

**SURVIVANCE, SOVEREIGNTY,
AND STORY**

Teaching American Indian Rhetorics

Edited by

**LISA KING
ROSE GUBELE
JOYCE RAIN ANDERSON**

with a foreword by Resa Crane Bizzaro

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Logan 2015

FOREWORD

ALLIANCES AND COMMUNITY BUILDING

Teaching Indigenous Rhetorics and Rhetorical Practices

Resa Crane Bizzaro

As an indigenous scholar, I have often been contacted by those who want to learn more about native peoples in the United States. Many who ask are non-native teachers who struggle to provide unbiased portrayals and culturally appropriate explanations of indigenous ways of viewing the world and our relationships to it. Just last week, I found a message in my inbox, which asked me for advice on bridging the gaps among urban high school students and contemporary indigenous peoples. The veteran English teacher who communicated with me noted that she had raised awareness among her students of the “Tonto Syndrome,” or what Hank Stuever (2004) identifies as “heap-big stereotypes—the residue of racism that has transfixed American Indian[s]” as absent or culturally extraneous in American society. But this teacher was at a loss for how to get students to stop talking about indigenous peoples in the past tense, as if we no longer exist.

Indeed, this problem is persistent among many, particularly those who rarely—if ever—come into contact with “real, live Indians” or only see depictions of indigenous peoples in movies and popular culture. Based on my observations of the media’s coverage of a variety of indigenous issues—ranging from using native names for sports mascots to drilling for natural gas and oil on indigenous lands without permission—many Americans are unaware that native peoples still exist and thrive. And, unfortunately, the stereotype of the proud warrior as “representative Indian” persists in American culture—along with other oversimplified portrayals, including the noble savage; the wasp-waisted, buckskin-clad

maiden; the heroic guide; and—more recently—Tonto himself, who has become the “Indian of the mind,” according to Stuever (2004). And that Indian of the mind is typically juxtaposed, as Cutcha Rising Baldy (2012) points out, against the “strong, valiant, white character.”

These misappropriations of culture and stereotypical portrayals are what this book aims to quash, while simultaneously providing evidence of indigenous peoples’ historical, cultural, and political contributions in an ever-diversifying United States. Several challenges exist for native peoples in this country today. One of the biggest is determining who speaks about us and how—what Scott Lyons (2000) calls rhetorical sovereignty. Another challenge is how to talk about and teach others about our survival of and resistance to (what Anishinaabe scholar Gerald Vizenor [1999] calls survivance) the assimilation tactics of the dominant culture since first European contact and which continue to this day. We also must continue to insist upon the U.S. honoring treaties and respecting indigenous nations as sovereign groups with our own systems of government within the territorial boundaries of the United States. Additionally, we seek to discuss these matters—and more—without essentializing native peoples, who come from oftentimes radically diverse communities and locations.

The past fifteen to twenty years has seen the publication of a number of articles discussing rhetorical practices and strategies, representing a variety of indigenous nations, and a developing discipline within English Studies. Within the past few years, we have seen a few books on indigenous rhetorics published, including Stromberg’s (2006) *American Indian Rhetorics of Survivance* and Baca and Villanueva’s (2010) *Rhetorics of the Americas*. However, in my discussions and correspondence with teachers who would like to present more accurate, legitimate, and representative histories—including the cultural continuance—of native peoples in this country, I have not had an opportunity to refer them to one source that will help them devise specific strategies for their classrooms.

With the publication of this collection, that lack begins to be remedied. Addressing key concepts, such as rhetorical sovereignty, historical and contemporary colonization, relationships among peoples, and the use of new technologies by indigenous peoples, this book demonstrates methods of teaching such information to non-native peoples, while affirming the practices of those native peoples among them. This book also addresses the purposes and uses of story to make meaning of both our places in the world and our understanding of those places. This text allows teachers to demonstrate indigenous ways of knowing and habits of mind that permit the development of an integrated psyche, focusing

on mind, heart, body, and spirit. This book is the one I will recommend to others—and use in my own classes—as we all work toward a more realistic and sensitive portrayal of native peoples and their knowledge, history, and culture.

