

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Language Shift Among the Navajos: Identity Politics and Cultural Continuity. By Deborah House.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8479n5rj>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 26(4)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Kamper, David

Publication Date

2002-09-01

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/>

The author's focus on the relationship between Euro-Americans and Native Americans often lacks a true Native perspective, despite his stated desire to provide a multiplicity of perspectives (p. xi). Gally examines Native adaptation, but only political adaptation—not cultural or social. He frequently lapses into long examinations of the politics of the region without incorporating any analysis of how Native cultures of the region might have shaped their responses in ways different from Euro-Americans. In the process, Native groups are often portrayed as being as concerned as Europeans with the regional power struggle being played out in the Southeast. While this may have been true in certain times and places for certain Native peoples, Gally does not prove that to be the case here. Knowledge of the role of Indian rhetoric and familial terms such as “Great Father” are essential tools to understanding the relationships between Natives and Europeans in the Southeast, and Gally demonstrates little understanding of how this affected their relationships with others. Native religion and cosmology was also critical in shaping Native actions, and this is given minimal attention by the author. In a book that focuses on Indian-Euro-American relations, one cannot simply assume that Indians were viewing events through the same political, economic, cultural, and military lens as were the Euro-Americans.

Despite the weaknesses of this volume, Gally is successful in showing how the Carolinians came to dominate the American South. He is adept at placing the events and stories of this era within a broader global setting. His exhaustive research and detailed accounts of the political and military struggle in the region—which centered on the Indian slave trade—make this rich history an essential volume to students and scholars of the region.

Stephen P. Van Hoak
Tustin, California

Language Shift Among the Navajos: Identity Politics and Cultural Continuity. By Deborah House. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2002. 122 pages. \$35.00 cloth.

Although she does not explicitly mention her motivations, the wording of Deborah House's title is significant. Her book details an apparent trend among speakers on the Navajo Reservation away from Navajo and toward English. It is important to highlight the extent to which this linguistic process is a change, or a shift, resulting from the choice of speakers, rather than an agent-less eventuality often evoked by the tag “extinct” or “dying” language. Neither House nor I mean to suggest that the decreasing number of Navajo speakers is unproblematic. But *Language Shift Among the Navajo* exposes the academic dilemma of concern for the maintenance of culture, language, and tradition and the simultaneous recognition that it is not for scholars to decide or judge the future of a Native language (and culture). House accomplishes this by cautioning against essentializing Navajo culture and by focusing her work on the opinions, ideologies, and agency of Navajos.

House's ethnographic research at Diné College in Tsailé, Arizona, the interviews with teachers, students, and local residents, and her analysis of discourse in this community through participant observation reveal an ambivalent attitude toward the larger American society and culture of which her Navajo informants are a part. She describes people's desires to ensure Navajo linguistic and cultural fluency and vibrancy coupled with their recognition of the benefits of Euro-American education and market economy. House tracks how Navajos manifest this ambivalence through talk about language use and through the transformation of tribal institutions—like schools—whose explicit and implicit missions are to support the use of the Navajo language.

House suggests that these are two of the more important realms in which contemporary Navajos express their identity or construct a sense of Navajo-ness. She argues that this happens in an oppositional fashion as Navajos define themselves as the antithesis of Euro-Americans. She interprets the historic trajectory of such Navajo attitudes, behaviors, and ideologies through two theoretical pairings: the notion of hegemony and counter-hegemony and Michael Taussig's concept of mimesis and alterity. She explains that since Euro-American contact the Navajo community has been affected by the hegemonic forces of "the military, schools, state and federal public services, and religious entities" (p. 15). These forces have worked in varying ways to incorporate Navajos into mainstream America through control of Navajo language, behavior, and everyday life. In the face of these exterior forces Navajos have worked to maintain their culture and their lifeways. House, following Gramsci and Williams, labels these efforts counter-hegemony. She sees what she calls the "Navajo-ization" of institutions that manage reservation life as the main counter-hegemonic efforts operating on the reservations. House locates Navajo-ization in "the development of the bilingual school programs, assertions of political sovereignty, and the eventual establishment of 'Navajo' executive, legislative and judicial branches of government" (p. 17). However, House believes that these attempts are mainly superficial and pose no real threat to the hegemonic domination of the United States over Navajo life. Although House works to develop this argument further throughout the book, it is certainly a debatable assertion—relevant not only among Navajo communities but among many marginalized communities in the United States.

