900. Francis Paul Prucha ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Spack, Ruth
2002 America's Second Tongue: American Indian Education and the Ownership of English, 1860-1900. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Strong, William.
1973 [1885} Remarks on Indian Reform. Form Proceedings of the third Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohawk Conference. In Americanizing the American Indians: Writings of the "Friends of the Indians" 1880-1900. Francis Paul Prucha, ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Truer, Anton
2001 Living Our Language: Ojibwe Tales & Oral Histories. Minnesota: Minnesota Historical Society Press.

2009 Aaniin Ekidong: Ojibwe Vocabulary Project. Anton Truer ed. Saint Paul: Minnesota Humanities Center.

Treuer, David
2008 If they're lost, Who are we? Washington Post: April 6, BO1.

Vuckovic, Myriam
2008 Voices From Haskell: Indian Students between Two Worlds, 1884-1928. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Wallace, Anthony F. C.
1999 Jefferson and the Indians: the Tragic Fate of the First Americans. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wilson H. William and Kauanoe Kamana
2001 "Mai Loko Mi O Ka 'I'ini: Proceeding From a Dream: The 'Aha Punana Leo Connection in Hawaiian Language Revitalization. In The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice. Leanne Hinton and Ken Hale ed. London: Academic Press.

Warner, Sam L. No'eau
2001 "The Movement to Revitalize Hawaiian Language and Culture. In The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice. Leanne Hinton and Ken Hale ed. London: Academic Press.

Wetzel, Christopher
2006 "Neshnabemwen Resistance: Local and National Potowatomi Language Revitalization Efforts." American Indian Quarterly, 30,1:61-86.

White, Fredrick
2006 Rethinking Native American Language Revitalization. American Indian Quarterly. 30, 1 & 2:92-109.