References

- Baca, Damián, and Victor Villanueva. 2010. *Rhetorics of the Americas: 3114 BCE to 2012 CE*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Baldy, Cutcha Rising. 2012. “The Lone Ranger and Tonto Movie: Could This Ever Be a Good Idea?” CutchaBaldy.weebly.com. March 20. <http://www.cutcharisingbaldy.com/1/post/2012/03/the-lone-ranger-and-tonto-movie-could-this-ever-be-a-good-idea.html>.
- Lyons, Scott. 2000. “Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do American Indians Want from Writing?” *College Composition and Communication* 51 (3): 447–68. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/358744>.
- Stromberg, Ernest. 2006. *American Indian Rhetorics of Survivance: Word Medicine, Word Magic*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Suever, Hank. 2004. “The ‘Tonto Syndrome’: Indian Stereotypes Ignore the Diversity of Modern Native People.” Brainerd Dispatch. *Washington Post*, September 27. http://brainerddispatch.com/stories/092704/opi_0927040014.shtml.
- Vizenor, Gerald. 1999. *Manifest Manners: Narratives of Postindian Survivance*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Introduction

CAREFUL WITH THE STORIES WE TELL Naming Survivance, Sovereignty, and Story

Lisa King, Rose Gubele, and Joyce Rain Anderson

So you have to be careful with the stories you tell. And you have to watch out for the stories that you are told. But if I ever get to Pluto, that's how I would like to begin. With a story. Maybe I'd tell the inhabitants of Pluto one of the stories I know. Maybe they'd tell me one of theirs. It wouldn't matter who went first. But which story? That's the real question. Personally, I'd want to hear a creation story, a story that recounts how the world was formed, how things came to be, for contained within creation stories are relationships that help to define the nature of the universe and how cultures understand the world in which they exist.

—Thomas King, *The Truth about Stories*

STORIES ABOUT BEGINNINGS

In *The Truth about Stories: A Native Narrative*, Cherokee author Thomas King presents the reader with a framework for stories that both affirms indigenous storytelling traditions—past and present—and undermines the larger cultural narratives that get told about indigenous peoples. Past a feel-good cheering for storytelling in the once-upon-a-time sense that dismisses stories as the place for children, King is arguing something much bigger: the stories we tell about ourselves and about our world frame our perceptions, our relationships, our actions, and our ethics. They change our reality. The stories we tell each other tell us who we are, locate us in time and space and history and land, and suggest who gets to speak and how.

One might therefore say stories are highly rhetorical. One might also say indigenous epistemologies, framed thusly, are also therefore powerfully rhetorical, drawing on persuasive and reality-shifting language practices as old as time immemorial and just as applicable now as they have ever been. They might even help suggest a way out of the colonial

stories that have blocked vision for so long, privileging some rhetorical storytelling traditions and silencing others.

Such a call for challenging the colonial stories that framed the discipline of rhetoric and composition are not new, and the last twenty years have seen rhetoric and composition scholars such as Victor Villanueva, Keith Gilyard, Jacqueline Jones Royster and Jean C. Williams, Catherine Prendergast, Gwendolyn Pough, Scott Richard Lyons, Malea Powell, and others call for a rethinking of the discipline that challenges the Greco-Roman tradition in rhetorical analysis and composition teaching as the primary or only appropriate framework. It is past time, as Villanueva (1999, 659) has argued, to “break precedent” with the stories that silence so many of our scholars and our students. A growing awareness of the exclusion of American Indian¹ voices has led to an increasing classroom focus on American Indian rhetorics and literature, and although this trend is notable, some of the potential for progress is thwarted by the unintentional perpetuation of stereotypes and appropriation of American Indian cultures. Complicating this process is the discipline’s tendency to prioritize so-called objective approaches to knowledge and Euro-American narratives of rhetorical practice, a tendency that discourages the inclusion of American Indian voices or misrepresents them. As a result, even the best intentions can result in damaging consequences for American Indians (Lyons 2000, 458–62; Powell 2002, 397–98).

We therefore echo and reinforce the call for critical evaluation of where we are as scholars and teachers in rhetoric and composition and the call for alliance among communities to work through the complexities of what breaking precedent with the master story would entail, particularly with American Indian and indigenous rhetorics. If we are to reset the terms of the story of our discipline, how shall we do that? What new terms and practices and stories can we draw from to better inform our scholarship and our teaching practices? How do we use our stories and the stories of our students—and *story* here reaches to the very foundations of how we frame our knowledge—to teach communication? Persuasion? Alliance building? Rhetoric? Writing?

