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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Languages are constantly undergoing change as the result of influences from other cultures, languages, and circumstances. Proto-languages are said to produce daughter languages which go on to thrive while the mother language eventually dies out. While many factors contribute to the disappearance of a language, an essential fact remains: when the last fluent native speakers of a language die, the linguistic and cultural heritage of an entire people goes with them. The terms which have been applied to this phenomenon, such as "obsolescence," "contraction," "shift," "attrition," and "death," serve as appropriate descriptors since they imply a more or less natural process at work which ultimately results in the disuse of a language over a long period of time.

The situation which resulted in the disappearance of languages indigenous to the North American continent following the arrival of Europeans, however, is different. Cultural genocide would be a more accurate term to describe what has been happening since the fifteenth century\(^1\) to Native American Indian cultures in general, and to languages specifically. For this reason, the term language "extinction" will be used to describe the situation relative to Native American Indian languages since it more appropriately implies a phenomenon of tragic and avoidable consequences.

The attitude has been expressed that the loss of a language to extinction is little more than a simple linguistic glitch in the relentless march of societal evolution.\(^2\) Such a view is simplistic at best. A
language, especially one without a written form (which was the case with all of the languages of the American continent north of what is now Mexico), is the repository of a people's entire cultural, historical, mythical, social, scientific, spiritual, and political knowledge. Every language embodies the knowledge systems of an entire culture. When a language becomes extinct, the loss is not just a question of morphemes, phonemes and syntax. The loss also incorporates everything the speakers of the language know and understand of the world, as well as their culture's unique interpretation of, and approach to, the universe. Native speakers of a dominant and thriving language such as English find it difficult to comprehend the consequences of such a loss. A world without English is inconceivable and they do not grasp the significance of the obliteration of an entire cultural understanding of the world and one's place in it when another language becomes extinct.

To provide an indication of the enormity of the loss due to the extinction of Native American Indian languages is one of the purposes of this paper. It is hoped that the paper will also serve as an informative introduction to, and general overview of, languages indigenous to the North American continent. Chapter Two examines the linguistic families and phyla of Native North American Indian languages, their distribution across the continent prior to the arrival of Europeans, the estimated number of speakers, and some of their linguistic features. Chapter Three consists of a brief look at the processes which have resulted in the actual extinction of, or threat of extinction to, so many languages. The current status of Native American Indian languages is examined in Chapter Four. This section includes a
survey of the number of languages which are already extinct, languages which are threatened with extinction, the number of speakers of surviving languages, and the prospects for those languages. Recent legislative and political set-backs and advances are also covered. Chapter Five focuses on the efforts being made to preserve languages on the verge of extinction and to strengthen those which are still viable.
CHAPTER TWO: BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

The current parceling of the North American continent into geographic units, such as states and countries, has no relevance to the earlier distribution of indigenous languages. The range of the language phyla was extensive. Speakers of languages belonging to the Na-Dené phylum, for instance, lived as far north as the Arctic Circle in what is now Alaska, and as far south as the southern portion of what is now Texas. Though some of the language groupings discussed here extend into the southern part of present-day Mexico, emphasis will be placed on languages of the area north of Mexico, including Canada and the United States, hereinafter referred to as North America.

Estimates of the native population of this area around the time of the European arrival range from 0.9 million to 18 million. The larger estimates are also the most recent, resulting from a reassessment of primary sources, archeological investigations, and detailed examinations of the food sources available to North American Indians in the fifteenth century, the time of initial European encroachment. Though it is not possible to pinpoint precisely the size of the indigenous population of North America at that time, indications are that considerably more people inhabited the continent than had been previously estimated.

Classification of Languages

Approximately 300 mutually unintelligible languages were spoken in fifteenth century North America. None of these had a written
form.\textsuperscript{4} When viewed as a whole, the most notable feature of the indigenous languages of the North American continent is their diversity. Though various linguistic features are shared among them, there is no feature that is common to them all; no general characterizations are possible. Some of the languages are as different from each other as are English and Chinese. Others share similarities comparable to those between Spanish, French, and Italian, indicating classification as members of the same linguistic family. Certain areas are especially notable for their language diversity. More distinct languages were spoken in the fifteenth century in the area of California alone than were spoken in all of Europe at the same time.\textsuperscript{5}

European explorers began compiling the first Indian word lists in the sixteenth century and a few grammars were produced. During the next two centuries, missionaries were most involved in the documentation of North American Indian languages. The nineteenth century saw the first efforts at systematic classification. Since then, scholars have proposed from 40 to 73 different language families for fifteenth century North America. Most researchers identify more than 50 and fewer than 60 language families. The vast diversity, and the difficulty in determining relationships between languages, has resulted in considerable controversy over the years among those who strive to classify Native American Indian languages. The difficulty arises from the problematic task of determining whether resemblances between languages are the result of borrowing or common origin.

Much debate also surrounds the question of how there came to be such marked diversity among the languages. Some believe that the
diversity could only be the result of diversification from a common root. Others believe that the degree of diversification could be due only to several distinct waves of migration. For only one phylum of languages, however, has there ever been any clear indication of a connection with any of the languages of Asia. That exception is the possible relationship between the Eskimo-Aleut phylum to certain Siberian languages.

There is a long history of classification of Native American Indian languages, featuring such notable contributors as John Wesley Powell and Edward Sapir. There have been numerous revisions and regroupings over the years as well as ongoing debates between the "lumpers" and the "splitters." The "lumpers" are those classifiers of Native American Indian languages who perceive connections between languages which lead them to classify in more comprehensive groupings. The "splitters" predilection is for dividing languages into a greater number of distinct classifications.

The most famous example of "lumping" was Sapir's article in the 1929 *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in which he classified the indigenous languages of North American into six "super-stocks," which later came to be called phyla. The influence of this classification was so great that it was accepted in varying degrees until the mid-twentieth century. The "splitting" tendency flourished in the 1960's and 1970's. A conference to review the classification of North American Indian languages was held in 1964 and attended by thirty scholars. The consensus reached at that deliberation resulted in the replacement of Sapir's six phyla with sixteen independent families. A second similar conference took place in 1976. At its conclusion, a grand total of 62
distinct genetic language groupings was agreed upon, thus accomplishing the final dismemberment of almost every genetic group that had previously been proposed.6

Contemporaneous with the "splitting" tendency, however, were the publications of a small group of researchers known as the "supergroupers." These scholars proposed groupings which were even more inclusive than Sapir's. Most recently, Joseph Greenberg stirred up a storm of controversy when he hypothesized the existence of three macro-phyla for North, Central, and South America.7 Two of the phyla were already familiar and accepted: Eskimo-Aleut and Na-Dené. The controversy revolved around the third new phylum which Greenberg called the Amerind phylum. This phylum incorporated all of the areas currently known as South America, Central America, most of the contiguous United States, and a large portion of Canada.

Prior to Greenberg's proposal, general consensus assigned approximately seventeen different phyla to the same area that Greenberg claimed all belonged to the same macro-phylum. Comparing the map of the Amerind macro-phylum in Figure 2.1 with the maps in Figures 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4, which illustrate the distribution of the seventeen phyla of North, Meso, and South America, gives an indication of the linguistic leap Greenberg was calling for.

Some scholars propose that Greenberg's three linguistic groupings correspond to three waves of migration across the Bering land bridge. The Amerind group arrived prior to 11,000 years ago, the Na-Dené approximately 9,000 years ago, and the Eskimo-Aleut most recently, around 4,000 years ago. It is also believed that greater linguistic
Figure 2.2: Distribution of North American Indian languages. From C.F. and F.M. Voegelin, *Map of North American Indian Languages*; copyright 1966 by University of Washington Press. Reprinted with permission.
diversity existed in the northwest of the present-day United States (Washington, Oregon and northern California), because of the larger number of contrasting environments, than in the more recently deglaciated northeast. It has been suggested that the territory from which the glaciers receded became populated by speakers of the Eskimo-Aleut, Na-Dené, and Algonkian languages as they spread out from the perimeter of the ice sheets. The two more recent migrations ranged across the north and northwest coast without venturing further into the continent.⁸
Figure 2.4: Distribution of South American Indian languages. From *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th ed.; copyright 1992. Reprinted with permission.
Further research and investigation of Greenberg's methods appear to support his conclusions regarding the Na-Dené, Eskimo-Aleut, and Amerind macro-phyla. Also, recent dentition and gene distribution evidence developed by Luigi Cavalli-Sforza roughly correspond to the three language macro-phyla. Even so, the Amerind macro-phylum remains controversial and continues to be accepted by some scholars and not by others.

While there is controversy surrounding Greenberg's Amerind macro-phylum, there does appear to be a general consensus regarding the designation of seven major North American language phyla and language isolates. The map in Figure 2.2 shows the location and distribution of the language isolates, languages which have no known structural or historical relationship to any other language, and the North American phyla: Eskimo-Aleut, Na-Dené, Macro-Algonkian, Macro-Siouan, Hokan, Penutian, and Aztec-Tanoan. Though he assigns different names to the phyla, Greenberg's classifications correspond for the most part to those of Figure 2.2. The primary difference has to do with the territory currently identified as northern Florida. The map in Figure 2.2 designates this as an area of language isolates. Greenberg, on the other hand, has assigned the area to an eighth phylum, Paezan.

Grammatical Features

As previously noted, the most striking aspect of North American Indian languages, when viewed as a whole, is their incredible diversity. To underscore this diversity, Edward Sapir and Morris Swadesh
translated the English sentence, "He will give it to you" into the following six American Indian languages:

Wishram (Penutian family)
\[ \text{ačmlúda} \]
\[ \text{a-č-i-m-l-ud-a} \]
"will-he-him-thee-to-give-will"

Takelma (Penutian)
\[ \text{ŋ̈ospink} \]
\[ \text{ŋ̈ök-t-xpi-nk} \]
"will give-to-thee-he or they-in future"

Southern Paiute (Uto-Aztecan)
\[ \text{mayavaaniak'aga'mi} \]
\[ \text{ma-yà-vaanía-aka-agà-?mi} \]
"give-will-visible thing-visible creature-thee"

Yana (Hokan)
\[ \text{ba'jamasiwa'numa} \]
\[ \text{ba·ja-masi-wa-?numa} \]
"round thing-away-to-does or will-done unto-thou in future"

Nootka (Wakashan - isolate)
\[ \text{?oyi' a· q ·kate?ic} \]
\[ \text{o·yi·-a· q·kate?ic} \]
"that-give-will done unto-thou-art"

Navajo (Athabaskan)
\[ \text{neido' hā' t} \]
\[ \text{n·a·-yi-diho-?ā·t} \]
"thee-to-transitive-will round thing in future"
Even though the variety of North American languages is readily apparent in a sample such as this, there are certain grammatical and phonological features of American Indian languages which are widespread enough to make them typical, though not necessarily unique, to the continent.

*Phonological Features*

The phonological systems of native North America, like other aspects of the language, are quite diverse. The most replete sound inventories occurred where bilingualism and multilingualism flourished and phonemes were borrowed between languages. Chipewyan, for example, has approximately 39 distinct consonants. At the other extreme is Wichita with only ten consonants, none of them either nasal or labial. (English, by comparison, has 24 consonant phonemes.) Voiceless glottalized stops (ejectives) exist in approximately a third of all Native American Indian languages. These phonemes, /p/, /t/, and /k/, are pronounced by holding the breath in the glottis. Some other consonantal features which might be unfamiliar to native speakers of English and other European languages are the glottalization of sonorants, labiovelars, glottal stops, voiceless vowels, and initial word consonant combinations such as 'tl' and 'ts'. The former unit, 'tl', can be either aspirated or glottalized. Some languages of the northwest coast are noted for their complex consonant clusters. The word in Bella Coola for "don't swallow it" is tlk'ix$. Some words have no vowels at all, such as this one meaning "animal:" nmnmk. 12
The number of contrasting consonantal phonemes is increased in many languages by distinguishing a larger number of tongue positions than does English. For example, many languages incorporate distinctions between palatal and velar positions and between velar and uvular positions. Some languages even distinguish between three different 'k' sounds, depending on where in the mouth and throat the sounds are formed. Where English has only two contrasting phonemes in the velar area, /g/ and /k/, one language, Tlinget, has 21: g, k, uvular G, q, glottalized k', q', labiovelar g*, k*, k''*, G*, q*, q''* the corresponding fricatives v and x, uvular X, glottalized x', X', and labiovelar x'', X'', x'''

North American Indian languages also feature more varieties of laterals than languages such as English. Many of them, in addition to the /l/ familiar to English speakers, have a voiceless version. Some languages also have glottalized varieties of /l/. One language, Navajo, has a total of five contrasting lateral phonemes.

A few North American languages make use of tonal systems to distinguish phonemes, though this phenomenon is rare compared to Asia or Africa. More common is the use of stress and a kind of pitch accent, or the contrast between high and low tones. For example, in Navajo bini means "his nostril," bini means "his face," and biini means "his waist."14

The number of vowel contrasts between languages is less variable, most possessing from four to six phonemes. Nasalization and length of vowels are sometimes additional distinguishing features. Native American Indian syllable structures are widely varied, ranging from the
simple, CV, (C)CV, or CVC, while others, such as the previously mentioned Bella Coola example, allow extensive consonant clusters.

**Vocabulary and Semantics**

The indigenous languages of North America are similar to other languages of the world in the makeup of their lexicons. Stem words can be combined with other stem words to form compounds, affixes can be added to stems to form derivations, and words can be borrowed from other languages. A few languages use internal sound changes comparable to the English distinction between "sing" and "song." For instance, the Yurok word for "dust" is *prncrc*, and for "to be gray," *prncrh*.  

