

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

ENDING THE THIRD EXTINCTION CRISIS: A TESTIMONY ON THE EFFORT TO
KEEP NATIVE AMERICAN VOICES FROM VANISHING

ANDREW WIGMAN
SPRING 2014

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for a baccalaureate degrees
in Archaeological Science, World Languages Education, and Classics & Ancient
Mediterranean Studies
with honors in Archaeological Science

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Lee Newsom
Associate Professor of Anthropology
Thesis Supervisor

Timothy Ryan
Assistant Professor of Anthropology, Geosciences, and Information Sciences and
Technology
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

Indigenous languages are threatened across the world, and the Native American languages of the United States are no exception. With a long history of maltreatment by the United States government, especially by residential schools, many languages have been lost and for many others intergenerational transmission was interrupted in only a number of years. Whether indigenous languages are seen as rights, the culminations of cultural history, or unique “species” that make up the greater linguistic diversity of the planet, it is clear that these vanishing voices are a part of a third extinction crisis, and that the endangered languages of the United States need to be kept from disappearing. It is a race against time, but there is plenty of hope—if we would only just do it! Given the current state of the linguistic diversity of North America, it is clear that both documentation and revitalization are necessary processes. As much must be salvaged as possible, and what is gotten from that can be augmented and passed on. Languages, whether seen as gifts from the Creator, fading facets of the human experience, or means of preventing drug abuse and delinquent behavior in Native American youths, are worth the effort of revitalizing. Such efforts should be done in ways that are as authentic as possible, but worries about authenticity should not halt revitalization efforts. There are numerous ways to create vocabulary, use the languages, and teach them as authentically as possible. Both schools and communities must work together if language goals are to be realized, and this is certainly happening in such places as Sitka, AK; Oneida, NY; Minnesota; and Montana.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	iii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Risk and Threat	2
Why Should We Care?	3
Ways of Viewing Language Diversity	5
Language as a Right	5
Language Diversity as Biological Metaphor	7
A Note on Terminology	9
A Word to Researchers and Scientists	10
Greatest Obstacles to Preservation	11
Historical Treatment	11
Views of Language in the United States Judicial System	13
Race Against Time	16
Plenty of Hope	17
Chapter 2 Problems in Preservation	19
Maintenance versus Revitalization	19
Motivation	22
Authenticity	25
Issues About Authenticity	25
Ways of Preserving Authenticity in Restoration and Revitalization	28
Need for a Paradigm Shift and Community Involvement	33
Community first: The Importance of Intergenerational Transmission	34
Application in Schools	35
Bilingualism	42
Chapter 3 Case Studies	45
Sitka Tribe of Alaska	46
Oneida Nation of New York	55
Ojibwe in Minnesota	68
Dakota in Minnesota	74
Blackfoot in Montana	83
Conclusion	88
Appendix A Text of Public Law 101-477 Title I	90
Appendix B Representation of North American Indian Languages on Wikipedia	95
Appendix C Stories Told by Gary	96
BIBLIOGRAPHY	100
Academic Vita	106

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

None of this would be possible without the constant help and guidance of Dr. Lee Newsom, whose expertise and encouragement from my very first semester onwards was the source of inspiration for this work. My roommates Melissa, Zach, and Doug, who were writing their *magna opera* just as fervently around me, were a constant source of motivation to “just write it!” I must also thank my good friends Tracy and Courtney, who tested the waters before me, and whose suggestions and encouragement made me wise to the road ahead. Dr. Mary Lou Munn was a frequent mentor as well. And of course, I must also thank the countless people who warmly received me to their homes and places of employment in order to answer my questions and tell me about themselves—Gary, Alice, and Leah in Sitka, Alaska, all of whom I have informed of their pseudonyms so they can see what an immense contribution they made to my research. I must thank Michelle in Sitka especially, for touring me around town for three days, inviting me to dinner when I was thousands of miles from home, and sending me off with gifts. Terri in Onieda, New York arranged all of the interviews I conducted there, with Rebecca, Rachel, Catherine, Jacqui, and Tom who all took time out of their busy schedules to speak with me. Richard and John in Red Lake, Minnesota, and Zach in Minneapolis also feature prominently in this work, and I must thank Dr. Anton Treuer at Bemidji State University for referring me to them. And I thank also Eleonore, who, though I never met her in person, was a great help and inspiration to me as well. The College of the Liberal Arts at Penn State, through an Undergraduate Summer Discovery Grant, and the Department of Anthropology, through an Enrichment Award, graciously awarded me the funds, without which this thesis would be many pages shorter or very possibly no pages at all.

Chapter 1

Introduction

I had just switched off the recording device, because Gary¹ and I had been talking to one another for about an hour. My list of research questions had run out, so we sat and watched the summer day camp activities that were going on at the Sitka Boys and Girls Club. We began to talk again, the pressure perhaps relieved by the fact that no one was being recorded. The conversation turned back to language, and Gary said something I would never forget. When I got back to my hotel room that afternoon, I wrote it down as best I could recall. “The one thing I want you to remember if you’re going to write something about language is that language is the most important. If the language goes, then everything goes. And I tell people from up North, ‘Keep speaking your language! Keep speaking your language.’ Because it is one of the first languages known in Alaska. But sometimes, I cry when I think about our language” (see chapter on Case Studies for Gary’s background).

When the first Europeans came to North America, they brought with them an impressive number of different languages: Spanish, French, German, and of course English were some of the most influential. That number, however, does not begin to compare to the number of Native languages already being spoken in the ‘New World’ they were entering. While the freshly introduced European languages still enjoy a large body of speakers today, the same cannot be said for the Native American languages that they displaced. Many today are extinct, and of those extant, many still are critically endangered. When Koning (2010:44) writes, “Language reflects culture and reinforces it—they are mirror images of each other,” a startling question arises. The

¹ See chapter on Case Studies: names have been changed to protect identities.

links between language and culture are such that one must wonder: given their history of maltreatment and forced assimilation, without unique languages to unite them, how much longer can the native cultures of the Americas survive? What can be done about these vanishing voices? The aim of this paper is review the literature that exists in some of the greatest issues facing language revitalization as well as to introduce data from interviews with tribal members involved in language revitalization initiatives. Both the literature and the evidence from the interviews for what is happening at this current time provides a hopeful picture for the future of many North American Native languages. Now is the time: if the current trend of momentum can be continued and amplified, there is still hope for dying languages. What follows are a series of introductory remarks on the historical situation of Native American languages as well as current trends from the revitalization movement.

Risk and Threat

In the field of indigenous language study, opinion differs as to which languages are considered endangered (Walsh 2005:294), but the situation was spelled out in its most dire form by the oft-cited paper “The World’s Languages in Crisis” (Krauss 1992). Krauss lists examples from the six populated continents, each showing the same trend. Of an originally large number of languages, 70, 80, sometimes 90% are moribund. Most are no longer being learned by children. Of the 6,000 languages in the world estimated in 1992, Krauss predicted 3,000—an entire half—would become extinct by the end of the next century (Krauss 1992:4-6). There certainly are less bleak opinions in linguistic circles, and many focus on the fact that some languages *are* being transmitted intergenerationally. Some languages are isolated geographically or buffered by pidgins that allow two linguistic groups to communicate without a loss of language for either. Some new languages are even arising in our age, and what is more, the phenomenon of language

extinction is not new. Languages have “ebbed and flowed for millennia” with the rise and expansion of Latin and Greek alone having been responsible for the death of 50 out of 60 languages spoken around the Mediterranean ca. 100 BCE (Walsh 2005:295-297). Thoughts like these begin to sound like naïve excuses, however, and most indigenous languages are clearly not flourishing. With the real threat of the pervasion of a few languages like English and Spanish in the Americas up against many native groups’ sincere desire to save their languages, it may be too early for optimism. But this is not a discussion of whether or not the indigenous languages of North America will survive. It is a solid ascertainment of the possibility of their survival. The message I wish to send with this work, an echo of the Blackfeet immersion school of Montana founder Darrell Kip is: “Just do it!” (quoted in Walsh 2005:308). Inaction is the only sure means of extinction. “This is the first and only time we will lose out languages” (Littlebear 1999:1), but it *can* be prevented: now or never.

Why Should We Care?

It is by this point in time, hopefully apparent that Native American languages both need and deserve to be kept from extinction. To some, though, it may seem like linguists are being pack-rats of sorts in attempting to keep around whatever there is in this present situation, or more cynically trying to keep alive the subject they study in order to have a job in the future (Whiteley 2003:713). The latter aside, it has been demonstrated that languages have an historically documented tendency to change. This explanation, however, is not as simple as one might think. We cannot change the way things were in the past, but we have direct agency over what we allow to happen in the present. Native American language extinction is *not* a natural process of change and shift. If it were, then meddling with it might be considered contradicting nature. It is rather the result of an old-fashioned process of artificial selection—one that is not only outdated but also

actively disagreed with today—by a government exerting undue influence over people it was constitutionally obligated to protect (see Bieder 2000 for the ideological changes through time). Each time a language dies out in this modern era, that antiquated policy of “breeding the Indian out” has reached its arms into the much-changed policies of today and continued to succeed in its frowned-upon aims. Each time a language dies, we realize that changing a paradigm does not extinguish its predecessor. Additionally, indigenous people often see their language spiritually—as the only way to gain access to certain sacred places or even to be able to pray. Some see their language as having been given to them by the Creator, not just as a gift but as a responsibility (Walsh 2005:307, see chapter on Case Studies). In this vein, countless authors and researchers have written about the connection between language and the culture to which it belongs (Agar 1995, Chen 1998:47, Koning 2010, Kövecses 2005, Lakoff and Johnson 1980, Wardhaugh 2006:222). If this perspective sounds too romantic or emotional, consider that Native American languages continue to inform Western scientific research in a variety of surprising ways as well. A recent article (Sicoli and Horton 2014) has suggested a complete change to the current paradigm of the peopling of the Americas. Without the linguistic evidence available to them, the researchers never would have discovered a trend that suggests Beringia was home to a population responsible for peopling *both* North America *and* Western Asia. An interview with one of the researchers reveals a very tenable fear: “A lot of the languages that can be used to answer these questions of ancient migrations are in the process of going extinct... So to address these questions in the future, we need people to document these languages right now—otherwise, we're losing our data faster than we can collect it” (Stromberg 2014).

Ways of Viewing Language Diversity

Language as a Right

Language revitalization is often justified in terms of protecting the “language rights” of minority indigenous populations:

Language rights are the rights of individuals and collective linguistic groups to non-interference by the State, or to assistance by the State, in the use of their own language, in perpetuating the use of the language and ensuring its future survival, in receiving information and State-provided services in their own language, and in ensuring that their exercise of other lawful rights, particularly fundamental human rights (e.g. the right to vote, the right to a fair trial, the right to receive education, the right to employment), will not be handicapped or subject to discrimination for linguistic reasons.

[Chen 1998:49]

Note that definitions of language rights do rely on the presupposition of State domination. A more powerful authority is granting these rights and protections to a minority group. When the full connotations of this term are realized, there are certainly benefits to viewing languages as rights, though the perspective comes with caveats as well. Of course, it extends legal protections and means that resources and aid are in some cases available. However, it forms the inception of a process of sociocultural and sociopolitical change that starts with reflexivization. The group that speaks the language begins to recognize what defines its culture and identity through examination of the ways it differs from other groups around it. This occurs in accordance with State-defined parameters, and requires for one that language become a reified object separable from self and community. In a modern, Western legal sense, one cannot possess the right to something that is not objectively definable (Whitely 2003:712-713). For North American Indian

groups, much of this process, including subjection and reflexivization, already occurred at the end of the last century and the beginning of the next. Groups are defined as sovereign Indian Nations as recognized by the federal government if they can act as to self-govern within the limits of federal authority (D'Errico 2000:693). Separating language from identity such that it can be granted distinct rights is something, however, that may not traditionally have occurred. This separation in addition to adaptation to literacy and modern media like the Internet, radio, and television can have the sociolinguistic effect of reducing a language's performativity—that which originally reflected the language's connection to a culture, worldview, and way of life—by encouraging Western logocentric discourses of language (Whiteley 2003:717).

This exacerbates the change, as discussed in the chapter on Authenticity, that has been occurring in the indigenous languages of North America ever since the meeting of cultures required the negotiation of multiple identities. For language to be considered a right, however, and for a group to have the ability to make legal decisions about its language's use, study, and development, it must undergo this change. The change also allows for languages to be considered the “possessions” of those that speak them (Errington 2003:727). “Illegitimate language shift is the *causal* outcome of coercive forces external to a minority community and needs to be distinguished from that arising from cumulative, self-interested, knowledgeable choices by social *agents* between one language rather than another” (Errington 2003:728). This has implications for preservation (see below on Maintenance versus Revitalization), as a group has a right to destroy its possessions as well as keep them.

Whiteley (2003:719-720) provides one further caveat in considering a language to be a right, and that is when the idea of language rights becomes equated to human rights. The premise of equating them means that language rights are *prima facie* naturally good and democratic, but the danger is that they may mask internal oppression in terms of gender, rank, race, etc. implicit in a culture's language. “Either a right is a human right, under some universally acceptable

definition of human, or it is not” (Whiteley 2005:719). When language rights interfere with human rights, it means endorsing human rights for certain humans and not for others—in other words, the equation is not so simple.

Language Diversity as Biological Metaphor

Various metaphors for considering language diversity allow for different ways to think of and work towards the prevention of language loss. Though anthropology has for some time now been averse to biological metaphors for culture, their use in this discipline is helpful in that they simplify otherwise complex situations and allow for easily intelligible comparisons between contexts. In short, they allow for a working model on talking about language death (Errington 2003:724).

A language can first be viewed as a “collection of projects that can be abandoned from one generation to the next, like a sinking ship” (Errington 2003:723). Steven Pinker (quoted in Errington 2003) wrote that, “Every time a language dies, we lose thousands of unique insights, metaphors, and other acts of genius.” Immediately, the value of viewing a language this way should become apparent. Should languages be considered reified objects—things to study—what good is it to lament their loss as someone who has had no direct contact or experience with them? As soon as a metaphor is spun, it is easier for an otherwise aloof reader to begin to see language loss the way a speaker of the language would see it. Errington (2003) continues to name two ways that language is often thought of in terms of a biologically living thing.

The first of these sees a language as bound organically to a certain place and culture. Just as land can be encroached upon, so this “terralingua” can be as well. A language’s lexicon can be seen as a symbolic embodiment of a history of lived relationships between speakers, whole communities, and the environment. This “organistic” view makes languages a part of nature. It

values culturally specific lexica, as these are the “repositories of vast accumulations of traditional knowledge and experience,” over linguists’ usual focus—that being phonology and morphology (Errington 2003:724). There is one earth, and one species of human. But there are thousands of different languages. Via an organistic paradigm, this is explained in that each culture’s unique experiences with one another and their environment are what gave rise to the unique differences amongst languages and even dialects, just as a species would accrue unique adaptations for survival. This means that preservation and documentation are not sufficient. “Just as a seedbank cannot preserve a plant’s biological ecology, *ex situ* linguistic documentation cannot preserve a language’s linguistic ecology” (quoted in Errington 2003:725). While Errington warns that a view such as this might only be applicable to those languages from biologically diverse areas of the world, it seems that the metaphor can be extended. A linguistic *ecology* cannot solely be in reference to the environment, but rather extends to all history of human interaction, specific oral traditions, life histories, et cetera. As the extinction of a species is the loss of a form that evolved to be perfectly suited to the environment in which it lived, adaptation by gradual adaptation, the extinction of a language is thus truly an “extinction of experience” (Errington 2003:724).

The second biological view of language extinction sees it as though languages were species, each one contributing to global biodiversity (Errington 2003:726, Haviland 2003:765). All languages have in common that they are each specific manifestations of universal human capacities. Each time one disappears, it negatively affects the amount of language diversity in the world as a whole. It does not require that a language be preserved *in situ*, but rather parallels the aims of comparative philology and modern linguistics: languages are able to be alienated from their contexts, communities, and environments in order to be studied. While what it allows for (namely this separation) may not be in concord with current revitalization trends, it does place great value on each individual language. Language extinction is like species extinction, and so affects all people, humanity and the globe in the same way (Errington 2003:726). Both models,

therefore pose language as a living thing, valuing its importance from opposite ends of a spectrum. If language is a species, then it is the manifestation of a series of unique adaptations to a certain environment. But if it is a species, then it is also a single representative in a larger, global ecosystem of linguistic biodiversity (perhaps to be called linguodiversity). Maffi (1999:21) indeed writes, in part inspiring the title of this paper, “Along with the loss of biodiversity and the erosion of traditional cultures, the world is currently undergoing a third extinction crisis: that of the diversity of human languages.” The death of a language is either the loss of an encoded series of historical experiences or the loss of one more member of a once thriving organic network: in both cases lamentable.

A Note on Terminology

Throughout this work, terms for linguistic change will be used interchangeably to reflect the variation in literature as well as not to favor the possible connotations of one term over another. This being said, there are different categories of terminology. For a language that is disappearing, the terms used will be “language death” and “language extinction,” both biological metaphors, but both semantically effective. A language that has died is “reconstructed.” Languages that are diminishing in numbers of speakers are “dying” or often “endangered,” and can be “revitalized.” On another note, the process in which languages change is often termed “language shift.” The language is not necessarily dying, but is the object of processes of language change that result from individuals’ self-interested and rational linguistic decisions throughout lifetimes. For endangered languages however, these choices can include transmission of one preferred language over another and the decisions made are often not the result of choice but rather coercion (Errington 2003:725). Therefore, in the field of Native American linguistic

revitalization, “language shift” is a synonym for “language death,” and something that must be “reversed.”

A Word to Researchers and Scientists

The issue of Native American language preservation and revitalization as well as that of other indigenous languages must be considered in a very particular way. It must include seemingly lofty goals, terms that seem at first glance foreign if not inappropriate to the arena scientific discourse: responsibility, foresight, holism, and collaboration. But the exceptionality of the situation deems that they are not inappropriate at all. The reason is simple: working to reconstruct a living language or one which can be claimed by individuals separated from fluent speakers by only a few generations is a situation unique to linguists who are accustomed to working with the processes behind thriving languages, whose daily-spoken structures they need not fear changing irreparably through the act of their observing, and to reconstructing long-dead languages whose most recent speakers may find their homes in museum vaults. In the vein of anthropological activism, any researcher must realize his/her great responsibility not *to do* this sort of work, but *in doing* it. Any research performed, hypotheses produced, and opinions given will be directly affecting living people, and have the potential to change the entire course of a fledgling language’s development regardless of how severely it unknowingly may diverge from what had come before. Any work done with the goal of advancing a language must keep as one of its motivations the fact that future generations will be using and continuing to adapt its products. A linguist must also take into strong consideration the fact that he/she is likely not a member of the culture whose language he/she is working to preserve, which is where holism must be the guiding principle. Each culture’s worldview, religious and cultural traditions, historical functionalities, material and ideological products (the list continues nearly indefinitely) are

implicit in language, and though to keep all facets in consideration may seem a Herculean task, it is one of the responsibilities of any linguist to do so. Thus collaboration is another vital requirement of any language work. No linguist can hope to learn enough about another culture to successfully produce a language for its constituents, nor should he/she. To do so is not only presumptuous and conceited but also an exercise in futility. With the current trend following legislation such as NAGPRA in which Native American groups are gaining more and more say in matters that concern them, there is no place for such exclusive scientific practice. Collaboration also means that a group has the right to deny help, either in part or in full, from non-members of the group. This idea may be foreign to scientific fields, but with regards to a language, if it can be seen as cultural or intellectual property like religious beliefs, working without permission can seem invasive at best if not offensive. Errington (2003:723) cautions scientists to keep in mind who might be using their work: indigenous groups, officers of funding institutions, government agencies, popular writers, et cetera. Each has the potential for very different consequences.

Greatest Obstacles to Preservation

Historical Treatment

Efforts to reverse language shift must face a number of difficulties that hamper the speed of success. Native American languages would certainly not be in as great a state of decline today had it not been for a history of maltreatment by European settlers. Europeans began arriving in the early 1600s, bringing with them new trade goods but also new diseases against which the indigenous populations of the Americas had no immunity. The years 1633-1635 brought waves of measles, and smallpox arrived with the Dutch in 1634. The effects of the new disease were catastrophic, causing populations among the Iroquois Nations, for example, to drop by more than

70%. Continued contact with growing numbers of new settlers and the wars they brought with them further diminished populations, even spurring internecine conflict. From the mid-1700s onwards, Indian peoples such as the Iroquois became increasingly more subjugated and marginalized by the newly arrived Europeans (Snow 1994).

American boarding and Canadian residential schools caused immense damage to the state of Native languages in North America beginning in the late 1800s, eradicating language and culture sometimes within a generation. The chapter on Case Studies contains multiple different testimonies as to the cruel treatment within such institutions as well as the long-lasting harm they created which manifests itself today in incredible difficulties to those trying to revitalize their own Native languages and cultures. The testimony of Eleanor is particularly inspiring, as she was sent to a residential school for five years of her childhood. Today she teaches her Native language at a university, evidencing the continuously developing volte-face in federal policy. In any case, the testimonies speak for themselves. The residential school era was a time period that reflected contemporary societal opinions of Native Americans, and they were not good ones.