To explain contemporary Navajos' relationship with larger mainstream America, House loosely employs Taussig's theory of mimesis and alterity. She uses the former term to describe the ways in which Navajos incorporate and utilize mainstream American traditions and culture and the latter to describe acts of resistance and rejection of these traditions and culture. House interprets her data as suggesting that Navajos' frequent use and positive valuation of English constitute acts of mimesis. She further suggests that these acts of mimesis are acts of control and attempts to access the power of Euro-American language and culture. At the same time, she finds many examples of alterity in the way other Navajos denigrate the speaking of English and propose a traditional Navajo lifestyle as the only solution to the problems of the modern world. House observes this discourse of alterity in the way some Navajo talk about how Navajo language should be used and its critical role in

the maintenance of Navajo culture. This data comes from interviews, public commentary, and Navajo studies classes she took as a student. She also sees alterity at work in the Navajo school system, which promotes and reinforces traditional Navajo values through its teaching methods.

Ultimately, House contends that these instances of mimesis and alterity are problematic because they promote an oppositional identity formation—defining Navajo-ness as all that is not mainstream American. This, she feels, leads to essentializing Navajo-ness and overdetermining the diversity of Navajo people. Even more dangerous she believes, is what she describes as an overreliance on Navajo otherness, expressed in often superficial ways that masks how Navajo people are subject to the hegemony and domination of larger American culture and government. She asserts: “Language and culture programs that deal in such essentialist and inadequate currency only contribute to the continued social disease and disorder, and therefore greater and faster Navajo language shift” (p. 89). A key example House uses to illustrate this point is the fact that despite the effort the tribe has put into bilingual education and promotion of the Navajo language, its use is still on the decline. House is concerned that all that is being preserved is discourse about the use of the Navajo language and about the performance of Navajo culture, not the actual use and practice. To her the distinction can be made in what she perceives as an emphasis “on image over substance” (p. 86). This commentary seems at odds with her earlier reliance on the work of Raymond Williams (who argues against the false dichotomies of image and substance in *Marxism and Literature*, 1977). However, as her research and interview data illustrate, the concern for a “substantial” preservation of Navajo language is not House’s alone, as the people she talks to espouse an isomorphic relationship between Navajo language and Navajo identity, culture, and traditions. These Navajo consultants assert that the survival of the Navajo language *is* the survival of Navajo communities.

House’s research conjures, but does not answer, a number of important questions that suggests that more extensive research and consideration on language shift among the Navajo is needed. What role does the notion of authenticity politics play in the perceived Navajo language shift? House points out that it is up to Navajos to decide what to do (if anything) about the current state of their language and culture. But which Navajos is it up to and who has the power with what political interest to make decisions about what is “authentic” Navajo culture and “real” Navajo language? This question leads to considerations of what role Navajo English plays in the shift House observes. Where does speaking in ways that are similar to mainstream English but coded to mark and index a reservation identity fit in the oppositional relationship of mimicry and alterity (see William Leap, *American Indian English*, 1993 for discussions on such hybrid codes)? And can Navajo English be used to maintain a distinct sense of Navajo traditions and cultures? I believe this discussion will lead to questioning the potential for multiple Navajo identities and multiple uses and functions of language on the reservation.

Many of House’s consultants construct an isomorphic relation between Navajo language and Navajo-ness. House tends to highlight this language ide-

ology, while downplaying another language ideology apparent in her data—others seem equally comfortable with the idea that a certain kind of language use is appropriate for certain situations. Perhaps further inquiries into a Navajo language shift could include examinations of when speakers are using what languages and under what circumstances, similar to Paul Kroskrity's methods conducting research among the Tewa in *Language, History, and Identity* (1993). Ultimately, *Language Shift Among the Navajo* provides a sound beginning for studying a complex phenomenon that, if it is happening among one of the largest and most populated tribes, must certainly be an issue for other American Indian communities as well.

David Kamper

University of California, Los Angeles

Native Pragmatism: Rethinking the Roots of American Philosophy. By Scott L. Pratt. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002. 316 pages. \$49.95 cloth; \$21.95 paper.

Pratt's informative book claims that a line of thought originating in large part with northeastern US Indian tribes is supposed to reflect well on that line of thought or on those tribes or both. That line of thought is roughly equivalent to ideas put forth by John Dewey, taken here as a culmination and summary of American pragmatism. Pragmatism, in Pratt's view, consists of commitments to four principles:

1. Things are what they do; or, they *are* the interactions they have with other things, rather than being just self-contained entities for abstract contemplation removed from context.
2. There are many kinds of things, not just one or two; this pluralism is at the most basic level of experience but extends to the highest levels of politics and human endeavor.
3. Experience is not individual but is mediated by community; human beings are not most fundamentally individuals; rather culture and society necessarily shapes and limits our experiences, our knowledge, our identities, and our inquiries.
4. Progress: the universe does not stand still, and a description of how things are now will not be complete in the future. Change is real. Further, human reflective thought cannot help but instigate growth because of the restlessness that prompts it, the changes it brings about in itself, and its striving for more inclusive or better understanding.

Pratt's summary of pragmatism is pretty good (especially regarding Dewey, whose thought upstages C. S. Peirce and William James), but he omits pragmatism's relations to the western problems of philosophy, even though one fairly standard way to summarize pragmatism is by way of its rejections of