An interesting process of lexical evolution is the one for the Karok word for "tennis shoe." To begin with, in the early nineteenth century the word *mákkay* entered the lexicon, thanks to a trapper with the last name McKay. By extension, the word also came to mean "white man." This sense of it was then compounded with the word for "deerskin blanket," *váas*, to create the word *makáy-vaas*, meaning "cloth." This item was in turn compounded with the word for "moccasin," *yukúkku*, to give the term for "tennis shoe," *makayvas-yukúkku*.  

North American Indian languages, like all languages, contain typologies and lexical terms which are reflective of particular environmental conditions and cultural traditions. Unlike English, which has only one, Hopi makes use of two distinct terms for water. The first term refers to "water in nature," *pāhe*, and the second to "water in a
container," kēyi. Whereas English distinguishes between "aviator," 
"airplane," and "flying insect," Hopi has one general term, masa'ytaka, 
meaning roughly "flier."^7

Taxonomies reveal how a culture categorizes phenomena and the 
nature of the hierarchical relationships to which they are assigned. 
English, for example, has this multi-levelled taxonomy in ascending 
order of specificity: "animal," "insect," "louse," "body louse." By contrast, 
the Yurok term for "body louse," wrryr, has no comparable category for 
"louse" or "insect" in which to be subsumed.^18

Some of the generic terms of Yurok correspond roughly to the 
English terms "quadruped mammal," "fish," "snake," "bird," "tree," 
bush," "grass," "flower," and "berry." A neighboring language, Tolowa, 
is simpler, lacking the categories for "fish" and "quadruped mammal." 
Instead of making classifications according to hierarchical relationships, 
languages such as Yurok and Tolowa make semantic associations on the 
basis of similarity. If a speaker of Yurok were asked to identify a 
flowering bush for which he or she does not know the name, the 
response would not be "a kind of bush," but rather, sahsip seyən, 
"similar to wild lilac."^19

The Papago language offers another example of this difference in 
semantic associations between languages. The Papago places "quail" and 
"deer" in the same taxonomic category, while placing "woodpecker" and 
"antelope" together in a second, distinct category. To speakers of 
English, "quail" and "woodpecker," and "deer" and "antelope," appear to 
have more in common with each other than the Papago pairings. 
However, within the Papago hunting tradition, the fact that "quail" is a
bird which stays close to the ground, as opposed to birds which fly, takes on a significance which is addressed linguistically.20

In Kwakiutl a speaker must clarify whether an object of discussion is actually seen, by both the speaker and whomever is being addressed. Navajo requires even more precise descriptions of topics under discussion. In Navajo a subject must be defined as either definite or vague, and verb stems always indicate whether an object is round, long, animate, etc., and whether an act is in progress, habitual, or brief. The specificity of context which Navajo requires suggests to some scholars a worldview in which people are subordinate to their surroundings and must place themselves accordingly.21

The Cherokee language provides another example of the specificity of expression inherent in some Indian languages. It distinguishes between "you and I," "another person and I," "several other people and I," and "you, one or more other persons, and I." English speakers express all of these concepts with the pronoun "we."22

**Syntax and Morphology**

The grammars of North American Indian languages show even greater differences from each other than their phonologies. Polysynthesis, though not exclusive to North America, is well developed and common enough to be considered typical of the continent. It is especially characteristic of Eskimo and Algonkian languages. Polysynthesis produces very long and complex words which contain
many elements of a sentence as a result of compounding and affixation, usually to a verb stem. Shawnee, for example, has an average of approximately ten phonemes per word. The following is a Southern Paiute illustration of polysynthesis: \textit{wii-to-kuchum-punku-rügani-yugwi-va-ntū-m(ū)}. A rough translation is "they who are going to sit and cut up with a knife a black cow (or bull) buffalo." A more literal translation is "knife-black-buffalo-pet-cut-up-sit(plural)-future-participle-animate-plural." Edward Sapir wrote a two-page analysis of this single Paiute word.

Here is another illustration from Wichita:


This is a sentence from a story about a squirrel who is carrying meat to a tree-top for safekeeping. It means, "By making many trips, he carried the big pile of meat up into the top of the tree." The two words of the sentence can be analyzed thus:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{kiya} "information from hearsay"
  \item \textit{a} "third person singular subject"
  \item \textit{ki} "past tense"
  \item \textit{riwa:c} "big"
  \item \textit{?aras} "meat"
  \item \textit{(r)a} "object is plural, i.e. in pieces"
  \item \textit{ri} "verb is transitive"
  \item \textit{kita} "top (shows location or goal of the action)"
  \item \textit{?a} "come (verb root)"
  \item \textit{hi:riks} "action is repeated"
\end{itemize}
"verb is subordinate or nominalized"

"wood"

(underlying k-r-w is surface hkw) "collective plural (required with 'wood')"

"inanimate object stands" (thus ya:k-r-wi "wood stands" means "tree")

"verb is locative, i.e. where-clause"

The second word expresses "where the wood stands up, i.e. where the tree is," and the first word expresses the remaining content of the sentence.

In polysynthetic languages, syntactic word order is actually a question of morphology. Languages which are less polysynthetic and have more words per sentence demonstrate all of the common types of word order.

Another feature typical of some Indian languages is incorporation, the compounding of a noun with a verb. English offers only a few examples of incorporation, one of them being "to baby-sit." The following is an illustration from Mohawk: ke-wēna-weiēhō, "I-language-understand."²⁶

The marking of verbs with prefixes which indicate the person and number of the subject is characteristic of Native American Indian languages. In Karok "I walk" is ni-áhoo and "he walks," nu-áhoo. Another characteristic feature is the indication of tense and aspect of verbs with suffixes, as is the case with many languages of the world. In some areas of North America, notably the Athabascan areas, prefixes
are used instead of suffixes. In Chipewyan, \textit{he-tsay} means "he is crying," \textit{yi-tsay}, "he cried," and \textit{ywa-tsay}, "he will cry."\textsuperscript{27}

Possession is commonly indicated by the addition of prefixes to nouns. The prefixes supply information about the person and number of the possessor. The Karok word for "food" is \textit{avaha}, "my food" is \textit{nani-avaha}, and "his food" is \textit{mu-avaha}. Many languages have what are called 'inalienable' nouns, meaning that they can only occur in the possessed form. Such nouns usually indicate body parts or kinspeople. In the southern California language Luiseño, it is possible to say "my mother," \textit{no-yó} or "your mother," \textit{o-yó}, but there is no word for just "mother."\textsuperscript{28}

Case systems are characteristic of some of the language areas. In California and other parts of the southwest, case systems can be found similar to the following illustration from Luiseño:\textsuperscript{29}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case System</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Word Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>&quot;house&quot;</td>
<td>\textit{kíiča}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>&quot;house&quot;</td>
<td>\textit{kíiš}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>&quot;to the house&quot;</td>
<td>\textit{ki-i-k}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>&quot;from the house&quot;</td>
<td>\textit{ki-i-gay}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>&quot;in the house&quot;</td>
<td>\textit{ki-i-ña}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>&quot;by means of the house&quot;</td>
<td>\textit{ki-i-tal}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preceding linguistic examples provide a glimpse of the richness and variety of the indigenous languages of North America. The devastation of Native American Indian societies during the last several
centuries, and the concurrent obliteration of many languages, is the subject of the next chapter.
CHAPTER THREE: THE PROCESS OF LANGUAGE EXTINCTION IN NORTH AMERICA

It is not possible to discuss the loss of Native American Indian languages without also examining how the Indian population came to be decimated. From the initial contact with Europeans in the latter part of the fifteenth century until the end of the nineteenth, warfare, genocide, slavery, social or economic habitat and food supply destruction, disease, forced removal and relocation, starvation, alcoholism, forced labor, demographic submersion, cultural disruption, and fertility decline contributed to a catastrophic collapse of the indigenous population of North America.

Though the exact size of the Indian population of the contiguous United States at the time of European arrival is uncertain and can only be estimated, it is known that there were no more than 250,000 Indians by the end of the nineteenth century. Russell Thornton has assessed various estimates of the North American population of the late fifteenth century and concluded that there were at least five million Indians living in what are now the lower 48 states. If this estimate is accurate, then the size of the Indian population in the 1890's was four to five percent of what it was prior to European contact.

Early European settlers and frontiersmen, clearly in the minority, tended to learn and make use of native languages when they needed assistance procuring desired objects or objectives, including furs, land, labor, or military assistance. The Indians otherwise were left alone, unless it was believed that they posed a threat to settlers. Two
exceptions to this were Christian missionaries, who learned native languages in order to proselytize and convert, and European diseases. The latter, transmitted intentionally or not, wreaked havoc on North American populations who had no immunity to diseases such as smallpox, cholera, diphtheria, and typhoid fever. The Puritans refer to a "wonderful plague" which killed a third of the Native American Indians of New England in 1616 and 1617.

By the early to mid-nineteenth century, European immigrants had settled the eastern third of the present-day United States and efforts were being made to "civilize," according to Western European standards, the Indians whose lands had been appropriated. Native language services were available in many schools, churches, newspapers, and government offices. Writing systems derived from the European system were developed for some Indian languages. Many of these were originated and introduced by white missionaries, teachers, and linguists, a notable exception being the syllabary single-handedly invented in the nineteenth century by Sequoyah, a Cherokee, for his native language. The syllabary, in which each of the 85 symbols stands for a consonant-vowel combination, was well suited to the language of the Cherokees and literacy flourished for a time until government intervention disrupted their society.

The reservation system was created by the United States government in the 1870's. Reservations undermined the way of life of the various Native American Indian societies in myriad ways, including the destruction of traditional systems of religion, government, kinship, and subsistence. In some cases reservations were established to
deliberately include members of different language communities. The purpose of this was to encourage cultural conflicts which, it was hoped, would serve a neutralizing function that would bring both groups closer to a state of "civilization."\textsuperscript{34}

By the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, simple use of Indian languages became the target of governmental policies aimed at the assimilation of Indians into the dominant society. All institutionalization of native languages came under attack in an effort to eradicate them. The most infamous, and perhaps the most effective, method employed to eliminate Native American languages was the forced attendance of Indian children at government boarding schools. Congress first appropriated funds for federally administered schools in 1870. As J.D.C. Atkins, United States Commissioner of Indian Affairs from 1885 to 1888, maintained:\textsuperscript{35}

The instruction of Indians in the vernacular [that is, in Indian language] is not only of no use to them, but is detrimental to the cause of their education and civilization, and it will not be permitted in any Indian school over which the Government has any control . . . . This [English] language, which is good enough for a white man and a black man, ought to be good enough for the red man. It is also believed that teaching an Indian youth in his own barbarous dialect is a positive detriment to him. The first step to be taken toward civilization, toward teaching the Indians the mischief and folly of continuing in their barbarous practices, is to teach them the English language.
Another educator, Captain Richard H. Pratt, superintendent of the Carlisle Indian School (formerly a famous Indian fighter), expressed the concept more bluntly: "All the Indian there is in the race should be dead. Kill the Indian in him and save the man."³⁶

By 1889, over $2,500,00 was being spent annually for 148 boarding schools and 225 day schools, with a total attendance of about 20,000 Indian children. The number of children attending these schools per year changed little until 1950 when 27,000 Indian children were enrolled in federal schools. But by 1967 the number had risen to 47,000, partially a reflection of the twentieth century recovery from the population nadir of the 1890's. Also in 1967, an additional 84,000 Indian children attended public schools and 9,000 more, mission and other private schools. In 1966, the Bureau of Indian Affairs spent $121,000,000 on its educational programs.³⁷

The boarding schools were notorious for the disruption they caused to the lives of Indian children, Indian families, and Indian culture. Children were forced to attend without regard for their preferences or the preferences of the family. They were kept at the boarding schools against their wills, in isolation, and at great distances from their relatives and culture. Much of what was purported to be "education" was actually forced menial labor.

Children from different language backgrounds were mixed as an additional means to bolster the use of English as the only language common to all the students. It was forbidden to speak any language other than English. Punishment was severe for this and other
infractions and often included physical abuse and humiliation, even of very young children. Teachers, 95 percent of whom were white, tended to have a vindictive attitude toward not only the children's' native languages, but also the spirituality and value systems of their cultures.

This treatment was characteristic of all the educational options available to Indian children, whether in federal, parochial, or local public schools, and continued into the 1970's. In 1970, nineteen off-reservation boarding schools were still being attended by over 12,000 Native American Indian children. Another 77 boarding schools on reservations housed 35,000 children, twenty-five percent of whom were under the age of nine. Indian children removed from their homes at a young enough age lost the ability to use their native tongue. Others returned to their homes indoctrinated with a belief that theirs was an inferior language and culture.