LOCATING PEDAGOGICAL STORIES, THEORY, AND PRACTICE

This collection is an endeavor to provide some answers to these questions as they have developed out of the American Indian Caucus (AIC) at the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), especially with the development of the AIC teaching workshop series of the past seven years. It is not meant as a final answer to how pedagogical

practice should be changed, but it is an ongoing endeavor to explore and present the work of indigenous teacher-scholars and allies as an alternative frame for how we might go about our classroom practice.

The exigence for the collection came out of this continued need for discussion concerning indigenous rhetorics in the classroom as the caucus has become a steady presence at CCCC. The American Indian Caucus, founded in 1997 by Malea Powell and Scott Lyons as the Caucus for American Indian Scholars and Scholarship, was intended to be a space for Native scholars and non-Native allies to meet and create a community within the larger CCCC framework (Elder, Hidalgo, and Pinkert 2011). As the caucus has grown and maintained its presence under the joint leadership of Powell, Resa Crane Bizzaro, and Joyce Rain Anderson, it has also been seeking ways to broaden the conversation about indigenous rhetorics and writing outside caucus conversation, especially as interest has grown among allies who wished to support indigenously oriented scholarship and pedagogies but were not sure how. In what ways could pedagogical and scholarly work be shared? What other venues could be tapped or created to support the conversations?

With this exigence in mind, members of the caucus proposed the first teaching workshop, “Survivance, Sovereignty, and Story: Teaching American Indian Rhetorical Texts,” for the 2008 CCCC, which brought caucus members forward to present critical sources, pedagogical practices, teaching demonstrations, sample units and assignments, and other materials on indigenous rhetorics and writing. The result was a small but effective workshop that has steadily increased its following at subsequent CCCC gatherings, and caucus members provided six additional workshops between 2009 and 2015.

This collection, then, is a moment to collect ourselves and the stories we have been telling, stories that have begun to reshape the discipline of rhetoric and writing and its pedagogical practices, and find ways to set new precedent. The essays in this collection are a result of the work of the past workshops and in reality are the work of the caucus since its founding. The collection makes available the sources, critical theorizing, and pedagogical practices caucus members have presented in past workshops and includes extended and updated examinations of praxis and discussion of American Indian rhetorics in the rhetoric and writing classroom. More specifically, the overall goals of the collection are (1) to develop a deeper understanding of the role of American Indian rhetorics in writing classrooms, (2) to situate the workshop within current literature, understandings, and practices of teaching American Indian rhetorics, and (3) to provide teachers with models they may adapt for their own classroom use.

While there are already-existing texts on how to teach American Indian and indigenous literatures, none have yet considered how to teach American Indian rhetorics. It is relatively easy now for teachers to find resources on how to teach well-known, individual indigenous authors such as N. Scott Momaday, Louise Erdrich, or Sherman Alexie, or even less widely known but important indigenous writers. The Modern Language Association publishes resources on several indigenous writers (all three of the above, to begin with), and the National Council for the Teaching of English also has support resources for teaching literature.² Furthermore, the Association for the Study of American Indian Literatures as well as its journal, *SAIL*, supports a much broader range of pedagogical and analytical discussion on indigenous writers and literary production.

As just noted above, however, American Indian *rhetorics* and their potential impact on the rhetoric/writing classroom are not subjects that have received much extended discussion or exploration. To be sure, Ernest Stromberg's 2006 edited essay collection, *American Indian Rhetorics of Survivance: Word Medicine, Word Magic*, began drawing attention to historical and contemporary analyses of American Indian writers/speakers/rhetors, and Baca and Villanueva's 2010 edited collection *Rhetorics of the Americas: 3114 BCE to 2012 CE* presents essays that explore the array of rhetorical traditions of the indigenous Americas precontact and their historical and contemporary manifestations. In addition, scholars such as Scott Richard Lyons, Malea Powell, Joyce Rain Anderson, Resa Crane Bizzaro, Angela Haas, Qwo-Li Driskill, Rose Gubele, and Lisa King have published work in the last twelve years that has begun building a body of work elaborating on and extending the discussion of American Indian rhetorics and pedagogies, frequently citing Lyons's (2000) germinal essay "Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do American Indians Want from Writing" and building on his concept of indigenous "rhetorical sovereignty." This collection therefore represents the accumulation of pedagogical theorizing and curriculum development that has developed alongside and in tandem with this scholarly work, from many of the same scholars named above and specifically through the CCCC American Indian Caucus workshops and their presenters.

