LSU Doctoral Dissertations   Graduate School

2013

Sites of indigenous language practice : geography of American Indian language policy

Thomas Pierre-Yves Brasdefer
Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

SITES OF INDIGENOUS LANGUAGE PRACTICE:
GEOGRAPHY OF AMERICAN INDIAN LANGUAGE POLICY

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of Geography & Anthropology

by
Thomas Brasdefer
Master, Université de Poitiers, 2005
August 2013

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Abstract

For over 1.9 million indigenous people in the United States, speaking their native language has become a rare opportunity. There are several obstacles standing in their way, from geographically separated communities to hundreds of years of contrarian policies and sometimes a collective lack of interest. Today, indigenous language use has become an integral part of self-determination and political sovereignty, sometimes more so than a communicative activity.

This dissertation examines the political steps taken by American Indian communities around the United States to ensure that their languages can still be spoken into the twenty-first century, and analyzes the complex implications of enacting language policy as a political minority. Using a critical framework inspired by Michel Foucault, I establish theoretical bridges between geography, anthropology and linguistics as a basis for the study of language practices. In combination with the geographical concept of site, I aver that language planning serves to build spaces where indigenous populations are able to express their own sense of community and develop their own cultures.

The particular legal and political history of American Indians situates them both inside and outside of the mainstream United States population. As a result they have developed a parallel political existence rooted in their intrinsic sovereignty rather than the amount of power delegated to them by the federal government. I argue that although policy seems to be enacted in their favor, American Indians are still facing outdated modes of thinking and suffering from a lack of comprehensive understanding. From a series of interviews with administrators of language programs throughout the United States, I found that the most efficient ways for them to cultivate positive change in their communities and languages is to proceed with their own solutions regardless of the existing legislation.

Functioning upon the premise that complexity is a defining element of both language and space, I suggest that ontological approaches provide the most productive approach to studying linguistics and geography, as they rely on practice rather than political paradigms. The concept of site gives way to a more respectful and impactful study of the human aspects of geographic phenomena.

Chapter 0.   Prologue

On my first trip into the Arizona desert in the summer of 2003, I accompanied my family on a tour of an Indian reservation. As the most proficient English speaker in my family and a student of American history, I was both a visitor and an interpreter to virtually everything in sight. I was often caught under-translating by my parents or siblings, as I was attempting to alleviate the workload for my brain. During this particular reservation visit however, I could not skimp on the information that I was passing along because there were no explanatory notes therefore all the interpretation that was delivered orally became precious.

An Indian reservation is not a museum: there is no signage, no audio-guide, and no pre-determined path to follow. This particular reservation did have tours, and as the guide drove us around the desert in a Sports Utility Vehicle, he made stops to introduce my family and I to various tribal members who each demonstrated a part of Indian life. During one stop, an extraordinary event took place: it started raining. If the mere event of a rainfall in the Sonoran desert were not extraordinary enough, this was a fantastic downpour, instantly flooding the barren trails accompanied by lightning bolts hitting rock formations around us. There was no driving around in this rain, so we found shelter in a large domed house structure (*wickiup*) where an elderly woman was demonstrating her basketry by the flickering light of a central fire. As we came to spend more than the requisite eight or ten minutes in her presence, we had the perfect occasion for small-talk, for which I was one conduit (French to English) and our interpreter was another (English to Hopi).

Once the conversation passed the stage "so… how about that weather?", my parents very practically observed that the adobe structure obviously withstood the rain much better than a tipi. And thus demanded that I ask our interpreters if they had tipis; in spite of my assurance that no, they do not. I was already sweating due to the temperature and fire burning inside the house and became extremely uncomfortable. How was I supposed to translate a blatant cultural misunderstanding without offending our hosts? My inner linguist was likely thrilled by the prospect, while my inner tourist certainly did not want to be left stranded in the middle of this desert. Our guide took the question lightheartedly though and patiently explained to my parents that tipis are a dwelling from "up North," that here they use adobe, because they are sedentary, and they are cooler.

Growing up outside of the United States (U.S.), the mental representation of American Indians is in large part informed by the media, i.e. the few western movies that were exported as well as history books. In the United States, the situation is not much different. Unless you actively seek to visit a reservation, chances are the average non-Indian will never come across one, let alone summon the courage to ask its residents the bluntest of questions. But the issue is not just hampering cultural sensibilities for the tribes who are attempting to make a living out of tourism. Their picturesque – if pastoral – traditions draw outsiders, while they must develop and adapt to the demands of the twenty-first century in the same way other modern peoples do.

Throughout this dissertation, the terms "Indian," "American Indian" and "Native American" will generically refer to the indigenous peoples of the mainland United States, unless otherwise noted. These terms are all inappropriate, but they remain widely used for convenience's sake (Wilkins 2002). Once regarded as insulting, the term "Indian" has found some rehabilitation by activists such as the late Russell Means, who famously stated: "We were enslaved as American Indians, we were colonized as American Indians, and we will gain our freedom as American Indians, and then we will call ourselves any damn thing we choose." (Means 1998) With respect to his opinion, I have used the self-elected tribal denominations (including the terms "band", "tribe," or "nation") whenever available, looking forward to use more of them in the future. I was made aware of the discretion that some of these communities like to employ when talking about their internal affairs, and I have decided to refer anonymously to my interlocutors (a term I find more appropriate than "consultant" or "respondent") by their gender-neutral occupational titles or more generally by the tribal names. Quotations from these exchanges are marked with "p.c." for "personal communication."

Chapter 1.   Introduction

An Indian reservation is not a museum. It is a place where the indigenous peoples of the United States reside, raise their families and if they are lucky, it is also where they earn a fair wage and thrive. Not all Indians live on reservations, and not all Indian tribes have a reservation. As a matter of fact, tribes do not so much own their reservations as they occupy them. The U.S. Federal government holds tribal lands in trust and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA, a branch of the U.S. Department of Interior) mediates the land ownership. Additionally, the BIA operates a Bureau of Indian Education, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services operates the Indian Health Service to serve indigenous peoples exclusively. Yet reservations rank consistently lower than the national average in most demographic indicators (U.S. Census Bureau 2004) and rarely do they appear in contemporary media portrayals of the nation.

American Indians are citizens of the United States of America, though the signs *supra* would point to the contrary. For tourists such as my family and for anyone encountering U.S. indigenous peoples without prior knowledge, the exact relation that they maintain with the federal government is unclear. Because the aboriginal presence in America predates the founding of the nation, the body of laws governing so-called "Indian Affairs" requires understanding the history and political linkages established before there were either a U.S. Department of Indian Affairs or the United States. Consequently, American Indian politics are as much the complicated result of a genealogy of legal dealings and philosophical thought as they are the tortuous consequences of *ad hoc* warfare (until the middle of the nineteenth century, Indian Affairs was part of the Department of War) and unsanctioned economies (French 2000). As a corollary, the vitality of indigenous cultures varies greatly following the same variables.

Systematic disregard for some parts of this history has produced inadequate accounts of American Indian cultures in the past (Conn 2004, S. Smith 2000), and to this day belonging to an indigenous tribe (which is sometimes referred to as the "Indian title," although the term can mean both land title or recognition title) is more a legal provision than a matter of ethnicity or cultural lineage. In turn, this tacit alignment with federal governmental visions has relegated indigenous populations to the demographic status of a minority, albeit one with self-sovereignty that is nonetheless partially dependent upon the final approval of the U.S. government. This contradictory foundation for their power has hampered American Indian development and

welfare by rendering the chain of command all but opaque and it has moreover produced a skewed perception of tribal efforts for the general public (Pommersheim 1995).

Nowhere is this lack of legal definition more crucial than in the matter of American Indian languages. Though there is no federal language policy in the United States, the U.S. government has re-iterated in recent times the promises already present in treaties to protect American Indian cultures, but also allowed states to pass language policies that cripple the civil rights of indigenous peoples who are not on a reservation. To complicate the matter, not all Native Americans speak their Native languages, and not all Native languages are codified, which would at least make them visible to outsiders. For those languages that have been studied by linguists, the extent of linguistic knowledge varies greatly depending on the diligence of the workers or the willingness of their interlocutors to contribute. By way of example, two tribes may consider their languages to be different when the linguist who codified them considered them to be the same by linguistic standards and conversely, a linguist may consider two languages to be markedly different (by technical standards) when the tribes consider them to be the same due to their common histories and sensibilities.

For American Indian communities however, language is an element of their daily lives that is omnipresent, either as part of their heritage or simply as a means of communication. This dissertation studies American Indian language policies as indicators of indigenous cultural activity and thence as spatial markers for tribes in the U.S. landscape. I argue that language is a primordial element not only of social life but also in the production of differential spaces where indigenous existence is protected and valued regardless of outsider influences. Language policy fulfills the seemingly impossible role of constraining language use to a certain jurisdictional space, and I am interested in demonstrating exactly how these spaces match up with previously established political and cultural boundaries.

The specialty areas of indigenous geography and indigenous anthropology provide a variety of possible approaches, from their historical beginnings as twin disciplines to their current inherent multi-disciplinarity and cross-pollination (Rundstrom, et al. 2003, Biolsi 2004). But beyond academic headers, I am following the lead of those advocating indigenous empowerment and collaboration rather than exclusion. I am thus calling upon novel geographical concepts that integrate the multiplicity of narratives as a resource to formulate an ontological understanding of the spatialities of U.S. American Indians in order to produce a geographical

account that is aware of the legal, popular, and tribal definitions without altogether disconnecting them from the economic and political context they are living in.

1.1. Indigenous Geography

Situating indigenous peoples in the U.S. landscape presents the challenge of identifying them first and then recognizing indigenous specificity without disconnecting them from mainstream society. As the aboriginal inhabitants of the land, American Indians were and are everywhere in the United States. Nevertheless, the definition of who is an American Indian has changed tremendously along the years, including tribal denominations, membership rules and the very nature of the tribal recognition title. Speaking of "Indians" today reflects a reality that is markedly different from that of the "Indians" of fifty years ago, let alone those of one hundred, two hundred, or five hundred years ago. Similarly, the term "Indian Country" is used to this day to refer to indigenous communities nationwide, by analogy with the 1763 Royal Proclamation which recommended that all lands not assigned by the colonial governments were left to indigenous peoples as hunting grounds; at the time, it meant all lands west of the Mississippi. The vocabulary of Indian Affairs has been largely imposed upon autochthonous populations with no regards to social or cultural accuracy and thus has failed to reflect their complexities.

When early European colonizers arrived on the North American continent, they had to rely on the indigenous economy to survive. From this state of dependence, Indians have slowly coalesced into mainstream American society over centuries, some forcibly enslaved by colonizers, others joining the colonial effort. Meanwhile, entire societies died at the hands of the U.S. Army whether in warfare or during their transfer to reservations (Utter 1993, Deloria 1988) – all of which depended on the colonial policy, monetary needs, or the spur of the moment. In spite of this grave history, each and every state in the U.S. has place-names of American Indian origin and several even bear a name that is itself related to its indigenous inhabitants or former occupants (Bright 2004). Yet many states do not have a federally-recognized tribe. Reservations, which are the quintessential locale associated with indigenous peoples, are a non-Indian construct that is neither guaranteed by law (although it was historically the case) nor under the control of the tribes. Landscape is thus entirely unreliable for the identification of tribes and the indigenous population of one state may be scattered without any external signs of existing as a community.

There are several standards for the identification of indigeneity today, which do not necessarily overlap. As a rule, tribes are the sole authority to decide on their membership, and though some tribes use blood quantum as a criterion for admission, only the BIA can deliver the Certificate of Degree Indian Blood (CDIB) and tribes may choose to require additional proof of tribal belonging. Census numbers show that there are people who claim American Indian ethnicity in each state (according to the 2010 American Community Survey) although this headcount relies primarily on the honesty of respondents and not on the CDIB. Furthermore, Hawai'i for instance does not have federally recognized tribes because the United States annexed the Kingdom of Hawai'i and made every indigenous resident of the newly formed state an American (*P.L.* 56-331). As a result, Native Hawaiians are not considered to be American Indians for census purposes even though Hawai'i is home to the second largest indigenous population among the U.S. states after Alaska (U.S. Census Bureau 2010), according to the more general dictionary definition of "indigenous," which is "[b]orn or produced naturally in a land or region; native or belonging naturally *to* (the soil, region, etc.)" (Oxford English Dictionary 1989).

Demographic studies of American Indians and their reservations have pointed out in the past that official data provided by the Bureau of Census or the BIA are often complicating the task of understanding the socio-economic realities of indigenous peoples (Eschbach 1993, 1995, Huyser, Sakamoto and Takei 2010, Khanna 2012, Shumway and Jackson 1995). As a result, geographers focused more especially on the vestigial traces of American Indian history in the landscape (Butzer 1990, Sutton 1994) while largely circumventing modern issues (Ballas 1966, 1995) and lead to a largely skewed framework for indigenous studies worldwide (Gregory 1994, Livingstone 1993). In the United States, Klaus Frantz first exposed the socio-economic realities of reservation life in a systematic geographical study of Arizona Indians (Frantz 1999), while post-colonial literature (Said 1993) inspired a reframing of reservations as colonial spaces where hegemonic governments reign supreme (Hannah 1993, 2000, R. C. Harris 1997) and tribal initiatives become acts of spatial resistance (Blomley 1996, 2004, R. C. Harris 2002).

Political geographers thus looked at the legal framework that enabled federal abuses and their ramifications throughout indigenous societies (Biolsi 2004, Mason 2000, Wilkins and Lomawaima 2001). Felix Cohen eloquently described the quandary of the place of indigenous peoples in the U.S. political power system as follows:

> The most basic of all Indian rights (the right of self-government) is the Indian's last defense against bureaucratic oppression, for in a realm where the states are powerless to govern and where Congress, occupied with more pressing national affairs, cannot govern wisely and well, there remains a large no-man's land in which government can emanate only from officials of the Indian Department or from the Indians themselves. (F. Cohen 1942, 122)

This so-called "no-man's land" does not mean that there are no rules governing the tribes. Rather, it is a space where there is no conventional source of power; from systems theory, we learn that all dynamical systems (manifolds) obey a certain amount of rules, due to the principles of complexity (even the most infinitely small system that we are aware of contains multiple elements) and emergence (when complex elements interact, they do so alongside patterns which have their own observable qualities). Niklas Luhmann has applied systems theory to social environments (Luhmann 1982, 1984, 1995) arguing that human societies behave similarly to natural dynamical systems, in which communication is a driving and organizing force (mediating and filtering the relationship between humans and their environments). This dissertation approaches the study of indigenous spaces in the spirit of systems theory with the added understanding that followed Luhmann's initial forays (Habermas 1984, Viskovatoff 1999): I am seeking patterns in the way American Indians are generating their social systems in order to understand the substance of these interactions.

1.2.   Orientations

How do language and space relate ontologically so they can be used in conjunction, and what concepts are best suited to apply them in a scientific observation? What are the benefits of using such an approach for the study of subaltern communities such as American Indians in the United States? And what observable phenomena are available to support the use of such methodologies? Since they are partially dependent upon the Federal government for their territory and sovereignty, I propose that an ontological look at space and language would serve both to enhance our understanding of indigenous lives and start to rectify previous misconceptions entirely inherited from inadequate forms of inquiry.

Several variables must be taken into account by anybody intending to research American Indian languages. Michael Krauss of the University of Alaska at Fairbanks is one of the leading authorities on American Indian languages. He estimates the number of indigenous languages in the United States to be around 175. In 1992, he testified to the United States Senate that forty-

five of them would be considered extinct by the year 2000 (Krauss 1992, 19). This is because he judged that about 70 percent were spoken by middle-aged to elderly people only, and were not being transmitted to younger generations. This decline would of course accelerate as the years go by and the older speakers die. Additionally, he counted around a hundred languages which disappeared altogether since the arrival of European settlers (Krauss 1996). Statistics regarding American Indian languages may therefore be misleading. Michael Krauss did note that

> It does not really make that much difference if such a language has a million speakers or only a hundred. If a language of a million people is not spoken by anyone under fifty, then it is not going to last very much longer than such a language spoken by a hundred people. A large number of speakers in itself does not assure survival. (Krauss 1996, 16)

Language does not fit neatly into statistical classes any more than it fits neatly into political spaces. There are many instances of indigenous tribes whose reservations straddle state or county lines, and tribal members whose domicile may be in one state and who live in another for part of the year for professional reasons.

Looking at language and space ontologically therefore serves a dual purpose of providing an identifiable locale for previously impalpable concepts as well as integrating disenfranchised populations on an even scientific field alongside the more conventional exemplars of political power. All too often, tribes evolve in an environment that was designed to negate their political existence and their language policies may seem irrelevant by comparison with existing state policies establishing English as the sole official language. However, both tribal and state language policies stem from the same ideological need and ultimately serve the same spatial purposes.

Following a trend of post-colonial research, where ontological approaches supply richer reflections of local realities that challenge the hegemonic view, I chose to employ the geographical concept of site (Marston, Jones and Woodward 2005) in combination with a correlated approach to linguistic anthropology (Duranti 2011), neither of which have been applied to studies of indigeneity prior. I found that principal units developed by these authors (namely the geographical site and the speech community) are similar, insofar as they are emergent ontologies that are self-organized by the practices of space and language. I propose to explore this similarity by studying how making language policy (a culturally-embedded language

practice) is serving to generate a site (a culturally-embedded spatial practice) for American Indian communities by the very exercise of their sovereign rights.

Whilst drawing from scientific and philosophical literature, this dissertation is also intended to clarify the political environment for indigenous peoples in the United States. In recent years, hegemonic attempts to take advantage of indigenous resources have reframed the political context in which tribes operate countless times and thereby established contradictory jurisprudence which has become complicated to navigate (Frantz and Howitt 2012, Miller 2012, Rossiter and Wood 2005, Scholtz 2006, Zelinsky 2011). By relying on ontologies, I intend to break the circle of lopsided expertise which has led to the current situation and goes in direct contradiction with the doctrine of self-determination that is being promoted for indigenous peoples by the same governmental entities that are trying to exploit them.

I shall first examine establish the theoretical linkages between power, space, and language, and the way they manifest themselves in indigenous communities across the United States. Rather than relying on political structures to start my analysis, I will build my research agenda around ontologies of space. I will then turn to the practices of generating this ontological space, especially as I reconsider the role of language planning – an umbrella term for all linguistic efforts seeking to enhance a language, whether linguistically or ideologically (Ruiz 1990) – not just as a linguistic activity but also as a spatial activity. The practices of being American Indian and the practices of speaking American Indian languages thereby become discrete geographic events that upset the conventional mode of understanding and representing indigenous communities. I have interviewed tribal members across the United States looking for epicenters of linguistic activity, and how community boundaries are negotiated through the use of language. Based on these findings, I shall extend the discussion of space and language practices into the realm of discourse, especially as it affects the political existence of indigenous peoples.

Chapter 2.   Background and Methodology

This dissertation extends principally on post-modern philosophical theories that have only found resonance in geography in the last decade. Before them, I must mention the input of Yi-Fu Tuan, whose geosophical approach undergirds much of the works quoted below insofar as he approached space phenomenologically and experientially. In his 1974 book *Topophilia*, Tuan spoke of "the affective bond between people and place or setting" (Tuan 1974, 4) centering his research on how one experiences space. Further, he took into account our social life in the experience of space: "The group, expressing and enforcing the cultural standards of society, affects strongly the perception, attitude, and environmental value of its members." (Tuan 1974, 246). He also made a distinction between modern (Western) and traditional approaches to space, all of which are themes which will be found throughout the following chapters.

The critical humanistic geographers who have followed his lead have laid the foundations for affective and ontological geographies via input from phenomenologists. Anne Buttimer in particular argued early on that such an approach allows geographers to question common assumptions about space and place (Buttimer 1976). Edward Relph added that all parts of the spatial experience need to be taken into account in order to provide a more immersive account that intends not to explain but rather provide a description of spatial experiences (Relph 1976). Yi-Fu Tuan's ideas, though inspiring, are derived from the phenomenology championed by Edmund Husserl which is anchored in the Cartesian tradition; in this view, objects of scientific inquiry are revealed within the observer's consciousness (Husserl 1958). In this regard, he posits that knowledge is entirely constituted of representations, and the observer's work is to analyze their own representations, especially via textual analysis.

Whereas Tuan and his followers wrote on the experienced sense of place, a new strand of geography developed following a rehabilitation of Martin Heidegger's ideas in the 1980s. For Heidegger, whose analysis is rooted in Aristotelian philosophy, knowledge is constituted simultaneously in the observer's comprehension (the nature of which is inscrutable) and in the observer's lifeworld, where objects of inquiry happen and where they can be observed. More critically-oriented due to an awareness of both representations and factual existence, these geographers focused especially (as the present dissertation does) on space as a place of Being, of happening, where freedom is freely freed ("*Räumen heißt roden, freimachen. freigeben ein*

Freies, ein Offenes" (Heidegger 1996, 13)) (Malpas 2012) and the fundamentally interactive relationships of people and place (e.g. Casey 1993, Fullilove 2004 and Kemmis 1995).

Indigenous geography and indigenous anthropology, both essentially interdisciplinary, will permeate the references taken mainly from critical geopolitics (also called geographies of power) and anthropological linguistics (more especially critical language policy) though I shall be calling upon the literature of many other qualitative sub-disciplines.

First and foremost however, I shall review the philosophical literature that serves as a basis for this study, revolving principally around practice-oriented interpretations of Michel Foucault's philosophy. A fair amount of the intellectual lineage of this dissertation could also be traced to Pierre Bourdieu's philosophy, whose notion of *habitus* (Bourdieu 1977) has been taken up by all disciplines of the social sciences, such as Anthony Giddens (1979), Hubert Dreyfus (1991), and Michel DeCerteau (1984) who will appear in the text below. Bourdieu argued that one's experience cannot be entirely summarized either by objective analysis or subjective perception. *Habitus* is thence the complex internalization of one's structural environment into a set of rules that guide the human experience and in turn informs one's perception for an emergent understanding of the world.

Geographically speaking, *habitus* has been interpreted as the constant redefining of one's spatiality according to the cues found in the entire realm of experience (Hillier and Rooksby 2002). The interpretation is certainly valid, but it disregards Bourdieu's opinion that only trained specialists are able to fathom these cues (Bourdieu 2000), negating the possibility of non-specialists being able to even observe their own situation. The ontological approach that I am advocating relies on everyone's own sense of experience. This is a fundamental difference in my opinion which renders Foucault's work to be more comprehensive, presenting versatile examples rather than deterministic applications of his theories.

2.1. Philosophical Background

Although Foucault's ideas have been expounded on by Deleuze and Guattari (Deleuze 1988, Deleuze and Guattari 1984), Hardt and Negri (2000, 2004) or Agamben (1998), Foucault himself has notoriously acknowledged the malleability of texts and refused strong forms of authorship (Foucault 1977) so his ideas remain pervasive even in the text of his critics. His conception of power resides in the precepts of immanence, freedom, and cooperation: power is a productive process, accessible to anyone, which is exercised throughout society.

2.1.1. Policy and Power

The following paragraphs will refer a great deal to "policy;" the term is used in its widest extent, *i.e.* the making of rules. Looking at the etymology of *pollicie*, the archaic French word for government from which the English word "policy" is derived, Michel Foucault argued that:

> Down to the end of the ancient regime, the term "police" does not signify at least not exclusively the institution of police in the modern sense; "police" is the ensemble of mechanisms serving to ensure order, the properly channelled [*sic*] growth of wealth and the conditions of preservation of health in general. (Foucault 1980, 170)

Policy is not the exclusive realm of the police force, or even governments as I shall explain below. Any organized community has a set of rules, however loosely established. At its most anodyne, respect should be considered a passive form of policy, aiming to avoid confrontations. Foucault's analysis of power was that of a dynamic struggle between society members (Foucault 2003).

Because the concept of power is most widely used to indicate official forms of government, one may be tempted to only recognize laws, which have been enacted by governmental figures, as the single valid form of "policy." However, such an analysis disregards figures of authority whose *dicta* are also recognized as policy, such as parents and bosses. Foucault argued that governments adjucate themselves the right to define order, thereby justifying their own existence that could be compromised by the existence of alternatives – a notion also present in Benedict Anderson's description of "imagined communities" (Anderson 1991). This is an important starting point in understanding this particular view of power, which recognizes all sources of authority without necessarily questioning the legitimacy of governmental power.

Foucault's inquiry was concerned with the reasons why individuals are willing to comply even with policies they disagree with (Foucault 1982). In the case of modern republics where a popular vote approves of the form of government, policing is entirely acceptable by a majority and probably necessary in most cases. Governments ultimately maintain the peace by their very promise for peace: there is no government in existence seeking disorder, and it is really in everybody's interest to share a minimum of values. Governments in turn exploit this common interest (*res publica*) to keep the peace among their ranks; churches and schools are part of the

policing apparatus – "technologies of domination" (Foucault 1988, 18) – teaching us to behave in a way that is consistent with the common interest (Foucault 1982).

As a result, techniques of government and resistance will vary depending on local government cultures. Foucault notoriously avoided the concept of ideology (central to Marxisms) as it exists only by opposition with something that is held as truth (Foucault 2000, 119). He preferred to speak of competing discourses, which exist regardless of their truth value (Foucault 1980). For our purposes, the two words can be used interchangeably. Local ideologies are guidelines for the negotiation of power: much as there are many ways to conform, there are many ways to differ from the established order. At the heart of these conflicting attitudes is the self, which absorbs the totality of our experiences to shape our behaviors, allowing one to choose whether to follow or refuse governmental rule. This process was called "ipseity" by Jacques Derrida (by way of Emmanuel Levinas (1978)):

> By ipseity I wish to suggest some "I Can", or at the very least the power that gives itself its own law, its force of law, its self-representation, the sovereign and reappropriating gathering of self in the simultaneity of an assemblage or assembly, being together or living together. (Derrida 2005, 11)

Ipseity shapes our identity, sourcing material from our lived experiences: each change in one's environment is therefore relevant to our relationship with power. Michel Foucault's equivalent is "technologies of the self" (Foucault 1988), which allow one to fashion a public personality, an external *façade* created by human beings in order to live in society (Foucault 1977). As a result, identity is situated at the epicenter of power, gathering information from one's environment (including but not limited to policy) and contrasting it with one's inner self. Gilles Deleuze further described identity as the dynamic product of difference, as a singular identity may only be recognized by contrast with another:

> […] [G]enus is determinable only by specific difference from without; and the identity of the genus in relation to the species contrasts with the impossibility for Being of forming a similar identity in relation to the genera themselves." (Deleuze 2004, 43)

In this context, identity is neither part of one's essence nor entirely pre-determined: it is the partly calculated manifestation of the self in the social world. Individuals use technologies of the self in order to fashion their identity, which is in turn expressed in discourse; the interface between one's technologies of the self and the technologies of government is a process called governmentality, to which I will return *infra*.

2.1.2. Foucauldian Power

Michel Foucault saw power as immanent in mankind: every/anyone has power, and a potential for political power. In particular, he differentiated power from biopower, which is the technique used by governments to gain control over the lives of their subjects. Following the same line of thinking, he called the interactional process by which some people obtain power over others "biopolitics" by contrast with politics, a discursive practice (Foucault 1980). Power as it is exercised by governments (biopower) is only the result of the authority that is granted to them by the people (in a democracy), by their lineage (in a monarchy), by a religious figure (in a theocracy), etc. Biopower is a concrete example of power as it is practiced in our everyday lives (Foucault 2010).

Foucault points to freedom as the necessary condition for power to be exercised: political action will be most effective if those who engage in it are free from outside pressures, such as political, financial or religious interests (Foucault 1984). If freedom enables power to be expressed, and in turn power opens up more room for freedom, then hegemonic power (through biopolitics) will seek conversely to reduce freedom and restrict expressions of power. Nikolas Rose (1994, 1999) has adapted this theory to the modern, neo-liberal world: the political discourse emphasizing freedom exists both in order to appeal to every man and woman's desire for freedom and as a smokescreen leading people to blindly follow liberal governments. Rose thus argued that for the promise of more freedom, citizens are often willing to sacrifice some of their freedom, altering their lives to follow the lines of conduct advocated by governments. To fulfill the promise of freedom, governments diminish their conspicuous presence (state police, courthouses) and resort to centers of authority (government agencies, schools, clinics), which are virtually unrelated to the hegemonic government yet carry its ideology, effectively planting government among society members. Coinciding with this vision, J.B. Harley had described how geographical landscape slowly became synonymous with political divisions: "The map becomes a 'juridical territory': it facilitates surveillance and control" (Harley 1989, 12).

The last component in Foucauldian power is cooperation, necessitated both by economic interdependence and by the biopolitical process: several individuals will always be more powerful than one. The voting system is a device to allocate some of every voter's power in order to build the authority of one leader. Needless to say, Foucault sees authoritarian systems such as Fascism, Marxisms and capitalism as the epitome of negative forces which attempt to limit

individual power and prevent fruitful cooperation. True power will "'de-individualize' by means of multiplication and displacement, diverse combinations" (in Deleuze & Guattari 1984, xiv) emphasizing not individual successes to the detriment of others but potential positive outcomes for all.

The nexus of these three concepts is a conception of the exercise of power as the result of a deliberate effort to change one's situation, to subvert the dominant paradigm; or in Foucault's words:

> At the very heart of the power relationship, and constantly provoking it, are the recalcitrance of the will and the intransigence of freedom. Rather than speaking of an essential freedom, it would be better to speak of an "antagonism" – of a relationship which is at the same time reciprocal incitation and struggle; less of a face-to-face confrontation which paralyzes both sides than a permanent provocation. (Foucault 1982, 221-222)

In addition to the complex diversity of devices for the exercise of power, here Foucault further exemplifies the dynamic aspect of power. Gilles Deleuze explored Foucault's ideas on biopower and extended power into what he called the plane of immanence:

> [t]here are only relations of movement and rest, speed and slowness between unformed elements, or at least between elements that are relatively unformed, molecules, and particles of all kinds. There are only haecceities, affects, subjectless individuations that constitute collective assemblages. (Deleuze and Guattari 1984, 293-294)

Just as Foucault separated power from the material world by making it immanent, Deleuze proposes that there is an entire plane of human existence – the self – that does not rely on territory or other materialities to function but rather it is active in the realm of pure philosophy or ethics. This theory builds upon Foucault's technologies of the self, which includes sovereignty – a term he believed became hackneyed by judicial notions (Foucault 2003).

Indeed, throughout the history of indigenous peoples in the United States, their sovereignty was always emphasized in political discourse yet negated in political practice. For instance, in its early history the federal government carried on the colonial system of factories (or "trading posts") whose primary function was to mediate trade with the tribes and ensure their protection but quickly became fortified military checkpoints on tribal lands (Prucha 1971); the very existence of a treaty system implicates a Nation-to-Nation relationship between the U.S. and each tribe, yet it scarcely included bipartisan negotiation or even allowed for the Native

voice to be heard after the ratification of the treaties (Jones 1982). Even in modern times, the policy of self-determination should legitimately be an application of American Indian sovereign rights, though it was in fact negated by reluctant administrations and banalized by rhetorical misuse (Cook 1994).

From the colonizing point of view, the sovereign status of indigenous peoples meant that the Federal government would attempt to negotiate an amicable outcome; from the indigenous point of view, sovereignty meant that the tribes remained in power over their own affairs (Pommersheim 1995). Their existence as "American Indians" today is the result of the early acknowledgement of indigenous power from the settlers, their perseverance to use that immanent power while it was denied to them by various U.S. administrations and their willingness to express it in spite of their current adverse economic situation. The survival of indigenous traditions is arguably due in large part to their dynamic response to policing, including some tribes' refusal of federal educational and economic programs as well as wherewithal against territorial manipulations. Because they insisted on expressing their power and individuality, American Indians have not been assimilated into the colonial effort and mainstream population.

Using this definition of power means recognizing the immanent power of indigenous tribes on an equal footing with other organized and unorganized forms of government, rather than an echelon below nation-states. When taken up in the social sciences, these theories have led to drastic changes in approaching the world and its representations. Geographers in particular have embraced Foucauldian ideas to account for social phenomena as faithfully as possible (see Dewsbury 2003, Latham and Conradson 2003, Thrift 2000, Whatmore 2002) regardless of political and historical considerations, and built a critical theory of geography resting upon these principles.

2.1.3. Geographical Applications

For instance, Nikolas Rose has introduced a view of political space articulated upon the use of power rather than administrative considerations (Rose 1994, 1999). Within their given territories, national governments are controlling their political reach in space through centers of authority – Bernard Cohn echoed the same sentiment, using the term "modalities" (Cohn 1996) – which create smaller territories that are easier to control. These spaces are meant to homogenize biopower over the large populations of nation-states as well as to maximize the reach of governments over large portions of the landscape. As a result, spatial entities which escape or

oppose this format are often framed as strange: homeless people, graffiti artists, online communities, etc. are often perceived as dissident because they utilize space differently.

John Allen argued more pointedly that power could be channeled through social actions in order to produce a variety of effects, whether it is "domination," "authority," "coercion," "manipulation," or "seduction" (Allen 2003). These activities of power help bring power into the world, each with their own spatial implications, and each affecting a particular subset of the population differently. Following Foucault's principle of "governmentality" (Foucault 1991) and Bruno Latour's performative definition of power (Latour 1986), Allen argues further that since power can only be conjured, it fluctuates in space according to social dynamics (Allen 2003). Institutions, interest groups, class actions and spontaneous protests become then the apparent forms of power which may be perceived more or less strongly by their political opponents depending on context; in Allen's analysis, spaces are the result of the "messy co-existences and awkward juxtapositions of power" created when these forms encounter one another (Allen 2003, 159).

However, John Allen's theories do not explicitly address the use of power for dissidence or resistance, reserving his analysis to governmental power. By interpolation, his view becomes especially relevant when studying subaltern communities, if only as a reminder that their disempowered status may only be for the time being. Considering that state boundaries represent the extent of governmental power, they are more aptly to be thought of as artifacts, relics of past eras that have become especially hard to change over the years. Thus state boundaries may only represent the present hegemonic paradigm, incapable to account for the communities that are numerical minorities in that present - even though they were once a majority whose existence shaped these borders (*e.g.*, indigenous peoples) or conversely minorities that may augment their importance in the future.

The re-envisioning of power relationships introduced by Michel Foucault is fundamental to the critical project of this dissertation. It shifts the focus off hegemonic domination (*i.e.*, by large scale institutionalized governments) and onto political action, regardless of their economic leverage or size. Using Foucauldian definitions of power upsets the basis of political thinking and challenges one-dimensional pre-conceptions of power-relationships. This should serve as a constant reminder that the significance of even the smallest communities cannot be underestimated as their idiosyncratic ways of being powerful may be the source for political

maps in the future. However, until very recently the techniques to map space were not designed to handle the "messy" situations described by Allen *supra*. Conducting geographic research according to these principles requires that the very tools that we use to present the world be abandoned.

2.2. Theoretical Background

While a traditional view of politics and space may regard state boundaries as the furthest extents where political power can reach, critical political geographers have been focusing on a view of power which transcends boundaries and resides in political actions. Geopolitical scholars have exploited Michel Foucault's theories in particular to analyze foreign policy (S. B. Cohen, Geopolitical Realities and United States Foreign Policy 2003, Dalby, Critical Geopolitics: Difference, Discourse and Dissent 1991, 1998, Dodds 1993, 1994, 2000, Coleman and Grove 2009), civil conflicts (Brenner, et al. 2003, Dikec 2008, Huxley 2008, Ó Tuathail 1994, 1996) and colonial mentalities (Bignall 2010, Crampton 2010, Said 1978). All agree that political action in the modern world cannot be fairly analyzed using the view of space that is typically employed in geography. As summarized by John Agnew: "established state boundaries are losing their ability to monopolise [*sic*] the representation of political power" (Agnew 1993, 253).

The idea incrementally spread out of political geography, as social scientists found that countless aspects of human life could not be mapped analytically. These authors gathered under the banner of Non-Representational Theory (NRT) because they refused to anchor their analyses in representations of the world (either popular or political), choosing instead to study phenomena on their own terms. There has been extensive debate over what role NRT can play in geography, especially in terms of the methods used and the objects of study. Its goal, as I and many others understand it, is to account for phenomena as faithfully as possible (see Dewsbury 2003, Latham 2003, Thrift 2000, Whatmore 2002). In this respect NRT seems particularly appropriate in order to study the role of language in space and especially the role that language and space play in our lives as people.

Most recently, Sallie Marston, J.P. Jones III and Keith Woodward have brought about a new vocabulary in geography following Theodore Schatzki's interpretation of practice theorists via Gilles Deleuze (Deleuze 2004, Marston, Jones and Woodward 2005, Schatzki 2002). They introduced the "site" as a complex flat ontology, to capture the spaces which are created (or, to emphasize the creativity involved, "authored") through our everyday practices. Sites are not

meant to replace scales in everyday usage: they are a new concept, a reconsideration of our vision of space for the realm of geography that allows us not to be restricted by scales.

2.2.1. Paradigm Shift: from "Scales" to "Sites"

Understandably, "scale" has been the representational medium of choice in human geography to visualize, quantify, and relate geographical objects between one another – most map users have been acquainted with the concept. In a 1992 article, Lam and Quattrochi separated three scales for geographical study: the "cartographic scale" puts into perspective elements on a map and elements in the lived world; the "geographic scale" links all occurrences of one event into a coherent whole that can be isolated for study; finally, the "operation scale" is how far an event can have repercussions in the world. The cartographic scale is probably the most common example that comes to mind. It is a measurement system that appears in the legends of maps about which there is little to argue.

2.2.1.1. The multiple scales of geographical analysis

The geographic scale is also easy to relate to, as its boundaries correspond to landmarks and landscape features, in addition to the daily reality that is generally accepted and portrayed in the media: the national scale of the United States of America is bounded by the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans in the East and West, by Canada and Mexico in the North and South. This scale may become contested as it is contingent on political events. Geography inevitably involves a history and impacts the lives of everyone who happens to be contained in the area. The national entity called the "United States" did not exist in the fifteenth century; two hundred years later the newly-anointed United States only occupied a small fraction of the North American continent; the United States came to occupy its current land mass in the middle of the nineteenth century through land acquisitions, explorations, and wars. The Civil War redrew some state boundaries within the U.S., and created a new geographical entity known as the Confederate States of America, also known in popular discourse as "the South."

To this day, the U.S. South remains a geographical concept in the imaginaries of a multitude of subcultures in North America. Those attached to the ideology promulgated by the Confederate States may find it offensive that states which were not significantly involved in the conflict (such as Kentucky or Maryland) would be promulgated to be part "the South." By contrast, mainstream usage of "the U.S. South," without the sentimental attachment, will produce

19

a variety of definitions that do not correspond to a historical reality but rather rely on an amalgam of historical, political, social, and personal references (King and Taylor 1996).

Such spaces will often create controversy because their very existence is contrary to mainstream ideology which purports a homogenous and stable national space (Summerhill and Williams 2000). Geographic scales were explicitly established as a convenience to reflect these conventional spaces, and therefore they are not the best suited to represent heterogeneous and dissident spaces such as the South, or indigenous spaces, whose existence challenges the primacy of national narratives (Walkowitz and Knauer 2009). The United States and indigenous peoples cannot co-exist on the same geographic scale without further explanation of their respective sovereignties.

For the same reasons, American history textbooks very reluctantly started using the term "colonization" when talking about indigenous peoples of the United States (Hoxie 1984b). To say that the United States government was still colonizing its own landmass well into several centuries of existence contravenes the image of a united and powerful nation. By contrast, radical indigenous writers such as Ward Churchill have argued that American Indians in the United States have been colonized, "subsumed within or permanently assimilated to an in-place 'replacement population' imported from the colonizing country" (Churchill 1998, 161). Churchill's history and geography are not designed to conform to the national ideal and thus he provides an alternative view of American history which explicitly values the input of indigenous peoples. However, because they challenge the mainstream, his views are controversial and he has been involved in several legal battles regarding the legitimacy of his claims (Chapman 2010).