Many, both young and old, believed that success could only be attained through assimilation and rejection of the "old ways." Some Indians who survived the humiliations of the boarding school returned vowing never to subject their own children to such an experience and chose to raise them in English-only households. This, it was believed, would assure that no language "handicap" would interfere with their children's educational future. The belief that assimilation was the pathway to survival and success, coupled with the sense of shame many Indians came to associate with their constantly devalued culture, precluded the perpetuation of many Indian traditions, customs, spiritual beliefs, and institutions - including language - from one generation to the next.
Two additional pressures which further weaken Indian languages are urbanization and intermarriage. In the case of intermarriage, English is often the only language a couple speaks in common and thus becomes the language their children acquire. Likewise, when Native American Indians move to urban areas in search of economic opportunity, they are often isolated from their culture and other speakers of their language. Their children attend schools where English is the only language. Though the children may become bilingual, it is more likely that they will grow up monolingual in English. Relocation to urban areas is an issue of major significance to the survival of indigenous North American languages since, as of the mid-1980's, one-third to one-half of the Indian population of the United States lived in cities.\textsuperscript{38}

Even in local Indian communities (whether in villages, settlements, or on reservations) the pervasiveness of English has a deteriorating effect. Indian languages lose some of their grammatical complexities, vocabulary is forgotten, and lexical and grammatical features of English become incorporated. Though there are a few native language newspapers, books, and radio stations, most American Indian publications and broadcasts are in English (only Navajo, Yupik and Lakota can be heard on regular radio broadcasts). Constant exposure to English-only mass media reinforces the use of English, especially among the young, and communicates the implicit message that English is the language of prestige, dominance, and even glamour.

The predicament faced by speakers of one North American Indian language has been shared to a great extent by speakers of all the
languages. The description of the fate of the Mahican (Mohican) people which follows is more or less typical of hundreds of North American Indian language communities:

Mahican society at the time of initial European contact resided in what is now the upper Hudson River Valley above the Catskill Mountains of New York State. Within Mahican territory there were approximately 40 villages occupied by 3000 to 4000 people. Probably one of the Mahicans' earliest encounters with white people was during Henry Hudson's journey in 1609 up the river which now bears his name. In 1664, after contact with the Dutch and war with the Mohawks, the Mahicans were forced to move to what is now Stockbridge, Massachusetts. Some of the Mahican groups scattered and merged with other Indian societies. Only those who remained in Stockbridge maintained a Mahican cultural identity.

A missionary by the name of John Sergeant arrived among the Mahicans in 1734. He learned their language and set about the task of "civilizing" and making Christians out of them. To this end, he conceived of a boarding school which he himself did not live to see, but which was established in 1749. He envisioned a school where both boys and girls could learn letters, arts, and crafts such as blacksmithing, farming, carpentry, sewing, and cooking. The school was considered a success, as reflected in this 1791 quote by the editor of The Massachusetts Historical Collection: "The Indians are civilized. All speak and write English. The men are good farmers. The women good housekeepers."39

It was a common government policy to induce Indians to sell their land, once it had become desirable to speculators and settlers, by
offering cash incentives and the promise of new land beyond the frontier. Over time, the Mahican had gradually sold their land and, succumbing to pressure and against their will, moved to Western New York. Eventually, the pattern repeated itself and in 1822 the Mahicans had to move again, this time to present-day Wisconsin.

Wanting to resolve the issue of territory in its favor, the federal government urged the Mahicans to become United States citizens. This meant that they would have individual land-holdings but no tribal guarantees. The issue of citizenship split the Mahicans into two factions. They were declared citizens by Congress in 1843 anyway, but there was so much opposition that the Mahicans succeeded in having the act repealed in 1846. In 1906 they were again made citizens and land was once again to be privately owned. In the 1930's, however, the Indian Bureau and the Resettlement Administration established a reservation for those who wanted one.

The Mahican language was still spoken habitually by some members of what had come to be known as the Stockbridge Indians until the late 1880's. By 1938 there were four people who still knew some vocabulary and a few phrases. While there are currently 447 Mahicans living on the Stockbridge Reservation near Green Bay, Wisconsin, Mahican is an extinct language.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE CURRENT SITUATION

For those American Indian communities which survived the European incursion, cultural disruption and physical dislocation like that experienced by the Mahicans was the norm. Today, land holdings of American Indian nations are two percent of what they were prior to the arrival of Europeans. The map in Appendix A shows the location of the land holdings of American Indian Nations as of 1993. Similarly, the language areas of each of the language phyla have also been considerably reduced. As of the early 1980's, there were approximately 350,000 North American Indians in the United States, out of a total of almost a million, who identified themselves as native speakers of an indigenous language. About half were residents of reservations and the other half lived in urban areas not connected to any reservations or other Indian settlements. Analysis of the 1970 data of the United States Bureau of the Census indicates that approximately 58 percent of Native American Indians living on reservations claimed an Indian language as their mother tongue while less than 22 percent of those who lived off-reservation did. The situation for Native American Indian languages over the past two decades has deteriorated and, due to a variety of factors which will be addressed below, the number of people speaking indigenous languages as their mother tongue continues to decline.

As previously mentioned, approximately 300 distinct indigenous languages were spoken in pre-contact North America. More than one third of these are already extinct. The majority of the surviving
languages are considered to be either 'moribund' or 'endangered'. 'Moribund' refers to languages which are doomed to extinction because they are no longer being acquired by successive generations as a first language. Languages which are 'endangered' are still being learned by children but this is unlikely to continue and extinction will probably occur within the next century.

Moribund American Indian languages are often spoken by only a handful of aged speakers. As of 1992, Osage had five fluent elderly speakers, Yokuts fewer than ten, Mandan six, Sirenikski Eskimo two, Iowa five, and Eyak only one, Marie Smith, aged 83. In 1982 Marie was one of two surviving speakers of Eyak, the second speaker being Marie's sister, Sophie Borodkin, who died in 1992 at the age of 80. The children of both women speak only English. George Louie, 81, is the last fluent speaker of Nootka, an Indian language of Western Canada. One by one, speaker by speaker, languages become extinct. The last speaker of Cupeño, Roscinda Nolasquez of Pala, California, died in 1987 at the age of 94.

In Alaska, only two of the area's twenty indigenous languages are still being learned by children: Siberian Yupik and Central Yupik. This makes the moribund rate for the Indian languages of Alaska 90 percent. Michael Krauss of the University of Alaska states that of the 187 Indian languages still being spoken in the United States and Canada, 149 are no longer being passed on to the next generation, making the moribund rate 80 percent for all of North America. It is estimated that by the mid-21st century, no more than a dozen North American Indian
languages will still be spoken with any fluency by a viable number of speakers.\textsuperscript{43}

The term fluency, as used here, refers to full native speaker ability and competency in all aspects of one's first language, or mother tongue. Indian language communities have resisted the pressures of linguistic and cultural assimilation with varying degrees of success and in a variety of ways. The consequences of these pressures have been described by William Leap as follows:\textsuperscript{44}

- Grandparents or great-grandparents are primarily or exclusively fluent in their Native American Indian language; members of lower age levels are predominantly first language speakers of English and have little or no familiarity with their ancestral language at all.
- People of all ages in some families speak the Native American Indian language, while no fluent speakers can be found in other families.
- People are fluent in the Native American Indian language, but prefer to use English in daily conversations.
- People throughout the community, while fluent in the Native American Indian language and English, use the Indian language as a means of distancing public discussions from outsiders and switch freely between the Indian language and English only when outsiders are not around.
- People throughout the community know and use the Native American Indian language, but the styles of speaking in common use throughout the community show high degrees of influence from English and differ, accordingly, from the speaking styles used by elders.
• People throughout the community know and use the Native American Indian language. Young people learn the language at home and enter school with that language, instead of English, as their first language. They leave school six or more grades later fluent only in English; and only in certain cases will fluency in the Native American Indian language be re-acquired later.

• People are not always able to speak the Native American Indian language but do understand the basic issues under discussion when the language is spoken and, if need be, may be able to identify and interpret individual words and phrases within and outside of conversational contexts.

• People are fluent in the Native American Indian language, but, for various reasons are unwilling to transmit their knowledge to non-speakers, forcing an increasingly large segment of the language community to remain unfamiliar with the language of their cultural tradition.

It is easy to see in descriptions such as those above how the integrity of Native American Indian languages continues to be whittled away with each succeeding generation of semi-speakers and non-speakers until they become 'moribund' or extinct. The remaining twenty percent of North American Indian languages which are not considered 'moribund' can be categorized as either 'endangered' or 'safe'. To qualify as 'safe,' a language needs to have a large number of speakers and be a language which is self-perpetuating from generation to generation. The clearest example of a 'safe' American Indian
language is Navajo, which is spoken fluently by more than 130,000 of the 175,000 Indian residents of the southwestern reservation. It is the only North American Indian language north of Mexico with more than 100,000 speakers. Some estimates indicate that there are more speakers of Navajo than of all other North American Indian languages combined.45

But even the future of Navajo is not assured. While speakers have language amenities (a commercially prepared typewriter keyboard designed especially for Navajo, a weekly newspaper in Navajo, and a radio station which broadcasts regularly in Navajo), fluency in English continues to spread on the reservation. As recently as the 1960's, 90 percent of Navajo children were acquiring Navajo as their first language. Today, however, due to years of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' imposition of English as a first language, most Navajo children are growing up speaking only English, or are only semi-fluent in Navajo. Dillon Platero, Headmaster of the Navajo Academy, pointed out in a public address in 1986 that even though there are more speakers of Navajo than ever before, there are also more Navajos who do not speak the language than ever before.46

It is difficult to arrive at an accurate assessment of the current number of speakers of North American Indian languages. For one thing, statistics from different sources do not always coincide. For another, the United States census only counts speakers of the largest languages. For these reasons, the most reliable figures are probably those of Wallace Chafe, who published the results of a survey he conducted for the continental United States (including Alaska) and Canada in 1962.
Chafe sent questionnaires to 500 consultants and his results are still considered to be the best source of information on North American Indian languages. His findings can be categorized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of speakers:</th>
<th>1-10</th>
<th>10-100</th>
<th>100-1000</th>
<th>1000-10,000</th>
<th>10,000+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of languages:</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering that this survey is over thirty years old, it is almost certain that the fifty-one languages in Chafe's first category no longer exist. What can be deduced from more current sources is that presently about twenty-six North American Indian languages can be counted as 'endangered'.

The languages considered to be 'safe' are less than half that number. The following are the only North American Indian languages with more than 10,000 speakers: Navajo, 130,000 speakers out of a population of 175,000 in 1977; Western Apache, 11,000 out of a population of 12,000 in 1977; Western Cree, 35,000 out of a population of 53,000 or more in 1982; Western Ojibwa, 35,000 out of a population of 60,000 in 1977; Choctaw and Chickasaw, 12,000 out of a population of 25,000 in 1987; Dakota, 19,000 out of a population of 23,000 in 1977; Eastern Canadian Inuit, 14,000 out of a population of 17,500 (date unknown); Cherokee, 10,000 out of a population of 70,000 in northeastern Oklahoma, and 1,100 in western North Carolina, in 1986; and Pima-Papago, 15,000 out of a population of 20,000 in 1977. Chafe's 1962 estimates and his 1965 corrections can be found in Appendix B.
The political climate of the 1960's and 1970's generated a series of legislative decisions and actions which provided a greatly improved educational situation for Indian languages spoken in the United States. In 1968, hearings were held before the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education, chaired by Senator Robert F. Kennedy, during which Indians expressed a desire to have more control of the federally subsidized schools, both public and those operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which 57 percent of all Indian children attended. It was noted that curricula which denigrate Indian cultures and languages were contributing to a drop-out rate twice that of the nation at large, and a suicide rate several times the national one.50

For a brief time in the 1970's, various attempts were made to revive and preserve Indian languages by instituting bilingual education projects. The 1980's, however, saw a period of conservative backlash, both at the federal and local levels. As Secretary of Education during President Ronald Reagan's second term of office, William J. Bennett pushed for total immersion in English for the earliest grades and succeeded in achieving increased funding for this purpose under Title VII, the 1968 Bilingual Education Act, which provides most of the funding for bilingual education in the United States. Bennett received important assistance in this effort from then-Senator Dan Quayle.

Federal programming was not the only arena of assault on Indian languages in the late 1980's. In 1987 the Director of the National Endowment for the Humanities proposed that there be no funding for the scholarly study of languages with small numbers of speakers and little or no written literature. The scholarly community responded with
such outrage that the Endowment was compelled to issue a "clarifying" statement.51

In addition to the hostility directed toward any efforts at indigenous language preservation from the highest levels of the federal government during the 1980's, Indian languages were embattled on the local level as well. In 1983, a lobbying group, 'US English', began a state by state movement to have the Constitution of the United States amended to make English the official language of the country. The stated goal of 'US English' was to prevent the "institutionalization of immigrant languages in competition with English."52 Though the focus of the 'US English' attack was immigrant languages, Native American Indian languages were threatened as well because the agencies which provided funds for immigrant bilingual education and language maintenance programs were the same ones which funded programs for indigenous languages. The local US English initiatives resulted in the passage by voters of 'Official English' statutes in sixteen states.53

The response in many Native American Indian communities to the threat posed by the 'Official English' movement was the establishment of language policies and laws of their own. The legal status of American Indian communities as sovereign nations made it possible for them to declare their own languages 'official' and English as a second language. The first group to do so was the Northern Utes in April 1984. Their declaration also required the endorsement of the Tribal government for any research of the Ute language, culture, traditions, history, or contemporary affairs. Minimum standards of knowledge of Ute culture and history were set for any teachers of Ute students attending the
reservation's public schools. The Utes also established a Tribal Language and Culture Committee to serve as the supervising body for the new policies. As of 1990, the Standing Rock Sioux, the Red Lake Band of the Chippewa, the Papago, the Southern Ute, the Yaqui, the Tohono O'odham, the Apache, the Navajo, and the Havasupai had all either established such official language policies or were considering them.

