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ABSTRACT

This study investigates the legacy of trauma in Native American arts education and examines the author’s positionality through his mixed race, Chinese and Alaska Native grandfather’s immigration trial records. There are two archives examined within the study a) The Institute of American Indian Arts (IAIA), historical records on the founding of the institution b) The National Archives at San Francisco immigration file of the author’s grandfather, Hong On. The first section poses genealogy as a method for uncovering Indigenous counter-narratives and challenges to hegemonic settler colonial understands of history. A review of literature on Indigenous art education and the history of the field of Art & Visual Culture Education reveals major gaps in the study of historical experiences of Native American art students. Critical Archival Methodology was employed to analyze the settler colonial violence within the two archives and to use speculation as a method for imagining the personhood of Indigenous subjects. For the first archive, the study analyzed archival materials at IAIA, focusing on the correspondence between Lloyd Kiva New and the Rockefeller Foundation. The findings for the first archive critique the ideological imperatives for Native art students to modernize and speculate on the life stories of Native student based on the teaching observations of Lloyd Kiva New from the Southwestern Indian Art Project in the early 1960s. The materials from the second archive document the author’s grandfather’s 1912 immigration trial while he was detained for suspicion of violating the Chinese Exclusion Act. The finding for the second archive center on the anti-Indigenous violence within the trial records and the attempts of the immigration officials to erase the identity of the author’s great-grandmother Hong Mon See Shee.

Keywords: Native American art education, Indigenous, Chinese immigration, archives, history
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement and Central Argument

Within the historiography of Art & Visual Culture Education and its narratives of its emergence as a field of study, the lives, experiences, and perspectives of Native American people are glaringly absent. Throughout my research and time studying Indigenous art education history, I have focused not only on the absence of Native American experiences from the field, but the settler colonial systems of knowledge within Art & Visual Culture Education that participate in the genocidal erasure and forced assimilation of Native American subjects. Further, I was interested in critically assessing the axiom within the history of AVCE that the objective of teaching art to students is always to encourage the spiritual, personal, or economic growth of students. The history of the trauma of Native American boarding school education reveals that the pedagogical tools of art education can and were used for violence and forced assimilation. My thesis takes this as its central problem and further contributes to the field of art education by addressing how settler colonial violence undergirds the extant historical knowledge about the field and offers possible interventions that center the experiences of Native people.

The central argument of my thesis is that a critical genealogical reworking of the history of art education must involve contesting the genocidal, anti-Indigenous terms by which historical and archival methods have existed in the field. To center the lives of Indigenous people in the history of art education, my thesis traces the genealogical strands of art education practice from the boarding school period of the late 19th and early 20th century to the modernist reforms of the midcentury, including the visions of Lloyd Kiva New, a Cherokee fashion designer, boarding school educator, and first president of the Institute of American Indian Arts. While illuminating the gestures of reforming genocidal boarding school education system, I also critique the
demands of modernization and innovation placed on the Indian artists to prove their worth in midcentury American society and highlight the discrepancy between educational discourses on who and what Native students were supposed to be or represent and the desires and dreams of the actual Native students themselves.

The first strand of the thesis project re-orient the historiography of art education towards an Indigenous centered approach to the history of the field, but also provides a critical analysis of educational structures that demand of Native art students to become modern and meet the demands of the settler society. Further, this analysis illuminates how in the present art education should be wary of the civilizing, modernizing, or pathologizing discourses within Native American art education today. Utilizing critical fabulation (Hartman, 2008) or a speculative approach to archival research, I imagine how Native American art students used art in ways that exceeded the social demands placed upon them.

The second strand of the thesis involves a personal examination of my positionality as a researcher and my relationship to archives and their violence. To personalize the act of research and approaching the archive, I hope to dispel the idea that research is subject-less, in fact it is embodied, personal, and often messy, and contest ostensible neutrality of archives and how knowledges comes to be stored and remembered. In this section, I turn to my grandfather’s immigration trial and examine the legal record of how he was detained for suspicion of being a non-citizen Chinese person in violation of the Chinese exclusion act and interrogated about his mixed-race Chinese/Alaska Native heritage. The purpose of this section is to situate myself as a researcher and unpack how the settler colonial violence within the archive continues to affect me and my family. I articulate how these experiences influence my research and how working with and against the archive through critical fabulation can subvert settler colonial violence of
archives and academic research. Through turning to a personal archive, which is also an archive of state violence, I interrogate the limits of archival research, consider how the official archive records marginalized Indigenous subjects through their erasure and subjection, and assert that by betraying the epistemological structures of the archive, critical fabulation imagines what the archive renders impossible, which is to say that it imagines the personhood of Indigenous subjects. This intervention into archival studies applies both to my personal history, but also to the Native histories found in my research of IAIA’s archive. Examining systems of enclosure and discipline, including art educational institutions, my work illuminates what experiences are lost in the official discourses that demand of Native students to become figures of uplift and modernization and in doing records little of their personal desires and interior lives.

**Structure and Overview of Chapters**

My thesis structure begins with a discussion of the art education studies of Indigenous arts education. Chapter 2: Genealogy of Trauma in Native American Arts Education critically examines the existing literature in art education on the history of Native American art education and offers a genealogical analysis of how Indigenous experiences continue to be absent from knowledge production within the field. Part of the work of this chapter is to define Foucauldian genealogy and the way I am using it to expose the misplaced origins and be critical about the narratives by which the field of art education makes sense of its historical emergence. By critiquing the historiography of art education histories, I create opportunities for new methods to tell history and introduce literature from outside the field from Indigenous history. This overview of the literature within and outside the field also supports my argument that my thesis is making a critical intervention in the scholarship on the history of Native American art education.
Crucial to Chapter 2 is a discussion of the absence of boarding school trauma within the historical narratives of art education and providing examples in literature from other fields to make the argument that the genocidal and forced assimilation practices of the boarding school are topics that must be discussed by art education. Another part of this section is a survey of Indigenous scholarship and decolonial pedagogy within the field of art education. My study will build on this research and make the case for the importance of historical and archival research on Native American art education, since histories are never just about the past, they are about how fields and disciplines organize themselves in the present and continue to reproduce structures of power through narratives of historical genesis. My overview of the literature shows how my project is an intervention into the field of Art & Visual Culture Education since it offers novel approaches to the history of art education centered on Native epistemologies and experiences and investigates Native Art education institutions in the 20th century that have not been studied in the existing literature. My genealogical study of the history of art education literature and methods reveals how the continuing absence of Native histories and perspectives will result in the reproduction of violent settler colonial perspectives.