CAREFUL WITH THE STORIES WE TELL: NAMING SURVIVANCE, SOVEREIGNTY, AND STORY

As noted in the epigraph, "Contained within creation stories are relationships that help to define the nature of the universe and how cultures

understand the world in which they exist" (King 2005, 10). The very terms in which a story is told shape the story, shape the epistemologies of the world glimpsed there, and draw a listener/reader's understanding in particular directions. Call it Kenneth Burke's "terministic screens," or Chaim Perelman's "presence," or Lyons's (2000, 452) observation that "he who sets the terms, sets the limits," but the terms we use here are significant and have been adopted with purpose. The study of American Indian texts (alphabetic, visual, digital, performative, oral, and material) requires an understanding of the importance of sovereignty to American Indian nations as well as the diversity of cultures and subject positions that exist under the umbrella term *American Indian*. Most importantly, the introduction of American Indian texts requires cross-cultural understanding. Knowing that power of naming the originating terms as a way to set the framework, in the following we offer a discussion of the terms that first shaped the original AIC teaching workshop in 2008 and how we understand them to connect to rhetoric, composition, and pedagogical practice.

Survivance, Rhetoric, and Pedagogy

Coined by Gerald Vizenor as a key term in describing his vision of Indigenous nations, *survivance* is survival and resistance together: surviving the documented, centuries-long genocide of American Indian peoples and resisting still the narratives and policies that seek to marginalize and—yes, still now—assimilate indigenous peoples. As he puts it, "Survivance is an active sense of presence, the continuance of native stories, not a mere reaction, or survivable name. Native survivance stories are renunciations of dominance, tragedy, and victimry (Vizenor 1999, vii). Survivance is resisting those-marginalizing, colonial narratives and policies so indigenous knowledge and lifeways may come into the present with new life and new commitment to that survival.

In terms of indigenous rhetorics, *survivance* can mean many things. It can refer to the survival and perpetuation of indigenous communities' own rhetorical practices, it can refer to indigenous individuals' and communities' usage of Euro-American rhetorical practices, and it can refer to all the variations and nuances in between. It has to do with the spoken word, the written text, material rhetorics, and contemporary technology. It is the recognition of how, when, and why indigenous peoples communicate, persuade, and make knowledge both historically and now.

Teaching survivance is therefore an act of recognition: acknowledging the ongoing presence and work of indigenous peoples, particularly the way indigenous communities negotiate language and rhetorical

practice in a paracolonial³ world. For educators and students to fully appreciate—or even to begin appreciating—indigenous rhetorics and what can be learned from them, students must understand American Indian rhetorical practices as survivance.

Sovereignty, Rhetoric, and Pedagogy

With the coinage of “rhetorical sovereignty,” Scott Richard Lyons (2000) has provided scholars and teachers of American Indian rhetorics with a powerful frame through which to read those rhetorical practices and a challenge to find ways to recognize that sovereignty by incorporating indigenous rhetorics into the classroom. Political sovereignty is, in many respects, what sets indigenous nation-peoples apart from being only another “minority” in the United States or anywhere on their homelands (Grande 2008). Though a layered and sometimes-contested concept given the word’s Euro-American roots, *sovereignty* has become a touchstone for any discussion of indigenous rhetorics because inherent in that discussion will be indigenous rhetors’, rhetoricians’, communities’, and peoples’ inherent “right and ability . . . to determine their own communicative needs and desires in this pursuit [of agency, power, and community renewal], to decide for themselves the goals, modes, styles, and languages of public discourse” (Lyons 2000, 449–50). It points to indigenous always-existing rights to exercise speaking, to refuse to be silenced. And it continues to point to the exigencies of oppression, unequal power, injustice, and land rights that prompt the need for indigenous peoples to speak, again and again, locally, globally, and even in our classrooms.

As a result, invoking indigenous sovereignty as part of a pedagogical framework calls attention to the fact that American Indian peoples are nations and have recognized rights. Labeling indigenous rhetorics as simply the study of another minority community within the United States commits the error of erasing those nations and those rights; recognizing indigenous sovereignty as part of rhetorical practice recognizes both an American Indian nation’s rights as a nation and the nation’s and its rhetors’ rhetorical choices as part of that frame, and lays the groundwork for appropriate, respectful, and historically accurate discussion of American Indian texts.