According to Lam and Quattrochi's classification, indigenous peoples may belong more appropriately to an operational scale. By comparison with the geographic and cartographic scales, it is the most complicated to represent as it is not the consequence of a democratic decision process, but rather the *de facto* area created by an event in space and time. Unfortunately, operational scales do not reflect the sovereign status of indigenous peoples in the United States, who would once again be relegated to the status of subalterns in their spatial representation. As such we cannot rely on conventional scales and methods to represent unconventional populations, as scales are not just the reflection of a spatial reality, they are also the product of a timeframe with the conflicting values that are attached to them over time (Cox 1998b).

2.2.1.2. Representing complexity

Lam and Quattrochi's definitions for geographical scales served an explanatory purpose as they advocated a novel type of analysis based on fractals. Fractals are the epitome of a complex form, with self-similar features that transcend scales and cannot be measured in and of themselves. They can, however, be used as a tool for analysis when scales fail to provide accurate results: "it may not be economically or logistically feasible to measure the phenomenon at the most appropriate scale, especially in the case of socio-economic data that are already collected by pre-defined areal units" (Lam and Quattrochi 1992, 94). Complex phenomena consequently require a complex unit for analysis, and in the case of socio-political entities with no spatiality or temporality such as Foucauldian power, conventional forms can only fail.

The latter methods further cannot support dynamic definitions, as subjective attitudes wax and wane with the spirit of the time. So the proverb goes: "history remembers kings, not soldiers." Thus the same applies to other disciplines: geography usually remembers kingdoms, not the realm of soldiers. There is no geographical terminology to represent the barracks that were once occupied by those who lost a war. Neither is there geographical evidence in most cases, as the victors often make a point to destroy evidence of antagonist presence in formerly occupied lands. In colonized areas, that means destroying dwellings as well as often replacing place-names that may reflect the former culture of the land (Berg and Kearns 1996). Fractal forms can support dynamic representations, and the domain of fractal cartography is still in its beginning stages, due in part to the recent evolution of software capabilities (Dauphiné 2012).

Meanwhile, the search for a geographical unit that is malleable enough to account for complex forms of social organizations without the need to provide a visual representation has led some geographers to look at other disciplines. Theodore Schatzki's concept of site, while grounded in social realities, provides an ontological unit that can serve to represent geographical areas for the purpose of geographical research. Widely defined, Schatzki summarized his argument thusly: "The social site is the site of human coexistence" (Schatzki 2002, 147). As such, sites are apt to subsume any aspect of human existence, whether it is population patterns, political enterprises or simple attitudes such as pride, gendering and politics which are intrinsic, inescapable parts of living. Sites, much like fractals, do not have a precise extrinsic definition: they can only be recognized through careful observation of patterns (self-similarity) of human interaction, irrespective of scale or regularity.

2.2.2. Realgeographie

The debate surrounding scale has become especially ardent in the second half of the twentieth century with the rise of international organizations and transnational exchanges giving rise to a new range of conspicuously similar attitudes across the globe. The process that became known as globalization has in turn dramatically increased the vastness and complexity of international exchanges. It is no longer rare for two people living poles apart on the globe to be able to discuss similar interests, circulate ideas and goods worldwide in an instant. Some authors have argued that it has also augmented the divide between those who have access to the technology enabling them to communicate across borders and those who do not (Jacobson 1995, Knauft 1999, Mitchell 2000); as such, globalization precipitated the changes in geographies of power.

Within the discipline, the first discussions involved two camps, led by Peter Taylor (1982, 1988, 1994), a political and economic geographer who thought in terms of "world-economy," "nation-state" and "locality," and Neil Smith (1989, 1992, 1993) an anthro-geographer who was a proponent of "urban," "regional," "national," and "global" scales. While these divisions had the advantage of being both thematic and geographic, they very soon appeared more arbitrary than actually useful, as they left out the spaces in between. Scales had been established as the geographical metric of our lives because they were conspicuous, not necessarily the ones we engage with the most.

However, one's geography is totally constituted from natural spaces and places in combination with one's perception of them. Using "scale" as a unique tool inevitably leads to an amalgamation of natural spaces and perceived spaces; furthermore, talk of "scale" has conjured two types of related concepts: on the one hand, the objective relation between objects in space and the subjective relation between places on the other. It is easy to see how polarizing these positions would be.

Predicated upon the input of Foucault and other phenomenologists, some geographers have initiated a change in vocabulary, similar to the late nineteenth century introduction of *realpolitik* for political scientists who did not want to be involved in the warmongering discourse which prevailed over Europe at the time. In this sense, ontological geography is "*realgeographie*": stripped from increasingly confusing terminology in order to study earth sciences. The new geographical tool that Sallie Marston and others have turned to is the concept

of "site." Along with John Paul Jones III and Keith Woodward, Marston has pioneered a flat ontology "composed of complex, emergent spatial relations" (Marston, Jones and Woodward 2005, 422). Far from reverting to emphasis on the "small scale", the "local", a site does not have a unique, prefabricated dimension.

> [I]t is necessary to invent - perhaps endlessly - new spatial concepts that linger upon the materialities and singularities of space. Manipulating a term from topology and physics, these consist of localized and non-localized event-relations productive of event-spaces that avoid the predetermination of hierarchies or boundlessness. It is imperative that such a reformulation not reproduce bordered zones that redirect critical gazes toward an 'outside over there' that, in turn, hails a 'higher' spatial category (a meta-zone or a scaling-up) that would bound them. Instead, a flat ontology must be rich to the extent that it is capable of accounting for socio-spatiality as it occurs throughout the Earth without requiring prior, static conceptual categories. (Marston, Jones and Woodward 2005, 424-425)

Geographic ontologies are typically represented by lattices connecting their different components around their distinctive elements based on logic (rather than physical or political laws). However, lattices are impractical for our geographical purposes as they leave the space "in between" unaccounted for. Our sites are multimodal and ever mutable, and thus may overlap several categories and disciplines so long as they are logically related. This is a radical change from scales which were unidirectional and exclusive by essence.

The new terminology of "sites" encountered a mixed reception: Arturo Escobar welcomed the initiative as a coherent effort within the trend in social sciences towards a "flattening" of social relationships (Escobar 2007). Conversely, Helga Leitner and Byron Miller refused to abandon scale, lest "we would be left with an impoverished understanding not only of the power relations that inhere in scale, but of the power relations that inhere in the intersections of diverse spatialities with scale" (Leitner and Miller 2007). Marston, Jones, and Woodward argue on the contrary that sites are complex containers of spaces and places with all their uniqueness and multiplicity. In their view, the fluctuating association of sites generates our spaces of engagement:

> We propose a spatial ontology that recognizes a virtually infinite population of mobile and mutable "sites" and that is ontologically flat by virtue of its affirmation of immanence – or self-organization – as the fundamental process of material actualization. Against the deployment of forms or categories that operate by carving up the

world into a delimited set of manageable object-types, we look to the unfolding state of affairs within which situations or sites are constituted as singularities – that is, as a collectivity of bodies or things, orders and events, and doings and sayings that hang together so as to lend distinct consistency to assemblages of dynamic relations. (Marston, Woodward and Jones 2007, 51)

This novel view of space eliminates the distance between the reality studied in geography and the reality experienced in the world. As a tool for analysis, scale stands between the researcher and its object of study. As such, an allegorical equivalent of scale would be a telescope, microscope, or magnifying glass. On the one hand, they allow us to conveniently study events which are otherwise lost in the large universe we live in; on the other hand, any event happening outside of the scope goes unnoticed to the scientists. Conversely, site does not obstruct the view of the researcher because it only circumscribes events to an observable unit. It is an entirely novel heuristic in geographical research which is better suited for the current political climate, where international relationships and internal dynamics are becoming increasingly complex.

Modern republics and democracies imply by their very nature a considerable political compromise. While some people in the ruling majority may have common interests, they may have different ways to achieve them and different sympathies towards the struggles of other groups. If one were to account for each set of different interests and fleeting opinions in one scale, they would most likely need one scale per person - one that could change at any moment; such a scale would be contrary to the already widespread use of "scale" as a fixed, representational concept. Using "site" as a metric enables us to encompass the history of the geographical areas as well as all of its actors by maintaining the focus on a single entity rather than the many realities that crosscut it. Even if the place were to disappear in the material world, its existence can still be accounted for in discourse as a site of nostalgia.

Conversely, sites cannot be predicted or analyzed until they happen in the world and one is able to experience them. Sites are self-contained, but they are liable to expand as they only reflect the assemblages that we make of the world around us. Following Kant:

the understanding can never accomplish a priori anything more than to anticipate the form of a possible experience in general, and, since that which is not appearance cannot be an object of experience, it can never overstep the limits of sensibility, within which alone objects are given to us. Its principles are merely principles of the exposition of appearances, and the proud name of

an ontology, which presumes to offer synthetic a priori cognition of things in general in a systematic doctrine (e.g., the principle of causality), must give way to the modest one of a mere analytic of the pure understanding. (Kant 1860, 183)

There is no all-encompassing site where everything would be related by virtue of simply belonging in the same world. In the former technologies geographers had to tie newly created entities in with existing scales or networks, because they met some required commonalities. Ontologies imply rather a careful inquiry in order to identify the most salient characteristics of the subject all the while accounting for (not discarding) its peripheral elements. American Indians, as a numerical minority in the United States, are not always included in the national debates, whether political, economic or cultural. They nevertheless exist in the United States by the same terms as mainstream Americans (not only inasmuch as they are American citizens, but also by their sovereign status) and they should thus be treated accordingly.

2.2.3. Complexity of Space

Thinking about improving the concept of scale, Erik Swyngedouw argued about the necessary "jumping of scales," (Swyngedouw 1997) which happens in economics when an institution needs to cater both to local markets and follow international guidelines. Such strategies effectively conflate the global and local scales into one new "glocal" scale (Robertson 1994), a local scale that is heavily influenced by the global scale. In his questioning of the seemingly all-powerful juggernaut of globalization, Swyngedouw further points out that due to popular and scientific use of the word "scale" researchers may have been misled into thinking of scales as congruent, impermeable units: "the scales are, of course, operating not hierarchically, but simultaneously, and the relationships between different scales are 'nested'" (Swyngedouw 1997, 169). Peter Taylor attempted to illustrate this process in 2000 by laying the emphasis on the "world-cities," which he contended gain more importance on the global scale than the territory on which they are situated. As illustrated in the modern economic crises, economies are so linked as a complex process of networking and interdependencies, that one local phenomenon may be felt all around the world:

To break free, we do not have to lessen our concern for states, but rather to see them as one important element in a nexus of power which straddles geographical scales. In fact, appreciation of the importance of interlocking scales is an important general mode of dismantling state-centric social sciences. (Taylor 2000, 28)

Arguably, this networking between the scales could very well represent another dimension of thinking rather than a coincidental event, more generative and heterogeneous than then term "interlocking" implies. David DeLaney and Helga Leitner noted this phenomenon in their introduction to an issue of *Political Geography* especially devoted to a discussion of the concept of scale:

> The problematic of scale in this context arises from the difficulties of answering the question: once scale is constructed or produced, where in the world is it? Scale is not as easily objectified as two-dimensional territorial space, such as state borders. We cannot touch it or take a picture of it (Delaney and Leitner 1997, 96-97).

"Scale" is therefore much more complicated than the popularity of the term suggests. Indigenous peoples are the quintessential counter-example to scales, nations within a nation, independent from states, constituted of cities which do not conform to established patterns of city planning. If I may rephrase Delaney and Leitner's question for the specific purpose of this dissertation: "where in the world is the American Indian site?"

According to the U.S. constitution and body of laws, American Indians should be considered as nations – though territorially and politically they are far removed from the all-powerful nation-states that we are now accustomed to seeing in the media. By contrast, few – if any – spaces in the U.S. have not been affected by their indigenous populations, yet they constitute a very small part of the total population. With a complex ontology such as site at our disposal, we can connect the vestigial traces of American Indian existence with current indigenous presence; instead of attempting to reduce peoples to a location, I shall consider them in terms of their influence, and focus on where their presence is meaningful.

2.2.4. Spaces of Engagement

In order to study the more intangible aspects of scales, Kevin Cox introduced a new paradigm by envisioning them in terms of their social construction rather than the observable, areal so-called reality (Cox 1998a). Cox further refined the difference between geographic scales and operational scales in terms of how they affect people. On the one hand, he talks of "spaces of dependence," to which people are conforming by sheer convenience: political boundaries such as city limits, national borders, and gated communities – even though they represent arbitrary fragmentations of space – play a tremendous role in organizing the experience of living in society. On the other hand, there are the "spaces of engagement" which inevitably happen when

human beings are interacting with the world. The space of engagement is formed by a meshing of human interactions, which may belong to any of the traditionally accepted geographic scales, but also may intersect and transcend all these scales.

In response, Cox calls on geographers to "liberate [them]selves from an excessively areal approach to the question" (Cox 1998a, 21). Erik Swyngedouw further pointed out that the outreach of scales is not only limited in space, it is also limited in time:

> Geographical configurations as a set of interacting and nested scales (the 'gestalt of scale') become produced as temporary stand-offs in a perpetual transformative, and on occasion transgressive, social–spatial power struggle. These struggles change the importance and role of certain geographical scales, reassert the importance of others, and sometimes create entirely new significant scales, but – most importantly – these scale redefinitions alter and express changes in the geometry of social power by strengthening power and control by some while disempowering others. (Swyngedouw 1997, 169)

In focusing on power, Swyngedouw expanded the vision of spatial relationships to their more volatile aspects, past the exchange of goods or population migrations. He laid the emphasis on practices, which necessarily unfold in spaces: economy is perhaps the most blatant example as merchandise and funds are physically transported from one space to the other. The same view can be extended by looking more generally to "capital," and in a capitalist world, looking at the institutional practices of economy and exchange. Post-modern geographers of power have been instrumental in showing space in a new light because of their emphasis on the humanistic aspect of power, rather than the disembodied view of a capitalist machine.

In terms of engagement, political power concerns many more than just politicians: the spaces of engagement include lobbyists and grassroots movements who clearly have an impact on changing the status quo, even though they do not lack political authority. The sum of their collective input generates a space where the policy is recognized: a site of American Indian co-existence which straddles state and even tribal boundaries.

American Indians who are not usually associated with political authority – as a matter of fact, they exemplify the loss thereof – thus provide a perfect example of subalternity, existing outside of the mainstream practices of power yet active enough to maintain their identity. I argue that this unique form of acknowledgement of their sovereignty puts them in a markedly different

decision-making position for their futures, contingent upon the popular engagement with political issues such as that of language.

2.3. Methodology

There is no unique methodology for phenomenological analysis; rather, it provides an ethical framework for those seeking to reach an ontological understanding of a subject. This has led to several schools of thought across the social sciences, sharing several common traits: invariably, archival work is required to understand historical context and interviews are a primary way to collect experiential information (see, *e.g.*, Lynch 2001). Both must be conducted comprehensively in order to be able to synthesize one account from the multiplicity of experiences. These methods only differ from the ethnographic approach in their finality, which is reductionist rather than holistic. In this respect, the phenomenological approach does not fundamentally differ from methods already commonplace with indigenous geographers and authors (McCarty 2005) and inscribes itself within the framework of qualitative methods gaining momentum across the geographic disciplines (DeLyser 2010).

Official documents regarding state language policies are generally available through the library system, and I was previously acquainted with much of the corpus through my Master's thesis work. As is recommended for indigenous research, I used first-hand interviews following a format loose enough to ensure that meanings were properly negotiated (Tuhiwai 1999) and that the interactions were adequately contextualized without forcing any of the issues (Katz 1992) all the while staying reflective about my practice and my subject (Thrift, Spatial Formations 1996). The data presented below were obtained through semi-directed telephone interviews with various tribal members around the continental United States, with whom I was connected as I requested information about tribal languages. I chose not to include Alaskan tribes as part of the sample because they have maintained a substantial amount of local independence from U.S. legislation (C. L. Brown 2004) and additionally their languages have been more thoroughly studied and protected by local experts (University of Alaska Fairbanks 2012).

I originally started this study wanting to make field trips to a handful of selected locations across the United States and experience the extent of the linguistic programs first-hand. I had chosen three tribes according to scant information on the internet and made preliminary contact with them in order to confirm the online information. Unfortunately none of the trips became feasible for reasons I shall explain below.

2.3.1. Initial Explorations

In Santa Ana Pueblo, I managed to reach by telephone the program manager who was very enthusiastic but also very busy. She agreed that meeting in person would be preferable because of her schedule, but she also asked that I tell her more about my dissertation and my point of view because she would have to sponsor me as a visitor to the tribal council. After a series of three 5 to 10 minute conversations over the course of several weeks, all interrupted by meetings and/or other calls, she became altogether impossible to reach when she left town to lead cultural summer camps. Her clerical staff was little to no help, unfortunately, relying exclusively on the director for guidance as the program hired workers seasonally.

It took me several weeks to get in touch with the language program of the Suquamish in Washington state. They maintain a relatively modern website which states that the tribe has a cultural program to preserve their language. More precisely, a handful of members are appointed as "keepers of the language" or "language carriers" whose role is to teach the language to younger generations (Suquamish, p.c., 2012). I did not receive a response to my emails, and the first couple of operators I talked to could only redirect my calls to the local school, where I found no information about the language carriers. I finally reached an operator who was aware of the language program, which resulted from a grant that had run its course; she informed me that its principal investigator had moved off the reservation to pursue professional opportunities.

The first person with whom I spoke in the cultural department of the Chitimacha of Louisiana was very helpful, and well-informed about the tribe's language activities. But the further I progressed in the hierarchy, the less my interlocutors were willing to give out any information. I successfully scheduled an appointment with the director of the language restoration project but when the date came and I attempted to confirm it (as she recommended), I was told that she was not taking appointments, and that I probably would not be able to meet her anyway. I drew up a questionnaire for a phone interview that was re-scheduled twice and finally rather bluntly expedited.

2.3.2. Ad Hoc Justification

In retrospect, these three initial contacts illustrate quite accurately the relationship I had with a majority of the tribes with whom I communicated over the summer and fall of 2011 for the most part. They came as a sober reminder than even though tribal governments appear to be

of familiar form, they do not necessarily behave in the way I expected them to – which I understand as the core principle of a phenomenological approach.

As time passed and I attempted more contacts, it became evident that looking for a "language policy" would not be fruitful and what are publicly presented by tribes as official channels were in fact a convenience for outsiders rather than a reflection of the chain of command or even the daily reality of the tribes. I re-developed my questionnaire to be more exploratory based on my early contacts which assumed the existence of a program (see appendices A and B). Hoping to find the most up-to-date listing, I downloaded the directory of Indian Tribes from the Bureau of Indian Affairs website. My goal was to call each and every tribe around the United States, in search for a "language program," a term broad enough to convey the goals of what linguists would otherwise call language maintenance. By and large, this was much more successful, barring another small hitch: approximately 10 percent of the phone numbers listed in the most recent edition of the BIA directory were not up to date. Additionally, over 70 percent of the internet addresses listed in the directory were incorrect and over half of the tribes actually had no website listed.

2.3.2.1. Gathering information

Once located, some tribal websites proved to be especially helpful in finding up to date contact information, but a large majority of them were either outdated or minimally kept up. Without exception, the phone numbers listed led to an automated menu, which rarely if ever listed language programs. I quickly opted to talk to the operators who were in general very welcoming and certainly more helpful than the lengthy and confusing (and many a time inaccurate) automated menus. The experience of using the BIA's tribal directory is therefore akin to calling the customer service of a private organization, an interface between the administration and its members that is only useful when one knows their party's extension number.

I called 335 tribes around the continental United States, reaching a knowledgeable interlocutor 276 times. There were 65 tribes for whom I either could not reach an operator or the operator had no information, sometimes redirecting me to a disconnected number or another person who had no answer. 170 tribes answered positively to the first question "Do you have a language program for the reservation?" In all, I was able to fulfill my questionnaire 126 times; the difference between these two numbers can be accounted for in large part by calls that were not returned. Other failures to complete the questionnaire were cases such as the Tunica-Biloxi

of Louisiana, where I learned that there was no language program presently, but one of their tribal members was in college and had started to make plans to organize a language program upon her return. On six occasions, I was told that there is a language program in existence, but it is strictly reserved for tribal members and their directors declined to answer my questions. (Appendix C presents a synoptic of the calls)

103 tribes answered that they did not have a program; in those cases, I asked if the local language was at all taught in the community in order to dispel any ambiguity about the subject, and none changed their answers. Language programs vary greatly in scope depending on the needs of the tribe and more importantly on the funding they receive from the tribes, the states or the federal government. Some programs currently exist nominally but they lack the means or manpower to organize any significant language activities – until the following fiscal year. I found nineteen language programs that were established in the last ten years, and in two cases the programs were just budding: for the Choctaw of Jena, Louisiana, the "cultural committee" committee had received the approval of the tribal council just two weeks before I called the tribe (Jena Band of Choctaw, p.c., 2011) while the Utu Utu Gwaitu tribe in California had started their program a few months prior (Utu Utu Gwaitu Paiute Tribe of the Benton Paiute Reservation, p.c., 2011).

Nine programs were described as being in dormancy: established several years earlier but currently inactive due to a lack of personnel or funds. The calls which yielded the most information occurred when the operator had personal knowledge of a person related to language activities, although they were often unaware of any full-featured language programs or language policy and nearly inescapably relayed my calls to the school districts which in half of cases did not administer indigenous language classes. My interlocutors were actually sometimes puzzled upon hearing me mention "language program," assuming I was mistakenly calling them instead of the local community college looking for foreign language classes. Very few language programs stand alone, whether integrated in a school or another administrative unit. One of the language coordinators had an office in a prefabricated building next door to the main office, which did not have a phone line – it took four weeks for me to finally reach him, only to learn that there was no one currently enrolled in the classes.

Another frequent answer I received recommended that I call a neighboring tribe with a more developed language program – whom I heard many times had "much better," "more

interesting" programs. This happened especially when calling an isolated band of the better known tribal groups (such as the Choctaw and Cherokee). Besides the initial confusion, I received overwhelmingly positive response, compounded by some melancholic statements on the lack of funds or interest. Only two tribes refused to answer my questions outright: the Miccosukee of Florida and Manzanita tribe of California, who both have long-standing policies to disallow non-tribal members on their territory. Three tribes required that I submit an application to the tribal council before they could answer my questions – in all three cases I submitted the paperwork and none of the tribes responded. I submitted twenty-six questionnaires by email based on the contact information I found on websites or answering machines; thirteen of them were completed and returned, nine could not be delivered, and five were not returned.

At the end of each interview where a conversation happened between me and my interlocutor, I asked for my interlocutor's email address in order to follow-up with them and keep them posted on my progress – all of them had a personal email address hosted externally (Gmail, Yahoo), few had an organizational email address with their tribe's internet domain name – these are provided and administered by the Federal government, but many confessed to not being able to check it mostly for technical reasons (or lost passwords that they could not reset), preferring their personal accounts. At the end of each week, I sent an email to these addresses renewing my thanks to the interlocutors, and remaining at their disposal if they ever needed anything. At time of writing (Fall 2012), only one person has emailed me back.

Chapter 3.   Mapping Practices

In 1989, J.B. Harley, inspired by the theories of Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida, called geographers to "challenge the epistemological myth (created by cartographers) of the cumulative progress of an objective science always producing better delineations of reality" (Harley 1989, 15). Harley was an early adopter of ontological ideas about space, predating decades of exegesis and indeed the finalization of these theories. The premise of Harley's argument is thus rather simple: maps are part of a scientific, political, and overall ideological discourse that should not be understood as the end of all arguments. Far from being neutral, maps often limit geographical knowledge, because their creators designed them to suit their own purposes.

The limiting power of maps cannot be understated, because they provide a reference for the space in which our lives unfold. A map that only shows political divisions provides a skewed basis to understand natural phenomena and conversely maps that only display landscape cues are blinded to inherent human phenomena. This reckoning comes with the realization that maps need at least to be interpreted critically, if not produced in a more transparent manner.

In a similar fashion, anthropological linguists found that language could not be accepted neutrally, yet struggled until recently to find a unifying argument that would define the breadth of the discipline (Duranti 2011). Critically speaking, the same concern agitated both disciplines: how to properly account for both the naturally occurring – sedimented – practices and their verily embedded – partial – representations.

Communities considered as marginal and outlying, such as indigenous peoples, embody this distinction. They inhabit the same lands and exist on the same plane, yet they lead their existence with some distance from a social order that most are taking for granted, whether casually oblivious or radically opposed to the frame established by the hegemonic system. In so doing, they are effectively forcing researchers to focus on the ways in which they differ from the mainstream and at the same time maintain a functioning organization – in spite of what the dominant discourse might claim.

The geographical concept of site brought about by Marston, Woodward and Jones (2005) that I am advocating in this dissertation is a thought-provoking alternative to the limitations that conventional analyses of space and power propose. It is predicated upon human existence rather than political existence, which is a processed, by-product of human interactions. Sites are

geographical containers for human practices, generated when people are in contact with their environments. The geographical site is derived from a concept previously expressed by Theodore Schatzki and others (Schatzki 2002) looking at the meaning of practices for the entirety of social sciences and I have found that it could very well also apply to linguistics. The link between geography and language has certainly been explored previously, and I will firstly examine in what respect. I will then enrich these early attempts by using the concept of site and modern conceptualizations of linguistic disciplines and apply my findings to the study of indigenous peoples and their languages in the United States.

3.1. Mapping Linguistic Practices

Language geography, or geolinguistics, is not a new discipline or concept. In fact it appeared rather early in the literature though mostly focused on morpho-syntactic differences within a single language setting (Jaberg 1935, Terracher 1924). National governments have used linguistic surveys as early as the eighteenth century in order to identify language use within specific national boundaries. Language geographers have produced atlases of regional languages within a particular political area (Bourcelot 1900, Breton 1976, Bruk and Apenchenko 1964, Grobler, Prinsloo and Van der Merwe 1990) or cultural area (Baviskar, Herzog and Weinreich 1992, Wurm and Hattori 1981). Erik Gunnemark and Bernard Nezmah launched a similar enterprise in their *Geolinguistic Handbook* which consists in large part of a list of country names and language names ordered alphabetically; in a following chapter, they classify languages by their statistical relevance, alongside brief demographic data as well as a summary of their linguistic properties, including the type of script, and the number of varieties of each language (Gunnemark and Nezmah 1992).

Another early trend of geography associated with languages was the study of toponymy of strategic places, with notable examples such as Poland (United States Army Map Service, 1940s), Portugal (Great Britain War Office 1943), Italy (United States Army Map Service 1943a), or Normandy (United States Army Map Service 1943b). Apart from these two trends, geographers also undertook local linguistic studies of their own regions to unearth their cultural heritage (McJimsey 1940, McMullen 1953). These are geographical studies, in that they focus on space and include a component of language.

The discipline of anthropological linguistics (also known as linguistic anthropology) is a branch of anthropology attached to observing how people use language in their everyday lives to

interact with their environment, and how one's environment influences their languages. Some anthropological linguists have combined language in space following the prototypical work of Franz Boas, a geographer by training (Boas 1887) who drew the model for American Indian familial lineages nationwide as we know them today. Franz Boas' first recorded map of indigenous languages was the work of Albert Gallatin (a senator working with the Bureau of Indian Affairs at the time) in 1836, which he described as

> [P]ractically a map of the linguistic families as determined by the author […] only eleven of the twenty-eight families […] appear, and these represent the families with which he was best acquainted. As was to be expected from the early period at which the map was constructed, much of the western part of the United States was left uncolored. Altogether the map illustrates the state of knowledge of the time." (Boas 1910, 89)

This map served as the foundation of several authors that followed, adding their own data to the layout and format introduced by Gallatin. The latter updated his map in 1848 and 1853 to reflect the new additions to linguistic knowledge as well as the advent of his own research. These maps served to survey the extent of American Indian languages in the United States that were still being discovered at the time. Franz Boas' own maps were published in his *Handbook of American Indian Languages* (Boas 1911), refining his predecessors' work by focusing on the linguistic and cultural groups on their own based on the more definitive classification established by his co-author John Wesley Powell, starting a trend of "areal-typological" studies (Sherzer 1976).

These localized maps focused more especially on linguistically dense areas of the western seaboard, where dozens of languages of related families presented similar features: Boas himself worked on maps of the Northwestern and Alaskan tribes (*e.g.*, Boas 1894, 1902) while his students Edward Sapir and Alfred Kroeber focused on Oregon and California languages (*e.g.*, Kroeber 1907, 1911, Sapir 1922). These maps were sometimes improved over the years though always staying within language families, and critics well into the second half of the twentieth century were calling for truly areal studies (Emeneau 1956, Hymes 1964) that would recognize cross-linguistic interactions with their geographical neighbors and focus on the evolution of languages independently of their genetic relations (Sherzer 1976).

3.1.1. Borrowing from Linguists

Although undeniably useful for visualization, these studies did not necessarily rely on geographical knowledge for the study of linguistics. Pieter Muysken has argued in favor of dubbing these studies "areal linguistics" (Muysken 2008) as geographical methods are not so much used as geography is being matched up with the linguistic considerations of the authors. He and other authors further argued that the boundaries commonly recognized in maps (whether political, cultural or linguistic) tend to blur – if they do not actually hamper research – when languages come into contact and linguistic features are transferred from one to another by contact (Aĭkhenval′d and Dixon 2006, Muysken 2008). To counteract issues of scale, some have attempted to provide maps of structural (Haspelmath 2005) or phonological features (Horvath and Horvath 2002, E. Kolb 1979), while others pinpointed trends in language disappearance (Wurm and Baumann 1996).

Language and space formerly entertained a much more straightforward relationship: with less personal mobility and less social communication, languages did not spread as far and wide as they do now. A direct result of this modern development is the political regulation of languages, which has become increasingly influential on the topic of language and discourse. Colin Williams attempts to draw more clearly "the relationship between languages and their physical and human contexts." (Williams 1988) Colin Williams and Jean-Louis Breton (Breton 1991) have both written authoritative volumes on the efforts in regional language maintenance of European countries and emphasized the importance of linguistic policy and ideology in political efforts. More recently, the formation of the European Union has revived some of the debates on the status of minority languages which came under scrutiny within the super-governmental frame of the European Union (E.U.) and the independent nations that constitute it (Hogan-Brun and Wolff 2003, Mar-Molinero and Stevenson 2006). Though the governmental histories may differ, there are notable similarities in the struggle of minorities across the world to protect their cultures.

Decolonization has similarly focused attention on languages that used to be stifled by the imperialist powers and their dominant languages (Blunt and Wills 2000). Recent toponymic studies have concentrated on exposing colonial discourse in the discrepancies between the names given to indigenous places by colons versus the indigenous name or the outsider's versus the insider's name of places (Jacob and Dahl 2006, Kadmon 2000, Monmonier 2006, Murray 2000).

Less overtly political, Keith Basso produced a groundbreaking study of Apache place names in 1996, cross-referencing anthropological data and geographical references, all from the Apache point of view, in an attempt to interpret (in the museological sense) the Apache worldview for a larger audience (Basso 1996). Literary studies have also produced new maps as ethnographers started publishing oral histories of indigenous peoples reflecting a different understanding of space and territory (Evers and Toelken 2001), which does not correspond to the geographical reality commonly understood outside of indigenous communities.

In order to analyze these representations beyond the understanding of different worldviews, linguists have had to (in Cox's words *supra*) liberate themselves from an areal approach to focus on cultural practices (Sherzer 1976). Though the term was not yet present in scientific literature, I propose that the concept of site was forecasted by linguistic work seeking to understand social cooperation through language use.

3.1.2. Linguistic Spaces

Through the discipline of sociolinguistics, areal linguistics has been further dismantled. Instead of using political divisions as the geographical basis for language, some linguists have opted to study language on its own terms. Observing a turn in methodologies, Jiří Neustupný noted that modern linguistics should be able to account for "language as it is, with all its irregularities and complexities" (Neustupný 1978, 46). Following linguistic conventions, he and his colleagues from the Prague School explored the ideas of Nikolai Trubetzkoy, a Russian linguist who introduced new terms to the study of language: the *Sprechbund* and the *Sprachbund* (Romaine, Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics 1994). Members of a S*prechbund* are linked by their speech and conversational practices, while members of a *Sprachenbund* speak genetically-related languages without necessarily understanding one another. Neustupný also noted that those two differently-defined areas overlap but seldom coincide, creating wide differences in language development and the micro and macro-levels; he further refined the *Sprechbund* as *Kommunikationsbund* (Neustupný 1978, 108). Interestingly, the German term *Bund* can indicate either a geographical area or a societal bond, its very versatility exemplifying that of language.

In more humanistic terms, Dell Hymes spoke of a "speech community." With its focus on interactive language use, the speech community may not have been designed as a geographical unit, but it provides a much clearer vision of the functioning of language in space:

37

> A community sharing rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech, and rules for the interpretation of at least one linguistic variety. Both Conditions are necessary. […] In sum, one's speech community may be, effectively, a single locality or portion of it. (Hymes 1972c, 54-55)

While relying on grammar and orthography to map languages might present the advantage of having material realizations, Labov (1972) conspicuously avoided such a theory. In our daily conversations, we tend to use a set of norms that are negotiated in the discursive situation rather than a pre-existing set of rules we have acquired in our schooling. This conception is especially useful with indigenous languages, some of which do not have a written form of their language and some of which have not been studied by linguists.

For my own purposes, if only superficially, Labov's emergent view of language directly relates to Foucault's emergent view of power. For Foucault, biopolitical decision-making is founded upon the immediateness (or "ahistoricity") of sovereignty: in the moment, anyone may reach a position of power. Derrida explicated this idea in 2005: "it is the contract contracted with a history that retracts in the instantaneous event of the deciding exception, an event that is without any temporal or historical thickness" (Derrida 2005, 101). Similarly, each speech community sets its own rules for language in an emergent negotiation process, regardless of what would be otherwise considered linguistic conventions.

This process is especially evident in language manipulations such as Pig Latin or slang. The purpose of Pig Latin is to avoid being understood by the mainstream crowd, who may be confused by the wordplay, however simple. Similarly, slang terms are used to replace words that would be unsuitable for a specific context, whether referring to something illegal, inappropriate, or recognized only by the members of the in-group that use them. Walt Whitman has described slang as "an attempt of common humanity to escape from bald literalism, and express itself illimitably" (Whitman 1885, 431). In a smaller measure, the same phenomena can be observed in our everyday lives as we do not express ourselves in the same manner when dealing with a hierarchical superior as we are when talking to our old-time friends.

There is no community of Pig Latin speakers in the traditional sense of the word "community", any more than there is one "slang" that is spoken by everyone. But two or more people who understand Pig Latin or slang may be able to communicate outside of the comprehension of others. Each unconventional use of language will have its own rules, determined by how well acquainted its speakers are. As such, slang could be a very small

phenomenon – understood by only a handful of people in a specific community - or a quite large phenomenon – understood all over the world by people (even across languages) who share the same interests. As a result, some critical linguists have started to move away from using "Speech Communities" as a unit for socio-linguistics, because the term of "community" was too predicated in social organization. This is the same thought process that led geographers to distance themselves from the concept of "scale" and I argue that the speech community is to language as "site" is to geography.

3.1.3. The Linguistic Site

In the last decade, an increasing number of linguists have found that the mobility of speakers and fast mutability of languages had rendered the concept of a Speech Community difficult to apply. Peter Patrick, in a chapter devoted to the controversial history of the speech community, declared that

> the [Speech community] should not be taken for a unit of social analysis; and we ought not to assume [Speech Communities] exist as predefined entities waiting to be researched, or identify them with folk notions, but see them as objects constituted anew by the researcher's gaze and the questions we ask. (Patrick 2004, 593)

As an illustration, he summarized the different strains of meaning, pointing out that "[w]hether the top-down approach of Labov or the bottom-up one of Gumperz and LePage is selected as a starting-point, a comprehensive [Speech Community] model must allow intermediate structures: in the first case, nesting, and in the second, overlapping." (Patrick 2004, 592). Interestingly, his sentiment echoes very closely the troubles that Marston, Woodward and Jones met with geographical scales, down to the lexicon. As a matter of fact, Patrick sees the debate on speech communities as one of scale, which he points out requires some improving:

> Such scales are not unidimensional – networks, as asynchronous assemblages, involve interaction at several levels – but concentric mappings occur. In practice, applications of the [Speech Community] are scattered across higher levels, and cannot be restricted to one point. It has a lower bound (it has been used for a single longhouse of two nuclear families, Jackson 1974), but cannot be distinguished in principle from networks, which are themselves potentially unbounded upwards. [The Speech Community] is a multi-leveled concept cutting across the ecology of nested contexts. (Patrick 2004, 592)

3.1.4. The Nexus of Geography and Linguistics

The similarity of language and power in space becomes more conspicuous when I put the ideas side by side. Marston, Jones and Woodward's described the geographical site thusly:

> A given site is always an emergent property of its interacting human and non-human inhabitants. Seen as a manifold [...] that does not precede the interactive processes that assemble it, [...] we can talk about the existence of a given site only insofar as we can follow interactive practices through their localized connections. (Marston, Jones and Woodward 2005, 425)

while Alessandro's Duranti's definition of a language community is the following:

> Any notion of speech community [...] depend[s] on two sets of phenomena: (1) patterns of variation in a group of speakers also definable on grounds other than linguistic homogeneity [...] and (2) emergent and cooperatively achieved aspects of human behavior as strategies for establishing co-membership in the conduct of social life. The ability to explain (1) ultimately relies on our success in understanding (2)." (Duranti 1988, 217-8)

The similarity of these two definitions was too blatant to be coincidental, yet I have had confirmation from Drs. Woodward and Marston that they were not aware of Duranti's work. Their inquiry aimed for a more general view of human activity, as Schatzki explained:

> The social site is the site of human coexistence. [...] [H]uman coexistence, in turn, is the "hanging together" of human lives. With this expression, I mean how lives inter-relate in and through the dimensions that compose them individually. By "human life," furthermore, I mean the mental conditions that a person is in together with the actions he or she performs. [...] Lives hang together, then through practical intelligibility, mentality, activity, and settings. (Schatzki 2002, 147)

Schatzki does make a mention of language early on, as it is "central to the organization of social life" (Schatzki 2002, 14-15). More specifically, he makes a difference between regulated language (such as technical terms) and what he calls "natural language," whose "fuzziness" (Schatzki 2002, 15) escapes categorizing patterns. Social order organized around linguistic principles will thus inevitably carry the same fuzziness in its borders, contrary to what its name implies.

The concept of site does not convey strong boundaries or social implications. Spatially, Schatzki described the site ontologies as "a complex, open, and multiply integrated mesh" (Schatzki 2002, xxi), "an opening or pervasive medium of some sort, central to the nature or

constitution of the social" (Schatzki 2002, 140). It does not imply official sanction but rather its extent depends upon the needs of those who create it. Instead of looking for geographical markers in the landscape, I am thence looking for social practices which will expand and contract the boundaries of the site as they unfold in space: social sites do not so much exist as they are authored in space and time, generated through practice. Elsewhere, Schatzki has characterized some of these practices: "knowledge, meaning, human activity, science, power, language, social institutions, and historical transformation" (Schatzki 2001, 11).

Here, Schatzki rejoins an idea previously embryonically developed by Michel de Certeau when he used languages and analogy to construct his theory of practice:

> By adopting the point of view of enunciation […] we privilege the act of speaking; […] speaking operates within the field of a linguistic system; it effects an appropriation, or reappropriation, of language by its speakers; it establishes a present relative to a time and place; and it posits a contract with the other (the interlocutor) in a network of places and relations. These four characteristics of the speech act can be found in many other practices (walking, cooking,etc.). (De Certeau 1984, xiii)

Combining these ideas, I am positing that the practice of language (language use, speech acts) is a geographic practice, which opens up spaces for social life. Through language, speakers are authoring spaces, defining their extent and quality according to their needs. In these spaces, cultural identity unfolds as an interface where different people interact to make or break societies.