Hartman in her work has interrogated how studying the archive of slavery has the potential to re-produce violence, since the historical record (the ledgers, court documents, records of subjection) only refer to Black people as non-human objects. Her critical examination of the archive asked the reader to call into question the terms by which official knowledge is created and illuminate the power structures that have determined whose voices are granted the status of subjecthood in the historical archive. Further, throughout her scholarship, Hartman has devised an archival method she called critical fabulation by which she imagined from the fragments within the archive who Black women and girls might have been, speculating about the desires, feelings, and wills of these subjects, even as the archive attempts to eradicate their personhood.

Hartman’s archival methods (Hartman, 2008, 2019) of speculation and fictive imagining have allowed me as a scholar and on a personal level to reconstruct from my grandfather’s immigration trial the personhood of my great-grandmother who was remembered in the archive as a dead Indian woman (Hong On’s Immigration Trial Transcript, 1912) whose existence the state cannot confirm, even when they are presented with her grave. Vizenor’s (1999) concept of survivance asserted the idea of Native presence, which counteracted the narratives of tragedy and genocide, moving beyond mere survival. Vizenor’s work resonated with Hartman in the sense that it gestured to an otherwise way of thinking that acknowledges genocide, but also offered ways in which Native people have lived on and created strategies of resistance outside of the terms of created by settler colonialism. Chapter 2 articulates the theoretical underpinnings of the project and lays the foundation for my critical approach to the archive that advocates for a personal, subjective orientation to studying historical materials that centers marginalized experiences that are made invisible by the official record. Speculation and fiction gesture to who
my grandfather, my great-grandmother, and the Native students at IAIA might have been and imagines a space where the interior lives of Indigenous people are centered.

Chapter 4 focuses on the archival research I did at the Institute of American Indian Arts and can be divided into two parts: a) my findings on the political ideologies and discourses that motivated the creation of IAIA and b) the absence of student experiences in the archive. I examine the correspondence that documents the institution’s inception in the late 1950s and the discourses surrounding its educational purpose and pedagogy. The IAIA archive included documents that describe the conversations, conferences, and pedagogical experiments that led to the creation of the institution. A central theme of this section of archival research is the reformatory or reparative gestures by which Native and non-Native educators, investors, and government officials sought to rectify the damage created by the boarding school system and produce new art education institutions and policies in the middle of the 20th century. I provide context on the termination policies of the era and the turn toward federal policies to dissolve reservations and move Native people to urban areas in the name of assimilation.

Much of the archival research I did focused on Lloyd Kiva New a Cherokee art educator, fashion designer who worked at the Phoenix Indian School, a federal boarding school, became successful as a fashion designer in Scottsdale, and eventually sought to open IAIA to become a center for Native students to find themselves in the modern world and create innovative, modern art. The archival materials show the genesis of IAIA from a conference held at the University of Arizona called Directions in Indian Art Conference in 1959 and an experimental art education program called the Southwestern Indian Arts Project. The documents include New’s correspondence with the Rockefeller Foundation, BIA officials, and the director of MOMA discussing and sometimes debating over what the best art education practices for Native
Students. Central to these debates is the question of traditionalism and the demand for Native art to become modern, exploring new forms and directions. A critical question for these historical discourses is how the demand for modernization differs from assimilation. Further, in the era where urban Native culture was created and evolved in the context of termination policies, how can we distinguish between the ideas of who Native people were supposed to be and who they were (what were their desires and feelings)? New fought for the creation of an institute where Native students could honor their traditions, but also experiment with new forms and be in conversation with the modern art world. I pay close attention to New’s characterization of the Native student as lost and disconnected and critically analyze the ideological demands placed on the Native subjects he imagined. In the end, I make the argument that in continuing a genealogical analysis of Native American art education that studying the pedagogical visions of mid-century art educators allows art education researchers to understand the complex interplay between social discourse and the creation of art education institutions.

At the end of Chapter 4, I attempt to reconstruct the experiences of Native American students, after discussing the ideological visions and discourse surrounding Native American art education in mid-century America. Evidence of students’ inner lives come mostly from the art and poetry that Lloyd Kiva New saved and the notes he took on potential art students and teaching notes on his time as an instructor at the Southwestern Indian Arts Project. I attend to the disciplinary nature of his commentary about students not performing to his standards and allegedly having no drive or vision. During his time as president of IAIA, New describes the psychological issues that Indian students face at the institutions in statements to the BIA and to a special senate subcommittee on Indian Education. In these descriptions, he attributes Indian students’ apparent psychological issues to experiencing loss of identity and purpose, which he
hints at the consequences of termination policies and the push for cultural assimilation. This section asks the question, what is it possible to glean from creative artifacts? Turning to the poetry and artworks from the 1960s and 70s, I analyze the performance of the self in these pieces and how students were encouraged to connect tribal identity to personal life experiences.

I combine my analysis of Lloyd Kiva New’s teaching observations and some written work that exists from other students. In doing so, I hope to achieve two aims. First, I show the disconnect between the discourses on modernizing students and the actual evidence of their creative practice. Second, I ask if these students were conforming to the visions of all those creating and funding IAIA and its precursors. This chapter ends with a discussion of gaps and what it is not possible to know before transitioning to my final thoughts on the limits of archival work.