It was a rocky road of broken treaties and dissatisfied peoples that followed the beginning of the official removal policy. Anton Treuer (2010) writes about growing up in the traditional Ojibwe culture and how federal policy was a constant threat to traditional lifeways. He mentions once going to collect wild rice with family, as his ancestors had done for centuries, and being stopped by some federal employees working in conservation. They were not allowed to be collecting rice there, and so the big bags of it were confiscated, only to be disposed of in a great show of vain waste. Even today, prejudices and stereotypes of Native Americans can be seen in sports teams that refuse to change their mascots from caricatured “braves,” “redskins,” and “chiefs,” out of “respect” for a people which seems more actually to be putting them on par with exotic animals. It sounds completely foreign to imagine any other minority epithet: the Cincinnati Bengals up against the Kansas City Jews, for instance.

Views of Language in the United States Judicial System

Major developments have occurred in US law aimed at the equal rights protections of indigenous peoples. The Native American Languages Act (Public Law 101-477) was introduced by Senator John McCain and passed in 1990, repudiating the earlier policies of language eradication and stating with confidence that Native Americans have the right to continue using their Native languages (Library of Congress THOMAS). See Appendix A for the full text of the law. The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (“NAGPRA” Public Law 101-601) was introduced by Representative Morris K. Udall and also passed in 1990, requiring by law that institutions receiving federal funding return Native American cultural materials (human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony) to lineal descendants and culturally affiliated groups (Library of Congress THOMAS). These two laws, passed in rapid succession (in October and November respectively) were aimed at addressing a deficiency of protections in the United States legal code. Haviland, writing in 2003, brings to light two courtroom scenes in which he was involved as a linguistic anthropological “expert.” Each demonstrates the way that language ideologies in the United States judicial system, often conflicting with scientific paradigms of language, influence legal outcomes. With the Native American Languages Act having been passed relatively recently, there is room for older views of language to persist in judicial affairs, preserving and extending the struggle to introduce views that better foster language revitalization.

Linguistic ideologies pervade our opinions of speakers, and these ideologies are not the same in all places. The United States judicial system, like many other institutions, has built a series of practices around a combination of theoretical and folk language ideologies, which affects the way it decides on issues of language rights. The issue is a complicated one, as on one side some science sees language stripped of social life, where it is a “genetically endowed human

faculty,” a “functionally driven construction kit for certain...communicative ends” (Haviland 2003:765). Other scientific disciplines emphasize sociocultural importance and attach structural, pragmatic, and ideological components to linguistic discourse. Politically, there is the notion of a “standard language,” influenced by the “English only” movement. A standard language is privileged and clear, unmarked or functionally neutral, and comparable to a tool that can be and is to be picked up by all responsible citizens. Consequently, the notion of language in criminal courts is of a distinct sort. The United States judicial system sees words as a vehicle for carrying referential meaning—that is, a message that is *either true or false*. It assumes that the majority language is logically and socially neutral. Finally, in the eyes of the law, language is entirely detachable from the social contexts under which it was learned and in which it is used and so is simply a tool to transmit meaning (Haviland 2003:766).

At the 1986 murder trial of a man whose first language was Mixtec and whose second was Spanish (and third English), Haviland documents the “Verbatim theory” of translation, where the judge expected the man’s speech to be capable of being unproblematically rendered into an uncontested one-to-one English translation. In the courts, where the atmosphere is heavily regulated, translation is itself subject to the rule of law, in terms of what constitutes an authoritative translation, when one is needed, who can do it, et cetera. The judge, expecting Mixtec-Spanish to function as English, told jurors, “I don’t know whether any of you...understand Spanish, but we don’t want to get into a situation where we have some juror in the jury room saying, ‘Well, that’s not what the witness really said’... You’re bound to accept the testimony as translated by the official court translator.” (Haviland 2003:768). At the Mixtec man’s trial, the fact that Spanish was a second language was generally ignored and in fact, a speaker of *Cuban* Spanish was the official court interpreter. No original recording of the proceedings exist, and the only notes were recorded from the interpreter’s English translations. When one of the witnesses could not speak Spanish, and the Cuban interpreter could not translate Mixtec, the judge tried to

coax the witness into using some other Spanish word to describe what he saw, the conversation ending with the frustrated witness saying, “I cannot talk” (Haviland 2003:769). Thus the only language rights in this case seem to be the right to translation. They can speak their languages, but they are subject to the State’s provisions to make up for their “linguistic handicap” (Haviland 2003:796).

At another trial, during which a nursing home employee was suing for unwarranted dismissal for use of Spanish in the workplace, Haviland shows how the court expected language to be detached from its social contexts. The employee was fired because she had been speaking Spanish, which spurred the fear that “residents with dementia or other cognitive dysfunctions may have their conditions ‘exacerbated by confusing communications’” (Haviland 2003:770). The claim may have some merit, but it was other employees who brought the complaints about the use of Spanish, exhibiting what Haviland deems “linguistic paranoia.” It was presumed that when the employees used a language that a listener did not understand, it could only be because they were saying something they did not *want* her to understand, that they were saying something uncouth about her. Speakers of languages other than English are seen as potentially threatening, as they are insubordinate, uncontrollable, and secretive to those who demonstrate the common phenomenon of linguistic paranoia (Haviland 2003:771-772). Certainly in some cases, this may be true, but when two members of a minority culture are speaking to one another in the language they learned at birth and speak at home, English-only policies shed light on the idea in legal circles that bilingual employees who *can* speak English *should* speak English. There is no “disparate impact” because that employee can still enjoy the privilege of speaking on the job, “as though the word, or code [the foreign language], is merely an exotic costume for shared meaning” (Haviland 2003:772). But minority languages are clearly more than “costumes” to express thoughts that could be just as effectively shared in English. They are a means of participating in one’s own culture (see above on the links made between language and culture). If those

institutions that are responsible for interpreting the law function under these sorts of understandings of language, the process of securing the precedent of valuing non-English languages in America, of course including Native American languages which need to be federally respected if they are to flourish, is going to be a difficult one.

Race Against Time

Recalling Krauss' (1992:4-6) statement that, of the estimated 6,000 languages in the world, a full half would be extinct by the end of the century in which we now live starkly reminds us of another difficulty: languages are dying out even as we try to save them. I had read a quotation in 2012:

In closing I want to relate an experience I had in Alaska. I met Marie Smith, who is the last speaker on earth of the Eyak language. It was truly a profoundly moving experience for me. We talked for about three hours. I felt that I was sitting in the presence of a whole universe of knowledge that could be gone in one last breath. That's how fragile that linguistic universe seemed. It was really difficult for me to stop talking to her because I wanted to remember every moment of our encounter. [Littlebear 1999:5]

Out of curiosity, I visited the Wikipedia site on the Eyak language for some quick information. There I found that Marie Smith had died in 2008, and that the Eyak language had indeed died with her. Looking back, it was no surprise: she was the very last speaker, and having been born in 1918, she had lived a long 90 years. Still though, when I read that word “extinct” about a language which just moments before I had read about being spoken... a language which had died *within my lifetime*, I thought of all the other languages which have suffered the same fate and of those today which are about to. It is in all reality a race against time. Nettle and Romaine (2000:3-4), whose book *Vanishing Voices* shares a sentiment with the title of this work, make this

abundantly and emotionally clear with a series of photographs, each of a smiling individual that the reader learns have died. Each photograph is captioned with the name of the individual, “last speaker of ...”

Plenty of Hope

It may seem like an unimaginable task to pull a language from the brink of extinction or, in many, many cases, to reconstruct a language that has ceased to be spoken or widely used. There is, however, one inspiring success story in this vein, and that is Modern Hebrew. Adapted from Biblical remnants, a ritual language first written down in the Iron Age, it was transformed (revernacularized) by speakers of Russian, German, Spanish, et cetera into a thriving national language. That meant adapting a primarily religious language to be used in administrative, musical, pop cultural, slang, romantic, and leisure registers. From a language restricted to liturgical texts, it exploded into a language used on all signs, on receipts printed, in e-mails and on websites (Fishman 2006:70). Other languages that have no roots at all, that is they are constructed, have also gained a large number of speakers. Esperanto, to name one, claims anywhere from 300,000 to 2 million fluent speakers, though it was invented in 1887 (Ethnologue 2013). While Esperanto may never achieve the success of Modern Hebrew, its appeal and thus the motivation to learn and promulgate it comes from its goals of creating a viable, politically-neutral, international language for all people to speak. Hebrew has been successful because it was a necessity. For a fledgling nation formed from refugees from many nations of many different tongues, all with a common religious heritage that happened to represent a common liturgical language, Hebrew was a way to unite all citizens. No one group’s language was to have precedence, but rather all had to learn a new yet common way of communicating and thereby create a new identity which was really, originally, one common identity that had diverged over

thousands of years. At its root, this is to say: motivation predicated upon identity (Walsh 2005:306). Therefore, if one language was successfully revernacularized from centuries of fossilization, and another was invented but a century ago, there is the possibility of hope. If linguistic preservation and revitalization efforts can be backed by full faith and confidence—by sincere and driven motivation from all those participating—there is chance for success.

There is certainly hope that, if the native languages of North America cannot yet achieve the first language status they once had, they can at least be kept from disappearing and be taught as second languages for the time being. Many native groups are of course trying to revive their languages (Walsh 2005:305, among others), and the possibility today exists like it never has before. We have today a spectacular new resource: the Internet. By means of the availability and access speed of email, websites, and other online forums, the pace of language extinction can be slowed or halted as the speed of documentation and revitalization is greatly facilitated (Errington 2003:726, Walsh 2005:305, Rindstedt and Aronsson 2002:723). The website http://www.sealaskaheritage.org/programs/tlingit_phrase_of_week.htm, for example is an excellent source, amongst countless others available with a simple Google search, of Tlingit language phrases and recordings. Through Amazon.com, I was even able to quickly find and purchase a dictionary of the Tlingit language, something that I imagine might be impossible to find without today's search engine capacities. In addition, Wikipedia offers great promise. Besides the English version of the site, there are hundreds of other languages with their own homepages and slews of articles. As of February 2014, nine North American Indian languages have their own Wikipedia versions, with varying numbers of articles. These include Cherokee, Cheyenne, Choctaw, Cree, Hawaiian, Inuktitut, Inupiak, Muscogee, and Navajo, with Muscogee still in its infancy. See Appendix B for more details on each language's representation. Any number of other groups could request representation and begin to build up a database actively using their languages to write about anything and everything.

Chapter 2

Problems in Preservation

Maintenance versus Revitalization

There are two main ways to view the work that keeps languages from going extinct: maintenance and revival. Many linguists have put them on a scale or continuum. One of the most well-known is Fishman's Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS), an eight-stage taxonomy used to determine a language's level of threat (Fishman 1991). At one end, level eight, is a language that needs to be reconstituted because it is only spoken by a few elders (or not at all). The scale quickly gets to intergenerational transmission at level six, showing how much importance is placed on the fact that a language is passed on from parents to children as a first language (Henze and Davis 1999:6, Walsh 2005:298). From there, the scale moves through languages with literate users, languages taught in schools, languages used regionally for work, languages used in regional government and mass media, and finally languages used at a nationwide scale. Fishman's 1991 book enumerates as well an eight-step means of going about Reversing Language Shift (RLS), which also places the reestablishment of intergenerational transmission at the third stage of the eight (Henze and Davis 1999:6, Lewis and Simmons 2010). Some problems have arisen with Fishman's GIDS and resulting steps for RLS, particularly revolving around its inclusion of literacy and the relevance of such to languages outside of Europe (Lewis and Simmons 2010, Walsh 2005:298). Lewis and Simmons (2010) even propose a thirteen-level E(xpanded) GIDS that goes from extinct through international, having expanded Fishman's category that explicates use restricted to the oldest generations and the category that deals with intergenerational transmission.

Fishman's GIDS has, since its introduction, been an important tool in the field of linguistics for putting the threat of extinction into perspective. It still places together two items that can be rather hotly contested. The fact of the matter is, first of all, that some languages must be revived—reconstructed. Some concern surrounds the fact that funding is sometimes put into the revival of dead languages to the ignorance of those struggling languages that are still alive (Walsh 2005:302), and seems almost to set the precedent that a language cannot be worked with until has died and must be rebuilt. This should not be the case, and for the purposes of this research, languages that are being reconstructed are considered in the category of those that are alive and being revitalized. Each has a body of speakers, either realized or potential, that are concerned with their language's continuance, and each risks facing the concerns spelled out in the section on Authenticity.

For languages that still live, do we document them or revitalize them? Preserve or strengthen them? The two Dauenhauers, oral historians of Tlingit, the language of the elder whose words introduce this thesis, have said that “preservation...is what we do to berries in jam jars and salmon in cans.... Books and recordings can preserve languages, but only people and communities can keep them alive” (quoted in Walsh 2005:301). It is easy to defend *revitalization* it seems, though a significant portion of this work is devoted to concerns about how this is done (see section on Authenticity). Where could *documentation*, as preservation, come in? Some groups, though they want to see the revitalization of their languages, oppose their documentation (Walsh 2005:302). This can stem from religious views—that the language is sacred and to write it down desecrates it irreparably. Recording also makes a language available to people who are neither its speakers nor its researchers, a fact which is just as deplorable to some groups as recording in general is to those just mentioned. Opposition to language documentation can also stem from general distrust of linguists and researchers—outsiders really (Walsh 2005:302). I experienced this when speaking with an Ojibwe elder in Minnesota. He politely declined having

our interview recorded, telling me “I was always told never to trust a white man.” He was working with a member of the Ojibwe nation, a graduate student from the University of Montana to document and revitalize Ojibwe. But these feelings are out there, and researchers must respect them, even if they interfere with documentation. Related are groups that have come to the decision to exclude work by linguists and allow their languages to die (Walsh 2005:302). If a group has a right to its language, to “own” it as a reified possession, it also has a right *not* to let it exist, be disseminated or taught (Whiteley 2003:717).

Is documentation, simply taking a snapshot of what exists at this present moment, then a waste of time? It cannot be. Some linguists have gone as far as to say that it is the linguists’ job to record and preserve—that revitalization attempts are futile but “that the disappearance of a language without documentation is a huge scientific loss” (Newman 2003:2). Newman (2003:6) feels that revitalization causes linguists to waste time that could be spent completely documenting an existing language on “linguistic social work” that in the end will amount to little. While it is the purpose of this paper to refute the idea that revitalization is fruitless, Newman’s point about documentation is an important one. Dixon (1997:138) says that, “If this work is not done soon it can never be done. Future generations will look back at the people who call themselves ‘linguists’ at the close of the twentieth and beginning of the twenty-first century with bewilderment and disdain” at having let languages disappear without documentation. Let me make myself clear: by arguing for the continuation of language revitalization work, I in no way advocate the abandonment of documentation attempts. Both are equally important to a linguist’s goals, and at this point in time I would hope that there are enough dedicated students and professionals in this field that both documentation and revitalization can receive equally fervent focus.

Motivation

Recent years have seen a push for the revitalization of Native languages like never before, and not just in North America. Entire books are devoted to discussing the implications and solutions of this “third extinction crisis” (Robins and Uhlenbeck 1991, Grenoble and Whaley 1998, Nettle and Romaine 2000, Fishman 2001, Argenter and Brown 2004, and countless others). Motivation to preserve dying languages is listed throughout the chapter on Case Studies, but includes many times the idea that a language was a gift from the Creator, or in any case a crucial part of Native identity. Dementi-Leonard and Gilmore (1999) wrote about a community-based preservation initiative in western Alaska, fueled by a motivation to undo past injustices from outside institutions, a desire to engage in self-determination and activism, and feelings of pride about Native identity, of which language is a part. Non-Native linguists are often driven by, as mentioned above, both scientific and personal concerns. A language that exists today and is on the verge of extinction is one more unique expression of human experience that may be lost to study. Scientists and linguists with the capacity to invest time and resources into continuing to eradicate the pervasive effects of antiquated colonialist methodology are thusly motivated. A problem arises when there is a lack of motivation to revitalize language. Motivation can be one of the greatest determining factors of language learning achievement (Zoltán 1994:273), and this fact must carry over into the success of language preservation programs. If no one is interested in saving a dying language, it will continue to die. Factors that may prohibit language revitalization programs are high cost, lack of staff, limited knowledge on how to structure such programs, or even fears as to authenticity or the ability of a Native language to socio-politically impede its speakers (see section on Authenticity below). For these issues, solutions exist: there are federal and state grant monies, studies done and organizations formed to assist in revitalization (this very paper may hopefully be a starting point for some ideas), and research shared on how to address

concerns of authenticity. If a language preservation initiative is prohibited due to a general lack of motivation, not much more can be done. Dr. Karol Kumpfer, at the University of Utah, however, has been doing research and publishing studies on a phenomenon that may just be motivation enough.

Dr. Kumpfer was instrumental in the 1981 development of and continues to be active in the services provided by the Strengthening Families Program (SFP). “Providing the support that families need to raise well-adjusted children is becoming increasingly important because of escalating rates of juvenile crime, drug abuse, and child abuse” (Kumpfer et al. 1996:241). SFP has, since its implementation, been very successful in reducing the delinquent behaviors of at-risk children and teens by working with whole families. Sessions teach parents how to increase desired behaviors in their children through attention and reinforcement with various techniques for each, as well as provide parental training in communication, alcohol and drug education, problem solving, and limit-setting behaviors with respect to their children. Children and teens receive training in the communication of group rules, understanding others’ feelings, social skills and communication, problem solving, alcohol and drug education, peer pressure concerns, anger management, and other related topics. As a family, parents and children can work together in supervised environments to use the training they have gained in the presence of a therapist who works with them to encourage interactions that are nonpunitive, noncontrolling, and positive (Kumpfer et al. 1994:247-248).

Kumpfer et al. (1994) list a series of special populations with which the SFP achieved excellent results. These included rural African American families, African American inner-city drug-abusing parents, at-risk low-income minority families in Utah, and economically disadvantaged rural families in Iowa. In each case, the program content was adjusted to fit the needs of the target population, and they write:

The use of focus and pilot groups has proven very helpful in adapting the SFP so that it is sensitive to local ethnic cultures...Participating individuals can help plan program adaptations that will meet local needs; they can also help clarify when and where to hold the program, effective incentives, and what groups and agencies might be appropriate for marketing and program implementation purposes. Professionals who are specialists in local cultural relevance have been employed to improve cultural sensitivity in program development, implementation, evaluation methods, and interpretation of results. [Kumpfer et al. 1994:259]

The need for local cultural relevancy is reiterated in Nation et al. (2003), of which Dr. Kumpfer was a co-author. A “review-of-reviews” of various success programs that targeted at-risk youth, twenty-five of which included Kumpfer’s own 1995 research with Alvarado on drug abuse prevention, identified nine predictors of efficacy: comprehensiveness, inclusion of varied teaching methods, sufficient dosage, reliance on theory-driven practice, opportunities for positive relationships with adults, inclusion of outcome evaluation, employment of well-trained staff, appropriate timing, and sociocultural relevancy. “The relevance of prevention programs to the participants appears to be a primary concern in producing positive outcomes,” they write. “Culturally tailoring prevention programs goes beyond *surface structure* language translation to *deep structure* modifications sensitive to cultural factors that influence development and receptiveness to the intervention (Nation et al. 2003:453). Via personal communication with Dr. Kumpfer, who is herself Pawnee, I learned that one extremely effective way of making a program like the SFP relevant to Native American groups is to include education on and encourage pride in Native culture and language. Thus, there is a double-edged benefit. Emphasizing pride in Native cultural identity and revitalizing Native languages have the benefit of the intrinsic aim of preventing dying languages, also assist in preventing the substance abuse and delinquency which can often be a large problem on Native American reservations. Their relevancy in raising well-

adjusted children should be an additional motivational factor in the quest for language revitalization. When I wrote to Dr. Kumpfer in March of 2014, she had just returned from working with indigenous peoples in the middle of British Columbia, and was currently working on SFP training in the western United States.

Authenticity

One of the foremost questions in the field of linguistic preservation and revitalization is that of authenticity. The concern of authenticity applies to the language—is this language the language that our ancestors spoke? It applies to the use and teaching of the language—what is the most authentic way to pass the language on? It even applies to the reconstruction—what is the most authentic way to fill in the gaps?

Issues About Authenticity

When a language has no living native speakers, any reference point for that language has been extinguished. In terms of indigenous cultures that live alongside or within a dominant culture, the force of assimilation and repression means that even if a language has a few dozen or even a few hundred native speakers, the complexities involved in negotiating more than one cultural identity (an issue often neglected when considering bilingual education) mean that any reference point has either been lost or changed enough so as to be unrecognizable (Henze and Davis 1999:8). For Native American groups whose most recent fluent speakers are now amongst grandparents and great grandparents, but whose younger generations have been participating in more “mainstream” American culture, technologies have surpassed the capacities of their languages to encompass them (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:56). For example, when the last people to

use the language fluently first learned the language, technology such as computers, cell phones, and the Internet had not even come into existence yet. With the push by residential schools and other American institutions to enforce English (Whiteley 2003:716), by the time these technologies had come about, the native languages had fossilized. The only language that was evolving and incorporating the new technologies was English. Meanwhile, as Native cultures changed, many of the practices and products that were reflected in their languages fell out of use and sometimes even out of knowledge.