Story, Rhetoric, and Pedagogy

Though the Euro-American canonization of texts has historically drawn a sharp line between “literature” and all other writing, that designation

does not necessarily exist in indigenous rhetorics: all literature, all theorizing, all writing are part of the stories, or as Thomas King suggests above, the connected narrative that tells us who we are in relationship to one another. Within this framework, it should be only natural that indigenous voices are heard, especially as they have not been recognized or listened to before. Furthermore, as Craig Womack asserts, indigenous voices should not be thought of as an addition to the canon but rather as the foundational voices, the foundational stories on and of these lands (Womack 1999).

Story and rhetoric, then, go hand in hand. Indigenous stories (theorizing, speaking, writing, making) are the rhetorical turns that reorient the framework that so long has pointed back toward the Greco-Roman tradition, even as Euro-American epistemologies have received and given that tradition new birth. Indigenous rhetorics are the memories, the memoria, so to speak, of this land, its original logos and the means through which relationships among all communities on this land can be restored. Recognizing and engaging indigenous rhetorics is in part how we begin to reason together. One place this work starts is in our classrooms: by recognizing story as a meaningful, theory-full practice, we can responsibly engage indigenous rhetorical practices as we find them, not only as the genres Euro-American education might validate.

Together, *survivance*, *sovereignty*, and *story* create a frame, or perhaps more properly a web of associations and meaning making that guides pedagogical practice. We hope this collection therefore serves to continue the discussion of pedagogical practice, decolonization, and the place of indigenous rhetorics in the classroom—thus serving as our own contribution to indigenous survivance, sovereignty, and story, even as we continue to build relationships within the wider community of instructors and students.

AMERICAN INDIAN RHETORICS: ALPHABETIC, VISUAL, DIGITAL, PERFORMATIVE, ORAL, AND MATERIAL

In sum, this collection of essays is meant as a starting place to talk about the teaching of indigenous rhetorics, especially in classrooms where the instructors and students are non-Native. It comes out of a community effort and alliances among Native and non-Native scholar-allies at the CCCC American Indian Caucus and an understood need to assist interested instructors in their efforts to do this kind of teaching. Covering a range of topics, including sovereignty, decolonial practices, community building, local knowledge, and specific examples of working with

indigenous texts, the essays theorize pedagogical practice and help frame both the why-teach and the how-to-teach of indigenous rhetorics as part of a rhetoric and/or writing classroom. The essays range in topic from teaching rhetorical sovereignty, indigenous languages, indigenous rhetorical practices, history, music, and land to collective and challenging the literary/rhetorical canon. While any one essay can stand alone as a discussion, the overlaps, reiterations, and elaborations on these concepts and themes also serve to form a conceptual web that builds through these essays' relationship with each other. As Leslie Marmon Silko observes of Pueblo storytelling and spiders' webs, there are "many little threads radiating from the center, crisscrossing one another. As with the web, the structure emerges as it is made, and you must simply listen and trust . . . that meaning will be made" (Silko 1997, 48–49). So it is here: the center comes from survivance, sovereignty, and story, and the following chapters build the web of related concepts.

As a beginning point, chapter 1, "Sovereignty, Rhetorical Sovereignty, and Representation: Keywords for Teaching Indigenous Texts," endeavors to work through the significance of the term *sovereignty* with respect to indigenous nations and communities. While the well-intentioned instructor might include an indigenous text for the sake of multicultural inclusion, Lisa King argues that if the instructor does not know the key concepts—especially sovereignty—that shape indigenous discourses, these concepts will likely be misrepresented. By providing a brief history of the term *sovereignty* to illustrate its resonance in Indian country as well as link it to historical representations and misrepresentations of American Indians, this essay offers a framework to better equip instructors to work through the rhetorical exigencies and ramifications of a given indigenous text. As a result, the pedagogical strategies for teaching the recognition of sovereignty, adapted to a particular institutional context, assist teachers in helping their students make connections among the representations of indigenous peoples students may have already seen, why those representations are significant as texts, and how those representations may be addressed and reflected in indigenous texts.