Chapter 5 focuses on my grandfather’s immigration trial archive and examines my personal history in relation to my thesis. The purpose of this chapter is to assert that I cannot separate my positionality from the archive. In other words, I am woven into the tapestry of history. Archives existence is contingent upon the often-invisible power relationships that make the preservation of material knowledge possible. My grandfather, Hong On, was a mixed-race, Chinese and Alaska Native person who was born in San Francisco at the turn of the century. After both his parents died, he moved to Hong Kong to live with family and when he returned to San Francisco in 1912 he was detained by immigration officials at Angel Island for being a suspected non-citizen in violation of the Chinese Exclusion Act. My sister and I recovered this transcript of his immigration trial from the National Archives, San Francisco. My grandfather’s immigration archive revealed how the settler colonial states dehumanized immigrants and remembered them as threats to be eliminated. The immigration officials interrogated my
grandfather and obsessively inquired about the identity of his mother, Mon See Shee, an Alaska Native woman. Ultimately, the officials determined that her identity was unverifiable, since no official record exists of her, despite Chinese testimony about the location of her grave. This chapter explores the relationship between personal trauma and the erasure of my great-grandmother within the archive. In doing so, I express my intimate connection to the project of critically examining how archives reproduce anti-Indigenous violence.

The end of the thesis synthesizes my questions about the archive from my research on IAIA and my autoethnographic study of my grandfather’s immigration trial. In Chapter 6 Conclusion, I theorize what official archives illuminate and what they seem to obscure. Certain archival records from the legal system, like my grandfather’s immigration trial, and the evidence of the genocidal boarding school system seem to manifest how settler colonial institutions remember Native subjects only through their management, discipline, and erasure. The extent of the violence makes this fact about the archive clear. However, I am also interested in what less obviously violent archives reveal. What do we know about the students at the Southwestern Indian Arts Project and the early days of IAIA? How do art educational institutions and their pedagogical discourses demand of students to become modern, or innovative, or to repair the damage of history, without considering the inner lives of the students themselves? This too is also a subtle erasure. In addition to posing these critical questions, my conclusion places the findings in conversation with one another, articulates how my study responds and adds to existing AVCE scholarship, and offers recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER 2: THEORIZING GENEALOGIES OF TRAUMA

My thesis situates itself within the longer history of Native American education and it is imperative to understand the legacy of boarding school trauma and its institutionalizing of cultural assimilation and genocide. However, my desire was to not just reveal how cultural and actual genocide impact Native American art education, I also have attempted to locate instances of what Gerald Vizenor (1999) has termed survivance, a combination of resistance and survival, which he argued resists narratives of “dominance, tragedy, and victimry” (p. vii), highlighting the agentic possibilities within Native American art education practice. In contradistinction to the genocidal logics of erasure, Vizenor (2008) asserted that “the character of survivance creates a sense of native presence over absence” (p. 1). While the archive of Native American arts education may contain evidence of cultural genocide and assimilation (Lentis, 2017), it might also contain traces of survivance, gestures toward Indigenous futures, and modes of resilience.

I am not suggesting that I wanted to diminish at all the traumatic resonances of the boarding school experience in Native American memory. Instead, I wanted to create a methodology that might serve to locate forms of Native presence and agency, akin to Saidiya Hartman’s (2019) formulation of waywardness, which referred to the everyday rebelliousness and experimentation she finds in the archives of Black women living at the turn of the 20th century cities and in the afterlives of slavery. When defining the possibilities generated by her wayward method, Hartman (2019) asserted:

Every historian of the multitude, the dispossessed, the subaltern, and the enslaved is forced to grapple with the power and authority of the archive and the limits it sets on what can be known, whose perspective matters, and who is endowed with the gravity and authority of historical actor. (p. xiii)
In this quotation, Hartman implied that to locate the archive of waywardness and rebellion, one must transform the systems that determine what constitutes historical evidence and knowledge. In other words, archives are not neutral. Instead, archives and archival practices within academic research are suffused with the ideologies of white supremacy and settler colonialism.

By attending to and disrupting how archival research operates within art and visual culture education (AVCE), I hoped to uncover new possibilities for understanding how Native American boarding school history have continued to reveal genealogies of both trauma and resistance. My genealogical overview of the literature on the history of Native arts education provided context for my archival research at the Institute of American Indian Arts, an institution borne out of the boarding school system, but transformed in the 20th century into a flourishing center for Indigenous cultural and artistic expression. To approach the genealogy of trauma within the history of Native American art education, I divided this chapter into the following sections: (a) genealogies, in which I discuss my theoretical justifications for a novel methodological approach to AVCE historical research on Native American arts education, and (b) my assessment of how the current literature in AVCE approaches the topic of historical trauma, specifically centered on Indigenous and Native American arts education.

**Genealogical Musings**

For this first section of Chapter 2, I ruminate on the theoretical possibilities of genealogical inquiry and attempt to provide justifications for why this mode of historiographic research differs from the traditional historical methodologies employed by AVCE as a field. Genealogy originates from Michel Foucault (1978a) who created the method by engaging with Nietzsche’s *On the Genealogy of Morals*. Rather than signifying the lineage or origins of
something as the term’s literal definition in English implies, genealogy, as Huffer (2013) formulated it, “eschews the search for origins and reconfigures the past as disparate, discontinuous, and radically contingent” (p. 8). For example, in Foucault’s (1977) *Discipline and Punish* he employed a genealogical method to uncover the discontinuity between the dominant narrative of the birth of the Western modern prison system, which Western society deems more humane alternative to public torture, punishment, and execution and the evidence that Foucault sees that prison system amplified and re-organized how power operated in society, turning prisoners into criminal subjects to be disciplined, regulated, and surveilled.

A key component in genealogical inquiry is the unearthing of subjugated knowledges from the archive that challenge the dominant narratives of history. In *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault (1972) described how the archives have the potential to expose radical discontinuities and workings of power in history when he stated:

> But it [the archive] deprives us of our continuities; it dissipates that temporal identity in which we are pleased to look at ourselves when we wish to exorcise discontinuities of history; it breaks the thread of transcendental teleologies; and where anthropological thought once questioned man’s being or subjectivity, it now bursts open the other, and the outside. (p. 131, emphasis mine)

In other words, the archive as Foucault described, it challenges the progress narratives (teleology) by exposing marginalized narratives and the histories that do not confirm the dominant histories of the powerful in Western society.