With this being the case, how is a language to be brought back into use when it retains words for “obsolete” technologies and concepts and has not been able to incorporate the ever-increasing vocabulary referring to new technologies and processes? A language, as an interesting example, would have to be predicting its own death to have a definitive phrase for the concept of language revitalization. Does it not seem like a sacrilegious aim to consider eliminating certain vocabularies that are no longer comprehensible to modern speakers and inventing new words and phrases to create modern functionality? It would presuppose literally and quite drastically changing what precious little often exists of a language in order for it to become useful to those who wish to use it. Walsh (2005:306-307) mentions that the English of one hundred years ago had a richly developed lexicon to refer to horses and horse-drawn transport, today mostly lost and yet nevertheless un lamented. But the situation for Native American languages, having been forced to change by outside compulsion seems arguably different. Thus: the question of authenticity.

This is a valid concern, though it can lead to an impasse. Wong (1999) describes the current concerns about language authenticity in Hawai’i, the situation the concerns have caused, and a mindset that allows for the continuation of revitalization aims. With such a large population of language learners, a power struggle has developed around whose version of the language is to be considered the most authentic. The problem arose between university scholars

who claim a pure version of the language reconstructed from historical documents and elders who grew up speaking Hawai'ian as their first language. On the one hand, potentially beneficial linguistic growth would be stymied whereas on the other there develops a situation in which successful revitalization efforts mean the marginalization of native norms of speaking. It is clear that two equally justifiable forms of the language have arisen, each with a perfectly tenable link to a past when Hawai'ian was spoken with first language status. That is to say that, in the simplest definition, both are authentic. The struggle between the two forms, Wong says, stems from a very common compulsion in circumstances such as these to select one and only one 'correct' form from a set of otherwise equivalent usages. Thus, authenticity has become a social construction depending on which side can be more convincing or garner the most power. So far, it is the version of the elders that is valued by the community, to the unfortunate alienation of the university scholars and their stricter 'book language.' (I say unfortunate because the university linguists certainly have much to contribute.) However, the population of elder fluent speakers is decreasing... (Wong 1999:94-102).

There are a number of aspects of this struggle that might make persevering with language revitalization seem almost futile. The fact of the matter should not be forgotten, however: Hawai'i has an extremely successful language program despite the power struggles. The language promoted by university linguists has a strong claim to authenticity. It is documented in early sources and so is arguably the purest form of the language remaining. The authenticity is called into question by the fact that times have changed. The university-trained language learners have been brought up under Western, colonialized worldviews. The language that they are extracting was used by people who had not been. And yet they are taking it and expecting it to fit Western worldviews (Wong 1999:99). Firstly, who is to say that the language we have recorded was not deemed inauthentic by the elders of its time? (Wong 1999:111). Secondly, even if one could access older worldviews and ways of speaking, they cannot be fit back into a modern

context. To expect that means the language becomes irrelevant to the lives of those who are trying to use it on a daily basis. (Wong 1999:103, 110). The language that the elders speak is by no means immune from the effects of English. In fact, their language is the last version in a long line of alterations that even predates the contact period: language indeed changes. Thus, though permeated by inauthenticity, this seems unavoidable, and the actual claim to authenticity should not be ignored. “If it can be established...that a clear connection exists between the emergent language and what the community perceives as traditional roots, a case can be made for the authenticity of that emergent language inasmuch as it has remained true to (has not become detached from) its tradition” (Wong 1999:103). This quotation applies to *both* the university and the elder paradigm. Thus, I suggest that the simplest definition of authenticity be chosen: a defensible link to earlier, more authentic forms. To ask for more risks creating a situation in which William Shakespeare must attempt to run a washing machine or send an email. Worse though, it can create an impasse which, in a world where the number of fluent speakers of endangered languages is yearly decreasing, could mean the death of a language well before using an ‘inauthentic’ form could. And if the goal is some language over no language, there is not time to nitpick.

Ways of Preserving Authenticity in Restoration and Revitalization

In order to address my view that questions like these, though extremely important and relevant, are prohibitive if they mean the end of discussion rather than instructive, it is most pertinent to again mention that all languages do change. (Recall Walsh’s 2005 note on the horse lexicon in English). Now, most languages do admittedly change slowly and gradually over time, but as I will show, this process is one that can be faithfully replicated. While some languages are even regulated by some form of authoritative institution as with French and the *Académie*

française, they still must incorporate new words for rapidly increasing numbers of new technologies. Apple Incorporated has come up with new terms on its own—iTunes, iPod, and iPad to name a few—and it has gotten to the point where a new variety of cell phone is no longer simply a cell phone. It is an Android, a Galaxy OS 3, an LG Optima...the list goes on *ad nauseam*. So whether it is big businesses creating and marketing these words or a board of forty *immortels* (Académie française) considering the most authentic way to incorporate them while preserving an already established language, the onslaught of new words on an annual scale is confusing at best if not tiring. The process is similar to what many Native American languages, particularly those which were extinct until being revived from archival documents, have had to face—though many orders of magnitude smaller. The task becomes significantly more difficult when no new words or phrases have been added to a language since a time before the widespread use of electricity. And it requires much more than simply adding words and phrases. The language must be reinvented to be adapted to fit a culture that has changed.

Hinton and Ahlers (1999) discuss the challenges of this required adaptation and propose a viable means of going about it. Their justification relies on a working definition of authenticity. Though perhaps loose, it is indeed valid, and it is this very reconsideration of paradigms that must be adopted if languages are to be preserved rather than simply lamented. “When considering ‘authenticity,’ it is possible to focus either on linguistic form, such as pronunciation and grammar, or on the expression of traditional values. We will demonstrate how language restoration activists in California have found ways to express traditional values and worldview even while allowing massive change of linguistic form and vocabulary” (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:57). They value preserving a particular metafunction of language—its ability to embody traditional values and worldviews—over preserving the current state of a language’s vocabulary. They go on to show that even the production of new vocabulary can be done in authentic ways. Errington (2003:731) agrees by saying linguists may be contributing to “invented” linguistic

traditions that are “nonetheless authentic” as they much more than “false construals of the past.” To represent languages that still have native speakers, Hinton and Ahlers detail the Master-Apprentice Language-Learning Program founded by the Native California Network, and for languages with no speakers they detail the California Native Language Restoration Workshop. In the former, a master speaker spends approximately twenty hours per week speaking only in the native language with a committed younger learner. They spend time especially doing traditional activities together so that language learning is contextualized (Sims 2005:104), and both are taught how to avoid English as much as possible (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:59-60). Much like techniques taught in world language teacher programs, gestures, actions, and context are emphasized. When new words must be introduced, master and apprentice work together to create meaning on a case-by-case basis, formulating only when necessary a way of referring to an object or concept that both mutual understand (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:61). In a way, this process is how new words and phrases are created in natural speech. In an effort to be able to communicate, users of a language create new ways to term objects and phenomena as necessary, often using the way that makes most sense according to language function and culture, which Hinton and Ahlers also mention. Because that is the best way to name that object, its use spreads amongst other language users, to whom it makes semantic and cultural sense, just like it would in any other living language (Walsh 2005:304). Wong (1999:104) writes that even for a language like Hawai’ian, with thousands of native speakers, new usages must be given a “probationary period” in which the community can choose to adopt them into normal use.

In the latter program, the Restoration Workshop, California Indians representing sixteen different languages are introduced to archival linguistic materials at the University of California Berkeley, and instructed to find words, pronounce them, and use them. The emphasis is on locating phrases and words that can immediately start being used in conversations, even if only at first amongst conversations in English (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:60). In this program too,

sometimes new words must be created to refer those technologies that did not exist in the culture that spoke the language. Just as with the Master-Apprentice program, though more difficult as there is no collaboration with a native speaker, there are ways to go about this as authentically as possible. “Authenticity can be maintained in vocabulary development through the analysis and teaching of traditional processes of word formation” (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:63). In the California languages they write about, the processes of metaphor and metonymy were the traditional, culturally recognizable ways of formulating vocabulary. This was demonstrated when in examining the archival materials as well as the documented lexica of spoken languages, these processes were found to be extremely prevalent. An example listed is the Hupa word for “bat,” which is composed of the linguistic units that translate literally to “at night—it flaps around.” Thus, when archivists are doing their work or when master and apprentice are conversing, they can be trained in these linguistic processes of metaphor and metonymy to create words based on methods that the language prefers (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:63-65). In the end, some original words that have disappeared may be replaced, but they are replaced by phrases still in their language. And when words for items and processes that did not exist when the language was last widely spoken are created gradually, it avoids flooding the language with borrowed loanwords.

This latter case is precisely what is happening with the revitalization of Hawai’ian. Because of the large population of speakers and the magnitude of current revitalization attempts, many new words are being coined. It is unclear who exactly has the authority to create these words, but so far many have been produced and distributed to immersion schools by Ke Kōmike Hua’ōlelo Hou, a committee founded for the modernization of the Hawai’ian lexicon. They have developed a hierarchy of preference in terms of techniques to coin new words that includes 1) a word printed in a dictionary 2) a word used by native speakers but not in the dictionary 3) circumlocution 4) broadening the meaning of a word already in the dictionary 5) transliteration of a foreign word 6) combining morphemes of existing words and 7) shortening and combining one

or more words. Though strategies 5, 6, and 7 represent the most likely to be found offensive by the community, they represent a disproportionately large number of new words. Particularly with transliteration, many defend it by saying that first, it allows a differentiation to be made between original words and the introduced (often scientific) lexicon—an internal tracking system of sorts. Second, it allows for the disambiguation of technical and lay meanings of words. Thirdly, and something that will be explicated in the section on schooling, it ensures that students being taught in Hawai’ian immersion schools will still be able to participate in global scientific discourse (the transliteration of molybdenum as *molaibedenuma* is easily connected with the English, as is the German *Molybdän*, the French *molybdène*, the Japanese *モリブデン* [moribuden], et cetera). The large and rapid quantities of these words are, however, seen by the community that has to use them as bastardization (Wong 1999:105-107).

The suggestions of Hinton and Ahlers are paralleled by Wong: a language is more than its phonemes. “Modernizers will attempt to create a corresponding word in Hawai’ian, eventually yielding a one-to-one correspondence with English at the lexical level as well as in worldview. All that will be accomplished in the end is the creation of an alternate code with which to express an English worldview” (Wong 1999:108). This is certainly not the goal of modernization, and could indeed be considered bastardization. Even in teaching World Languages like German, I encourage my students to associate the target language vocabulary with images rather than with English translations so that the full *concept* of the of the object stands behind the word, rather than the German simply becoming a one-to-one code for English. Furthermore, just as Hinton and Ahlers suggest for Hupa, Hawai’ian is rife with metaphoric speech, which suggests itself as a much more natural way to expand vocabulary than the creation of portmanteaux. Many vocabulary additions seem to serve the purpose of disambiguation in a language with a limited number of phonemes (only eight consonants). Wong suggests, though, that disambiguation was a low priority among previous speakers of Hawai’ian, a language that

clearly demonstrates a preference for indirectness in historical linguistic records. It seems that the need to disambiguate between homophones is a byproduct of a Western worldview, and to attempt to incorporate it into the Hawai'ian language would be simply inauthentic (Wong 1999:107-108). It is much more in congruity with Hawai'ian's linguistic metafunction (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:59) to view ambiguity as a resource rather than a liability (Wong 1999:108).

Need for a Paradigm Shift and Community Involvement

For suggestions of Wong—that there may not be just one authentic language—and of Hinton and Ahlers—that it is the incorporation of traditional worldviews and values that connote authenticity rather than simply linguistic form—to be of use, entire communities must be on the same page. On a small scale, one problem is often that fluent speakers of a language criticize less experienced speakers on their mistakes, a natural result of hearing their language misspoken. The Master-Apprentice programs try to get both partners to focus on patience and cooperation, so that criticism is reduced. It often has the result of dissuading new learners from even trying (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:62), and has to do with the issue of authenticity. It is a large change to have to accept—that languages will be changing so drastically. When younger generations begin to speak a new language, it is often with an American accent. They find the native accent too difficult to emulate, a common phenomenon even in American world language classrooms (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:62, Walsh 2005:304). If a language program is going to take hold within a community, that community has to agree that in attempting to preserve a language, they will change it. The best paradigm to adopt, which is by no means easy, is the one in which the focus of speakers is on using the language as much as possible, rather than only using it correctly (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:62). It is the paradigm that ensures the language will actually be used enough to have a chance at proliferation. That means that emphasis must be placed on

communication rather than preservation. Henze and Davis (1999:8) ask, “Is the purpose to keep the *language* alive? Or is it to maintain or recapture language as a vibrant and central component of culture, as it embodies the cultural worldview and identity of an indigenous people?” This is the way a language can become more than a dictionary or scientific essay on grammar and morphology. This is what languages that claim millions of speakers have as their purpose. But this requires that communities whole-heartedly accept the goal of cultural and ideological preservation via language as just as authentic as structural and lexical preservation.

“Without...ownership by speakers themselves or their descendants, attempts at revitalization are destined to flounder and ultimately fail” (Henze and Davis 1999:4).

Community first: The Importance of Intergenerational Transmission

Another aspect of authenticity is that languages must be taught in authentic ways. Many revitalization efforts have centered on literacy and schooling through bilingual education programs and immersion programs. Henze and Davis (1999:8) cite this as a potential problem, the reason being that both types of programs operate within dominant societal structure of education, in other words, an inauthentic system. Schooling in this way, regardless of whether the language is taught full-time or part-time, takes away from what many regard the most pivotal ability of a language if it is to be considered thriving: intergenerational transmission (Fishman 1999:399, Henze and Davis 1999:8, Sims 2005:104). Now, schooling can indeed be an important way of reversing language shift, but as Hinton and Ahlers (1999:58) warn, “A language that is kept alive only in the schools is both stylistically and conceptually restricted” (reiterated in Sims 2005:104). That is, it loses the functional registers that tie it to the worldview and culture of the people who spoke it by introducing it to a system whose goals are different than its goals. In this way, it becomes an issue of authenticity. Fishman (1996:193) states, “Vernacularization is the

opposite of institutionalization,” and means that when a language is taught through schools, it must first be adapted to them. It must be standardized (institutionalized), a preferred dialect chosen above others to be taught, applied to subjects such as math and science rather than songs, stories, and other oral communications (vernacular uses). Languages that were traditionally orally maintained now must be conveyed heavily in writing. (Think of the oft-repeated difference in graduate school programs, “I only need a *reading* knowledge of German,” implying there is very much a difference, attested by educational research.) One major authenticity concern is that in schools, “creation of new vocabulary,” which must be done in very large quantities, “must be regulated in order to maintain homogeneity of the curricula across schools” (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:61) rather than case-by-case user-created vocabulary that spreads slowly, though naturally, throughout the community.

Application in Schools

None of this is to demonize the attempts of schools to teach Native languages. Compulsory education laws in the United States deem that children will be away from any means of inter-generational transmission for six hours per day, 180 days per year. Given that, schools must necessarily play a large role, just not the primary role, in language revitalization. An ideal program of revitalization combines both.

Gunn et al. (2010:325-326) detail the drop-out statistics among native populations (First Nations, Métis, and Inuit) in Canadian schools, saying that, compared to 90% for non-Aboriginal Canadians, only around 60% of Aboriginal Canadians aged 20 to 24 have a high school certificate. In Alberta, the province in which the study of Gunn et al. takes place, the rate of Aboriginal high school graduation is 64% for *off-reserve* students, whereas the percent is much lower, at 32%, for reservation residents. They show that one of the best ways to motivate

students to graduate is to include, in the most authentic way that the compulsory education system allows, Native language and culture in schools.

Reasons that Gunn et al. list as negatively effecting Aboriginal student graduation are many. They mainly hinge on issues of authenticity. "...Several theories have been posited, each undergirded by the notion that the mainstream education system fails to recognize Aboriginal culture... After all, if one of the primary functions of education is to teach individuals about the culture of its society and thereby become one of its members..., the disregard of Aboriginal culture can be interpreted as a disregard of the Aboriginal person" (Gunn et al. 2010:324). That is to say, the national system of education feels irrelevant and unsuited to native people's needs: inauthentic. Aboriginal students around the world report that they perceive that they are expected to fail and that for them there is a general lack of care and concern. They also mention poor relationships with classmates and teachers. A primary function of Canadian residential schools, as of American residential schools as well, was to eradicate Aboriginal culture and language. While the residential schools have been closed down for many years, the malicious fact remains in the history, as the Euro-centric approach to education (the "'hidden curriculum' of western education") has remained in schools (Gunn et al 2010:327). Little is done in schools to make them in any way similar to authentic ways of conveying knowledge in native communities.

This is not to say that there is no way. The Canadian province of Alberta, whose aboriginal student high school completion rate is mentioned above, recognizes and has been trying to improve the situation. One of its provincially-funded government agencies, the Alberta Initiative for School Improvement (AISI) has been funding programs, among which are those aimed at improving education for First Nations, Métis, and Inuit students (Gunn et al. 2010:324). Gunn et al. provided the details of the 16 most effective projects of some 48 funded over a nine-year stretch. Commonalities identified between the successful programs make good sense—that is to say they are aspects of school culture that would improve graduation rates for any sector of

the population: a improved culture of community and care, a strong school-based commitment throughout the community, positive peer influences that encourage good decision making and life choices, and a focus on motivating students to be enthusiastic about and want to attend school (2010:328). What they show is that these facets of school culture were previously absent for aboriginal students.

That the province of Alberta funds these programs, hearkens back to what Henze and Davis (1999:7) suggest: “Successful intervention also requires language planning and policy changes at the local as well as state or national level so that the indigenous or minority language can be supported.” What Gunn et al. (2010:329) suggest about how to incorporate the improving facets of school culture hearkens back as well. “...Education is not culturally neutral, and education with a non-Aboriginal cultural basis cannot reinforce Aboriginal identity.” Thus, curricula must be modified to include Aboriginal viewpoints and contributions. As a caveat, they state that “adding-on” to the curriculum, what they also call “the beads and feathers approach,” is only partially effective at best if not simply “a placating, status quo approach to Aboriginal education.” They say that to truly amend the curriculum, that is—to truly make it more authentic and relevant to Aboriginal students, much deeper changes must occur. First Nation, Métis, and Inuit stakeholders like parents and Elders must be included in the decision-making. Stand-alone courses must be constructed which accurately include Aboriginal history, culture, and ways of knowing. Teaching styles must also change to better agree with Aboriginal learning styles—team-based instruction and cooperative over competitive styles that match with Aboriginal styles that are largely collectivist. Teacher preparation programs, those that train pre-service and student teachers, must be made aware that First Nation, Métis, and Inuit peoples “are not merely “add-ons” in Canadian educational institutions. Rather, [they] are fully entitled, valuable contributors to Canadian society, and they must be regarded as such” (Gunn et al. 2010:329-330).

AISI-funded programs that have begun to work to meet these stipulations help Aboriginal students to feel competent and successful. They make them feel like a part of their own school community, like they are important and responsible for their own education. Many projects focused on lowering class size, creating reward and incentive programs, and introducing counseling and “cultural liaison” staff who were themselves members of the Aboriginal community. But one also very important way was by enhancing cultural awareness, particularly by educating staff and students about Aboriginal culture, history, and *language*. It enhanced a sense of belonging for Aboriginal students, and when they were taught about those things as well, they gained an enhanced understanding and sense of pride in their own culture (Gunn et al. 2010:335-337). This ties in very well with the work that Dr. Karol Kumpfer does, mentioned below, in using pride and cultural awareness to work with Native American youths who suffer from drug and alcohol abuse problems. Littlebear (1999:4) also suggests that the sense of belonging that comes with a community’s language use and a school’s support of it might mean that youth would stop turning to gangs for a sense of identity.

The AISI funded programs allow for native community aims at solidarity to be reflected within a public school setting, and the clear benefits of such attempts are irreproachable but what of immersion schools? At first thought, a school that teaches all information in the native language all the time is thoroughly appealing. It follows exactly the sort of environment that ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) students find themselves in upon immigrating to the United States, or Americans immigrating to any other country for that matter. It is often claimed that the best way to learn a language is to go to the country where it is spoken. Greymorning (1999) writes about the success the Cheyenne had been having at the time of his writing with part-day immersion programs. He put the idea of starting with the youth into practice, but at first met with resistance. He implemented an immersion-based program in a kindergarten class, and had great success in teaching them 136 words and phrases in the Arapaho

language over the course of twelve weeks. From my own experience with team teaching Spanish to a class of elementary school students, my colleagues and I at first thought it would be too much of a shock to students and then nothing would be accomplished. However, after hearing about the successful experiences of one of the other teacher teams, we decided to give it a try, and met with equal success. Greymorning could not understand where the resistance was coming from, and it seemed the more success he had in teaching the students, the more Arapaho speakers opposed the program, saying that the children should instead be learning Spanish—a language they perceived as more immediately useful to their children.