As an illustration, I shall now turn my attention to indigenous peoples with a brief history of the components of American Indian geography in the United States. I argue that under colonial rule, authorship of the indigenous site was the exclusive realm of the U.S. Federal government, and it has been slowly turned over to the tribes in recent years.

3.2. Indigenous Situation

Practices have become especially relevant to social studies as other indicators of identity have been increasingly muddled in modern times. In the case of U.S. indigenous peoples, the political domination was so complete that American Indians used to have no right to claim American Indian ancestry. Just as other Americans can claim any ancestry reasonably freely, one might assume that being "American Indian" is a question of ethnicity. Some may be aware of

some biological requirements due to popular representations of the blood quanta of Indians in Hollywood movies depicting the Far West (Churchill 1998).

However, blood quantum is not sufficient to claim American Indian status, which is dependent upon federal or state acknowledgement. The Code of Federal Regulations 25 *CFR* 83.7 outlines the requirements that tribal groups must meet in order to be federally recognized, including historical evidence of tribal existence since 1900 and mainstream identification of the group as "Indian." In other words, tribes must have a documented history having behaved and existed as tribes before they can be officially recognized as such. Remarkably, this documented history has to be provided by the tribes, but remains subject to legal and scientific scrutiny in the recognition process. In spite of its ratification as a permanent rule of the highest authorities in the Nation, the process is lengthy, unclear and its outcome scarcely in favor of the tribes because of conflicts of interests with local authorities who are very protective of their space and jurisdiction (Quinn 1992). Additionally, states may decide to recognize tribes according to their own guidelines, providing some but not all of the benefits or protection that are allowed by the Federal administration – this situation typically arises when a tribes does not have enough documentation of its history to fulfill the Federal mandate, yet the states wish to recognize their regional importance (Koenig and Stein 2007).

Until the definition entered the Code of Federal Regulation in the 1970s there was no legal definition for American Indian-ness; additionally, until the *Indian Citizenship Act* of 1924, tribal members were not considered citizens of the United States unless they gave up their tribal affiliation (Peterson 1957) or sold their land (197 U.S. 488 , 497-503, 25 S.Ct. 506, 507-510). These legal provisions came after centuries of policies forcibly integrating American Indians into the mainstream U.S. population. During that interval, hundreds of tribes lost their aboriginal title, while new societies formed within the colonial format with newly merged tribes and tribal children were adopted into non-Indian families. By the end of the twentieth century, geographical, cultural and biological indicators had become so blurred that legislation inspired by pre-colonial considerations had become an impediment for tribal recognition rather than a guideline.

3.2.1. Finding the "American Indian"

As Indian ancestry no longer guaranteed "Indian-ness" by law, nor did exterior signs correspond with Indian tribes such as language, religion, or even living on a reservation. It is

difficult to make generalizations on the relationship of American Indians with their land without falling into stereotypes. If their sense of property is different from that of settlers, that does not make them aliens to the notion of territory; but legally American Indians were never considered to have real territory in the United States. In *Johnson v. McIntosh* (1823), one of three landmark Supreme Court opinions known as the Marshall trilogy, John Marshall emphasized that international law and the discovery doctrine dictated that the settlers had acquired the American territory, indigenous peoples notwithstanding.

Settlers interpreted *Johnson v. McIntosh* as the assertion that tribes had no rights to claim their own lands – a view rectified by *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* (1831) where the same Supreme Court asserted that tribes retain their right to self-government within the boundaries dictated to them. This power of self-government is also granted to them by the Federal government, and liable to be removed at any time due to the recognition process described *supra*. This ruling marks the beginning of the institutionalized colonization of American Indians; until that time, there was no dedicated administrative branch such as the Bureau of Indian Affairs and colonization was focused on the American land, led by the U.S. Army. From the early nineteenth century onwards, the United States would enforce of a policy of colonization of the indigenous people.

Following the annexation of Texas and the *Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo*, there was a much larger territory to the United States, including many more indigenous peoples than the U.S. government was willing to handle. The *Indian Appropriation Act* of 1851 legally established the first reservations in the area now constituting the state of Oklahoma, both to limit the amount of land that tribes could own and to put a clear boundary between the jurisdiction of tribes and that of the states. In 1871, another Appropriation act extended the practice nationwide and Indians were defined as "wards" of the U.S. government – no longer as tribes with sovereignty (25 *U.S.C.* 71). Symbolically, the same act ended the practice of making treaties with tribes in order to negotiate the terms of their existence in the United States, annulling another formal recognition of the tribe's political power.

After colonial times and the establishment of a Constitution in the United States, tribes became recognized as governmental entities whose extent (including land ownership and tribal membership) and therefore acknowledgement was negotiated in treaties determined on a tribe by tribe basis (Quinn 1992 numbered 372 of them) and renewed periodically. The fairness of these

treaties is questionable (see for example Pierre 1971), but at least formally it recognized tribal input. Under the Marshall Trilogy, tribes have had a right of occupancy of the land, granted by the United States. To honor this geographic anomaly of amicable occupation (and in order to control Indian livelihoods), the reservation system provided settlers with a material representation of indigenous space in the landscape. Yet reservations are in fact no more the property of American Indians than their confiscated ancestral lands: the territory still belongs to the United States, and only the Federal government has the final decision in the matter.

On the reservations, the Bureau of Indian Affairs administered educational programs aiming to reduce the influence of indigenous cultures (Hoxie 1984a) and with support from the Army reorganized the very geographical arrangement of the tribes (Harmon 1941). Families were physically separated from their neighbors by non-Indian businesses and homesteads that received incentives to settle on tribal land (through a process called allotment in the Dawes Act 24 *Stat.* 388), leading tribes to break up and struggle for their identities (Deloria 1985). The federal policy to forcibly integrate indigenous peoples culminated in 1953 with the plain and simple termination of the Indian title of dozens of tribes (H.C.R. 108) and the end of Indian jurisdiction on their own land for dozens more (P.L. 280). Following the so-called Termination Acts, the Indian Title of selected tribes (who had typically found economic self-sufficiency in the reservation system) was extinguished, effectively ending the direct relationship with the Federal government.

As a result, hundreds of tribes, thousands of individuals who were born and raised American Indians cannot legally claim their heritage. Oklahoma presents an exceptional case in this respect, where reservations were re-categorized as "Oklahoma Tribal Statistical Areas" (OTSA) following a criminal case involving the contestation of state authority on tribal lands several years after the end of allotment and termination years (*Murphy v. State*, 47 P.3d 876, 879 Okla. Crim. App. 2002). On the OTSAs, tribal government rules apply within the limits allowed by the state, insofar as tribes are acting upon their sovereignty in the same way other organized communities do, but the lands do not belong to the tribes.

There are numerous extraordinary cases such as that of Oklahoma, including tribes rehabilitated after termination who were not able to retrieve their lands and other tribes expropriated by eminent domain (a 1903 decision in the Supreme Court case *Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock* held that Congress could unilaterally void any treaty provision, especially regarding

tribal land holdings), so it is difficult to equate tribal appurtenance with a territory such as the reservation. Generally speaking, Indian tribes receive official recognition by the U.S. Federal Government in a "recognized Indian title," which is different from the aboriginal title regarding land and formerly established by common law (a distinction judicially established for all tribes in the Supreme Court decision *Sioux Tribe v. U.S.* (1974) where the recognized Indian title of the Sioux tribe was deemed insufficient to guarantee ownership of the lands that used to belong to the tribe by aboriginal title).

Considering these provisions, it is no overstatement to say that American Indian existence in the physical world has been entirely co-opted by the U.S. government. When one looks for an American Indian site, they should not expect to see a clear boundary marker; per their aboriginality, American Indians are Americans and residents of the United States and since the Indian Citizenship Act of 1924 they are also citizens of the country. Due to colonization efforts, the conspicuous markers of indigenous difference have been further blurred and in the next section I will analyze how deeply colonization is rooted in the geography of indigenous peoples of North America.

3.2.2. Colonized Geography

According to the views expressed in the Marshall Trilogy, still pervasive today in Indian policy, indigenous peoples have no definable permanent space in the United States landscape. Following this logic, the tribes must receive federal recognition as Indian tribes before they can claim a territory; conversely, both the land title and the title of Indian recognition can be cancelled by the U.S. government. There used to be a defined Indian Territory in the United States, legally established in the *Indian Intercourse Act* of 1834: "[…] all that part of the United States west of the Mississippi and not within the states of Missouri and Louisiana, or the territory of Arkansas" (4 *Stat*. 729, 730). This tract of land continually shrunk as colonizers progressed westward, but to this day indigenous media have symbolically retained the name of "Indian Country" as a referent for indigenous presence in the United States, even though it corresponds to geographical pockets scattered around the U.S. landscape. Legally, indigenous peoples are nonetheless entirely dependent on federal policies for their geographical locations. Those who have lost their titles in the past, either scattered around cities or living as tribes without federal recognition, do not receive any protection from the United States – even though they may be considered American Indians by their cultural practices or heritage.

Two hundred years of Indian policy have sought relentlessly to disperse American Indians into the general U.S. population, both physically and mentally. Expropriating them of the land was the first step in a process that Theodore Roosevelt has described as "[a] mighty pulverizing engine to break up the tribal mass" (Roosevelt 1901). Not only did governmental manipulations separate tribal entities, Richie Howitt further narrowed them down to affecting tribal members at their very core: "[a]t the scale of the body, indigenous peoples were disciplined to conform or be punished" (Howitt 2003, 148). Of course, no country can be mapped at this scale, and Howitt is pointing out the paradox of scale being used literally. To counteract maps attempting to take over indigenous bodies, indigenous geographers have attempted to provide their own maps of the world, reflecting both their rejection of colonization and the fuzzy geographical aspect of this colonization pointed out by Churchill (*supra*). A decolonization of the geography of the United States includes not only rehabilitating indigenous spaces in the landscape and also ensuring that the changes are not only cosmetic (on representational maps) but also a concrete reflection of modern indigenous livelihood in the present.

The direct consequence of this essentially disconnecting history of Indian Affairs is a tendency to separate everything indigenous from the mainstream. Of course, the physical isolation of the tribes is one example, but the academic disciplines dedicated to studying them have also become entirely separate from their mainstream practices (Pommersheim 1995). Steve Silvern even argued that indigenous peoples had become so estranged from the rest of the United States that they effectively constituted a "third geographical scale" (Silvern 1999, 2), especially designed "to facilitate the power of the dominant society to control, exclude, and marginalize native populations" (Silvern 1999, 27). This notion is closely related to Edward Soja's "thirdspace" where he contended (following Foucault 1986) that marginalized people were able to express their difference away from the public and private sphere (Soja 1996).

These conceptions however imply either a will to separate or at least an acceptance of marginalization that is questionable, especially as far as American Indians are concerned: in spite of the colonization history, the latter have seldom (radicals notwithstanding) reneged on their belonging in America, or even in the United States. I believe that such methods only serve to widen the gap between indigenous peoples and the general population amongst whom they live and advocate a more constructive view.

I have mentioned *supra* that Foucault differentiated politics from "biopolitics" and power from "biopower." Many post-structuralist philosophers following Foucault have observed that governments are attempting to affect people at the most base, internal levels to ensure that they remain subject to the hegemony, and deprived from access to political power (Agamben 1998, Moses 2008). This is the very principle echoed by Howitt whereby contemporary governments attempt to take control of the very biological lives of their populations. For instance, the fact that the Federal Government of the United States has the authority to bestow or withhold Indian identity upon the indigenous peoples of the United States is certainly part of this mechanism. The entire vocabulary of Indian affairs which is inherited from the colonial era further shows little regard for indigenous entities, from the outdated and inaccurate word "Indian" to their oxymoronic status as "domestic dependent nation" (per *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*). Geographical methods tapping into that terminology are bound to reproduce the same unilateral thinking that has been used to negate the existence of American Indians in the past.

The term of "colonization" itself is inspired from the biological world; it refers primarily to the process of a species entirely taking over an area to the point of fostering an environment stable enough for its survival. Installing European townships and villages in North America was the first step to colonizing the area, followed by the cultural colonization of the local population. The Manifest Destiny doctrine, boarding schools, and allotment policies are all examples of biopower, attempts from the hegemonic federal power to control everything (living or not) that has not yet been colonized on the reservations. To this day, the lobbying attempts to establish English as the official language of the United States are seeking to infiltrate every cultural space in the United States, even tribal areas that are legally exempt from state legislation but whose residents must still obey state legislation if they intend to interact with the world outside of the reservation.

As biopower is slowly turning all communities into discrete occurrences of a working archetype, the minorities become more and more ostracized as they attempt to retain their singularities. In the Snyder Act of 1921 (42 *Stat.* 208), Congress put the "conservation of health of Indians" in the hands of the Federal government; a measure undeniably meant to curb the dismal demographic situation of Indians which as a side-effect makes their life dependent upon Federal funding. From the provisions of the Snyder Act, the Indian Health Service (IHS) was instituted in order to cater more specifically and efficiently to health issues in Indian country, in

part because reservations were situated nowhere near hospitals, and in part because Indian health was starting to become a specific area of expertise for doctors. As a direct consequence from colonization, tribal members ought to receive health care in establishments separate from the general population, which contradicts the aim of colonizing policies yet humanely responds to a dire health crisis.

Facilities provided by the Indian Health Service are contributing to the American Indian site in the United States as they are a federal agency exclusively dedicated to indigenous peoples. They also exemplify the complexity of the site, as the IHS has non-indigenous employees who are working on the reservations while some tribal members prefer to receive health care outside of the IHS facilities. These cultural and economic intersections epitomize the essence of how the concept of site differs from that of scale.

Through an ontological study of space and language social scientists are able to gain a better understanding of the commonalities that undergird these concepts, all the while reaching a better appreciation of difference in their make-up. These changes have set the scene for a study of "others" no longer as exotic oddities (belonging to another world as it were) but as peers who are coping with the world by their own methods. This is especially significant for the study of colonized spaces, where aboriginal populations may live side by side with an occupant, each cultivating their own way of life and traditions. I aver that practices of indigenous self-sovereignty are only threatening to a colonial system seeking to eradicate them: in a republic, and a democracy, they present no danger to society at large.

3.2.3. Indigenous Resistance and Resilience

Invariably, the geographical studies mentioned above have pointed out that each and every policy decision is significant in indigenous affairs since any given opinion is liable to be used as a precedent for another tribe. Other authors have also emphasized that legal matters bear especially on the tribal morale, because of the history of colonial relationships: Richard Howitt's 2003 article mentioned *supra* focuses especially on the ways in which indigenous issues are especially important in the way space should be understood by researchers. Citing examples in Canada (Notzke 1995) and Oceania (McHugh 1996), he concludes that recent political disputes have provided sufficient evidence that the focus on scale has obnubilated politicians' and researchers' perceptions while indigenous peoples were "creating new geographies – new landscapes of power and recognition and opportunity" (Howitt 2003, 150).

In the U.S., Nathan Goetting has traced this sentiment to the Marshall Trilogy, which he argues contains "the very essence of political domination and hegemony" (Goetting 2010). The argument here is that even before issues of geography became contentious in academic literature, the very process of abusing federal power over indigenous space already existed, and was already causing damage in Indian country. Not only do adverse decisions affect morale, they induce changes in the very fabric of indigenous communities who realize they cannot rely on help from their disempowered tribal governments any more than they can expect assistance from uninterested U.S. authorities. This is why the greatest challenge many tribes face is the apathy of their own populations faced with the sluggishness of administrations.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the American Indian population amounted to just over two hundred thousand individuals (Census 1900) from a conservative estimation of 7 million in the fifteenth century (Thornton 1987). Edward Curtis, whose photographs are possibly the most influential in shaping our vision of the American West at the turn of the century, spent several years documenting what he called the "Vanishing race" (Gidley 1998), a term which has remained in popular culture (it became the title of a 1912 movie, a 1913 book, as well as a 1964 Johnny Cash song and a 1993 album by Australian soft-rock band Air Supply). Yet indigenous peoples have not vanished; in spite of the human and cultural losses, American Indian identity has survived years of adverse policies, arguably thanks to their strategic exercise of power. The most vibrant indigenous communities to this day are the ones who emancipated themselves from the U.S. hegemony, such as the Navajo who founded a tribal police as early as the nineteenth century in order to fend off raiders and refused the 1934 *Indian Reorganization Act,* whose provisions were generally beneficial to other tribes but were incompatible with the Navajo's economic livelihood. Similarly, the liveliest languages are those that have been actively protected and defended through the years (Sherzer 1976).

Although they may be regarded as acts of dissidence by some, these efforts were in fact expressions of the tribes' power as communities, as political entities within their rights towards the Federal government. My interlocutor for the Keweenaw Bay of Michigan expressed his belief that language rights came as "part of [their] self-sovereignty." American Indians are an especially remarkable minority insofar as they benefit from a certain amount of authority that is given to them by the U.S. Federal government, which is often reinforced by indigenous belief in

their own strength as a community. A critical geopolitics of the United States therefore needs to consider power outside of the federal / state / local triune.

In the twentieth century, the rhetoric has changed to allow the native communities (not only in the United States but worldwide) to decide on their own politics and possibly repair the damage done by previous eras of government. Numerous authors have engaged in studying the negotiations between indigenous tribes and their former colonial powers, especially regarding natural resources (Agius *et al.* 2001, B. Cohen 1994, Dodson 1994, Feit 1985, Grand Council of the Crees 1995, Howitt 1991, 1993, 1998, 2001, Howitt, Connell and Hirsch 1996, Jhappan 1992, Notzke 1995, Puddicombe 1991, Silvern 1999, Tatz 1999), as every tribal group presents a slightly different political situation, with specific issues. Because of the obvious financial interests at stake and the growing long-term concern over natural resources, these cases are the most visible traces of the claims to self-determination expressed by indigenous peoples around the world.

Little mention is made however of similar political action regarding cultural resources in any of the scientific literature. Some authors have nevertheless pointed out that policies affecting tribes if only tangentially could have a profound impact. Douglas Herman (1995, 1999) for example, has documented in his thesis and dissertation how Hawaiian identity has shifted as a result of politics affecting their material and linguistic environments. A few similar studies were also made in Alaska (Behnke 2002, Champagne-Aishihik Indian Band 1988, Highleyman 1994). The relative isolation of these communities exposes more sharply the impact of internal and external influences on their populations. Similarly the situations of Canadian indigenous populations (Blomley, Shut the Province Down: First Nation Blockades in British Columbia, 1984-1995 1996, Bone 1992, Brealy 1995, Brody 1988, Burley and Horsfall 1989, Clayton 1996, Galois 1994, Muller-Wille 1987, Newton 1995) and Australian aborigines (Agius, et al. 2001, Dodson 1994, Howitt 1991, 1993, 1998, Jonas 2000) have also been subject to many academic inquiries, because of their situations in multicultural systems that recognized indigeneity early on.

In this study, I am focusing more particularly on the power of U.S. indigenous peoples regarding their languages. Language practice is a direct expression of culture and it is very difficult to contain by political means; for the same reason, there is a lot of leeway to enact language policies within the tribes without encroaching on federal or state jurisdiction. These

examples of tribal self-determination are constantly redefining the extent of the site of indigenous existence in the United States as spaces that used to be considered vacant or left undefined, and which are starting to bear the symbols of indigeneity. Sites are bringing the indigenous worldview into our analysis of spaces in order to provide a "sense of embedding immersion" (Schatzki 2002, 138) conspicuously recognizing that the official version of geography is only one part of the story. Sites are steeped in the practices they represent, albeit with awareness of the world in which they unfold. As a theoretical construct, sites are not just a tool, they are a manifestation of human behavior and as such we can experientially perceive their effects. I shall now turn my attention to the ways in which language policies can be used to assert community presence and thus political power.

3.3. Mapping Language Practice

Based on the premise that power is immanent in mankind, the concept of site was brought about to delineate the practices of power in the landscape. By the same token, language in itself is immanent and therefore cannot be mapped, but practices of language can be captured with the same concept of site, which is already present in the notion of speech community. Language policy is a language practice just as policymaking is a practice of power. Moreover, language policy is a sign of language activity: the community that enacts it acknowledges that language is a significant issue (Ricento 2006).

As a result, individuals and groups who engage in a language policy effort are contributing to the same site of language practice, within which the same rules apply and are agreed upon. Conversely, those who do not subscribe to that same policy do not participate in the latter site. By its very nature, policy fosters the sense of belonging to the community as it provides its participants with a common rule of behavior. Those who follow the rules are undeniably community members while those who do not follow the rules alienate themselves and become ostracized by the community as a result. For instance, the etymology for the English word "barbarous," from the Greek βάρβαρος, refers onomatopoeically to the incomprehensible sound of non-Greek languages, and came to signify "uncivilized" and "foreign." To this day, "speaking the same language" means having a special understanding and a closer relationship than would otherwise exist without a common idiom.

As the geographic site becomes a place for shared values and practices, I therefore understand policymaking to be an integral part of place-making; or more specifically for the

purpose of this dissertation, I shall consider language policy as an instrument of power which dedicates the space for language practice. Language policy marks a choice, a decision-making process; it is the result of the concerted effort to push language beyond the stage of a communicative conduit, and establish it as a cultural item (Mufwene 2001) whether under the impetus of community members or political lobbies. If it were a simple medium between people, language would be mapped as a straight line from person A to person B. As a cultural item, language draws on a historical baggage as well as an ahistorical creative process that is valid whether there are two or two billion speakers. If a language exists, it will create a linguistic space which will be regulated, explicitly or implicitly, by the speech communities (groups which share a language practice). The limits of that speech community can only be tested through communication, they cannot be identified from without due to the dynamic nature of language

Linguistic literature commonly represents languages in the same way other living organisms are represented. The realm of linguistics includes family trees, mother tongues, orphan languages, as well as entire ecologies, contexts in which languages live and die, or as Einar Haugen originally explained the term: "the true environment of a language is the society that uses it as one of its codes" (Haugen 1972), however big or small. While the metaphor (unless it is an allegory) is certainly vivid and valuable in order to convey the more humanistic aspects of language, it is also misleading when it comes to studying language spatially. Language does not leave spatial traces of itself such as buildings or bones. It does appear in the landscape under the guise of place-names assigned by (past or present) local populations, however these place-names are more often than not subject to the political *zeitgeist* and they require their own archaeology in order to be fully understood.[1]

The main historical evidence for languages appears in their phonological systems and use cultural similarities to infer missing links in the data (Campbell and Mithun 1979); applying a comparative method, some historical linguistics have been able to extract vestigial data from phonological clues (Poser and Campbell 1992) but detractors regard their results as conjecture and established their own typology of American Indian languages following bio-genetic

[1] The naming of places is another linguistic activity that is a corollary of language policy. Critical analyses of toponymy have found their way into the geographic literature, especially in the immediate aftermath of political conflicts where the renaming can be observed as it happens. See the examples of Kenya (Nabea 2009), Israel (Cohen and Kliot 1992) and for a more general discussion based on the case of Iraq (Rose-Redwood, Alderman and Azaryahu 2010). For the discipline of linguistics, Landry and Bourhis have provided an analysis of the effect of place-names on the public psyche based on the cases of Belgium and especially Québec by introducing the notion of "linguistic landscape" (Landry and Bourhis 1997) which has since been enriched in (Shohamy and Gorter 2009).

evidence (Greenberg 1987). As it happens in the United States, some indigenous languages do not have an established orthography to this day and many do not have a dictionary or a grammar – the Ely Shoshone of Nevada have started codifying their language in 2001, and are currently finalizing their first dictionary (Ely Shoshone, p.c., 2011). While speakers may provide some linguistic data, they may be unaware of (or unwilling to share) dialectal differences or linguistic ideology. Studying language through language planning allows us to gather some essential linguistic data as well as some metadata (language-as-data about the language-as-data).

Such data cannot be geographically mapped using conventional methods. There is no ownership of words, and certainly no possibility to account for all lexical meanings and grammatical rules. Moreover, the clues for communication, the expression of personal and emotional meaning, attitudes, or poetry all extend language further than the personal communication and permeate space beyond tribal boundaries and community belonging. Language policy provides outsiders with clues to the affective values of language, as policy is enacted in order to protect a language or at least ensure that it is used in certain contexts. However un-sentimental it may be, language policy is only enacted when people feel strongly about the role of language in society.

Lastly, approaching language through policy in particular avoids prying into the lives of our consultants. I assume that there are several reasons why the linguistic situation of U.S. Native populations has undergone very little study in political geography. The number of languages is rather daunting, few of them are actually related, to the point that tribes in neighboring states may speak mutually unintelligible languages, and many have their own orthographic systems, when they even have one. The notable exception to this rule are the larger discrete communities such as the Navajo of Arizona, New Mexico and Utah as well as Alaskan Natives, whose numbers and relative geographical isolation allowed for greater cultural protection as well as higher visibility on the political maps where their geographical extent allows them to stand out . Due to the very personal nature of language, and the intrusive history of teachers in Indian Country since the colonial era, outsiders may not always be welcome to look as deeply as they would like into the last rampart of indigenous culture in the United States. Linguistic policy provides clues into the language that are part and parcel of an ideology that is meant to be shared with the world, contrary to purely functional linguistic data that are often considered a private matter.

3.3.1. Spaces of Linguistic Engagement

Tracing the various histories of linguistics as a discipline, Alessandro Duranti pointed out that for all their differences, all linguists seemed to follow a tacit agreement about the ontology of language as a medium, which can serve a variety of purposes:

> [F]rom a coding system (e.g. for classifying the surrounding world as well as the experience that people have of such a world) to a form of social organization (e.g. a way of doing things that defines the activity as well as the roles and relations of the participants), and, finally, to an instrument of differentiation, capable of reproducing inequality and discrimination. (Duranti 2011, 48)

Combining this idea with that of the speech community as a container of linguistic practices (*supra*), I can formulate a vision of language use as a binding component in society and thus in the creation of social space. When space is dynamically created around the practice of language, each utterance provides an opportunity to extend the space to a new listener, and maintaining that dialogue (whether in person or remotely) also maintains the existence of the space. To wit, the ability to communicate is present throughout society, and it is not sufficient to foster an environment in itself: English speakers around the world clearly can speak the same language and understand one another, but they do not interact on a daily basis and few would consider themselves part of a community. Following Kevin Cox's lead for power (Cox 1998a), I therefore need to analytically separate areas where people are able to speak the same language without necessarily communicating as "spaces of dependence" and the sites in which people (in their constant interactions) are generating a speech community that is markedly distinct as a "space of engagement." I should note that in this frame of thought, linguistic engagement is also liable to happen across languages if only in the creation of a communication space.

Pre-modern exercises in linguistic geography surveyed word usage in order to map dialectal differences, or local varieties (De Certeau, Julia and Revel 1975). Governments would mandate these surveys and thus they would present the ideological biases of the time as they sought to illustrate the reach of the national languages over dialectal zones rather than to present a faithful account of linguistic diversity. Their maps did show very fragmented space representing several cultural areas in a time when national boundaries were not entirely set in stone. Later surveys by linguists also represent a new set of linguistic boundaries which could span whole continents - in the case of language families from Indo-European origins – to small mountainous regions where language isolates are thriving as is the case for Basque. This

dissertation is focusing more pointedly on the social underpinnings of these areas, which have experienced dramatic changes in the last few decades.

The advent of Information Technology has fostered new environments for communication beyond political borders. Whether for trivial purposes or explicitly to fulfill political goals, international communities can be born overnight online, provided that they find a cause around which to assemble. These online communities share a commonality with earlier social movements in their alternative existence, outside of the mainstream, hegemonic power structure. Researchers in feminist studies (Benjamin 1986, Bondi 1993, Massey, Spatial Divisions of Labor 1984), communication studies (Adams 1992, Hartley 1992, McLuhan 1962), and information sciences (Boyer 1996, Gelernter 1991, Rheingold 1994) have had to question and transcend established geographical borders for that very reason (M. Featherstone 1990, Lash and Friedman 1992) even before it became common practice in other disciplines. Robert Foster further pointed out that local particularities are only obscured by an excessive focus on so-called global phenomena:

> The question of comparative modernities, however, is ultimately a question of scale, the scale on which to do ethnography. It is a question of how to avoid dissolving local particularities in the uniform sameness of global conditions without treating the radical distinctiveness of the local as if it stood against or apart from the global (as opposed to, say, being an effect of it). (Foster 2002, 247)

In the search for a meaningful research unit, Dell Hymes expressed his opinion clearly: "The natural unit for sociolinguistic taxonomy […] is not the language but the speech community" (Hymes 1974, 43). This concept was phrased by several schools of thought over the years, and is present in sociolinguistics in what Penelope Eckert & Sally McConnell-Ginet (following Lave and Wenger) have referred to as a "community of practice" (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1999, 185, Lave and Wenger 1991). In the postcolonial world, we can definitely observe how people speaking different languages may create new idioms (called pidgins and creoles), mixing various linguistic influences for the express purpose of communicating. These are clearly speech communities as they unite peoples of varying ethnicities and historical allegiances into one community whose only common point is language. Further, they are spaces of linguistic engagement, allowing diverse groups of people to live together and collaborate. Born out of necessity, pidgins may last as long as need dictates, and as creoles even outlast the colonial power as exemplified in Haiti, Jamaica or Nigeria. The bond

created by this engagement is therefore much stronger than the physical proximity or the arbitrary colonial politics.

Among the many definitions given to the speech community, William Labov's is probably the most notable as it relates directly to my analysis:

> The speech community is not defined by any marked agreement in the use of language elements, so much as by participation in a set of shared norms. These norms may be observed in overt types of evaluative behavior, and by the uniformity of abstract patterns of variation which are invariant in respect to particular levels of usage. (Labov 1972, 120-121)

In other words, there are no pre-conditions to building a speech community. Its members may or may not have the same mother tongue, as long as they reach a functional communication medium. Labov markedly dismisses a pre-established set of rules governing language use in speech communities because the authority of language is somewhat dissipated among the community members.

One such rule can be as simple as politeness: the French will for example call a disagreeable comment *déplacé* ("out of place"), illustrating how going against etiquette can be alienating to a community member. People engaging in a common process create the space for language to happen without the need for outside monitoring: within a given circle, the rules of linguistic (and social) behavior are already understood. In wider terms, schooling teaches children the basic rules of grammar, but we learn from experience how to use language based on these teachings in order to fit in (Forman, Minick and Stone 1993, D. A. Kolb 1984). David Lightfoot has further emphasized the role of language learning in the evolution of language: children making mistakes, parents correcting these mistakes and enriching everyone's language capability in the process (Lightfoot 2006).

In the communicative moment (or event-relation, or site), all speakers assess what would otherwise be considered errors, and failure to do so will be rectified by one's community (parent, or interlocutor) if need be. We harken back to the notion of emergence in power and language expressed *supra*, with a diffuse source of authority checking and balancing the participants in a conversation to ensure that communication takes place. Those who break the rules are also breaking away from the established event-relation, using their power to create a new event-relation following a new set of rules.

Linguistic engagement therefore relies on the complexity and emergence of language production in order to create sites which will in turn gain demographic and geographic significance by the very fact that something meaningful is happening, pulling them out of the ordinary. Once they reach critical mass, a community of speakers will often need to codify their language use in order to assuage the place of language in their ideological apparatus. This is done by the establishment of language policies, a set of laws governing language use and designed to ensure that the site is maintained through time.

3.3.2. A Language Policy History of the United States

The United States was founded as a nation of liberty: freedom of expression, of worship, of the press, all were inscribed in the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution in 1789. Though the thirteen original colonies spoke various languages (most prominently French, Spanish and Dutch in addition to English), the Founding Fathers did not find it necessary to impose the use of any one of them, predicting that the most convenient language would impose itself over time (as well as avoiding further rival sentiments between the colonies). Similarly, the treaties used to negotiate peace with American Indian tribes during the colonial period included not only their physical protection but also their cultural protection (Deloria 1974). There was no governmentally mandated mission to teach the English language to indigenous peoples in the formative years, corresponding to a lack of interest in colonizing them.

Leaving language policy out of the U.S. Constitution was both a prudent and a bold move by early legislators: while they admitted that they were not in a position to legislate on the issue, they left it up to the people of the United States to decide what language they – and their children – would speak. Additionally, they recognized that restricting any language use might be construed as a restriction of religious freedom, since language is necessary for the practice of religion (Heath 1977). And indeed, the majority of the colonial languages were nearly extinguished, without the need for legislation. However, some geographical pockets (such as French-speaking communities in Louisiana) attempted to retain the language of their ancestors. Later immigrant populations also added their own languages to the U.S. linguistic situation, and sometimes created their own urban communities in order to better maintain their Native languages, as evidenced in Chinatowns and Little Italies across the United States. The 2007 American Community Survey showed that over fifty-five million Americans (approximately twenty percent) speak a language other than English in their household on a daily basis (U.S.

Census Bureau 2010), and over seventy-five percent of them also speak English "well or very well" (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). Comparatively, immigrants to the U.S. are switching to monolingualism faster than in other countries (Dalto, Johnston and Lieberson 1975) a statement which still applies to the newer generations overtly targeted by Official English policies (McKay and Wong 2000).

Neither the Founding Fathers' intent nor observable data have tempered language policy efforts though: Louisiana passed the oldest language policy in the nation because the state had retained a large French-speaking population from the colonial era, kept alive by commerce with France and French possessions. The state adopted its language policy in 1811 as part of the *Louisiana Enabling Act*: when Louisiana became a state of the Union, the government was required to publish its materials.

> [...] [T]he laws which such state may pass shall be promulgated and its records of every description shall be preserved, and its judicial and legislative written proceedings conducted in the language in which the laws and the judicial and legislative written proceedings of the United States are now published and conducted (2 *Stat*. 641)

The matter was a practical rather than a linguistic imperative, as the law only required manuscripts from State government representatives to be written in a language the federal entities would understand. In addition, the governor (first appointed by President Madison to the Territory of New Orleans) elected by popular vote only spoke English. While the law does not explicitly preclude the use of other languages in the state, he felt vested with the power to require that all matters of government be conducted in English. His followers alternately spoke French and English so the bilingual status quo remained until the Civil War, when French language rights were abolished by the English-speaking Union victors in order to accelerate the integration of the state with the rest of the country (Kloss 1998).

However, most examples of language legislation are more recent and much more restrictive. They are the result of several decades of nationwide lobbying efforts built up mostly by the latest immigrating peoples from South and Central America. Idaho's 2007 legislation states for instance:

> English is hereby declared to be the official language of the state of Idaho [...] any document, certificate or instrument required to be filed, recorded or endorsed by any officer of this state, or of any county, city or district in this state, shall be in the English language

or shall be accompanied by a certified translation in English and all transactions, proceedings, meetings or publications issued, conducted or regulated by, or on behalf of, or representing the state of Idaho, or any county, city or other political subdivision in this state shall be in the English language. (Idaho Senate Bill 1172)

The bill does include a number of exceptions for cases of health and safety, but clearly enforces English in every realm of state participation. The State of Kansas, which also passed an official English law in 2007, had to include a paragraph specifically targeted towards its American Indian population:

This act may not be construed in any way to limit the use of any other language by a tribal government of Native Americans located in the state of Kansas. A school district and a tribe, by mutual agreement, may provide for the instruction of students that recognizes the cultural identity of Native American children and promotes the use of a common language for communication. (Kansas Statute 73-2801)

This caveat relies on the possibility of a "mutual agreement" that is obviously lopsided: there are four federally recognized tribes in Kansas representing around 1 percent of the total population (Census 2010). Indigenous speaking families cannot achieve a critical mass in any school district in order to effectively make demands and it is doubtful that any school district would economically justify any expense for less than 1 percent of its population (in an ideal case where all children would be at least bilingual). While the indigenous tribes of Kansas are able to teach their own languages in reservation schools, entering their children in the public system effectively means the end of indigenous language teaching except as extra-curricular instruction (Prairie Band, p.c., 2011, Sac & Fox, p.c., 2011).

As of 2012, there are thirty U.S. states with an official English policy. Spanish-speakers are often the target of groups such as U.S. English and English First (founded in 1983) and Pro English (founded in 1994) who argue that the English language is the basis upon which the United States are built, allowing communities to communicate with each other, as well as with the authorities. They present language diversity as a problem, using the linguistic conflicts of Québec, Belgium and India as examples of the damage linguistic diversity can cause to a nation. They present an inevitable course of events where language difference creates language divisions and societal barriers, which are detrimental to society as a whole. In turn, they argue that immigrant populations would most likely find better-paying jobs if they had a better knowledge of the English language. On their website, U.S. English devotes a page of news snippets

accounting for the cost of "multilinguism" in the United States: from translation services to educational programs and advertising (US English 2008).

U.S. English lobbyists do not otherwise provide linguistic rationalization for their initiatives. Yet they regularly provide their financial support to "official English" legislation in the states, and periodically attempt to lobby in Washington for more English-restrictive language policies to be adopted. The avowed aim of their bills is the establishment of English as the official language of the United States, with no exception: Section 162 of their *National Language Act* of 2009 innocuously reads:

> In General- The Government of the United States shall preserve and enhance the role of English as the national language of the United States of America. (H.R. 1229 §163(a) 2009)

This provision is then followed by a paragraph discouraging any government official from accommodating speakers of any language that is not English:

> Unless specifically stated in applicable law, no person has a right, entitlement, or claim to have the Government of the United States or any of its officials or representatives act, communicate, perform or provide services, or provide materials in any language other than English. If exceptions are made, that does not create a legal entitlement to additional services in that language or any language other than English. If any forms are issued by the Federal government in a language other than English (or such forms are completed in a language other than English), the English language version of the form is the sole authority for all legal purposes. (H.R. 1229 §163(b) 2009)

Such a bill could potentially disenfranchise any American-Indian whose second language is English. Representatives who subscribe to U.S. English's agenda have also attempted to amend immigration, election and workplace bills in order deny access to translation of official documents. One of their latest submissions cites "to avoid misconstructions of the English language texts of the laws of the United States" (H.R. 997 2011) as one of its objectives.

Even though linguistic laws nominally apply to languages, they are actually meant to control much more than how people speak. For instance, proponents of an official language policy in the United States are arguing that it would improve all Americans' understanding of the legal system and promote social stability by removing cultural misunderstandings, in addition to reducing governmental spending on translation services (US English 2012). By doing so, they transform the human rights of foreigners and American Indians into a background issue,

secondary to unfounded hypotheses of public welfare. Also absent from the debate are speakers of non-standard varieties of English who are liable to fall victims to an institutional cultural bias if they do not speak the official version of English (even though that standard is never clearly established in official English legislation) in order to receive basic civil rights such as a fair trial or medical assistance.

According to the standards imposed by Official English lobbyists, indigenous peoples are a non-English speaking minority just like the others – despite existing legislation pointing to the contrary, as I shall demonstrate *infra*. In this respect, organizations such as U.S. English are carrying on the colonizing agenda of past eras, seeking to mark the entirety of the U.S. territorial site as "English-speaking" and nothing else. The imposition of English in Indian Country was not only a means to transform the indigenous cultures through educational programs, it was also a way for the United States government to implant new centers of authority (following Rose *supra*) within the tribes: speakers of Native languages were put in a position of dependency towards the U.S. government virtually anywhere translation is required, from schools to BIA offices and trading posts. There was no federal action targeting American Indians or their languages specifically until the end of the twentieth century, when the sovereignty of indigenous peoples in the United States became somewhat rehabilitated and American Indians became free to let their voices be heard, and to rebuild their own sites.

3.3.3. American Indian Languages in the United States

In 1990, George H. W. Bush passed the first *Native American Languages Act* (NALA) which stated: "It is the policy of the United States to […] preserve, protect, and promote the rights and freedom of Native Americans to use, practice, and develop Native American languages" (25 *U.S.C.* 2903(1)). This is the most explicit language policy ever enacted by Washington, and the first time the U.S. government made a move in favor of indigenous languages. Additionally, such special legislation also emphasizes the very exceptional relationship that indigenous tribes in the U.S. share with the federal government.