---

1 Although, archaeology and genealogy represent discrete periods/methods for Foucault, they are according to Huffer (2013) both focused on exposing the workings of power & knowledge in archives/discourse (p.8)

2 Teleology in Philosophy, from the Greek word telos meaning end, refers to ends and finalities, which are the goals of Western progress narratives
Since it attempts to uncover subjugated knowledge from the archive, genealogy can serve as an important method for examining Indigenous resistance against the dominant settler colonial narratives. Dunbar-Ortiz (2014) in *An Indigenous People’s History of the United States* exposed how settler colonial historical narratives such as the Doctrine of Discovery, or the idea that Europeans had the right to acquire lands they “discovered,” continue to perpetuate damaging ideas that erase Indigenous people’s experiences and claims to land. Therefore, it is crucial that Native scholarship counteract and critique these damaging settler colonial historical frameworks. In his writing on Native people within the visual archive of modernity, Deloria (2004) discussed how Native people appear as anomalies, since the hegemonic expectation is that Indigenous people live in the past and are not modern. He used as an example to counteract this expectation a photograph of a Native woman in the 1940s wearing a “beaded buckskin dress” getting her hair done at a beauty salon (Deloria, 2004, p. 3). Smith (2009) further illustrated this point by discussing how the photographer Edward S. Curtis in the early 20th century produced a generalized, romanticized image of Native people, as primitive and living in the past, and disregarded the between different Native cultures and identities. According to Leavitt et al. (2015), Native people were seldom represented in the media and when they were present, they appeared as “a homogenous group ‘frozen in time,’” which rendered “hundreds of diverse tribal culture[s]” into a single stereotype (p.43). Indigenous genealogical research, therefore, has the potential to challenge the narrow, genocidal settler colonial histories of Native people and assert counter-narratives, providing alternative historiographies of Native agency and resistance.

It is imperative that I acknowledge that Foucault’s genealogical research was Eurocentric and conspicuously ignores colonization and the transatlantic slave trade. The absence of any

---

3 Huffer (2013) also has this problem
discussion of race and colonization was glaring especially given Foucault’s commitment to uncovering the workings of power and knowledge within the archives of Western modernity.\(^4\)

When discussing the racial politics of ignorance, Sullivan and Tuana (2007) have contended, “White ignorance also impacts social and individual memory, erasing both the achievements of people of color and the atrocities of white people. A collective amnesia about the past is the result, which supports the testimony and credibility of non-white people” (p. 3). This quote illustrates how ignorance, silence, and forgetting racialized violence are never accidental. This is akin to what Barbara Applebaum (2017) defined as “ignorance” which she used to describe the particular way of knowing that allows white subjects to disavow their complicity in creating racial oppression (pp. 37-38). Ironically, Foucault (1978b) himself discussed in *The History of Sexuality* how silences—what is not said or ignored—are crucial to how discourse operates.

Byrd (2011) argued that Western identity and knowledge were formed in relation to the displacement of Indianness and therefore always have been in relation to Native people. Stretching and deconstructing the epistemology of anthropology, Povinelli (2006) argued that settler societies maintain intimacy with Indigenous people, and that settler colonialism has always involved materiality and flesh. However, Povinelli (2011) also maintained settler epistemologies cannot grasp Indigeneity through discourse and that forms of settler recognition from liberal and neo-liberal states, she used Australia as her example, often have left Indigenous people in states of abandonment and strife. Brayboy’s (2006) research further explained that settler colonialism has been an ongoing project and the state has continued to attempt to create policies of assimilation and suppression. Indigenous centered genealogy that asserts the

---

\(^4\) He does not even discuss race or colonization while still centering European history; he simply ignores them. Even when he uses the term “race” in reference to biopolitics, he uses it to discuss the European state formation/ the regulation of populations. Race for Foucault is never about scientific racism or the discourses of white supremacy.
autonomy of Native people challenges the historical erasure endemic within dominant modes of Foucauldian genealogy.

The last portion of this section on genealogy focuses on the necessity of Indigenous interventions into the historiography of art and visual culture education. When searching for an account of how Native American boarding school trauma fits into the history of AVCE, it is interesting that Lentis’s (2017) monograph *Colonized through Art* is the most substantial. Lentis (2017) received her PhD from the University of Arizona in American Indian Studies. AVCE is an interdisciplinary field that I believe is amenable to research on Indigenous histories and pedagogy; however, it largely ignores genealogical inquiry into the entanglement of settler colonialism in the history of art education. Lentis (2017) did a thorough job of deconstructing the historiography of arts education.

In the beginning of her monograph, Lentis (2017) stated that “the pleasurable creative act” of art making in the Native American boarding school “has now become an oppressive instrument for reshaping the world according to a different set of foreign and unfamiliar standards that do not value the individual’s own imagination, background, and heritage” (p. 13). Throughout the book she detailed in the late 19th and 20th centuries how art education pedagogical practices created to encourage artistic growth for children, such as the ones described by history of art education scholars such as Efland (1990), Brown and Korzenik (1993), and Stankiewicz (2001), were used as weapons of cultural assimilation in the boarding school settings. When art educators review the history of art education in relation to Native boarding school trauma, they must question how historical methods of art teaching, whether to cultivate creativity, help students develop, or gain practical skills, became mechanisms to oppress and traumatize children. This realization calls into question the neutrality of the methods
and theories of Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Rousseau, which ostensibly sought to cultivate the intellect, creativity, and moral development of children. Furthermore, history from a Native-centered point of view illuminates that 19th century art educational ideas were used only to foster the growth of White European children and for Native students was a tool of conquest and settler colonialism.