In June of 1993, designated representatives of the Dakota-Lakota-Nakota Nations met on the Pine Ridge Reservation of South Dakota to declare the Articles of Unification Accord for Peace, Alliance and Sovereignty. Resolution No. 93-02 of this, the fifth such summit, addresses the issue of preservation of the Lakota language and calls for, among several other goals, the establishment of a Lakota speaking facility for the teaching of the language. Appendix C contains the entire text of this Resolution.

Native American Indians have developed other strategies to resist the 'Official English' threat. The stimulus for legislation developed out of resolutions formulated by the participants of the 1988 Native American Indian Languages Institute in Tempe, Arizona. The resolutions were forwarded to a number of policy makers and a copy of the resolutions was sent to the United States Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs, chaired by Senator Daniel Inouye. Senator Inouye formed the resolutions into a bill which he introduced in the U.S. Senate as S. J. Res. 379. The Joint Resolution proposed that it "be the policy of the United States to preserve, protect, and promote the rights of indigenous Americans . . . to use, practice, and develop Native American
languages, including the right to use Native American languages as the media of instruction in State and Federal institutions of compulsory education and as the official language in their traditional territories[.]

S. J. Res. 379 passed the U.S. Senate without opposition in the autumn of 1989. However, the resolution was not introduced in the House of Representatives and no final action was taken by the 100th Congress.

The following year S. J. Res. 379 was reintroduced in the 101st Congress as S. 1781, the 'Native American Language Act'. The resolution was incorporated into another act, H.R. 5040, passed by both houses of Congress, and signed by President Bush in 1990. Highlights of the Act include recognition of the special status of Native American Indian languages and cultures and of the responsibility of the United States to act together with Native American Indians to ensure their survival. Past oppressive federal actions were acknowledged as not being consistent with the policy of self-determination for Native American Indians. The Act recognized that young people do best in school if they are taught to respect their natal language and culture. It was further stated that U.S. policy would be to preserve, protect, and promote the rights and freedom of Native American Indians to use, practice, and develop their languages. The value of native languages as a medium of instruction was noted, as well as the need to include Native American Indian languages in curricula at all levels. A final highlight of the act was the recognition of the right of Native American Indian governing bodies to adopt native languages as official languages.

The bill was mostly a statement of policy and made no provisions for funding of any programs. This need was addressed two years later.
in October of 1992 when Senate bill 2044, the Native American Languages Act of 1992, allocating two million dollars a year for Native American Indian language studies, was passed and signed by President Bush.

The White House Conference on Indian Education also took place in 1992. The purpose of this conference was to develop recommendations to improve Indian educational services. Native Languages and Culture was one of the eleven targeted "topic areas." Resolutions were passed addressing the primary theme of this topic area: "strengthening and preserving American Indians and Alaska Natives language and culture under the auspices of U.S. policies and mandates." The full text of the resolutions can be found in Appendix D.

The current legislative and political climate for American Indian languages is somewhat improved. President Clinton has made appointments to high administrative positions in the Department of the Interior that were initially well-received by many Indians: Bruce Babbitt as Secretary, and Ada Deer as assistant secretary of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. But despite the new attitude of openness and support for sovereign Indian culture and governance, the prospect for the survival of most Native American Indian languages remains uncertain.
CHAPTER FIVE: LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE AND RENEWAL

Language maintenance projects for viable languages, and renewal projects for endangered and moribund languages, are crucial elements in the struggle to maintain the integrity and stability of Native American Indian communities. Common language is one of the key elements of cultural cohesion, identity, and strength. Fluency in the ancestral language is significantly related to a people's world view and spiritual traditions. Because they cannot speak the language, members of one New Mexico pueblo under the age of forty are unable to pray and participate in traditional ceremonies. The loss of a language erodes the very foundation of the culture, traditions, and identity of a people.

Though the social ramifications posed by the loss of a language are comparable for all Native American Indian communities, there is no one solution appropriate for all circumstances. Language support programs work best if tailored to each unique situation. Hence, Native American Indian language maintenance and renewal efforts take many forms depending upon the particular problems faced, and the desires expressed, by each language community. In some communities the threat to the membership's native language is being addressed by bilingual programming for children in the schools, some offer courses at the local community college, others have summer language immersion camps for children, or summer language institutes for adults, and some communities have radio and television broadcasts, periodical publications, informal classes offered by religious^57 or secular
organizations, or do-it-yourself language learning materials such as textbooks, computer programs, and cassette tapes.

A variety of obstacles, issues, and challenges can inhibit the implementation and success of language maintenance and renewal efforts. One of the first of these problems is the lack of consensus among the members of a language community regarding the desirability of language support projects. Rarely is there consensus within a community on the issue of language maintenance or renewal. Differences of opinion on this subject can sometimes result in political struggles and delays in programming which might get underway sooner were there no opposition.

It was noted previously that some Native American Indians have come to hold the view that assimilation and fluency in English are the path of progress. Parents who hold this view do not want their children to be limited to what they fear would be a linguistic ghetto. These views may be the result of school personnel who claim that bilingualism will negatively affect children's proficiency in English and their overall school achievement. Not wanting their children to be "harmed," some parents have actively opposed the teaching of the native language in reservation schools.

In 1970, Yuk Eskimos resisted the use of their native language in the schools because parents felt it would interfere with their children's chances for success. The native language was to be used only in the lower grades to facilitate the acquisition of English. The parents were pleased when this turned out to be the case and when it became clear that the children were also performing better in all subjects and
enjoying school more. Similar successes in the early years of bilingual education for Indian children reduced the number of objections to the use of ancestral languages in the classroom.\textsuperscript{58}

In some cases, resistance to teaching of the ancestral language in schools also stems from distrust of formal education. The concept of formal education according to a European model is one that has been imposed and bears little resemblance to traditional ways of teaching. The Indian "silent way" of learning centers on years of apprenticeship and is accomplished by participation, experience, and observation of those respected for their knowledge and expertise.\textsuperscript{59} It is felt among many Indians who maintain traditional ways that their culture's customs and traditions, as well as its language, should be passed on by means of the indigenous system of teaching. Schools are seen as more appropriate for the learning of that which is not Indian, such as English.\textsuperscript{60}

Sometimes community-wide surveys or dialogues are initiated in order to assess the language needs and desires of a language community, or to create an awareness that the survival of a language is threatened. Such was the case recently on FM station KILI, located on the Pine Ridge Reservation of South Dakota, which featured a series of call-in/talk shows hosted by two women, Ardis Iron Cloud and Rosalie Little Thunder. The programs were well-received by the community and succeeded in raising awareness of the erosion of Lakota language use within individual families, as well as stimulating interest and a number of ideas and suggestions from throughout the reservation regarding the issue of Lakota language preservation.\textsuperscript{61}
A major challenge to language support efforts is the scarcity of qualified educators. Those who are fluent in a language are often elderly and lack any training as teachers. On the other hand, those who are qualified as teachers often are not fluent speakers. Team-teaching with representatives from both of these groups has proved successful on some reservations. The most successful, stable, and popular approach to language projects over the years has proven to be the training and certification of fluent community members as full-time teachers of Indian students in a local school.

Developing appropriate teaching materials is another major challenge faced by those interested in language maintenance and renewal efforts. Not all Native American Indian languages, for instance, have orthographies. The development of a written form for Indian languages also is sometimes met with resistance. Many elders feel that to have their language reduced to print is to rob it of its warmth and to make it available for use inappropriately and out of context. One elderly man, the last fluent speaker of his northern California language, explained that he would not participate in any studies of his language in the following terms, as summarized by William Leap:

Aboriginal hunting grounds and gathering lands are no longer under Tribal control, the traditional economy is destroyed, and the people are dependent on wage-labor (when available) as their only source of livelihood. Contracts with non-Indians have weakened marriage restrictions and blurred finer points of Tribal social life. Under such circumstances, linguistic skills and spiritual knowledge were the only two components of the ancestral culture which had been kept free of outside influences, and he was committed to keeping it that way.
When it is the general desire of the members of a community to have an alphabet developed for their language, the result is often linguistically sound but impractical for the purposes of teaching, especially at the beginning level, and for the development of materials. Many of the linguistic symbols used to form the scripts are unfamiliar and unavailable on standard typewriters. Funding usually does not allow for the expense of specialized typewriters or publications.

One solution has been the utilization of microcomputers. Once the initial investment has been made in equipment, computers have proven to be economical and beneficial. With computers, communities can produce their own language materials, including illustrated workbooks and dictionaries, at a fraction of the former costs. For languages such as Cherokee, which make use of a syllabary for their writing system, computers have made it possible to generate teaching materials for children and adults at many levels of ability.

It is an expensive undertaking to have orthographic and grammatical materials developed for those languages which do not already have them. Though there has been a movement in recent years to train native speakers as linguists, their numbers are still too few. Consequently, it is often the case that assistance of researchers from outside the community is sought. These linguists often do not know how, or are not interested in, producing materials that are culturally appropriate for teaching. Sometimes state offices for the National Endowment for the Humanities fund the services of a linguist for a few weeks. This is only enough time to generate an introduction to the phonology, vocabulary lists, and some verb paradigms. If a
comprehensive grammar is produced, often in the form of a doctoral dissertation, the material is usually much too advanced for use at beginning levels. It is seldom the case that American Indian language programs have the resources to produce teaching materials which are comprehensive and range from the beginning to the advanced levels.\textsuperscript{65}

The lack of opportunities for the students to make use of their developing abilities in natural contexts will invariably undermine the efforts of any language maintenance or renewal program. When there are limited opportunities for conversation at home or in the community, language ability will atrophy. Even though there may be fluent speakers, usually elderly, available to interact with, this is not always a help. Several sources indicated that criticism of the faltering attempts of learners of a language by fluent elders has an inhibiting effect which discourages further study.

The most promising approach to American Indian language maintenance to date appears to be bilingual education which fosters both native and English language development from a young age. Historically, however, school personnel have given native languages low priority, or even excluded them as being "esoteric." Bilingual education as it existed prior to the 1970's was aimed at assimilating Indian children; the purpose of incorporating native languages in their education was to further ability in English, not to maintain bilingualism.

In more recent years, the focus of bilingual programs has shifted to better accommodate the needs and desires of Indian students and their communities. In situations where children start school fluent in their ancestral language and are minimally familiar with English, the
bilingual program involves instruction in the language arts of their native language coordinated with English as a second language (ESL) education. The goal is to develop the students' ability in Standard English without adversely affecting their native language competency. In instances where the reverse is true and children begin school primarily possessing a command of English and not their ancestral Indian language, bilingual education involves Native as a second language (NSL). In NSL programs, education is conducted so that the development of skills in English will not be adversely affected by the acquisition of Indian language skills. In both cases, however, the emphasis is still on the development of English language skills.

The role of Native American Indian languages in bilingual education might no longer be seen exclusively as a means to the end of English ability, but they are still, in most cases, relegated to a secondary status. Such is the case for the Sak-Fox Day School of the Mesquakie Settlement near Tama, Iowa. Approximately 75 Indian children attend classes from pre-kindergarten to eighth grade. When they first begin school, approximately half of the children are speakers of the Mesquakie language and the other half are speakers of English. There are ten teachers, four of whom are fluent speakers of the ancestral language. The Mesquakie language is used to facilitate other learning, including the acquisition of English. English is not used to enhance the children's knowledge or appreciation of the Mesquakie language and culture. By the time the students complete the eighth grade and leave to attend the local public high school, those who began fluent only in Mesquakie leave fluent in both that language and English. Those
students who started school speaking English, leave fluent only in English and with some NSL ability in the Mesquakie language.\(^{67}\)

There has been widespread misunderstanding of bilingual education and of the effects of teaching conducted in the ancestral language. Research indicates that incorporation of the native language actually improves the academic performance of Indian children. One example of many is the shift which occurred in the academic achievement of the Navajo children at the Rock Point School on the Navajo Reservation after Navajo was reintroduced as a language of instruction. Prior to that time the students' academic achievement was two years behind the national norm even though they had received six years of intensive English instruction. Once Navajo language and literacy development was begun in the early years of schooling and continued into later grades, the children's performance improved until it was above the national norm. It was found that once skills became established in Navajo, they could then be transferred to English.\(^{68}\)

Similar results have been achieved with children who were members of other Indian language communities. Students who were said to have the strongest skills in the Keresan language also demonstrated the strongest skills in English speaking, writing, and reading. Among the students of the Laguna pueblo, fluency in the native language is associated with higher levels of fluency in English.\(^{69}\) One researcher found that children who were taught to read and write in Dakota could then master English more easily.\(^{70}\) Research has found that students in bilingual programs consistently received higher English
language test scores in reading, language skills, mathematics, and total achievement.\textsuperscript{71}

Not only has it been found that native language instruction improves students' ability in both their ancestral language and English, but that English immersion programs are the least successful; the greater the students' exposure to English, the worse they performed.\textsuperscript{72} The majority of Native American Indian children have been in English-only immersion programs of study for most of this century, a fact which has no doubt contributed to the historically low academic achievement of Native American Indian students, relative to other groups, and their consistently high drop-out rate.

The trend of the past two decades has been away from English-only immersion programs toward bilingual programs such as those referred to above. That bilingual programs have succeeded in teaching English language skills is clear. Whether these same programs have managed to develop comparable skills in Indian languages is less clear. Regarding the specific concern for the maintenance and renewal of Native American Indian languages, the question to be answered is, to what extent are these and other types of language support programs actually able to achieve the goal of language continuity? The answer is mixed. Bilingual education can maintain fluency in the ancestral language while teaching English. None of the programs, however, manage to create fluent speakers of Native American Indian languages.

