

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

America's Second Tongue: American Indian Education and the Ownership of English, 1860-1900. By Ruth Spack.

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3dd250h0>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 28(2)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Johansen, Bruce E.

**Publication Date**

2004-03-01

**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/>

## Reviews

---

---

**America's Second Tongue: American Indian Education and the Ownership of English, 1860–1900.** By Ruth Spack. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002. 240 pages. \$45.00 cloth.

The story of the Indian industrial schools' war on Native American languages and cultures—to, as General Richard Henry Pratt asserted, “kill the Indian and save the man”—has been well documented. Less well told is the irony of this situation, taken up here by Ruth Spack, as many boarding-school students used the English language, a primary tool of colonization, to “talk back” to the system. As surely as the boarding-schools' inventors understood that language is the vessel of culture, none of them gave much thought to the ways Native Americans would use English to critique the schools into which many of them had been unwillingly enrolled.

The schools' engines of assimilation left us with some deep critiques of their methods (and of Anglo-American society generally) by the likes of Luther Standing Bear, George Eastman, and Gertrude Bonnin-Simmons (Zitkala-sa), among others. “This is a story,” writes Spack, “of language and how people used it to further their own political and cultural agendas” (7). As with all communicative acts, influence flowed both ways, not only in the single direction that the monolingualists had planned.

Spack elaborates: “It is a story of linguistic ownership, and the meaning of ownership keeps shifting, depending on whether one is perceived to own English or to be owned by it. . . . Language can be used to justify, to resist oppression” (7). The innovative nature of her ideas earned Spack, who is a professor of English at Bentley College, the Modern Language Association's Twenty-third Mina P. Shaughnessy Prize for an outstanding research publication on the teaching of English, awarded in November 2003. From 1975 until her death in 1978 Shaughnessy served as a dean and director of the Instructional Resource Center of the City University of New York.

*America's Second Tongue* examines the English-only educational reform movement established by the United States government after the Civil War. This educational process was aimed more at the eradication of indigenous languages than at the incorporation of Native Americans into the dominant Anglo-European culture. Through analysis of archival records, educational

materials, and English-language literary texts written by Native Americans, Spack demonstrates the enormous effort made by the federal government in the late nineteenth century to establish English as the dominant language of the United States. Given this history, Spack suggests that ESL, which currently signifies English as a second language, should be taken to mean English *is* a second language.

This is not, of course, the way Pratt and his cohorts constructed their reality. Their school of thought, often called “Americanization” at the time, was, according to Spack, based on eliminating Native languages and cultures in order to stamp out tribal identity. The end result, they supposed (as with the General Allotment Act, enacted at about the same time), would subvert Native American sovereignty. Instead, many boarding-school students exercised a sense of ownership of the words they spoke and wrote, making of English a device by which culture, identity, and sovereignty could be preserved in a bilingual world. The boarding schools’ emphasis on monolingualism was not universally accepted as it was being implemented. Spack quotes from a series written by Zitkala-sa in the *Atlantic Monthly* during 1900 that favored a bilingual approach much more congruent with prevailing educational attitude a century later. Several Native Americans advocated bilingualism as an alternative. One such advocate was Sarah Winnemucca, who served as a translator for General Oliver O. Howard (who played a major role in the founding of Howard University). Winnemucca designed an entire bilingual curriculum for Native American boarding-school students during the 1880s and won some congressional support. Many Native parents also opposed monolingualism. The “Americanists,” however, refused to utilize her program in the boarding schools. Spack does an excellent job of delineating the political context that spurred the defeat of such initiatives.

As it critiques the assumptions on which boarding schools’ curricula were constructed, Spack’s book also takes to task the entire web of assumptions that propelled European colonization. The boarding schools were built on nineteenth-century European-American notions of what constitutes civilized life, as stated, with some sense of irony, by Booker T. Washington: “No white American ever thinks that any other race is wholly civilized until he wears the white man’s clothes, eats the white man’s food, speaks the white man’s language, and professes the white man’s religion” (23). Eastman inverted these assumptions by reflecting on his education at Dartmouth College: “It was here that I had most of my savage gentleness and native refinement knocked out of me” (134). English lessons drilled into Indian students not only language but a sense of European cultural superiority. Spack quotes from workbooks that drilled students in a rank order of races, with “whites” the strongest, followed, in immutable order, by “Mongoloids or yellows,” “Ethiopians or blacks,” and “the Americans or reds” (72).

The schools’ military-industrial model and Anglo-American ethnocentricity affected students in many very different ways. The discipline that Pratt built into his system inculcated star athletes, such as James Thorpe, and literary talents, including Standing Bear, Eastman, and Zitkala-sa. It also filled graveyards with young suicides. This book brilliantly describes the former; it

is less successful at describing the pain of young men and women who tried to cope with the forceful stripping away of their languages and cultures. They were the silent ones, leaving few historical records from which to quote. Of roughly twenty thousand Native students enrolled in boarding schools, according to Spack's account, only forty left behind extensive autobiographical accounts of their educations (109). Some of the students who left only brief records summed up how they felt by comparing their experiences to those of prisoners of war facing firing squads (115). Others, described by Zitkala-sa, felt like "little animals driven by a herder" (116).

Spack's work leaves a distinct impression that Native American students in the boarding schools knew, by and large, exactly what was happening to them. Francis LaFlesche, for example, exposed the way English was being used to make indigenous peoples invisible so that their land could be taken with impunity. He answered by using language, according to Spack, to assert historical, spiritual, and rhetorical ownership of land. This begins, following Spack's finely nuanced study, the political, economic, and cultural trajectory that we know today as self-determination.

*Bruce E. Johansen*

University of Nebraska at Omaha

**Anthropologists and Indians in the New South.** Edited by Rachel A. Bonney and J. Anthony Paredes. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2001. 286 pages. \$29.95 cloth.

*Anthropologists and Indians in the New South* reaches beyond the Southeast to touch on issues in all areas of Native American studies and on contemporary methodological and ethical issues in anthropology and other fields such as history. It makes an excellent resource for research as well as teaching.

In his foreword Raymond Fogelson marks the historical changes both in scholarly attention to southeastern Native groups and to their growing political, economic, and social prominence in the South. Like many of the essays in the text, Fogelson's foreword points out how power has shifted from researchers to Native communities that increasingly shape and direct research and hire anthropologists. Fogelson calls this new era of research "an anthropology of mutual engagement" (x).

J. Anthony Paredes follows with an introduction that places the volume in its broader context by efficiently condensing the history of the Southeast, of Native communities, and of anthropology without sacrificing its complexity. His account, and the text as a whole, applies to the history of anthropology and to the changing relationships between researchers and the communities with whom they work.

The volume emphasizes Native groups as actively involved in the cultural, political, and economic milieu of the Southeast. Most of the tribes discussed reside in what could be considered the South proper, from North Carolina to Louisiana. Yet attention is also given to some tribes removed from the South