But decolonizing classroom practice and the study of rhetorics does not end with the recognition of sovereignty. In chapter 2, "Socioacupuncture Pedagogy: Troubling Containment and Erasure of Indigeneity in the Composition Classroom," Sundy Watanabe draws particular attention to teaching in a first-year composition classroom and in doing so focuses on a pedagogy of socioacupuncture to address the problems inherent in a tradition of composition that privileges only the Euro-Western vantage

point. Instead of fixing indigenous peoples in the past as static entities, as traditional pedagogies often do, Watanabe argues that a socioacupuncture method of pedagogy allows instructors and students to trouble institutionally sanctioned boundaries and power structures, upending traditional conceptions of containment and erasure in at least one local academic community they study. The chapter defines and explains socioacupuncture, provides interpretation based on specific examples from field research, and then utilizes the concept to explore the degree to which instructor and students as a scholarly community are able to produce texts that conform to academic conventions while incorporating a sense of indigenous voice and community.

Chapter 3, "Decolonial Skillshares: Indigenous Rhetorics as Radical Practice," extends both the critique of academic institutions and "texts" and proposes further ideas for how indigenous rhetorics can be taught in order to reshape classrooms and pedagogical practice. Here, Qwo-Li Driskill asserts that the colonization of classrooms continues through an exclusive focus on the Greco-Roman tradition; the counter to colonial practices then becomes the recentering of the classroom on indigenous rhetorics. In Driskill's classroom, students do not learn only about indigenous rhetorics—students also begin learning the rhetorics themselves through linguistic, embodied, and material practices. Drawing on the idea of the skillshare from her experiences with activism in trans and two-spirit movements and within indigenous craft circles and language groups, Driskill uses the idea of decolonial skillshares as a guiding pedagogy in the classroom to counter the destruction of indigenous cultural memory, to transform cultural memories for both indigenous and non-indigenous people, and to create spaces for Native people to learn and teach embodied rhetorical practices as a tactic of decolonization.

Continuing the theorizing of indigenous rhetorics and pedagogy in the first-year classroom, Gabriela Raquel Ríos observes in chapter 4, "Performing Nahua Rhetorics for Civic Engagement," that writing and rhetoric pedagogies traditionally understand the written text as the central framework for civic or public rhetorical practice when that may not necessarily be the case. Using her work with the Nahuatl difrasismo *in ixtili in yolloitl* to enact a rhetorical framework for inquiry in a first-year writing course designed in conjunction with the Ford Foundation's Difficult Dialogues Initiative, Ríos articulates how *in ixtili in yolloitl* combines the act of acquiring knowledge with what it means to be human—learning about the world and Nature around us as a necessary means for becoming fully human and understanding ourselves as relatives who are in turn related to the cosmos that surrounds us. From her research and

pedagogical experience, Ríos demonstrates how helping students incorporate *in itili in yollol* into their rhetorical repertoire both challenges students to understand civic participation as human responsibility and provides a land-based framework for inquiry beyond Aristotelian logic or social constructivism.

Chapter 5, “Un-learning the ‘Pictures in Our Heads’: Teaching the *Cherokee Phoenix*, Boudinot, and Cherokee History,” provides a different turn in analyzing indigenous texts with its emphasis on history and primary texts, and here Rose Gubele examines the use of primary print texts from indigenous authors. By taking these kinds of texts as her primary focus, Gubele illustrates a method to bring written indigenous histories forward as legitimate histories as well as to explore the continued formation of written indigenous rhetorics as they changed and developed through contact with European-American forms of literacy. This chapter provides a case study in nineteenth-century Cherokee written rhetorics from the Cherokee and English-language newspaper, the *Cherokee Phoenix*, and in doing so Gubele uses materials that touch on some of the most difficult and pivotal times in Cherokee history—the encroachment of the United States and state governments onto Cherokee land, ending ultimately in Cherokee removal—in order to assist students in reexamining history and rhetoric from a written Cherokee perspective.

Kimberli Lee provides another angle for pedagogical practice and student participation in revisiting her work with contemporary indigenous musicians in the classroom.⁴ While noting that the musicological and anthropological work done on traditional or ceremonial songs and chants is important work, in chapter 6, “Heartspeak from the Spirit: Songs of John Trudell, Keith Secola, and Robbie Robertson,” Lee argues for the value of using contemporary indigenous artists’ music as exemplars of rhetorical practice. Citing the wide thematic range of contemporary indigenous music, including resistance to oppression, cultural continuance, and indigenous historical viewpoints, Lee illustrates how text and music interact in rhetorically powerful ways for both Native and non-Native students and prompts discussion concerning the rhetorics of music and how music can function as a language unto itself. Thus, contemporary indigenous musicians draw on multiple rhetorical practices in the production of their music, making the study of that music an opportunity to learn about both the music of living indigenous artists and communities and music as indigenous rhetorical practice.

