

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Lessons from Fort Apache: Beyond Language Endangerment and Maintenance. By M. Eleanor Nevins.

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/07t7d2ss>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 38(3)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Werito, Vincent

**Publication Date**

2014-06-01

**DOI**

10.17953

**Copyright Information**

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

“Dead Indians” to placate or appeal to white people. Puzzlingly, only a few pages after he seems to call into question the authenticity of Native peoples who express their cultural heritage by wearing traditional regalia, King writes, “For us Live Indians, being invisible is annoying enough, but being inauthentic is crushing.” King does not engage with how his observation about dressing as “Dead Indians” can, and should, be complicated to explore any number of Native peoples who still utilize these regalia pieces as “live Indians” in contemporary cultures.

King’s writing seems accessible, yet almost deceptively so. While the book could be presented as an introduction to Native American history and contemporary politics, each chapter contains so much information it almost assumes at least some background in Native history. As an introductory text it might at times feel overwhelming, fraught with complexities and contradictions at every turn. Perhaps this is King’s intention, as this provides a clear illustration of just how complex and contradictory Native history in North America can be. Ultimately, his engaging humor helps to guide his reader through these complexities. King may not be the historian some readers expect, but he is definitely a memorable one with some really great stories to tell.

*Cutchá Risling Baldy*

University of California, Davis

**Lessons from Fort Apache: Beyond Language Endangerment and Maintenance.** By M. Eleanor Nevins. Malden: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2013. 280 pages. \$99.95 cloth; \$119.94 ebook.

*Lessons From Fort Apache: Beyond Language Endangerment and Maintenance* is an important contribution to the literature on language documentation and maintenance, as well as indigenous language revitalization. Aimed specifically at scholars in the sociology and anthropology of language as well as sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics, the book explores the dynamics and complexities of language documentation and maintenance as they play out in local, national, and global contexts. Drawing on her work with the Fort Apache community as a university language expert and her ethnographic work with Apache elders, parents, and religious leaders, M. Eleanor Nevins accounts for why it is important for those engaged in language documentation and maintenance work to listen to community voices and to “anticipate processes of (creative) misrecognition in indigenous language advocacy” (3). At the same time, she also advocates for shifting the discourse from saving and preserving languages to engaging in “innovative social actions . . . amenable to

open-ended, underdetermined consequences and opportunities” (218). This underscores larger processes of social and cultural mediation in indigenous language communities, highlighting different ways that indigenous language communities address and deal with internal conflicts about language use and purpose.

The author begins the introduction with a statement from a UNESCO document about language endangerment and a quotation from Gerald Vizenor about challenging mainstream ideas regarding voice and recognition to show the contrasts and conflicts within the politics of language, shifting cultural identities, documentation, and maintenance. Nevins contends that past literature on language endangerment and maintenance is often “framed too narrowly” to adequately address the complex past and present social relations that mediate ongoing community practices and concerns around issues of language documentation and maintenance (2). As a result, Nevins argues that language experts recast “vernacular speech from local meanings and uses to the representational regime of the modern nation-state—as emblems of ethnic or cultural identity” (22). She uses the particular example of language programs that utilize dominant ideologies and textual models to authorize ways of knowing language and to recontextualize local speech as cultural heritage objects, while also negating the localized alternate forms of discourse.

In chapter 3, Nevins’ ethnographic descriptions of the Fort Apache community’s ambivalent and critical responses towards language maintenance projects reveal the complexities of language ideologies that influence community discourse. As captured in the voices of community elders in statements about what it means to speak Apache, these statements reveal overriding moral concerns about language loss and the effectiveness of Apache language programs. Further, she demonstrates in chapter 4 why it is important to recognize local ways of speaking and pedagogical practices as creative responses to larger encompassing sociocultural regimes. For example, in contrast to the traditional Apache practice of place-naming, Apache speakers of English and Apache assign places names like Lonesome Dove, BenGay, and Smurfville, wordplay that is part of an “emergent discourse genre” that draws on popular media to comment on changes in the community. Nevins highlights the “appropriation of media discourse for local purposes and meanings” to reveal the complex mediations with surrounding social orders that occur when indigenous communities engage in acts of self-definition that are grounded in alternative, emergent histories of colonial encounter and differentiation (100).