At that time, he was able to attend a conference on Native American Language Issues in Hilo, Hawai'i. It showcased the success of the Hawai'ian Pūnana Leo preschool immersion programs. The video he took there and edited was convincing enough that the elementary school principle allowed him to create a half-day immersion class for kindergarteners. He then worked with the Music, Art, and Physical Education teachers to allow parts of their classes to be taught in Arapaho. Pushing forward, he helped establish a two-hour-per-day four-day-per-week immersion preschool program that was quickly increased to three hours per day five days per week. The next year, the first all-day immersion preschool program was implemented, and its success led to a second one established the following year. At the time of the article, these classrooms had been running smoothly and successfully for five years (Greymorning 1999).

It sounds like immersion schools are multi-beneficial. The Hawai'ian case however has shown that preparation for immersion school can be a danger to the integrity—the authenticity—of a language. To continue with the example of science mentioned above, enormous numbers of vocabulary must be added to a language to account for all of the technical vocabulary in biology, chemistry, physics, geology, etc. English is quite good at assimilating these words because it has a long history of Latin and Greek influence. To add all of these words to a fledgling language could result in a situation wherein new science-themed words outnumber the words that

comprised the language to begin with. How many new words would have to be coined to write a simple science textbook (a literary source—something that may or may not be an authentic means of transmission in the language in question to begin with)?

Now, these words could be arrived at via metaphor, metonymy, the broadening of existing definitions, et cetera. But, English at this point is becoming a global lingua franca. And in the United States, it is particularly difficult in school contexts to succeed without English. If American students are to have any success in a career in science, it can be argued, they need to know the English means of referring to scientific concepts. How is this to happen if they were taught about photosynthesis in Hawai'iian? Perhaps all of the scientific words could be transliterated from English into the native language thereby, presumably, making the English easier to recognize. But we have already discussed how this would be a terrible detriment to the language...not to mention it is likely to be completely rejected by the community of language users (Wong 1999:106-107). The best thing to do, it seems, is to stop and wait. It sounds counter-intuitive at first. However, to encode English scientific concepts into native languages at this juncture would be a detriment to students, and to simply transfer them would be a detriment to the language. There are plenty of ways to use the language in schools and in communities that will utilize what exists of the language, will help build and revitalize the language, and will continue to increase its number of fluent users (more than speakers, users implies that it is a necessity for everyday life). Note that Greymorning was working with kindergartners and preschoolers. The success he experienced is inspirational, but his use of Arepaho fits much better with current kindergarten and preschool curricula than it would with upper-level classes. Would this have been the case if he were teaching biology in Arepaho? A speaker of the German language learns sulfur dioxide as *Scwefeldioxid*, not quite readily recognizable to an English-speaker, but German still has a viable scientific community. A German speaker can productive and successful career in science without having to use English on a daily basis. Until the day

when this can happen with indigenous languages—when their users can participate in mainstream science without the fear of needing to translate into English—immersion instruction for subjects that do not have current vocabulary representation is a distraction and even a potential threat. Do note that the opening of immersion schools is a goal for many of the people I spoke with in the chapter on Case Studies. And many of them spoke about such schools that were already achieving great success. I hope that the aforementioned concerns can be taken at least as a caveat into consideration.

That some universities offer courses in native languages at first seems promising. And indeed, making such languages available at institutions with variegated materials, archival documents, active linguists, and accessible funding can be a powerful resource and can bring newly established validation to the languages. But it is only a benefit if students and professors are motivated enough to fully teach and learn the language. The same potential problem is present in secondary school language classes. A simple thought back to high school and collegiate language courses for many may reveal something in common with those who might profess, “I took French for four years in high school, and I don’t remember a word of it.” The challenge of teaching a language in a high school or university is 1) that there are normally relatively few speakers fluent enough to teach the language, and of that number vastly fewer are certified to teach, 2) that there are a number of constraints that are de facto placed upon the learning of tribal languages by nature of the academic environment, and 3) learning institutions are rarely able or willing to put forth the resources necessary to encourage and sustain long-term language learning (Sims 2005:104-105). There are certainly exceptions to each of these points, but the third especially seems to hold true. While some students will be motivated to continue with the language, very few courses are likely to focus on the production of fluent speakers and fewer still will have the resources to offer contextualized language learning. University language courses generally have as their goals the fulfillment of basic language requirements and the

instilling of a general, passive knowledge of the grammar and structures—no focus on representing tribal sociocultural, socioreligious, or sociopolitical life (Sims 2005:105). A students' home community, however, *is* a context, so any language instruction therein, whether formalized or informal, is contextualized.

Bilingualism

Much of the push behind the literature written about preservation programs deals with implementing programs for young children through the school systems that are currently in place. The idea behind this is that if young children can grow up as bilinguals, valuing their native language and the cultural insight and unique ways of thinking that it provides, then the quickly disappearing languages will have a chance at proliferation (Greymorning 1999, Littlebear 1999). Just above I mention that immersion schools may not be the best to start out with, in that they force languages to change at unnatural speeds and also deny students the ability to participate in developed scientific fields while their languages are still considered in their infancy. One of the first important milestones in the revitalization of a language, paralleling the third step in Fisher's Reversing Language Shift as spelled out by Henze and Davis (1999:6), is to develop bilingual fluency in English (the dominant language) and the native language. Of course the very first goal should be teaching as many people as much of the language as is possible. And *when* possible or whereupon *becoming* possible, bilingualism can be the goal. This means that the language must first be acquired with second language status (step two of RLS), in the best-case scenario having been learned mainly in the community with support from schools. "A language kept alive only in the schools is both stylistically and conceptually restricted" (Hinton and Ahlers 1999:58), though schools can certainly contribute resources and encourage the motivation to learn the language by teaching about it to all members of the community. As soon as second language proficiency

develops, it can be passed on intergenerationally—mother to child. There are of course the countless studies of the benefits of bilingualism for developing children's brains (Bialystok 2011, for one). Moreover, bilingualism is the first step in approaching a reality where the native language has equal status to the dominant language. It is the beginning of the phase in which nearly monolingual communities can develop again, using English in the same way as the Quebecois. And from that point, a full school curriculum could be developed. Learning biology words would be less and less restrictive.

There is a caveat when the goal in language revitalization is bilingualism, one which Rindstedt and Aronsson (2002) term "the ethnic revitalization paradox." Their research comes from South America, though the subject is relevant to North American revitalization attempts. In Ecuador, being Indian and speaking Quichua are seen sometimes as synonymous, with the speaking of Quichua a distinct political act in that it displays Incan descendants' pride at having survived Spanish oppression. Thus, adults in the parental and grandparental generations express great enthusiasm about the speaking of Quichua and its intergenerational transmission. The reality seems to be one of acute over-confidence. Although the adults profess that their children can speak Quichua, and ideally this is most favorable situation to them, they do nothing to secure that outcome. Grandparents, grandmothers in most cases as they are the ones still living, although they consider their Spanish to be poor, try to speak to their grandchildren in Spanish. Parents also speak to their children only in Spanish, explicitly stating that if they were to use both, they fear their children would grow up speaking the frowned-upon mix called *mete mete*. Parents sometimes even correct their children when they hear them use Quichua words in otherwise Spanish sentences. Children are never exposed to a constant source of Quichua input, and thus never really learn it. Because parents recognize that their children need Spanish to survive, they use Spanish with them, convinced that their children will somehow pick up Quichua later in life or that upon growing up they will somehow be able to speak Quichua just as they do

as adults now—the “genetic fallacy.” Just as Spanish is to Quichua, English is to North American Indian languages. It is understandable that parents want what is best for their children, and so would not wish for them to be excluded from the possibility of success by not being able to speak the majority language. But if language revitalization is to be successful, an effort must be made to avoid the ethnic revitalization paradox. Research shows that a bilingual upbringing does *not* confuse or retard a child’s development (Pettito et al. 2001). If parents ideally want their children to learn a language, they must teach it to them. Children will pick up English at school, from their friends, from television, and every now and again perhaps from their families. But only the parents can teach them the native language.

Chapter 3

Case Studies

During the Summer of 2012, funded by an Undergraduate Summer Discovery Grant, I travelled to three states and conducted a phone interview with one other in order to ask questions about linguistic preservation and revitalization programs. I spoke with representatives from the Sitka Tribe of Alaska, The Oneida Indian Nation in New York, the Red Lake Band of Chippewa in the Red Lake Nation of Minnesota, a professor of Dakota at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, and an instructor of the Blackfoot language at the University of Montana in Missoula. My original intent was to, in each place, ask the questions that I had prepared (found in Table 1), though the nature of my research changed as I began to conduct the interviews.

As I began to speak with the representatives of the various languages, it became clear that the best way to go about the research was to collect information on anything and everything related to the language: its history, perceptions of it, its frequency, and what is being done today to preserve it. In each of the following case studies, I have summarized the information I learned from my contacts about the history of the people who speak the language, their thoughts on the language itself, and what is being done to preserve the language so that I can compare it to the previous chapters of background research in this work. I have included as much of what I heard about storytelling, traditional history, traditional ecological knowledge, and societal change because I feel that this information is crucial to preserve and in addition speaks to the amount of cultural preservation each group is coming from already.

Please note: *All of the names of my contacts have been changed in this document out of respect for the privacy of their identities.*

Table 1. Questionnaire

Quantitative Inquiry
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where does the funding for language preservation programs come from? (i.e. federal/state government, external organizations, or within the tribe) 2. How much funding is available? 3. What percentage of the tribe's budget is invested in the program(s)? 4. How many members are registered as belonging to the tribe? 5. What is the extent (area) of tribal lands? Do they include a "reservation?" 6. How many members of the tribe live on the tribal lands? 7. Where is the tribe located? 8. How many people can speak the native language(s) currently? 9. Of those that can speak the language(s), what is the ratio of males to females? What is the age range/distribution of speakers? 10. What percentage of the tribe participates in the language program(s)? (Or, how many people participate, if percentage cannot be estimated?) 11. Who is most likely to be involved in the program(s)? Tell me in terms of age, gender, and on-/off-reservation residence. 12. What is the success rate of the program(s)? (You can relate this information by any means that you have, for example retention rate of participants, growth/decline in program functions, or even language retention rate upon program completion.)
Qualitative Inquiry
<p>Tell me about what sort(s) of language program(s) your tribe has and how they are structured. Could you speak some of the language for me? Maybe tell me your favorite story.</p>

Sitka Tribe of Alaska

The Sitka Tribe of Alaska located in Sitka, Alaska is a federally recognized tribe of more than 4,000 tribal citizens. Sharing the traditions of the totem pole and potlatch with the Kwakiutl, it comprises speakers of Tlingit, Haida, Aleut (Unangan), and Tsimshian (Sitka Tribe of Alaska 2011). I arrived in Sitka, Alaska on June 18, 2012 where I was met by Michelle, the Education and Employment Director of the Sitka Tribe. Through her, I met three elders who work with the Sitka Native Education Program (SNEP) and I was able to observe a summer camp program at the Sitka Boys and Girls Club and conduct interviews with the three elders.

Gary, a Tlingit-speaking elder, gave me plenty of background on the Tlingit groups living in Sitka. Upon introducing himself, he gave both his English name and his Tlingit name and clan affiliation. He explained the Tlingit system that has two descent groups—moieties often called “sides.” These are called Raven and Eagle (though in some other Tlingit regions, Eagle is Wolf or simply “not Raven”), in his opinion to prevent incest, as a Raven must traditionally marry an Eagle. Each of these sides is divided into clans that may be spread throughout various Tlingit populations (tribes, of which the Sitka tribe is one) or may be confined to a number of tribes in one area. Each clan is then divided into houses within a tribe (ANKN 2006). Over 400 years ago, the people of the T’akdeintann clan (of the Raven moiety) were once of the Coho Salmon clan (L’uknax̄.ádi, also of the Raven moiety). But when they moved into Sitka, they became T’akdeintaan. A Shaman came to the chief, saying there were too many T’akdeintaan people in this area, that they should go back (Gary stressed this phrase) to being L’uknax̄.ádi, and so they did.

Fishing and trapping were the main sources of income for the Tlingit people. They could tell from the fur which minks come from the islands and which come from the mainland. Gary grew up getting food from hunting and collecting from the land and sea. Russians were the first Western group to contact the Sitka, and many of them learned to speak Tlingit (and vice versa). There had been a period of violence with the Russians, Gary told me. A Russian boat had come by, but it did not seem to bother the Tlingit, who were accustomed to Russian visits. This time, however, the Russians massacred them, letting one go free to tell the rest of the people, beginning the war with the Russians. Michelle provided more background on this time period, saying that in 1804 there was large-scale battle between the Tlingit and the Russians (along with Unangan peoples enslaved by the Russians), the conflict having escalated from concerns about otter hunting rights. Sitka National Historic Park encompasses one of the battlefields, where Russian ships bombarded the shore, once the site of huge Kiks.ádi clan houses (home to 40, 50, or even 60

people at a time), with artillery. The site today is a serene grassy clearing with a distinct reverence about it. Herman has a traditional hat and cape, the cape with a musket hole in it. The wearer of the cape, he told me, had been shot in the battle.

Relations improved and the Russians did not try to take away the Tlingit language, Gary said. That would not occur until Americans began to arrive. Because the Russians were there first, the Russian Orthodox Church it was the first religion the Tlingit people were exposed to. The priests and bishops had been attempting to convert the Tlingit to Russian Orthodoxy, and one of the clan chiefs liked what he heard, talked to his clan, and encouraged them to go over. Gary believes his people already thought there was a higher power, so when they began to understand the services and what the religion entailed, many of them became converts. This remains the dominant religion to this day. Some began to translate the Russian texts and hymns into Tlingit, and Gary told me that many recordings were made at parties and at church gatherings, but that many of them were taken from the church and are now lost. He believes that they exist, but that people are unwilling to give them up. He knew of old recordings of church songs in Tlingit like the Lord's Prayer, which he sang for me. The new priest hopes that Herman can help translate more of the songs into Tlingit again, but he says it is a difficult task. Many of the words in the Bible have different connotations than they do in Tlingit.

It was Americans who discouraged the speaking of Tlingit, especially with the schools they established. "You must speak English. Only English," Gary said the policy was. The government school he attended would not allow him to speak Tlingit as a child. He was lucky, however, because four of the women and one of the male teachers who worked at the school were Tlingit. "So as soon as the door closed, boy that Tlingit started coming out!" Gary said that he had never experienced being told not to speak his language except at the Government School, referring to it as a "genocide of our Tlingit language." Even now, he continued, some of the ministers forbid them to use their language. His niece became a minister relatively recently, and

she had inherited a blanket from his sister (her mother). Another minister asked her to get rid of the blanket, telling her, “You cannot have that blanket and preach the word of God at the same time.” Although she still recognizes her clan ties, she cannot have anything to do with them, and had to send the blanket away to her sister.

Gary is an excellent storyteller, and he related to me a story about the *Kóoshdaakáa*², land otter spirits that take control of your mind, and can lead you away to your death. Switching between Tlingit and English, he told me, “When you go hunting, this is what I want to tell you. If you hear voices in the woods, and if you know that you’re the only one there, don’t go towards the voice. Go back to the boat.” I include his full story in Appendix C, along with a story he told to the day campers. As an educator for the tribe, he tries to teach the children about the meaning of the word respect. To teach it to the children, he told me, means that they will grow up with it in mind. The story he told the campers had as its moral the idea of respect; respect for each other, for the land, for mothers and fathers, grandfathers... “For the things that are walking in the forest, have respect for them. All that stuff in the water, respect them... Paying attention and respect, *káa yáa at wooné*,” he told them, was what he wanted to emphasize. He also had something else to tell me, which he did phrase-by-phrase, first in Tlingit and then in English:

“I’m happy for where you’re going. Where you’re going to be a teacher. And this one too I’m glad about. I’m glad also that we as Tlingit people, you want to learn about us. A long time ago, this was hardly a thing said. From the Raven side to the Eagle side—maybe a long time ago they had a different name for it—that’s they way they settled it.”

Michelle showed me around Sitka National Historic Park as she gave me some background on the Sitka Tribe and traditional ecological knowledge. The park includes many totem poles, made by both Tlingit and Haida peoples. In fact, Sitka itself is home to Tlingit,

² Edwards 2009 Dictionary of Tlingit was crucial to the transcription of the Tlingit words in many of the interviews I conducted.

Haida, and Tsimshian peoples, but at the time of the Japanese internment camps in WWII, Unangan people from the Aleutian Islands were interned in southeastern Alaska, and so they make up a portion of the population as well. Many of the totem poles are replicas or even replicas of replicas of much older totem poles. Within the park, the Sitka tribe has a memorandum of understanding with the National Parks Service. For each park, there is an official compendium which states that, as native people who used to gather from the land, the Sitka tribe is allowed to collect from the National Historic Park. Every now and again, a new employee arrives who is not aware of this policy, but of late the two groups have been working together. Michelle herself, when she was younger, was accustomed to drying seaweed for consumption on the beach, and beading with an elder who took her around the park frequently, teaching her about the various edible and medicinal plants. She told me she learned a lot by “creating opportunities for herself,” and “asking elders, befriending different people, and just asking, asking, asking.” On our thirty-minute walk that day, she was able to point out to me Devil’s Club (*Oplopanax horridus* or s’áxt’ in Tlingit), salmon berries (*Rubus spectabilis* or was’x’aan tléiGu, though it has a different name in Sitka) and their edible young shoots (k’eit), wild celery (introduced to me as yaana.eit, and seemingly actually *Heracleum maximum*, the cow parsnip, from the description that it is sweet when young and small but causes irritated blisters when mature), Usnia (family Parmeliaceae) used as an indicator of good air quality and as a potent antibiotic medicine, ferns and edible fiddleheads, blueberries that could be preserved by drying them into “fruit roll-ups” or mixing them with seal oil, and twisted stalk with watermelon berries (*Streptopus amplexifolius* or tleikw kahínti). She explained that the compounds in roots are known to be stronger than those found in the stalks, and that elders suggested the root cambium of certain plants to treat cancer.

Michelle introduced me to two more Tlingit elders, Leah and Alice, both teachers of the Tlingit language in schools during the school year. Alice attended the summer day camp that I

observed as well. I interviewed the two of them together, and our conversation touched mainly upon their views on and expectations for the Tlingit language. “Language is the base of culture. If you lose the language, you lose your culture,” Leah stated. Both stressed the importance of continuing to conduct interviews and make recordings, because soon enough there will be no one left to ask questions of. They teach pre-school through twelfth grade, trying to bring in Tlingit stories and songs, even translating nursery rhymes. They said that the real hope lies with the youngest children. Some of the teenagers seem to only come to the classes “for the food,” and they feel like they are babysitting, though they will teach anyone they can. Alice said she has a feeling very few of them will ever become fluent speakers of Tlingit, and those who do will have it “botched up.” Those who have learned to speak it, she said, have to take the time to stop and think about what they are going to say next, or they paste together the sentences they have learned out of books. They estimate that only 10% of the population of Tlingit people can speak any Tlingit at all or at least understand it when it is spoken to them, and 5% if that can actually speak it well. The problem with the older generations of learners is that they are afraid of making mistakes. They are reluctant to speak because they are made fun of at home. The youngest students do not seem to mind, “and they’ll even correct you!”

Both Leah and Alice say they do not use Tlingit “as much as they should.” Alice grew up at a time when speaking it was forbidden. Her mother did not allow her to speak it or to spend time with her monolingual grandparents. Although they are some of the only Tlingit experts living in the community, they do not refer to themselves as fluent users of the language. Gary, too, shied away from the word. He says that there are other members in the community that he sometimes must consult about words he does not recognize. “It is a language that is slowly going to get away from us,” he told me. Leah and Alice told me that there are plenty of actually fluent speakers who deny that they can speak the language at all, leading Leah to add, “It must have been very horrific, the punishments,” referring to the things done in the boarding schools to keep

children from speaking. So horrific that even today, as the push to speak and preserve the language is flourishing around them, force of habit instilled in childhood keeps them from uttering a word.

Sealaska (combination of SE [southeast] and Alaska) and many of the Alaska Native Regional Corporations are now attempting to make recordings of the language, and a number of books have been published on the subject of nouns and verbs that Leah has not heard in a long time. “Somebody is digging deep,” she said, again placing value on the need to record. Both Leah and Alice mentioned the way that new words are added to the Tlingit lexicon, something that has been happening more frequently of late. The people doing this work are doing so in collaboration with a number of different elders, though not everyone agrees on the results. Their reaction to the invention of new words was a bit ambiguous. They seemed to speak of it as a necessity, and said that they liked it, though they laughed when they talked about words for “wheelchair,” “typewriter,” “saddle,” and “computer,” (the words for the latter two translate to “horse’s chair” and “smart box” respectively). Leah lamented that the situation of language revitalization allows for a good deal of exploitation. The tribe had received permission to translate *Green Eggs and Ham*, though the high profile nature of the task and its promise to be aired as national news led to so many people wanting to be involved and so much controversy as to how it should be done that the project had to be dropped. In addition, Leah mentioned piracy, in that some people are using other’s materials and publicizing them as their own, or not giving credit to the people they learned from. Some claim to be self-taught, “but no one is self-taught,” Leah said.