Many of the programs are successful to the extent that they introduce students to significant phonological, lexical, and grammatical features of the various Indian languages, but in no way can such
knowledge be compared to the abilities of a native speaker. For children who do not already have fluency in their ancestral language, the program does not yet exist which can help them achieve this. Schools and other educational programs can only reinforce what is learned in the home. Apparently, in situations where bilingual education is not an option, the best that can be hoped for, beyond the teaching of an ancestral language as a second language, is that those children who have inherited an Indian language as their mother tongue not lose it in the course of their education and a lifetime of exposure to English.

The Hualapai Bilingual/Bicultural Program provides an example of the kind of effort which has succeeded in maintaining and developing the language skills of Hualapai speaking children while also teaching them English. The program, founded in 1975, has been so successful that it has served as a model for other projects and is considered to be one of the best in the United States. Hualapai is a member of the Yuman family of languages and is the ancestral language of a community of 1000 living in northern Arizona. The key elements to the success of the Hualapai program, according to its director, Lucille Watahomigie, have been the active involvement of the community, the support and endorsement of the tribal council, the attention paid to staff training and professional development, and cooperative arrangements with linguists and researchers.

The classroom content, which is provided in both English and Hualapai, is "community based;" the content of the curriculum is derived from, and strives to develop, an appreciation and understanding of the
Hualapai community and environment. The general staff is mostly composed of members of the Hualapai community whose relatives, including grandparents, have served as resource people for the program. Though most of the certified teachers are not Hualapai, the Hualapai staff serve as teachers' aides and present Hualapai language materials in the classroom.

The Hualapai program has set a precedent by requiring that any researchers and linguists leave "useful and usable" materials for the school's and community's use. Linguists have been requested to provide linguistic training to speakers of Hualapai, working with them to produce grammars and lexicographical studies of the language. As a result of such collaborations with researchers and trained consultants, the Hualapai bilingual/bicultural program has been able to produce accurate and culturally relevant books and materials in the Hualapai language. An educational foundation donation has made it possible for the school to have a sophisticated computer laboratory, in addition to its state-of-the-art media center, and a television station which broadcasts language programs for the school and community. In addition to ensuring maintenance for the Hualapai language, the Hualapai Bilingual/Bicultural Program has also succeeded in reinforcing pride in the Hualapai language, culture, and community.

Since fluency is not a realistic goal of renewal efforts for moribund languages, some programs take what has been called "the culture language approach" to teaching appreciation of a community's language, culture and history. This is accomplished through the presentation of "culture-loaded vocabulary." Culturally-loaded lexical
items represent concepts which do not translate well into English and for which English usually has no equivalent terms. The vocabulary, being culture-specific, reflects the unique concepts contained within a particular community's language, such as cosmology, counting systems, mythology, fishing and hunting techniques, oral tradition, etc. \(^{79}\)

Syntactic structures are not taught since communication in the language is not one of the goals of the approach.

Schnitsu'umshtsnt: The Coeur d'Alene Language Preservation Project of northern Idaho has made use of the culture language approach. As of 1988 there were fewer than two dozen fluent speakers of Coeur d'Alene out of a population of 1,100, of whom about 300 live on the reservation. The language being clearly moribund with essentially non-existent prospects for any kind of viable renewal, the culture language approach was adopted as a method of language and cultural preservation. Sample exercises from Coeur d'Alene project workbooks, developed with the help of a computer, are contained in Appendix E.

Other language teaching methods which have been suggested or are in use for the teaching of Native American Indian languages include the Natural Approach, \(^{80}\) the Whole Language Approach, \(^{81}\) an approach referred to as the "explorer classroom," \(^{82}\) Total Physical Response, and High Intensive Training. \(^{83}\) Some second-language teaching methods, however, are culturally inappropriate for Native American Indians. Indian "styles" of learning which have been observed to differ from the Anglo-American tradition include a reluctance to compete in class against friends, reluctance to perform solo in front of a group, and
"particular uses of silence." When students are expected to perform in a manner which violates their culture's code of behavior, learning is certain to be impeded.

A Menominee language teacher, Wallace Pyawasit, has suggested language teaching which models the traditional way Indian children learn to perform ceremonial drumming. The only materials the students are exposed to are examples of real, natural language. Actual texts, such as legends, are recited or read aloud by native speakers. Students are not expected to attempt early verbal expression. The use of natural texts as an approach to teaching cultural history, as opposed to language fluency, appears to be successful and popular among Indians of all ages.
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION

The inclusion of culture is integral to Wallace Pyawasit's natural-text language teaching approach, as it is with many other Indian language maintenance and renewal programs throughout North America. Recognizing that language and culture cannot be separated, many Indian communities want education for their children which is culturally appropriate and relevant. This integration of language and culture is a significant development in the education of twentieth-century Native American Indian children.

Previously, one of the tactics employed by the dominant culture to undermine Native American Indian languages was by means of educational assimilation. Reclaiming control of the content of children's education is essential to the survival of Native American Indian languages and cultures. William Leap put it this way, "... Indian language issues are self-determination issues." Adeline Wanatee, an elder of the Mesquakie Indian Settlement of Tama, Iowa recently said, "Along with our Indian religion, I strongly urge my people to preserve our precious language. I see some of our new generation not using this invaluable asset. We must continue to uphold and use our Mesquakie dialect. To lose use of the Mesquakie language is tantamount to 'cultural death'."

Cultural death is the legacy resulting from the loss of the more than 100 North American Indian languages which have already disappeared. This is more than one-third of the languages which were spoken on the continent at the time Europeans first began to arrive in
significant numbers some five centuries ago. Considering the embattled status of Native American Indian cultures and languages during this period, that any have survived at all is a testament to their resilience.

The indigenous languages of North America are remarkable for their diversity. Some are polysynthetic and others are not. Some have complex phonological, morphological, or syntactic systems while others do not. Some have large numbers of speakers and others do not. In either case, prospects for the long-term survival of most Native American Indian languages are not good if the present patterns of language loss prevail.

Awareness of the critical need to take concrete measures to preserve their languages has burgeoned within Indian communities during the last two decades and this in turn has engendered a wide variety of language maintenance and renewal efforts. The challenges faced by each Indian language community are unique and solutions work best if tailored to the particular situation. Some communities are still feeling their way while others, such as the Hualapai community in Arizona, have already experienced some success in their language maintenance program. So far, bilingual education, like that offered in the Hualapai program, seems to offer the best results for native language preservation.

The recent change in attitude at the federal level toward the Indian desire for greater involvement and control of Indian affairs is marked. Formerly, the United States government behaved as though its mission was to eradicate all that was unique to Indians. The attitude toward Indians was confused at best. On the one hand, it was believed
that Indians should be as much like people of European descent as possible. On the other, racism made Indian acceptance into the dominant society an impossibility. To some degree the value of differences among people is beginning to be understood and appreciated, both in United States society in general and in the government. If recent legislative acts are any indication, there is now a measure of support for Indian self-determination. This has certainly not always been the case and may not continue to be. But for now the improved climate bodes better for the essential task of language and cultural preservation facing Indian peoples today.

What is at stake is the cultural heritage of nearly 200 Native American Indian civilizations. The extinction of a language is a loss to the entire world, not just to its native speakers, because we all suffer the consequences of reduced diversity. Humankind is on the brink of a tragedy propelled by the momentum of over 500 years of genocidal history. The concern over the impending extinction of the indigenous languages of North America has given impetus to the movement for maintenance and renewal efforts. For most of the languages the attention is too late. For some Native American Indian languages, if the will, desire, and resources prevail, there is hope.
NOTES

1The Christian-based method for sequencing years (B.C./A.D.) is used here out of necessity. While it is not appropriate for many contexts, especially those of Native American Indians, there is no other method for measuring time which is accepted or used widely enough for use here.

2See the "Utne Network for Communications, Letters and Epistles" in the Utne Reader (July/August 1993), pps. 11-12, for the letter by Mark Chalkley in response to the article, "The Lost Horizon," by Catherine Gysin (Utne Reader, May/June 1993):

"... While there is something sad about a language vanishing forever, it is also a very natural occurrence - an inevitable consequence of evolution in human society. Gysin presents language death almost as the linguistic equivalent of rain-forest destruction, as another sin of culturally insensitive Western imperialism against non-white peoples."


4Three cultures of the American continent had a written form for their languages. The Olmec, Maya, and Zapotec of Mesoamerica wrote in ideographic glyphs.


6A summary of the conclusions arrived at during this conference were published in the volume edited by Lyle Campbell and Marianne Mithun, The Languages of Native America: Historical and Comparative Assessment (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1979).


10Ever-more ambitious super-groupings continue to be proposed for the world's languages. A "super-superphylum" has recently been suggested which


13 Ibid., p. 783.

14 Ibid., p. 784.

15 Ibid.

16 Ibid.

17 Ibid.

18 Ibid.

19 Ibid.


27 Ibid.

28 Ibid.

29 Ibid.


31 Ibid., p. 32.

32 Ibid., p. 39.


Ibid., p. 136.


Ibid., p. 147.

Ibid., p. 140.


Mark Bordeaux, administrator of the Sac and Fox Settlement School, telephone conversation with author, February 24, 1994, Mesquakie Settlement, Iowa.


85 Ibid., p. 246:

"The student spends hours sitting behind performers as they drum, perhaps several months. The student is finally invited to join the circle of drummers and to keep up with the songs by tapping lightly with small straight sticks on the edge of the drum, again for an unspecified period of time. Eventually the student will be provided with real drumming sticks and allowed to participate in the performance. Never was the drumming process analyzed into component structures and presented to students, nor were they made to perform elementary, preliminary songs. Never were students forced to perform before they were ready, nor did the occasion arise to criticize them for their efforts, however constructive that might have been."

86 Ibid., p. 246 and 249.


Articles of Unification Accord For Peace, Alliance, and Sovereignty.


APPENDIX A: MAP OF AMERICAN INDIAN NATIONS

(From The American Indian Digest by George Russell,
Thunderbird Enterprises, 1993, p. 32-33.)

Used with permission.
AMERICAN INDIAN NATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Reservation</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>15,662,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tohono O’Odham</td>
<td>2,774,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wind River</td>
<td>1,888,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>1,826,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pine Ridge</td>
<td>1,780,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fort Apache</td>
<td>1,664,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hopi</td>
<td>1,561,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Crow</td>
<td>1,517,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cheyenne River</td>
<td>1,395,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>1,130,286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:
1. The Navajo Nation has its own Area Office.
2. BIA Area Offices chart on page 63.

LEGEND
- Federally recognized tribes
- State recognized tribes
- States without federal reservations
- BIA Area Office administrative boundary
APPENDIX B: CHAFE'S 1962 ESTIMATES OF NORTH AMERICAN INDIAN LANGUAGE SPEAKERS


- Abenaki (St. Francis). Approx. 50. Over 50. Quebec. See also Penobscot.
- Achumawi. 10 to 100. Over 50. California.
- Acoma. See Keresan.
- Alabama. 200 - 400. All ages. Texas. See also Koasati.
- Aleut, Eastern. 600-700. All ages. Alaska.
- Aleut, Western. Approx. 100. All ages. Alaska. (Approx. 400 additional speakers on the Commander Islands, in the former Soviet Union.)
- Apache, Chiricahua. 100 to 1,000. All ages (over 20 in Oklahoma, where fewer than 100 speakers), Arizona, Oklahoma.
- Apache, Jicarilla. Approx. 1,000. All ages. New Mexico.
- Apache, Mescalero. Approx. 1,000. All ages. New Mexico.
- Apache, Western. 8,000 - 10,000. All ages. Arizona (White Mountain 3,000-4,000, San Carlos 3,000 - 4,000, Cibecue approx. 1,000, Tonto approx. 500).
- Arapaho. 1,000 - 3,000. All ages. Wyoming, Oklahoma. See also Atsina.
- Assiniboin (Stoney). 1,000 - 2,000. All ages. Montana, Alberta, Saskatchewan. See also Yankton, Teton, Santece.
- Atna. See Ahtena.
- Atsina. Fewer than 10. Over 50. Montana. See also Arapaho.
- Beaver. Approx. 300. All ages. British Columbia, Alberta. See also Sarsi, Sekani.
- Bellabella. See Heiltsuk.
- Blackfoot. 5,000 - 6,000. All ages (but few children in Montana). Montana, Alberta.
- Cahuilla. 10 to 100. Over 20. California.
- Carrier. 1,000 - 3,000. All ages. British Columbia. See also Chilcotin.
- Cayuga. 500 to 1,000 (approx. 25 in Oklahoma). Over 20 (Oklahoma over 50). Ontario, New York, Oklahoma.
Chehalis. See Halkomelem.

Chehalis, Lower. Fewer than 10. Over 50. Washington. See also Chehalis, Upper; Cowlitz; Quinault.


Chemainus. See Halkomelem.

Chemehuevi. 100 to 200. All ages. California, Arizona.

Cherokee. Approx. 10,000. All ages. Oklahoma, North Carolina. (Approx. 1,000 speak North Carolina or Middle dialect.)


Cheyenne. 3,000-4,000. All ages (few children in Oklahoma). Montana, Oklahoma.

Chickasaw. 2,000-3,000. All ages. Oklahoma. See also Choctaw.

Chilcotin. 500 to 1,000. All ages. British Columbia. See also Carrier.

Chilliwack. See Halkomelem.