Indigenous rhetorical practices do not belong only in undergraduate education, however, and chapter 7, “Making Native Space for Graduate Students: A Story of Collective Indigenous Rhetorical Practice,” theorizes

how indigenous pedagogies and the practice of indigenous rhetorics can inform work at the graduate level. Malea Powell and Andrea Riley Mukavetz present their experience of collaboratively teaching a graduate seminar, *American Indian Rhetorics*, focusing especially on the stories of their collective struggles in accumulating an indigenous rhetorical practice that lives in balance with the demands of the academy. This is, they argue, the space from which their theorizing arises—the intersection of their experiences as both teachers and learners in the shared space of the course. The result is a course outline that is more suggestive than comprehensive and that follows the advice of Lisa Brooks to map Native space over/into/around/under academic and other dominant spaces. Together, Powell and Riley Mukavetz weave stories about indigenous rhetorical practices and theoretical/methodological frames from specific indigenous locations into both their own practices as scholars and teachers within the academy and within the various exigencies of their own lives.

Joyce Rain Anderson reinforces this connection to Native space and indigenous knowledge tied to land in her affirmation of bringing local Native knowledge into the classroom as a means to reconnect students with the land they walk on, to break the primacy of colonial stories, and to reassert the living presence and knowledges of local Native communities. Using her own classroom and university as a case study of creating a “common pot” that sustains all communities and knowledges, in chapter 8, “Remapping Colonial Territories: Bringing Local Native Knowledge into the Classroom,” Anderson demonstrates the pedagogical importance and vitality of foregrounding indigenous ways of knowing that connect and educate the mind, heart, body, and spirit in how she links local indigenous material practices and rhetorics. As examples, Anderson highlights a Three Sisters Garden; a visiting Wampanoag artist who teaches quilting; student activities that include making corn-husk dolls, beading, and pottery; and the how-to of building indigenously based campus-wide initiatives. In this way, Anderson argues that working with local, land-based indigenous knowledges in the classroom contributes to a deeper student understanding of material and rhetorical relationships to land and to Native communities.

Focusing on rhetorical practices of survivance in language and literature, chapter 9, “Rhetorical Sovereignty in Written Poetry: Survivance through Code-Switching and Translation in Laura Tohe’s *Tseyi/Deep in the Rock: Reflections on Canyon de Chelly*,” makes the case that by studying how American Indians use written language—particularly through code-switching and the decision to translate or not translate terms or ideas in

their works—students will begin to understand how American Indians articulate intellectual and cultural sovereignty, as well as rhetorics of alliance and survivance, and their significance. Jessica Hoover observes that colonial educational systems have endorsed problematic ways for both non-Indians and American Indians to engage with literatures and rhetorics authored by, for, and about American Indians. Thus, making students privy to texts that display said rhetorical moves is imperative because many students do not understand, or even acknowledge, that American Indians struggle for sovereignty. By using Diné writer Laura Tohe's *Tseyi/Deep in the Rock: Reflections on Canyon de Chelly* as an example, Hoover encourages students to discuss the importance of language, the reasons for how/why shifting languages is critical, and how different American Indian nations may use language in various ways to affirm their cultural and intellectual sovereignty.

Chapter 10, "Toward a Decolonial Digital and Visual American Indian Rhetorics Pedagogy," brings the collection full circle as Angela Haas makes the case for employing a decolonial pedagogy specifically aimed at digital and visual rhetorics in the teaching of American Indian literatures. Providing an array of examples for teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels, Haas works simultaneously to demonstrate the "perpetuation of a colonial rhetorical assemblage" that places American Indian peoples' intellectual traditions outside the accepted narrative of (post)modern society and to affirm American Indian peoples' always-ongoing relationship with technology. In doing so, she demonstrates that this pedagogy interrogates the "rhetorical velocity" (Ridolfo and DeVoss 2009) of colonial rhetorical tropes that shape digital and visual representations of Indian-ness, privileges evidence of indigenous digital and visual survivance, supports a digital and visual rhetorical sovereignty, and holds non-Native students accountable as allies to American Indians. Such a pedagogy functions to decolonize habits of mind and practice that have historically shaped how we understand American Indians and indigenous rhetorical and technological traditions.

