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LITERACY PRACTICES AT THE GENOA INDUSTRIAL INDIAN SCHOOL

AMY GOODBURN

In the past twenty-five years, historical studies on Indian boarding schools have proliferated, ranging from analyses of federal policies regarding Indian education (Adams, Coleman, Prucha) to particular institutional histories such as They Called It Prairie Light, The Phoenix Indian School, Cultivating the Rosebuds, To Change Them Forever, and Out of the Depths. While the specifics of institutional practices may differ, for the most part scholars of American Indian education agree that the boarding school experience was and continues to be a seminal moment for generations of Indian families. Although initial histories of federal Indian boarding schools mainly relied upon official bureaucratic documents that focused on government assimilation policies, recently scholars in Native American studies have begun to question and critique this focus. Using reproduction theories of education, scholars have begun to theorize how federal off-reservation Indian boarding schools served as sites of cultural production and to examine how students and teachers resisted these sites through strategic acts. They Called It Prairie Light, for instance, analyzes oft-repeated tales told by Chilocco alumni, such as the “bloomer story,” to illustrate how daily practices were contested and subverted, resulting in “a symbolic marker of Indian identity for Chilocco alumni.” Celia Haig-Brown analyzes thirteen life histories of former students of the Kamloops Indian Residential School to explore “the resistance movement which the students and their families developed against the invasive presence of the residential school,” and Patricia Carter describes how six Indian Service teachers resisted the monolithic and oppressive mandates of Bureau of Indian Affairs policy to negotiate their own responsibilities and to address their students’ needs.

Amy Goodburn is Assistant Professor of English at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln where she teaches composition, rhetoric, and literacy studies.
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Despite this abundance of scholarship, however, few studies of federal Indian boarding schools have focused on literacy as a central term for investigation. Although literacy studies is necessarily interdisciplinary and contributes to insights about the relationship between language and, in Levinson and Holland's words, the "cultural production of the educated person," few Indian boarding-school histories have focused on the significance of particular literacy practices for understanding Indian students' school experiences. When literacy is discussed, it is usually in terms of the federal "English only" requirement that prohibited Indian languages or the drill and rote exercises used in the primary language curriculum. Few scholars have examined the texts used in the curriculum or the written texts that students produced within these classrooms. And yet, as Deborah Brandt suggests, literacy artifacts reflect how individuals intersect "at a certain time with the ongoing, official history of mass literacy and the institutions that have controlled it," representing "a complex, sometimes cacophonous mix of fading and ascending materials, practices, and ideologies." Examining literacy artifacts from a particular school, then, offers historians of education and Great Plains scholars a case study for understanding how federal policies regarding education were enacted, resisted, and remade by students and teachers in local and personal ways.

This essay focuses on literacy practices at one off-reservation government boarding school: the Genoa Industrial Indian School at Genoa, Nebraska (1884-1934), the fourth and one of the largest of the almost thirty Indian government boarding schools built in the United States. In particular, I focus on three types of literacy artifacts: (1) literary texts that students read, (2) students' writing within the curriculum, and (3) student writing outside the curriculum. In examining these literacy artifacts, I find Mary Louise Pratt's metaphor of "the contact zone" useful. Pratt suggests that literacy artifacts can be read as contact zones or "social spaces where disparate cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination." Rather than reading these literacy artifacts solely as a barometer of how Genoa students were assimilated, I suggest that they can be read as contact zones which illustrate how Genoa students' reading and writing practices served as spaces to name, define, and claim (or reject) identities in relation to the larger cultural discourses that surrounded them.

THE GENOA INDIAN SCHOOL

The Indian dialects are numerous, and in them there have come down the stories and traditions of their ancestors. These stories are told about the campfires and rehearsed over and over to their children and they have a tremendous force to keep them out of the tide of modern civilization.

Give these young Indians a knowledge of the English language, put them into a great current of thought which is expressed in the English language and it will break that up.

The Genoa Industrial Indian School was started in 1884 in a school originally built for Pawnee children before the tribe relocated to Oklahoma in 1875. From this one room, the Genoa Indian School grew to encompass a 640-acre campus with over thirty buildings, sixty teachers and staff, and almost 600 students from over thirty different tribes. Although Genoa Indian School students were drawn primarily from reservations in Nebraska and South Dakota, they also came from as far away as Canada and Michigan to attend school in this small agricultural Nebraska town.

As the above quote by federal Indian Commissioner Thomas Morgan suggests, teaching of English was a main priority of the federal government and, in its initial years, of the Genoa Indian School. The students, whose ages ranged from four to twenty-four, were grouped together in classes based on their
English proficiency and ability. Morgan’s curriculum policy toward language assumed that eradicating students’ native languages was the first step in “civilizing” them. To break up students’ stories and traditions, Morgan’s policy of “no talking Indian” was instituted at Genoa. Students who spoke their Indian languages were punished in various ways, ranging from being forced to walk endlessly back and forth along a path, to removal of privileges, to whippings by the superintendent or school disciplinarian. In 1888 Superintendent Horace Chase wrote that he was especially fortunate because he had a corps of teachers “who are in thorough sympathy with the rule prohibiting the use of the Indian tongue” and that he had “as far as possible dispensed with interpreters, thus forcing all new-comers to quickly learn enough English to at least express their wants.”

Genoa Indian School teachers also used peer pressure and rewards to divide students between those who spoke English only and those who didn’t, as an excerpt from the school newspaper illustrates: “Tuesday was Mr. Backus’ [the superintendent’s] birthday. The girls who had not talked Indian for a month had their treat of nuts and candy up in the parlor, while those who had to pay the penalty were sent to their rooms with the privilege of listening to the merry-making of those who were enjoying themselves.”