Lentis (2017), in her careful study and history of the art education practices on Native American boarding schools, explained how art making became a form of discipline in addition to the regimes of bodily regulation Mitchell (2005) has detailed, such as hygiene, the forcible cutting of hair, which Ballengee-Morris and Staikidis (2017) argued was extremely violent given the spiritual significance of hair for Native people. She quoted the curriculum instructions for Native students from the 1892 and then stated that “Indian schools served to absorb generations of Indian children into mainstream society by teaching them how to become good and loyal citizens, industrious and effective workers” (Lentis, 2017, p. 36). Furthermore, at the start of Native boarding school education students worked using “blocks, clay, paper, and even color” (Lentis, 2017, p. 38) modeling the teachings of Frederick Froebel who, as Efland (1990) has stated, “called his school a ‘a garden of children’ (kindergarten) and devised a curriculum based on the principle of play” (p.122). While certainly using Froebelian “gifts” in their instruction, Lentis provided a photograph of Native students using the gifts, Native boarding school art educators did not have students engaging in artistic play to allow them to express themselves or utilizing the gifts “to find unity in diversity and patterns of things and to understand the mathematical principles that express the harmony of the universe” (Efland, 1990, 122). Lentis (2017) argued further that “training the ‘poor Indian’ in the use of forms, colors, and shapes was an innocent yet subtle way to put into practice the Indian Service’s master plan of assimilation”
This proved that the art education practices of Froebel, designed to “[enable] children to bring their inner thoughts into the outside world” (Brown & Korzenik 1993) were, for Native boarding school students, used instead to destroy their inner Native self and force assimilate them into American culture and thinking. Froebelian art education became a mechanism of institutional discipline for boarding school students.

Studying the genealogy of Native American arts education does not simply mean that AVCE should take on the history of the Indigenous arts education as a subject of study. Genealogical inquiry allows the archive to challenge fundamentally how we understand knowledge production in relation to power. Instead of merely including Native American histories, AVCE should interrogate the narratives it tells about its own history, exposing the tacit Eurocentric, settler colonial strands of discourse within it. If we allow the archive of AVCE to “[burst] open the other, and the outside” (Foucault, 1972, p. 131), then we as art educators and researchers must be willing to undergo transformation.

This might mean that we cannot speak of a neutral child who is a tabula rasa waiting to learn art making or is the recipient of art teaching practice, and that the conceptualization of such a child is imbued with unmarked whiteness and European, settler colonial philosophies of the human. Kraehe & Acuff (2013) asserted that unmarked whiteness frequently has operated within art educational spaces and that Critical Race Theory and in this case Brayboy’s (2005) TribalCrit (Tribal Critical Race Theory) (p. 427) have been necessary interventions into discussing how racial power dynamics operate within the field. Moreover, it necessary to dismantle the idea that educational institutions themselves are also neutrally beneficial to all students and to uncover how settler colonialism and cultural assimilation operate within the spaces of art education. This does not foreclose the possibility of resistance and survivance of Native people within the
archive of art education within boarding. Instead, this genealogical inquiry opens up AVCE to encountering alternative modes of being, beyond what the current historical literature provides.

During my site visit to the archives of the Institute of American Indian Arts, I used genealogical inquiry to help me construct alternative modes of doing history and while interacting with the archive. I pushed the boundaries of art education history by moving beyond the civilizing, assimilationist pedagogy described by Eldridge’s (2001) account of Dorothy Dunn painting classes at the Santa Fe Indian School. I was inspired by Hartman’s (2019) speculative archival work on wayward Black women’s lives and I similarly want to find traces of resistance and experimentation; however, I am also cognizant of when I am projecting my own desires onto archive.

**Indigenous Scholarship in Art and Visual Culture Education**

For the final section, I survey the current scholarship Indigenous scholarship in AVCE and articulate how my genealogical, archival research will be in conversation with the literature. In their recent edited collection *Transforming Our Practices: Indigenous Art, Pedagogies, and Philosophies*, Ballengee-Morris & Staikidis (2017) asserted that the experience of Indigenous people in education and Indigenous forms of knowledge have been largely ignored by AVCE. A central theme in this collection is the creation of Indigenous counter-narratives within AVCE knowledge production and pedagogy. Academic research itself has a contentious and violent history with regard to Indigenous people. Eldridge (2017) pointed out that historically Anthropologists and other academics used research to create narratives about Indigenous primitivism and inferiority. Therefore, she argued that to reclaim research in AVCE Indigenous
people should incorporate their voice, their narratives, and their ways of knowing on their own terms.

Several Native AVCE scholars have written about how to approach trauma in Indigenous-centered scholarship. By highlighting the importance of reclaiming stories and narratives, Muñoz (2017) wrote, “rather than remaining entrenched in stories of trauma, it becomes necessary to consider how a process such as restor(y)ing may reframe out teaching practice” (p.13) and continued to assert that it is crucial that Native people have the space to take ownership over their historical narratives. In an interview with renowned Native artist and art educator Ruthe Blalock Jones (Shawnee, Peoria, Delaware), Eldridge (2017) and Blalock Jones discussed the legacy of the boarding school period: “For a long time, an Indian person probably had no symbol whatsoever except his own appearance as an Indian. This was an outgrowth of the boarding school period when a tradition appearance was outlawed” (p. 32). Drawing from the work of Gerald Vizenor, Eldridge (2017) discussed the importance of survivance as “more than instinctive survival; it is an active rejection of domination” (p. 33). In the wake of cultural assimilation and genocide of the boarding school era, Native people have worked to reclaim their artistic traditions and forms of knowledge. In a separate interview with artist, art educator, and activist Charlene Teters (Spokane Nation) Ballengee-Morris & Staikidis (2017) discussed the long-lasting implications of boarding school trauma on Indigenous art education pedagogy. Teters (2000) discussed how her mother was raised in her culture and spoke the Spokane language until “she went to school where everything Indian was being attacked in the missionary schools, the government boarding schools. It was about save the children by destroying everything Indian in them, by teaching them that their parents’ way was backwards” (Teters as quoted in Whitehead, 2000, pp 197-199; Teters as quoted in Ballengee-Morris & Staikidis, 2017,
p. 60). In response to this legacy of cultural genocide, Teters (2000) reflected on the effects of dominant settler colonial narratives and says:

The oppressor uses your history to deflate you, and he can do that in the way he tells the story. Our story has been told by the conqueror for so many years. But when you use your history, you can use it in a way that inspires you. (Teters as quoted in Whitehead, 2000, pp 229; Teters as quoted in Ballengee-Morris & Staikidis, 2017, p. 60)

In other words, Native people can reclaim their stories and take ownership of the historical narratives that for so long were only told by the dominant settler culture.