Leah herself is an avid user of Facebook, and she uses it to connect with other Indian tribes, but both Leah and Alice stressed that the great extent to which things have changed in the past 50 years is much more negative than it is positive. The way people live has changed, in that they no longer subsist on a traditional diet but rather increasingly consume fast food. Leah

suggested that this was the reason for the high rates of diabetes and obesity. In the past, people went to the grocery store only very infrequently. “Even doctors are saying we should go back to the land for our diet,” Leah told me. Alice told me she is not diabetic because she grew up eating fish, and Leah admitted to thinking that milk was an oddity when she first tasted it. In her childhood, Leah’s gum was spruce sap that had to be processed on the stove and strained, with sugar added on special occasions. “Everything has changed. The living, the language, the people, the customs, the clothes.” Berry-picking locations have been built over by houses, and people complain about the occasional sightings of bears, but Leah says it is because “we’re living in their bedrooms!” Traditional socio-economic strata have eroded away to the point where anyone can wear traditional regalia, regardless of its earlier meanings or appropriate use by certain castes, because “it is pretty.” “It was once a rich culture,” she said, “but it’s all watered down really bad.” Unsure of whether she had answered all my questions, Leah ended by saying, “As a Tlingit people, we tell little stories in between. It’s the norm.”

I observed the summer camp program over the course of three days. Each morning a number of high school-aged teens would arrive and prepare for the day’s activities along with Michelle and some other adults. One of these included a science teacher, Sally, who was very experienced with regard to traditional ecological knowledge. Gary and Alice would come each day as well to work with the elementary-aged students who arrived for the activities. Each day would start off with a song in which the children practiced asking, “Wáa sáa duwasáakw?” (What is your name?) and answering with, “___ yóo xát duwasaakw” (My name is ___). The adults would use Tlingit to greet the students, to say thank you, to reference certain objects, and to intersperse throughout otherwise mostly English speech. I observed the students creating and presenting team chants in Tlingit and singing traditional songs (like the Raven Peace canoeing song, sung with drums). Gary told me, “A lot of these songs were composed before even Mozart and Beethoven were born. All the songs our clan owns. You can use them if you ask permission,

but you almost have to be an in-law of the clan to do it!” In addition, the children went out into the forest of the park to collect spruce tips to make spruce shortbread cookies as well as a salve including beeswax, Devil’s Club, and Usnia.

Many of the details that I included in the chapters before this one match up well with what the Sitka Tribe of Alaska is doing to preserve the language of Tlingit. Many members of the tribe are motivated by the need to jointly preserve their culture and identity along with the language, and much of these have not yet been lost. Gary suggests that raising children with traditional notions of respect for people and nature will keep them out of delinquency. All of the elders I spoke with agree upon the importance of recording and documenting their language in order to have as much of it preserved as possible for the future days when no more fluent elders are around to consult. The Sitka Native Education Program (SNEP) works alongside schools, teaching the language still in many traditional contexts and thereby preserving its authenticity and metafunction as an embodiment of a traditional worldview (Hinton and Ahlers 1999).

In fact, Michelle was leaving her position as a tribal administrator when I visited in 2012 because the job did not allow her to invest as much time in educational and cultural programs as she would have liked. She was moving back to a career with the school district so that she would be able to more fully devote her time to the sorts of things that Gunn et al. (2010) suggest are effective. Michelle mentioned too that a small budget from the school district as well as mini-grants from the State of Alaska help fund the summer camp activities, in accordance with Henze and Davis’ (1999:7) call for support from local as well as state and even national levels. In addition, linguists are working with the community to create new words, although whether it is being done in a way that mimics word production in natural speech is uncertain. With cultural traditions and knowledge that are, though today “watered down,” so vibrant and supported by members of the Sitka Tribe of Alaska, the Tlingit language may survive and continue to grow in

the number of speakers if the people of Sitka can continue to be motivated (and dissuaded from discouragement) to preserve their native language.

Oneida Nation of New York

I travelled to the Oneida Indian Nation in Oneida, NY first in 2011 and again on August 13 and 14 of 2012. There I spoke with two teachers of the Oneida language, Rebecca and Catherine, two students of the language, Rachel and Jacquie, the Director of Education and Cultural Outreach, Terri, and the director of the language program, Tom. Terri gave me some information about the background of the Nation, “so that you can know how we came to be in a state where we have very few speakers.” Oneida people and others amongst the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois Confederacy) had begun to learn English since the first times of contact. During the reservation period, the Oneida were originally given an extensive reservation, but throughout years of land dealings with the State of New York, additional treaties, and sales, the size of the reservation was whittled down to only 32 acres—its current size, the area having been willed back to the Nation upon the death of Chief William Rockwell. In the 1800s, Oneida people moved to Wisconsin and to Ontario, and more recently many moved to the Onondaga Nation whose reservation was much larger. From the mid-1800s through 1960, “Indian children were forcibly taken from their homes. They were placed in boarding schools. Lots of times these schools would be hundreds if not thousands of miles from their home reservations. One thing they could not do was speak their language. If they spoke their language, they would be punished—oftentimes very severely.” Throughout this time, loss of language and culture were “almost a necessity. To survive in this assimilated world, you couldn’t really maintain those

same cultures and languages...It was not a good thing to be Indian.” A lot of Indians tried to “pass” for other ethnicity—Puerto Rican, Hispanic, Italian—anything but Indian. Terri’s mother recalls going to a restaurant that had a sign on display: “No dogs or Indians allowed.”

There are around 1,000 to 1,100 registered members of the Oneida Nation of New York, 15 of which live on reservation land and perhaps 100-150 of which live in the nearby tribe-owned development known as the Village of the White Pines. Some of the Oneida still consider the Reservation to include the land first set aside (“reserved”) for them by under the 1794 Treaty of Canandaigua. Since the only way to disestablish a reservation is by Congress, the ways in which the Oneida have lost land can be seen as perhaps illegal. Over the years, the Oneida Nation has been purchasing (“or reacquiring as we like to call it”) land, especially since the opening in 1993 of the Turning Stone Resort and Casino. At first the local municipality would remove the land from the property tax rolls since the Oneida Nation, as a sovereign nation, does not have to pay taxes to another government. The City of Sherrill refused to do so and began foreclosure proceedings against the Nation, and the ensuing court case made it to the Supreme Court of the United States in the 2005 *City of Sherrill v. Oneida Indian Nation of New York*. The Supreme Court decided in favor of the City of Sherrill, ruling that repurchase of tribal lands did not restore tribal sovereignty to those lands, but it did recommend that the Nation apply to have those lands taken into trust by the federal government—thereby restoring their reservation status. The Department of the Interior recommended that 13,000 of the 17,000 reacquired acres be taken into trust, but in 2012 this had yet to occur.

Terri continued to talk about the Oneida in Canada, saying that since their land is rather isolated, they have been able to maintain their language better, and the 73-year-old fluent speaker who works with the New York Oneida to train its language teachers is from Ontario. Though they speak a different dialect of Oneida, Terri says that, like Wong (1994) recommends, “at this point, we can’t be too choosy about that.” Tom, the director of the language program was able

to give me details about the program functions. Having grown up on the Reservation, his experience with the Oneida language was limited to a few words. But as a retired elementary school teacher, he has the experience with education needed to run the program, which he had been doing for two years. At the very beginning of the program, there were eight students. Only one of them continued to learn the language and began teaching a class of twelve, starting around 2006. Of these twelve, two continued with the language, continuing to work with the native speaker from Canada: these two were Rebecca and Catherine. When they started with the program, it was based on a Berlitz course, and was full immersion. Learners, in addition, were paid a stipend. Rebecca and Catherine worked to reformat the program, eliminating the full immersion aspect and reworking the content as well. When Tom started as director of the program in 2010, his experience as an educator was crucial to Rebecca and Catherine who not only had to keep learning the language, but had also then to learn how to be teachers. Four months before I had arrived, the program had started up again, with four students having successfully completed what Tom called the 101-level course. It was the first week of those students having moved on to the 201-level course while eight new students were enrolled in the 101-level. In addition, the teacher who came from the very first cohort of eight students is teaching children at homes in a family setting. Tom spoke to some first grade teachers who were colleagues of his in order to ask them for materials designed for beginning readers that were then adapted for use in Oneida. Things were going well, but Tom told me they were working in “crisis mode,” since the fluent speaker could only donate one more year of his time. (He stayed in New York, and drove back to Canada every other weekend.) “I tell my students this. You guys are our last battleground.” He has plans to begin videotaping the 201-level class teaching the 101-level class, so there will be archival DVDs as well as video material to be able to distribute to Nation members. He does not expect that all of the advancing 201-level class will become teachers, but since it is the first time there are two levels of the language being taught, there is

hope that the students can at least be unofficial teachers of the language throughout the community. The word “teacher” might be scary, but the idea, he told me, is just sharing what they love: the language.

The students in the program are still paid a stipend, and they range from 18 years of age (the minimum age, since the courses run all day, and would interfere with school) to 72. All are female except for one. Enrollment in the course is contingent upon passing a drug test. Penny, the government programs and services analyst informed me that 88% of the funding for the language program is provided for by the Oneida Indian Nation itself (it owns the Turning Stone Resort and Casino as well as several SavOn™ gas station/convenience stores), and 12% is provided by the Bureau of Indian Affairs under a Self-Determination Education and Assistance Act contract. More than half of the total budget (55%) goes toward the stipends for the language students. Some federal funding also comes through the Administration for Native Americans Native Language Preservation and Maintenance grant program, but these monies are extremely limited. “We are working to develop a comprehensive strategy for revitalizing the Oneida language using both the very oldest and very newest learning methodologies. Having strong leadership support and community engagement in the development and implementation of this long-term strategy will help us to be more competitive in our quest for outside funding and more effective in our use of Nation funds,” Penny wrote to me³.

In the long-term, Tom is interested in starting a charter school for children. If he had the fluent speakers to do it, which he is working on having trained (the three teachers now, along with their students who will advance in the language), the goal is to start with a pre-school, then move to a kindergarten, first grade, et cetera. Someday, it could become a full immersion program. So far, he has visited the Cherokee Nation, the Seminoles in Florida, and the Ojibwe in Wisconsin to see how their immersion schools function and perform. First though would be to

³ Dated August 22, 2012

have a charter school where Oneida is the subject of the day, taught alongside content material in English. Parents would have to trust the school's ability to provide a solid, complete, and competitive education enough to allow their children to enroll, of course. Like Wong (1999) mentions, a lot must happen linguistically, and students taught subject-specific vocabulary in a non-English language may have trouble being successful in non-Native enterprises. But if the immersion schools in other Indian Nations are experiencing success, then this ought to speak for itself. In any case, Oneida immersion schools, though the ultimate goal, are a long way off, with Tom having predicted that the required fluency of teachers can be achieved at the earliest within the next 10 years. "Because we're so short on time, we don't want to make the wrong decision of which way to go. We want to make the right decision and pour all of our efforts into that."

Rebecca, who teaches the 101-level students, was herself a student beginning in 2006. "It was a two-year program, so I was full-time, 40 hours a week, for two solid years, learning *nothing but Oneida*. Full immersion...Very, very intense." Always asking why and learning more, she thoroughly enjoyed learning her language. The Berlitz program that her classes were based upon classifies languages as A-list and B-list for the more difficult. It has been suggested, partially in jest, that Oneida belongs to a C-list. Though extremely difficult, "If you can catch a clue of the word, it might take you a minute, but you could then be able to change it to who you're talking about or change the tense of the word." In the Oneida language (onayota'a:ká), "Our words tell a story. So it could be, for us, one word, but it could mean a whole sentence...All that is happening in one word." As a teacher, she tries to simplify it and start small so that her students do not feel intimidated.

As an adult in the full immersion program, she did not like it. It took her awhile to understand things, since she did not have any prior knowledge of the language; though even those who did, she told me, struggled just as much as she. For an adult in full immersion, "Your mind wanders. You're constantly guessing...well, are they saying this? Do they mean this? Is it this?"

And then you're lost." She and Catherine, when they teach, say the Oneida word and immediately translate so that there is no guessing. A week later, she begins to take away the English translation. Slowly, the English is worked out of the classroom until eventually the program will become full immersion. "You don't want to scare them [the students] that first week. I mean we're still teaching them Oneida. We still want them to speak. We're just taking the edge off."

In 2009, she returned to the language, working with Catherine to become an instructor. She had no previous teaching experience, but did recall the difficulty and intensity of the immersion program. She worked with Catherine to emphasize the parts of the language that they felt were important, and to plan to get their students to the point where they would be able to speak it with their family and friends—trying to promote casual, everyday conversation. "We tell them—if you know one word, then use it!" When one signs up for the class, she said, "You better have that drive and that desire to learn!" One must be a member of the Oneida Nation to take the class, and she has eight students. Space is one limiting factor, but she cannot imagine teaching more than ten students. Because she is teaching for fluency, and trying to revive her language, she must ensure that every single student is grasping the content. "Regular classes you can go with the middle and just move on, but if you still have three over here that aren't getting it, you know? You don't want to leave them behind." The students are expected to work so that they can actually use the language, not just get a good grade. She is a dedicated teacher, and while her students have Fridays off, she takes that day to plan for the next week, and to work with the native speaker to improve her own fluency. He sits in on her and Catherine's classes to provide expertise knowledge on the spot when necessary.

Her methods, from a World Languages Education perspective are very sound. Class runs at hour intervals, beginning on the hour and ending after 45 minutes so that they students have a 15-minute break. She starts off each day with a 30-minute "bellringer" to key her students into

the content of the lesson. As for activities, “It’s like they’re back in kindergarten. They can use magazines, markers, little flashcards... You want it to be fun, because you want them to come back.” In other words she differentiates instruction for auditory, visual, and kinesthetic learners to keep her students engaged and motivated. As for the future, if people really take an interest in learning it, she thinks that, though maybe not in her lifetime, Oneida may be spoken fluently again.

Catherine, the second teacher I interviewed, had known nothing of the language growing up. Her mother was Oneida and her father was Onondaga, so she spent time on the Onondaga Reservation. Her mother had grown up hearing her own mother and grandmother speak it, but it was a way to talk about the children so that they could not understand what was being said. In 2006, Catherine started taking the immersion language class, and was so passionate about the language that she did all kinds of independent research. She followed through and now teaches the newest 201-level class four days a week. The students come in at 8:30 AM, and instruction begins at 9 AM. Like Rebecca, she puts up a bellringer on the board “to get their wheels rolling.” She starts off with the weather and the date, some review of the previous day, and moves into the new material. Every 45 minutes comes a 15-minute break until 4 PM.

Her own daughter is in the Youth Work/Learn (teen internship) Program and is taught 45 minutes of the Oneida language each day through that program. Catherine is trying to get her to realize how important the language is, because her two younger children at home are soaking up all the Oneida they can (in addition to Portuguese). She hopes by the time they grown, they will not have to take Oneida in school—they will already be semi-fluent! In this vein, she told me that the program is trying to target those families with children (like Rachel, below, and her five daughters) so they can go home and continue teach it there, reestablishing parent-to-child intergenerational transmission. Catherine also strives to make her lessons and material hands-on, teaching vocabulary pertinent to cooking, household, etc.

She told me that most of her students have a passion for the language and really want to bring it back. They are inquisitive and always want to know the details behind the information. For them, it seems, the stipend they receive is simply an extra benefit. Originally wanting to be an accountant, she, like Rebecca, had no previous teaching experience. She told me that it was particularly important for her to do this now, while there was still a fluent speaker for her to work with. She was a student from 2006 to 2008, took a year off, and spent the next three years working with Rebecca and the fluent speaker. Like many who were involved, Catherine told me she thought that the Berlitz immersion program did not work very well. Her conversational style of teaching is indeed progressively switching from English to immersion Oneida, but she had to adjust their techniques if she wanted a successful program. The Berlitz program was structured for use in travelling to another country, and does not seem to have followed the advice of Hinton and Ahlers (1999) for the creation of vocabulary or the focus on traditional uses of language. She says that it was really quite strange hearing phrases for talking about airplanes, renting hotel rooms, and calling cabs. It was completely irrelevant too, because there are not many airports near Oneida, NY, nor would Oneida be of any use in an American airport in 2012. “Airplane itself is easy. But trying to ask when does it land and stuff gets harder. Airplane itself is teka:tá. And we’re really descriptive. It means ‘it flies’ and that’s how our words work. Things that describe, you know, a table will be “food sits upon it.” And the words are like this long [she indicates with her hands], but it’s a whole description in one word. It makes it beautiful.” She told me that for her students, she stresses the rises, drags, and falls in the words. It makes the language sound like a song to her, and is beautiful.

She would like to see more staff in the program as soon as possible. She and Rebecca both have families, so that cannot expand the program much further on their own. More instructors and staff would create the possibility of expansion, especially night and weekend classes. As soon as the 101 and 102 classes move up, there will be room again for a 101-level,

and ideally there would be a teacher for that level as well. A lot of thought is being given to structuring interaction time between the 201-soon-to-be-301 students and the soon-to-be-incoming 101 students. Everything would be made easier if the language program could acquire its own building. Like, Tom, in the long-term, she would like to see a school for teaching Oneida. Members could get degrees in education to be able to teach actual course content in their own language. Catherine thinks that, even after she retires, she will still be involved in the teaching. She would be willing to come back to teach if she were needed. But her hope is that, eventually, the Nation will not need to teach Oneida in a classroom setting.

Rachel, a 201-level student, was extremely avid about the language program. Five years prior to the time we had spoken, Rachel had taken part in a part-time language course, but could not continue with the program. For those five years, she called constantly, asking when another program would begin again, and when she heard that the language was being offered again, she actually withdrew from her second semester of an associate's degree program in college to be able to learn it. Because it is a dying language, and *her* language, she was comfortable with putting her ultimate goals aside for the time being. She said to herself at the time she had heard about the opportunity, "Look, the language is coming around. I think the Creator is trying to tell me something. I've got to walk away from school." At home she has five daughters, with whom she constantly speaks as much of the language as she is able to. And in a matrilineal society where descent is traced through the mother's line (like in the Oneida and other Haudenosaunee peoples), this is an especially meaningful statistic. She considers her work with the language to be extremely important, because she is helping to preserve it. The grim statistics of dying languages sadden her, and she knows it gives the elders peace to hear the language being spoken around them. Rachel told me that she uses the Oneida language outside of class as much as she can as well—with elders, and even with other tribes. She also encourages everyone she can to apply for the next language class. She told me that she "lives, sleeps, and breathes the language,"

going through word forms even as she is falling asleep at night. “Because if we don’t fight for it, no one else is. We have to fight for it. Because it was given to us. It was gift.”

Rachel spoke very well of the fact that the original Berlitz-type program was reworked to include everyday phrases that can be used in the household and community—“table talk.” It is more hands-on and immediately relevant. Shorter, simpler phrases add up over time and English translations slowly disappear until the course will be taught immersion-style, rather than just throwing adults into a completely foreign language environment. She also greatly praised her teacher Catherine, who makes sure to teach the “behind-the-scenes” aspects of the language. She is taught why the words do what they do in order that she may later begin to recognize the patterns on her own. She said many times how helpful it was that Catherine knows to slow down when she sees her students are not able to understand something. Instead of the competitive atmosphere of any other kind of classroom, the class of Oneida students, all of whom have the common goal of reviving their own language, work rather more like a family, supporting and reinforcing each other.

“I hope 20 years from now, we don’t have to sit in a classroom,” she told me. “We can go out into the community, and jump on the porch and have a cup of coffee to have a conversation. And use English.” In an ideal world, they could use both because they would be perfectly fluent in both. Referring to the Mohawk school in Canada which is a full-immersion program, her goal is to someday see Oneida children who have been learning the language “since they were in diapers.” Teaching it to the children and making them realize how important it is to preserve is crucial for her. They will want to learn it too, and then Fishman’s (1991, 1996) all-important intergenerational transmission will be re-established. Through using it at home and following up each phrase she uses with English, even her husband, a member of the Mohawk Nation, can understand what she says. If she asks for something, he can bring it to her. To continue a goal like this, she hopes someday that the Nation will be able to offer night and

weekend classes for members with full-time jobs and families who otherwise have no time. She would like to see it extend to the day-care, and to the Youth Work/Learn Program. She hopes that she and her current classmates can perfect what they know to someday be able to carry on the teaching. “Yes, we know our culture,” she told me. “Yes, we know our heritage. But without the language... That’s what goes on! That’s what is documented in books.”

Jacquie is another student in the language program. She’s an elder in the Nation, and she was able to jump at the opportunity. Though an elder, it is the first time in her life that she was able to do so. Jacquie is an artist and storyteller and teaches at the Nation as a storyteller and a lecture-giver on Oneida culture and history at the Cultural Center. Never having learned much about Oneida culture growing up, she learned by being at the Cultural Center, reading, taking Native American culture courses at university, training in Museum Studies at the Smithsonian, and listening to what people had to say. Deep down, she said, she was always interested, but she never had the opportunity. After she retired from her work in a hospital is when she says her life began. She came to the Nation and started as a Family Advocate, and then moved to the Shako:wi Cultural Center. In 2007, she finally fulfilled her dream by receiving a BFA in 2007, and now another dream of hers, that of learning her language, is coming true as well. “It’s like I came alive after I decided to work for the Nation.”