Virtually until the enactment of the NALA, American Indian policy exclusively sough to impose the English language upon the tribes. The *Civilization Fund Act* of 1819 established the boarding school system where American Indian children would be taught "reading, writing, and arithmetic" (3 *Stat.* 516-517). By 1923, Commissioner of Indian Affairs Burke still stated that English was the language American Indians "must of necessity adopt" (Lindquist 1923) if they

wanted to survive. Governmental envoys have been predicting the extinction of a majority of the indigenous languages of the United States since the beginning of the twentieth century (Krauss 1998), when their population barely exceeded two hundred thousand individuals (U.S. Census Bureau 1900). Since then, the indigenous population has grown but their languages have not, due to existing and past policies undermining Indian education (Prucha 1986). It is nevertheless remarkable that a number of these languages are still alive today, albeit in isolated areas and spoken by increasingly isolated community members.

The first step towards language revival came in 1972, when the *Indian Education Act* authorized educational programs funding for

> curriculum materials for use in elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education relating to the history, geography, society, economy, literature, art, music, drama, language, and general culture of the group or groups with which the program is concerned. (86 *Stat.* 347)

Unfortunately, the subsequent oil crisis put a damper on federal budgets and the money allotted to tribes was often not sufficient to encourage the development of indigenous education programs, but combined with the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 14), it allowed tribes to slowly take control of the curricula in reservation schools (Havighurst 1978).

In their early years, the effectiveness of the NALA has been criticized because they only provided a verbal protection and little support for programs seeking to apply the provisions of the acts (Romaine 2002, Schiffman 1996). But their limited immediate impact is compounded by the positive ideological change they instituted (Reyhner and Eder 2006) and the fact that they set the stage for later legislation which would provide some funding for American Indian programs. One such resultant act is the *Esther Martinez Native American Languages Preservation Act* of 2006 which has authorized the Administration for Native Americans (ANA) to fund language classes in tribal schools (as of 2013, funding for the act has not been renewed). Over the course of my interviews, a large majority of my interlocutors either credited the ANA with providing the necessary funds to launch a program or mentioned that they were seeking funding from the agency. In 2010, twenty-four language projects were funded with a total amount over twenty million dollars, representing approximately a third of the number of projects funded by the ANA in that year (Administration for Native Americans 2010).

While only Federally-recognized tribes may receive Federal funding, the ANA does occasionally award funds to State recognized tribes. Nevertheless, Congress relies on academic linguistic experts to determine the feasibility of language projects proposed by the tribes; it is important that these experts do not rely on outdated information which may have deemed some languages extinct in the past – although we shall see that it may not always be the case. Similarly, the existence of a language without scientific codification has led tribes with strictly oral languages such as the Cochiti Pueblo of New Mexico to be turned down for ANA grants in the past (Cochiti Pueblo, p.c., 2011), but that situation has changed since the passing of the *Esther Martinez Act*.

Some authors have argued that teaching according to indigenous methods varies greatly from the non-Indian standards (Cajete 1986, Deloria 1999, More 1989). As a result, Cajete has observed that strictly cultural items such as language are taught indirectly through other subject matters, serving as teaching tools rather than objects (Cajete 2000). According to this hypothesis, assuming that language revitalization would primarily take place in schools would be a mistake, and I have found over the course of my interviews that language teaching may take many forms, few of which were institutionalized. Depending on the tribes, language teaching could equally take place in arts class (Trinidad Rancheria, p.c., 2011) and immersion school program (Confederated Salish and Kootenai, p.c., 2011), as well as community centers, where "conversation hour" (San Felipe Pueblo, p.c., 2011) happens, and coffee shops or libraries (Shoshoni, p.c., 2011, Cochiti Pueblo, p.c., 2011, Pueblo of Sandia, p.c., 2011) which host poetry and story readings.

Similarly, whereas a dictionary is the ultimate language reference for non-Indians, language programs may instead focus on documenting tribal histories on tapes and CDs (Potawatomi, p.c., 2011, Salt River Pima, p.c., 2011), using bilingual signage on the reservation (Absentee Shawnee, p.c., 2011) or translating Dr. Seuss books (Makah, p.c., 2011) as a more efficient, accessible and interesting method to re-introduce the indigenous languages in the lives of tribal members.

The scope of these language policies will vary according to the local decision-making process of the tribes, their political leverage and their funding abilities. This is why language use cannot be studied on its own terms: the beliefs that Native communities hold about their languages are equally as crucial (if not more so) as the institutional means taken to protect or

enhance them (Hale 2004). Language preservation is thus an issue of power, of sovereignty, in the Foucauldian sense of the term. Though indigenous communities may be minorities in the United States, they are also empowered by their aboriginal situation on the American territory.

The rise in popularity and the political actions of U.S. English in the last thirty years give us a glimpse of the dominant language ideology in North America. In the same timeframe, federal policy has been enacted to support indigenous language restoration and preservation while lobbies are attempting to curb the use of immigrant languages. The issue at hand is purely discursive as it greatly overstates the influence of Spanish (the most ubiquitous immigrant language) in the collective unconscious, and all the while undermines indigenous language efforts which are notably absent from the popular debate on establishing a national language. Understandably, the recognition of several hundred indigenous languages alongside English would dilute the idea of national unity that these lobbies are heralding. Nonetheless, simply allowing them to exist presents no threat against English-speaking America, yet U.S. English has made no efforts in that direction.

Speaking one language does not preclude speaking another. Relying on census data in order to quantify language use in the United States presents a skewed view at best. As a matter of fact, the Bureau of Census has changed its methodologies concerning language in the last few decades to purposefully present a narrower spatial account, focusing on households instead of the individuals (*i.e.* language use instead of language capability). The Bureau of Census pamphlet explaining this methodological change states that: "Given the patterns of location and relocation over time, local areas may see specific or diverse changes in the languages spoken in any given locality." (U.S. Census Bureau 2010, 11). A simple survey is not flexible enough to account for these constant changes, let alone understanding the similarities and differences that communities share in these situations. Only through a site approach is it possible to account for the language diversity present in the United States as it is currently the only unit to recognize complexity and difference.

An additional dimension that the concept of site can capture beyond language use is its political repercussions. Due to its interactive nature, it is a crucial element to understand in order to present a more comprehensive vision of language and space beyond their public forms. The NALA has suddenly activated a nationwide indigenous language site, compared to the previously episodic sites that waxed and waned in activity depending on the human and

economic resources of the tribes. With federal backing for indigenous language programs, some tribes have been able to take unprecedented steps towards a strong cultural revival, while others found the initial impetus to work towards re-establishing their cultures. Against the backdrop of Official English lobbying, indigenous languages are exemplifying a more diverse view of the United States, where English is a common language for social involvement and local languages also have a place within the household, the schools and other non-conventional spaces.

3.4. Language and Power

Questions of language and power have agitated social sciences especially during the so-called "linguistic turn," when academics across all disciplines began to reduce most political conflict to issues of semantics. As a result, there is a fair amount of literature on the subject, most notably by Norman Fairclough (1989), Kramarae, Schulz and O'Barr (1984) and indirectly by Pierre Bourdieu, whose 1991 *Language and Symbolic Power* is a collection of classes and interviews. I stand on the shoulders of these giants in contributing my own theory linking language and power and how they unfold in space.

The discipline of linguistics is separated in two very distinct areas of research, after the fundamental differentiation established by Ferdinand de Saussure's *langue* and *parole* (Saussure 1916): whereas *parole* is the practice of language, *langue* is the underlying mental ability that enables us to use *parole*. *Parole* is the aspect of language that one can alter by producing various forms of their linguistic knowledge (*langue*), adapting one's speech based on the people we are dealing with. In other words, *parole* is the practice of *langue*.

Advocates of studying only *langue* are following the generative grammar theory introduced by such prominent linguists as Noam Chomsky. Chomsky, recognizing the "vast complexity and scope" of language (Schaff 1973, xiii), chose to firmly restrict the exercise of linguistics to idealized language situations:

> Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech-community, who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance. (Chomsky 1965, 3)

Though descriptive linguists were active contemporary to Chomsky, studies of language in a real-world context did not reach critical mass until later in the twentieth century. After the

linguistic turn (Rorty 1967), during which researchers focused on logical aspects of argumentation and interpretation of social phenomena, the socially-relevant aspects of linguistics became much more popular even outside of the realm of linguistics. Later theories developed by Michael Halliday (Halliday 1977) and George Lakoff (Lakoff 1987) increasingly recognized emergence and immediacy as the norm in linguistic studies, and emphasized the role of language in the creation and maintenance of social structures. Pierre Bourdieu summarized this point of view in radical opposition with idealized forms, and that uniform language communities are only a byproduct of political engineering:

> To speak of *the* language, without further specification, as linguists do, is tacitly to accept the *official* definition of the *official* language of a political unit. [...] Integration into a single 'linguistic community', which is a product of the political domination that is endlessly reproduced by institutions capable of imposing universal recognition of the dominant language, is the condition for the establishment of relations of linguistic domination. (Bourdieu and Thompson 1991, 45-46) (emphasis in original)

Assuming that homogeneity in language is a by-product of political power has implications for the world: the imputation of areas of perfect language homogeneity in our societies also entail that there are perfect areas of social homogeneity – an out-of-place framework that is only possible in theory. Nevertheless, the two worlds of linguistic study have been reconciled since the late 1990s, as articulated most notably by Steven Pinker, who studied language acquisition based on Chomskian principles in combination with evolutionary biology. According to Pinker, human comprehension of language is an instantaneous and emergent process directly related to genetic adaptation and while his conclusions remain controversial for lack of knowledge of the human brain, his argument remains the most compelling to date:

> The workings of language are as far from our awareness as the rationale for egg-laying is from the fly's. Our thoughts come out of our mouths so effortlessly that they often embarrass us, having eluded our mental censors. […] The effortlessness, the transparency, the automaticity are illusions, masking a system of great richness and beauty. (Pinker 1995, 19)

In his view, the complexity of mankind's perception of language has a direct correlate in the complex biology of our bodies and the biological world in general, which Pinker illustrates with the creativity of language production, referring as far back as Charles Darwin when he said:

> [L]anguage is an art, like brewing or baking; but writing would have been a better simile. It certainly is not a true instinct, for

every language has to be learned. It differs, however, widely from all ordinary arts, for man has an instinctive tendency to speak, as we see in the babble of our young children; while no child has an instinctive tendency to brew, bake, or write. Moreover, no philologist now supposes that any language has been deliberately invented; it has been slowly and unconsciously developed by many steps. (Darwin 1871 in Pinker 1995, 20)

However embryonic, Darwin's comment heralded later continental philosophers who posited the necessary intentionality behind human practices:

> Because the usual separation between a subject with its immanent sphere and an object with its transcendent sphere -- because, in general, the distinction between an inner and an outer is constructive and continually gives occasion for further constructions, we shall in the future no longer speak of a subject, of a subjective sphere, but shall understand the being to whom intentional comportments belong as *Dasein*, and indeed in such a way that it is precisely with the aid of intentional comportment, properly understood, that we attempt to characterize suitably the being of *Dasein*. (Heidegger 1988, 64)

Regardless of the opinion whether language is an instinct, an art, or a practice, all agree that language has a complex structure, and that language can and will serve a purpose in a person's life. We can see by analogy that power and language function along the same lines: from the immanent sense of language and power, one can derive practices that are conducive of existence and identity. The ontological site is the space in which these practices of language and power can be shared to attain common goals. Attempts from hegemonic governments to control language use should then be considered as a manipulation of human actions in addition to a control of communication channels. The study of how language policy affects human interactions is the domain of Critical Language Policy.

3.4.1. Critical Language Policy

Language policies can take many forms; generally speaking, any measure that attempts to alter language use – whether positively or negatively – is a language policy. For this reason, the making of language policy has been interchangeably referred to as language planning, language management or language engineering. Since very few nations actually have a central authority on language, any authority figure may be directly involved in a language policy initiative, be they novelists, businessmen, educators, elders, or parents. Critical Language Policy (CLP) is the domain of linguistics concerned with understanding the processes that lead to linguistic policies

(Spolsky 2004), and their results (Baldauf 1994). CLP is often cross-disciplinary as anthropologists, sociologists and political scientists tap into their combined expertise to expose the real motives behind the establishment of a language policy.

CLP usually distinguishes two different kinds of policies: explicit (or overt) policies are laws enacted by governments regarding language, such as those establishing a national language council, recognizing the existence of minority languages, or allowing for translators in courtrooms. Implicit (or covert) policies have no governmental mandate, but rather come from practice and enjoy popular support. Harold Schiffman uses the United States' situation as an example for covert policies, as a majority of the population believes that English is the official language throughout the country in spite of the lack of federal language policy (Schiffman 1996). CLP assumes that language policies are meant not just to control language, but entire populations (Collins 1997, Schieffelin, Woolard and Kroskrity 1998, S. Wright 2000). For example, Michael Billig has demonstrated that the language policies adopted by France after the Revolution were in fact directly aiming to impose the power of the French monarchy on all aspects of French society, breaking up local communities rather than effectively stamping out regional languages (Billig 1995).

For explicit policies, CLP studies focus on the social and historical context in which language policies are submitted, the debate surrounding them (if any) and their adoption. These governmental policies may take up one line in a national constitution (as is the case in Lebanon), several pages summarizing a history of legal and public debate (as is the case with the 1969 Official Languages Act of Canada) or a couple of paragraphs in a local newsletter announcing "language awareness week." For implicit policies, an ethnographic approach is required in order to fully understand the community's history and attitude to language, as the policy will appear in the behavior of speakers rather than in writing. Implicit policies are more readily available because they do not require financial support or a critical mass of speakers to be enacted.

As language authority is decentralized, the policies will vary greatly in scope. Large scale policies have received the most attention from linguists, because they have the most destructive potential and present a certain shock value. Suresh Canagarajah edited a volume containing several examples of the importance of local policies in populous federal systems (Rajagopalan 2005, David and Govindasamy 2005). They point to the fact that within smaller communities such as indigenous tribes, language policies that are enacted by geographically closer authorities

do not only affect the behavior of speakers, they also have a very deep impact on the languages themselves. At the site level, the shared the authority for language practice means that community members are actively adapting to the feedback they are receiving, and thus they are affected faster in the constant monitoring of their mutual language use

3.4.2. Critical Language Policy in the United States

The main proponent of CLP in the United States is James Crawford, who has recounted the history of linguistic conflicts in the United States, starting with Benjamin Franklin's informal dispute with Pennsylvania Germans who wanted to establish an exclusively German-speaking educational system (Crawford 2000, 15). The first recorded linguistic conflicts in the United States came after the first massive migratory waves in between the middle of the nineteenth century and World War I. For want of scientific accounts, we are left with court cases such as parts of the "Trading with the Enemy Act" (40 *Stat.* 411, §19, 1917) forbidding the circulation of any printed communication about the United States in foreign languages or *Meyer v. Nebraska*, in which the Supreme Court had to strike down a law forbidding teaching in languages other than English before the eighth grade (262 U.S. 390, 1923). Following World War II and the Cold War, new migrants came to settle in the U.S., giving rise to lobbies such as Official English led by Senator S.I. Hayakawa's demand to add a language amendment to the Constitution (Baron 1990, 18). Several states have since passed policies establishing English as the official state language, sometimes without further legislating on language use.

Most impactful in recent years was Arizona's Constitution Article 28, passed by a narrow margin of popular vote, establishing English as "the language of the ballot, the public schools and all government functions and actions." (Arizona Prop. 106, 1988). The original article was brought to the Arizona Supreme Court by several state employees and struck down as an "overbroad" restriction of free speech (69 F.3d 920 (1995). The article was re-written in 2000 to exclude the "unofficial" communication of government officials and subsequently passed by a large referendum margin in 2006 (Arizona Const. Art. 28 §5). The controversy that arose following the passage of language policy in the state was undeniably due to the large number of people there whose lives are potentially affected by a language policy – for the same reasons, official language policy receives the most public and scholarly coverage in states where sizeable populations would fall prey to restrictive laws: such as California (W. Wright 2004), Arizona (Wright and Chang 2005), and Texas (Valenzuela 2005).

Nationally, the premise for not imposing a language in the United States was that auxiliary languages would disappear as the federal government would assert its power and authority over the nation; indigenous languages were noticeably absent from the discussion. And indeed the Spanish, Dutch, and French-speaking populations for the most part did not offer resistance to the United States and took up the English language in immediate post-colonial days. So far, the federal government has followed suit and refused to enact an official English policy, comforted in part by the lack of evidence for the efficiency of such a law.

Several critical studies of English-only measures exist in the literature, with by-and-large a consensus that English-only policies are a poor substitute for full-fledged immigrant educational programs (*e.g.* Crawford 1992, 2000; Krashen 1996; Schiffman 1996). From a more philosophical standpoint, Terrence Wiley suggests that the language ideology promoted by English-only movements has transformed a policy of federal "tolerance" into one of local "intolerance" and in fact created conflicts which previously did not exist (Wiley 2004). Wiley is also a strong believer that language policy in the U.S. goes beyond the realm of linguistics or politics, and that measures such as Official English are only an acceptable manner to disenfranchise minorities. He and others have further refined the policy analysis to implicit and covert/tacit forms of governing language (Schiffman 1996, Wiley 2000).

To this day, a majority of the U.S. population (Califa 1989) believes that English is the official language of the United States at least in part due to the intensive lobbying from Official English organizations; Bernard Spolsky has argued that English-Only has reached the status of implicit language policy in some parts of the United States (Spolsky 2004). Even though the Federal government is not constitutionally allowed to legislate on language, states and sometimes businesses have taken it upon themselves to prevent other languages from being spoken within their respective spheres of authority (Davis 1997, Peña 1998). Language policies in Indian country have only received scant attention. Due in part to their legal and physical separation from the general population, indigenous language matters are not treated with the same attention as immigrant languages. However, American Indian boarding schools were one of the first sites of English-Only policing in U.S. history, as the nation recovered from the Civil War but continued to be plagued by internal wars with American Indian tribes.

Modern efforts towards a language policy for the United States are framed as a response to the latest immigration waves, and they have certainly gained momentum due to recent worries

about government spending – presidential hopeful Ron Paul, whose political platform opposes "big government," was a staunch supporter of Official English policies (Pro English 2012). In the same interval, minority languages in the U.S. have also exhibited signs of renewed vitality, bolstered by international policies and new nationalisms (Johnson 2000). Without institutional support, the authority for these language efforts cannot be found in lobbies or official documents: they are the product of ideological currents emphasizing linguistic protection within the communities. A small number of tribes did enact explicit language policies (seven of my interlocutors confirmed that their tribes had adopted one) typically as part of their constitution (Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation, p.c., 2011; Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, p.c., 2011) or amendments thereof (Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, p.c., 2011; Pascua Yaqui Tribe, p.c., 2011). A number of language program leaders additionally expressed themselves in favor of policy to support their efforts, but they often faced financial and political hurdles in enacting one.

Generally speaking, language program leaders lack the decision-making power and political leverage to propose long-lasting policies; the Ho Chunk Nation of Wisconsin was able to declare 2008 the "Year of Ho Chunk" thanks in part to a very pro-active tribal president but other tribal leaders have proved to be less enthusiastic (Ho Chunk, p.c., 2011). For the Pauma Band of Luiseno Indians, policy is not out of question, but they "focus on kids right now" (Pauma, p.c., 2011). The final decision on making policy belongs to the tribes, as I was reminded by three tribes who significantly rejected the idea: Acoma Pueblo excluded the idea of policy based on the fact that their language is not written (Acoma Pueblo, p.c., 2011), while the Tonto Apache language coordinator simply declared: "we don't do that" (Tonto Apache, p.c., 2011). For the Yavapai Apache policy is unnecessary because the tribe shares the belief that those who want to learn the language have the option to do so: "there's no pressure" to take lessons (Yavapai Apache, p.c., 2011).

Most saliently, the Quechan tribe in Fort Yuma, California rejected the idea of a policy based on the fact that there are ten languages spoken on the reservation and the undertaking seemed unthinkable (Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation, p.c., 2011). In other cases, the tribes seemed to rely on a strong ideological support: my interlocutor with the Acoma Pueblo, though they do not have an explicit policy because their language is not written, recognized that the tribe had an "understanding" about protecting the language (Acoma Pueblo, p.c., 2011). For the Mescalero Apache, there is "not really" a policy, but the language is

"protected by the tribe" (Mescalero Apache, p.c., 2011). At Keweenaw Bay in Michigan, there is no official language policy but they consider language rights as "part of [their] self-sovereignty" (Keweenaw Bay, p.c., 2011). The ideological component is crucial to support any policy, and the first language policies applied to indigenous peoples were in fact meant to directly counteract their ideological foundations, following unsuccessful external policies which did not penetrate tribal sites at their very core.

3.4.3. Language Ideology

In 1868, the Indian Peace Commission appointed by Congress made its first report to the President, noting that the language barrier was a crucial reason why settlers and indigenous tribes were not able to cohabitate, and recommending that only English be taught in reservation schools. They noted:

> The difference in language, which in a great measure barred intercourse and a proper understanding each of the other's motives and intentions. Now, by educating the children of these tribes in the English language these differences would have disappeared and civilization would have followed at once. (U.S. Office of Indian Affairs 1868, 43)

The historical context in which this proposal was made is indicative of a dire need for a unifying ideology in the United States. The nation was approaching its first centennial after several of its states had decided to secede, to the point that a National Union Party ran for election with a Democratic vice-president with the Republican election bill, expressly meant to ensure Abraham Lincoln's second term. Dozens of conflicts were nonetheless still raging in the western states, as tribes from Texas to Oregon fought with the U.S. Army and local militia to protect their lands against settlers. According to the Indian Peace Commission, English-language education was a means to easily resolve these conflicts, emphasizing how it was perceived to be a superior and powerful language as well as the very potency of language – such was the language ideology of the colonizers.

Widely defined, language ideology has been characterized as the "self-evident ideas and objectives a group holds concerning roles of language in the social experience of members as they contribute to the expression of the group." (Heath 1977, 53) Later, in his investigation of language as a means of personal expression, Michael Silverstein defined ideology as the prism through which we see our language ability in order to produce linguistic forms:

> The total linguistic fact, the datum for a science of languages, is irreducibly dialectic in nature. It is an unstable mutual interaction of meaningful sign forms contextualized to situations of interested human use mediated by the fact of cultural ideology. (Silverstein 1985, 220)

Language ideology therefore enables speakers to calculate their utterances in accordance with the image they are painting of themselves, whether trying to separate oneself from or to blend into a given environment.

In our case, the belief that English is the unifying language of the United States has been well documented (see *supra*) but the language ideologies of American Indian tribes has barely received any attention, appearing as a side-note of in-depth linguistic studies. Authors of linguistics atlases have for example mentioned personal attitudes to language that they observed within the population they observed (e.g. Kroeber 1939) and later attempted to link attitudes with linguistic traits (Dozier 1966a), admitting reluctantly that there are no available geographical tools allowing for a reliable geographical study of language (Sherzer 1976).

Paul Kroskrity even pointed out that understanding language ideology greatly improves a researcher's approach to both social processes and linguistic products, presenting great geographical potential (Kroskrity 1992). Arguably, language ideology itself could be used as a boundary marker; inasmuch as it can be elicited by survey, the method to map them would be similar to those used to differentiate "red" and "blue" states – but the issue lies in the micro-spaces where slight changes in ideology appear (such as households), and the movability (both physical and emotional) of speakers which would render maps unusable after a few years. At this point in the history of indigenous languages and Indian Affairs, enacting such strong language planning as a policy does not seem unthinkable, because of the severity of the situation: the Eastern Shawnee, the Aroostook Micmacs, Shishone-Bannock, Pauma, Sac & Fox, Kewa Pueblo all expressed interest in establishing a policy if only as support to educational efforts, though they did not express reasons why there was presently no legislation.

Ontologically, this means observing language practices in order to fathom the ideologies, and in turn explore how the ideology extends. In cases where the ideology is explicitly promulgated within a community, those speakers who practice language in accordance with the ideology signify their will to belong to the group, while a refusal would indicate distancing oneself from the group. At this point in the history of Indian affairs, speaking an indigenous

language is already symbolic of an ideology to refuse the history of English-only teachings and to reconnect with the era when tribes had the sovereignty to choose what language they spoke.

3.5. Conclusion

The focus on practices is not new to social sciences, but it has only recently been applied to geography. Admittedly, the theoretical framework is quite uncontroversial, but practice-based geography requires a complete change of direction from the methods that are currently being used. Yet, there is plenty of evidence in favor of using the concept of site to replace that of scale in geographical discourse, especially for geographers studying populations living outside of the western conventional type of representation.

One does not need to look very far in order to find such examples: indigenous peoples in the U.S. are leading a political existence that transcends state lines and they have maintained their cultural identities in spite of a history of efforts to assimilate them into the mainstream American system. A close look at their language practices highlights the tremendously complex task of locating them within that system: being the sole responsibility of the U.S. government, their languages do not fall under the jurisdiction of states. From a strictly legal standpoint, Official English measures passed by the states should not impact American Indian populations as long as they remain within the confines of their reservations. However, I have demonstrated that tribal belonging rarely coincides with territory: not all tribes have a reservation, and furthermore tribal members working, going to school or residing off reservation lands are faced with an English-Only environment, not to mention exceptional cases that require leaving the reservation such as voting in elections or treatment for medical emergencies.

Additionally, the rising popularity of official English policies in the states blurs the distinction between the Federal policies of promoting English as a unifying language for the country and imposing English as a means to eliminate all practices that do not correspond to a U.S. American ideal. Predating these contemporary policies are hundreds of treaties that were used to negotiate peace with indigenous tribes, indicating both their sovereign power and unique cultural status (within the parameters of mainstream U.S. politics). Though the treaties have been breached and disrespected, they are still legally binding and certainly ideologically important for the tribes. In the current governmental rhetoric of self-determination, tribal councils are allotted a restricted amount of authority to counteract former policies and establish their own rule.

Based on the responses I have received in my interviews, language policies as instituted by the tribes themselves seem to be the most popular method for language activists not only to reactivate language use but also foster the ideological sentiment that is necessary for the language to survive in the next generations. When they are separated from their communities, American Indians can only rely on their personal convictions to maintain their native language lest they would lose it by attrition against a backdrop that is overwhelmingly English-speaking. Studies in language ideology are not new, but there have not been any significant uses of language ideology as a geographical marker and I believe that the concept of site allows us to bridge this theoretical gap. In the next chapter, I shall use a site approach to link language policy and language ideology to space in my observations of how some tribes around the United States have sought to establish their self-sovereignty and protect their livelihood through language.

Chapter 4.   Indigenous Communities

In terms of ideology, the United States hegemonic discourse has long (though not always) emphasized English as the only valuable language– resulting in the early educational policies seeking to impose English as a language for the tribes, as well as the widely held belief that English is the official language of the United States. Within American Indian cultures however a strong attachment to the value of indigenous languages has enabled the survival of the languages even through times of contrarian policing. Since the enactment of NALA in 1990 and its following versions, the dominant discourse has changed to include indigenous languages as part of the U.S. American heritage. Nevertheless, it will take more than a couple of decades for this change to affect popular beliefs.

Moreover, this federal agenda does not provide any protection for American Indians outside of the reservations; there is no central language institution in the United States, so the states serve as the only centers of authority with complete control over language matters. When states enact an Official English policy, they take part in a hegemonic discourse that is perceived more strongly than popular opinion for several reasons: (1) states are a historically recognized and respected authority; (2) these legislations are the result of a democratic process that is seen as legitimate by the majority; (3) the law directly affects the majority and only disserves an alienated minority.

Over the course of the past chapters, I have established that American Indians are subject to a set of rules different from the rest of the United States population, yet they participate in the same political process. I have also shown that American Indian communities cannot always be identified by the same standards as other communities in the mainstream population; I have proposed a more sensible approach relying on the practices of American-Indian-ness such as those regarding language because they are both culturally and politically embedded. Of course, the role of language in social construction has been previously studied; as I will briefly discuss below.

Society requires people to communicate in order to achieve common goals, whether it is encountering a stranger, trading goods, or drafting a national constitution. Language is thence at the center of social organization, as the necessary medium for cooperation – each collaborative occurrence can be seen as a micro-society being established in order to achieve a common goal. As such, these micro-societies constitute sites, defined in time by the willingness of their

participants to communicate (and cooperate). The sites correspond precisely to the ontological conception of the speech community insofar as they describe an instantaneous and unregulated occurrence likely to appear at any time and in any space, however big or small. Though it used to be improbable, people can now establish communities online, spanning the entire world without the need for prior contact. Strangers of all walks of life are now able to meet on the Internet with social media or massively multiplayer online role-playing games, and in so doing they will develop idiosyncratic languages best suited for their communicative needs within these cooperative sites.

Meanwhile in the physical world such politico-cultural ventures as *la Francophonie* transcend state boundaries by bridging French-speaking peoples across continents, regardless of their respective governments. Sites are then created around the use of a specific and self-serving linguistic code and do not need to comply with any geographical zone or societal group. Indigenous speech communities in the United States are fighting the same battle against language shift, and they share advice and methods in regional, national, and international conferences whenever they have the chance (e.g. Reyhner 1999, Amery & Nash 2008). In this section, I observe the organizational basis for these spaces as well as the ideological means they have used towards achieving their goal.

4.1. Searching for the Authors of Linguistic Spaces

As I have previously established, official forms of government are not the only source of power to be found in our societies. Each time power is expressed, a space is generated for that power to unfold: in this dissertation, I am looking for the centers of indigenous linguistic power in the U.S., the spaces of American Indian linguistic engagement. Though I was searching for language policies on reservations, my first realization was that the official representatives of tribal languages do not hold a title related to language or policymaking. And indeed many of these representatives were reluctant to speak of policies – or indeed programs – when it came to describing their language activities.

This can be explained by the relative amount of power they hold when it comes to language as well as a possible lack of assurance. For instance, the language coordinator for the Red Cliff Indian band of Wisconsin is also involved with the tribal Environmental Protection Agency (Red Cliff Band, p.c., 2011). Similarly, as the programs are started with volunteer speakers, they will often downplay any political role, calling themselves "coordinators" or

"specialists" instead of affirming any administrative titles, as they do not have linguistic or educational training. At the Tonto Apache in Arizona, my interlocutor referred to himself as the "culture person" (Tonto Apache, p.c., 2011).

They and many others teach language as part of their cultural traditions, without considering it necessarily a language program. As a result, the Tribal Historical Preservation Officer (THPO, a position partially funded by the National Park Service to oversee federally-approved "historic properties" on reservations) becomes the person of reference for everything relating to language and culture, even though they may not be language specialist themselves. For instance, the THPO of the Trinidad Rancheria considers language maintenance as a responsibility, and though the office does operate language classes with an elder, they do not consider themselves to have a language program (Trinidad Rancheria, p.c., 2011). Similarly, some tribes have included language activities in their summer camp curriculum where it can be taught in conjunction with sewing, basketry, or hunting/fishing.

Summer camps happen in a very specific time and place: outside of the school-year and often off the grid. They present the advantage of being tribally-ran and funded by the families of camp-goers so there is less institutional pressure to certify teachers, develop a clear-cut curriculum or materials. The Apache resorted to holding summer and winter camps after their open-class format failed due to time and location concerns (Apache, p.c., 2011). Their short-term duration is not ideal for language retention, but they are an excellent occasion for acclimating children to using the indigenous language all the while taking part in everyday activities and collaborating with tribal members of all generations. Alternatively, the Sycuan Summer Camps include readings by elders on tribal history and traditional ethnobotany, during which children are exposed to many native terms (Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation, p.c., 2011).

Tribes often cited immersion as a goal, consistent with modern language teaching theories, but the basic tenets of immersion teaching are often unavailable to the tribes. Helena Curtain-Anderson and Carol Ann Dahlberg recommend that immersion students receive extended and intensive exposure to the language (which require full-time personnel and parental involvement) as well as a high quantity and quality of linguistic input (Curtain and Dahlberg 1994). Unfortunately, tribes do not always have access to the linguistic data generated on the subject of their languages (and belonging to universities), or the training to interpret them: a teacher for the Yavapai Apache tribe lamented that the most comprehensive resource book

concerning the Apache language was written by linguists and "hard to read" (Yavapai Apache, p.c., 2011).

For tribes that do dispose of a corpus that is teachable, total immersion becomes a much more attainable goal. The Ponca tribe in Oklahoma administers a 26-week Master-Apprentice program in coordination with Oklahoma University, funded by a grant from the federal Administration for Native Americans. Masters are trained by the University professors during half of the year, and in turn teach the language to apprentices (children as young as 4 years old) during summer camps. With only 5 native speakers left (all over 85 years of age) and a total of thirteen fluent speakers, they managed to retain the language through songs and stories. Due to the specifications of grant funding, the tribe was not able to reproduce teaching materials until 2010, when they published a 96-page phrase book for beginners. An additional resource for the tribe to promote the language is a reservation-wide Ponca Language Week when open classes and readings are held for families to attend (Ponca, p.c., 2011).

Ponca Language Week was a political decision, sponsored by community members, which does not enforce the use of one language over the others but rather raises awareness about the importance of language for the Ponca. The linguistic effort has now reached the Ponca tribe in Nebraska who are starting to train teachers (Ponca of Nebraska, p.c., 2011). With less of a coercive element, such locally-developed legislation is perceived more amicably by tribal members than an official language policy, and it takes less time for it to be accepted both by the tribal council and the tribal members.

4.2. The Importance of Legislating

Much as ordinary Americans only possess a superficial knowledge of the entire legal apparatus in which they live, ordinary American Indians are rarely up to speed with the various legal subtleties that apply to them in particular. When asked about their state's language policy, only a handful of tribes seemed to be aware of the legal situation – the latter were mostly situated in Oklahoma, where the legislation was passed very recently. Officially-enacted policy does have the advantage of standing the test of time by its very institutionalization; when I enquired about the starting dates of the program, eighteen of my interlocutors noted that their programs were less than a decade old.

Though few tribes have actually adopted a language policy, language specialists did generally not oppose the idea (Eastern Shawnee, p.c., 2011, Shishone-Bannock, p.c., 2011). In

the most drastic cases, they actually deplored the lack of tribal legislation which would provide the necessary incentive to revive interest in the language (Aroostook Micmacs, p.c., 2011, Bear River, p.c., 2011). The Sac & Fox Nation's cultural representatives have considered adopting a language policy but they feel that their leaders are not ready yet to adopt it (Sac & Fox Nation, p.c., 2011). How highly they rank language on the tribal agenda is thus a matter of tribal ideology and varies greatly from one tribe to the other.

For the Kaw Nation of Oklahoma (linguistically related to and neighbors of the Ponca mentioned *supra*), who enacted a language policy in the nineties, establishing guidelines to revive the language two decades after the last native speaker died. A strategic plan was put in place in 1999 and revised in 2008, keeping the language program active and benefitting the tribe even when funds were low. The current program director deems this language policy "essential," removing a lot of the guesswork for the direction she needs to follow (Kaw Nation, p.c., 2011).

For the Keweenaw Bay Indian community of Michigan, policy is unnecessary. They consider that language is a human right and therefore assume that language restoration is an integral part of their self-sovereignty (Keweenaw Bay, p.c., 2011). The language coordinator for the Nez Perce declared "I'm sure there is a policy in writing" (Nez Perce, p.c., 2011) and was aware of many controversies regarding the various writing systems used by the tribe to this day, even though the tribal council agreed on a particular system in 1997. His opinion was that people know the language "as long as they say [the words] properly" (Nez Perce, p.c., 2011) and that no policy can dictate what language people speak: "We know what our language is" (Nez Perce, p.c., 2011).

In the early years of English-Only efforts, a few tribes started enacting a language policy as a response to their State's language policy (Zepeda 1990). The Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation enacted their language policy in 1973, when the state of Utah in which they reside first considered declaring English as its official language. The ballot did not pass until the year 2000, but the tribe has maintained a language program "off and on" (Uintah and Ouray, p.c., 2011) in the interval, finding renewed interest after the enactment of the official English legislation. However, controversy often arises among the three different dialects present on the reservation, hampering the establishment of one unified language program (Uintah and Ouray, p.c., 2011).

The Absentee Shawnee tribe of Oklahoma adopted a language policy in 2008 in response to state efforts to enact an official language policy. They devised a five-year and a ten-year plan to revive the language, although the language program has been functioning "off and on" for over twenty years. The Cultural Preservation Director expressed his disagreement with the state's pressures regarding language issues: "we can do what we want […] how are they going to tell us what to speak?" (Absentee Shawnee, p.c., 2011). Perhaps due in part to a distrust of state policies, and most definitely thanks to a strong sense of community, most tribes seem to privilege local initiatives, however small they may be.

4.3.   Local Initiative Prevails

Grassroots efforts are by no means new or exclusive to American Indian tribes; the principle seems nevertheless to find special resonance on reservations, where so-called "Big Government" is inevitable. Indicating as much the self-sovereignty of indigenous peoples as the urgency of the situation, tribal residents seem to resort more readily to taking matters in their own hands, especially when the future of their language is concerned.

The Cheyenne and Arapaho tribes share the same tract of land in Oklahoma, where the two unrelated cultures cohabitate. The Cheyenne language is endangered but it is considered on an equal footing with English as it does enjoy some informal use as well as ritual applications (Cheyenne and Arapaho, p.c., 2011). Though the closest other Cheyenne speakers reside in Montana, there was no established link of communication between the tribes until 2010, when a seventeen year-old Oklahoma Cheyenne reached out to his Montana counterparts to start a distance learning program between the two communities. With a group of volunteer students and teachers, he started developing a curriculum and compiling a dictionary which lead the THPO of the tribe to declare the language "on the verge of revitalization" (Cheyenne and Arapaho, p.c., 2011).

Following the format of local initiatives enables tribes to hold classes in public spaces such as community centers, libraries, and casinos. These have the advantage of being accessible but they are harder to coordinate. The Apache tribe of Oklahoma had to give up open meetings because they could not find an agreeable time and place for people who wanted to be involved. Nevertheless, tribes who receive public assistance are usually required to hold public meetings by their administration. This method of spreading public awareness is especially efficient in California where several rather small communities reside and a special program was started in

the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program for them to receive limited funding.

Otherwise, classrooms remain the primary place for indigenous language teaching: besides some notable exceptions, schools are the primary place for American Indian children to learn languages. On the one hand, parents do not have the time or knowledge to properly teach within the household, and on the other, tribes have by and large decided to focus on teaching children exclusively. According to the National Indian Education Study statistics, at least 87 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native children are schooled exclusively in English-speaking environments (Mead, et al. 2010, 2) while only 33 percent received reading lessons that includes elements of indigenous culture (National Center for Education Statistics 2012, 19). Teaching language classes in schools is perhaps too mundane a method to be counted as a language policy in all cases, but considering the overwhelming majority of single language teaching and the special accreditations required to teach indigenous language classes, they can legitimately be considered a political endeavor because they require supplemental effort and dedication to take place.

Schools may provide minimal institutional support (people are more likely to attend the classes if they have to pay for them) and ensure a protected space that will not be jeopardized by conflicting schedules. Most tribes also receive Head Start funding due to their economic situation, and as a result twelve of the tribes I interviewed have started their language teaching under Head Start – this works in their favor as children generally learn languages more easily. When they are able to allocate funds for that purpose, many school leaders count on the potential of classrooms to teach a larger number of children, some of whom will be able to go home and keep the language alive in the household. The language coordinator in Reno-Sparks spoke of creating a generation of "language warriors," (Reno-Sparks, p.c., 2011) while the Tuolome Mewuk of California enthusiastically echoed that "just one person speaks the language with their kids and the language is back" (Tuolome Mewuk, p.c., 2011).