Four months later, Genoa Indian School administrators claimed even more success for eradicating the use of students’ native languages, reporting that girls who had not been able to speak “a word of English, are now making excellent progress, while reporting a roll-call for talking Indian grows decidedly less. With the exception of two or three new girls, all are prepared to say ‘no’.” But beyond this “just say no” campaign against speaking tribal languages, other forms of literacy instruction also shaped Indian students’ experiences at federal off-reservation boarding schools.

One often-ignored dimension of Morgan’s literacy curriculum was the emphasis on reading and the role that literature played in his overall goal to civilize and assimilate Indian students. For Morgan, literature provided an opportunity for Indian pupils to learn patriotism and civic duty: “They [Indian pupils] should be taught to look upon America as their home, and upon the United States Government as their friend and benefactor. They should be made familiar with the lives of great and good men and women in American history, and be taught to feel a pride in all their great achievements. They should hear little or nothing of the ‘wrongs of the Indians’ and of the injustice of the white race. If their unhappy history is alluded to, it should be to contrast it with the better future that is within their grasp.”

In keeping with these goals, Morgan’s curriculum for advanced students supplemented the McGuffey Reader Series with literary texts such as *Robinson Crusoe in Words of One Syllable*, *The Swiss Family Robinson*, *Swinton’s American Classics*, *Grandfather’s Stories*, and magazines such as *Harper’s Young People*, *Chatterbox*, and *Wide Awake*. For the most part, Genoa Indian School educators supported Morgan’s curriculum. In an annual report to the commissioner, one Genoa Indian School teacher wrote: “We hope to obtain some story-books and pictorial papers for our boys and girls to read. They enjoy them thoroughly, and I am sure that it will broaden their views of life and give them a greater desire to live and be ‘like a white man’.”

The principal teacher, Bessie Johnston, wrote an addendum to the yearly narrative report that “two Friday evenings each month we have exercises consisting of compositions, recitations, singing, &c.”

And early editions of the *Pipe of Peace* emphasize that students were engaging in the literacy instruction that some federal inspectors found lacking: “The school reading room is a favorite place of resort. It is always well patronized, and the large collection of story books, papers, and magazines that have been made seem to be appreciated in an intelligent manner by the children. . . . It seems to be much more noticeable of late and it is certainly gratifying to find a child here and there when work hours are over, improving a few leisure moments in
reading a story book or taking up a paper and gleaning from it some new ideas and thoughts.”\textsuperscript{17} A later article noted that, through reading, Genoa Indian School students “are learning—though perhaps slowly—to grasp new ideas and subjects which were unknown to their ancestors.”\textsuperscript{18} By 1913 a school calendar illustrates that literary society meetings were held every other week, and the 1931-32 school handbook describes the library as holding 2,942 volumes and 51 different periodicals with an additional 300 volumes in the first six grades of the school.\textsuperscript{19} One former Genoa Indian School student, who attended in the early 1920s, said that administrators and teachers promoted reading through prizes and recognition: “We used to read a lot, and they used to give recognition to the ones that read a lot. I used to read a real lots, but I never got the first recognition. There was always somebody who read more than I did.”\textsuperscript{20}

To understand how students were experiencing the curriculum, it is useful to examine more closely the literature that they were reading. Two literary texts in particular, \textit{Stiya} and \textit{Ramona}, illustrate the cultural discourses about Native American life to which Genoa Indian School students had access.\textsuperscript{21} Both written by white women involved in the Indian Reform Movement, \textit{Stiya} and \textit{Ramona} present two different types of images regarding Indian assimilation that were promoted at the Genoa Indian School.

\textbf{STIYA: WHOLESALE ASSIMILATION}

\textit{Stiya: A Carlisle Indian Girl at Home} was written by Marianna Burgess, a teacher and superintendent of printing at the Carlisle Industrial Indian School in Pennsylvania. Because Burgess had taught at the Genoa Indian School in its early years, she retained a keen interest in its progress and frequently visited the school to give lectures.\textsuperscript{22} At the Genoa Indian School, students were encouraged to read her book as soon as it was published: “One of our teachers has received a copy of ‘Stiya,’ an account of an Indian girl’s experience at her home after a few years at Carlisle. The story is written by one of the Carlisle teachers, and is replete with interesting facts, giving a very graphic description of the trials of a young girl and the strength and fortitude with which she met the barbarism and cruelty of her own people, and nobly stood up for the right. It should be read by every Indian girl and boy.”\textsuperscript{23} Two weeks later \textit{Stiya} was endorsed by the Genoa Indian School superintendent, “Monday evening Superintendent Backus gave the children an interesting and instructive talk, using ‘Stiya’ for a text. It is a subject that cannot be too thoroughly discussed before the Indian children.”\textsuperscript{24} The subject of \textit{Stiya} that was so appealing to Genoa Indian School educators—assimilation of white values and rejection of an Indian identity—clearly mirrored Commissioner Morgan’s curricular goals to awaken for Native Americans “loyalty to the Government, gratitude to the Nation, and hopefulness for themselves.”\textsuperscript{25}

\textit{Stiya} purports to be a realistic depiction of the transition between boarding school and reservation life “founded on the author’s actual observations.”\textsuperscript{26} The plot is fairly straightforward. After attending Carlisle for a few years, \textit{Stiya} returns to her pueblo where she becomes dissatisfied with her family and their way of life. She refuses to “dress Indian,” engage in the family’s domestic practices, or participate in a mandatory tribal dance. \textit{Stiya}'s refusal to dance results in her family’s arrest, and their public whipping and rejection by the community. Her courage in the face of this hardship inspires her father to turn away from Native ways—he takes a job hauling coal for the railroad so that he can build his family a bigger home. In the end, \textit{Stiya}'s example transforms her entire family: her father begins to dress “civilized”; her mother, while maintaining Indian dress, begins to clean and cook like a white woman, and \textit{Stiya} bases her life around Carlisle values. A subsequent visit by former Indian school teachers confirms \textit{Stiya}'s success and the family lives a contented life thereafter.
As with the character Stiya, negotiating one’s movement between reservation and school communities was central to Genoa Indian School students. Students were often ill-prepared to return to reservation life after having spent years in government boarding schools premised upon white values. And Genoa Indian School educators, who viewed students’ home lives in deprecating terms, were concerned that the money spent on educating and “civilizing” Indian youth would be wasted if students returned to tribal values and cultures upon leaving school. Samuel Tappan, Genoa Indian School superintendent in 1885, described reservation life as having “the horrible and disgusting features of Mormonism, socialism, and kindred evils.” Similarly, Superintendent Horace Chase wrote in his 1887 annual report:

The difficulty lies not so much in the school children as in their parents and homes. At present the children are in the minority. Struggle as they may they find the battle at home overwhelming and themselves almost helpless. Very few of them can withstand the surroundings. They must either return to school or drop down to the parents’ level. . . . Among those who returned to one of the Dakota agencies was a girl thirteen years of age. She spent one night at home, when, seeing the escort who accompanied her to the reservation, ran to him and refused to leave him. It is needless to add she was permitted to return to school and is now entered for another term.

Stiya represented the assimilationist values of Genoa Indian School educators as well as the larger educational discourses of Commissioner Morgan and Colonel Richard Henry Pratt, the founder of the Carlisle Industrial Indian School. As a text, Stiya was useful not only because it reinforced the value of the boarding-school experience in which students were located but also because it anticipated future experiences that Genoa Indian School students might face and attempted to model strategies that students could use to resist the “temptations” they would encounter upon returning home. Written as a first-person narrative from the perspective of an Indian student, Burgess claims that Stiya is truly representative of an Indian student’s off-reservation boarding school experience: “The story of Stiya and her trials is woven out of the experiences of girls at various times members of the Indian Industrial School at Carlisle, Pa. The fundamental facts, therefore, are true. Different Indian villages have contributed incidents and served for the pueblo of the story. This circumstance gives those interested in Indian education the hope that a brighter day may now be dawning, when the home conditions will be so changed that there will be no more tribal tyranny, but all will be under the protection and enjoy the privileges of our good Government.” One strategy that Stiya models for its Indian readers is the importance of controlling one’s outward negative responses upon returning home while remaining determined to transform such conditions. Stiya constantly monitors her inward feelings about her family and tribe so as not to offend them but also to resist their values. This book teaches students to see anew what before was hidden and to provide strategies for changing such conditions without breaking connections among family members: “I never in the world would have learned to be disgusted at this way of living,” says Stiya, “had I not been taken clear away from it, where I could not see it, nor hear anything about it for years.” This new way of seeing that Stiya espouses encourages students to resist their parents’ values when they return upon graduation. In a scene with a classmate who has also recently returned to the pueblo, for instance, Stiya advises her friend to reject parental advice about wearing native clothing: “It is best to obey our fathers and mothers, but, Annie, I think we know so much more than they do now that if we are kind to them we ought at the same time to do what we know is right, even if it is contrary to what they wish.” In Stiya the white educators, not the pupils’ parents, know what is in
the pupils' best interests. Stiya states that not to live the white man's way is to be unappreciative of the schooling that she recognizes as being in her best interest. Consequently, she pledges to remain ever vigilant about her identity transformation: "Do you think I would be so ungrateful after the Government has spent so much time and money to educate me as not to use the knowledge I have obtained? . . . I mean to beat out the Indian ways, if such a thing is possible, and I believe it is possible."32 In addition to beating out the Indian ways in herself, Stiya vows to transform her parents as well. In this sense, Stiya served as an assimilationist handbook for Genoa Indian School students' behavior both at and beyond the school campus.

The use and chronological placement of "real" photographs within Stiya further signifies the identity transformation that schools like the Genoa Indian School sought to render. Seven photographs are scattered throughout the text, beginning with a Carlisle girl in uniform standing beside a chair in a formal pose, followed by five pictures of pueblo life—a woman with a water jar, women washing clothes in a stream, burros loaded with wood, a sundance at the Catholic mission, and a distance view of Pueblo village homes—and ending with the campus of the Carlisle school. Although Stiya is a fictional compilation, these "real" photographs lend the text an aura of authenticity and participate in the larger photographic rhetoric utilized by government boarding schools to persuade government agencies and private patrons that boarding schools were "civilizing" Native American pupils. As Lonna Malmsheimer suggests, the before and after photographs that Colonel Pratt produced at the Carlisle school, which were duplicated at Genoa and other schools, served as "iconic representations of the cultural transformation that was the central aim of the school."33 Like the school newspaper, student photos—which were sold to the public as postcards and posters—served a rhetorical function in persuading various agencies and patrons to support the schools.

While it is clear that Genoa educators viewed Stiya as an important conduct book, it is difficult to know how most students viewed the book's themes in light of their own experiences, although one former student, Sam J. Bordeaux, exhorted Genoa students to read Stiya in a letter that he wrote for publication in the Pipe. For Bordeaux, who worked as a typesetter for the Pipe before leaving the school, Stiya reinforced the values that Genoa Indian School educators sought to teach and that he found valuable in his own life:

Now let me tell you one thing. Learn all you possibly can. Every thing you learn will come handy to you some day when you start out to make your own living. This is specially to the boys. If any of you have to stay at school one, two, or three years, don't waste your time, but try to learn much as you possibly can. You will some day be so glad you did it, if you do. I am sorry that I ever wasted my time. Sometimes I thought "I know enough," but now I find out I was greatly mistaken. Every little thing we learn is much help to us.

To my teachers I am thankful with all my heart for the instruction they gave me and for what I learned from them. Also to my superintendent and band teacher. Today I read the story of the Carlisle girl called "Stiya." All Indian children should read it and follow her example.