In chapter 5, Nevins draws on her own work with Apache informant Rebekah Moody and the collected texts of Harry Hoijer’s work with Lawrence Mithlo, a Chiricahua who was imprisoned at Fort Sill, Oklahoma after the

Apache wars, to encourage us to interpret “text collections as rhetorical acts towards an exchange of perspectives” and to see language documentation and maintenance as “boundary work that emerges through encounters between actors embedded within alternate networks” (145). In this way, we see how, within different regimes of meaning as constituted in schools, homes, and the larger community, language documentation proceeds from a history of colonial encounter to contemporary concerns with what counts as knowledge of language. In chapter 6 Nevins discusses how cultural knowledge, such as that contained in Coyote stories, when placed and recognized as the “language and culture” of the broader community, obscures the full range of meanings and practices in the community, creating “communicative disjuncture” between homes and the school (178). Similarly, chapter 7 focuses on what should be included or not within the school context, discussing the restrictions imposed by religious leaders, both traditionalists and Apache Christians. Instead of lamenting the exclusion of textual forms, Nevins states that “conflicts and arguments can be frustrating and disruptive, but also work to establish relevance and concern” for the language within the community, thereby revealing that community members are in fact exerting control and authority in engagements with the colonial order (188).

In the last chapter of the book, Nevins postulates that the success of language efforts depends on political negotiations and being mindful of differences in perspectives. Contending with the notion that indigenous language-maintenance efforts fail due to internal schisms or a lack of interest on the part of indigenous communities, Nevins shows why it is important for documentary field linguists and other language workers to embrace political negotiation. In compelling ways, Nevins implicates notions of authority (who has authority?), voice (whose voice should be included?), and purpose (what is the purpose of indigenous language to our youth?) within language documentation and maintenance work as undertaken by language experts, educators, linguists, and local community members.

As an indigenous language educator and scholar with some background in linguistics, I found the book to be insightful, not only because of my familiarity with many of these issues, particularly language maintenance, but because of Nevins’ perspective regarding the controversial issues of language, language shift, and language maintenance. I was reminded of my initial reaction to Deborah House’s *Language Shift Among the Navajo* (2005), when I struggled to accept what she was writing about and how she framed her critical ideas in regard to the notion of Navajo cultural homogeneity. In retrospect, I see now that as an indigenous person, it may be hard at times to accept critique from others outside your group who talk about your community in a certain way that may cause resentment. While seeing through your

own lenses, you may have been unable to realize how the issue might be addressed differently. Thus, the willingness to accept an outsider's perspectives about important issues relevant to your work and community may inform your understanding in new ways.

The critical question of who has the authority to speak to issues of language revitalization or to speak for a language community resonated with me to rethink and reconsider what it means to me to engage with others from my community and from outside my community in language maintenance or revitalization efforts. As part of my critique of Nevins' work, at times I found myself struggling to keep up with the ideas presented, especially the use of some terms of academic discourse, such as "entextualisation." While part of my confusion may have been due to unfamiliarity with anthropological linguistic discourse, the author's ideas also seemed disjointed, and, in some respects, particularly in regard to philology and documentation, overanalyzed, with heavy emphasis on linguistic jargon. I raise this concern specifically because indigenous language speakers and community members who may be interested in this work may find the reading to be dense and overtheorized. Yet Nevins also does a wonderful job of restating and reconnecting those seemingly disconnected ideas and theories to earlier statements and chapters, as well as summarizing and restating her main ideas at the end of each chapter and at the beginning of the next chapter.

Overall, Nevins accomplishes the task of showing what a critical understanding of indigeneity can offer, both in terms of alternative ways of knowing and in discourse about language documentation and maintenance that are located in local community contexts. At the same time, she cautions us to be cognizant of how various forms of knowledge can become objectified within dominant mainstream institutions, such as schools or culture centers, where their purpose and meanings run counter to other community practices. By elaborating on three paradoxes that confront indigenous communities in terms of temporal framing—the place of indigenous languages in modern times, who is credited with expertise and authority, and the meanings of language to reveal how language programs are positioned within indigenous communities—Nevins offers some critical insights into ways that we can shift our gaze and rhetoric from saving endangered languages to cultivating "sustainability" that recognizes indigenous agency and voice.

*Vincent Werito*

University of New Mexico