Since one local initiative may spark a new center of authority for language, and thence reservation-wide or even inter-tribal repercussions, it is crucial to look more closely at the variety of solutions that tribal members have found to defend their linguistic heritage.

4.4. Bridging Ideological Divides

I have mentioned that the response to changes in language ideology varies greatly. Some tribes have chosen to seclude themselves as a protectionist measure but if past policies have already taken their toll on the language, tribes often opt for a more active investment in their languages to reverse the declining tendencies.

Due to the lack of funds, previous failures from within or outside the tribes, lack of youth involvement and the current ideological climate for languages in the United States, some of my interlocutors were somewhat resigned as to the fate of their languages:

> The new generation is "too occupied with computers and handhelds" (Ely Shoshone, p.c., 2011)
> "I hate to say it but (…) [there is a] lack of wanting" (Lac Flambeaux Chippewa, p.c., 2011)
> "[E]lders are gone [now] (…) All we have is paper stuff" (Ewiiaapaay, p.c., 2011)
> "You probably wouldn't be interested" (La Jolla Luiseno, p.c., 2011)
> "every program is beyond our resources" (Wichita and Affiliated, p.c., 2011)
> "lack someone who is really interested… and money" (Quechan Tribe, p.c., 2011)

By contrast, other tribes had adopted a more resolute approach to deal with outsiders head-on:

> "it's our first language, we're a sovereign nation" (Winnebago, p.c., 2011)
> "[Language] is always here, it has always been here" (Makah, p.c., 2011)
> "We know what our language is" (Nez Perce, p.c., 2011)
> "We do what we need to do" (Tuolome Mewuk, p.c., 2011)
> "we can do what we want… how are they going to tell us what to speak?" (Absentee Shawnee, p.c., 2011)
> "[First language is] Apache, of course" (Mescalero Apache, p.c., 2011)

Older generations of speakers often express their dismay at the lack of interest on the part of children in learning the indigenous languages. One creative way to counterbalance the generation gap is being explored by some entrepreneurs who are designing indigenous language programs for smartphones and video game devices. Thornton Media Incorporated, a Las Vegas-based company, has a team of programmers and experts who are contracted in by the tribes to develop linguistic software for Apple iOS and Android platforms and any other format the tribes

may require (Thornton Media, Inc. 2012). I became aware of the existence of Thornton Media through the Pauma of California, who were able to contract with the company thanks to a joint grant from California State University and Palomar Community College, which has a campus on the Pauma reservation (Pauma, p.c., 2011); the Chemehuevi of California have also been working with Thornton Media, thanks in part to revenues from their casino (Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians, p.c., 2011).

New technologies are also allowing individual designers to develop their own programs: Michael Sheyahshe is a self-employed Caddo web developer who developed a basic word reference guide for Google Android smartphones. He started working on it on his own time and he liked the idea of being able to find words wherever he went. He sourced material from several books published on Caddo culture and he has made the app available for free online. When asked why he would not charge for it, his answer was:

> The language doesn't belong to me, alone; certainly, the work I've done assembling bits of the language into a database and programming various search engines is mine, though. I can only guess that a partial answer is this: I did these various projects for not only myself (I benefit by having a searchable Caddo language database where I am), but Caddo people, in general. *(*Sheyahshe, p.c., July 20, 2011)

Though the application was only downloaded a few hundred times in two years, he is constantly working to expand the database and improve the software, and hopes to make it available to Apple devices in the future.

Biagio Arobba, a Sicangu Lakota from Rapid City, SD, is providing computer solutions as a software developer to tribal members looking to expand their language projects online, though contracted projects are hampered by lack of funds and bureaucracy (Arobba, p.c., July 8, 2011). Even without exorbitant amounts of technological know-how and minimal funds, Information Technologies have provided an outlet for tribal members eager to share their love and knowledge: Samuel Brown of the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay designed his own website, including lessons and word list updated when he has the chance. When I asked him if he had any statistics on the use of his site, he replied "I rarely get feedback on my site from anyone. Since I am doing it myself no one can critize [*sic*] me as they don't have a site and I do." (Brown, p.c., July 11, 2011).

4.5. Conclusion

Language ideology is a tremendous aid to the survival of minority languages: it enables languages with no institutional support to survive in a site even when the community itself is separated. Geographically, it signifies that some communities have a shared space even though they may not have a territory. Though the attitudes may differ and fluctuate, the common denominator to all successful language programs in the United States is the continuity of their activity: ideology maintains the languages and economy maintains the political activity. But many programs around the U.S. are doomed by a lack of continuity in their immanent existence, *i.e.*, in their spatial boundaries, the amount of political power they hold and the amount of funds they can generate. A large number of indigenous languages in the United States, after surviving the early physical assaults of federal Indian policy, are now weathering the ideological assault of U.S. hegemony and tribes have to make a political decision on how to actively maintain their languages in a sea of English speakers (Silentman 1995).

These existing methodologies are certainly useful to create synthetic representations of language, but they do not necessarily yield the best results when the social reality differs from the established model. By scientific standards, a number of indigenous languages of the United States are considered extinct, arguably due in part to the lack of flexibility of previous methodologies. The Summer Institute of Linguistic's *Ethnologue* encyclopedia is considered as a reference by many language experts; and according to its latest edition the Chitimacha, Iowa and Siletz languages are extinct, numbering zero known speakers for Chitimacha and Siletz, and a handful of speakers with "some knowledge" of Iowa (Ethnologue 2009). However, all three languages are being taught in schools to this day.

From the indigenous point of view, considering these languages as "extinct" is deletory: a geographer mapping the languages of America will not instinctually list extinct languages; even worse, such classifications are considered insulting to the revitalization efforts of tribes, as the Eastern Shawnee language coordinator explicitly told me (Eastern Shawnee, p.c., 2011). I argue in favor of adopting the terminology of site in order to center the linguistic analysis on language production instead of rooting language use into inert grounds such as vocabulary lists, geographical features or political divisions.

The essential *milieu* for language to thrive cannot be found on a map or established by law: it happens when (rather than where) language is spoken. The latest attempts to codify these

linguistic moments resulted in several definitions of the concept of "speech community," which have been tailored by linguistic authors to serve their express purpose. I contend that the concept of site – as an event-relation rooted in practice – captures the format more accurately. Viewing the world through sites affords researchers an augmented reality of space which takes into account practices that would not otherwise be considered to be spatial.

This understanding of linguistic sites as emergent is especially important for languages which do not have an orthography or dictionary. The latter have no formal signs of existence because they have not undergone scientific inquiry, but their importance should not be predicated on scientific (etic) principles alone. As tribes are growing extremely protective of their languages, they risk losing any historical acknowledgement were they to disappear or simply fall out of favor with a mainstream strand of experts. I therefore propose that the issue is not purely linguistic or spatial, but ontological.

Chapter 5.   Ontological Analysis

The question of the ontology of language has caused many rifts in the language community, from Chomsky's 1986 distinction between I(nternal)-language and E(xternal)-language to Devitt and Sterelny's 1989 theory of tokens of language. I have illustrated that language is not anchored in one place, but rather born out of one's need to communicate. Perhaps more helpfully, de Certeau considered speech acts as a tactic: "a calculated action determined by the absence of a proper locus. … The space of a tactic is the space of the other" (de Certeau 1984, 37).

Alastair Pennycook further refined the view of language as practice by rooting it in the "local" (Pennycook 2010). I shall thus consider that each occurrence of language grows and flourishes out of the local environment in which it was uttered, permeating through and bridging the various domains of our experience together:

> Practices prefigure activity: they are not reducible to things we do, but rather are the organizing principle behind them. Hence the usefulness of looking at practices as meso-political action to capture the level of activity between the individual and the social. Language, from this perspective, becomes a social practice, as are language teaching, translation and language policy: such practices operate above the level of activity and below the level of social order, as mediators of how things are done. (Pennycook 2010, 29)

Pennycook's characterization of language as a practice of a human potential effectively removes it from the geographical grid; the only way to find language in the landscape is to focus on how people actualize it – transforming our immediate environment into a space for linguistic knowledge to unfold.

This realization comes with the acknowledgement that language is "eminently complex" much like space. Alessandro Duranti hinted that the boundaries of a language community need to be "definable on grounds other than linguistic homogeneity" (Duranti 1988, 217).

5.1.   Ontological Coincidences between Space and Language

In the modern history of philosophy, the disconnect between space as a concept and space as an ontology has been first approached through semiotics, notably since Alfred Korzybski's 1931 statement that "the map is not the territory." (Korzybski 1990, 170) Interestingly, his very next exemplar concerns language, as he parallels his previous premise with the statement that "Words are not the things they represent" (Korzybski 1990, 171). In a

sense, Korzybski saw maps as dictionaries of space, purely representational of a unique spatial reality. He later warns that

> The label 'identification' is applied to the semantic process of wrong evaluation going on inside of our skins on the un-speakable objective levels, when we are not aware of the differences between different orders of abstractions. […] If we try to identify a name for a definition, implying permanence, with the objective level which is made up of absolute individuals, and represents ever-changing processes, we must live in a delusional world in which we should expect every kind of paradoxes [*sic*] and psycho-logical shocks (Korzybski 1990, 171)

Following his argument, the naming of places mistakenly implies permanence in our environment and a static view of space which obfuscates not only its complexity but the views that other cultures may hold about space and place. Korzybski thus foretold the issues with scales, by which (relatively) temporary geographical areas are given relatively permanent names, and the issues with speech communities, by which languages are given permanent names according to certain parameters, not allowing room for their constantly evolving nature.

5.1.1. Ontological Objects

It is therefore important firstly to recognize that we are only able to produce heuristic accounts of language and space (the words in dictionaries, the geometric shapes on maps), whose nature extends far beyond our comprehension. These accounts will be deeply influenced by our perceptions and reflect our modes of thinking and the diversity of visions that constitutes the totality of our knowledge. The popular perception of American Indians and their languages is skewed by multiple factors, first and foremost the complicated history that I have mentioned above, often escaping the grasp of laymen and experts alike. A related issue is geographical seclusion of American Indians, hindering first-hand contact and experience of the indigenous side of the argument. Because Indian Affairs have built their own set of rules, proximate tribes even in the same state may not receive the same benefits depending on their individual treaty negotiations and histories. It is easy to see how this situation gave rise to many misconceptions (and ultimately stereotypes) about the American Indian situation.

Henceforth, it is crucial that we take into account this diversity in order to reflect indigenous space (and, widely speaking, the world around us) more exhaustively. Failure to do this will inevitably produce endless amounts of paradoxical studies, *e.g.*, maps of the United

States where indigenous peoples are either everywhere or nowhere to be found, or linguistic accounts of dead languages that are still spoken.

I have used the term "emergent" without defining it clearly; though the concept is not entirely new in physical sciences, it has been revivified in the latter part of the twentieth century with the advent of new technologies that have broadened our understanding of quantum physics and molecular biology. The ability to observe living and non-living systems at the microscopic level has put complexity at the center stage of scientific study and exposed the propensity of complex systems to adapt when their equilibrium is disturbed. The same principle has come to be applied in social sciences, where complexity is more readily observable though not necessarily easier to explain (Eve, Horsfall and Lee 1997).

Generally speaking, the term "emergence" occurs throughout in the philosophy of sciences to signify that from one set of initial conditions, several situations may occur which cannot be predicted in advance (Marion 1999). It is characterized by the dynamic appearance of new distinctive features, which do not compromise the integrity of the system but rather emerge out of their local properties (Byrne 1998). In human contexts, self-expression is thus the embodiment of emergence, evidence of our ability to react to the world around us and our will to change it. In the context of this dissertation, American Indians tribes in the United States are providing us with examples of the emergent properties of language and space in their use of sovereign power to generate sites where their societies and their languages will grow within the larger United States system. As such, it is part of a current in geography and anthropology that has been called an "ontological turn."

5.1.2. Ontological Study

Rooting geography in ontologies, the way this dissertation does, serves to counteract the dominant discourse of space as it is commonly understood. Because conventional epistemology provides an understanding of spaces as passive recipients of our attention, *ex post facto*, it does not allow for the study of spaces as they are dynamically generated by individuals who do not conform to the mainstream apparatus of power. By contrast, site ontologies are spaces that are discrete and observable (Dixon and Jones 1998) yet "always under construction […] always in the process of being made […] never finished; never closed" (Massey 2005, 9).

For indigenous peoples in particular, ontological geography provides a possibility to locate indigenous peoples in a space that is partly informed by remnants of the colonial era and

partly by the modern, neo-liberal politics that are pervasive in mainstream culture, yet entirely differentiated from both (Morgensen 2011). Failure to acknowledge this ontological difference in the past has contributed to maladapted – sometimes violently so (Blomley 2004) – policies and even established indigenous peoples as deviants for simply existing (de Leeuw, Greenwood and Cameron 2010). The aim of ontological studies is thus to provide a reference point that is grounded in the very object of study (Cloke 2011).

Another foundation of the ontological enterprise is to recognize these alternative ontologies as equally valid with those painstakingly constructed by linguists and geographers. Though they do not benefit from the backing of academic or political institutions, indigenous ontologies have their own local legitimacy and their embodied realities (Blaser 2012). Ultimately, using the concept of site enables us to look at space exclusively as indigenous peoples are using and producing it, and to set colonial structures aside since they are irrelevant, if not contrarian, to the indigenous understanding (Hodge and Lester 2006).

This dissertation has to this point provided an application of the ontological site to American Indian speech communities derived from the language policy practices of indigenous tribes. However that analysis would not be complete without an ontological look at language itself. Lest we forget, language policies do not only affect peoples, they also affect the languages, which are also complex and generative.

5.2. Complexity of Language

Speaking of the complexity of language does not only refer to the thousands of words in dictionaries or multiple grammatical structures; as a matter of fact, anthropological linguistics has more often than not been dedicated to the study of words that do not appear in the dictionaries as well as ungrammatical sentences (Duranti 2001, 22). We have seen that political boundaries are imposing arbitrary limitations to the study of places, and in the same fashion reserving linguistic studies to officially sanctioned methods of expression is obliterating part of the reality of language. Following the same line of thought, the languages spoken in economically successful nations are receiving a lot more public attention (that includes scientific literature) than those spoken by communities less economically relevant (Lippi-Green 1997, Romaine 1994).

5.2.1. Linguistic Creativity

In 1981, philosopher Paul Ricoeur pointed out that "language could extend itself to its very limits forever discovering new resonances within itself" (Ricoeur in Kearney 2004, 127). It could be argued that our language abilities are bounded by several elements: from sentence structure to word formation and the few words that we have learned in our schooling. Efficient use of language, much like the efficient use of power, consists in tapping into our (linguistic) potential – otherwise formulated as "meaning potential" (Halliday 1977, 64) or "communicative competence" (Hymes 1972a) – in order to achieve the most accurate expression of ourselves. Giorgio Agamben describes the exercise of freedom as creating a "zone of indistinction" between the possible and the impossible, "in which possibility and reality, potentiality and actuality, become indistinguishable" (Agamben, The Coming Community 1993, 182).

There are no doubts about the complexity of language, acknowledged by neurolinguists and grammaticians (Miestamo, Sinnemäki and Karlsson 2008) who acknowledge the "remarkable complexity and range" (Chomsky 1965, 28) of our internalized grammars. Formal typologies certainly allow us to group languages according to set attributes such as etymology, morphology or syntax, which are beyond the grasp of speakers not trained in linguistics. Nevertheless, anthropological linguists must also be able to recognize the increased complexity of their task by accounting for idiosyncrasies, neologisms and errors without altogether dismissing them as aberrations – in the same way subaltern populations should not be dismissed from population studies. Besides adding to understanding of languages, these studies also serve to value non-standard forms of language by the same standards as international languages (Lippi-Green 1997).

In my argument for a complex site ontology, the complexity of language forms as well as language production finds a new resonance. Because we produce language emergently, instantaneously, we encounter such interstitial situations all the time in conversation: we are dealing with a virtually unlimited lexicon that cannot be reduced to the words we know at any given moment: it is not rare that we need to invent new words to convey new ideas, new concepts. From the potential linguistic resources that we have, we are fine-tuning the sentences that will best convey the meaning that we are intending. Zawada pointed out that "(Linguistic) creativity is an essential and pervasive, but multi-dimensional characteristic of all human beings (irrespective of age, education, intelligence, social status or artistic bent)." (Zawada 2006, 235).

We therefore need to emphasize that those languages that are considered global today are exceptions rather than a linguistic norm. They have achieved this status due to colonial history and economic concerns, not because they would be somehow more apt to represent the world than others. Moreover, speaking of English (for instance) as a global language is only partially true: anyone who has heard someone from the United Kingdom, Australia, South Africa or India speak English can observe that these are actually variants of the same base language. It could be argued that these are ontologically different languages as accent and lexicon may be substantially different to the (extreme, yet probable) point of obscuring comprehension. (See Schneider 2007 for a discussion of the reach of World Englishes.)

Conversely, there are languages that are only found in very specific parts of the world because their speakers were historically isolated (Basque, Korean, Zuni) or on the contrary because they could only appear in very specific situations of contact (pidgins and creoles created by an assemblage of colonial, indigenous and local languages). Alastair Pennycook has described language as "always local" (Pennycook 2010, 72), *i.e.*, the products of situated histories. Before scale terminology used the term local to designate the micro, the term is also reminiscent of Carl Sauer and early modern geographers who emphasized "local" knowledge in the understanding of space (Sauer 1920). Local knowledge[2] of space contains a wealth of information for the geographers just as well as local knowledge of language contains a wealth of knowledge for the linguists (Pennycook 2010). Conversely, local knowledge has a component of familiarity that makes it more readily identifiable to locals; for instance when one recognizes their regional speech variety in their interlocutor's voice.

5.2.2. Constructing a Frame of Reference

Language acts as a medium between us and the world; the use of a word inevitably conjures an image or a concept in the mind of the listener. This imagined object may however be entirely different from one listener to another, because they have grown up in different cultural contexts and therefore have not experienced the world in the same manner. This formal

---

[2] Local knowledge used to be referred to as "indigenous knowledge" at a time when geography was embracing new technologies and reneging on popular understandings of space (Grillo 2002). Local knowledge became slowly rehabilitated in areas where modern technologies failed (Diawara 2000, Huntington and Fernández-Giménez 1999) and then gained ground in metropolitan areas (Potter, et al. 2003) as hegemonic forms of knowledge came under scrutiny (Robbins 2004). Critical approaches to local knowledge have also surfaced, emphasizing the relative nature of what constitutes the "local" (Harris, et al. 1995) and the dialectic relationships that constitute them (Jovchelovitch 2007)

relationship between the existential world and the linguistic forms is called indexicality, and it can be extended to the larger cultural referential framework.

Issues of indexicality are especially crucial when translation is involved because slight differences of meaning are not always perceptible without proper linguistic training. On a formal level, discrepancies in indexicality were often pointed out in educational materials which used to be produced for American Indian schools nationally, with no regard for the differences in local cultures and knowledges. The Meriam Report of 1928, which was intended to review the educational strategies employed for indigenous education, pointed out that:

> It is doubtful if any state nowadays in compiling a course of study even for its comparatively limited territory would do what the national government has attempted to do, that is to adopt a uniform course of study for the entire Indian Service and require it to be carried out in detail. The Indian school course of study is clearly not adaptable to different tribes and different individuals; it is built mainly in imitation of a somewhat older type of public school curricula now recognized as unsatisfactory, even for white schools, instead of being created out of the lives of Indian people, as it should be[.] (Meriam Report 1928)

This failure to properly address educational needs is relevant on many levels: the intended recipient of the teaching methods used in American Indian schools was a mainstream American child from another decade, and thus the system failed to relate with indigenous children. By extension, the model for American Indian diplomacy was copied from the model of international relations, functioning upon principles of geographical separation and mutual respect which did not exist in the colonial era, leading to a failure in Indian affairs as a whole. Of course, not all failures were indexical in nature, but these two examples seem especially symptomatic of the situation.

More internally, I have pointed out that the identification of American Indians is further complicated today by the volume of legal precedents and administrative conditions that tribes are required to fulfill. As a result, in its most essential form, the vocabulary used to relate tribal titles and language names consists of descriptors chosen by outsiders to the tribes: most famously, the name "Eskimo" was commonly used until the late twentieth century to designate Inuit and Yupik peoples, though the exact origin of the term is uncertain (Mailhot 1978, Goddard 1996) and the name "Sioux" designated at least three distinct linguistic groups (Gibbon 2003). Interestingly, a possible etymology (borrowing from the neighboring Innu-aimun and proto-Algonquian

language respectively) for both names is "speaking a different language;" to this day, the names "Eskimo" and "Sioux" remain in the official nomenclature of language families.

Similarly, the tribal names used by the Bureau of Indian Affairs reflect the hegemonic agenda and decades of policies oblivious to the diversity of indigenous peoples, which were irrelevant to a colonial mindframe in which the cultures and their corresponding languages would eventually give way to the American way of life. Today, referring to tribes by their linguistic denominations is a much more accurate manner to identify the cultural allegiances of the tribes, even though one must remain discerning in finding the various speech communities contained within the tribal denominations. For example, the Alabama-Quassarte tribal town of Oklahoma counts among its members speakers of three Muscogean languages, including the Mvskoke language in addition to the Alabama and Koasati languages, which are very closely related. Alabama language is considered extinct in the Alabama-Quassarte tribal town, while Koasati, also called Coushatta or Quassarte, is the only language maintained by a language program, which is receiving financial support from the Alabama-Coushatta tribe of Texas (Alabama-Quassarte, p.c., 2011).

By providing the framework for language practices, the different language ideologies amongst the tribes have fostered more or less thriving environments for the languages, and the cohabitation of two tribes on the same geographical tract is not necessarily synonymous with equal economic support. Nevertheless, if two communities with vivacious languages are living together such as the Confederated Salisk and Kootenai tribes of Montana, they will enact different policies for the protection of the different languages that are spoken by the tribe (Confederated Salisk and Kootenai, p.c., 2011), asserting each their own sovereignty against the artificiality of hegemonic political divisions.

A site approach is absolutely required to establish a properly referential system for outsiders to avoid false assumptions when approaching tribes and their languages. Because they are mediating cultural items for speech communities, the referential systems of American Indian languages cannot be understood in the terms of other cultures. Just as educational materials must be developed specifically for a certain site, so must policies take into account the individual history and environment of the tribes in order to treat them fairly. This issue is all the more crucial if we consider multivariety as explained below.

5.2.3. Multivariety and Variation

The multivariety of languages is easily exemplified: the English language is spoken in the U.S. and the United Kingdom (among many others), yet it is easy to make out that American English and British English are not the same when spoken or even written. They are undoubtedly similar in a number of respects but certainly different varieties of what used to be a single language source. Considering that about 400 years ago a majority of settlers came from the United Kingdom and therefore spoke British English, we are reminded of how fast language can change. Depending on the typologies, linguists are finding between three (Greenberg 1987) and over a hundred original language groups in North America (Campbell 1997). In the most favorable conditions, linguists have only recorded less than two hundred years of data regarding indigenous languages of the United States, a sober reminder of how little information is available to understand the breadth of their variation.

American Indian tribes in the U.S. have experienced the emergent change of languages firsthand, accelerated by the colonial effort: the Bear River tribe of Rohnerville in California have lost all their fluent speakers of Athabaskan and attempted to restore the language via an exchange program with a Hawaiian school – following the pioneering Pūnana Leo model which has provided a blueprint for a fair amount of early immersion schools in the United States (McCarty 2006) – that teaches a different dialect from the one they had developed. My interlocutor explained to me that "close by they change, thousands of miles away they stay the same" (Bear River Rohnerville, p.c., 2011). One question that may arise is: when are two linguistic practices different enough to become two separate languages? Speaking in terms of site allows us to recognize that even though the Athabaskan language is evolved in many ways depending on its localities, the interaction of a California tribe with a Hawaiian school (as well as input from experts at the University of Alaska-Fairbanks) encapsulates their language practice within one and the same site, despite the lack of formal connections between the locales.

As we have pointed out above, site is eminently complex in that it recognizes the different agents and their definitions of variation. The same applies to registers of language: we usually learn very early which registers of our mother tongue are appropriate in what contexts (or sites). If one is willing to accommodate difference, there is no reason for researchers to discard their view as invalid or judge it to be superior or inferior. Variation happens whether speakers want it to or not, and it also may happen even if they do not want it. After decades of

collaborating with Mexicans, the Kumeyaay San Pasqual of California have told me they "added" Spanish to their traditions (Kumeyaay San Pasqual, p.c., 2011). This addition marks a continuity in terms of geographical site, even though there are two very distinct languages in conurbation.

Edward Dozier also observed that two Pueblo cultures (the Rio Grande Tewa and the Yaqui), although Spanish-language elements have encroached on their lands and culture, have developed strategies to cope with the influx of new language elements without abandoning their mother tongue (Dozier 1966a). The Yaqui represent a case in which borrowing from Spanish has been exhaustive: all aspects of Yaqui lexicon, morphology, and syntax show Spanish influence. The Yaqui language is not, however, simply a mixture of Spanish and Yaqui elements; it is an amalgam where Spanish and Yaqui elements have been thoroughly integrated (Dozier 1954, 156).

Pueblo peoples are the prime example of linguistic purism (Henningsen 1989), actively avoiding outside influences on their languages. The fact that Tewa speakers are for the most part bilingual and recognize Spanish-derived words prompts them to find new terms, primarily descriptive designations in Tewa, in order to avoid being understood when talking in the company of Spanish-speaking interlocutors. The same principle applies when Tewa speakers are in the presence of English speakers whom they suspect of knowing Spanish. (Dozier, The Hopi-Tewa of Arizona 1954, 150) Once again, I need to emphasize the continuity of the language practice for these communities, privileging intrinsic changes and adapting to their environments more readily than switching from one language to another.

The linguistic sites of the Tewa and Yaqui cannot be studied from a traditional linguistic or geographic perspective, because the Yaqui language has become a hybrid of Spanish (as Spanish language was forcefully integrated in their environment) and though the Tewa may answer that they do not speak Spanish or Tewa, Dozier observed that they preferred to remain coy about their language choice in the presence of outsiders. Yaqui and Tewa are two languages closely related by both history and geography which have evolved very differently. Other cultures may instead compartmentalize their language use: the Native language will be reserved for official, family or religious use whereas the second language will be adopted for other social and/or public situations.

I should also note that the terms "Rio Grande Pueblo" and "Yaqui Pueblo" do not correspond to modern nomenclature or designations offered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Rio Grande Pueblo culture encompasses Tewa, Towa and Tiwa languages – of the same language family yet mutually unintelligible. Speaking of the Tewa language in particular allows us to narrow the site's scope to the Pueblos of Santa Clara, Pojoaque, Nambé, San Ildefonso, and Tesuque as well as the Ohkay Owingeh (formerly known as San Juan Pueblo) and the Arizona Tewa (also known as Tano or Hano, or Thano), a federally-unrecognized tribe currently residing on the Hopi reservation.

I have learned from speaking with the telephone operator of the Hopi that the Arizona Tewa's variety of language is now difficult to understand by other Tewa speakers (Hopi, p.c., 2011), because they have maintained a strict separation between Tewa, Hopi and Spanish, unlike the speakers described by Dozier either in his study of Pueblo quoted above or in his ethnography of the Hano (Dozier 1966b). Such clear demarcation is only possible thanks to a strong linguistic (and cultural) ideology that is widely shared in the community (Dozier 1966b, 24-25); but these strong beliefs may also give rise to conflict within the community and with neighboring tribes if a contingent were to disagree with them.

5.2.4. Conflict and Conventionalization

With the kind of proximity and multivariety described above, it should not be surprising that conflicts may arise between speakers of the same language or speakers of different languages who might privilege their own language over others. All languages, and those of American Indians in particular, are often associated with spiritual and political matters that are bound to create controversy. By contrast, we consider language sites to be equally valid whether one or one million people share it, or whether one site is constituted of economically powerful or disadvantaged peoples.

Even though larger sites increase the statistical likelihood of conflict, smaller sites are not excluded from the possibility of disagreement. Conflict is part and parcel of the political process, as political endeavors reflect the urgency to change the paradigm, whether it came about organically or it was imposed by a previous administration. Since languages mark cultural activity, they are dependent on the ebb and flow of conflict and conventionalization; conventionalization is a way for communities to ensure that the language is not lost by dispersion

into too many varieties or excessive borrowing from without, both of which may cause conflict with the dominant ideology.

Both conflict and conventionalization stem from the multivariety described above, and answer the same needs for a unifying (nationalistic) agenda; whether a community is attempting to define itself in its own terms or by comparison with others is trivial to our purposes. The current situation of American Indian languages is the result of centuries of colonizing policies: governments believed that English was a superior language to the indigenous norms and believed that speaking English would undoubtedly improve the social situation of American Indians. This created conflict for tribes who wanted to preserve their mother tongues and still creates conflict today as tribal governments are enacting linguistic policies that can be contrary to the state policies.

When speakers of two distinct language communities meet, a new site of interaction will be created as members will choose what is best for them. The Saginaw of Michigan, realizing that their numbers were dwindling, have started an immersion program with another tribe in Canada speaking the Anishinaabe language, as their languages are "basically the same." If their variety of Anishinaabe was previously different, one can only assume that the new generation will be speaking the language according to the conventions set by their Canadian counterparts. Cultural survival in this case supersedes the internal differences. Similarly, the California Valley Mi'Wok tribe gathers speakers of seventeen different dialects of Mi'wok; my interlocutor informed me that in the central area of the tribe they are "all about the same at this point" as their interactions function to conventionalize the language into a new dialect perhaps unlike any of the previously existing ones (California Valley Mi'Wok, p.c., 2011).

Looking at language ontologically emphasizes its complexity far beyond the reach of scales and representational views of space. Focusing more especially on the spatial dimensions of language practices, both abstract and concrete, presents further arguments for an ontological understanding of space.

5.3. Generating Space through Language

The ontological complexity of space and language indicate that the two will intersect in various ways. Looking at indigenous peoples as sovereign generators of human practices reveals the underlying spatial elements in language.

98

5.3.1. Making Space through Language Practices

Chief among the many spatial qualities of language is its potential to include or exclude. Mastery of linguistic codes enables speakers to actively control their audience, by addressing only those who are privy to the language. Moreover, from a passive standpoint, not being able to understand linguistic cues can be a very alienating experience. The mere fact of communicating with outsiders can be seen as overstepping a boundary: the THPO of the Kashia band of Pomo who sympathized with my research and advised me that "some people may not want to talk to you, our tribe doesn't like a lot of information out there" (Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of the Stewarts Point Rancheria, p.c., 2011)

Early researchers were able to go onto reservations for their research, but they actively remained outsiders to the community by their refusal to learn indigenous languages and cultures before attempting to study them (Bieder 1986), producing inaccurate accounts of indigenous cultures in the process. Later, anthropologists attempted to rectify those early mistakes by increasing collaborative work and publication in the local languages, but it was too late as indigenous peoples had become weary of outsiders prying into their cultures and were reluctant to allow any conversation with researchers (Hymes 1972b). I argue that an additional step needs to be taken by researchers to discard even the most basic assumptions about space and language in order to re-negotiate every element in accordance with the local practices.

Language policy itself, as a formulation of linguistic ideology, also functions as a clear spatial indicator. Firstly, the very existence of an indigenous language policy clearly indicates that the language is being practiced within the community: due to their status and numbers, we can only assume that people who speak native languages are nearly exclusively indigenous. Moreover, language has a component of personal significance that is intricately tied to both culture and identity, so that people will often be proud and protective of their mother tongue. Because it is so personal, language is harder to regulate from the outside, and finally, language is instrumental in tying communities together. Consequently, language policy plays a very particular part in the assertion of indigenous identity and thus the creation of indigenous spaces. Because ancestral lands are not always available, and American Indian communities may be scattered around a state, culture becomes an extremely significant indicator of personal identity.

Besides geographical space, I now need to take an extra reflexive step and turn to studying the abstract space that is created by the popular and scientific discourse about American Indians.

5.3.2. Space and Discourse

Talking about a place - if only mentioning it by name - actualizes it in discourse, much like mentioning an issue in the media will make people more aware of it in their everyday life. Looking at political discourse, we can see that it is pretty standard fare for candidates and elected officials alike to talk about issues without necessarily tackling them: demagogy emphasizes the discourse before actions. The semiotic process for place-names is similar to that of everyday words (remember that maps are dictionaries of spaces) yet they remain the domain of different authorities. Studying geography and linguistics (and other subjects) ontologically means leaving conventions in the back of our minds and studying language and space as they are practiced instead of how they are institutionally defined.

Gayatri Spivak has thus argued in an interview with Leon de Kock that subalternity – living outside of mainstream practices of power – amounts to living in a "space of difference" (de Kock 1992, 45). Interestingly, her statement works in two ways: (1) subaltern communities are living in a space that is parallel with the institutionally-defined space of society; (2) subalternity is a physical space where people exercise their difference, by contrast with institutional space, a place of similarity where the goal is to conform. Although they have conflicting goals, people living outside of the norm do not necessarily intend to conflict with the mainstream; rather, they are defining themselves on their own terms, a practice that is often understood as undermining the authority of the hegemony.

The development of alternative media (music, news networks, practices) is part and parcel of the development of this space of difference, as subaltern communities choose to forego recognition in the mainstream and instead find their own expressions. Within alternative spaces, authority might be as clearly defined as it is in the mainstream, stemming from *ad hoc* practical agreements rather than institutionalized voting processes. Very literally, Michael Sheyahshe has registered his business as "alterNative Media," emphasizing his choice of an alternate route whilst keeping his indigenous roots (Sheyahshe, p.c., July 20, 2011).

Hegemonic systems, present throughout society in their centers of authority, have an institutional mandate to create the hegemonic space: schools, police, and the mainstream media

100

essentially dictate what is acceptable in the mainstream, and what is not. As a result from the various positivist frameworks in scientific research, it is hardly an exaggeration to state that much of social and humanistic research have been prone to what Ian Hacking has called linguistic idealism, in which "only what is talked about exists; nothing has reality until it is spoken of, or written about" (Hacking 2001, 24). This is similar to the process of creating "reality" as authoritatively described in media studies by Gaye Tuchman (Tuchman 1978) and Philip Schlesinger (Schlesinger 1978).

An early device of colonizing American Indians in the United States was to deprive them of a land base: part of the federal recognition process for tribes involves their lands being held in trust by the Federal government. While it was meant to negate the separate existence of indigenous peoples in the United States, it has turned into an instrument of control over American Indian populations, and I argue that it had perhaps unforeseen results in their morale to this day.

5.3.3. Nostalgia and the Transformation of Space into Place

The most essential dichotomy upon which human geography was founded opposes place to space; "place" is generally understood as a part of space with which one is emotionally bound (e.g. Cresswell 1996, Tilley 1994, Tuan 1979). An anthology of country music in the United States would probably present the best example of longing for a place that is lost. Yi-Fu Tuan mentioned this phenomenon as a result of urbanization in *Topohilia* (1974). He found a shared sentiment of nostalgia among poets of different eras, expressing melancholy for simpler times. It is important to note that "nostalgia" is a post-classical Latin term, coined by Johannes Hofer in 1688 to describe a medical condition otherwise known as *Heimweh* (literally "home pain", homesickness). Symptoms of nostalgia as observed by Hofer in returning soldiers include sadness, insomnia, fever, hunger, thirst, diminished senses, loss of strength, high blood pressure and even death; strong physical symptoms for a condition that is considered to be entirely psychological (Martin 1954).

Although this analysis (and definition) may be regarded as vestigial by today's medical standards, it is a testament to the overwhelming importance of place - and home - in a person's life. Discussions on the sense of place in human geography are not new, especially for populations displaced by conflict (Black 2002, Potts 2008, Yeh 2007), and more generally mobile populations (May 2000, Moore 2007, Van Criekingen 2008). We can extend this

discussion to discursive space: mainstream populations are able to see peers in the media on an everyday basis, bolstering their feeling of pride and belonging, while subaltern populations are not only ignored in the public discourse, they are also often negatively portrayed (if unintentionally), contributing to ill-feeling and certainly to their alienation from the mainstream. Reversing the logic, I would argue that economic depression and deviant behavior could be caused at least in part by nostalgia for a public space.

5.3.4. American Indian Space in America

Historically, indigenous peoples in the United States have been deprived of their identities by the mainstream government. The reality of American identity as it was promoted by the colonial government implied a narrow unity of practices, conceived as the strongest path to achieve national unity. American Indian tribes, with their own national and sovereign claims were often perceived to be standing in the way of the American ideal – and today their economic destitution is certainly a somber record for the United States.

In the early twentieth century, several pieces of legislation were enacted to return the areas of sovereignty previously taken away from the tribes, leading to drastic improvements in Indian Country (Peterson 1957). More recent developments have alternatively been advantageous, such as empowering tribes with deciding on their own membership rules (436 U.S. 49 1978), and detrimental to the tribes, especially regarding natural resources (Wilkins 2002). For all the political changes, the Secretary of Interior still retains the final authority to review tribal decisions, especially regarding the administration of Federal funds.

Some tribes have successfully negotiated a limited space for their brand of indigeneity by taking advantage of local opportunities, such as the Puyallup of Washington, whose language program is entirely funded by tribal businesses and donations from members – perhaps as a result of this self-sufficiency, they were one of the tribes who refused to further comment on the subject and redirected me to their website for further information (Puyallup, p.c., 2011). By contrast, on the Colville Reservation in Oregon, there are three programs entirely funded by the tribal business council, holding classes on alternative days in order to conversationally teach the three different indigenous languages spoken by tribal members. Though there are no fluent speakers left, the programs are collaborating on the recording of what language is left among elders, who are also teaching the classes on a volunteer basis (Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, p.c., 2011).

Another factor in fostering the development of a parallel language world is the increasing inter-tribal collaboration. Many Southwestern tribes have enacted policies to protect their languages using local connections: the Kewa Pueblo, whose infrastructure was nearly entirely destroyed and whose community was scattered following a hailstorm in 2010, have decided to ensure their cultural survival by developing a language policy based on the experience of other Pueblos (Kewa Pueblo, p.c., 2011). The Salt River Pima of Arizona (who share a reservation with the Maricopa) have similarly been sending teachers for training with the neighboring Tonoho O'Odham Nation and Gila River community in order to train them for certification (Salt River Pima, p.c., 2011).

The California Indian Museum and Cultural Center based in Santa Rosa, California has been offering language training to Pomo-speaking tribes since 2004. There are seven dialects of the language spoken in twenty-one communities of various sizes, prompting the director of the museum to declare that:

> While many of our dialects are very different, we account for the fact that many of our elders (native speakers) could communicate across dialects. Thus it is important to focus on preservation across the separate communities, support efforts and promote collaboration. (Nicole Myers-Lim, p.c., July 2, 2011)

Although there are very few native speakers of Pomo languages left, their numbers are currently growing as young tribal members who are interested in learning the language are taking classes with elders from other tribes and raising awareness in their own communities. This progress is also aided by non-tribal members who donate to the museum and academics who have contributed resources to develop the curriculum or enrich the language corpus.

For the Penobscot Nation of Maine, recipient of an ANA grant for Language Preservation and Maintenance in 2005 and 2011, an important aspect of the protecting the language resides in regaining control of the linguistic resources that concern their own language. In the grant application process from previous years, they have discovered that non-tribal members were applying in the name of the tribe in order to publish the work of Frank Siebert, whose archives contain the most comprehensive information about Algonquian languages and especially the Penobscot language. The head of the cultural department for the Nation is currently attempting to secure the rights to access Siebert's work, for some "healing around language loss" (Penobscot Nation, p.c., 2012) as the tribe is vulnerable to outsiders profiting from their cultural property, a sentiment echoed by the Isleta Pueblo language coordinator (Isleta Pueblo, p.c., 2011).