Well, dear school mates, I guess I have said enough now. I hope you will always pay attention to the instructions of your superintendent, and if you do you will never be sorry; for I know now that what he told me was true and right, and I see it more and more every day. This is all. I will close now with my best regards to you all.34

**RAMONA: RESISTING THE WHITE MAN'S IMAGE**

While the promotion of Stiya reflected the Genoa Indian School's focus on wholesale assimilation and the rejection of Native
American identity, the school’s promotion of Ramona reflected a different moment in educational policy, one more sympathetic to valuing the cultures of Indian people and more critical of the US government’s assimilation policies.

Published in 1884, Helen Hunt Jackson’s two-volume protest novel chronicles three cultures in conflict—Mexican, Indian, and Anglo—through the fictional love relationship between Ramona, a young woman of Indian and Mexican heritage, and Allesandro, an Indian sheep shearer. In volume 1 Alessandro falls in love with Ramona but is forbidden to marry her because he is Indian. The two run away, marry, and have a daughter. In the process, Ramona discovers that her mother was Indian and decides to take on Indian ways. In volume 2, Alessandro is unjustly murdered by a white man. The novel concludes with Ramona leaving California for a new life in Mexico. If Stiya depicts the white man as savior, Ramona depicts Americans as greedy and selfish liars bent on stealing property from Mexicans and Indians, relying upon US courts to unfairly adjudicate land claims and “running up and down everywhere seeking money, like dogs with their noses to the ground.”

Jackson describes California as a fading and decaying land where Anglo capitalistic values are destroying Mexican and Indian cultural and social traditions.

Unlike the realism of Stiya, Ramona is a historical romance, a conscious choice of the author who wanted to “set forth some Indian experiences to move people’s hearts” in the tradition of Uncle Tom’s Cabin. Like the author of Stiya, Jackson wrote Ramona after observing Indian life at several missions and reservations; however, Jackson viewed Anglos as the problem, not the solution. Perhaps it was Ramona’s refusal to culturally assimilate that so appealed to Genoa Indian School student readers, making Ramona one of the six most demanded books in the library. Ramona’s popularity suggests that students actively sought forms of Native American representation beyond that of Stiya.

Perhaps one reason Ramona enjoyed such popularity is the connection that students might have felt with its author. Described as a cultural power broker between white and Indian communities, Jackson’s work is mainly represented by her nonfictional polemic A Century of Dishonor and by Ramona. Stirred into action by a lecture given by Ponca Chief Standing Bear about his tribe’s forced removal from their Missouri River Reservation, Jackson spent the seven years before her death researching and writing about injustice toward Indians regarding land rights and political power.

Credited as the person responsible for making the Ponca’s case visible to the national scene, Jackson was a visible and appealing figure in the Indian Reform Movement. Given that the majority of Genoa Indian School pupils were drawn from the Ponca, Winnebago, and Lakota tribes in Nebraska and South Dakota, it is not surprising that students might have felt an affinity for Jackson’s work. Indeed, the death of Alessandro in her novel is often loosely attributed to the historical events of two separate unpunished murders of Indian men by white men, one a Winnebago and the other a Cahuilla.

Ramona’s popularity with Genoa Indian School students is interesting in light of the messages about literacy that the book projects. Although Jackson shared the Genoa Indian School educators’ values in terms of promoting English to Native Americans (she desired to build a mission school for Indians), throughout Ramona she illustrates that race, not literacy, holds the power in society. Even though Alessandro and Ramona are learned and educated; their positions as Native Americans leave them little power. Alessandro’s father dies of a broken heart after his village is taken over by whites, and literacy offers no recourse to Ramona when Alessandro’s killer is brought to trial. Ultimately, Ramona decides to live in Mexico rather than the US, a rather contradictory message to Genoa Indian School students living in an environment that touted literacy as the currency for success in white society. Regardless of this message, Ramona
was popular with students. One former student recalled being influenced by *Ramona* over fifty years after the Genoa Indian School had closed: “One of my favorites was *Ramona* by Helen Hunt Jackson. I read that more than once. . . . It’s beautiful. She knew about the Indians and their conditions way, way back . . . when the people were first going out west to settle in California and all that. She wrote about the Indians . . . when they were being displaced and they didn’t know where to go.”

For this reader, *Ramona’s* value lay in its depiction of Indian life rather than its love story, a striking contrast to most of the contemporary reviewers and readers who seemed to miss the political critique about Anglo culture that Jackson sought to make. Indeed, Genoa Indian School students seemed to embrace *Ramona* because it offered them a sympathetic reading of their own positions as American Indians negotiating their positions within a school setting.

Beyond its popularity in the school library, *Ramona* was also discussed by members of the all-female Victoria Society, a monthly literary society in which girls participated in a variety of literacy events, such as reading written compositions, giving oral recitations, singing, and debating. During one meeting, a student led a discussion of *Ramona* accompanied by the head librarian’s sketch of Helen Hunt Jackson’s life. The fact that students so eagerly read *Ramona* and included it in their extracurricular school activities illustrates its importance. Unlike other literary texts that Genoa students read—such as *Robinson Crusoe*, *Swiss Family Robinson*, or *Stiya*, where the main characters adopt and or replicate white values—*Ramona* offered students a character who claims an Indian identity and rejects white society both for herself and her child. And despite the fact that *Ramona* is a fictional romance, Genoa Indian School students, like the public at large, viewed the story in almost nonfictional terms. Indeed, the boundaries between fiction and reality about this book were so blurred that the school newspaper ran a short article about a basket supposedly made by the “real” Ramona housed at another Indian boarding school in California.