Chinook Jargon. 10-100. Over 50. Scattered through Northwest.

Chipewyan. 3,000-4,000. All ages. Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Mackenzie. See also Yellowknife, Slave.

Chiricahua. See Apache, Chiricahua.


Choctaw. Approx. 10,000. All ages. Oklahoma, Mississippi, Louisiana. See also Chickasaw.

Chuckchansi. See Yokuts, Chuckchansi.


Cibecue Apache. See Apache, Western.

Cochiti. See Keresan.

Cocopa. 300-400. All ages. Arizona. (But the majority live wholly or partially in Sonora, Mexico.)


Colville. See Okanagan.

Comanche-Wenatchi. Approx. 1,500. Over 50. Oklahoma. See also Shoshoni, Panamint.

Comox. 2 or 3. Over 50. British Columbia. See also Sliammon.

Coos (Hanis). 1 or 2. Over 50. British Columbia. See also Sliammon.


Coushatta. See Koasati.

Cowichan. See Halkomelem.

Cowlitz. 1. Over 50. Washington. See also Chehalis, Upper and Lower; Quinault.

Cree. 30,000-40,000. All ages. British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, Montana. See also Montagnais-Naskapi.

Creek. Approx. 10,000. All ages. Oklahoma, Alabama. See also Seminole.

Crow. Approx. 3,000. All ages. Montana.


Dakota. See Santee, Yankton, Teton, Assiniboine.

Delaware. 10-100. Over 50. Oklahoma, Ontario. (Fewer than 10 speak Munsee dialect in Ontario.)


Dogrib. Approx. 800. All ages. Mackenzie. See also Hare.

Duwamish. See Salish, Southern Puget Sound.

Eskimo, Inupik. 40,000-50,000. All ages. Alaska, Yukon, Northwest Territories,
Ontario, Quebec, Newfoundland, Greenland.

Eskimo, Yupik. 13,000-14,000. All ages. Alaska. (Approx. 900 additional speakers in northeastern Siberia.)


Fox (including Sac). Approx. 1,000. All ages. Iowa, Oklahoma, Kansas. (Few children in Oklahoma and none in Kansas.) See also Kickapoo.


Gitksan. See Tsimshian.

Gosiute. See Shoshoni.

Haida. Approx. 700. All ages. British Columbia, Alaska. (Skidegate dialect has fewer than 100, most over 50.)

Haisla (including Kitamat). 100-1,000. All ages. British Columbia.

Halkomelem. 1,000-2,000. All ages. British Columbia. (Chehalis approx. 150, Chemainus approx. 300, Chiliwack approx. 150, Cowichan approx. 500, Katzie approx. 50, Kwantlen approx. 15, Musqueam approx. 100, Nanaimo approx. 150, Sumas approx. 60, Tait approx. 250.)

Han. Approx. 60. Over 50. Alaska, Yukon. See also Tutcherone.

Hanis. See Coos.

Hano. See Tewa.

Hare. Approx. 600. All ages. Mackenzie. See also Dogrib.

Havasupai. 300-500. All ages. Arizona. See also Walapai, Yavapai.

Hidatsa. 500-1,000. All ages. North Dakota.

Hopi. 3,000-5,000. All ages. Arizona.


Huron. See Wyandot.


Ingaliik (dialect of Nicolai). Approx. 100. All ages. Alaska.

Iowa. 100-200. Over 50. Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska. See also Oto.

Isleta. 1,000-2,000. All ages. New Mexico. See also Sandia.

Jemez. Approx. 1,200. All ages. New Mexico.

Jicarilla. See Apache, Jicarilla.


Kalapuya. Possibly 1 or 2. Over 50. Oregon.

Kalispel. See Flathead.

Kansa. 10-100. Over 50. Oklahoma. See also Omaha, Osage, Ponca, Quapaw.

Karok. 100-1,000. Over 20. California.

Kashaya. See Pomo, Southwestern.

Kaska. 200-500. All ages. British Columbia, Yukon, Alaska. See also Tahltan.


Katzie. Hee Halkomelem.


Keresan. Approx. 7,000. All ages. New Mexico. (Acoma 1,000-2,000, Cochiti
approx. 500, Laguna approx. 2,000, San Felipe approx. 1,000, Santa Ana
approx. 300, Santo Domingo 1,000-2,000, Zia approx. 300.)
Kickapoo. Approx. 500. All ages. Oklahoma, Kansas. (Roughly an equivalent
number of speakers live in Chihuahua, Mexico. Children in Kansas are
not speakers.) See also Fox.
Kiowa-Apache. See Apache, Kiowa.
Kitamat. See Haisla.
Klallam. See Straits.
Klitzitat. 10-20. Over 50. Washington. See also Umatilla, Walla Walla, Warm
Springs, Yakima.
Koasati (Coushatta). 100-200. All ages. Texas, Louisiana. See also Alabama.
Koyukon. 400-500. Over 20. Alaska. See also Tanana.
Kutchin. Approx. 1,200. All ages. Alaska, Yukon, Mackenzie.
Kwakiutl. Approx. 1,000. All ages. British Columbia. See also Haisla, Heiltsuk.
Kwantlen. See Halkomelem.
Launa. See Keresan.
Lake. See Okanagan.
Lakota. See Teton.
Lillooet. 1,000-2,000. All ages. British Columbia.
Lipan. See Apache, Lipan.
Luiseno. 100-200. All ages. California.
Lummi. See Straits.
Maidu, Northwest. 10-100. Over 50. California.
Maidu, Southern. See Nisenan.
Malacite. 600-700. Over 20. New Brunswick, Maine. See also Passamaquoddy.
Maricopa. Approx. 500. All ages. Arizona. See also Mohave, Yuma.
Mescalero. See Apache, Mescalero.
Miami. 10-100. Over 50. Indiana. See also Peoria.
Micmac. 3,000-5,000. All ages. Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick,
Quebec.
Mikasuki. Approx. 700. All ages. Florida.
Miwok, Coast. 1. Over 50. California.
Miwok, Sierra. Approx. 50. Over 50. California. (Southern approx. 20, Central
fewer than 5, Northern 20-30.)
Mohave. Approx. 1,000. All ages. Arizona. See also Yuma, Maricopa.
Mohawk. 1,000-2,000. Over 20. Ontario, Quebec, New York.
Mono. 100-500. Over 50. California. See also Paiute, Northern.
Montagnais-Naskapi. Approx. 5,000. All ages. Quebec, Newfoundland. See also
Cree.
Muckleshoot. See Salish, Southern Puget Sound.
Musqueam. See Halkomelem.

Nabesna (Upper Tanana). 400-500. All ages. Alaska.
Nakota. See Yankton, Assiniboine.
Nambe. See Tewa.
Nanaimo. See Halkomelem.
Naskapi. See Montagnais-Naskapi.
Navaho. 80,000-90,000. All ages. Arizona, New Mexico, Utah.
Nez Perce. 500-1,000. All ages. Idaho.
Niska. See Tsimshian.
Nisqually. See Salish, Southern Puget Sound.
Nittinat. 10-100. All ages. British Columbia.
Nootka. 1,000-2,000. All ages. British Columbia.

Ojibwa. 40,000-50,000. All ages. Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, Montana, North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan. See also Ottawa.
Okanagan (including Southern Okanagen, Sanpoil, Colville, Lake). 1,000-2,000. All ages. British Columbia, Washington.
Omaha. 1,000-3,000. All ages. Nebraska. See also Kansa, Osage, Ponca, Quapaw.
Oneida. 1,000-2,000. Over 20 (Ontario only, elsewhere over 50). Wisconsin, Ontario, New York.
Osage. 100-400. Over 50. Oklahoma. See also Kansa, Omaha, Ponca, Quapaw.
Oto. 100-500. Over 50. Michigan, Oklahoma. See also Iowa.
Ottawa. 1,000-2,000. Over 20. Michigan, Oklahoma. See also Ojibwa.

Paiute, Southern. 1,000-3,000. All ages. Nevada, Utah, Arizona, California. See also Ute.
Panamint. 10-100. Over 50. California. See also Comanche, Shoshoni.
Papago. 8,000-10,000. All ages. Arizona (extending into Sonora, Mexico). See also Pima.
Paviotso. See Paiute, Northern.
Pawnee. 400-600. Over 20. Oklahoma. See also Arikara.
Pend d'Oreille. See Flathead.
Penobscot. Fewer than 10. Over 50. Maine. See also Abenaki.
Peoria. Fewer than 10. Over 50. Oklahoma. See also Miami.
Pima. Approx. 5,000. All ages. Arizona, Mexico. See also Papago.
Pojoaque. See Tewa.
Pomo, Southwestern (Kashaya). Approx. 50. Over 50. California.
Ponca. 100-1,000. Over 20. Oklahoma, Nebraska. See also Kansa, Omaha, Osage, Quapaw.
Potawatomi. 100-1,000. Over 20. Oklahoma, Kansas, Wisconsin, Michigan.
Puyallup. See Salish, Southern Puget Sound.
Quapaw. Fewer than 10. Over 50. Oklahoma. See also Kansa, Omaha, Osage, Ponca.
Quinault. 10-100. Over 50. Washington. See also Chehalis, Upper and Lower; Cowlitz.

Saanich. See Straits.
Sac. See Fox.
Salinan. 2 or 3 (not fluent). Over 50. California.
Samish. See Straits.
San Carlos Apache. See Apache, Western.
Sandia. 100-200. Over 20. New Mexico. See also Isleta.
San Felipe. See Keresan.
San Ildefonso. See Tewa.
San Juan. See Tewa.
Sanpoil. See Okanagan.
Santa Ana. See Keresan.
Santa Clara. See Tewa.
Santee (Dakota proper). 3,000-5,000. All ages. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Montana, Manitoba. See also Teton, Yankton, Assiniboin.
Santo Domingo. See Keresan.
Sarsi. Approx. 50. Over 20. Alberta. See also Sekani, Beaver.
Sekani. 100-500. All ages. British Columbia. See also Sarsi, Beaver.
Semiahmoo. See Straits.
Seminole (Florida dialect of Creek). Approx. 300. All ages. Florida. See also Creek.
Serrano. 2 or 3. Over 50. California.
Shoshoni (including Gosiute). Approx. 5,000. All ages. California, Nevada, Idaho, Oregon, Wyoming. See also Comanche Panamint.
Shuswap. 1,000-2,000. All ages. British Columbia.
Slave. 1,000-2,000. All ages. British Columbia, Alberta, Mackenzie. See also Chipewyan, Yellowknife.
Sliammon. 500-600. All ages. British Columbia. See also Comox.
Snoqualmie. See Salish, Southern Puget Sound.
Songish. See Straits.
Stoney. See Assiniboine.
Straits. Approx. 500. All ages (Saanich only; most dialects over 50). British Columbia, Washington. (Klallam approx. 100, Lummi approx. 150, Saanich approx. 200, Samish approx. 2, Samiahmoo approx. 2, Songish approx. 40.)

Sumas. See Halkomelem.
Swinomish. See Skagit.

Tagish. Approx. 5. Over 50. Yukon.
Tahltan. 100-1,000. All ages. British Columbia, Yukon. See also Kaska.
Talt. See Halkomelem.
Tanaina. Approx. 300. Over 20. Alaska. See also Inglik.
Tanana, Upper. See Naches.
Taos. Approx. 1,000. All ages. New Mexico. See also Picuris.
Tenino. See Warm Springs.
Tesuque. See Tewa.
Teton (Lakota). 10,000-15,000. All ages. South Dakota, Montana, Manitoba. See also Santee, Yankton, Assiniboine.
Tewa. Approx. 2,000. All ages. New Mexico, Arizona. (Hano approx. 200, Nambe 100-200, Pojoaque fewer than 10 if any, San Ildefonso 200-300, San Juan approx. 1,000, Santa Clara 500-600, Tesuque 100-200.)
Thompson. 1,000-2,000. All ages. British Columbia.
Tlingit. 1,000-2,000. Over 20. Alaska, British Columbia, Yukon.
Tonto Apache. See Apache, Western.
Tsimshian. Approx. 3,000. All ages. British Columbia, Alaska. (Coast Tsimshian has the most speakers. Niska and Gitksan have fewer than 1,000 each.)
Tutchone. Approx. 1,000. All ages. Yukon. See also Han.

Umatilla. 10-100. Over 20. Oregon. See also Klikitat, Walla Walla, Warm Springs, Yakima.
Ute. 2,000-4,000. All ages. Utah, Colorado. See also Paiute, Southern.

Walapai. 500-1,000. All ages. Arizona. See also Havasupai, Yavapai.
Wampanoag. 1 or 2. Over 50. Massachusetts.
Warm Springs (Tenino). Approx. 250. Over 20. Oregon. See also Klikitat, Umatilla, Walla Walla, Yakima.
Wenatchi. See Columbia-Wenatchi.
White Mountain Apache. See Apache, Western.
Winnebago. 1,000-2,000. All ages (but most over 50 in Nebraska). Wisconsin,
Nebraska.
Wyandot (Huron). Fewer than 5. Over 50. Oklahoma, California (?).

Yakima. 1,000-2,000. All ages. Washington. See also Klikitat, Umatilla, Walla Walla, Warm Springs.
Yankton (Nakota, excluding Assiniboin). 1,000-2,000. All ages. North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana. See also Assiniboin, Teton, Santee.
Yavapai. 100-200. All ages. Arizona. See also Havasupai, Walapai.
Yellowknife. 400-600. All ages. Mackenzie. See also Chipewyan, Slave.
Yokuts, Chuckchansi. 10-20. Over 50. California.
Yuki. Fewer than 10 (not fluent). Over 50. California.
Yuma. Approx. 1,000. All ages. California. See also Maricopa, Mohave.