Unfortunately, not all tribes have a sufficient support network and when languages disappear, the loss is not only linguistic: the Wichita & Affiliated tribe of Oklahoma only has one fluent speaker remaining, eighty-four years of age. Unable to garner enough interest about a full-fledged language program, the tribe is attempting to record as much of the language as possible, noting that one of the difficulties they meet is that the elder is "sad about not being able to speak to others." (Wichita & Affiliated, p.c., 2011) While I have mostly focused on the creation of spaces up to this point, the loss of space and community is also relevant to our discussion.

5.3.5. The Effects of Lost Space

Native Americans have nearly been exterminated following a forcible integration by U.S. federal and state agents into a frame of existence that was not designed to accommodate them. They have been physically and culturally dislocated from every part of existence with which they were familiar, from their land to their religions and languages. There are very few Native American cultural activities that have not been co-opted or altogether eradicated, leaving little room for finding refuge in cultural practices. There are very limited options for indigenous peoples to find inspiration in the mainstream system. Language is an especially important component in fostering the feeling of home because it carries in itself an entire set of cultural references and attitudes such as accent, slang or humor, which are conjured by the very act of speaking. When we visit foreign places, hearing someone speak our language is a reassuring element that is – literally – lost in translation.

To this day, medical practitioners are still discovering how indigenous peoples in the U.S. are physically and mentally affected by their living situation: although their economic and demographic situation have improved overall in the last 50 years, cases of substance abuse and suicide in Indian country have skyrocketed, far above the national average (Indian Health Service 2005). Though they can only partially account for such dismal health conditions, the cultural losses endured by the tribes have certainly played a role in the increased anxiety levels and lifestyle changes. This anecdote published in a Public Health Report certainly seems to support such a theory:

> One of the tribal leaders asked a young psychiatrist to describe the nature of the mental problem among American Indians. […] After a length of time in which everybody was becoming quite uncomfortable, the then and still present chairman of the

> Miccosukee tribe of Florida, Mr. Buffalo Tiger, stood up and said, "Let me explain it this way." "Today," he said, "Indians are like a man who got up early in the morning and looked out his door and saw something shining in the road a little way away. It was something he wanted and he walked over and picked it up and when he was done picking it up he saw something further along that he also wanted. He went and got that and it happened again and he kept walking down the road picking up things. Then, all of a sudden, he turned around and he couldn't find his way back home again." (Townsley and Goldstein 1977)

The physical separation between the tribes and general population as well as among the tribes themselves makes it difficult for them to create a support network (although new technologies are changing slowly changing in this aspect). What is more, their ideological isolation and subsequent ill-feelings that many have developed against Indians who are perceived to receive unfair privileges have not made their lives easier.

5.4. Decolonized Practices

I have shown that studying language as it is spoken within artificial geographical areas is inaccurate in the best cases. A nationwide survey usually drowns minority languages to percentile fractions, and a survey at the census tract level for example will create an arbitrary division within communities which are otherwise united. Additionally, surveys relying on self-evaluation will inevitably yield a number of aberrant results, as diverse as the personalities of respondants.

The human ability to articulate language is a function of brain: everyone can potentially produce every language, natural or artificial, dead or alive; this ability may unfold anywhere in the world, based on the presence of an interlocutor, and the initiation of a communicative situation. The speech communities of non-standard languages such as "nerd girls" (Bucholtz 1999) cannot be mapped in terms of areas, nor can discussions using "1337 speak" (Leblanc 2005) be pinpointed in one place. This is a testament to the instantaneity of language production: it cannot be accounted for in either conventional space or a timeline because it only exists in the realm of interaction. By focusing on the collaborative aspects, the concept of site is capable of accounting for even the smallest of interactions, with no upward limitation to their breadth. Using such methodology, there is no possible supremacy or order of importance for the study of human phenomena and no hierarchy as they all exist on the same (flat) plane of human ability.

Additionally, since sites are not contingent upon a particular political paradigm, they can also account for past events that may only have resonance in archaeological evidence. As ontology, the concept of site applies whether we can find artifacts in the physical landscape or not, so long as we can derive a practical observation; this eliminates issues of validity regarding so-called imaginary places, artificial idioms, mythical lands and heritage languages. Instead of relying on the vocabulary of dominant governmental systems, subaltern spaces can be represented in terms of sites to be analytically on par with nation-states and villages, local dialects are as potent as language spoken worldwide. I shall thus argue that scales are not only inadequate for geographical study, but also they reflect a hegemonic thinking system that has contributed at least in part to perpetuating stereotypes into scientific research and political practice. Site gives us an opportunity to decolonize the discipline of geography and in turn inform a decolonized policy.

Further, a site approach provides meaningful spatial units for study that are not altogether severed from the real-world experience of place. Favoring ontological spatial qualities of space or language means exploiting all of their facets as constitutive of the ontology and choosing not to discard marginal elements for legibility purposes. I have pointed out that language itself does not have spatiality, any more than humans do further than their arms' reach yet there are no limits to their spatial reach – consequently, the emphasis on human practices produces a truly human geography. This involves approaching indigeneity not as an attribute or label, but rather as an exercise of personal identity and thus the marking of a territory. The malleability of identity, much like that of space and language, is therefore to be accepted as an inevitable fact of human existence instead of a deviance that needs to be bent into shape to be subject to scientific scrutiny.

5.4.1. Creativity and Emergence

Language practices are the result of the creative use of human linguistic potential. Similarly, spatial practices are the result of creative use of human spatial potential. Michel Foucault and his followers have argued that the primary role of institutions is to stifle human creativity: if power is immanent in mankind, freedom is the necessary condition for us to express our power.

> At the very heart of the power relationship, and constantly provoking it, are the recalcitrance of the will and the intransigence

of freedom. Rather than speaking of an essential freedom, it would be better to speak of an 'antagonism' – of a relationship which is at the same time reciprocal incitation and struggle; less of a face-to-face confrontation which paralyzes both sides than a permanent provocation. (Foucault 1982, in Allen 2003, 77-8)

Modern governments, which are constantly looking to achieve hegemony and maintain the status quo, will therefore prevent the individual exercise of power by restricting freedom. This thought-provoking, albeit grim, view of government has rung true for a number of thinkers (*e.g.* Fairclough 1989, Rose 1990, Pile 1995, Soja 1996, Hannah 2000).

5.4.2. Creative Freedom

We must also point out that this issue cannot be reduced to economic status or cultural deviance, as Sallie Marston pointed out, even within one given societal framework smaller spaces are often fragmented by a dominant ideology, giving the patriarchal model as an example:

> Ideally, men and women occupied separate, naturally ordained, nonoverlapping spheres of influence and operation: the public one men's and the private women's. In reality, however, while bourgeois patriarchal ideology constructed a role for women in the private sphere, the two spheres tended more to overlap than to exist in isolation. (Marston 2000, 235)

Similarly, English-Speaking U.S. ideology has created a role for non-English languages as a historical relic incompatible with modern existence. By analogy, immigrant and indigenous peoples are constantly fighting the position of inferiority assigned to them by asserting their cultural identities by using their languages in modern situations and creative ways.

More generally speaking, I argue that hegemonic discourse has contributed to creating a time and place for subaltern groups (such as women or indigenous peoples) that fits its own comfortable expectations, and hidden behind a discourse of equality and unity. Marston further points out that "Women, through their social roles as wives, mothers and managers of the household, participate in the maintenance *as well as (at times) the alteration of the cultural systems* that reinforce and require these roles." (Marston 2000, 234, emphasis added). Creative power has led women to challenge the established power structure in order to further their own goal of equality; similarly, indigenous peoples since the latter half of the twentieth century have come to challenge the hegemonic discourse imposed onto them by enacting language policies that are enabling them to regain some cultural sovereignty and maintain their ideological difference.

107

There are several cases of tribal language programs stemming from non-linguistic initiatives. For the Isleta Pueblo, the language program was founded as part of a first-language counseling technique within a social work program sponsored by the state. When welfare funds ran out, they were encouraged by the positive results of first-language assistance and decided to make it part of their education department for more families to benefit from the efforts. Examples include the Lac Flambeau Chippewa who also fund language classes through their Wellness Center, as do the Chehalis of Washington. The Karuk tribe has benefitted from a grant by The California Council for the Humanities designed to preserve Californian folk stories in order to record their elders.

The Ho-Chunk Nation of Wisconsin have started funding their language classes through their gaming compact, which requires that the tribe be credited a fraction of their State fees to be used for public benefit projects (teaching is not explicitly mentioned in the compact, but rather the tribe negotiated funding the project with the state (State of Wisconsin 1992)). Interestingly, Official English legislations have been defeated several times in Wisconsin since 1985 (Wiconsin Legislative Reference Bureau 2002). The state's politico-linguistic atmosphere cannot be underestimated in the creation of tribal linguistic initiatives as the tribes rely on state funds for most of their public enterprises. While the Isleta Pueblo aforementioned consider themselves lucky to be able to protect their language, less than fifty miles away the less populated San Felipe Pueblo is struggling to maintain a community class on a year-to-year basis and have closed the community to visitors. Their language is entirely oral, and they have been turned down for federal funding due to the lack of documentation; the vitality of the language therefore relies entirely on state funding, as well as the will of community members to defend it (San Felipe Pueblo, p.c., 2011).

Complete isolation is a last resort but it is the most radical protection against constantly expanding spaces for this Pueblo and tribes such as the Tonto Apache whose languages are entirely oral. The Miccosukkee of Florida, whose land is an island in the Everglades and was undiscovered until the beginning of the twentieth century, have preserved their language entirely (they rarely allow visitors and were very reticent to answer my questions). It is perhaps the only way for a tribe to ensure complete freedom within its own boundaries and to maximize their resources.

5.5. Conclusion

The spatiality of indigenous peoples is similarly both inherited and emergently created: having aboriginal status, they benefit from special legal and geographical prerogatives within the power structure that was built around them, and today they fight for recognition and equal footing in the modern world. Though isolated from the mainstream population, they have found creative ways to take advantage of the authority and funds afforded to them by their indigenous status.

The relationship between language and space works thus both ways: language allows one to create environments and one's environments affect their languages. Language exists as a medium between people, as it allows us to communicate, to influence each other's lives in a certain way; it is therefore very sentimentally valuable to us, beyond its practical aspects. I have experienced this first-hand when strangers' eyes lit up as they heard I could speak French in foreign countries: from fellow travelers to expatriates to minority speakers in Louisiana and Canada, it was clearly a boon that I could communicate in a language they understood. This was even more true for those who could identify my regionalisms, or at least identify a non-standard variation in my speech: similar languages and accents bring up a feeling of familiarity like no other: the "mother tongue" is the one spoken at home.

Speaking in terms of site, we can observe the creation of indigenous space, whereby tribal members interact and share the same vision of society, while still belonging to the wider frame of reference of the United States by obeying state laws and generally interacting with the mainstream population. By contrast, their languages have reached a critically low point and too much input from outsiders may prove to be detrimental; as a result, many tribes are also favoring immersive approaches to teach their languages. As much as possible, they foster environments where only the indigenous language is spoken; whether in a classroom or school-wide, these methods have been found be the most efficient to revive endangered languages. Policy then becomes a crucial element because it is only way for these linguistic sites to be created and respected.

Chapter 6.   Conclusions

6.1.   Summary

I started this dissertation upon the premise that all knowledge generated within a hegemonic framework should be closely examined for biases. Though spatial and linguistic knowledge may seem universal at first glance, looking at alternative practices from subaltern populations exposes the misleading nature of epistemologically given units such as geographical scales and speech communities. Insofar as studies relying on scale only reflect the hegemonic point of view, they are also incompatible with the lives of populations who live outside of the hegemonic framework, whether by choice or circumstance: "Preoccupied with questions of capitalist production, contemporary writing about scale in human geography has failed to comprehend the real complexity behind the social construction of scale and therefore tells only part of a much more complex story" (Marston 2000, 233). Maps of political entities and national interests are therefore not suited for the study of populations whose existence was negated for the very making of these maps; similarly, the vocabulary to describe their situation is often lacking to describe phenomena that are not politically sanctioned. The ontological concept of site is a remedy for the geographical disciplines to this nomenclatural failure, and I decided to apply it to the issue of indigenous language planning.

In Chapter Two, I anchored my inquiry in the concept of power, which undergirds in large part any discussion on politics and political divisions. Site can be used as a container for power as it is conceived by Michel Foucault and others, *i.e.* as a dynamic and dialectic relational event. Instead of using political divisions as the foundational boundaries for societies, site serves to shift the focus to political action, whereby I integrate American Indians into the discussion of power in the United States. Rather than considering tribes as leftovers of a past era, I demonstrated that they are active political units whose sovereignty is both confirmed by the U.S. federal government and affirmed by the political decisions taken daily by indigenous individuals. These are the decisions that make up the "site" of American Indians across reservation and state boundaries.

From that vantage point, I studied in Chapter Three how their language policies are serving the very same agenda as those of the United States in terms of power. They are allowing tribes to concretely engage with their populations on a political level to foster a sense of

community (that maintains the ontological site in existence) and protect their heritage even though they are generally neglected by federal and state authorities.

In Chapter Four, I gave specific examples of how American Indian communities are functioning with that decentralized power structure. Depending on local cultures, the initiative to articulate a language policy may emanate from a conventional power source (*i.e.*, tribal government) as well as any citizen with a vested interest in the language (i.e. librarians, basket-weavers, environmental specialists). In this context, language policies are the result of a common effort to instill linguistic knowledge in realms of life that are less regulated than political life. Similarly, I have argued that using schools as a primary conduit to promote language use is a direct reversal of boarding school policies, ultimately serving to rebuild the indigenous site around shared cultural values. If separating the children from their families was a drastic method to destroy aboriginal communities at their core, using immersion strategies in schools today is serving to strengthen the sense of communal belonging already present in schools and in hopes to spur language use in the households (as recommended in the Esther Martinez Act of 2006, for instance).

In Chapter Five, I examined how the use of a one-sided system of thinking has in turn created a positivist scientific tradition of partial representations implicitly validating any object that fits biased descriptors and invalidating elements that do not fit. However, looking at so-called "marginal" phenomena ontologically allows for the recognition of their inherent multifacetedness and the depth of their repercussions in the real world. By contrast, ontological studies also place non-mainstream identities and personhoods on the same level as the hegemonic site in terms of their immanent power, in spite of the epistemological hierarchy that is embedded in political order and decision-making. Using epistemological tools only functions *post-facto* and fails to recognize events as they unfold, whereas ontological studies focus on the elaborative processes as they happening. Ontological sites thus carry a lot more cultural importance and personal relevance because they are attached to the embodied experience of living.

Rather than unconditionally adopting an entirely external or internal point of view, the concept of site and by extension ontological geography means accepting difference and diversity as constitutive of society. Perhaps more importantly, it forces us to recognize the limits of our comprehension compared to the infinite constructive possibilities of space, language and power.

We harken to Schatzki here in asserting that language, power and space are each connecting people in their own "complex, open, and multiply integrated mesh." (Schatzki 2002, xxi). These are dynamic relational sites that may be approached and expressed by a multitude of avenues (practices); that may be interacted with at will; and that may contain multiple iterations of themselves in a constantly shape-shifting object. This object is thus by essence incompatible with the hegemonic, standardizing mainstream; attempts from the mainstream to capture these objects only produce an inaccurate but convenient translation (representation, iteration). Looking at each phenomenon ontologically allows us to view them for what they are instead of viewing them by comparison with fixated forms whereby they are ill-fitting, recondite, and ultimately innocuous (Smith and Varzi 2000).

6.2.   Findings

As evidenced in this study, language and space share very similar ontologies: from our linguistic knowledge, we can draw practical information and construct ways to speak that ultimately strengthen our linguistic interactions; from our spatial knowledge, we are able to structure spaces for ourselves and for our kin to be in the world (*dasein*) together. The linguistic "speech community" and the geographical concept of site are two applications of these ontologies which rely not so much on ready-made categories but rather emergently manifest themselves in our social lives.

Just as the linguistic turn has forecasted a re-envisioning of practices in social sciences and further explored elements of language dissociated from established standards, shifting the attention away from normalization and onto the complexity of language production, I propose that the inclusion of non-standard spaces into the mainstream understanding of geography is the most potent solution to revalue subaltern spaces throughout the world. As such, site ontologies are providing a novel solution to a concern that has been present in cultural (K. Mitchell 2007, Aitken 2001) and human geography (Castree 2004, D. Featherstone 2008) and generally rampant in radical social studies during the last few decades.[3]

The heuristic advantage of such ontologies is that they are equally applicable to the infinitely small as they are to the infinitely large. In other words, whether one person creates an entirely idiosyncratic personal space (with its own invented language) or if each and every one

---

[3] Antonio Gramsci has notoriously recommended that subaltern social groups be considered "in continuous but disorganic expansion, unable to go beyond a certain qualitative level, which still remains below the level of the possession of the State and of the real exercise [*sic*] of hegemony over the whole of society" (Gramsci 1971, 396)

were speak the same universal language and forego all territorial forms, the social principles of assembly would remain the same. Issues of prestige (whether economic, political or linguistic) do not apply and because they share the same ontological basis, and the sites of American Indian language use in the United States are just as valid a unit of study as the fabricated site of homogenous English-speaking that Official English lobbies are promulgating above all minority languages.

Indigenous peoples of the United States are building their societies and sites in the twenty-first century in accordance with their own cultural practices and towards their own political goals, all the while participating in the same economy and national allegiance as mainstream U.S. society. Indigenous livelihoods are now very much integrated into mainstream society and save certain formal exceptions such as the CDIB, there are few outward signs of indigenous identity; thus I have chosen to study indigenous peoples through their languages, which are both a mundane element and a strong identity marker that can be regulated. Languages can uniquely convey both physical existence and ideological activity: when languages are spoken, they are the proof that the people are alive and that they are making a political effort to retain their particularity. Though indigenous languages have subsided, their continued existence to this day is an observable proof of the vitality of American Indian sites in the United States.

The adoption of explicit or implicit language policies marks the solidification of indigenous power and as such they are sometimes perceived as a threat to hegemonic power. Ontologically however, the linguistic planning efforts are not meant to rival the existence of English but rather to cultivate a local culture that is relevant and significant for the tribes' prosperity. Due to their local histories and the system in which they have become embedded, American Indians are living a political existence of constant action and reaction to residing in one of the largest, most powerful countries in the world. The tribes' recourse to emergent forms of power should not be considered their choice to be dissident but their expression of sovereignty when faced with the result of the inadequate governmental structure that the colonial era has fashioned around them (as is consistent with Heideggerian and Foucauldian visions of productive immanent power). In other words, the survival of indigenous languages in spite of adversity further supports the fact that American Indian power does not primarily exist because indigenous peoples are a minority in the U.S., but rather because they are simply living in the world. However, hegemonic power is providing an epistemological place for indigenous peoples which

is disempowered and infertile, and ontological analysis serves to re-evaluate this bias and return indigenous peoples to a site of power.

By threading together theories from geography, anthropology, and linguistics rooted in critical thinking, I recommend to understand language and space ontologically rather than within the epistemological confines of any one of the disciplines. For the concept of site in particular, adopting an ontological stance means to set aside the spatial pre-conceptions that appear on maps and other previous geographical endeavors in order to allow spatial areas to reveal themselves organically; though it is tempting to rely on existing language typologies, the ontological purview serves as reminder to remain critical of all linguistic data as language practice is constantly changing. More pointedly, I adduct that an ontological approach is better suited to reflect modes of thinking that are too often lost in the linear, regimented practices of academia (Fixico 2003) by its acknowledgement not only of the existence of alternative worldviews but also of the deeply personal affectations in the construction of social realities as well.

6.3. Site Contributions

The concept of site remains a recent addition to the geographers' toolbox and it has not received much practical application at the time of writing this dissertation. This dissertation is further enriching the idea by establishing strong philosophical linkages with anthropological and linguistic study, where similar avenues have been (or are currently being) explored (Heath 2012, Ochs 2012, Reich 2011, Shohamy 2006). As many authors argue for the existence of an ontological turn in social sciences, this dissertation contributes to the ontological literature for the geography and social sciences in the United States, where indigenous studies tend to focus on disputes regarding natural resources and economic welfare, leaving cultural studies in the background.

Anchoring geographical research in ontologies renders the praxis more accessible to indigenous peoples themselves, whether as academics or as participants in the study (Howitt and Suchet-Pearson 2006); in this sense the "discipline" effaces itself in favor of a less coercive guidance in the comprehension of space. Moreover it provides an understanding of indigenous spatial thinking for researchers outside of the realm of indigenous studies (Turnbull 2005) by engaging in a mutual conversation that is also a fundamentally collaborative questioning of the elements of space which are generally accepted as common sense. Though they do not provide a

key into aboriginal minds, spatial ontologies do provide an open platform for collaboration (Larsen and Johnson 2012).

These developing methodological endeavors are paving the way for more in-depth studies of sites as autonomous units with their own inner workings (at the domestic and familial levels) and interactions (Aitken 2009, M. Jones 2009). The discussion can also be extended to another developing realm: the geographies of affect (B. Anderson 2012, S. Pile 2010, Woodward and Lea 2009), where transitional and dialectic relationships are taking place and in turn inform geographies of power for a complete political ontology (Joronen 2012, Clough 2008).

Chapter 7. References

Adams, Paul. "Television as a Gathering Place." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 82, no. 1 (1992): 117-135.

Administration for Native Americans. *2010 Impact and Effectiveness of Administration for Native Americans Projects Report to Congress.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2010.

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life.* Translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.

—. *The Coming Community.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Agius, Parry, Jocelyn Davies, Richard Howitt, and Lesley Johns. "Negotiating Comprehensive Settlement of Native Title Issues: Building a New Scale of Justice in South Australia." *Native Title Representative Bodies Legal Conference.* Townsville, QLD, 2001.

Agnew, John. "Representing Space: Space, Scale and Culture in Social Science." In *Place/Culture/Representation*, by James Duncan, & David Ley, 251-271. London: Routledge, 1993.

Aĭkhenvalʹd, Aleksandra I͡Urʹevna, and Robert M.W. Dixon. *Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance: Problems in Comparative Linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Aitken, Stuart C. *Geographies of Young People: The Morally Contested Spaces of Identity.* London: Routledge, 2001.

—. *The Awkward Spaces of Fathering.* Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.

Allen, John. *Lost Geographies of Power.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

Amery, Rob, and Joshua Nash. *Warra Wiltaniappendi = Strengthening Languages : Proceedings of the Inaugural Indigenous Languages Conference (ILC) 2007, 24-27 September 2007, University of Adelaide, South Australia.* Adelaide, SA: Discipline of Linguistics, University of Adelaide, 2008.

Anderson, Ben. "Affect and Biopower: Towards a Politics of Life." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 37, no. 1 (2012): 28-43.

Anderson, Benedict R. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso, 1991.

Baldauf, Richard. ""Unplanned" Language Policy and Planning." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 14 (1994): 82-89.

Ballas, Donald J. "Geography and the American Indian." *Journal of Geography* 65, no. 4 (1966): 156-168.

Ballas, Donald J. "Historical Geography and American Indian Development." In *A Cultural Geography of North American Indians*, by Thomas Ross, Tyrel G. Moore, & Laura R. King, 11-27. Southern Pines, NC: Karo Hollow Press, 1995.

Baron, Dennis. *The English-Only Question: An Official Language for Americans?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990.

Basso, Keith H. *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language Among the Western Apache.* Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1996.

Baviskar, Vera, Martin Herzog, and Uriel Weinreich. *The Language and Culture Atlas of Ashkenazic Jewry.* Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1992.

Behnke, Steven. "Alaska's Contested Rural Landscapes and the Subsistence Claims of Alaska Natives." In *Geographical Identities of Ethnic America: Race, Space, and Place*, by Kate Berry, & Martha L. Henderson, 149-173. Reno, NV: University of Nevada Press, 2002.

Benjamin, Jessica. "A Desire Of One's Own: Psychoanalytic Feminism and Intersubjective Space." In *Feminist Studies, Critical Studies*, by Teresa De Lauretis, 78-101. Milwaukee, WI: University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee. Center for Twentieth Century Studies., 1986.

Berg, Lawrence D., and Robin A. Kearns. "Naming as Norming: Race, Gender and the Identity Politics of Naming Places in Aoteara/New Zeland." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 14, no. 1 (1996): 99-122.

Bieder, Robert E. *Science Encounters the Indian, 1820-1880: The Early Years of American Ethnology.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986.

Bignall, Simone. *Postcolonial Agency: Critique and Constructivism.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010.

Billig, Michael. *Banal Nationalism.* London: Sage, 1995.

Biolsi, Thomas. "Introduction: What is the "Anthropology" of "American Indians"?" In *A Companion to the Anthropology of American Indians*, by Thomas Biolsi, 1-4. Malden, MA : Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

Biolsi, Thomas. "Political and Legal Status (''Lower 48'' States)." In *Companion to the Anthropology of American Indians*, by Thomas Biolsi, 231-247. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004.

Black, Richard. "Conceptions of 'Home' and the Political Geography of Refugee Repatriation: Between Assumption and Contested Reality in Bosnia-Herzegovina." *Applied Geography* 22, no. 2 (2002): 123–138.

Blaser, Mario. "Ontology and Indigeneity: On the Political Ontology of Heterogenous Assemblages." *Cultural Geographies*, 2012: 1-10.

Blomley, Nicholas. "Law, Property, and the Geography of Violence: The Frontier, the Survey, and the Grid." *The Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 91, no. 1 (2004): 121-141.

Blomley, Nicholas. "Shut the Province Down: First Nation Blockades in British Columbia, 1984-1995." *BC Studies* 3 (1996): 5-35.

Blunt, Alison, and Jane Wills. "Decolonising Geography: Postcolonial Perspectives." In *Dissident Geographies: An Introduction to Radical Ideas and Practices*, by Alison Blunt, & Jane Wills, 167-207. Edinburgh: Prentice Hall, 2000.

Boas, Franz. *Chinook texts.* Washington, DC: Smithsonian institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, 1894.

—. *Handbook of American Indian Languages.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1911.

—. *Introduction to Handbook of American Indian languages.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1910.

Boas, Franz. "The Study of Geography." *Science* 9, no. 210 (1887): 137-141.

—. *Tsimshian texts.* Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, 1902.

Bondi, Liz. "Locating Identity Politics." In *Place and the Politics of Identity*, by Michael Keith, & Steven Pile, 84-101. New York, NY: Routledge, 1993.

Bone, Robert. *The Geography of the Canadian North: Issues and Challenges.* Toronto, ON: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Bourcelot, Henri. *Atlas Linguistique et Ethnographique de la Champagne et de la Brie.* Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1900.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

—. *Pascalian Meditations.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and John B. Thompson. *Language and Symbolic Power.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Boyer, M. Christine. *CyberCities: Visual Perception in the Age of Electrionic Communication.* New York, NY: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996.

Brealy, Ken. "Mapping Them 'Out': Euro-Canadian Cartography and the Appropriation of the Nuxalk and Ts'ilhqot' in First Nations' Territories, 1793-1916." *Canadian Geographer* 39 (1995): 140-156.

Brenner, Neil, Bob Jessop, Martin Jones, and Gordon MacLeod. *State/Space: A Reader.* Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.

Breton, Roland J. L. *Atlas Géographique des Langues et des Ethnies de l'Inde et du Subcontinent: Bangladesh, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Népal, Bhoutan, Sikkim.* Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 1976.

—. *Geolinguistics: Language Dynamics and Ethnolinguistic Geography.* Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa Press, 1991.

Bright, William. *Native American Place Names of the United States.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004.

Brody, Hugh. *Maps and Dreams: Indians and the British Columbia Frontier. Vancouver, BC: Douglas & McIntyre.Brody, Hugh. 1988. Maps and Dreams: Indians and the British Columbia Frontier.* Vancouver, BC: Douglas & McIntyre, 1988.

Brown, Caroline L. "Political and Legal Status of Alaska Natives." In *A Companion to the Anthropology of American Indians*, by Thomas Biolsi, 249-267. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

Bruk, Solomon Il'ich, and V.S. Apenchenko. *Atlas Narodov Mira.* Moscow: Glavnoe upravlenie geodezii i kartografii Gosudarstvennogo geologicheskogo komiteta SSSR, 1964.

Burley, David, and Gayel Horsfall. "Vernacular Houses and Farmsteads of the Canadian Metis." *Journal of Cultural Geography* 10 (1989): 19-33.

Buttimer, Anne. "Grasping the Dynamism of Lifeworld." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 66 (1976): 277-292.

Butzer, Karl W. "The Indian Legacy in the American Landscape." In *The Making of the American Landscape*, by Michael P. Conzen, 27-50. Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman, 1990.

Byrne, David S. *Byrne, David S. Complexity Theory and the Social Sciences: An Introduction.* London: Routledge, 1998.

Cajete, Gregory A. *Science: A Native American Perspective - A Culturally-based Science Education Program.* Ph.D. Dissertation, Phoenix, AZ: International College, 1986.

Cajete, Gregory A. "The Native American Learner and Bicultural Science Education." In *Next Steps: Research and Practice to Advance Indian Education*, by Karen G. Swisher, & John W. Tippeconnic, 135-160. Charleston, WV: Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, 2000.

Califa, Antonio J. "Declaring English the Official Language: Prejudice Spoken Here." *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review* 24, no. 2 (1989): 293-348.

Campbell, Lyle. *American Indian Languages, the Historical Linguistics of Native America.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Campbell, Lyle, and Marianne Mithun. *The Languages of Native America: Historical and Comparative Assessment.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1979.

Casey, Edward S. *Getting Back into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-World.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1993.

Castree, Noel. "Differential Geographies: Place, Indigenous Rights and "Local' Resources." *Political Geography* 22, no. 9 (2004): 133-167.

Chambers, Samuel A. "Foucault's Evasive Maneuvers: Nietzsche, Interpretation, Critique." *Angelaki: Journal of Theoretical Humanities* 6, no. 3 (2001): 101-123.

Champagne-Aishihik Indian Band. *From Trail to Highway Kwaday kwatan ts'an ek'an tan kwatsin: A Highway Guide to the Places and the People of the Southwest Yukon and Alaska Panhandle.* Victoria, BC: Morriss Printing, 1988.

Chapman, Roger. *Culture Wars: An Encyclopedia of Issues, Viewpoints, and Voices, Volume 1.* Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 2010.

Chomsky, Noam. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press, 1965.

—. *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin and Use.* Westport, CT: Praeger, 1986.

Churchill, Ward. *Fantasies of the Master Race: Literature, Cinema, and the Colonization of American Indians.* San Francisco, CA: City Lights Books, 1998.

Clayton, Daniel. "Islands of Truth: Vancouver Island from Captain Cook to the beginnings of colonialism." Ph.D. Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1996.

Cloke, Paul. "Introduction." In *A Companion to Social Geography*, by Vincent Jr. J. Del Casino, Mary E. Thomas, Paul Cloke, & Ruth Pannelli, 11-16. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2011.

Clough, Patricia T. "The Affective Turn: Political Economy, Biomedia and Bodies." *Theory, Culture & Society* 25, no. 1 (2008): 1-22.

Cohen, Barri. "Technological Colonialism and the Politics of Water." *Cultural Studies* 81 (1994): 32-55.

Cohen, Felix. *Handbook of Federal Indian Law.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1942.

Cohen, Saul B. "Geopolitical Realities and United States Foreign Policy." *Political Geography* 1 (2003): 1-33.

Cohen, Saul B., and Nurit Kliot. "Place-Names in Israel's Ideological Struggle over the Administered Territories." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 82, no. 4 (1992): 653–680.

Cohn, Bernard. *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Coleman, Mathew, and Kevin Grove. "Biopolitics, Biopower, and the Return of Sovereignty." *Environment And Planning D, Society and Space* 27, no. 3 (2009): 489-507.

Collins, James. "Comments On "The Reproduction Of Symbolic Capital: Language, State, And Class In Egypt"." *Current Anthropology* 38 (1997): 806-07.

Conn, Steven. *History's Shadow: Native Americans and Historical Consciousness in the Nineteenth Century.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Cook, Samuel R. "What is Indian Self-Determination?" *Red Ink Magazine* 3, no. 1 (May 1994): 23.

Cox, Kevin R. "Representation and Power in the Politics of Scale." *Political Geography* 17, no. 1 (1998b): 41-44.

Cox, Kevin R. "Spaces of Dependence, Spaces of Engagement and the Politics of Scale, or: looking for local politics." *Political Geography* 17, no. 1 (1998a): 1-23.

Crampton, Jeremy W. *Mapping: A Critical Introduction to Cartography and GIS.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Crawford, James. *At War with Diversity: U.S. Language Policy in an Age of Anxiety.* Clevedon: Multilingual matters, 2000.

—. *Language Loyalties: A Source Book on the Official English Controversy.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Cresswell, Tim. *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Curtain, Helena Anderson, and Carol Ann Dahlberg. *Curtain, Helena Anderson, and Carol Ann Dahlberg. Languages and Children, Making the Match: Foreign Language Instruction for an Early Start Grades K-8.* White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing Group, 1994.

Dalby, Simon. "Critical Geopolitics: Difference, Discourse and Dissent." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 9, no. 3 (1991): 261-83.

Dalby, Simon. "Globalisation or Global Apartheid? Boundaries and Knowledge in Postmodern Times." *Geopolitics* 3, no. 1 (1998): 132-150.

Dalto, Guy, Mary-Ellen Johnston, and Stanley Lieberson. "The Course of Mother Tongue Diversity in Nations." *American Journal of Sociology* 81 (1975): 34-61.

Dauphiné, André. *Fractal Geography.* London: ISTE, 2012.

David, Maya, and Subra Govindasamy. "Negotiating a Language Policy for Malaysia: Local Demand for Affirmative Action Versus Challenges from Globalization." In *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice*, by A. Suresh Cangarajah, 123-146. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers, 2005.

Davis, Ann. "English-Only Rules Spur Workers to Speak Legalese." *Wall Street Journal*, January 1997: B1.

De Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1984.

De Certeau, Michel, Dominique Julia, and Jacques Revel. *Une Politique de la Langue: La Révolution Française et les Patois : l'enquête de Grégoire.* Paris: Gallimard, 1975.

de Kock, Leon. "Interview With Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak: New Nation Writers Conference in South Africa." *A Review of International English Literature* 23, no. 3 (1992): 29-47.

de Leeuw, Sarah, Margo Greenwood, and Emilie Cameron. "Deviant Constructions: How Governments Preserve Colonial Narratives of Addictions and Poor Mental Health to Intervene into the Lives of Indigenous Children and Families in Canada." *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction* 8, no. 2 (2010): 282-295.

Delaney, Dan, and Helga Leitner. "The Political Construction of Scale." *Politial Geography* 16, no. 2 (1997): 93-97.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Difference and Repetition.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2004.

—. *Foucault.* Translated by Seán Hand. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia.* London: Athlone, 1984.

Deloria, Vine Jr. *American Indian Policy in the Twentieth Century.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985.

—. *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties: An Indian Declaration of Independence.* New York, NY: Delacorte Press, 1974.

—. *Custer Died for Your Sins.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988.

—. *Spirit And Reason: The Vine Deloria Jr. Reader.* Golden, CO: Fulcrum, 1999.

DeLyser, Dydia. *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Geography.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage, 2010.

Derrida, Jacques. *Rogues: Two Essays on Reason.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2005.

Devitt, Michael, and Kim Sterelny. *Language and Reality. An Introduction to the Philosophy of Language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989.

Dewsbury, J-D. "Witnessing Space: Knowledge without Contemplation." *Environment and Planning A* 35, no. 11 (2003): 1907-1932.

Diawara, Mamadou. "Globalization, Development Politics and Local Knowledges." *International Sociology* 15, no. 2 (2000): 361–371.

Dikec, Mustafa. *Badlands of the Republic: Space, Politics and Urban Policy.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008.

Dixon, Deborah P., and John P. III Jones. "My Dinner with Derrida, or Spatial Analysis and Poststructuralism Do Lunch." *Environment and Planning A* 30, no. 2 (1998): 247-260.

Dodds, Klaus. "Geopolitics and Foreign Policy: Recent Developments in Anglo-American Political Geography and International Relations." *Progress in Human Geography* 18, no. 2 (1994): 186-208.

—. *Geopolitics in a Changing World.* Harlow: Pearson Education, 2000.

Dodds, Klaus. "Geopolitics, Experts and the Making of Foreign Policy." *Area* 25, no. 1 (1993): 70-74.

Dodson, Michael. "The End of the Beginning: Re(de)fining Aboriginality (The Wentworth Lecture)." *Australian Aboriginal Studies* 1 (1994): 2-13.

Dozier, Edward P. "Factionalism At Santa Clara Pueblo." *Ethnology* 5 (1966a): 172-185.

—. *Hano, A Tewa Indian Community in Arizona.* New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966b.

—. *The Hopi-Tewa of Arizona.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1954.

Dreyfus, Hubert. *Being-in-the-World: A Commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time, Division I.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991.

Duranti, Alessandro. "Ethnography of Speaking: Towards a Linguistics of the Praxis." In *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey, vol. IV. Language: The Socio-cultural Context*, by Frederick J. Newmeyer, 210-228. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Duranti, Alessandro. "Linguistic Anthropology: History, Ideas and Issues." In *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*, by Alessandro Duranti, 2-59. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.

Duranti, Alessandro. "Linguistic Anthropology: Language as a Non-Neutral Medium." In *The Cambridge Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, by Rajend Mesthrie, 28-46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Eckert, Penelope, and Sally McConnell-Ginet. "New Generalizations and Explanations in Language and Gender Research." *Language in Society.* 28, no. 2 (1999): 185-202.

Emeneau, Murray B. "Indian As A Linguistic Area." *Language* 32 (1956): 3-16.

Eschbach, Karl. "Changing Identification Among American Indians and Alaskan Natives." *Demography* 30, no. 4 (1993): 635-652.

Eschbach, Karl. "The Enduring and Vanishing American Indian." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 18, no. 1 (1995): 89-108.

Escobar, Arturo. "The 'Ontological Turn' in Social Theory. A Commentary on 'Human geography without scale', by Sallie Marston, John Paul Jones II and Keith Woodward." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 32, no. 1 (2007): 106-111.

Ethnologue. *Languages of the World.* Sixteenth Edition. Edited by M. Paul Lewis. Dallas, TX: SIL International, 2009.

Eve, Raymond A., Sara Horsfall, and Mary E. Lee. *Eve, Raymond A., Sara Horsfall, and Mary E. Lee. Chaos, Complexity, and Sociology: Myths, Models, and Theories.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997.

Evers, Larry, and Barre Toelken. *Native American Oral Traditions: Collaboration and Intepretation.* Logan, UT: Utah State University Press, 2001.

Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power.* London: Longman, 1989.

Featherstone, David. *Resistance, Space and Political Identities: The Making of Counter-Global Networks.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008.

Featherstone, Mike. *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization, and Modernity: a Theory, Culture & Society (Special Issue).* London: Sage Publications, 1990.

Feit, Harvey A. "Legitimation and Autonomy in James Bay Cree Responses to Hydro-electric Development." In *Indigenous Peoples and the Nation-State: Fourth World Politics in Canada, Australia and Norway. N. Dyck. St Johns: Institute of Social*, by Noel Dyck, 27-66. St Johns: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1985.

Fixico, Donald. *The American Indian Mind in a Linear World: American Indian Studies and Traditional Knowledge.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2003.

Forman, Ellice A., Norris Minick, and C. Addison Stone. *Contexts for Learning: Sociocultural Dynamics in Children's Development.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Foster, Robert. "Bargains With Modernity." In *Critically Modern Alternatives, Alterities, Anthropologies*, by Bruce M. Knauft, 57-81. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2002.

Foucault, Michel. "Governmentality." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, & Peter Miller, 87-104. London: Harvester/Wheatshaf, 1991.

Foucault, Michel. "Of Other Spaces." *Diacritics* 16 (Spring 1986): 22-27.

—. *Power.* Edited by James D. Faubion. New Yrok, NY: New press, 2000.

—. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977.* Translated by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

—. *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège De France, 1975-76.* Edited by Michel Mauro, Alessandro Bertani, Franço FontanA, François Ewald, & David Macey. New York, NY, Picador, 2003.