**STUDENT WRITING ABOUT RACE AND LANGUAGE**

Beyond the school library, another dimension of Genoa Indian School literacy instruction was the students’ own in-class writing. While few of the Genoa Indian School students’ original texts remain, some student writing was preserved in the May 1908 commencement issue of the *Indian News*, showcasing “samples of regular school room work, selected with reference to scope of work done, also representing as many tribes as possible.” This compilation of essays from first to eighth grade includes stories about animals, American presidents, gardening tips, and schoolwork details. More relevant to this discussion are the eighth grade essays. Written in persuasive modes on assigned topics such as “Shall the Indian Tongue be preserved?” and “Should Indians be absorbed into the white race?,” these students’ essays seem to have been produced in a cultural moment not far removed from present-day literacy debates about the politics of language, race, and identity. The fact that Genoa Indian School teachers allowed these essays not only to be written on such topics but also to be published for other students, parents, and subscribers of the *Indian News* to read suggests the importance of these topics to Genoa educators. These essays also illustrate how students rhetorically negotiated within the confines of the academic essay and larger assimilationist discourses to affirm, question, and sometimes oppose the educational goals of the Genoa Indian School.

The first set of essays, “Shall the Indian Tongue be preserved?,” are surprisingly varied, illustrating that, while the topic was clearly assigned, students were not required to simply parrot an English-only policy. Indeed, these students’ essays represent a wide range of arguments both for and against the preservation of Native languages and evidence of knowledge about contemporary Indian language
preservation efforts. While some writers assert that English is the civilizing force that must take precedence, others argue that Native languages can and should be maintained and preserved. A close examination of these different essays points to the complicated ways that students co-opted and resisted assimilationist discourses about literacy to argue their own positions.

One of the most conservative essays of the group, written by Ida McNamara, a Chippewa, seems to echo Commissioner Morgan's appeals for progress through the “civilizing” forces of English: “The Indian boys or girls ought to learn the English language so well that they will not go back to their Indian language; for probably within a few years from now the Indian will not speak it, and why should they want to preserve it? The English language is far ahead of the Indian languages. . . . This world is not standing still but is growing more civilized every day, and I am sure the ambitious Indian boys or girls do not want to speak one language all the days of their life while there are so many foreigners coming to this country who are grasping the English language and are so ambitious to learn and why not the Indians take the same chance that is given to them?”

Ida’s essay expresses almost a fatalistic attitude toward the loss of Indian languages and the comcomitant view that English is “far ahead” of Indian languages in terms of its civilizing power. Moreover, she implies that Indians who do not learn English are not ambitious and wasting the “chance” that is being given to them through educational programs such as those provided by the Genoa Indian School. Another common discourse represented in Ida’s essay is the notion that the students’ cultures are foreign, particularly in terms of language. In keeping with the larger social discourse regarding the “Indian Question,” most Genoa Indian School students compared their positions as Indians to that of immigrants from other countries, saying that they need to work like other immigrants to gain access into white society.

Despite this shared assumption about their foreignness, however, not all Genoa Indian School students agreed upon the devaluing of Native languages. For instance, in counterpoint to Ida’s essay, Zoe Lamson, an Omaha, argues that Indians can and should use both English and their Native languages to move back and forth between communities.

I think the Indians should always be able to speak [sic] their own language whatever comes. They could also learn the English as well as all of them do. . . . Nearly all the Indians can speak both languages even though they speak the English most of the time, they almost entirely forget their own speech. Most all the foreigners that come from their own countries can not speak English: but after they are over here awhile they almost forget their languages but when they go home it comes back to them very easily. The same with the Indians, when the boys and girls come to school and mix with the whites they almost forget the Indian languages. But when they go back again it all comes back to them and should be remembered.

Zoe’s strong opening sentence resists the notion that English is a civilizing force and describes the future not in terms of progress but rather as “whatever comes,” a decidedly more qualified statement than the enthusiasm for progress represented in Ida’s essay. And although Zoe’s essay echoes Ida’s in its references to foreigners who learn English, she uses foreigners as an example of those who preserve and speak their native languages within their home communities rather than those who forget their native languages in the pursuit of English. Zoe’s essay also implicitly criticizes government boarding schools like the Genoa Indian School for precipitating the loss of Native languages, noting that when Indian pupils “mix with whites they almost forget the Indian languages.” In addition, Zoe’s essay refers to a central concern of Indian service teachers—that students returning to their
home communities will return to speaking their Native languages—pointing out how easily one's language "all comes back to them" once they leave school.

Probably the most nuanced argument for the preservation of Indian languages comes from Thomas Come Last, a Sioux, in an essay that, while short in length, provides a persuasive argument regarding the possibility for native languages to be preserved: "The Indian language should be preserved. There are many dialects but many of the Indians can easily understand each other. There are six or seven dialects in the Sioux language, but Rev. J. P. Williamson and Rev. A. L. Riggs publish a paper in that language and the Indians subscribe to the Word Carrier and read it. Rev. J. P. Williamson and Rev. A. L. Riggs take Missionsaries to different parts of the Sioux Reservation and give instruction in the language and they have published books in that language; so I think it should be preserved." In this essay, Come Last accomplishes several tasks. First, he responds to the belief that the many dialects of Native languages make it impossible to preserve them, a particularly strong argument against valuing Indian languages within schools that were comprised of many different tribal populations. While Come Last acknowledges that different dialects exist, he maintains that these differences are negligible in preventing Indians from communicating with each other. In an institution that groups all Native languages together as "talking Indian," naming "Sioux" as one language with different dialects is critical for redefining the terms in which language policy is framed. Secondly, Come Last emphasizes the textual production of Indian languages, highlighting how they are not solely oral but have been used in scholarly papers, the Word Carrier newspaper, and in books. Come Last's emphasis on how missionaries have used Native languages on the Dakota reservation also establishes his ethos in terms of valuing assimilationist principles. The fact that the language can be incorporated into a schooling context (they "give instruction in the language") illustrates how Thomas Come Last rhetorically appeals to the ideology of school and at the same time argues for the retention of Native languages.