When she was growing up, her mother was a fluent speaker of Oneida. Her aunts and uncles would speak it with her mother, and the children would either be playing outside or asked to leave. It was a private time for them to enjoy the language. They refused to pass their language on to their children, and Jacquie only picked up a few words here and there. She did not think very much about the fact that she could not speak it. Nor was she interested in learning, because her mother never encouraged her to be. She told me she is sure that if her mother had put any emphasis on it, she would have learned it with her. But her mother had reasons for not passing the language on, which Jacquie thinks had much to do with the boarding schools. Natives

were severely punished if they spoke their own language, and there must always have been something at the back of her mother's mind that her daughter might be taken away if she spoke Oneida with her.

Oneida was her mother's first language. In fact, when she started school, she spoke no English. When Jacquie sees pictures of her mother as a child, she remarks at how odd it is to see her mother dressed in non-Native clothing, yet still unable to speak English. Growing up, there weren't that many Natives around, and her mother's goal was to teach her to survive. The main goal was to have Jacquie graduate from high school, and to do that, her mother had to forget about passing on traditional culture in favor encouraging survival in the non-Native world. "She never dreamed in a million years that what's happening to the Oneidas now would happen...If she only knew now!" Today, as she is learning it, she feels it is part of a tribute to her mother.

One of the reasons for Jacquie's passion about the language, she told me, is that she believes the Creator gave the Oneidas their language. Thus, she feels extremely honored to be able to learn the language—her language—for the first time in her life. Anyone who has the opportunity to learn it should, she said. Even if they learn one word, that is something. Just like anything else, it cannot be learned all at once. She compared it to a puzzle that must be pieced together. Just like with a painting, "It has to look really bad before it starts looking good!" I found it inspiring to see her, as an elder, still learning and making progress—in a world where folk wisdom tells us there is a certain age after which that very such thing becomes impossible.

Jacquie, a student of Rebecca, enjoys the program itself for its intensity but also for Rebecca's ability to incorporate fun. Through cutting out pictures and other crafts, she says she sometimes feels like a "baby with baby-talk," but it does not bother her. The fifteen-minute breaks give students time to rest and to review in any way they would like. Jacquie also has opportunity to use the language outside the classroom, even on people who do not speak the language—some Oneida and some not! Should anyone be offended, she would tell him or her

she was using her language. She has given a lot of thought, because she is a teacher, to being one of the people who teaches the language. She looks at the language as art, which is the subject that she teaches. She would also like to incorporate the language into her storytelling. At the time of our interview, she felt she could start right away, because she could introduce herself. “I think when an Oneida introduces themselves in Oneida, the audience really looks at them like they’re Oneida. It’s sometimes a difficult chore to convince people that you’re an Oneida. But if you speak it, right then, right on that spot, people believe you’re an Oneida.” “That’s one of the first questions,” she said. “They ask, ‘Are you Oneida?’ or ‘Are you Indian?’ And I say yes. And they say, ‘Well do you know your language?’” When she uses Oneida with people who cannot speak it, she said, she sees a lot interest. Even when she tells non-Natives about the class, they want to take it and are willing to pay to do so. It is hard for her to understand, she said, but particularly as they are just starting out with the program, it is important for them to first keep it within the community. Someday, maybe it can be expanded—offered, for example, in the employee day care center. Then even non-Native children will be able to learn it, and it could begin to be used conversationally.

As a long-term goal, she, like Terri, would like to see something available on computers, so the people who have to work or who are in school can have the opportunity to learn it at their own speed. In the short-term, she is happy to continue what is happening right now—getting the language out there, and giving the opportunity for the Oneida people to learn their language. For now, even getting enough of the language out for people to begin greeting each other in it is a link to their identity. She began to tell me about the Oneida vowel system, with rises, drags, and falls. “See?” she said, “I’ve got your interest already!” Her own personal goal, in this vein, is to share as much of the language as she can. Starting to use it to tell stories and to say prayers before she eats will all help get her to the point where she can be inspired by the language to paint. Now when she paints, she thinks in English; but even just thinking of the colors in Oneida, she said,

would be a start. “To me, when I hear it spoken, it’s like a body of water. And there’s just waves going across. It’s not choppy. It’s very well spoken and it’s a beautiful language.”

The Oneida are extremely fortunate in that their Nation takes in a large amount of revenue from lucrative business enterprises, which they can then use to put towards language initiatives. Their reservation is rather small, however, and there are no fluent speakers that live in New York. But as long as interest in the revival of the Oneida language continues—particularly if it continues to increase, and as long as other fluent speakers of the language from other reservations are willing to donate their time to bolster the revitalization efforts, the Oneida language may begin to thrive again in New York. Rachel was one of the most enthusiastic and devoted language students I have ever spoken with. The fact that she has many children at home, with whom she uses the language regularly, is an early indication of successful revitalization.

Ojibwe in Minnesota

I travelled to Minnesota on August 21, 2012 in order to speak with two Ojibwe men working on language preservation. John was a Ph.D. student in Linguistics at the University of Minnesota at the time of our speaking. He was born and raised on the Lac Courte Oreilles Reservation in Wisconsin. Richard is an elder who grew up in Ponemah on the Red Lake Reservation in Minnesota. There are six Reservations in Wisconsin (Bad River, Lac Courte Oreilles, Lac du Flambeau, Red Cliff, Mole Lake, St. Croix); seven in Minnesota (Bois Forte, Fond du Lac, Grand Portage, Leech Lake, Mille Lacs, White Earth, and Red Lake), with over 50,000 Ojibwe people living on them (Treuer 2010); seven in Michigan (Bay Mills, Grand Traverse, Isabella, L’Anse, Lac Vieux Desert, Ontonagon, Sault Ste. Marie); and many more in Canada. There are still more than 56,000 native speakers of Ojibwemowin (the Ojibwe language) today, one fifth of whom live in the United States, with the rest in Canada (Treuer 2010).

I met with John and Richard at the Red Lake Reservation, about five hours north of Minneapolis. John spent time growing up with his grandmother, a fluent Ojibwemowin speaker. “I inherited the responsibility of learning Ojibwe and making sure we pass it on to our kids. So, I’m very, very busy making sure we’re doing that.” He told me he learned Ojibwemowin through hard work. “Anybody that did it [learned Ojibwemowin] worked pretty hard.” He took grammar classes, but the way he really excelled with the language was through recording elders, transcribing stories, and listening to people talk. “Sitting with guys like Richard, asking him how to say things, and trying to get the humor. You know, when our elders get together, they’re always laughing. They’re always joking around. So that’s something that I try to learn about. It’s hard work you know.” John’s mother never learned Ojibwemowin, though her mother spoke it fluently. His mother understands more than she admits, he said, “but there was a long history there. That’s a whole other issue,” he said, referring to the sorts of things that went on to keep Native peoples from using their languages.

Ojibwemowin itself is an Algonquian language, one of the widest spread language families in North America. “Depending on how you figure your numbers would determine how many speakers there are,” he responded when I asked about numbers of speakers. “And it depends on what you would consider a speaker.” Familiarity ranges from knowing a few words to communities of entirely monolingual speakers in Severn Ojibwe Country past Sioux Lookout, Ontario. There are numerous bands and reservations spread quite widely throughout the northern United States and southern Canada, and because each one has sovereign status with its own government, each is different. Even their names differ. In the more eastern areas, they are known in federal capacity as Chippewa, a mispronunciation of “Ojibwe.” In Ontario, they are known as Ottawa or Odawa, though none of these is what they use to identify themselves. They use Anishinaabe, meaning ‘native people’ in Ojibwemowin (or Anishinaabemowin), their language.

On John's Reservation, Lac Courte Oreilles, there are approximately 5,000 people living on reservation land, with 3,000 to 4,000 people in the surrounding area. A few thousand others with Lac Courte Oreilles heritage are spread throughout the United States, especially in pockets in what John called "relocation cities." These were the places that Native Americans moved to under encouragement by the 1956 Indian Relocation Act—one additional push by the US government to encourage assimilation and the abandonment of traditional language and culture. In fact, he mentioned 1978 American Indian Religious Freedom Act by Congress as the first time that American Indian ceremonies and religious practices were made legal, or at least protected. His was the first generation for whom it was not shameful to participate in and learn about traditional religion. Lac Courte Oreilles has considerably fewer speakers than Red Lake where the interview took place. In fact Ponemah on the Red Lake Reservation, where Richard was born, has more speakers than any other community in the US. Therefore, John and others in Lac Courte Oreilles are working hard to preserve Ojibwemowin. They have realized that the language is disappearing, which is not such an urgent concern in some of the Canadian reservations. In Severn Ojibwe Country, a lot of communities are just now getting TV and Internet. John warned that "they're going to be dealing with the same issues [as we are dealing with] if they don't become aware of it now." As it stands, there are a lot of Canadians that help out at language functions in the US, as well as with the dictionary and language documentation. "We don't discriminate by the invisible lines in the sand," John told me, referring to the country borders.

He described Ojibwemowin as "very endangered," but did not let it end at that. "We're almost turning the corner as far as younger people go. We have kids engaged in Ojibwe now in different immersion schools and settings and small family groups. So, there's hope." Ojibwe can be taken for credit at the University of Minnesota, as well as many other universities in the United States and Canada that are located in proximity to Indian Reservations. Lac Courte Oreilles

actually has a Pre-K through fifth grade immersion school, a K-12 tribal school, a Head Start program, and a tribal community college. “They are all institutions controlled by the tribe. So there’s a big effort to revitalize Ojibwe in the community. And the immersion school is kind of like the pioneers. They’ve been in operation over ten years now. So, it’s a pretty strong program.” Students in the immersion school begin at age three, and have two years of pre-school. Throughout the two years, they are weaned off of English so that Kindergarten through fifth grade are entirely Ojibwemowin immersion. “So math, science, reading. Kids learn to read and write Ojibwe before they learn to read and write English.” Elders have a very strong role in the school, overseeing younger teachers. They are always being corrected and guided to the right vocabulary and forms of words. The school though, is very small. Only 35-40 students total are enrolled throughout all of the eight age grades. Because of this, third, fourth, and fifth grades are in one classroom, as are first and second grades. Kindergarten has a separate classroom as does the pre-school (both years in one room).

The only thing holding back the goal of adding a grade every year such the students never have to leave the immersion school is the lack of teachers certified by the state of Wisconsin. A teacher must be 1) certified to teach 2) fluent in Ojibwe *and* 3) able to teach specific content area material with a specific set of vocabulary. “The farther we go with grades, they more work we need to do with elders for words.” Wong (1999) of course comments on the idea that adapting a language to something like Algebra can be problematic for the integrity of a language as well as for the marketability of the students learning the content material in a non-English language. From the other side, the possibility of doing this is clearly not something that is easily achieved. It takes a great deal of training and effort. With such large populations and reservations, it is quite possible that Ojibwe students could lead fully successful lives using only Ojibwemowin—something that smaller tribes may not be able to manage—so immersion schools for the Ojibwe, if they can achieve the requisite teacher training, seem to be quite feasible. At the K-12 tribal

school, where the majority of the Reservation students go, Ojibwemowin is taught every year, but not as an immersion program. “I would say it’s not very effective,” John said. “I mean it’s something. Something’s better than nothing, but it’s not what it could be.”

John told me that the immersion school is a charter school funded completely by grants from all over. A lot of work goes into the grant application writing process. They apply to multiple private, federal, and state sources. The K-12 tribal school is a BIA school, funded by the federal government. Just like with each different Reservation and tribe/band of the Ojibwe, each school has a different story. As for the Ojibwemowin offered at the University of Minnesota, it has been taught since at least since the 1980s. One of the professors is from Canada and speaks a little differently than local speakers, though other professors teach as well. Some of the more advanced levels, in fact are taught by Minnesota locals, and there are certainly still some fluent speakers that live in Minneapolis.

In addition to the schools’ language programs, there are a lot of different summer camps that take place throughout Minnesota and Wisconsin. Many of them are immersion camps. Font du Lac in Wisconsin runs quite a sizable program. “I think just about every Reservation has some sort of language initiative going on,” John told me, saying that a lot of them are open to the public in addition to being free. They are attended predominantly by tribal members, but other interested people come from time to time as well.

John speaks Ojibwemowin at home and helps with community efforts to increase the use of Ojibwemowin, and as a Ph.D. student is extremely involved in the documentation of the language. He mentioned John Nichols, who wrote a very important and extensive dictionary published in 1995. Though not “standard” or accepted by all tribe members, it is by far the most commonly used and popular text available. Nichols is about to retire, and “there are a bunch of us young guys who are trying to pick up the skills.” John wants to finish up his own classes first, but his goal is eventually to teach Ojibwemowin at a university level and continue to remain tied

to various Ojibwe communities as a linguist. “It’s a huge language. There are thousands and thousands and thousands of words. Every time we hear Eugene talk, we hear a word we never heard before.” Ojibwemowin uses the Latin alphabet with a double vowel system. There are no diacritics, slashes, or dashes.

Richard, an elder from the Red Lake Reservation, politely declined to be recorded by me. He works with John on recording the language for preservation purposes, but as I was a stranger meeting him for the first time and perhaps never to see him again, he justifiably preferred that I take written notes instead. When I walked into the hotel room at the casino where the interview was to take place, and which Richard and John were using to conduct a recording session (which they graciously allowed me to interrupt for a few hours), Richard greeted me with “Boozhoo,” hello. He told me that he was raised by fluent Ojibwemowin speakers, and that he regrets not having taught the language more consistently to his children. He speaks Ojibwe fluently, though his wife often corrects him on the way he says certain things—even though they grew up only five miles apart in Ponemah. There is a lot of work to do with the language, he said, and it will be hard because people occupy themselves with drugs and alcohol. Richard himself works in close collaboration with John and some other linguists to preserve Ojibwemowin.

Richard gave me a wealth of information on Ojibwe beliefs as well, beginning by placing emphasis on listening to the Great Spirit. Clan identity is passed along the paternal line, and if one’s father is anything besides Indian, he belongs to the Eagle clan. In Canada and the easternmost areas of the US, most people are of the Bear clan, which Richard told me was because they were the hunter and warrior societies. When growing up, elders warned him against being recorded and against trusting white men. Given what many of the people I interviewed told me about past federal-tribal relationships, I cannot blame them for advising such things. Richard also shared with me a creation story, which I was able to write down in only minimal detail. It

involved six human-like beings coming out of the Atlantic. One of the six had a veil covering his face. They came upon some Indians on the shore, who told the veiled one never to lift his veil. He became curious though, and lifted it. The Indian man he was looking at dropped dead on the spot, so the other five beings made him return to the salt water. The five remaining became the groups of clans. Richard is a respected Midewin elder, and told me that one cannot teach this secret medicine. Everything he knows about it now, he learned from experience and from applying what he had listened to from other elders.

The fact that there are still communities of monolingual speakers of Ojibwemowin in Canada is promising. It means that there will likely be plenty of opportunities to work with fluent speakers. However the community decisions that Hinton and Ahlers (1999) emphasize will be harder to make with such a geographically wide spread of speakers. The natural production of new vocabulary of which Hinton and Ahlers suggest safe methods and against inauthentic and rapid methods of which Wong (1999) warns may not be so much of an issue in the more monolingual Ojibwe communities. As native speakers of the language come across new technology for which words must be created, their words—from the minds of people who have no other language to go off of—may be the most valuable to the rest of the community. With this in mind, and if people like John continue to work on documentation and preservation with the surviving elders, Ojibwemowin has a very good chance of surviving.

Dakota in Minnesota

While in Minnesota in 2012 speaking with John and Richard about Ojibwe, I was also able to meet with Zach, who teaches the Dakota language at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis and St. Paul. He is very avid about the revitalization of the Dakota language, especially in Minnesota. “I’m Mdewakantonwan (Bdewákhathurwan) Dakota,” he told me,

“which some have translated ‘Dwellers of the Spirit Lake.’ It’s referring to Mille Lacs, so that’s where my group originally was and then we moved south. And then in 1862, we went to war with the United States. And actually, this is the year of the sesquicentennial, so we’re talking a lot about how the effects of that still affect us today. And one of those is language. Because the United States perpetrated genocide on the Dakota People and ethnically cleansed us from Minnesota. So, to this day, currently, there are four Dakota communities [Prairie Island, Shakopee, Upper Sioux, and Lower Sioux]. There are actually five—there’s an unofficial fifth one [Mendota] that is not federally recognized, not too far south from here. But amongst the four federally recognized, there are about six speakers left. And this is our homeland! In our creation story, where the airport is now, that’s where we came from. So we’re the only ones who can claim to be here.” Now there are Dakota speakers in Canada, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska, and those areas have far greater numbers of speakers. But in the Dakota homeland, there are only six who grew up with the language (out of an estimated 10,000 Dakota people in Minnesota). A number of speakers moved to Minnesota from other areas (including one man from Sioux Valley in Canada who says he “has come back home”), and when these are counted amongst Dakota *and* Lakota native speakers, the number is still shockingly low: only around 20.

Zach began learning Dakota when he was 25, and began working at the University of Minnesota, which in 2012 when we spoke he had been doing for 12 years, when he was 30. There was a curriculum in place that he had completed as a student, but he realized that it needed to be enhanced. “I was taking German and Dakota at the same time. And I saw that after a year of German, I knew far more German than I did after two years of Dakota.” He was able to condense first and second year Dakota curricula into one year, and could then focus on conversational topics in the second year curriculum. Since then, a number of courses have been added. There is a third year Dakota language course, a class on Dakota linguistics, a class on Dakota language for teachers, and another called “Dakota language for the classroom and

community.” The need for these last two courses arose when it was observed that students were completing the first and second year language courses and subsequently going on to teach, though they had had no teacher preparation besides their language coursework. The number of teachers of Dakota is growing, which is very good news and amazing to see. When he started in 2000, Zach said that there were two or three other teachers, all of whom were speakers. Almost everyone else teaching now came through the program at the university, amounting to a total of about fifteen who came through the university program and went on to teach. Now, a semester at the university can cost about \$1,200. If someone comes up to Zach or his colleagues and offers them some tobacco (a traditional gift item), asking if he or she can take the language course, they tell them: if you will do all the work, then yes. It is not fair to the other students taking out loans to be in school if such a student only comes when he or she feels like it.

Besides the University of Minnesota, there are in the rest of the state two once-per-week Dakota “language tables” that are free and open to the community—Native and non-Native, young and old alike. Sometimes, they are even potluck-style. They are language courses that teach conjugation, vocabulary, pronunciation, orthography, et cetera set up so that one can come in at any time. Most teachers are volunteers, but some are paid a small amount per class through a fund set up by a family in the name of their son, a lover of the Dakota language. Sometimes the Mendota Dakota Community also has once-per-week Dakota programs. There is an organization called Dakota Wiçohaŋ (DW) that does a lot of work with the native speakers that are still living in Minnesota, recording and video-taping them. They have instituted a Master-Apprentice program, precisely like that mentioned by Hinton and Ahlers (1999), in which four apprentices had been paired with master speakers to increase fluency, and improve pronunciation and vocabulary. The aim is to help them sound Dakota when they speak, rather than letting them maintain an American accent.

The Dakota language is also taught at Yellow Medicine East High School, the local school near the Upper Sioux Indian Reservation. An amazing elder, who used to teach at the university, in 2012 about to be 83, teaches at the high school and also offers community courses. “When we see people like her, we know we will never be able to retire. That’s something to think about in language revitalization is that we will never *ever* be able to retire. Because it took quite a few generations for our languages to get into this mess, it’s going to take quite a few to get out.” Zach and the university had been collaborating to produce instructional TV broadcasts with them so that the high school students could connect with university students. Now there are ways to connect via the Internet so people far removed can take the courses from where they live. A lot is going on in the Twin Cities as well, with the language being taught K-12 in St. Paul. Many of these schools in the city are funded through the federal Bureau of Indian Education, a division of the Department of the Interior. The program consists of a K-6 magnet school, a middle school, and a high school where Dakota is taught as a foreign language credit, with large amounts of culture included in the curriculum. There is in Minneapolis also a pre-school immersion program for Dakota and Ojibwe. This school is not entirely immersion, however, and the reason is simply the challenge of working within the public school system. “There are some people who first off don’t get why we need our languages to live on. And there are some people that are really challenged by the concept of using the language as a medium to pass on [content] knowledge.” Opponents see it more as a language class, rather than a class that uses Dakota language as its instructional medium. Before taking immersion-type courses himself, Zach told me, “I thought immersion was if you conduct the class in the language. But that’s just really good language classes. It’s taking the content areas, you know—math, science, history, whatever—and teaching those through the language. So in a way you’re teaching the language, but you’re really teaching *through* the language.”

Zach told me that, when he teaches, his focus is really producing speakers—speakers at all levels. “I don’t like to say I teach language. I say I produce speakers.” One of the things that is very important for people to know, according to Zach, is that there are far more second language learners of Dakota in Minnesota than there are first speakers. “And we have to do something about that. We have to make ensure what we teach is Dakota, which is challenging within a colonial institution. Because you can’t indigenize a colonial institution.” The Ojibwe program at the university always has good enrollment. This is not the case with Dakota. He and his colleagues constantly have to justify why they must keep the classes at the university. There have been a few times that, because of the numbers, the classes have been at risk of cancellation.