Foucault, Michel. "Space, Knowledge, and Power." In *The Foucault Reader*, by Paul Rabinow, 239–256. New York, ny: Pantheon, 1984.

—. *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault.* Edited by Luther H Martin, Huck Gutman, & Patrick H Hutton. Amherst, MA : University of Massachusetts Press, 1988.

—. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège De France, 1978-1979.* Translated by Michel Senellart. New York, NY: Picador, 2010.

Foucault, Michel. "The Subject and the Power." In *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, by Hubert Dreyfus, & Paul Rabinow, 208-226. Brighton: Harvester, 1982.

Foucault, Michel. "What Is An Author?" In *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice : Selected Essays and Interviews*, by Michel Foucault, edited by Donald F. Bouchard, translated by Donald F. Bouchard, & Shery Simon, 113-138. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977.

Frantz, Klaus. *Indian Reservations in the United States: Territory, Sovereignty, and Socioeconomic Change.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Frantz, Klaus, and Richard Howitt. "Geography For and With Indigenous Peoples: Indigenous Geographies as Challenge and Invitation." *GeoJournal*, 2012: 1-5.

French, Laurence A. *Addictions and Native Americans.* Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000.

Fullilove, Mindy T. *Root Shock: How Tearing Up City Neighborhoods Hurts America, and What We Can Do About It.* 2004: One World/Ballantine Books, New York, NY.

Gallatin, Albert. "A Synopsis of the Indian Tribes within the United States East of the Rocky Mountains, and in the Bristish and Russian Possessions in North America." *Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society (Archaeologia Americana)* 2 (1836).

Galois, Robert. *Kwakwaka'wakw Settlements, 1775-1920: A Geographical analysis and gazeteer.* Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press, 1994.

Gelernter, David. *Mirror Worlds or the Day Software Puts the Universe in a Shoebox... How It Will Happen and What It Will Mean.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Gibbon, Guy E. *The Sioux: the Dakota and Lakota Nations.* Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003.

Giddens, Anthony. *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1979.

Gidley, Mick. *Edward S. Curtis and the North American Indian, Incorporated.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Goddard, Ives. *Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 5 (Arctic).* Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1996.

Goetting, Nathan. "The Marshall Trilogy and the Constitutional De-Humanization of American Indians." 2010. http://www.indigenouspolicy.org (accessed 03 03, 2013).

Goffman, Erving. *Forms of Talk.* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci.* Translated by Quintin Hoare, & Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. New York, NY: International Publishers, 1971.

Grand Council of the Crees. *Sovereign Injustice: Forcible Inclusion of the James Bay Crees and Cree Territory into a Sovereign Québec.* Nemaska, QC: Grand Council of the Cree, 1995.

Great Britain War Office. *Short Glossary of Portuguese.* London: G.S.G.S., War Office, 1943.

Greenberg, Joseph H. *Language in the Americas.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1987.

Gregory, Derek. *Geographical Imaginations.* Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1994.

Grillo, Ralph D. "Anthropologists and Development." In *The Companion to Development Studies*, by Vandana Desai, & Robert B. Potter, 54–58. London: Arnold, 2002.

Grobler, E., K.P. Prinsloo, and I.J. Van der Merwe. *Language Atlas of South Africa: Language and Literacy Patterns. .* Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council, 1990.

Gunnemark, Erik V., and Bernard Nezmah. *Countries, Peoples and Their Languages: The Geolinguistic Handbook.* Gothenburg: Geolingua, 1992.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Theory of Communicative Action.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1984.

Hale, Lorraine. *Native American Education: A Reference Handbook.* Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2004.

Halliday, Michael A.K. *Explorations in the Functions of Language.* New York, NY: Elsevier North-Holland, 1977.

Hannah, Matthew. *Governmentality and the Mastery of Territory in Nineteenth-Century America.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Hannah, Matthew. "Space and Social Control in the Administration of the Oglala Lakota ("Sioux"), 1871-1879." *Journal of Historical Geography* 19, no. 4 (1993): 412-432.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Empire.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.

—. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire.* New York, NY: The Penguin Press, 2004.

Harley, John Brian. "Deconstructing the Map." *Cartographica* 26, no. 2 (1989): 1-20.

Harmon, George D. *Sixty Years of Indian Affairs, Political, Economic, and Diplomatic, 1789-1850.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1941.

Harris, R. Cole. *Making Native Space: Colonialism, Resistance, and Reserves in British Columbia.* Vancouver, BC: Universit of British Columbia Press, 2002.

—. *The Resettlement of British Columbia: Essays on Colonialism and Geographical Change.* Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press, 1997.

Harris, Trevor M., Daniel Weiner, Timothy Warner, and Richard Levin. "Pursuing Social Goals Through Participatory Geographic Information Systems: Redressing South Africa's historical Political Ecology." In *Ground Truth: The Social Implications of Geographic Information Systems*, by John Pickles, 196-222. New York, NY: Guilford Press, 1995.

Hartley, John. *The Politics of Pictures: The Creation of the Public in the Age of Poular Media.* London: Routledge, 1992.

Haspelmath, Martin. *The World Atlas of Language Structures.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Haugen, Einar. *The Ecology of Language.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1972.

Havighurst, Robert J. "Indian Education Since 1960." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 436 (1978): 13-26.

Heath, Shirley Brice. *Social History.* Vol. 1: Social Science, in *Bilingual Education: Current perspectives*, by Center for Applied Linguistics, 53-72. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

—. *Words at Work and Play: Three Decades in Family and Community Life.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Heidegger, Martin. *Bemerkungen zu Kunst - Plastik - Raum.* St. Gallen: Erker-Verl, 1996.

—. *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1988.

Henningsen, Manfred. "The Politics of Purity and Exclusion: Literary and Linguistic Movements of Political Empowerment in America, Africa, the South Pacific, and Europe." In *The Politics of Language Purism*, by Björn H. Jernudd, & Michael J. Shapiro, 31-52. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1989.

Herman, Douglas. "Kalai'aina: Carving the Land. Geography, Desire and Possession in the Hawaiian Islands." PhD Thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1995.

Herman, Douglas. "The Aloha State: Place Names and the Anti-Conquest of Hawai'i." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 89 (1999): 76-102.

Highleyman, Emily. "Subsistence and Culture: The Gwich'in Indians in Alaska." PhD Thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison., 1994.

Hillier, Jean, and Emma Rooksby. *Habitus: A Sense of Place.* Ashgate: Aldershot, Hants, England, 2002.

Hodge, Paul, and John Lester. "Indigenous Research: Whose Priority? Journeys and Possibilities of Cross Cultural Research in Geography." *Geographical Research* 44, no. 1 (2006): 41-51.

Hogan-Brun, Gabrielle, and Stefan Wolff. *Minority Languages in Europe: Frameworks, Status, Prospects.* Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2003.

Horvath, Barbara M., and Ronald J. Horvath. "The Geolinguistics of /l/ Vocalization in Australia and New Zealand." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 6 (2002): 319–346.

Howitt, Richard. "Aborigines and Restructuring in the Mining Sector: Vested and Representative Interests." *Australian Geographer* 222 (1991): 117-119.

—. "Native Title and Resource Management: Issues from the Australian Aluminium Industry." 1993. http://www.es.mq.edu.au/rhowitt/MABOA.htm (accessed May 18, 2012).

Howitt, Richard. "Recognition, Respect and Reconciliation: Steps Towards Decolonisation." *Australian Aboriginal Studies*, no. 1 (1998): 28-34.

—. *Rethinking Resource Management: Justice, Sustainability and Indigenous Peoples.* London: Routledge, 2001.

Howitt, Richard. "Scale." In *A Companion to Political Geography*, by K. Mitchell, G. Tuathail John Agnew, 138-147. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

Howitt, Richard, and Sandra Suchet-Pearson. "Rethinking the Building Blocks: Ontological Pluralism and the Idea of 'Management'." *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography* 88, no. 3 (2006): 323-335.

Howitt, Richard, John Connell, and Phil Hirsch. *Resources, Nations and Indigenous Peoples: Case Studies from Australasia, Melanesia and Southeast Asia.* Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Hoxie, Frederick E. *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920.* Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1984a.

—. *The Indians Versus the Textbooks: Is There Any Way Out?* Chicago, IL: Newberry Library, 1984b.

Huntington, Henry P., and María E. Fernández-Giménez. "Indigenous Knowledge in the Arctic: a Review of Research and Applications." *Indigenous Knowledge and Development Monitor* 7, no. 3 (1999): 11-14.

Husserl, Edmund. *Ideas; General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology.* London: Allen & Unwin, 1958.

Huxley, Margo. "Space and Government: Governmentality and Geography." *Geography Compass* 2 (2008): 1635-1658.

Huyser, Kimberly R., Arthur Sakamoto, and Isao Takei. "The Persistence of Racial Disadvantage: The Socioeconomic Attainments of Single-race and Multi-race Native Americans." *Population Research and Policy Review* 29, no. 4 (2010): 541-568.

Hymes, Dell. "Alfred Louis Kroeber." *Language in Culture and Society*, 1964: 689-710.

—. *Foundations in Sociolinguistics; An Ethnographic Approach.* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1974.

Hymes, Dell. "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life." In *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, by John J. Gumperz, & Dell Hymes, 35-71. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1972c.

Hymes, Dell. "On Communicative Competence." In *Sociolinguistics. Selected Readings*, by J. B. Pride, & Janet Holmes, 269-293. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972a.

—. *Reinventing Anthropology.* New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1972b.

Jaberg, Karl. *Aspects Géographiques du Langage.* Paris: Librairie E. Droz, 1935.

Jacob, Christian, and Edward H. Dahl. *The Sovereign Map: Theoretical Approaches in Cartography Throughout History.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Jacobson, M.F. *Special Sorrows: The Diasporic Imagination of Irish, Polish, and Jewsih Immigrants in the United States.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Jhappan, C. Radha. "Global Community? Supranational Strategies of Canada's Aboriginal Peoples." *Journal of Indigenous Studies* 3, no. 1 (1992): 58-67.

Johnson, Fern L. *Speaking Culturally: Language Diversity in the United States.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2000.

Jonas, William. *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner: Native Title Report 1999.* Annual Report, Sydney: Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, 2000.

Jones, Dorothy V. *License for Empire: Colonialism by Treaty in Early America.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Jones, Martin. "Phase Space: Geography, Relational Thinking, and Beyond." *Progress in Human Geography* 33, no. 4 (2009): 487-506.

Joronen, Mikko. "Heidegger, Event and the Ontological Politics of the Site." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 2012.

Jovchelovitch, S. *Knowledge in Context: Representation, Community and Culture.* London: Routledge, 2007.

Kadmon, Naftali. *Toponymy: The Lore, Laws, and Language of Geographical Names.* New York, NY: Vantage Press, 2000.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason.* London: Henry G. Bohn. York Street, Covent Garden, 1860.

Katz, Cindi. "All the World is Staged: Intellectuals and the Projects of Ethnography." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 10, no. 5 (1992): 495-510.

Kemmis, Daniel. *The Good City and the Good Life.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1995.

Khanna, Nikki. "Multiracial Americans: Racial Identity Choices and Implications for the Collection of Race Data." *Sociology Compass 6* 6, no. 4 (2012): 316-331.

King, Richard H., and Helen Taylor. *Dixie Debates: Perspectives on Southern Cultures.* New York, NY: New York University Press, 1996.

Kloss, Heinz. *The American Bilingual Tradition.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1998.

Knauft, Bruce M. *From Primitive to Postcolonial in Melanesia and Anthropology.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1999.

Koenig, Alexa, and Jonathan Stein. "Federalism and the State Recognition of Native American Tribes: A Survey of State-Recognized Tribes and State Recognition Processes Across the United States." *Santa Clara Law Review* 48 (2007): 79-153.

Kolb, David A. *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* . Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1984.

Kolb, Eduard. *Atlas of English Sounds.* Bern: Francke, 1979.

Korzybski, Alfred. *Collected Writings, 1920-1950.* Edited by Marjorie Kendig. Englewood, NJ: Institute of General Semantics, 1990.

Kramarae, Cheris, Muriel Schulz, and William O'Barr. *Language and Power.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1984.

Krashen, Stephen D. *Under Attack: The Case against Bilingual Education.* Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates, 1996.

Krauss, Michael. "Statement of Mr. Michael Krauss, Representing the Linguistic Society of America; President, Society for the Study of the Indigenous Languages of the Americas; Director, Alaska Native Language Center, University of Alaska Fairbanks." *Hearing Before the Select Committee on Indian Affairs United States Senate, One Hundred Second Congress, Second Session on S. 2044 to Assist Native Americans in Assuring the Survival and Continuing Vitality of their Languages, June 18, 1992.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1992. 18-22.

Krauss, Michael. "Status of Native American Language Endangerment." In *Stabilizing Indigenous Languages*, by Gina Cantoni, 15-20. Flagstaff, AZ: Center for Excellence in Education, Northern Arizona University, 1996.

Krauss, Michael. "The Condition of Native North American Languages: the Need for Realistic Assessment and Action." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 132 (1998): 9-21.

Kroeber, Alfred. *Cultural and Natural Areas of Native North America.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1939.

Kroeber, Alfred. "Phonetic Elements of the Mohave Language." *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 9 (1911): 279-435.

Kroeber, Alfred. "The Washo Language of East Central California and Nevada." *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 4 (1907): 251-317.

Kroskrity, Paul V. "Arizona Tewa Kiva Speech As A Manifestation of Linguistic Ideology." *Pragmatics* 2, no. 3 (1992): 297-309.

Labov, William. *Sociolinguistic Patterns.* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.

Lakoff, George. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Lam, Nina, and Dale A. Quattrochi. "On the Issues of Scale, Resolution, and Fractal Analysis in the Mapping Sciences." *The Professional Geographer* 44 (1992): 88-98.

Landry, Rodrigue, and Richard Bourhis. "'Linguistic Landscape and Ethnolinguistic Vitality:An Empirical Study." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 16, no. 1 (1997): 23-49.

Larsen, Soren C., and Jay T. Johnson. "Toward an Open Sense of Place: Phenomenology, Affinity, and the Question of Being." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 102 (2012): 632-646.

Lash, Scott, and Jonathan Friedman. *Modernity and Identity.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

Latham, Alan, and David Conradson. "The Possibilities of Performance." *Environment and Planning A* 35, no. 11 (2003): 1901-1906.

Latour, Bruno. "The Powers of Association." In *Power, Action and Belief. A New Sociology of Knowledge?*, by John Law, 264-280. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986.

Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Leitner, Helga, and Byron Miller. "Scale and the Limitations of Ontological Debate: a Commentary on Marston, Jones and Woodward." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 32, no. 1 (2007): 116-125.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *Otherwise than Being or Beyond Essence.* Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Dordrecht and Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1978.

Lightfoot, David. *How New Languages Emerge.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Lindquist, G.E.E. "The Red Man in the United States: An Intimate Study of the Social Economic and Religious Life of the American Indians." *Archive.Org.* 1923. http://archive.org/details/redmanintheunite008584mbp (accessed September 09, 2012).

Lippi-Green, Rosina. *English With An Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States.* London: Routledge, 1997.

Livingstone, David N. *The Geographical Tradition: Episodes in the History of a Contested Enterprise.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.

Luhmann, Niklas. *Social Systems.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995.

—. *The Differentiation of Society.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1982.

—. *The 'State' of the Political System.* Wassenaar: NIAS, 1984.

Lynch, Michael. "Ethnomethodology and the Logic of Practice." In *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, by Theodore R. Schatzki, Karin Knorr-Cetina, & Eike Von Savigny, 140-157. London & new York: Routledge, 2001.

Mailhot, José. "L'Étymologie de "Esquimau" Revue et Corrigée." *Etudes/Inuit/Studies* 2, no. 2 (1978): 59-69.

Malpas, Jeff. *Heidegger and the Thinking of Place: Explorations in the Topology of Being.* Boston, MA: MIT Press, 2012.

Marion, Russ. *The Edge of Organization: Chaos and Complexity Theories of Formal Social Systems.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1999.

Mar-Molinero, Clare, and Patrick Stevenson. *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices: Language and the Future of Europe.* Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2006.

Marston, Sallie. "The Social Construction of Scale." *Progress in Human Geography* 24, no. 2 (2000): 219-242.

Marston, Sallie, J.P. Jones, and Keith Woodward. "Human Geography Without Scale." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30, no. 4 (2005): 416-32.

Marston, Sallie, Keith Woodward, and J.P. III Jones. "Flattening Ontologies of Globalization: The Nollywood Case." *Globalizations* 4, no. 1 (March 2007): 45–63.

Mason, W. Dale. *Indian Gaming: Tribal Sovereignty and American Politics.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2000.

Massey, Doreen. *For Space.* London: Sage, 2005.

—. *Spatial Divisions of Labor.* New York, NY: Mathuen, 1984.

May, Jon. "Of Nomads and Vagrants: Single Homelessness and Narratives of Home as Place." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18, no. 6 (2000): 737–759.

McCarty, Teresa L. "AEQ, 1970–2005: Reflections on Educational Anthropology— Past, Present, Future." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 36, no. 4 (2005): 299–304.

McCarty, Teresa L. "Revitalising Indigenous Languages in Homogenising Times." In *Bilingual Education: An Introductory Reader*, by Ofelia García, & Colin Baker, 33-49. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2006.

McHugh, Paul G. "The Legal and Constitutional Position of the Crown in Resource Management." In *Resources, Nations and Indigenous Peoples: Case Studies from Australasia, Melanesia and Southeast Asia*, by Richard Howitt, John Connell, & Philip Hirsch, 300-316. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1996.

McJimsey, George Davis. *Topographic Terms in Virginia.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1940.

McKay, Sandra, and Sau-ling Cynthia Wong. *New Immigrants in the United States: Readings for Second Language Educators.* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

McLuhan, Marshall. *The Gutenberg Galaxy; The Making of Typographic Man.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 1962.

McMullen, Edwin Wallace. *English Topographic Terms in Florida, 1563-1874. .* Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press, 1953.

Mead, Nancy, Wendy Grigg, Rebecca Moran, and Kuang Ming. *National Indian Education Study 2009 - Part II: The Educational Experiences of American Indian and Alaska Native Students in Grades 4 and 8.* NCES 2010–463, National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 2010.

Means, Russell. *I Am An American Indian, Not A Native American!* Edited by Jim Hickinbotham (Rabid Wolf). December 5, 1998. http://web.archive.org/web/20090331231413/ http://www.peaknet.net/~aardvark/means.html (accessed May 18, 2012).

Miestamo, Matti, Kaius Sinnemäki, and Fred Karlsson. *Language Complexity: Typology, Contact, Change.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2008.

Miller, Robert J. *Reservation "Capitalism": Economic Development in Indian Country.* Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger Pub Text, 2012.

Mitchell, Don. *Cultural Geography: A Critical Introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

Mitchell, Katharyne. "Geographies of Identity: the Intimate Cosmopolitan." *Progress in Human Geography* 31, no. 5 (2007): 706-720.

Monmonier, Mark S. *From Squaw Tit to Whorehouse Meadow: How Maps Name, Claim, and Inflame.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Moore, Jeanne. "Polarity or Integration? Towards a Fuller Understanding of Home and Homelessness." *Journal ofArchitectural and Planning Research* 24, no. 2 (2007): 143-159.

More, A.J. "Native Indian Learning Styles: A Review for Researchers and Teachhers." *Journal of American Indian Education*, August 1989: 15-28.

Morgensen, Scott Lauria. *Morgensen, Scott Lauria. Spaces between Us: Queer Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Decolonization.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011.

Moses, A. Dirk. *Empire, Colony, Genocide: Conquest, Occupation, and Subaltern Resistance in World History.* New York, NY: Berghahn Books, 2008.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. *The Evolution of Languages.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Muller-Wille, Ludger. *Gazeteer of Inuit Place Names in Ninuvik (Quebec, Canada).* Inukjuak, QC: Avataq Cultural Institute, 1987.

Murray, John. *Politics and Plce-names: Changing Names in the Late Soviet Period.* Birmingham: University of Birmingham, 2000.

Muysken, Pieter. *From Linguistic Areas to Areal Linguistics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2008.

Nabea, Wendo. "Language Policy in Kenya: Negotiations with Hegemony." *The Journal of Pan African Studies* 3, no. 1 (2009): 121-138.

National Center for Education Statistics. *National Indian Education Study 2011.* NCES 2012–466, Institute of Education Sciences, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 2012.

Neustupný, Jiří. *Post-Structural Approaches to Language: Language Theory in a Japanese Context.* Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1978.

Newton, John. "An Assessment of Coping with Environmental Hazards in Northern Aboriginal Communities." *Canadian Geographer* 39 (1995): 112-120.

Notzke, Carol. "A New Perspective in Aboriginal Natural Resource Management: Comanagement." *Geoforum* 26, no. 2 (1995): 187-209.

Ó Tuathail, Geraóid. *Critical Geopolitics: The Politics of Writing Global Space.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Ó Tuathail, Geraóid. "The Critical Writing/Reading of Geopolitics. Re-reading/writing Wittogel, Bowman and Lacoste." *Progress in Human Geography* 18, no. 3 (1994): 313-332.

Ochs, Elinor. "Experiencing language." *Anthropological Theory* 12, no. 2 (2012): 142-160.

Oxford English Dictionary. *s.vv. "indigenous, adj.".* 1989. http://dictionary.oed.com (accessed 4 23, 2013).

Patrick, Peter L. "The Speech Community." In *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, by J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill, & Natalie Schilling-Estes, 573-598. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2004.

Peña, Maritza. "English-Only Laws and the Fourteenth Amendment: Dealing with Pluralism in a Nation Divided by Xenophobia." *The University of Miami Inter-American Law Review* 29, no. 1/2 (Fall 1997 / Winter 1998 1998): 349-371.

Pennycook, Alastair. *Language As a Local Practice.* Milton Park, Abingdon: Routledge, 2010.

Peterson, Helen L. "American Indian Political Participation." *American Academy of Political and Social Science*, May 1957: 116-121.

Pierre, George. *American Indian Crisis.* San Antonio, TX: The Naylor Company, 1971.

Pile, Steve. "Emotions and Affect in Recent Human Geography." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 35, no. 1 (2010): 5-20.

Pile, Steven, and Nigel Thrift. *Mapping the Subject: Geographies of Cultural Transformation.* London: Routledge, 1995.

Pinker, Steven. *The Language Instinct.* New York : Harper-Perennial, 1995.

Pommersheim, Frank. *Braid Of Feathers.* Berekeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1995.

Poser, William J., and Lyle Campbell. "Indo-European Practice and Historical Methodology." Edited by L.A. Buszard-Welcher, L. Wee, & W. Weigel. *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society.* Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society, 1992. 214–236.

Potter, Robert B., Tony Binns, Jennifer A. Elliot, and David Smith. *Geographies of Development.* Harlow: Pearson, 2003.

Pro English. *Ron Paul.* 05 18, 2012. http://proenglish.org/index.php?view=article&id=504 (accessed 03 30, 2013).

Prucha, Francis Paul. "American Indian Policy in the 1840s: Visions of Reform." In *The Frontier Challenge: Responses to the Trans-Mississippi West*, by John Garretson Clark, & George LaVerne Anderson, 81-110. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1971.

—. *The Great Father.* Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1986.

Puddicombe, Stephen. "Realpolitik in Arctic Quebec: why Makivik Corporation won't fight this time." *Artic Circle*, Sept.-Oct. 1991: 14-21.

Quinn, William W. "Federal Acknowledgment of American Indian Tribes: Authority,Judicial Interposition, and 25 C.F.R. § 83." *American Indian Law Review* 17, no. 1 (1992): 37-69.

Rajagopalan, Kanavillil. "The Language Issue in Brazil: When Local Knowledge Clashes with Expert Knowledge." In *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice*, by A. Suresh Cangarajah, 99-122. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers, 2005.

Reich, Wendelin. "The Cooperative Nature of Communicative Acts." *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, no. 5 (2011): 1349-1365.

Relph, Edward C. *The Phenomenological Foundations of Geography.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto, Dept. of Geography, 1976.

Reyhner, Jon. *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages.* Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University, Center for Excellence in Education, 1999.

Reyhner, Jon, and Jeanne M Oyawin Eder. *American Indian Education: A History.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006.

Rheingold, Howard. *The Virtual Community: Homesteading on the Electronic Frontier.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1994.

Ricento, Thomas. *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Robbins, Paul. *Political Ecology.* Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004.

Robertson, Roland. "Globalisation or Glocalisation?" *Journal of International Communication* 1, no. 1 (1994): 33-52.

Romaine, Suzanne. *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Romaine, Suzanne. "The Impact of Language Policy on Endangered Languages." *International Journal on Multicultural Societies* 4, no. 2 (2002): 1-28.

Roosevelt, Theodore. "First Annual Message (December 3, 1901)—Miller Center." *University of Virginia Miller Center.* December 03, 1901. http://millercenter.org/president/speeches/detail/3773 (accessed May 18, 2012).

Rorty, Richard. *The Linguistic Turn: Recent Essays in Philosophical Method.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Rose, Nikolas. "Expertise and the Government of Conduct." *Studies in Law, Politics and Society* 14 (1994): 359-97.

—. *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self.* London: Routledge, 1990.

—. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Rose-Redwood, Reuben, Derek Alderman, and Maoz Azaryahu. "Geographies of Toponymic Iinscription: New Directions in Critical Place-Name Studies." *Progress in Human Geography* 34, no. 4 (2010): 453–470.

Rossiter, David, and Patricia K. Wood. "Fantastic Topographies: Neo-liberal Responses to Aboriginal Land Claims in British Columbia." *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe Canadien* 49, no. 4 (2005): 352-366.

Ruiz, Richard. *Official Languages and Language Planning.* Vol. 14, in *Perspectives on Official English: The Campaign for English as the Official Language of the USA*, by Karen L. Adams, & Daniel T. Brink, 11-24. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1990.

Rundstrom, Robert, Douglas Deur, Kate Berry, and Dick Winchell. "American Indian Geography." In *Geography In America at the Dawn of the 21st Century*, by Gary L. Gaile, & Cort J. Willmott, 600-615. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism.* New York, NY: Alfred A. Kopf, 1993.

—. *Orientalism.* New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1978.

Sankaran, Devyani, and Sharma Lavanya. "Cognitive and Social Forces in Dialect Shift: Gradual Change in London South Asian Speech." *Language Variation and Change* 23 (2011): 399-428.

Sapir, Edward. "The Takelma Language of Southern Oregon." In *Handbook of American Indian Languages, Part 2*, by Franz Boas, 1-296. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1922.

Saussure, Ferdinand (de). *Cours de Linguistique Générale.* Paris: Payot, 1916.

Schaff, Adam. *Language and Cognition.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Schatzki, Theodore R. "Practice Theory." In *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, by Theodore R. Schatzki, Karin Knorr Cetina, & Eike von Savigny, 10-23. London: Routledge, 2001.

—. *The Site of the Social: A Philosophical Account of the Constitution of Social Life and Change.* University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.

Schieffelin, Bambi, Kathryn Woolard, and Paul Kroskrity. *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Schiffman, Harold. *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy.* London: Routledge, 1996.

Schlesinger, Philip. *Putting "Reality" Together: BBC News.* London: Constable, 1978.

Schneider, Edgar W. *Postcolonial English: Varieties Around the World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Scholtz, Christa Sieglinde. *Negotiating Claims: The Emergence of Indigenous Land Claim Negotiation Policies in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2006.

Scott, James C. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998.

Sherzer, Joel. *An Areal-Typological Study of American Indian Languages North of Mexico.* Amsterdam: North Holland, 1976.

Shohamy, Elana. *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches.* London: Routledge, 2006.

Shohamy, Elana, and Durk Gorter. *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery.* New York: Routledge, 2009.

Shumway, J. Matthew, and Richard H. Jackson. "Native American Population Patterns." *Geographical Review* 85, no. 2 (1995): 185-201.

Silentman, Irene. "Revaluing Indigenous Language Resources Through Language Planning." *The Bilingual Research Journal* 19, no. 1 (Winter 1995): 179-182.

Silvern, Steve E. "Scales of Justice: Law, American Indian Treaty Rights and Political Construction of Scale." *Political Geography* 18 (1999): 639-668.

Silverstein, Michael. "Language and The Culture of Gender: at the Intersection of Structure, Usage and Ideology." In *Semiotic Mediation: Sociocultural and Psychological Perspectives*, by Elizabeth Mertz, & Richard J. Parmentier, 219-239. Orlando, FL: Academic Press, 1985.

Smith, Neil. "Geography, Difference and the Politics of Scale." In *Postmodernism and the Social Sciences*, by Elspeth Graham, and Mohammed H. Malek Joe Doherty, 57-79. London: MacMillan, 1992.

Smith, Neil. "Homeless/global: Scaling Places." In *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change*, by John Bird, Barry Curtis, Tim Putnam, & Lisa Tickner, 87-119. London: Routledge, 1993.

Smith, Neil. "The Region is Dead! Long Live the Region!" *Political Geography* 7, no. 2 (1989): 141-152.

Smith, Sherrt. *Reimagining Indians: Native Americans Through Anglo Eyes, 1880-1940.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Soja, Edward. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real and Imagined Spaces.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1996.

Spolsky, Bernard. *Language Policy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

State of Wisconsin. "Amendments to the Ho-Chunk Nation and the State of Wisconsin Gaming Compact of 1992." *DOA Home.* 1992. http://www.doa.state.wi.us/docview.asp?docid=2133 (accessed 05 18, 2012).

Summerhill, Stephen J., and John A. Williams. *Sinking Columbus: Contested History, Cultural Politics, and Mythmaking During the Quincentenary.* Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2000.

Sutton, Imre. "Indian Land, White Man's Law: Southern California Revisited." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 18, no. 3 (1994): 265-270.

Swyngedouw, Erik. "The Contested Production of a New 'Gestalt of Scale' and the Politics of Marginalisation." In *Geographies of Economies*, by Roger Lee, & Jane Willis, 167-176. London: Arnold, 1997.

Tatz, Colin. *Genocide in Australia.* AIATSIS Research Discussion Papers No 8, Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies., 1999.

Taylor, Patrick J. "A Materialist Framework for Political Geography." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 7 (1982): 15-34.

Taylor, Patrick J. "The State as a Container: Territoriality in the Modern Wolrd-System." *Progress in Human Geography* 18, no. 2 (1994): 151-162.

Taylor, Patrick J. "World Cities and Territorial States Under Conditions of Contemporary Globalization." *Political Geography* 19, no. 1 (2000): 5-32.

Taylor, Patrick J. "World-Systems Analysis and Regional Geography." *Professional Geographer* 40, no. 3 (1988): 259-265.

Terracher, Adolphe-Louis. *Géographie Linguistique: Histoire et Philologie.* Paris: Librairie Ancienne, 1924.

Thornton Media, Inc. *About Us.* 2012. http://www.ndnlanguage.com/about.html (accessed 05 18, 2012).

Thornton, Russell. *American Indian Holocaust and Survival: A Population History Since 1492.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987.

Thrift, Nigel. "Afterwords." *Environment and Planning D. Society and Space* 18, no. 2 (2000): 213-255.

Thrift, Nigel. "Dead Or Alive?" In *Cultural Turns/Geographical Turns: Perspectives on Cultural Geography*, by Ian Cook, Simon Naylor, James Ryan, & David Crouch, 1-6. Harlow, Essex: Prentice Hall, 2000.

—. *Spatial Formations.* London: Sage, 1996.

Tilley, Christopher Y. *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths, and Monuments.* Oxford: Berg, 1994.

Townsley, H.C., and G.S. Goldstein. "One View of the Etiology of Depression in the American Indian." *Public Health Report* 92, no. 5 (1977): 458-461.

Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Space and Place.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1979.

—. *Topophilia: a Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Tuchman, Gaye. *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality.* New York, NY: Free Press, 1978.

Tuhiwai, S.L. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* London: Zed Books Ltd., 1999.

Turnbull, David. "Futures for Indigenous Knowledges." *Futures* 41, no. 1 (2005): 1-5.

U.S. Census Bureau. "1900 Census - Census of Population and Housing - U.S. Census Bureau." *Census Bureau Homepage.* 1900. http://www.census.gov/prod/www/abs/decennial/1900.html (accessed 5 18, 2012).

U.S. Census Bureau. *2004 American Community Survey, Selected Population Profiles, S0201.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2004.

—. *Language Use in the United States: 2007.* Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010.

U.S. Office of Indian Affairs. *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the Year 1868.* Annual Report, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1868, 26-50.

United States Army Map Service. *Special Strategic Map.* Washington, DC: United States Army Map Service, 1943a.

United States Map Service. *A Short Polish Glossary of Geographic Terms.* Washington, DC: United States Map Service, 1940s.

—. *Normandy Peninsula : Special Strategic Map.* Washington, DC: United States Map Service, 1943b.

United States Senate. "English Language Unity Act of 2011." *Government Printing Office.* March 08, 2011. http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/search/pagedetails.action?packageId=BILLS-112s503is (accessed September 09, 2012).

University of Alaska Fairbanks. *Alaska Native Language Center.* 5 18, 2012. http://www.uaf.edu/anlc/mission/ (accessed 5 18, 2012).

US English. *U.S. English | Making English the Official Language | Fact Sheets: Costs of Multilingualism.* 2012. (accessed 05 18, 2012).

Utter, Jack. *American Indians: Answers to Today's Questions.* Lake Ann, MI: National Woodlands Publishing Company, 1993.

Valenzuela, Angela. *Leaving Children Behind: How "Texas-Style" Accountability Fails Latino Youth.* New York, NY: SUNY Press, 2005.

Van Criekingen, Mathieu. "Towards a Geography of Displacement. Moving Out of Brussels' Gentrifying Neighbourhoods." *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 23, no. 3 (2008): 199-213.

Viskovatoff, Alex. "Foundations of Niklas Luhmann's Theory of Social Systems." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 29, no. 4 (1999): 481-516.

Walkowitz, Daniel J., and Lisa Maya Knauer. *Contested Histories in Public Space: Memory, Race, and Nation.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009.

Whatmore, Sarah. *Hybrid Geographies.* London: Sage, 2001.

Whitman, Walt. "Slang in America." *North American Review*, November 1885: 431-435.

Wiconsin Legislative Reference Bureau. "Wisconsin Briefs from the Legislative Reference Bureau." *Wisconsin State Legislature.* September 2002. http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lrb/pubs/wb/02wb10.pdf (accessed 08 08, 2012).

Wiley, Terrence G. "Continuity and Change in the Function of language Ideologies in the United States." In *Ideology, Politics, and Language Policies: Focus on English*, by Thomas Ricento, 67-86. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2000.

Wiley, Terrence G. "Language Policy and English-Only." In *Language in the USA: Perspectives for the Twenty-First century*, by Edward Finegan, & John R. Rickford, 319-338. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Wilkins, David E. *Indian Politics and the American Political System.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2002.

Wilkins, David E., and K. Tsianina Lomawaima. *Uneven Grounds: American Indian Sovereignty and Federal Law.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2001.

Williams, Colin H. *Language in Geographic Context.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1988.

Woodward, Keith, and Jennifer Lea. "Geographies of Affect." In *The Handbook of Social Geography*, by Susan J Smith, Rachel Pain, Sallie Marston, & J.P. Jones III, 154-175. London: Sage Publications, 2009.

Woodward, Keith, J.P. Jones III, and Sallie Marston. "The Politics of Autonomous Space." *Progress In Human Geography* 36, no. 2 (2012): 204-224.

Wright, Sue. *Community and Communication: The Role of Language in Nation-State Building and European Integration.* Clarendon: Multilingual Matters, 2000.

Wright, Wayne E. "What English-only Really Means: A Study of the Implementation of California Language Policy with Cambodian-American Students." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 7, no. 1 (2004): 1-23.

Wright, Wayne E., and Pu Chang. *Academic Achievement of English Language Learners in Post Proposition 203 Arizona.* Education Studies Policy Laboratory, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, AZ: Language Policy Research Unit, 2005.

Wurm, S.A., and Shiro Hattori. *Language Atlas of the Pacific Area Part I, New Guinea Area, Oceania Australia.* Canberra: Australian Academy of the Humanities (distributed by Geocenter, Stuttgart 80), 1981.

Wurm, S.A., and Theo Baumann. *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger of Disappearing.* Paris: UNESCO Publications / Pacific Linguistics, 1996.

Zawada, Britta. "Linguistic Creativity from a Cognitive Perspective." *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 24, no. 2 (2006): 235-254.

Zelinsky, Wilbur. *Not Yet a Placeless Land: Tracking an Evolving American Geography.* Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2011.

Zepeda, Ofelia. "American Indian Language Policy." In *Perspectives on Official English*, by Karen L. Adams, & Daniel T. Brink, 247-256. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1990.

Appendix A

INTRO

Can you briefly describe your activities, and the number of people involved in the department?

What is your educational background?

How long have you been working in your current position?

Do you know your predecessor? What can you tell me about the history of the department?

Is there a particular training required from employees in the department?

What kind of language materials do you have for your language?

Where do you find funding for your activities?

EDUCATIONAL ASPECT:

What is the decision-making process regarding curriculum?

Do you develop your own teaching materials?

Does the tribal council have any influence over your decisions?

POLICY ASPECT:

Would you say that [your native language] is the official language on the reservation?

Are there any governmental measures taken regarding the language? (how do you feel about it?)

Have you met any difficulties either to receive approval from the tribe or to implement your program?

COMMUNITY ASPECT:

Do you have any attendance numbers for your programs?

Are you taking any steps to increase attendance?

Do you have people come in from outside of the reservation?

Do you collaborate with other tribes at all?

What would you say is the status of your native language?

Do you know about any federal or state policies affecting language?

If so: do you feel that these policies have affected the tribe in any way?

Appendix B

Does your tribe have a language program?

If **YES**:

What is your title?

How long have you been working in your current position?

What can you tell me about the history of the program?

Can you briefly describe the activities of the program?

What language materials do you have?

(if dictionary – how did it come about?)

(if classes – How well-attended?)

How are decisions affecting the program taken? (Where do you find funding?)

What would you say is the status of your native language?

Do you know about any federal or state policies affecting language?

Would you say that [your native language] is the official language on the reservation?

If **NOT**:

Is anyone teaching language classes for the tribe?

Appendix C

The following table presents a synoptic view of the calls I made in order to obtain the data included in this dissertation. The table headings refer to the administrative regions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, from whom I obtained the list of federally recognized tribes and official names. In column Q(uestionnaire), a check mark indicates that my full questionnaire was administered. In column P(rogram), "y" indicates the existence of a language program, "n" indicates that there is no current language program; I have marked "?" when I could not find sufficient information on the subject and included an explanation in footnotes. A check mark in column S(chool) signifies that the language is taught in the tribal school system.