Courtney Elkin Mohler (2017) (Santa Barbara Chumash) discussed the historical pedagogy she employed when she taught courses on Native American performance and culture at a predominately White institution. Mohler (2017) wrote:

Perhaps the most challenging aspect is helping students understand that just because history has been written, does not mean it is ‘fact.’ We begin the course by discussing the making of history, the differences between historiography, and how these differences relate to the colonization process” (p. 93)

This highlights the importance of challenging dominant settler colonial narratives of Native people, which depict Native people as primitive, backwards, or as invisible. Relating back to the idea of the Doctrine of Discovery, Mohler (2017) unpacked how the writing of history impacts how we understand colonization and the theft of Indigenous lands. The way Mohler (2017) described teaching Indigenous historiography resonates with genealogy’s attention to the way power and knowledge impact the telling of historical narratives. Deconstructing the way Western histories privilege writing, Mohler (2017) asserted, “We explore the concept of oral history and discuss how written history is widely privileged, despite those peoples whose stories it silences
and attempt to represent” (p. 93). Breaking down the dominant narratives of history is an important tool for doing Indigenous genealogical research. Moher (2017) echoed Hartman’s (2019) discussion of how power informs what is considered to be archival knowledge and who is represented in the archive. Furthermore, the Indigenous scholarship in AVCE emphasized how incorporating oral histories and Native voices could be a powerful method of creating new Indigenous counter-narratives.

**Summary**

In this chapter, I have explored the theoretical possibilities of doing Indigenous genealogical research in AVCE and situated my thesis project’s archival research within the existing literature on Indigenous art education within the field. I utilized genealogy as a method for critically dismantling the settler colonial modes of viewing history within the field, provided connections to existing Indigenous scholarship of Native art education and critical pedagogy, and illuminated how my thesis makes an intervention in the field.

This exploration showed that one cannot tell the history of art education without attending to the archive of settler colonial art education within the institutions of cultural genocide. Further, the absence of Indigenous history in the field points to (a) the need to reformulate how historical research is conducted and written and (b) a need for critical interrogation into the settler colonial ideologies that undergird art education pedagogy. Put another way, I contend that Native survivance, or the active refusal of Native disappearance and cultural genocide, must be centered within art education scholarship and the histories written and told about the field.
CHAPTER 3: CRITICAL ARCHIVAL METHODOLOGY AND THE RECLAIMING OF INDIGENOUS ART EDUCATION HISTORIES.

The purpose of this chapter is to overview the specific methods I used when conducting my archival research and discuss the methodological concerns that arose during my study. Additionally, from the methodological questions generated by my study, I tie my thinking to specific theorists whose work helps me unpack the ethical implications of my work. My thesis focuses on the question, why has AVCE ignored the perspectives of Indigenous people in its historical narratives about the field. Furthermore, during research, I interrogated the settler colonial power dynamics embedded in historical knowledge production and seek to counteract them by employing a Critical Archival Methodology. The methodology took two important critical perspectives: a) it illuminated the anti-Indigenous discourse within archives and b) offered alternative narratives of Indigenous presence through speculation. I organized this chapter in five sections: a) Research Settings, b) Description of Research Process and Organization of Materials c) Critical Archival Methods, d) Speculative Reconstruction at the Limits of the Archive, e) Attunement to Native Worldviews and Epistemologies, and f) A Critique of Settler Epistemologies and Research Methods. The first section identifies the archive, explains the institutional setting in which the archival objects live, provides an overview of the materials I looked at in the study, and introduces the methodological challenges in each setting. Within the second section, I identify and describe the methodological theories, which provide solutions to problems I faced in the archives. Specifically, I focus on the work of Saidiya Hartman (2008; 2019) and her deployment of critical fabulation, a speculative methodological tool that I define as in the domain of Critical Archival Methodology. The third section applies the methodological interventions from the second section to my archival research. In the last two
sections, I make the case for using methods that connect Black studies and Native studies because of the entanglement of settler colonialism and the afterlives of slavery. Finally, I conclude by re-focusing on decolonial interventions into research methodologies and discusses the possibilities in Indigenous refusal.

**Research Settings**

My archival work contained two separate, but interrelated strands, conducted at two very different sites--one formal, one familial but both presenting similar methodological issues. In strand one, I investigated Native American art education in the wake of the boarding school era. My investigation took the form of a dual-site summer research project at the Institute of American Indian Arts (IAIA) and the archives of the Heard Museum in Phoenix. In strand two, I examined my positionality as a researcher and my relationship to archives and their violence through an examination of a familial archive that consists of my grandfather’s immigration trial and the legal record of how he was detained for suspicion of being in violation of the Chinese exclusion act and interrogated about his mixed-race heritage.

**IAIA**

The Institute of American Indian Arts in Santa Fe, New Mexico is the leading tribal arts college and has become a major center for contemporary Native arts practice. As an institution, it is known for synthesizing Native traditions and innovative, forward-thinking arts practice. Notable alumni of IAIA include: writers such as Joy Harjo, Tommy Orange, Layli Long Soldier, photographer and curator Hulleah Tsinhnahjinnie, and artist and educator Charlene Teters.

The IAIA archives, located in the campus’s library, contain a wide array of institutional records related to the evolution of the school from the time IAIA opened in 1962 until the
present. The archives also contain collections relevant to Native American art broadly and include papers from faculty and artists connected to the institution. The materials I looked at were all located within the manuscript collection entitled Lloyd H. New papers, which include letters, papers, ephemera, artwork donated by co-founder and former president of IAIA. I was most interested in News records of the founding of IAIA, which focus on the Directions in Indian Art conference (1959) and the Southwestern Indian Art Project (1960-1963), two important events that led directly to the creation of the institution. My archival research focused on examining the ideological debates surrounding the purpose of art education for Native students and searched for accounts of the experiences of Native students in their own words.