There are in Minnesota only about twenty people, in addition to the twenty native speakers (the number that includes Lakota, which is a Siouan dialect mutually intelligible to speakers of Dakota), who can speak the language well enough to teach. Many of them work with programming at the Concordia Language Villages, an institution that has been around for fifty years. These are not “villages” where people live, but rather seasonal camp programs, where participants stay in lodges and dorms with classrooms beneath them. The Villages used to feature mostly European Languages, but now include Korean and Japanese. Officially, fifteen languages are represented, but unofficially the Dakota have begun working with them. And that is challenging because the goal at these camps is to stay in the language. The primary focus of the Dakota language efforts at the Concordia Language Villages is the intergenerational weekends, where families—most of whom have never been around the language—come out to spend Friday evening through Sunday morning doing activities in the language. A small English zone is set up, and otherwise there are very few times when English is allowed to be spoken. They learn basic phrases, and instruction is set up in such a way that they can understand stories (accompanied by gestures and actions) told in the language. They play games and engage in traditional activities like animal tracking and tipi building, as well as attend discussions on history, the importance of

the bison to Dakota people, et cetera. The program staff really try to engage them in Dakota at mealtimes, asking them to describe what they are eating and drinking.

One challenge of revitalization that Zach mentioned was the almost twenty different orthographies variously used to write the Dakota language, “which is really annoying. It doesn’t have to be standard, but all of us should be using a consistent orthography.” “When I give a student a text, they shouldn’t have to guess what it sounds like. The ones who are opposed to it are all [native] speakers. So they read it and already know what it sounds like, but for second language learners...” They have to decide if a sound is aspirated or nasalized or anything along those lines. Zach and his colleagues use a consistent orthography at the University, and there is the Lakota Language Consortium that uses a consistent orthography. In the upper level classes, Zach teaches the different dialects and orthographies, because he wants his students to be able to take any materials and teach with them. In fact, he has seen materials written in all capital letters with no diacritical markings at all—quite a difficult set of materials to adapt for instruction. He thinks that the number will be chiseled down to a few consistent orthographies, but he is against standardization. The Lakota language has a few sounds that Dakota does not have, and so consistency rather than standardization is the main goal. The Lakota Language Consortium is trying to push their orthography to become the standard. Even with that, though, some do not like that they spell *k* as *kh*. Zach referred to all of this as “orthography wars.”

Another challenge of revitalization, Zach mentioned, is that there are many programs that teach the language, but few produce proficient or even conversational speakers. Many are the “animals-colors-numbers curricula.” That is, they teach basic vocabulary and then stop there. The native speakers that are left learned to speak Dakota from birth—their parents were speakers, and so they used it in the home. The current situation in Minnesota does not allow that. Zach wanted to raise his children in Dakota, but his wife at the time, who was non-Indian, did not feel comfortable with the idea, and they ended up raising their sons bilingually. Zach told me he can

see the difference between his children, who learned Dakota in the home, and those who learned it at school. “It isn’t as difficult [to raise children bilingually] as people think it is.” The challenge was that they knew he spoke English, so many times they would answer his Dakota in English.

Only about half of the teachers and half of the university students are themselves Dakota, and most of the students who do well in the university courses are non-Indian. Many of the Dakota students feel bad that they didn’t grow up with the language, or are frustrated thinking they should already know it. Some come from single-parent households, are non-traditional students, are older and have full-time jobs, or just do not do the work. Many of these frustration factors seem to parallel what Henze and Davis (1999:8) warn about in terms of teaching in programs that operate within the dominant societal structure of education. The language is being taught in inauthentic, non-Native ways. Non-Native students are succeeding, while Native students can struggle, becoming even more frustrated when they see non-Native students outperforming them at their own language. “I should be getting this. I mean, I am Dakota!” Zach told me the mindset sometimes goes. While this sounds a bit like the “genetic fallacy” mentioned by Rindstedt and Aronsson (2002), Zach told me he really does believe “the idea that we are born with the language and the culture. It’s up to us to pull that out.” Zach also struggles trying to reconcile indigenous versus western pedagogy. Elders tell him to avoid using books, writing, dictionaries (all less authentic means of instruction), but current World Language Education research states that these methods are extremely effective in second language acquisition. He must respect the elders *and* still teach effectively.

Zach encourages his students to use the language outside of the classroom. “This is Dakota Territory, and it’s the language that ties us to the land. If you’re going out—even to the grocery store—say what you need to in Dakota and then say it in English. And you know what? Don’t feel weird about it, because this is Dakota Land, and you should be able to use it in every

context.” He is trying to push the students to use the language to facilitate communication, producing speakers rather than just teaching the language. “And you know, we get flack from the community. People who ask, ‘Why are you getting paid for that?’ And, ‘You shouldn’t be doing that. You didn’t grow up with the language.’ If somebody can come in and say they can do my job better, I’d step aside. Because I want my language to live on. There are a lot of critics, but you know, we’re doing the best job we can. And to criticize us? You’re seeing a need to be filled? Then you need to come help us instead of complaining.”

The complaints relate to a deeper issue amongst the Dakota. Even before the genocide and ethnic cleansing, Zach told me, United States policy was preferring Dakotas who wanted to become farmers and assimilate over those who wanted to maintain their way of life. That division still exists today, manifested in groups who want to casually learn the language versus those for whom the language is their identity. “The effects of colonization are pretty prevalent in the communities today. We’re dealing with that, and with internal pressure and internal hatred. There’s all of that on top of what we’re trying to do.” The boarding schools caused extensive damage, he said. “In the late 1800s, they put up these boarding schools where they figured, what’s going to really make these people assimilate and stop speaking their language? Well, we’ll start with their kids. So they put them in these boarding schools, terrible things happened, and I don’t know the figures for America but in Canada—where they call them Residential Schools—50,000 children died. Died: part of that is benign language. Because some of them were murdered or killed just for speaking their language or having brown skin.” Zach told me about Darrell Kipp and the Blackfoot (Piegan) immersion school, saying that when they were looking for native speakers to be teachers at the school, they found an elder and asked him if he could teach for them. “No, I can’t speak the language,” he said. “Well, we’ve been told you know the language very well.” “Yes, I know the language, but I can’t speak it. It’s the language

of the Devil.” That mindset was a result of a boarding school. “They were indoctrinated into thinking that everything about them is bad. So we’re dealing with all that.”

As for definite short-term goals, Zach told me he hopes to get his colleagues to change from thinking about being language teachers to thinking about producing speakers. The focus should be on what that means, so the instructors need to plan their goals out and pay real attention to the sequence and scaffolding of curricula. He wants to become better informed about immersion as well as on good language teaching methods. On another note, he mentions that the attitudes of learners could do to change. “If you want to learn the language then you’ve got to make time. ‘Oh, I’m too old...’ No you’re not. One of my best students was 62!” Students who think, ‘I’ll never be a fluent speaker’ are done before they have even started. Another one of Zach’s students has a more insightful motto: “Get fluent or die trying.”

In the long-term, he would like to see children being raised in their homes with the language again. Students of the language can often speak well about school-related things, but ceremonial, household, community, and traditional vocabulary is as yet lacking. Assisting in this aim would be immersion schools. “So it’s not just, ‘They teach Dakota language in that school.’ No! That’s a Dakota school. Where you go in and hear Einstein’s theory being talked about in the language. That’s not a language class. It’s a lesson that just happens to be in Dakota. Just like at any other school.” His personal goal is to have the language come to the point where he can go to a child and have a conversation in Dakota. At the end of our conversation, Zach said, “I think if you’re really focused and really dedicate yourself to language revitalization, you’re going to have a job for the rest of your life. Not an economic...If you’re in it to get rich, that’s not what we are here for. None of us is here for that. We’re here to make sure the language lives on. Like I said, none of us can retire.” And given the motivation and the dedication of the university and other programs, I think Dakota should begin to increase in Minnesota. While Sims (2005:104-105) warns against the type of instruction that can go on in a university, in the case of Dakota, it

seems that it is the focus of the courses that will indeed lead to success. Zach's aim of producing conversational, proficient speakers of the language as well as his dedication to achieving such an aim is surely an exception to the learning institutions that are rarely able or willing to put forth the resources necessary to encourage and sustain long-term language learning. In addition, having such a strong program at the university level means that teachers of the language can become certified by, therefore eligible to teach in, the State and with each graduating cohort, the goal of an immersion school grows closer and closer to being realized.

Blackfoot in Montana

I was unable to travel to Missoula, Montana to speak with Eleanor in person, but we spoke together over the phone on August 24, 2012. Eleanor is originally from Canada, but has been teaching at the University of Montana since she earned her B.A. in 2008. She told me about her background with the language, saying, "Well, I was born into the language, and spoke it up until I was about 5 years old. And then I was placed into a residential school, where I wasn't allowed to speak my language any longer. So by the time I left the school which was when I was 10 years old, I had pretty much not spoken the language at all." I was shocked to find out that Eleanor had actually experienced a residential school. Some sources on the goings on at such institutions as well as their mortality rates would call her a "survivor," so I was particularly honored to have been speaking with her. What was even more surprising was that she came from a childhood of being forced to discard her language to a career that started with her being asked to teach it. "That's an interesting journey, because technically I wasn't going in that direction as far as the language was concerned. I graduated with my B.A. here at the University of Montana in '08, and I was approached by the university and asked if I was interested in teaching the Blackfoot language here on campus. Before that I had tutored a class that was being televised in

Browning, Montana with a Blackfoot instructor.” She was, at the time, the only fluent Blackfoot speaker on campus, and still is. The Blackfeet Tribe had been negotiating with the university to have a language class taught there for many years.

The Blackfoot Nation spans the divide between the United States and Canada. On the US side are the Blackfeet, with one reservation—Blackfeet Indian Reservation—that is a part of Glacier National Park. Just four hours north of Missoula, the Blackfeet Tribe is one of four groups, the other three being in Canada, that make up the Blackfoot Nation. Though divided between two countries, it is all one Nation and they all speak one language. In the US, there are perhaps fifteen fluent speakers of the Blackfoot language left in the Blackfeet Tribe, all of whom are elders in their 70s and 80s. This number is out of roughly 8,500 enrolled in the Tribe. Out of nearly nine thousand, only fifteen are fluent! And this is after they had just lost a fluent speaker three or four months ago—one who had been very involved in efforts to keep the language going. “The Blackfoot Nation has been very instrumental in trying to promote the language as far back as the 80’s,” Eleanor told me. “They have promoted and gotten a lot of immersion programs going up there. Their community college has a Blackfoot class that they teach as part of their curriculum.” There was in 2012 another immersion school that was headed by Darrell Kipp called Cuts Wood School. He had been quite successful and the program had been up and running since 1995. The school is geared towards children ages 7 to 13, and is complete immersion. Though the school is still achieving success today, I am sorry to say that Darrell passed away in November of 2013. Cuts Woods School has to apply for funding, as the Tribe is limited when it comes to being able to contribute, and most of the funding comes from federal, state, and private sources. Some Head Start programs also exist on the Reservation, and they teach the language too.

Eleanor gave me details about the Blackfoot language courses that she teaches. At the start of the semester, enrollment is capped at twenty students. This is for Blackfoot I, wherein she

teaches very basic language in addition to structure and Blackfoot culture. In the spring semester, she teaches Blackfoot II, with more in-depth language, linguistics, and cultural aspects.

Enrollment goes down during this second semester. Age range in her classes varies and the majority of students are college age, but a few are older students. Enrollment is open to everyone, and a large number are actually non-Native students, with the majority of her Native students being mostly Blackfeet. As to her courses, since they are such a new initiative, there is not much in place to measure success objectively, but she told me, “I consider it successful because every semester, we are turning out twenty people that can speak or have at least some of the language, regardless of whether they’re from the tribe or not. So that gives you a sort of idea that every year we have forty people who have been introduced to the language. Whether or not they take the language further is something I can’t answer. But I imagine that at least it gives that language, the Blackfoot language, a start in trying to be revitalized.” Her focus in designing the curricula is on a combination of things. “The most important part for me is that they become aware of the fact that the language is—we’re losing it. And it’s important that the language be taken seriously. It’s not something where they can walk in and get four credits for and then just kind of walk away. It’s something where we’re making an effort to not lose it completely. And it’s so much a part of the people, the culture, the way of life that it’s a wealth of knowledge. It’s not just a language.” She makes sure to teach culture along with the language. “You pretty well have to because the language is so involved with the culture. Everything that we do—it’s part of that. So there’s no way of getting around it. Linguistically we could just teach the syntax of the language, but it’s really difficult when you’re trying to explain why some words are what they are without teaching the culture.” The valuing of the intrinsic link between culture and language is shared by many authors, as has been mentioned (Agar 1995, Chen 1998:47, Koning 2010, Kövecses 2005, Lakoff and Johnson 1980, Wardhaugh 2006:222 to name a few).

Residential schools, Eleanor told me, are certainly one of the main factors for the loss of fluency, “Because it was a law that was enacted that the tribes were no longer allowed to speak their languages. It impacted all the tribes throughout the US and Canada. So a great many tribes and their languages were affected by that policy.” Continuing to teach and speak the Blackfoot language is important to her. “It’s important to me because I lost a lot of it. I lost a lot of the language because of the whole thing about forcing us not to be able to speak our language. The communication I have with my family, a lot of it is lost because of the fact that I have certain members who speak Blackfoot fluently from what I call ‘Old Blackfoot’ as opposed to ‘New Blackfoot.’ My generation has pretty well had to compensate to get this language back, and that means bringing in words that don’t—that aren’t the same. Of course languages are adaptive, and they’re very creative with bringing in new words. With Blackfoot, it’s difficult to communicate with our older people because a lot of the words we’re using now are a little bit foreign to what they understand.”

This seems to be a realization of what Hinton and Ahlers (1999) warn about trying to avoid, as well ties in to the authenticity concerns and generational gaps mentioned by Wong (1999). “It’s hard for me to be able in my generation to speak the same Blackfoot as my elders.” Because the language is so descriptive, and because speakers have to describe the things they are doing for which there were not previously Blackfoot words (like computers and cell phones), “it would take you days to describe what it is. So we have to be creative and come up with ways to sum it up and make it a little bit shorter so that we can understand one another.” This has resulted in a New Blackfoot—a modernized version of the language that is hard for elders to understand. “We have a new generation that is coming in and accommodating the language to go with the times. And what’s happening now is that the language is in a combination with English, so you have some English words that are a part of Blackfoot. And it really takes away from the essence

of the language that way.” Is this change something that will be bemoaned as inauthentic as language fluency increases?

At the University of Montana, Eleanor told me that she does not have anybody other than family members back home that she can speak with. A lot of the Blackfeet students coming to the University do not have the language. They have some of it, like the greeting and few words here and there. To carry on a conversation, though, she told me that she would have to go back to her own community. And even then, if she were talking to someone older than her, she would have to adjust her Blackfoot. There are many more fluent speakers in Canada. “Don’t get me wrong. It doesn’t mean that that language is thriving. But it’s just that the language up there, and the community is a lot closer. They speak the language a lot more than they would in the Blackfeet Tribe here.” In fact, language initiatives in the United States frequently call in Canadian speakers to be the resource or teach classes here. This is similar to what the Oneida Nation in New York is doing to teach their language. The dialects are different from North to South, but, again like the Oneida, the essence of the language is the same, “So it’s not a real issue.”

As a short-term goal, Eleanor would like to deliver a language program that would be viable enough for it to be carried through to the next speakers and to keep it going as much as possible. In the long run, she wants to develop teaching materials to help her and other instructors who might be able to come in and keep the language going. “Because there is absolutely no material. The other programs that are up North at the tribal end are teaching at very young levels. Whereas for me, there was no material or curricula. The requirement for this university is that it had to be university material, so we had to develop a whole curriculum right from scratch.” “French and Spanish, they have books like you wouldn’t believe. But there is virtually nothing for the Blackfoot language.” When I asked her if she thought fluency would someday be on the rise amongst Blackfeet people in the United States, she said, “Well you know,

I want to be optimistic and say yes. But right now, the reality is no, we're losing a lot more of our fluent speakers. And it's really getting difficult to hang on to that." With the intergenerational gap of Old versus New Blackfoot, revitalization may be a difficult task, but the Nation has already taken many steps to advocate for linguistic preservation. The greatest challenge, it seems, may be reconciling differences within the various Blackfeet and Blackfoot communities. A balance must be found between adapting the language to be used in a modern world and preserving traditional functions of the language that are not as welcoming to the influx of English vocabulary influence—issues addressed by Hinton and Ahlers (1999) and Wong (1999).

Conclusion

Indigenous languages are threatened across the world, and the Native American languages of the United States are no exception. With a long history of maltreatment by the United States government, including especially residential schools, many languages have been lost and for many others intergenerational transmission was interrupted in only a number of years. Whether indigenous languages are seen as rights, the culminations of cultural history, or unique “species” that make up the greater linguodiversity of the planet, it is clear that these vanishing voices are a part of a third extinction crisis, and that the endangered languages of the United States need to be kept from disappearing. It is a race against time, but there is plenty of hope—if we would only just do it! Given the current state of the linguistic diversity of North America, it is clear that both documentation and revitalization are necessary processes. As much must be salvaged as possible, and what is gotten from that can be augmented and passed on. I believe that anyone can be convinced of the necessity. These languages are either a gift from the Creator, a fading facet of the human experience, even—if one needs this much convincing—crucially

relevant to many ongoing scientific enterprises, but perhaps most of all their preservation offers the chance at preventing drug abuse and delinquent behavior in Native American youths.

Languages should be revitalized in ways that are as authentic as possible, but worries about authenticity should not halt revitalization efforts! There are numerous ways to create vocabulary, use the languages, and teach them as authentically as possible. Both schools and communities must work together if language goals are to be realized, which they are being in such places as Sitka, AK; Oneida, NY; Minnesota; and Montana.

To conclude, I will mention one more story. While paging through Nettle and Romaine (2000:15), I came across a dark photograph. The face was of a woman who looked exhausted by her years. The caption? “Marie Smith, last speaker of Eyak.” It was that same wrenching story (see page 16) coming back to me once more, this time in even more vivid detail. My resolve stronger than ever, with this work I hope to encourage any and all initiatives to preserve endangered Native languages. Naxtoo.aat! End of tale.⁴

⁴ A Comanch/Seneca storyteller at a powwow I attended at Penn State in April of 2014 ended each one of her stories this way, asking the children in the audience, “Did you like that story?” To honor her dedication to bringing attention to the preservation and continuation of her culture’s traditions, I could think of no better way to end this work.

Appendix A

Text of Public Law 101-477 Title I

TITLE I--NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES ACT

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the 'Native American Languages Act'.

FINDINGS

SEC. 102. The Congress finds that--

- (1) the status of the cultures and languages of Native Americans is unique and the United States has the responsibility to act together with Native Americans to ensure the survival of these unique cultures and languages;
- (2) special status is accorded Native Americans in the United States, a status that recognizes distinct cultural and political rights, including the right to continue separate identities;
- (3) the traditional languages of Native Americans are an integral part of their cultures and identities and form the basic medium for the transmission, and thus survival, of Native American cultures, literatures, histories, religions, political institutions, and values;
- (4) there is a widespread practice of treating Native Americans languages as if they were anachronisms;
- (5) there is a lack of clear, comprehensive, and consistent Federal policy on treatment of Native American languages which has often resulted in acts of suppression and extermination of Native American languages and cultures;
- (6) there is convincing evidence that student achievement and performance, community and school pride, and educational opportunity is clearly and directly tied to respect for, and support of, the first language of the child or student;

- (7) it is clearly in the interests of the United States, individual States, and territories to encourage the full academic and human potential achievements of all students and citizens and to take steps to realize these ends;
- (8) acts of suppression and extermination directed against Native American languages and cultures are in conflict with the United States policy of self-determination for Native Americans;
- (9) languages are the means of communication for the full range of human experiences and are critical to the survival of cultural and political integrity of any people; and
- (10) language provides a direct and powerful means of promoting international communication by people who share languages.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 103. For purposes of this title--

- (1) The term 'Native American' means an Indian, Native Hawaiian, or Native American Pacific Islander.
- (2) The term 'Indian' has the meaning given to such term under section 5351(4) of the Indian Education Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2651(4)).
- (3) The term 'Native Hawaiian' has the meaning given to such term by section 4009 of Public Law 100-297 (20 U.S.C. 4909).
- (4) The term 'Native American Pacific Islander' means any descendent of the aboriginal people of any island in the Pacific Ocean that is a territory or possession of the United States.
- (5) The terms 'Indian tribe' and 'tribal organization' have the respective meaning given to each of such terms under section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).
- (6) The term 'Native American language' means the historical, traditional languages spoken by Native Americans.

(7) The term ‘traditional leaders’ includes Native Americans who have special expertise in Native American culture and Native American languages.

(8) The term ‘Indian reservation’ has the same meaning given to the term ‘reservation’ under section 3 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1452).