Together, these essays of survivance, sovereignty, and story in the rhetoric and writing classroom and their accompanying sample materials (<http://www.survivancesovereignty.org>) provide a decolonized vision of what teaching rhetoric and writing can be, and they give us a foundation to talk about what rhetoric and pedagogical practice can mean when examined through American Indian and indigenous epistemologies and contemporary rhetorics. They recognize and honor the intellectual work of indigenous thinkers and rhetoricians who have carried this knowledge into the present. They bring the discussion of

breaking precedent in the discipline forward to show how the balance that never was there might be established and how decolonizing the ways we think about rhetoric and writing might proceed. Ultimately, this work continues the call for alliance among Native and non-Native scholars, teachers, and students to transform the discipline for the benefit of all.

Notes

1. We have chosen to discuss the work here in terms of *American Indian* rhetorics, while *Native American* as a term has recently been privileged in indigenous studies, because the following work comes out of the American Indian Caucus at CCCC, we have retained *American Indian* as the broad descriptor.
2. One example is Dorthea M. Susag's (1998) *Roots and Branches: A Resource of Native American Literature*, for use at the middle-school and high-school level. Also available are individual lesson plans such as Read-Write-Think: Native Americans Today for grade-school levels at http://rwtiverto.ncte.org/lessons/lesson_view3221.html#id=63. Additionally, some author-specific materials have been published, such as the pedagogical essay collection on Sherman Alexie: *Sherman Alexie in the Classroom*. "This is not a silent movie. Our voices will save our lives" by Heather E. Bruce, Anna E. Baldwin, and Christabel Umphrey (Bruce, Baldwin, and Umphrey 2008). At the same time, there is no comprehensive discussion of American Indian rhetorics and little published on their pedagogical use or ramifications.
3. For more on *paracolonial*, see Gerald Vizenor (1999 77); within rhetoric and composition studies, see Mailea Powell (2002).
4. Reprinted from *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 19.3, published in fall 2007.

References

- Baca, Darnián, and Victor Villanueva, eds. 2010. *Rhetorics of the Americas: 3114 BCE to 2012 College English*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Bruce, Heather E., Anna E. Baldwin, and Christabel Umphrey. 2008. *Sherman Alexie in the Classroom*. "This is not a silent movie. Our voices will save our lives." NCTE High School Literature Series. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Elder, Crislyn L., Alexandra Hidalgo, and Laurie A. Pinkert. 2011. "American Indian Caucus: 'We wanted to have an open and welcoming space': An Interview with Mailea Powell." In *Listening to Our Elders: Working and Writing for Change*, edited by Samantha Blackmon, Cristina Kirklighter, and Steve Parks, 6–27. Logan: Utah State University of Press.
- Grande, Sandy Marie Anglós. 2008. "American Indian Geographies of Identity and Power: At the Crossroads of Indígena and Mestizaje." In *The Critical Pedagogy Reader*, edited by Antonia Darder, Marta P. Baltodano, and Rodolfo D. Torres, 183–208. New York: Routledge.
- King, Thomas. (2003) 2005. *The Truth about Stories*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lyons, Scott Richard. 2000. "Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do American Indians Want From Writing?" *College Composition and Communication* 51 (3): 447–68. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/358744>.
- Powell, Mailea. 2002. "Rhetorics of Survivance: How American Indians Use Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 53 (3): 396–434. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1512132>.

- Ridolfo, Jim, and Danielle Nicole DeVoss. 2009. "Composing for Recomposition: Rhetorical Velocity and Delivery." *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy* 13 (2). http://www.technorhetoric.net/13.2/topoi/ridolfo_devoss/index.html.
- Silko, Leslie Marmon. 1997. "Language and Literature from a Pueblo Indian Perspective." In *Yellow Woman and a Beauty of the Spirit: Essays on Native American Life Today*, 48-59. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Stromberg, Ernest, ed. 2006. *American Indian Rhetorics of Survivance: Word, Medicine, Word Magic*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Susag, Dortha M. 1998. *Roots and Branches: A Resource of Native American Literature*. Urbana, IL: NCIE.
- Villanueva, Victor. 1999. "On the Rhetoric and Precedents of Racism." *College Composition and Communication* 50 (4): 645-61. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/358485>.
- Vizenor, Gerald. 1999. *Manifest Manners: Narratives of Postindian Survivance*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Womack, Craig. 1999. *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.