Zia. See Keresan.
Zuni. 3,000-4,000. All ages. New Mexico.
APPENDIX C: ARTICLES OF UNIFICATION ACCORD

SUMMIT V RESOLUTION NO. 93-02

DAKOTA, LAKOTA NAKOTA SUMMIT V
LAKOTA NATION
JUNE 7-11, 1993

RESOLUTION OF THE DAKOTA, LAKOTA, NAKOTA NATIONS AND BANDS OF THE 1993 SUMMIT V MEETING APPROVING AND SUPPORTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTITUTION, AN INTERNATIONAL LAKOTA COLLEGE FOR ALL LAKOTA-DAKOTA-NAKOTA NATIONS.

WHEREAS, a National Concept of an International Lakota College, an institution, which all Lakota-Dakota-Nakota Leaders can support from their own existing resources for unity in the survival of the Lakota Language; Lakota Language knows no boundaries and only provides for the unity of the people, and

WHEREAS, this Institution for the Ikce Wicasa is to teach the Sacred Ceremonies, preserve the Lakota Language, retain Cultural Values and experience Tiospaye Government, and

WHEREAS, the International Lakota College will provide a service to all the Lakota people living in the United States and Canada, and create a new generation of Lakota people, who will continue to speak the Lakota Language and strengthen their identity, and

WHEREAS, in 1991, Lakota Summit III, Resolution III-91-10, requested Tribes and Bands to establish Ikce Wicasa Woonspe Oaye, to provide a service for all Lakota Oyate to teach the Lakota Language and to understand Spirituality, Ceremonies, Culture, Thought and Oyate Oaye. A Council of Ikce Wicasa be established to provide policy direction and membership for the United States and Canada; Summit III Resolution No. III-91-13, also supported Lakota Language as "Top National Priority", and

WHEREAS, Lakota Language is the outward expression of an accumulation of learning experiences, which have resulted in a world of wisdom shared by the Ikce Wicasa people for thousands of years and the wisdom is a dynamic force, which shapes the way an Ikce Wicasa looks at the world, his thinking about the world and his philosophy of life; knowing his Lakota Language, helps an Ikce Wicasa to know himself, communicate with the Wakan Tanka and in being proud of his language, helps an Ikce Wicasa to be proud of himself, and

WHEREAS, the Lakota people are expressing a growing concern that the Lakota Language is being lost and the younger Lakota generation can no longer speak or understand their Lakota Language, and
WHEREAS, the issue is, if the Lakota identity is to be preserved, Lakota Leadership must take steps to reverse this trend of lost Lakota Language; in the future, the Lakota People will exist without a language, therefore, culture, history, spiritual prayers and ceremonies in the language will be gone forever, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that formal instruction in the Lakota Language is critical and process for Language Development is needed to be housed in an Institution for the benefit of all tribes in the Lakota Nation and the formal instruction in the Lakota language will address these two major areas of language instruction;

1). Teaching in the Lakota Language
2). Teaching the Lakota Language, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Wakan Iyeska and Spiritual Leaders must be involved in teaching their knowledge and wisdom of the spiritual ways, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the goals to be implemented are as follows:

1). Establish a Lakota speaking faculty to teach the Lakota Language, Lakota Thought, History, Tiospaye Government, Treaties and Community Development;

2). Establish a program to develop Lakota Linguists for schools that have Lakota Children;

3). Establish a Traditional Faculty on Lakota Thought, employing Wakan Iyeska;

4). Establish a Council of Spiritual Leaders, who will provide policy and direction;

5). Establish Lakota Language services to schools and communities, with support of curriculum, teaching methods and instructional materials, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an Interim Steering Committee is authorized to set direction and funding for this Lakota Woonspe Gaye Institution, and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Interim Steering Committee be made up of these persons, who have a great deal of experience in the areas of Indian Education and can help the Ikce Wicasa establish this Institution:

1). Dr. Elgin Bad Wound, President, Oglala Lakota College;
2). Lionel Bordeaux, President Sinte Gleska University;
3). David Gipp, President, United Tribes Technical College;
4). Gwen Hill, President, Sisseton Wahpeton Community College;
5). Margaret Roscelli, Tribal Treaty Negotiator, Sioux Valley Band;
6). Velma Bear, Educator, Standing Buffalo Dakota Band;
7). Darlene Spiedel, Lakota Language, Indian Languages Department, Saskatchewan Indian Cultural Center;
8). Thelma Thomas, Santee Sioux Tribe, Nebraska Indian Community College.

I, as Recording Secretary of the Dakota, Lakota, Nakota Nations Summit V Meeting, hereby certify that this Resolution was presented and adopted during a formal duly called and convened meeting of the Dakota, Lakota, Nakota Nations, held on the 10th day of JUNE, 1993 in Kyle, South Dakota.
SUMMIT V RESOLUTION NO. 93-02
Page Four

A-T-T-E-S-T

Chairman
Ikce Wicasa Ta Omniciye
1993 Summit V

GERALD ONE FEATHER
Coordinator
Ikce Wicasa Ta Omniciye
1993 Summit V
APPENDIX D: WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON INDIAN EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

The White House Conference on Indian Education (WHCIE) was enacted as Public Law 100-297. The Conference was convened on January 22 and adjourned on January 24, 1992. Principally, the Conference was mandated to develop recommendations to improve Indian education services. While the Task Force and Advisory Committee structured the Conference into working sessions that maximized all efforts to develop such recommendations, it was a heavy workload which faced the Conference Delegates during this very short period of time. It is evident that they rose to the challenge.

Expectations for the White House Conference varied greatly. Much depended on whether one was aware of the great amount of work undertaken prior to the actual Conference or not. The Advisory Committee's and Task Force's expectations were very high due to their knowledge of the tremendous amount of work accomplished in the 30 State, tribal and Regional Pre-conferences and the great concern in Indian country over education issues and needs. This event was a tremendous opportunity to develop a realistic road map for future actions to improve Indian education.

This Conference was uniquely designed to facilitate solutions, not revisit and redebate the problems. This goal was realized, as evidenced by the details provided, both within the resolutions and their plans of action, by the Delegates for implementation guidance purposes. Additionally, there was the expectation that the results would produce a holistic picture of Indian student education, health, and cultural needs. This holistic overview of needs did occur and has helped identify areas to be addressed in a comprehensive manner.

At the Conference, a total of 113 resolutions were adopted, many with accompanying plans of action. These resolutions were developed and adopted by 234 Delegates. These adopted resolutions encompassed a broad array of issues and were drawn from 30 state, tribal and regional reports, through the planning of state steering committees. These committees were composed of educators, Indian parents, tribal leaders, and state education officials, along with other concerned individuals.

The state steering committee reports were comprised of numerous recommendations for improving Indian education, locally and nationally. It was the responsibility of the Task Force to distill these recommendations from the reports into a comprehensive listing of issues to be considered at the national Conference.

These reports were first condensed into 17 goal areas. However, after careful review, the Advisory Committee of the WHCIE felt that these 17 goal areas could be further consolidated under 11 topic areas. The 17 goal areas, and later the 11 topic areas, were initially premised on the categories of need identified in the recently released "Indian Nations at Risk" report. There were, however, issues identified by the States that were outside the scope of the 10 areas of need targeted by this earlier report. The 11 topic areas finally selected to capture all of the recommendations submitted to the WHCIE were:

1. Governance of Indian Education/Independent Board of Education.
2. Well Being of Indian Communities & Delivery of Services.
3. Literacy, Student Academic Achievement & High School Graduation.*
4. Safe, Alcohol/Drug-Free Schools.*
5. Exceptional Education.
6. Readiness for School.*
7. Native Languages & Culture.*
8. Structure for Schools.*
9. Higher Education.
11. Adult Education & Lifelong Learning/Parental, Community and Tribal Partnership.*

[*Goals under the "Indian Nations at Risk" Report.]
In order to produce an accurate reflection of the Conference work products it was necessary for the Task Force to undertake a very careful review and provide technical edits to the documents adopted by the full Assembly of Delegates. After technical review and edits were made to the resolutions and plans of action, these documents were further reviewed by the elected spokes-person for each topic area (a Delegate selected by his/her peers). Their review ensured that any changes made to such documents did not go contrary to the intent of the participating Delegates.

An analysis is included that is intended to identify any emphasis given by the Delegates to the recommendations necessary to improve Indian education. More specifically: what are the policy, legislative and funding changes indicated by these resolutions? When these resolutions involved more practical considerations, for example the need to identify infrastructure and resource capabilities, the analysis also captures these practical concerns.

Overall, the analysis has produced a comprehensive review on what commonalities of concern exist from one target area to another (i.e. training, partners, performance standards, accountability issues, etc.). It has also helped identify the strengths and deficiencies in the existing educational system. This analysis, coupled with the voted upon Resolutions (and plans of action), should provide Indian country with a blueprint for action. At what level this action should occur, and in what order of priority, are issues that still challenge our communities.

Some of the goals or issues identified in the adopted Resolutions are expected to be easily translated into immediate actions or policies. This final report catalogues all of the Resolutions into a comprehensive spectrum of Indian educational needs, both for policy and community action purposes.
INTRODUCTION

Overview

The issues contained in this Topic Area paper were divided into seven categories. The purpose of the seven categories was to assist the Delegates in understanding the numerous issues and recommendations developed at the 30 State and Regional Pre-Conference activities held in 1990 and 1991. The seven categories helped to consolidate and streamline similar issues of concern.

The work session products from this topic area included a major recommendation for a United States policy in support of the preservation and strengthening of the languages and cultures of American Indians/Alaska Natives.

Work Session Activity & Results

When this session was convened, the Delegates were given an overview of the process that had been designed to assist them in achieving their goals. These Delegates produced several recommendations, many with accompanying plans of action developed through indepth discussions and other work session activities. The approved resolutions and proposed plans of action were presented to, and eventually adopted by, the assembly of Delegates on the final day of the Conference.

The primary themes of this topic area were means of strengthening and preserving AI/AN language and culture under the auspices of U.S. policies and mandates. A Federal statement of policy and mandates was viewed as ensuring the effective oversight needed for implementation of a variety of mechanisms recommended in this topic area.

Other recommendations adopted to protect and enhance language and culture included the enforcement of existing laws, specifically the Indian Religious Freedom Act, P.L. 95-341. The Bilingual Education Act, also, needed to be impacted to redefine its focus to ensure improved standards that are culturally appropriate and improve the quality of assistance provided. Other national policies and mandates requiring adjustment include Title V- subpart I, P.L. 81-874, and the Johnson-O'Malley Program, to allow for greater parental participation in the decision-making process in regards to planning, implementation and evaluation, as well as holding account of LEAs.

Specific mechanisms to achieve the goals established within these recommendations included:

- Availability of appropriate funds for strengthening/preserving AI/AN languages and cultures;
- Protection of Indian education funds and assistance from the Graham-Rudman-Hollings Deficit Reduction Act;
- Amend S. 2044 (Native American Language Act) to amend title VII, the Bilingual Education Act to provide a new AI/AN chapter, along with other amendments;
- Educational institutions must provide and develop culturally appropriate AI/AN training, instruction, curriculum, and materials.
- Accreditation standards and teacher certification requirements to be revised to incorporate a requirement for culturally appropriate instruction and curriculum, AI/AN language, literacy and cultural teacher certification standards;
- Parental and community participation in development of culturally appropriate activities and materials; and
- Implementation of the "Indian Nations at Risk" recommendations related to AI/AN language, literacy, culture, evaluation, research and accountability.
In this area, the Delegates were able to provide valuable insight into their perspectives on the many issues of concern addressed. It was also true, that with the various constraints to this process, that some resolutions and plans of action were not as conclusive as preferred by the Delegates. It is important to place this topic area’s work product in the context of the enormous number of issues confronting the Delegates, as well as the diversity of view represented in the recommended resolutions and plans of action.

These resolution and plans of action should be viewed as dynamic documents which have provided the foundation for additional, future activity. The plans of action, in particular, should not be viewed as rigid instructions, since the assumptions utilized by the Delegates in the formulation of their recommendations were premised on many variables subject to changing circumstances.
White House Conference on Indian Education

RESOLUTION #07-01

PREAMBLE

The White House Conference on Indian Education was convened on January 22, 23, and 24, 1992, pursuant to P.L. 100-297.

WHEREAS, the White House Conference was directed to identify those problems which impact and interfere with Indian students realizing their full potential.

WHEREAS, the White House Conference was also directed to develop recommendations for the improvement of education programs to make them more relevant to the needs of Indians,

WHEREAS, Pre-White House Conference recommendations were developed from the State pre-White House Conference Meetings and reviewed by the assembled Delegates,

WHEREAS, the Delegates have reviewed all recommendations developed by the Pre-White House conference meetings pertaining to language and culture of American Indians and Alaska Natives; and,

recognize the urgent need to revive, restore, and retain the language and culture,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the White House Conference on Indian Education hereby requests the President of the United States and the U.S. Congress to strengthen and increase support for the language and culture of American Indians and Alaska Natives by the following actions:

1. Amend S.2044 by adding a new chapter amending Title VII, the Bilingual Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 3001) to include a new chapter for American Indian and Alaska Native bilingual education.