Beyond the issue of preserving Native languages, these Genoa Indian School students' essays also address the question "Should Indians should be absorbed into the white race?" Not surprisingly, all the essays assert that Indians should be assimilated. Yet these writers reflect different attitudes toward such assimilation. Given that the dominant discourse surrounding the Genoa Indian School and the nation at large was framed in terms of the "Indian Question," it is interesting that these students' essays—while highly regulated in terms of topic—contradict and resist this language, showing the complicated rhetorical stances these writers adopted in expressing their beliefs. Rather than participating in the discourse of blaming themselves for the "Indian Situation," for instance, most of these writers criticize the whites who displaced them. This naming of white responsibility usually occurs in the opening paragraph, before the writer then argues that Indians need to accept such conditions by participating in the assimilation process. For example, Martin Vallie, a Point p'Oreille, writes:

In the early days before the white race had ever discovered this continent the Indians were living at liberty and in peace. But when it was discovered by the white race they gradually came in year after year to settle into the country for their new homes; thousands of people came every year.

In this way they drove the Indians further west, till at last they were bunched together in reservations here and there in different states. The government had the difficult task to have them settle down; for years this fight with Indians raged but the Indians finally desisted from their wild and cruel ways and are now living at peace in their homes. The majority of the Indians today have become part of the white race and are living as the white people do.
Martin's essay reflects the difficult rhetorical task faced by Genoa Indian School students as they named whites responsible for Indians' poor living conditions in essays to be read and evaluated by white teachers. Thus the seemingly contradictory statements that even though the Indians were living “at liberty and in peace” before white settlers arrived, it is the Indians who needed to desist “from their wild and cruel ways” once whites took their land and bunched them on reservations. Martin's attitude toward the civilizing value of white society also seems conflicted. While he notes that the majority of Indians have “become part of the white race and are living as the white people do,” he does not describe this assimilation in terms of success. Rather, he seems to view it in almost fatalistic terms, in the same way that Zoe described the future as “whatever comes.” Indeed, the question of “Should Indians be absorbed into the white race?” becomes regarded as a statement of fact rather than a question to pose. For Martin, the majority of Indians already have become part of the white race, although they are also clearly separate from it because they live “as white people do,” rather than “as white people.”

Mary Rutledge, a Piegan, shares Martin's rhetorical stance in both criticizing white society and agreeing with the need for assimilation. Her opening paragraph asserts the unfairness with which Indians have been treated and emphasizes that white society needs to grant Indians opportunities to assimilate: “In the first place the Indians owned this country, and they were gradually driven off their lands, by other nations, so we find reservations where they are packed together. And I think it should not be done, they should become a part of the white race by allowing them to mingle more with their white brothers and sisters, that is they should go to school together and work side by side.” Mary Rutledge's argument that Indians and whites should attend the same schools complicates the Genoa Indian School agenda, which isolates Indian students in boarding schools, but then she returns to the “civilizing” discourse, emphasizing that Indians need to improve before they can be considered equals in white society: “They [Indians] should have the same privileges as the white people because I think the Indians are just as capable of learning. . . . of course the Indian has made a wonderful progress toward civilization, because they were once savages, but they can improve a great deal more so that they will be able to stand on the same footing as the white people and make good, honest citizens of the United States.”

Apart from the almost apologetic tone that Mary's essay takes, it is also interesting to note the way that she distances herself from the Indians she describes. By using the pronoun “they” instead of “we” with regard to Indian progress, Mary distinguishes between her own position as a Genoa Indian School student and other Indians who need to improve before they can become good and honest citizens, a rhetorical maneuver that allows her to support Genoa Indian School discourse without locating herself as one who has not already earned the right to be considered equal to white citizens.

The third writer who wrestles with the assimilation topic is Grace Lamson, an Omaha. Like Martin and Mary, Grace begins her essay by acknowledging the need for Indians to assimilate but also emphasizes white society's role in displacing Indians in the first place:

From my point of view, I do think that the Indians should be absorbed into the white race for many reasons.

In the first place the Indians had possession of all this land, and people from different countries, such as the Scotch, French, German, Swedes, and Danish people came over and drove the Indians out, as it is called.

Grace then softens her rhetoric by emphasizing that whites have helped Indians and that assimilation should now be valued:

But the whites have done a great deal for the Indians: taught some of them how to farm their land and work for themselves.
and they should become as quickly as possible part of the white race. Mix up with them and associate with the white man more. They should send their children to the white public schools, study the same books, and have the same privileges as their white brothers and sisters.

So the English people should not be ashamed to recognized [sic] the Indian men, women, or children any place. 54

Unlike Martin and Mary, who conclude by emphasizing Indian responsibility in assimilating, Grace emphasizes that white society needs to change its attitude toward Indians and afford them the same privileges. Implicit in her essay is the notion that integration would be more useful than isolating Indians in Indian schools such as the Genoa Indian School. Thus, while the topics and forms for Genoa Indian School student writing were proscribed, these students’ essays reflect a variety of rhetorical stances regarding political and social issues that connected to their identities as Indian students and illustrate how students used their literacy instruction to question and complicate the institutional values of the Genoa Indian School.

WRITING RESISTANCE TO SCHOOL PRACTICES

In addition to school essays, Genoa Indian School students also participated in other forms of writing—such as letter writing—that reflected their resistance to school ideology and, in many cases, to particular teachers and administrators. Within the classroom, students were taught forms of letter writing and frequently were asked to write letters to outside audiences, especially to supporters of Indian schools who were curious about students’ daily lives. But some of the most interesting forms of student writing are out-of-class letters that students wrote to Indian Service administrators to criticize and change the institutional and administrative practices at the Genoa Indian School. Ironically, in many cases, these students’ letters directly contradicted the “Rules for Letter Writing” that they were taught within the classroom. 56