**Heard Museum**

The Heard museum located in Phoenix, Arizona is one of the preeminent Native American art museums in the country, which in addition to housing a vast permanent collection of historical Native American art, exhibits contemporary Native voices in art. The museum is also known for its ongoing exhibition, *Away from Home*, which is a multi-faceted, multi-media museum experience that traces the history of federal Native American boarding schools and their devastating impact on the lives of Native people. The exhibition, which has evolved since it first opened in 2000, incorporates oral histories from Native people and scholars whose families experienced boarding school trauma. Prominent within the exhibition too are photographs of life in Indian boarding schools and physical objects from the schools. These objects are contained within the Heard museum archives, which contain numerous photographs, manuscripts, and artwork from boarding schools, including the Phoenix Indian School. I examined the photographic collection of the Phoenix Indian School and looked at artworks created by Native boarding school students in New Mexico.
Challenges and Opportunities in Conducting Formal Archival Research

Before visiting both archives, I ruminated over the ethical implications of looking at the documents of cultural genocide and assimilation from the Heard and using them to reconstruct the lives of art students at IAIA, coming out of the boarding school era and seeing a metamorphosis of their education experience. The particular challenge I imagined was that documents infused with the rhetoric of cultural assimilation would appear to me calculating and benign. As a critical scholar, I felt the ethical imperative to read and organize these materials through a perspective that is critical of settler colonialism.

At the Heard, I faced unforeseen challenges because I was only allowed to view the materials and take notes and forbidden from taking photographs. Ultimately, I decided to not include the site in the findings for my research, since the restrictions on reproducing materials severely limited the access I had to substantial and usable materials. I have included my experiences at the Heard, since they inspired my discussion of methodological problems in this chapter. At IAIA, I encountered a wealth of documentation of the school’s inception, its institutional records, and the story of IAIA told from the position of those in power. I had a strong desire to see in the archive the voices of Native students, their thoughts, feelings, and desires about making art, their life stories, and how they interacted with institutions. While I am uncertain if these narratives are completely absent from the materials record, I know there are oral histories and further sources besides the ones I investigated. What I can say is that these narratives are not the focus of the archival records, which are told from the perspective of educational administrators.

---

5 I should note that the archives at IAIA and the Heard are vast and extensive. There are things I did not have time to comb through and for which future research should be done.
While at the IAIA Archives, I became interested in examining the power relationships embedded in art education institutional records, looking for the absences and ghosts. I began to see resonances between the IAIA archives and the archival research I had done on my grandfather’s immigration trial. I began to witness how marginalized people could be recorded, while simultaneously enacting subtle or overt discursive violence against them. Thus, the transcripts of my grandfather’s immigration trial became the second strand of my study. During the trial, he was interrogated about his citizenship status and the existence of my Alaska Native great-grandmother is conjured (she is named) and the negated (she cannot be verified by the state). I began to ask whose voices matter and who is allowed to speak in the archive and on what terms?

**Familial Archive**

For the second strand of archival work for my thesis, I examined my grandfather’s immigration trial records from the Nation Archives at San Francisco. The National Archives are a collection of institutions across the United States that contain a wide array of government documents, records, and manuscripts. As a government institution, the National Archives seek to make publicly accessible historical records of interest for researchers, genealogists, and people seeking information about family histories. The National Archives located in San Bruno, California (a suburb of San Francisco on the Peninsula) contain a multitude of Chinese immigration records dating all the way back to the 19th century, since the San Francisco area was historically a major center for Chinese immigration. For my autoethnographic study of my familial archive, I examined the legal transcripts of my grandfather’s 1912 immigration trial, which also contained copies of his birth certificate and vital records.
Challenges and Opportunities in Conducting Familial Archival Research

The major challenges from studying my grandfather’s immigration trial did not arise from problems with institutional access to materials. In fact, the archivist found my grandfather’s immigration file incredibly quickly and without hesitation provided me and my sister with photocopies of everything contained in the immigration file. The documents themselves caused the challenges, since they originate from immigration enforcement and policing of unlawful immigration in 1912. What the archival materials contained are a meticulous dossier that articulates the immigration officials desire to ascertain whether my grandfather was a U.S. citizen. In other words, the archive is a legal document told from the perspective of U.S. state violence. My grandfather’s voice appeared, but only as he is recorded answering questions during his interrogation, while he was living in an immigration detention center on Angel Island. It is remarkable that immigration enforcement and other government institutions took such detailed records and that the National Archive in its mission for public access lets anyone freely make copies of their materials. However, what the archive made difficult is reconstructing the experiences of my ancestors outside of the violence they were subjected to. This led me to see how power functioned through the ways in which the archive produced knowledge about immigrant and Indigenous subjects.

My methodological questioning inspired me to look at the work of Saidiya Hartman and connect her archival study of violence and subjection of Black people to the work of Critical Indigenous scholars and the theoretical musings of Anishinaabe scholar Gerald Vizenor. These theories informed my methodology by enabling me to explore the question of how to do archive work when the said archive remembers marginalized people only through the optics of their subjection. I also drew inspiration from Hartman and Vizenor as I sought to develop my own
way of approaching the archive by looking for Native presence over absence and challenging the
dominant narratives of trauma, tragedy, and genocide.

Description of Research Process and Organization of Materials

The Site Visit to the IAIA Archives

In this section, I describe the personal experience with the research process. This includes
a discussion of what I looked at in the archive, how I decided to look at those materials and not
others, how I organized and coded the data, and ultimately why did I choose to discuss the
materials I chose for the thesis. My goal is to be transparent with my research process, which
may be useful to readers of the thesis and those who are doing research on the same or similar
topics. This section focuses primarily on my site visit to the IAIA archives and not the other
sites, since it represented the majority of the research labor that I did for this project. I obtained
my grandfather’s immigration in 2012 from the National Archives at San Francisco. The
materials were bounded/ contained to my grandfather’s immigration trial and my personal and
intellectual justifications for this exist in the narrative of Chapter 5. Therefore, this section
examines centrally the story of my trip to IAIA, the site visit research itself, the procedure of my
methodological organization of the materials, and my eventual inclusion of the materials in my
thesis.