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 104. It is the policy of the United States to--

(1) preserve, protect, and promote the rights and freedom of Native Americans to use, practice, and develop Native American languages;

(2) allow exceptions to teacher certification requirements for Federal programs, and programs funded in whole or in part by the Federal Government, for instruction in Native American languages when such teacher certification requirements hinder the employment of qualified teachers who teach in Native American languages, and to encourage State and territorial governments to make similar exceptions;

(3) encourage and support the use of Native American languages as a medium of instruction in order to encourage and support--

(A) Native American language survival,

(B) educational opportunity,

(C) increased student success and performance,

(D) increased student awareness and knowledge of their culture and history, and

(E) increased student and community pride;

(4) encourage State and local education programs to work with Native American parents, educators, Indian tribes, and other Native American governing bodies in the implementation of programs to put this policy into effect;

- (5) recognize the right of Indian tribes and other Native American governing bodies to use the Native American languages as a medium of instruction in all schools funded by the Secretary of the Interior;
- (6) fully recognize the inherent right of Indian tribes and other Native American governing bodies, States, territories, and possessions of the United States to take action on, and give official status to, their Native American languages for the purpose of conducting their own business;
- (7) support the granting of comparable proficiency achieved through course work in a Native American language the same academic credit as comparable proficiency achieved through course work in a foreign language, with recognition of such Native American language proficiency by institutions of higher education as fulfilling foreign language entrance or degree requirements;
- and
- (8) encourage all institutions of elementary, secondary and higher education, where appropriate, to include Native American languages in the curriculum in the same manner as foreign languages and to grant proficiency in Native American languages the same full academic credit as proficiency in foreign languages.

NO RESTRICTIONS

SEC. 105. The right of Native Americans to express themselves through the use of Native American languages shall not be restricted in any public proceeding, including publicly supported education programs.

EVALUATIONS

SEC. 106. (a) The President shall direct the heads of the various Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities to--

- (1) evaluate their policies and procedures in consultation with Indian tribes and other Native American governing bodies as well as traditional leaders and educators in order to determine and

implement changes needed to bring the policies and procedures into compliance with the provisions of this title;

(2) give the greatest effect possible in making such evaluations, absent a clear specific Federal statutory requirement to the contrary, to the policies and procedures which will give the broadest effect to the provisions of this title; and

(3) evaluate the laws which they administer and make recommendations to the President on amendments needed to bring such laws into compliance with the provisions of this title.

(b) By no later than the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this title, the President shall submit to the Congress a report containing recommendations for amendments to Federal laws that are needed to bring such laws into compliance with the provisions of this title.

USE OF ENGLISH

SEC. 107. Nothing in this title shall be construed as precluding the use of Federal funds to teach English to Native Americans.

Source: The Library of Congress THOMAS

Appendix B

Representation of North American Indian Languages on Wikipedia

Language Name	Abbreviation	Script	Size of Corpus**
Cherokee	chr	Cherokee	2
Cheyenne	chy	Latin	2
Choctaw	cho	Latin	1
Cree	cr	CANS*/Latin	2
Hawaiian	haw	Latin	3
Inuktitut	iu	CANS/Latin	2
Inupiak	ik	Latin	2
Muscogee	mus	Latin	0
Navajo	nv	Latin	3

* CANS stands for Canadian Aboriginal Syllabics

** The corpus size (number of articles) is listed in decadic logarithm such that:

4 = more than 10,000 articles

3 = more than 1,000 articles

2 = more than 100 articles

1 = more than 10 articles

0 = Muscogee has 2 articles

Appendix C

Stories Told by Gary

Gary's story about the Kóoshdakáa

Willy Joseph had gone halibut fishing with his father:

“He was cleaning fish on the beach. He'd caught halibut and he was cleaning halibut on the beach, and his dad went up and put dry twigs on the fire, and stoked it, and the campfire got started again. And every once in a while, Willy would look up to see how his dad was doing. And then he would continue to clean halibut. And he would look up several times, and he said 'OK' and continued cleaning halibut. And then one time he looked up there and he saw his dad gone from the campfire. He got a little concerned and looked around and saw his dad heading toward the creek that was coming down out of the woods further down the beach. And he yelled out to him, 'Dad!' You know just like I told you, he gave his dad a nickname. He called him Papacito. He says, 'Papacito, where are you going?' His dad didn't look back—he kept on walking. He goes, 'Papacito, where are you going?' yelling louder this time. And he didn't look back. He kept on walking toward that creek coming out of the wood. And you know his dad was deaf in one ear, but he can still hear things with it. And he yelled out real loud, he says, 'Papacito where you going?' And his dad didn't look back, he just kept walking towards the creek. Finally he disappeared into the woods. And he yelled, 'Papacito wait for me!' Boy, Willy started running towards his dad, to the creek. And just when he reached the grass line...heading up into the bushes, he heard his dad's voice back by the campfire saying, 'John, where are you going?!' Willy stopped right there, and what the heck? There was his dad standing back by the campfire. The story goes that things like that happened, and they take control of your mind.”

Another story, one which happened to Gary himself:

“I was hunting with two friends of mine and we were coming along the beach that came around the point and headed up this way. It was a big island about two miles long. There were no other boats on this side of the island when we were coming around. And just when you came around that point and started going slow along the beach, my two friends said, ‘Oh no! There’s already someone on the beach.’ And I said, ‘What?’ ‘There’s somebody on the beach there, can you see them?’ And I was looking around and said, ‘No, I don’t see anybody there.’ They go, ‘What’s the matter with you, are you blind? They’re right there. They’ll jump out and bite you pretty soon.’ ‘No I can’t see anybody.’ And I forgot to mention this. There was nobody on this side of the island either. There was nobody there. My buddy told him, ‘Why don’t you go ashore and catch up with him, see what he’s doing? Ask him where his boat is.’ I forgot to mention that to you. He says, ‘Oh, I’m not going ashore.’ Good thing he didn’t because they say that they can lead you away. When they take control of your mind. And your body. They can lead you away where ever and they’ll never find you. They won’t even find your bones. ...Those guys said they were glad they didn’t go ashore. Because there wasn’t a boat on that side either. We were the only ones in the whole area!”

Gary’s story for the Day Campers, about respect and following instructions

“What I’m going to talk about is respect. For the ocean and for the animals that feed you and used to put clothing on our ancestors in the days when the Russians were here and even before the Russians came. This one I’m going to tell you is about hunters that were out hunting for seal and deer. When they left the camp, it was nice and calm. No wind. So they kept on going further and further away from the camp. And while they were hunting they were so successful that they didn’t even notice that the wind was getting stronger and stronger. Until one of them said, ‘Hey. Look at the water. It’s starting to whitecap. I think we better go back to the

camp.’ And he was right. And when they were going back to the camp, they started paddling as hard as they can. They had a hard time going against the wind. And when they finally got back to their camp, they unloaded all they had got for that day. All the seal and deer. And they worked on them and dressed them so they could get them ready to take back to their main camp, which was further away. The storm still continued the next day. The storm still continued the next day. Pretty soon the man that was in charge started to get worried. He started to think about his children and his wife and so did all the others. When they woke up the next day again, the storm was still pretty strong and they started to talk among each other trying to decide what to do. ‘Shall we try to go and hope that we don’t tip over? Or shall we wait until the storm is over?’ And one of them said, ‘How do when know when it’s going to be over? How do we know when the wind will stop?’ So after they had that meeting they all sat and thought for a while and all went to sleep. When they woke up the next day, the wind was still strong. And the man that was in charge was down by his boat—his canoe. ‘What am I going do? How are we going to get home?’ And that’s when the voice came from behind him. Kóoshda Kwáan. [Kóoshda Kwáan can be helpful in addition to insidious.] ‘We’ll help you. We’ll help you get home. We’ve been listening to and watching you guys for three days. We’ll help you get home.’ So the head man went up and told the men that the Kóoshda Kwáans are going to help them get back to camp—get back to their wives and children. And they loaded all the stuff in the canoe, but the Kóoshda Kwáan gave them instructions. They said, ‘We’re going to cover you guys with a cover. No matter what you feel, when you’re out in the storm, even if it feels like you’ve tipped over, don’t stand up. Because if you do, all the water will come in and you’ll all drown.’ See, this is a story about listening to what they tell you, and to pay attention to what’s being said. They loaded all the stuff and the men got aboard, and the Kóoshda Kwáan covered them. And they started going out into the ocean. And they could feel the canoe, how it was going. It felt like it was going to tip over and then a couple times it did. It tipped over. But no water came into the canoe. No

water came into the canoe. But one man he started to get scared. He wanted to stand up and get out of the canoe, so they all had to hold him down so he doesn't stand up. Because if he did stand up, all the water is going to come into the canoe and they'll all drown. So they all held him down. In the meantime, they could still feel the canoe still rocking back and forth. Then pretty soon, it started tipping less. Then pretty soon it wasn't rolling any more. And when they uncovered the boat—the canoe—they were back in their own land, and they could see their family standing on the beach waving to them. They were worried too because of the storm. It was a huge storm that lasted a long time. But fortunately, when the Kóoshda Kwáan told them not to stand up, they all made it back to the camp. So when your instructors, your mother and father, your grandfathers and grandmothers instruct you, listen to them. God gave you these ears to listen. Listen good. That way you will all have good lives. And don't drop out of school. It's just like standing up in that canoe. Because if you drop out of school, later on in years...technology is moving so fast, that you're going to get left behind. You won't know what is going on around you."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Académie française

N.d. Les quarante aujourd'hui. Académie française. <http://www.academie-francaise.fr/les-immortels/les-quarante-aujourd'hui>

Agar, Michael H.

1995 *Language Shock: Understanding The Culture Of Conversation*. New York, New York: William Morrow.

Alaska Native Knowledge Network (ANKN)

2006 *Tlingit Tribes, Clans and Clan Houses*. Alaska Native Knowledge Network. <http://ankn.uaf.edu/ANCR/Southeast/TlingitMap/>

Argenter, Joan A., and R. McKenna Brown, eds.

2004 *On the Margins of Nations: Endangered Languages and Linguistic Rights*. Bath, UK: The Foundation for Endangered Languages.

Beider, Robert E.

2000 *The Representations of Indian Bodies in Nineteenth-Century American Anthropology*. In *Repatriation Reader*. Devon A. Mihesuah, ed. Pp. 19-36. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Bialystok, Ellen

2011 *Reshaping the mind: The benefits of bilingualism*. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology/Revue canadienne de psychologie expérimentale* 65(4): 229-235. doi: 10.1037/a0025406

Chen, AHY

1998 The Philosophy of Language Rights. *Language Sciences* 20(1): 45-54.

Dementi-Leonard, Beth, and Perry Gilmore

1999 Language Revitalization and Identity in Social Context: A Community-Based Athabascan Language Preservation Project in Western Interior Alaska. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 30(1): 37-55.

D'Errico, Peter

2000 Sovereignty. In *The Encyclopedia of Minorities in American Politics*. Jeffrey D. Schultz, Kerry L. Haynie, Anne M. McCulloch, and Andrew Aoki, eds. Pp. 691-693. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Dixon, Robert M.W.

1997 *The Rise and Fall of Languages*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, Keri

2009 *Dictionary of Tlingit*. Juneau, Alaska: Sealaska Heritage Institute.

Errington, Joseph

2003 Getting Language Rights: The Rhetorics of Language Endangerment and Loss. *American Anthropologist* 105(4): 723-732.

Ethnologue

2013 Esperanto. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*. <http://www.ethnologue.com/language/epo>

Fishman, Joshua A.

1991 *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters

1996 *Maintaining Languages: What Works? What Doesn't? In Stabilizing Indigenous Languages*. Gina Cantoni, ed. Pp. 186-198. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University Press.

2006 *Do Not Leave Your Language Alone*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Fishman, Joshua A., ed.

- 2001 *Can Threatened Languages be Saved?* Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters Ltd..
- Grenoble, Lenore A., and Whaley, Lindsay J, eds.
- 1998 *Endangered Languages*. Cambridge, UK: University of Cambridge Press.
- Greymorning, Stephen
- 1999 *Running the Gauntlet of an Indigenous Language Program*. In *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*. J. Reyhner, G. Cantoni, R. N. St. Clair, and E. P. Yazzie, eds. Pp. 6-16. Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.
- Gunn, TM, G Pomahac, EG Striker, and J Tailfeathers
- 2010 *First Nations, Métis, and Inuit Education: The Alberta initiative for school improvement approach to improve indigenous education in Alberta*. *Journal of Educational Change* 12: 323-345.
- Haviland, John B.
- 2003 *Ideologies of Language: Some Reflections on Language and U.S. Law*. *American Anthropologist* 105(4): 764-774.
- Henze Rosemary, and Kathryn A. Davis
- 1999 *Authenticity and identity: Lessons from Indigenous Language Education*. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 30(1): 3-21.
- Hinton, Leanne, and Jocelyn Ahlers
- 1999 *The Issue of "Authenticity" in California Language Restoration*. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 30(1): 56-67.
- Koning, Patricia
- 2010 *"Culture is Integral to Language Education—But How do we Make that a Reality in the Classroom?"*. *The Language Educator* 5(5): 44-49.
- Kövecses, Zoltán

2005 *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Krauss, Michael

1992 *The World's Languages in Crisis*. *Language* 68(1): 4-10.

Kumpfer, Karol L, Virginia Molgaard, and Richard Spoth

1994 *The Strengthening Families Program for the Prevention of Delinquency and Drug Use and Drug Use in Special Populations*. In *Childhood Disorders, Substance Abuse, and Delinquency: Prevention and Early Intervention Approaches*. R. Dev Peters and R. J. McMahon, eds. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson

1980 *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Lewis, MP and GF Simons

2010 *Assessing endangerment: Expanding Fishman's GIDS*. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 55(2):103–120.

The Library of Congress THOMAS

N.d. Bill Text: 101st Congress (1989-1990) H.R.5237.ENR (NAGPRA). The Library of Congress THOMAS. <http://thomas.loc.gov>

N.d. Bill Text: 101st Congress (1989-1990) S.2167.ENR (Native American Languages Act). The Library of Congress THOMAS. <http://thomas.loc.gov>

Littlebear, Richard

1999 *Some Rare and Radical Ideas for Keeping Indigenous Languages Alive*. In *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*. J. Reyhner, G. Cantoni, R. N. St. Clair, and E. P. Yazzie, eds. Pp. 1-5. Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

Maffi, Luisa

- 1999 Linguistic Diversity. In *Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity*. Darryl Posey, ed. P.p. 19-58. Nairobi: United Nations Environmental Programme
- Nation, Maury, Cindy Crusto, Abraham Wandersman, Karol L. Kumpfer, Diana Seybolt, Erin Morrissey-Kane, and Katrina Davino
- 2003 What Works in Prevention: Principles of Effective Prevention Programs. *American Psychologist* 58(6/7):449-456. DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.58.6-7.449
- Nettle, Daniel, and Suzanne Romaine
- 2000 *Vanishing Voices*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Newman, Paul
- 2003 The Endangered Language Issue as a Hopeless Cause. In *Language Death and Language Maintenance: Theoretical, Practical and Descriptive Approaches*, edited by M. Janse and S. Tol. pp. 1-13. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Jon Benjamins B.V..
- Pettito, Laura Ann, Marina Katerelos, Bronna G. Levy, Kristine Gauna, Karine Tétreault, and Vittoria Ferraro
- 2001 Bilingual Signed and Spoken Language Acquisition from Birth: Implications for the Mechanisms Underlying Early Bilingual Language Acquisition. *Journal of Child Language* 28(2): 453-496. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0305000901004718>
- Rindstedt, Camilla and Karin Aronsson
- 2002 Growing up Monolingual in a Bilingual Community: The Quichua Revitalization Paradox. *Language in Society* 31(5): 721-742.
- Robins, Robert H., and Eugenius M. Uhlenbeck
- 1991 *Endangered languages*. Oxford, UK: Berg Publishing Ltd..
- Sicoli, MA, and G Horton
- 2014 Linguistic Phylogenies Support Back-Migration from Beringia to Asia. *PLoS ONE* 9(3): e91722. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0091722

Sims, Christine P.

2005 Tribal Languages and the Challenges of Revitalization. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 36(1): 104-106.

Sitka Tribe of Alaska

2011 Welcome to the Sitka Tribe of Alaska. Sitka Tribe of Alaska. www.sitkatribes.org

Stromberg, J

2014 Ancient Migration Patterns to North America Are Hidden in Languages Spoken Today.

Smithsonian, March 12. <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/science-nature/ancient-migration-patterns-north-america-are-hidden-languages-spoken-today-180950053/>

Treuer, Anton S.

2010 *Ojibwe in Minnesota*. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Historical Society Press.

Walsh, Michael

2005 Will Indigenous Languages Survive? *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34: 293-315.

Wardhaugh, Ronald

2006 *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Fifth edition. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing.

Whiteley, Peter

2003 Do "Language Rights" Serve Indigenous Interests? Some Hopi and Other Queries.

American Anthropologist 105(4): 712-722.

Wong, Laiana

1999 Authenticity and the Revitalization of Hawaiian. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 30(1): 94-115.

Zoltán, Dörnyei

1994 Motivation and Motivating in the Foreign Language Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 78(3): 273-284.

Academic Vita

Andrew M. Wigman

356 E Lancaster Ave. Downingtown, PA 19335

Phone: (610) 316 0092 E-mail: andrew.m.wigman@gmail.com

Education

Pennsylvania State University
Schreyer Honors College, Paterno Fellows Program

Expected May 2014

Bachelor of Science in Archeological Science
Bachelor of Arts in Classics and Ancient Mediterranean
Bachelor of Science in World Languages Education
Minors: German Language
International Studies

Emphasis: Ancient Languages
Emphasis: Latin Teaching

Research Experience

Pribilof Islands Environmental Archaeology; Penn State Cataloguing, conserving, and analyzing lakebed sediment cores as well as performing library research to address questions of climate change in Beringia	2013
“Vanishing Voices” thesis research; Alaska, New York, Minnesota, Montana Recording interviews with native peoples on-site about language preservation programs to include in an undergraduate honors thesis	2012 - present
Florida wetland archaeology lab work; Penn State Cataloguing and describing pieces of wood tool debitage from Salt Springs, FL	2012
Environmental Archaeology class; Penn State Sorting samples of environmental debris from a wetland site in Florida	2009

Publications

Honors undergraduate thesis An investigation into North American indigenous language preservation and revitalization	Expected 2014
A Note on Latin <i>necessus</i> . 2013. <i>Journal of Latin Linguistics</i> 12(2): 137-146. Co-authored with Dr. Philip Baldi	2013

Leadership Experience

CAMS (Classics and Ancient Mediterranean Studies) Club - President Working with club officers and department faculty to plan meetings, lectures, social events, and professional opportunities	2013-2014
Anthropology Club - Website Manager Updated website, planned events, meetings, and field trips	2011-2012
Adult Literacy Tutoring Corps - Vice president Helped plan events, such as a poetry reading fund-raiser	2010-2011
Outdoor School Camp Counselor at Shaver's Creek overnight camp Supervised a group of fifth graders, many with special needs, throughout a week of outdoor learning activities	2010

International Experience

Vienna, Austria (Spring semester) Courses in music, film, German, anthropology at the study abroad center; Celtic archaeology course at the University of Vienna	2013
Rome, Italy (2.5 Weeks in Summer) Study tour of Roman archaeological sites, three-day trip to Pompeii/Herculaneum	2012
Tel es-Safi, Israel (1 Month in Summer) 6 credits of field work at a Bronze Age archaeological site, with time for travel on weekends	2011
Munich, Germany (3 Weeks in Summer) GAPP exchange program: lived with a host family and attended 2 weeks of classes at Theresien Gymnasium	2008

Teaching Experience

Pre-Service and Student Teaching Taught 7 th and 8 th grade German and 9 th through 12 th grade Latin, worked with two mentor teachers at Park Forest Middle School and state College Area High School	2013 - 2014
Teaching Internship in Vienna, Austria Taught English to two Austrian high school classes and wrote a research paper on Austrian exit exam practices	2013
Latin Tutoring Tutored college students in the subject of Latin	2011 - 2012
Spanish teaching field experience Taught Spanish to second-graders for six weeks during a Tuesday/Thursday afterschool program	2012
English tutoring Tutored a Korean adult learner to improve his English language proficiency	2010 - 2011
Friendship Tutoring Program Mentored a kindergartner once per week, focusing on improving reading and math skills	2010 - 2011

Honors

Honor Societies

Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society	2013
Phi Beta Kappa Honor Society	2012
Delta Phi Alpha (German Honor Society)	2012
National Society of Collegiate Scholars	2009

Awards and Grants

Evan Pugh Senior Award For academic excellence	2013
Undergraduate Summer Discovery Grant For use in summer independent research, including travelling to Native American reservations and recording interviews about indigenous language preservation	2012
Evan Pugh Junior Award For academic excellence	2012
President Sparks Award For academic excellence	2011
President's Freshman Award For academic excellence	2010
Reverend Thomas Bermingham Scholarship in the Classics For the study of Latin	2010

Work Experience

Target Corporation - Cashier Conducted business transactions, provided customer service, occasionally helped train new employees.	Uwchlan Township Target Store	2010-2013
--	-------------------------------	-----------

Skills

Linguistic

Professional and research writing
Latin
German

ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview: Advanced Low (October 18, 2013)
ACTFL Writing Proficiency Test: Intermediate High (October 4, 2013)

Computer

Microsoft Office (Word, Excel, PowerPoint)
Mac and Windows operating systems