The last two columns refer to the mode of contact; telephone was my primary choice because every tribe had a phone number listed and the date and time listed correspond to the call during which I received the information that appears in the table. As I rule, I made three attempts to contact each tribe, so the date may correspond to the day when contact was established or the day of my last attempt. In some cases I was referred to an email address either by the phone operator, my interlocutor at the language program or from their website; the results from email contact appear in the @ column, where "rep" means I received a reply; "fail" means email delivery failed; "sent" means that I the email I sent received no response. In these cases, I have written down the date and time when I received the email reply.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
OKLAHOMA REGION					
Alabama-Quassarte Tribal Town		n			02 30 PM, Thursday, 14 July 2011
Chickasaw Nation	✓	y	✓		03 37 PM, Tuesday, 29 March 2011
Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma	✓	y	✓		03 40 PM, Tuesday, 29 March 2011
Cherokee Nation	✓	y	✓		01 42 PM 26 November 2011
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	✓	y	✓	rep	08:26 AM, Thursday, 2 June 2011

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Kialegee Tribal Town		n			10 03 AM Wednesday, March 30 2011
Miami Tribe of Oklahoma		n			01 52 PM 28 November 2011
Muscogee (Creek) Nation	✓	y	✓		01 58 PM 28 November 2011
Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma		n			10 12 AM Wednesday, March 30 2011
Modoc Tribe of Oklahoma		n			10 17 AM Wednesday, March 30 2011
Osage Nation	✓	y			03 23 PM, Wednesday, 06 April 2011
Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma		n			10 20 AM Wednesday, March 30 2011
Quapaw Tribal Business Committee		n			10 29 AM Wednesday, March 30 2011
Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma		y	✓		11 09 AM Wednesday, March 30 2011
Thlopthlocco Tribal Town		y		fail	11 13 AM Wednesday, March 30 2011

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Seminole Nation of Oklahoma	✓	n			11 22 AM Wednesday, March 30 2011
Shawnee Tribe		y			11 29 AM Wednesday, March 30 2011
United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians		y			11 35 AM Wednesday, March 30 2011
Wyandotte Nation		?			11 43 AM Wednesday, March 30 2011
EASTERN REGION					
Aroostook Band of Micmac Indians of Maine	✓	y			01 51 PM, Tuesday, 19 April 2011
Cayuga Nation of New York		y			02 12 PM 28 November 2011
Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana		y			02 31 PM, Thursday, 28 October 2010
Catawba Indian Nation		y			01 29 PM, Tuesday, 19 April 2011
Chitimacha Tribe of Louisiana	✓	y			02 29 PM, Tuesday, 26 October 2010
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians of North Carolina		y	✓		02 07 PM, Tuesday, 19 April 2011
Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians of Maine	✓	y	✓	rep	06:46 AM Tuesday 9 June 2011
Mashantucket Pequot Tribe of Connecticut	✓	y			02 21 PM, Tuesday, 19 April 2011

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida	✓	n			02 34 PM, Tuesday, 19 April 2011
Jena Band of Choctaw Indians	✓	y			02 36 PM, Thursday, 28 October 2010
Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe		y	✓		03 11 PM 28 November 2011
Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians		y			03 28 PM 28 November 2011
Mohegan Indian Tribe of Connecticut	✓	y			02 49 PM, Tuesday, 19 April 2011
Oneida Nation of New York	✓	y	✓		09 48 PM 29 November 2011
Passamaquoddy Tribe of Maine	✓	y	✓		10 09 PM 29 November 2011
Narragansett Indian Tribe of Rhode Island		?[4]			10 37 PM 29 November 2011
Onondaga Nation of New York		y			10 41 PM 29 November 2011
Passamaquoddy Tribe of Maine - Pleasant Point Reservation		y	✓		n/a[5]
Penobscot Tribe of Maine	✓	y	✓		11 02 PM 29 November 2011
Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe		?[6]			11 22 PM 29 November 2011

---

[4] I was referred to the Narrangassett THPO by the operator, who did not know of a language program. I was not able to reach the THPO after several calls.

[5] Though the reservations of Motahkomikuk (or "Indian Township", herein Passamaquoddy Tribe of Maine) and Pleasant Point are different governmental entities, represented by different Tribal Councils, language education is coordinated jointly by the American (and Canadian) Passamaquoddy tribes.

[6] The St Regis Mohawk have a language specialist, an individual tribal member who took it upon herself to revive the language. I was not able to reach her on the phone, and she did not return my voicemail requests.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Seneca Nation of New York		?[7]			11 25 PM 29 November 2011
Poarch Band of Creek Indians of Alabama	✓	y			11 31 PM 29 November 2011
Seminole Tribe of Florida (Dania, Big Cypress, Brighton, Hollywood, 6300 Stirling & Tampa Reservations)		y	✓		11 38 PM 29 November 2011
Tonawanda Band of Seneca Indians of New York		y[8]			11 48 PM 29 November 2011
Tunica-Biloxi Indian Tribe of Louisiana	✓	n			02 54 PM, Thursday, 28 October 2010
Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah) of Massachusetts	✓	y			02 58 PM, Thursday, 28 October 2010
Tuscarora Nation of New York		?[9]			03 04 PM, Thursday, 28 October 2010
GREAT PLAINS REGION					
Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe of the Cheyenne River Reservation	✓	y	✓		04 15 PM, Tuesday, 19 April 2011
Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe of South Dakota		y	✓		02 28 PM Friday, 22 April 2011
Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation		?[10]			02 32 PM Friday, 22 April 2011
Crow Creek Sioux Tribe of the Crow Creek Reservation		n			02 39 PM Friday, 22 April 2011

[7] My first call attempt reached an interlocutor at the Seneca Nation who told me that her supervisor was unavailable; I left my contact information and did not hear back from them. When I attempted to call back, the operator directed my call to the THPO's office, who did not know whether or not there was anyone in charge of language for the tribe.

[8] Upon asking the operator if the tribe had a language program, he answered in the positive, asked where I was calling from and hung up the phone after I answered.

[9] Each of my call attempts was directed to a voicemail box, which was full and did not accept messages.

[10] Preservation of the Oglala Sioux language is part of the tribal Constitution but there is no branch of the government specifically dedicated to the task. Approximately a third of the tribe is fluent in the language.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Lower Brule Sioux Tribe of the Lower Brule Reservation		n	✓		02 44 PM Friday, 22 April 2011
Omaha Tribe of Nebraska		y	✓		02 58 PM, Tuesday, 26 April 2011
Ponca Tribe of Nebraska	✓	y	✓		02 52 PM, Tuesday, 26 April 2011
Santee Sioux Nation		n	✓		02 57 PM Friday, 22 April 2011
Spirit Lake Tribe		?[11]			03 01 PM Friday, 22 April 2011
Rosebud Sioux Tribe of the Rosebud Indian Reservation	✓	y	✓		03 11 PM, Tuesday, 26 April 2011
Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate of the Lake Traverse Reservation		n	✓		03 06 PM Friday, 22 April 2011
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of North & South Dakota		y	✓		03 20 PM, Tuesday, 26 April 2011
Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Rsvn. (Mandan, Hidatsa, Arikara Nation)		?[12]			03 23 PM, Tuesday, 26 April 2011
Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians of North Dakota		?[13]			03 30 PM, Tuesday, 26 April 2011
Yankton Sioux Tribe of South Dakota		y			03 34 PM, Tuesday, 26 April 2011
Trenton Indian Service Area		n	✓		03 37 PM, Tuesday, 26 April 2011
Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska	✓	y	✓		04 06 PM, Tuesday, 26 April 2011

[11] The operator knew of language workshop in the casino, but he did not know who was in charge of them.

[12] There are three different indigenous languages spoken on the reservation, and each community takes the responsibility to maintain them. The operator did not know where to direct my call.

[13] At time of calling, the tribe had just joined an agreement with other Anishinaabe-speaking tribes in order to protect the language. However, the cultural director had no details on how the tribe was involved.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
MIDWEST REGION					
Bad River Band of Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa		y	✓		02 12 PM, Wednesday, 27 April 2011
Forest County Potawatomi Community		y			03 31 PM, Wednesday, 27 April 2011
Hannahville Indian Community		y	✓		03 15 PM, Wednesday, 27 April 2011
Bay Mills Indian Community			✓		03 09 PM, Wednesday, 27 April 2011
Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians		?[14]			03 01 PM, Wednesday, 27 April 2011
Ho-Chunk Nation of Wisconsin	✓	y	✓		02 21 PM, Wednesday, 27 April 2011
Nottawaseppi Huron Band of the Pottawatomi		?[15]			03 41 PM, Wednesday, 27 April 2011
Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin		?			03 47 PM, Wednesday, 27 April 2011
Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians		?			03 52 PM, Wednesday, 27 April 2011

[14] The number I reached at the cultural department rang without voicemail. I was not able to reach an interlocutor.
[15] My calls to the language coordinator for the tribe were not answered, and my voicemails were not returned.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Keweenaw Bay Indian Community	✓	y	✓		02 36 PM, Tuesday, 03 May 2011
Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa	✓	y	✓		02 46 PM, Tuesday, 03 May 2011
Little River Band of Ottawa Indians	✓	y	✓	rep	01 56 PM, Wednesday, 10 June 2011
Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians		?[16]			02 53 PM, Tuesday, 03 May 2011
Match-e-be-nash-she-wish Band of Pottawatomi Indians of Michigan		?[17]			03 14 PM, Tuesday, 03 May 2011
Minnesota Chippewa Tribe		n[18]			03 52 PM, Tuesday, 03 May 2011
Lower Sioux Indian Community of Minnesota	✓	n			03 07 PM, Tuesday, 03 May 2011
Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin	✓	y	✓		03 30 PM, Tuesday, 03 May 2011
Bois Forte Reservation Business Committee		y	✓		04 09 PM, Tuesday, 03 May 2011
Fond du Lac Reservation Business Committee		n	✓		04 04 PM, Tuesday, 03 May 2011
Leech Lake Reservation Business Committee		y			01 59 PM, Wednesday, 04 May 2011

---

[16] My calls to the language coordinator for the tribe were not answered, and my voicemails were not returned.

[17] I was able to reach the cultural coordinator twice, but he was not able to answer my questions. I left my contact information, but he never called me back.

[18] The "Minnesota Chippewa Tribe" is a governmental entity gathering several tribal groups, each of which is responsible for its own education and language programs.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
White Earth Reservation Business Committee	✓	y	✓		02 11 PM, Wednesday, 04 May 2011
Grand Portage Reservation Business Committee		?[19]			02 32 PM, Wednesday, 04 May 2011
Mille Lacs Band Assembly	✓	y	✓		02 41 PM, Wednesday, 04 May 2011
Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin		y	✓		02 50 PM, Wednesday, 04 May 2011
Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians	✓	y	✓		03 06 PM, Wednesday, 04 May 2011
Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin	✓	y	✓		03 15 PM, Wednesday, 04 May 2011
Sac & Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa	✓	y	✓		04 13 PM, Wednesday, 04 May 2011
Prairie Island Indian Community in the State of Minnesota		y			05 40 PM, Tuesday, 10 May 2011
Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians	✓	n	✓	rep	09 24 PM, Thursday, 12 May 2011
Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan	✓	y	✓		03 40 PM, Tuesday, 10 May 2011

---

[19] The only available contact information for the tribe is its casino. The casino's operator had no information regarding language programs for the tribe.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin		n	✓		03 12 PM, Tuesday, 24 May 2011
Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community of Minnesota	✓				03 58 PM, Tuesday, 10 May 2011
Stockbridge Munsee Community		?[20]			04 03 PM, Tuesday, 10 May 2011
Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Michigan		?[21]			03 18 PM, Tuesday, 24 May 2011
Sokaogon Chippewa Community		?[22]			03 30 PM, Tuesday, 24 May 2011
Upper Sioux Community		?[23]			03 36 PM, Tuesday, 24 May 2011
NAVAJO REGION					
Navajo Nation	✓	y	✓		03 31 PM, Friday, 13 May 2011
NORTHWEST REGION					
Burns Paiute Tribe of the Burns Paiute Indian Colony		y	✓		04 16 PM, Tuesday, 24 May 2011
Coeur D'Alene Tribe of the Coeur D'Alene Reservation	✓	y	✓		03 58 PM, Wednesday, 11 May 2011
Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians of Oregon		y			02 12 PM, Tuesday, 17 May 2011
Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation		y	✓		02 30 PM, Tuesday, 17 May 2011

---

[20] The Stockbridge Munsee band of Mohican Indian has a monthly meeting regarding language activities in the library, but I was not able to reach the person in charge of it.

[21] At time of writing, the Sault tribe of Chippewa Indians had applied for an ANA grant, which they received in late 2011.

[22] The receptionist for the Sokaogon Chippewa Community cultural department did not feel comfortable answering questions about policy, and referred me to the program director, who did not answer or return my calls.

[23] The operator did not have information regarding language programs on the reservation.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation	✓	y	✓		03 05 PM, Tuesday, 17 May 2011
Coquille Tribe of Oregon	✓	y			03 26 PM, Tuesday, 17 May 2011
Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians of Oregon		y	✓		03 42 PM, Tuesday, 17 May 2011
Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation of Idaho	✓	y	✓		03 59 PM, Tuesday, 17 May 2011
Hoh Indian Tribe of the Hoh Indian Reservation	✓	y	✓		02 46 PM, Wednesday, 18 May 2011
Cowlitz Indian Tribe		?[24]			03 01 PM, Wednesday, 18 May 2011
Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon		?[25]	✓		03 14 PM, Wednesday, 18 May 2011
Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe of Washington		y	✓	rep	11:18 AM, Monday, 4 August 2011
Kalispel Indian Community of the Kalispel Reservation		y	✓	sent	03 32 PM, Wednesday, 18 May 2011
Kootenai Tribe of Idaho		y			01 58 PM, Tuesday, 24 May 2011
Lummi Tribe of the Lummi Reservation		y			02 12 PM, Tuesday, 24 May 2011

---

[24] The tribe has made efforts to revive the language but is lacking funds to do so; I was directed to a tribal member for more information, but they did not return my call.

[25] At time of writing, the Confederated Tribes of Grande Ronde had applied for an ANA grant, which they received in late 2011.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Klamath Tribes		y			02 23 PM, Tuesday, 24 May 2011
Lower Elwha Tribal Community of the Lower Elwha Rsvn.		y		sent	02 41 PM, Tuesday, 8 April 2011
Makah Indian Tribe of the Makah Indian Reservation	✓	y	✓		03 49 PM, Tuesday, 24 May 2011
Nez Perce Tribe	✓	y	✓		04 12 PM, Tuesday, 24 May 2011
Nooksack Indian Tribe of Washington		y			04 38 PM, Tuesday, 24 May 2011
Muckleshoot Indian Tribe of the Muckleshoot Reservation		y			02 28 PM, Wednesday, 25 May 2011
Nisqually Indian Tribe of the Nisqually Reservation		y			02 42 PM, Wednesday, 25 May 2011
Northwestern Band of Shoshoni Nation of Utah (Washakie)	✓	y	✓		02 53 PM, Wednesday, 25 May 2011
Port Gamble Indian Community of the Port Gamble Rsvn.	✓	y	✓	rep	11:02 AM, Monday, 06 June 2011
Quileute Tribe of the Quileute Reservation		y			03 18 PM, Wednesday, 25 May 2011
Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Rsvn.	✓	y	✓		02 45 PM, Monday, 06 June 2011
Puyallup Tribe of the Puyallup Reservation		y			03 02 PM, Monday, 06 June 2011

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Quinault Tribe of the Quinault Reservation		n			03 08 PM, Monday, 06 June 2011
Samish Indian Tribe		?[26]			03 16 PM, Monday, 06 June 2011
Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe of Washington		?[27]			03 22 PM, Monday, 06 June 2011
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon	✓	y	V	rep	09:14 PM, Tuesday, 07 June 2011
Snoqualmie Tribe		y	✓	sent	03 54 PM, Monday, 06 June 2011
Shoalwater Bay Tribe of the Shoalwater Bay Indian Reservation		?[28]		sent	04 04 PM, Monday, 06 June 2011
Skokomish Indian Tribe of the Skokomish Reservation		y			02 20 PM, Friday, 10 June 2011
Spokane Tribe of the Spokane Reservation		?[29]			03 22 PM, Friday, 10 June 2011
Squaxin Island Tribe of the Squaxin Island Reservation		y		sent	03 16 PM, Friday, 10 June 2011
Suquamish Indian Tribe of the Port Madison Reservation	✓	y	✓		03 04 PM, Friday, 10 June 2011
Tulalip Tribes of the Tulalip Reservation		y		sent	02 51 PM, Friday, 10 June 2011

[26] The Samish tribe received an ANA grant in 2010 to build a dictionary for the tribe's language. A few tribal members with first-hand knowledge of the language are transcribing recordings, but the operator did not know who was in charge of the project.

[27] Two different operators did not know whether or not the tribe has a language program.

[28] The Shoalwater Bay Tribe has a cultural department in charge of language preservation but at time of writing there was no staff or funds to administer language programs.

[29] The Spokane tribe has a language program, but I was not able to contact its staff members, either by email or phone.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Stillaguamish Tribe of Washington		?[30]			02 38 PM, Friday, 10 June 2011
Swinomish Indians of the Swinomish Reservation		?[31]			03 49 PM, Friday, 10 June 2011
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation	✓	y			03 56 PM, Friday, 10 June 2011
Upper Skagit Indian Tribe of Washington		n			04 12 PM, Friday, 10 June 2011
Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation		?[32]			04 23 PM, Friday, 10 June 2011
Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon		y		fail	04 29 PM, Friday, 10 June 2011
PACIFIC REGION					
Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Reservation		?[33]			02 13 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Augustine Band of Cahuilla Indians	✓	n			02 26 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Bear River Band of Rohnerville Rancheria	✓	y	✓		03 14 PM, Monday, 20 June 2011
Alturas Indian Rancheria		?[34]			03 34 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011

[30] The operator informed me that the director of the cultural resources department of the tribe had recently quit the position. She offered to direct my call to the tribal chairman, with whom I left a voicemail, which he did not return.

[31] Two different operators did not know if the tribe operated a language program.

[32] I reached the voicemail box of the language program and left my contact information, but my call was not returned.

[33] The Agua Caliente tribe operates a cultural preservation program, whose mission includes preserving the language, but they do not have sufficient funds or staff to actively maintain language activities.

[34] The only contact information available for the Alturas Rancheria refers to its casino. The casino operator did not know of a language program.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Barona Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians	✓	y	✓		03 36 PM, Monday, 13 June 2011
Utu Utu Gwaitu Paiute Tribe of the Benton Paiute Reservation		n			11 15 AM, Tuesday, 14 June 2011
Berry Creek Rancheria of Maidu Indians of California	✓	y			11 40 AM, Tuesday, 14 June 2011
Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley		?[35]			11 52 AM, Tuesday, 14 June 2011
Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians of the Big Valley Rancheria		?[36]			12 01 PM, Tuesday, 14 June 2011
Big Lagoon Rancheria		n			12 08 PM, Tuesday, 14 June 2011
Big Sandy Rancheria of Mono Indians of California		y			01 03 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Paiute-Shoshone Indians of the Bishop Community of the Bishop Colony		y	✓		01 16 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Blue Lake Rancheria		n			01 22 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians of California	✓	y			01 29 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011

---

[35] The operator identified language preservation as the duty of the Big Pine Paiute's THPO; my voicemail message at the THPO's office was not returned.

[36] The Big Valley Pomo received a preservation grant from the ANA in the past, but they have run out of funds to actively administer language activities. The materials created by the grant are still available through the tribal library.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Cahto Indian Tribe of the Laytonville Rancheria		n			01 42 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Bridgeport Paiute Indian Colony of California		?[37]			01 54 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Cabazon Band of Mission Indians		y			02 08 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Cahuilla Band of Mission Indians of the Cahuilla Reservation	✓	y	✓		02 24 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
California Valley Miwok Tribe	✓	y	✓		03 43 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Cedarville Rancheria		n			03 51 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Cloverdale Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California		n			03 56 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Campo Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of the Campo Reservation		n			04 10 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Chicken Ranch Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians of California		n			04 16 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011

[37] The receptionist of the Bridgeport Paiute informed me that their community is very small and the tribe thus maintains a small government; she believed that the tribe's language is everyone's responsibility and that the tribal council is very supportive of any effort to preserve or promote it.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Cold Springs Rancheria of Mono Indians of California		?[38]			04 22 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Cachil DeHe Band of Wintun Indians of the Colusa Rancheria		n			04 29 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Coyote Valley Band of Pomo Indians of California		n			04 33 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Elem Indian Colony of Pomo Indians, Sulphur Bank Rancharia		?[39]			04 39 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Cortina Indian Rancheria of Wintun Indians of California		n			04 46 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Dry Creek Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California		n			04 49 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Elk Valley Rancheria		n			04 54 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Enterprise Rancheria of Maidu Indians of California		n			04 58 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011

[38] The operator of the Cold Springs Rancheria directed my call to an unidentified voice mailbox, wherein I left my contact information but my call was not returned.

[39] The tribe does not have funds to administer a language program; the Elem Pomo language has only one native speaker remaining, and the tribe is cooperating with UC Berkeley to record her knowledge.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria		?[40]			05 02 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Fort Independence Indian Community of Paiute Indians		y			05 10 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians		n			05 14 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Fort Bidwell Indian Community of the Fort Bidwell Reservation		n			05 42 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Greenville Rancheria of Maidu Indians of California		?[41]			05 45 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Grindstone Indian Rancheria of Wintun-Wailaki Indians of CA	✓	y	✓	rep	04 37 PM, Friday, 24 June 2011
Habematolel Pomo of Upper Lake		n			05 51 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Hopland Band of Pomo Indians of the Hopland Rancheria		n			05 58 PM, Wednesday, 15 June 2011
Guidiville Rancheria of California		n	✓		01 14 PM, Friday, 17 June 2011

---

[40] Though the tribe does not operate a language program, it supports the college education of one tribal members attending classes at UC Berkeley to learn and eventually teach the Coastal Mi'wok language that was once spoken by the tribe.

[41] I left a message on the Greenville Maidu's cultural director's voice mailbox with my contact information, but she did not return my call.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Hoopa Valley Tribe		y			01 26 PM, Friday, 17 June 2011
Inaja Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of the Inaja and Cosmit Rsvn.		n	✓		01 34 PM, Friday, 17 June 2011
Ione Band of Miwok Indians of California		n			01 39 PM, Friday, 17 June 2011
Jamul Indian Village of California		n			01 44 PM, Friday, 17 June 2011
La Jolla Band of Luiseno Indians		n	✓		03 39 PM, Monday, 20 June 2011
Jackson Rancheria of Me-wuk Indians of California	✓	n			03 52 PM, Monday, 20 June 2011
Karuk Tribe	✓	y	✓	fail	04 33 PM, Monday, 20 June 2011
La Posta Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of the La Posta Rsvn.		n			04 49 PM, Monday, 20 June 2011
Paiute-Shoshone Indians of the Lone Pine Comm. of the Rsvn.		y			04 53 PM, Monday, 20 June 2011
Lower Lake Rancheria (Koi Nation)		n			03 08 PM, Wednesday, 22 June 2011
Manchester Band of Pomo Indians of the Point Arena Ranch.	✓	y	✓		03 21 PM, Wednesday, 22 June 2011
Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla and Cupeno Indians		n			03 42 PM, Wednesday, 22 June 2011

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Lytton Rancheria of California		?[42]			04 22 PM, Wednesday, 22 June 2011
Manzanita Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of the Manzanita Rsvn.	✓	n			01 04 PM, Friday, 24 June 2011
Mechoopda Indian Tribe of Chico Rancheria		y			01 16 PM, Friday, 24 June 2011
Middletown Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California		?[43]			01 24 PM, Friday, 24 June 2011
Morongo Band of Mission Indians		n			01 31 PM, Friday, 24 June 2011
Mesa Grande Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of the Mesa Grande Rsvn.		n			01 38 PM, Friday, 24 June 2011
Mooretown Rancheria of Maidu Indians of California		?[44]			01 44 PM, Friday, 24 June 2011
Northfork Rancheria of Mono Indians of California		n			01 58 PM, Friday, 24 June 2011
Pala Band of Luiseno Mission Indians of the Pala Rsvn.		y			02 13 PM, Friday, 24 June 2011
Pauma Band of Luiseno Mission Indians of the	✓	y	✓	fail	01 51 PM, Monday, 27 June 2011
Picayune Rancheria of Chukchansi Indians of California		y			02 08 PM, Monday, 27 June 2011
Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians of California	✓	y			02 14 PM, Monday, 27 June 2011

---

[42] I spoke to a receptionist for the Lytton Rancheria's cultural department, who took my contact information in order to pass it along to her supervisor; my call was not returned.
[43] The phone operator directed my call to the tribe's Human Resources department, who did not know of language programs for the tribe.
[44] Two different phone operators did not know whether or not the Mooretwon Rancheria had a language program.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians of the Pechanga Rsvn.		y	✓		02 19 PM Friday, 1 July 2011
Pinoleville Pomo Nation		?[45]			02 25 PM Friday, 1 July 2011
Pit River Tribe (XL Ranch, Big Bend, Likely, Lookout,	✓	n			02 31 PM Friday, 1 July 2011
Quartz Valley Indian Community of the Quartz Valley Rsvn.	✓	n			02 44 PM Friday, 1 July 2011
Redding Rancheria		?[46]			02 51 PM Friday, 1 July 2011
Potter Valley Tribe		?[47]			03 00 PM Friday, 1 July 2011
Ramona Band of Cahuilla		?[48]			03 09 PM Friday, 1 July 2011
Redwood Valley Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California		n			03 14 PM Friday, 1 July 2011
Resighini Rancheria		?[49]			03 24 PM Friday, 1 July 2011
Robinson Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California		n			03 31 PM Friday, 1 July 2011
Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation (formerly the Rumsey Indian Rancheria of Wintun Indians of CA)	✓	y	✓		03 48 PM Friday, 1 July 2011

---

[45] Two different phone operators did not know whether or not the Pinoleville Pomo had a language program.
[46] I was directed to the cultural department of the Redding Rancheria, and left a message on their voice mailbox; my call was not returned.
[47] The operator did not know if the tribe administered any language program and directed my call to the tribal chairman. I left a message on his voice mailbox, which was not returned.
[48] On three occasions I called the tribe and there was no response, neither operator nor voicemail.
[49] On three occasions I called the tribe and there was no response, neither operator nor voicemail.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Rincon Band of Luiseno Mission Indians of the Rincon Reservation		y	✓		02 04 PM, Wednesday, 06 July 2011
Round Valley Indian Tribes of the Round Valley Reservation		n			02 08 PM, Wednesday, 06 July 2011
San Manuel Band of Mission Indians		?[50]			02 16 PM, Wednesday, 06 July 2011
San Pasqual Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of California		y			02 22 PM, Wednesday, 06 July 2011
Santa Rosa Indian Community of the Santa Rosa Rancheria		n			02 48 PM, Wednesday, 06 July 2011
Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel	✓	y	✓		02 42 PM, Wednesday, 06 July 2011
Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians	✓	n	✓		02 26 PM, Wednesday, 06 July 2011
Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians of the Santa Ynez Rsvn.	✓	y			03 57 PM, Wednesday, 06 July 2011
Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians of California		n			02 00 PM, Friday, 08 July 2011
Sherwood Valley Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California		y			02 01 PM, Friday, 08 July 2011

[50] I left a message on the cultural director's voice mailbox, and my call was not returned.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Smith River Rancheria	✓	y	✓		02 17 PM, Friday, 08 July 2011
Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of the Stewarts Point Rancheria	✓	y	✓		02 37 PM, Friday, 08 July 2011
Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, Shingle Springs Rancheria		?[51]			02 42 PM, Friday, 08 July 2011
Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians		y			02 45 PM, Friday, 08 July 2011
Susanville Indian Rancheria		n		rep	07 25 PM, Tuesday, 12 July 2011
Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation	✓	y	✓	rep	05 30 PM, Monday, 11 July 2011
Death Valley Timbi-Sha Shoshone Band of California		n			03 01 PM, Friday, 08 July 2011
Cher-Ae Heights Indian Community of the Trinidad Rancheria	✓	y		fail	03 40 PM, Friday, 08 July 2011
Table Mountain Rancheria of California		n			03 41 PM, Friday, 08 July 2011
Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians	✓	y	✓		03 30 PM, Monday, 11 July 2011
Tule River Indian Tribe of the Tule River Reservation		y			03 52 PM, Friday, 08 July 2011
Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians of the Tuolumne	✓	y	✓		02 35 PM, Monday, 11 July 2011
United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria	✓	y	✓		04 16 PM, Friday, 08 July 2011
Wiyot Tribe (formerly the Table Bluff Reservation-Wiyot Tribe)		n			02 37 PM, Monday, 11 July 2011

[51] On three separate occasions, my calls to the cultural department went unanswered.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians of California	✓	y	✓	rep	05 25 PM, Monday, 11 July 2011
Viejas Band of Mission Indians	✓	y		rep	08 01 PM, Monday, 11 July 2011
Yurok Tribe of the Yurok Reservation					03 54 PM, Monday, 11 July 2011
SOUTHERN PLAINS					
Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma	✓	y	✓		04 06 PM, Monday, 11 July 2011
Apache Tribe of Oklahoma	✓	y	✓		01 25 PM, Thursday, 14 July 2011
Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes	✓	y	✓		01 26 PM, Thursday, 14 July 2011
Alabama-Coushatta Tribes of Texas		y			03 27 PM, Tuesday, 29 March 2011
Caddo Nation	✓	n		rep	03 16 PM, Tuesday, 19 July 2011
Citizen Potawatomi Nation		y			03 52 PM, Thursday, 14 July 2011
Comanche Nation		y	✓	sent [52]	03 55 PM, Thursday, 14 July 2011
Fort Sill Apache Tribe of Oklahoma		n			03 59 PM, Thursday, 14 July 2011
Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma	✓	n			04 04 PM, Thursday, 14 July 2011

---

[52] I sent an email to the contact address listed on the Comanche language program's website; I received a reply the next day recommending that I check the website for more information. I sent another message with my questionnaire attached to it, but I received no reply.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Delaware Nation		?[53]			04 12 PM, Thursday, 14 July 2011
Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska	✓	n			03 18 PM, Friday, 15 July 2011
Kaw Nation	✓	y	✓		03 42 PM, Friday, 15 July 2011
Kickapoo Traditional Tribe of Texas		?[54]			03 45 PM, Friday, 15 July 2011
Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma		n			03 47 PM, Friday, 15 July 2011
Otoe-Missouria Tribe of Indians	✓	n	✓		02 23 PM, Monday, 18 July 2011
Kickapoo Tribe of Indians of the Kickapoo Reservation in Kansas					02 19 PM, Monday, 18 July 2011
Kiowa Indian Tribe of Oklahoma	✓	y	✓		02 32 PM, Monday, 18 July 2011
Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma		n			02 34 PM, Monday, 18 July 2011
Ponca Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma	✓	y	✓		02 58 PM, Monday, 18 July 2011
Sac & Fox Nation of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska	✓	n			03 26 PM, Monday, 18 July 2011
Tonkawa Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma	✓	n			03 04 PM, Monday, 18 July 2011
Prairie Band of Potawatomi Nation	✓	y	✓		03 18 PM, Monday, 18 July 2011

[53] Two different tribal operators did not know whether or not the tribe administered a language program; once I was directed to the local school, where my call went unanswered.

[54] The operator directed my call to the tribe's THPO, who directed my call to a tribal member who has been attempting to teach language classes. I left a message on his voice mailbox, but he did not return my call.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Sac & Fox Nation	✓	y	✓		03 01 PM, Monday, 18 July 2011
Wichita and Affiliated Tribes (Wichita, Keechi, Waco & Tawakonie)	✓	y	✓		03 28 PM, Monday, 18 July 2011
SOUTHWEST					
Jicarilla Apache Nation		?[55]			03 33 PM, Monday, 18 July 2011
Ohkay Owingeh (formerly Pueblo of San Juan)		y			04 05 PM, Monday, 18 July 2011
Pueblo of Cochiti	✓	y	✓		03 52 PM, Wednesday, 20 July 2011
Mescalero Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation	✓	y	✓		04 07 PM, Wednesday, 20 July 2011
Pueblo of Acoma	✓	y	✓		04 22 PM, Wednesday, 20 July 2011
Pueblo of Isleta	✓	y	✓		03 03 PM, Wednesday, 27 July 2011
Pueblo of Jemez		y	✓		03 23 PM, Wednesday, 27 July 2011
Pueblo of Nambe		n			03 26 PM, Wednesday, 27 July 2011

[55] I was directed to the Jicarilla tribe's education department, where my call went unanswered.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Pueblo of Pojoaque		y	✓	fail	03 37 PM, Wednesday, 27 July 2011
Pueblo of Laguna		y			03 45 PM, Wednesday, 27 July 2011
Pueblo of Picuris		n			04 39 PM, Wednesday, 27 July 2011
Pueblo of San Felipe	✓	y	✓		04 42 PM, Wednesday, 27 July 2011
Pueblo of San Ildefonso		n			04 45 PM, Wednesday, 27 July 2011
Pueblo of Santa Ana		y	✓		02 12 PM, Friday, 10 June 2011
Kewa Pueblo (formerly the Pueblo of Santo Domingo)	✓	y	✓		03 05 PM, Friday, 29 July 2011
Pueblo of Sandia	✓	y	✓	rep	09:06 AM, Friday, 16 September 2011
Pueblo of Santa Clara		?[56]			03 13 PM, Friday, 29 July 2011
Pueblo of Taos	✓	y			03 18 PM, Friday, 29 July 2011
Pueblo of Tesuque		?[57]			03 25 PM, Friday, 29 July 2011

---

[56] I left a message on the cultural department's voice mailbox, but my call was not returned.
[57] On three separate occasions, my calls to the tribe's main phone number went unanswered.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Zuni Tribe of the Zuni Reservation	✓	y	✓		03 47 PM, Friday, 29 July 2011
Southern Ute Indian Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation		?[58]		fail	03 52 PM, Friday, 29 July 2011
Pueblo of Zia		n	✓		04 17 PM, Friday, 29 July 2011
Ramah Navajo Chapter		n	✓		02 44 PM, Monday, 01 August 2011
Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation		?[59]			04 26 PM, Friday, 29 July 2011
Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo of Texas (Tigua)	✓	y			02 40 PM, Monday, 01 August 2011
WESTERN REGION					
Ak Chin Indian Community of the Maricopa Reservation	✓	y			02 13 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Cocopah Tribe of Arizona	✓	n			02 15 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Duckwater Shoshone Tribe of the Duckwater Reservation	✓	n			03 31 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Chemehuevi Indian Tribe of the Chemehuevi Reservation		?[60]			02 21 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011

---

[58] The operator directed me to the tribe's website for information about the language program. I emailed the address provided on the website, but delivery of my message failed.

[59] On my first attempt to reach the cultural director, I reached her before a meeting and she recommended that I call the next Monday. I attempted to call her twice the following week, and she was unavailable both times.

[60] The operator forwarded my call to the Cultural Center, where I was informed that a tribal member is organizing occasional classes; I left a message on his voice mailbox but he did not return my call.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Colorado River Indian Tribes of the Colorado River Reservation		?[61]			02 56 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Ely Shoshone Tribe of Nevada	✓	y	✓		03 09 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Paiute-Shoshone Tribe of the Fallon Rsvn. and Colony		n			03 14 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation		y			03 16 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Gila River Indian Community of the Gila River Rsvn.	✓	y	✓		03 33 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribes of the Fort McDermitt Rsvn.		?[62]			03 37 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Fort Mojave Indian Tribe of Arizona, California & Nevada		?[63]		sent	03 46 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation		n	✓		03 55 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011

[61] The cultural director for the Colorado River Indian Tribe informed me that the tribe has an Ethics Review Board that needed to review my questionnaire before she could answer it. I mailed my questionnaire and contact information to the address she gave me, and I have not received a response ever since.

[62] I was not able to reach the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone – the phone number in the BIA directory was disconnected, and I could not find another valid number on the internet.

[63] I was able to speak to a cultural coordinator at the Fort Mojave tribe, who recommended that I email her my questionnaire. I sent in my questions, but did not receive a reply.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Havasupai Tribe of the Havasupai Reservation		n			03 59 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Hualapai Indian Tribe of the Hualapai Indian Reservation		?[64]			04 01 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Las Vegas Tribe of Paiute Indians of the Las Vegas Indian Col.		?[65]	✓		04 05 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Hopi Tribe of Arizona	✓	y	✓		04 11 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians of the Kaibab Indian Reservation	✓	y	✓		02 17 PM, Monday, 08 August 2011
Lovelock Paiute Tribe of the Lovelock Indian Colony		n			04 21 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Moapa Band of Paiute Indians of the Moapa River Indian Rsvn.		n			04 23 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona	✓	y	✓		04 38 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation	✓	y	✓		04 59 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011

---

[64] On three separate occasions, I was told that the cultural coordinator was absent, and that I needed to call the next day. I was never able to reach them.

[65] The operator transferred me to the education department, where I spoke to a teacher who did not feel confident about the information she had. She referred me to the teaching supervisor with whom I left a voicemail message; she did not return my call.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah (Cedar, Kanosh, Koosharem, Indian Peaks, and Shivwits Bands of Paiutes)	✓	n	✓		05 06 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of the Pyramid Lake Reservation	✓	n	✓	fail	05 13 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Reno-Sparks Indian Colony	✓	y	✓		05 33 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Comm. of the Salt River Rsvn	✓	y	✓		02 30 PM, Monday, 08 August 2011
San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe of Arizona		n		fail	02 38 PM, Monday, 08 August 2011
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians of Utah		n	✓		03 48 PM, Wednesday, 03 August 2011
San Carlos Apache Tribe of the San Carlos Reservation	?[66]				02 55 PM, Monday, 08 August 2011
Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation	✓	y	✓		03 02 PM, Monday, 08 August 2011
Summit Lake Paiute Tribe of Nevada		n			02 39 PM, Wednesday, 10 August 2011
Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada		n			02 42 PM, Wednesday, 10 August 2011
Elko Band Council		n			n/a
Wells Indian Colony Band Council		n			n/a

---

[66] On three separate attempts, I was directed to the voice mailbox of the cultural director of the San Carlos Apache tribe, the automated message thereof said it was "not available."

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Battle Mountain Band Council (Owyhee)		n	✓		03 08 PM, Monday, 08 August 2011
South Fork Band Council		n			n/a
Tohono O'odham Nation of Arizona	✓	y	✓		02 51 PM, Wednesday, 10 August 2011
Tonto Apache Tribe of Arizona	✓	y	✓		03 04 PM, Wednesday, 10 August 2011
Walker River Paiute Tribe of the Walker River Reservation		n			03 08 PM, Wednesday, 10 August 2011
Carson Community Council		?[67]			02 40 PM, Monday, 08 August 2011
Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah & Ouray Reservation	✓	y	✓		02 51 PM, Thursday, 17 March 2011
Washoe Tribe of Nevada & California		n			03 16 PM, Wednesday, 10 August 2011
Dresslerville Community Council		n			n/a
Stewart Community Council		n			03 18 PM, Wednesday, 10 August 2011
White Mountain Apache Tribe of the Fort Apache Reservation	✓	n	✓		03 27 PM, Wednesday, 10 August 2011

---

[67] The phone number for the Carson Community Council in the BIA directory was disconnected, and I could not find another contact number for the tribe – it is a member of the Washoe Tribe of Nevada & California, who informed me that the community "probably" did not have a language program.

Tribal Denomination	Q	P	S	@	☎
Yavapai-Apache Nation of the Camp Verde Indian Rsvn.	✓	y	✓		03 35 PM, Wednesday, 10 August 2011
Woodfords Community Council		?[68]			05 09 PM, Wednesday, 10 August 2011
Winnemucca Indian Colony of Nevada		n			05 13 PM, Wednesday, 10 August 2011
Yavapai-Prescott Tribe of the Yavapai Reservation	✓	y	✓		03 54 PM, Wednesday, 10 August 2011
Yerington Paiute Tribe of the Yerington Colony & Campbell Ranch		?[69]			04 49 PM, Wednesday, 10 August 2011
Yomba Shoshone Tribe of the Yomba Reservation		n			04 53 PM, Wednesday, 10 August 2011

---

[68] Woodfords Community Council does not have an official language program, but the education director told me that they were seeking funding to organize one.

[69] I left a message on the Yerington Paiute's education department's voice mailbox with my contact information, but my call was not returned.

Vita

Thomas Pierre-Yves Brasdefer earned his undergraduate degree in American language, literature, and civilization at the Université d'Artois in Arras, France, and his Diplôme d'Études Appliquées / Master's degree at the Université de Poitiers, France, in September 2005. He moved to Baton Rouge, Louisiana, a few weeks previously, as part of an exchange program with the Department of French Studies at Louisiana State University. He entered the doctoral program in Geography & Anthropology in August 2006. His Doctor of Philosophy degree will be conferred at the August 2013 Commencement Ceremony.