One frequent form of communication between student and administrator was the request to visit home. Because school policy required that most children remain on the campus year round for at least three years and because school funding was tied to the number of pupils enrolled, administrators usually refused to allow students short visits home because they feared that students would not return to campus. Nonetheless, Genoa Indian School administrators’ files are full of letters by students requesting permission to go home. And, when students’ requests were denied by the school superintendent, some went over his head and wrote directly to the Indian commissioner for a second opinion. For instance, Iva Valliere wrote such a request for permission to go home for a week: “Would you please let me go home on a visit as I have been gone for a year and want to go home for a while. I want to stay a week at home and then come back to school. All the rest of the girls got to go home and I didn’t. Mr. Chandler, my agent said if you were willing for me to go home a week it was all right with him. I have been good and I have always minded the rules.”57

In keeping with the in-loco-parentis role that Genoa Indian School educators assumed for their pupils, Iva’s rhetoric mirrors that of a typical teenager attempting to gain privileges—negotiating for rights on the premise that “All the rest of the girls” had them, reminding the reader that she has always played by the rules of the Genoa Indian School, and referring to her reservation agent, Mr. Chandler, in an attempt to bolster her claim with another administrator’s approval. Upon receiving letters from Genoa Indian School students, the commissioner usually wrote to the school superintendent to ascertain the reasons for the initial refusal. In this particular case, the superintendent’s reply to the commissioner—which was never sent to Iva herself—illustrates other motivations for retaining her at school, namely his belief that the mother
sought Iva’s inheritance from her dead father and that her request to return for a week “is simply a ruse to get home. She would not return.” Clearly, Iva could never have rhetorically persuaded the superintendent about the validity of her request given the assumptions underlying his decision of which she had no knowledge. But this letter exchange illustrates one type of out-of-class writing that allowed Genoa Indian School students to resist or challenge the superintendent’s decisions.

Another type of written discourse was the request for transfer to another school, either back to public schools that some had previously attended or to other off-reservation boarding schools where additional educational training could be received. Like letter requests for home visits, students frequently wrote the commissioner behind the superintendent’s back. One student, for instance, wrote the commissioner requesting a transfer so that he could take a higher course of study: “I have the honor to request that I be transferred from Genoa Indian School Genoa Nebr. to Lawrence Kansas, I mean the Haskell Institute, to complete my education, would like to take a 4 year course. I have being [sic] at Genoa school six years and wish a change and better my self in line of education. I am eligible for the 7th Grade. I enclose my certificate of promotion for your information.” The interplay of Luke Goings’ discourse and the superintendent’s response illustrates the mixed literacy messages that students received at the Genoa Indian School. While Luke wanted to further his education at Haskell in keeping with the Genoa Indian School’s assimilationist goals, the superintendent’s response to the commissioner reflects the oftentimes patronizing attitude the Genoa Indian School administration took toward its Indian pupils:

I have the honor to state that this boy is a very good pupil. He has been here six years and has made his grade each year. He will be in the 7th grade this next term.

He will never make an office man. It would be a waste of time and money for him to undertake a commercial course. He will, in all probability, devote his time to farm pursuits after finishing his next term. At least, that in my opinion, is what he should do. This school is convenient and a number from his reservation are enrolled here. He can receive as good advantages here as at any Government school, therefore, I recommend the disapproval of his application for transfer.

The superintendent’s reply illustrates a key problem with the organization of the Genoa Indian School and government Indian schools in general. Despite the ideology of assimilation promoted at the Genoa Indian School, vocational education was still stressed over academic study because most educators did not truly believe that their Indian students could be as successful as their white counterparts. Although Luke had successfully completed the Genoa Indian School’s academic course of study, he was not considered “office man” material. Frequently students were confused by these mixed messages. Another student who attended the Genoa Indian School for twelve years, said that he, too, was denied a transfer to Haskell without being given a reason. Instead of being given the opportunity to pursue agricultural studies, he returned to his home where he built a log cabin, raised a family, and still lives today.

In addition to letters of request, some students used writing to lodge complaints about their treatment. In 1909 several girls wrote Commissioner R. G. Valentine asking for the removal of their house matron. While the girls’ original letter no longer exists, apparently their rhetoric was successful because the commissioner wrote to the superintendent: “From the tone of the letter, I judge that these girls are sincere in their complaints, and did not write in a malicious or defiant spirit, and it seems to me that a kind-hearted, tactful employee with a knowledge of where the trouble lies should be able to win them over in a very short time. Much discontent and homesickness can often be overcome by giving
thoughtful consideration to such appeals as this."62

Although Valentine's reply attributes the girls' request to homesickness rather than the legitimacy of the complaint, the girls' letter still seems to have been well received, despite the fact that it directly conflicts with the letter-writing rules to not criticize a BIA employee.

One of the most dramatic examples of Genoa Indian School students' resistant literacy practices is a petition that two Genoa Indian School students wrote seeking to oust a longtime superintendent, whom they alleged used student labor to profit his own farm:

We the undersigned do swear that the superintendent Mr. Davis has taken us from school hours and put us on his farm and work. When we should have been in school. Some of the boys have staid [sic] on his farm. Nearly three weeks at a time.

We are asking for a new superintendent and a disciplinarian. We would like to have an Indian disciplinarian. The assistant disciplinarian would please us as he is an Indian and a good man. The whole student body is with me now asking for this change. Which will be betterment for the whole school.63

While this petition, with its brief and incomplete sentences, would hardly have been judged successful by the school's academic standards, it was rhetorically persuasive and helped to produce material consequences for its writers. This petition, along with several affidavits filed by other Genoa Indian School students concerning heavy-handed corporal punishment, led to an investigation of this particular superintendent's financial records and ultimately resulted in his early retirement.64 This petition also illustrates how students asserted their rights to be disciplined by a fellow Native American. By requesting that the assistant disciplinarian, a fellow Indian, replace the white disciplinarian they sought to oust, the students assert their rights to participate in school staffing decisions. Appealing to the "betterment for the whole school," the student writers of this petition claimed ownership of their education by resisting Genoa Indian School practices through written literacy, even though they were being denied basic literacy instruction by the school's superintendent.