   A. Ensure the strengthening, preservation, and revival of native languages and cultures to permit students to learn their tribal language as a first or second language.

   B. Encourage opportunities to develop partnerships (in programs funded or amended by S.2044) between schools, parents, universities, and tribes.

   C. Provide for long term assessment and evaluation of programs funded under this new chapter.

The purpose of this part will be to evaluate the effectiveness of programs, conduct research that would lead to a better understanding of language development and to identify exemplary models for other groups (including heuristic, anthropological, ethnographic, qualitative, quantitative research).

D. Native language teacher competence must meet competency requirements established by tribes. These standards may be developed in cooperation with the advice of language experts of the tribes and universities that are responsible for teacher training programs.

E. Allow for program development based on successful education programs as well as new models that are innovative and explore new theories of bilingual education and language development including emersion programs.
THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the above recommendations be adopted with the accompanying Plan of Action for Group 7.

CERTIFICATION

The foregoing resolution was adopted at the White House Conference on Indian Education, held at the Ramada Renaissance in Washington, D.C. on January 22-24, 1992 with a quorum present.

Co-Chair of the Conference

Chairman of the Advisory Committee
White House Conference on Indian Education

RESOLUTION #07-02

PREAMBLE

The White House Conference on Indian Education was convened on January 22, 23, and 24, 1992, pursuant to P.L. 100-297.

WHEREAS, the White House Conference was directed to identify those problems which impact and interfere with Indian students realizing their full potential.

WHEREAS, the White House Conference was also directed to develop recommendations for the improvement of education programs to make them more relevant to the needs of Indians.

WHEREAS, Pre-White House Conference recommendations were developed from the State pre-White House Conference Meetings and reviewed by the assembled Delegates.

WHEREAS, the Delegates have reviewed all Recommendations developed by the Pre-White House Conference meetings pertaining to language and culture of American Indians and Alaska Natives; and, recognize the urgent need to revive, restore, and retain the language and culture.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the White House Conference on Indian Education hereby requests the President of the United States and the U.S. Congress to strengthen and increase support for the language and culture of American Indians and Alaska Natives by the following actions:

1. Amend Senate Bill 2044 to provide for the:
   A. Inclusion of "Language, Literacy, and Culture" in the Title; and use of the terminology "Language/Culture" throughout the Act.
   B. Development of curricula for Language/Culture, together with appropriation levels which enable the restoration of lost languages; and an overall appropriation of $200 million for language, literacy, and culture including model programs.
   C. Development of language literacy and culture certification standards by tribal governments, recognition of such certification by SEAs and accrediting institutions; and, appropriation levels which enable full implementation of the standards.
   D. Establishment of course credit for Native Language classes at Institutions of higher education Indian, by students who demonstrate literacy and proficiency in Native languages.
   E. Inclusion of American Indian/Alaska Native history and culture as a requirement for teacher certification of all teachers.
   F. Availability of appropriated funds to Indian/Alaska Native tribes and organizations including urban and rural Indian organizations, for Indian/Alaska Native language and culture.
   G. Allow American Indian and Alaska Natives to assume total responsibility for their education programs.
H. Require state and local education agencies that receive federal funds to include American Indian and Alaska Native language, culture, and history into the core of the curriculum.

2. Require the Office of Indian Education, U.S. Department of Education to collaborate with the Senate on S.2044 to include the recommendations heretofore set forth.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the above recommendations be adopted with the accompanying Plan of Action for Group 7.

CERTIFICATION

The foregoing resolution was adopted at the White House Conference on Indian Education, held at the Ramada Renaissance in Washington, D.C. on January 22-24, 1992 with a quorum present.

[Signatures]

Co-Chair of the Conference

Chairman of the Advisory Committee
White House Conference on Indian Education

RESOLUTION #07-03

PREAMBLE

The White House Conference on Indian Education was convened on January 22, 23, and 24, 1992, pursuant to P.L. 100-297.

WHEREAS, the White House Conference was directed to identify those problems which impact and interfere with Indian students realizing their full potential.

WHEREAS, the White House Conference was also directed to develop recommendations for the improvement of education programs to make them more relevant to the needs of Indians/Alaska Natives,

WHEREAS, Pre-White House Conference recommendations were developed from the State pre-White House Conference Meetings and reviewed by the assembled Delegates,

WHEREAS, the delegates have reviewed all Recommendations developed by the Pre-White House Conference meetings pertaining to language and culture of American Indians and Alaska Natives; and, recognize the urgent need to revive, restore, and retain the language and culture,

WHEREAS, a special relationship exists between the Federal government and American Indians and Alaska Natives; and

WHEREAS, there is a National crisis in Indian education.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the White House Conference on Indian Education hereby requests the President of the United States and the U.S. Congress strengthen and increase support for the language and culture of American Indians and Alaska Natives by exempting all Indian Education monies from the requirements of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the above recommendations be adopted with the accompanying Plan of Action for Group 7.
CERTIFICATION

The foregoing resolution was adopted at the White House Conference on Indian Education, held at the Ramada Renaissance in Washington, D.C. on January 22-24, 1992 with a quorum present.

Co-Chair of the Conference

Chairman of the Advisory Committee
White House Conference on Indian Education

RESOLUTION #07-04

PREAMBLE

The White House Conference on Indian Education was convened on January 22, 23, and 24, 1992, pursuant to P.L. 100-297.

WHEREAS, the White House Conference was directed to identify those problems which impact and interfere with Indian students realizing their full potential.

WHEREAS, the White House Conference was also directed to develop recommendations for the improvement of education programs to make them more relevant to the needs of Indians and Alaska Natives.

WHEREAS, Pre-White House Conference recommendations were developed from the State pre-White House Conference Meetings and reviewed by the assembled Delegates.

WHEREAS, the Delegates have reviewed all Recommendations developed by the Pre-White House Conference meetings pertaining to language and culture of American Indians and Alaska Natives; and, recognize the urgent need to revive, restore, and retain the language and culture.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the White House Conference on Indian Education hereby requests the President of the United States and the U.S. Congress to strengthen and increase support for the language and culture of American Indians and Alaska Natives by the following actions:

1. Require that the Office of Indian Education and the Bureau of Indian Affairs enforce legislative requirements for parental participation in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs under Title V, Subpart 1, P.L. 81-874 and Johnson-O'Malley.

2. That sign off parent committee authority be required and be limited to the authorized chairperson of the parent committee in Title V, Subpart 1, P.L. 81-874 and Johnson-O'Malley programs.

3. That the Office of Indian Education establish grievance procedures for grantees and parent committees.

4. That local education agency be accountable to the parent committee.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the above recommendations be adopted with the accompanying Plan of Action for group 7.
CERTIFICATION

The foregoing resolution was adopted at the White House Conference on Indian Education, held at the Ramada Renaissance in Washington, D.C. on January 22-24, 1992 with a quorum present.

Co-Chair of the Conference

Chairman of the Advisory Committee
White House Conference on Indian Education

RESOLUTION #07-05
PREAMBLE

The White House Conference on Indian Education was convened on January 22, 23, and 24, 1992, pursuant to P.L. 100-297.

WHEREAS, the White House Conference was directed to identify those problems which impact and interfere with Indian students realizing their full potential.

WHEREAS, the White House Conference was also directed to develop recommendations for the improvement of education programs to make them more relevant to the needs of Indians.

WHEREAS, Pre-White House Conference recommendations were developed from the State pre-White House Conference Meetings and reviewed by the assembled Delegates.

WHEREAS, the Delegates have reviewed Recommendation:

That the Federal Government establish and provide adequate funding for Native languages, literacy and cultural programs for American Indians and Alaska Natives as one of the nation’s highest priorities.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the above recommendation be adopted with the accompanying Plan of Action for Group 7.

CERTIFICATION

The foregoing resolution was adopted at the White House Conference on Indian Education, held at the Ramada Renaissance in Washington, D.C. on January 22-24, 1992 with a quorum present.

Co-Chair of the Conference

Chairman of the Advisory Committee
White House Conference on Indian Education

RESOLUTION #07-06

PREAMBLE

The White House Conference on Indian Education was convened on January 22, 23, and 24, 1992, pursuant to P.L. 100-297.

WHEREAS, the White House Conference was directed to identify those problems which impact and interfere with Indian students realizing their full potential.

WHEREAS, the White House Conference was also directed to develop recommendations for the improvement of education programs to make them more relevant to the needs of Indians,

WHEREAS, Pre-White House Conference recommendations were developed from the State pre-White House Conference Meetings and reviewed by the assembled Delegates,

WHEREAS, the Delegates have reviewed Recommendation:

Immediately implement the Indian Nations At Risk Task Force Recommendations including those specifically related to American Indian and Alaska Native language, literacy, culture evaluation, research and accountability (Indian Nations At Risk: An Education Strategy for Action, pp. 22-31).

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the above recommendation be adopted for implementation absent an accompanying Plan of Action.

CERTIFICATION

The foregoing resolution was adopted at the White House Conference on Indian Education, held at the Ramada Renaissance in Washington, D.C. on January 22-24, 1992 with a quorum present.

Co-Chair of the Conference

Chairman of the Advisory Committee
White House Conference on Indian Education

RESOLUTION #07-07

PREAMBLE

The White House Conference on Indian Education was convened on January 22, 23, and 24, 1992, pursuant to P.L. 100-297.

WHEREAS, the White House Conference was directed to identify those problems which impact and interfere with Indian students realizing their full potential.

WHEREAS, the White House Conference was also directed to develop recommendations for the improvement of education programs to make them more relevant to the needs of Indians,

WHEREAS, Pre-White House Conference recommendations were developed from the State pre-White House Conference Meetings and reviewed by the assembled Delegates,

All funds appropriated for Indian Education must have provisions for Indian control and accountability.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the above recommendation be adopted for implementation absent an accompanying Plan of Action.

CERTIFICATION

The foregoing resolution was adopted at the White House Conference on Indian Education, held at the Ramada Renaissance in Washington, D.C. on January 22-24, 1992 with a quorum present.

Co-Chair of the Conference

Chairman of the Advisory Committee
White House Conference on Indian Education

RESOLUTION #07-08
PREAMBLE

The White House Conference on Indian Education was convened on January 22, 23, and 24, 1992, pursuant to P.L. 100-297.

WHEREAS, the White House Conference was directed to identify those problems which impact and interfere with Indian students realizing their full potential.

WHEREAS, the White House Conference was also directed to develop recommendations for the improvement of education programs to make them more relevant to the needs of American Indians and Alaska Natives.

WHEREAS, Pre-White House Conference recommendations were developed from the State pre-White House Conference Meetings and reviewed by the assembled delegates.

WHEREAS, the American Indian/Alaska Native children/students are suffering from culturally insensitive federal, public, private, parochial and community school systems treatment to observe their respective tribal affiliations.

WHEREAS, our American Indian/Alaska Native children/students are subjected to culturally insensitive federal, public, private, parochial, and community school systems requiring that these individuals wear their hair by prescribed hair codes enforced by these school systems.

WHEREAS, the culturally insensitive federal, public, private, parochial and community school systems are contradicting the traditional language, culture and religious expression practiced by American Indian/Alaska Native learners.

WHEREAS, the culturally insensitive federal, public, private, parochial and community school systems hair style regulations, and policies are not correlated to learning enhancement and athletic ability.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that:

1. The White House Conference on Indian Education Native Language and Culture delegates hereby approve this resolution requesting the President of the United States, Honorable George A. Bush and Congress of both the Senate and the House of Representatives recognize, acknowledge and support the need for Native language and culture as a significant instrument to the improvement of American Indian/Alaska Native education.

2. The White House Conference on Indian Education Native Language and Culture delegates also request that the federal, public, parochial and community school systems receiving federal funding for American Indian/Alaska Native learners to expedite the implementation of the Indian Religious Freedom Act by immediately developing dress and hair code policies and regulations that reflect the traditional language, culture and religious expressions practiced by these students.
3. In this recognition and acknowledgment, the White House Conference on Native Languages and Culture delegates further requests that the U.S. Department of Education recognize, acknowledge and support the importance to carry out the intent of this resolution.

WHEREAS, the delegates have reviewed Recommendation:

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the above recommendation is agreed to, with the stipulation that further review and, where necessary, modifications be made prior to its implementation.

CERTIFICATION

The foregoing resolution was adopted at the White House Conference on Indian Education, held at the Ramada Renaissance in Washington, D.C. on January 22-24, 1992 with a quorum present.

Co-Chair of the Conference

Co-Chair of the Conference

Chairman of the Advisory Committee
APPENDIX E: SNCHTSU'UMSHTSN: COEUR D'ALENE
LANGUAGE PRESERVATION
PROJECT WORKBOOK EXERCISES


The Coeur d'Alene Indians once made beautiful corn husk bags.
Write the word which means "corn husk bag."

Fix the word which means "corn husk bag."

---

qha means "good."
-’qs means nose.
Write a word that means "good nose" or "moose."

The "q" in qhae changes to an "u" in qhae’qs.
That's because of the "q" in -’qs.
WHAT HAPPENED?

What did the chg in chglekhw change to?
What did the e in lekhw change to?
What did the l in chglekhw change to?

O'ele' means "lake"
Chat- means on a flat, like a meadow
-tip means "bottom."
Chch'likhw lives at O'ele'lp
Who lives at O'ele'lp?
What is a word that means "bottom of the lake?"

What is a word that means "flat lake?"

KHW is the sound of wind on Halloween night.

How many letters in the sound khw?
Circle the right answer.

ngk'we' gael ch'jes