THE LEGACY OF GENOA INDIAN SCHOOL LITERACY PRACTICES

In 1934 the Genoa Indian School was closed due to a changing federal policy that aimed to educate Indian children more economically and efficiently in public and reservation schools. The 1928 publication of the Meriam Report, which scathingly critiqued the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the educational system it governed, coupled with the appointment of progressive John Collier as the new Indian commissioner and the economic impact of the Depression, all coalesced in a movement to shut down off-reservation boarding schools, signaling an end to fifty years of instruction at the Genoa Indian School. Today, one building, along with a few artifacts and the memories of the surviving students, are all that remains of the Genoa Indian School.

Studying the literacy artifacts from the Genoa Indian School offers Great Plains scholars opportunities to more richly understand students' educational experiences at off-reservation boarding schools and to further appreciate the sophisticated rhetorical strategies they developed in accommodating to and resisting school discourses. Of course, recovering literacy practices from a site such as the Genoa Indian School is inherently problematic because most everyday school texts—especially teachers' plans and student writing—are generally not preserved in the archives. Another limitation is the lack of available knowledge about the Genoa Indian School teachers' motivations. Although narrative reports written to BIA administrators describe Genoa Indian School teachers as following the larger federal curriculum, student
interviews suggest that some teachers resisted federal policies. One student recalled that in the early 1920s an English teacher argued for and won the students' right to speak their own languages on the playground. But while the literacy artifacts remaining from the Genoa Indian School do not provide us a complete picture of how students responded to literacy instruction on the Great Plains, they do provide us with glimpses of how texts were used and produced by Genoa Indian School students. It is clear that Genoa Indian School students mastered a variety of rhetorical forms in their writing: persuasive essays, short stories, narratives, news articles, business letters, petitions, and so on. And students used their school literacies to question and resist school policies. To be sure, some of this resistance was partial and ineffective—students' letters to the commissioner usually did not result in changing the superintendent's original decisions. Still, these Genoa Indian School literacy artifacts depict a complex and contested contact zone of literacy, one in which students found spaces to assert their voices and to claim ownership in their education.

For some former Genoa Indian School students, literacy as a contact zone remains a central theme in reflecting upon their school experiences. At a Genoa Indian School reunion forty years after the school closed, alumnus Noah White stated, "As soon as you learned English, you were forbidden to speak Indian. They wanted to wipe out your identity. They tried to make us carbon copies of them, but it hasn’t worked yet. After three, four hundred years it hasn’t worked yet. It just about worked with me, but after I got back to the reservation I reverted back to the ways of my people." In recalling his first glimpse of the Genoa Indian School, former student Stanford Whitewater said, "I think if I could have gotten away with it, I would have jumped out of the car and headed for home. . . . But I survived it until the last day of the school." Ironically, Whitewater not only survived his twelve years at the Genoa Indian School school, he outlived it. Today he works with a language project on the Winnebago reservation in Nebraska, videotaping Winnebago elders, including himself, who speak the language so that it can be preserved and taught to younger generations.

Other former students continue to use rhetorical strategies as an avenue for understanding their school experiences and for contesting others' interpretations. For instance, Genoa alumnus Sidney Byrd has used writing to complement and, in some cases, complicate the ways that current Genoa residents have interpreted the meaning of the Genoa Indian School in its historical commemorations. In 1991 the town newspaper, the Genoa Leader Times, printed a letter exchange between Byrd and his white boyhood friend, Leonard Lowe, reminiscing about their experiences with the Genoa Indian School. While these letters represent primarily a friendly exchange of long-ago memories and stories about the two writers' childhood experiences, they also can be read as a contact zone of how the history of the Genoa Indian School is being written. While Lowe's letters emphasize a somewhat romanticized version of how the Genoa Indian School operated (as told to him by his father who worked at the school), Byrd's letters often tell "the rest of the story" from an Indian perspective. Lowe's conclusion of his initial letter, for example, contextualizes the "Indian tales" in terms of his personal memories, his general affection for Genoa, and a sense of longing for the past:

Well, that is about the extent of "Indian tales" and as the years slip silently by and trails in the woods by the Beaver grow dim, I like to sit back and reminisce about the past, when the Beaver and Loup and ponds were clear and teeming with fish, the sloughs and back waters that held the big frogs that yielded the meals of succulent legs, I am thankful to have been able to spend my youth in Genoa, my home town.

Looking ahead, which I hope is the far distant future, and it is time for me to join my ancestors, it would be nice to stop in
the "Happy Hunting Grounds," where a place around "little fire" would be waiting for "white boy" to parch some corn with his Red Brothers once again.\textsuperscript{68}

In response, Byrd's letter, while imitating Lowe's style and his longing for the past, also locates his story within his participation in a larger Native American community and within the history of the federal Indian boarding-school movement:

The days of the old Indian schools, as I knew them, are gone forever, and perhaps, it's just as well. However, our people continue to struggle for quality education, despite the proliferation of community colleges on or near our reservations in recent years.

We see no immediate relief nor improvement in our economic opportunities. We continue to fight to be ourselves, to live as other human beings, and for the right to enjoy the freedom of our great land with dignity and respect.

One day, when we join that great rabbit hunt in the sky, we just might see a skinny, little Lakota boy, with a grinning face, armed with a bean shooter, standing with a circle of friends, and greeting us with an old Lakota expression of gratitude, "Haho! Haho!"\textsuperscript{69}

While Byrd's challenges to Lowe's stories are subtle, they serve to open up new understandings of how the history of instruction at the Genoa Indian School can be read. Byrd's letter provides him with an opportunity to respond to, reframe, and sometimes resist Lowe's interpretations of his experiences while at the same time participating in the commemoration of the school's history. For the many other Genoa Indian School students whose voices have gone unrecorded, recovering literacy artifacts casts an important light into the shadows of educational practices at off-reservation boarding schools on the Great Plains.
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