I was able to visit the IAIA archives because I was awarded Medici Scholar funds
through the College of Fine Arts at the University of Arizona. The purpose of these small grants
is to fund summer projects, including research and working on art, that graduate students could
not normally afford to do. I was grateful to receive the award, especially since I applied for it to
fund the preliminary site visits to archives that I wanted to do research at for my prospective
thesis project. At this point in my research, my questions were still forming, and my topic was much broader: to look at the legacy of boarding school trauma in art education. As I have already stated, I went to the Heard Museum and, while it was an invaluable experience, I ultimately did not decide to pursue its archives for my thesis project. I planned my trip to Santa Fe, New Mexico where IAIA is located and reached out to the archivist, Ryan Flahive. Fortunately, since it was the summer, the archive was less busy, and he was able to devote time and energy to helping me with the project.

In retrospect when I emailed Ryan Flahive, I expressed interest in looking at more materials than I had time for in the week that I visited and, further, it may have seemed unfocused. For example, I asked him to look at IAIA records, curriculum materials, museum education files, photo negatives, teacher materials, and student art. Of course, it was an initial site visit, and I had yet to condense and refine the scope of the project. Things became more focused when I talked to Flahive in person and was able to have a dialogue about what my main research questions were. He seemed to understand that I was interested in the legacy of the boarding school era and, therefore, might be interested in Lloyd Kiva New’s papers, specifically the material relevant to the founding of the institution. Flahive thought a good place to start would be the correspondence between New and the Rockefeller Foundation in their planning of the conference and art program that would build the foundation for IAIA, which I discuss in depth in chapter 4. He introduced me to Gritton’s (2000) book on the formation of IAIA and planted the seeds for my thinking through the ideologies of modernization from IAIA’s early days. A major takeaway from this experience is that archives are institutions run by human beings and fueled by social relationships. I was able to narrow my focus on certain materials
because of my conversations with Flahive, which allowed me to be efficient with my finite time at the IAIA archives.

Since this was largely my first time working with materials in an exploratory manner, I went through as many materials as possible, photographing with my phone anything that seemed like it could possibly be useful for the thesis. I was prepared to work quickly, efficiently, and safely with materials from my time interning at the Center for Creative Photography’s registration department at The University of Arizona. In other words, I had experience cataloguing and processing photographic materials. One thing that I have learned while reflecting is that while it was important to capture as much data as possible, I think I could benefit from taking time to sit with and move slowly through the materials. Fortunately, however, since I took so many photos and scans, I was able to later on read through the materials slowly and deconstruct the materials at the level of discourse.

I narrowed my focus to the Lloyd Kiva New Papers and the Rockefeller Foundation Papers (contained in New’s papers) because, while at the archive, reading about the ideological debates surrounding the foundation of IAIA piqued my interest. These debates interested me because they centered around the idea that the Indian artist should enter modern American society and because they explicitly addressed the social and economic turmoil experienced by the Native students in 1950s and 60s, the time when IAIA was founded. I typed notes in addition to taking photos of nearly every item I thought could be of interest. I took over 700 photos and scans with my iPhone. While it may seem that I narrowed my focus with looking just at New’s paper, I still had an enormous amount of materials to review. The Lloyd Kiva New Papers consist of 60 boxes and a wide of array materials from his life before IAIA up until his retirement in 1978. I decided to look primarily at his materials from the 50s and 60s and zoom in
on the founding of IAIA. I combed through letters, newspaper clippings, student art and poetry, Bureau of Indian Affairs records, institutional statistics, and photographs. The materials followed Lloyd Kiva New’s life trajectory and story. The material from the 1950s show his life as a fashion designer and his transition into the 60s as the educator and organizer of the Directions in Indian Art Conference and the Southwestern Indian Art Project (both precursors to IAIA). In Chapter 4, I talk more specifically about why I chose to look at Lloyd Kiva New’s life and correspondence from this period and the significance of the conference/art project.

Organizing the Materials after the Site Visit

While my notes from the site visit were helpful, they were not nearly as detailed as I needed them to be to make sense of what materials were important and usable for the thesis. So, I had to go through the over 700 photos and scans, reading and re-deciphering the materials, and taking notes in a Google doc and in a notebook. The Rockefeller Foundation documents were particularly difficult to organize since I had to make sense of the foundation’s abbreviations and documentation styles. This process was at times incredibly frustrating. I realized quickly that archival work requires much more systematic organization from the start that I had used. However, all of my frustration and figuring out how to organize were important learning experiences for me in the archive. After reading and re-reading the materials, I decided to code them based on author and chronology, which gave me a reference point for the specific materials and allowed me to place them in the context of the stages of the development of the Rockefeller sponsored conference and program. Placing the materials in chronological order allowed me to see the progression of Lloyd Kiva New’s thinking and him planting the seeds for the creation of IAIA. Once I had diligently passed through, organized, and coded the materials, I was able to
start thinking about the potential themes I could generate from the data using my chosen methodological tools.

**Methods and Preparation for Analysis**

While re-reading the materials several times, I became hyperaware of the language different speakers used about Native art students. The linguistic landscape of ideological debates is often not explosive and conflict-ridden, especially in official written correspondence. Therefore, I found it necessary to employ discourse analysis to break down the figurative and rhetorical strategies that the Rockefeller Foundation and Lloyd Kiva New used to sketch different pictures of who the Native art students were and should become. I rewrote and retyped quotes from different actors, which served as a heuristic for interpreting the text at a micro level. This type of close reading reminded me of the skills I had learned from taking literature and literary theory courses in undergraduate. This type of close reading also helped me figure out where the gaps in knowledge were. I paid attention to every time an actual Native student appeared in the text. I noted it and kept written/typed notes on every instance in which a reference was made to a real Native person. While doing this, I wrote questions in my notes if there seemed to be missing or incomplete information about the Native person. These questions would form the basis of my speculative reconstruction of Native students. To imagine the lives of Native students I first had to see what appeared and what was missing from the archive.

Having outlined my practical experiences as a researcher working with archival materials and given the reader insight into my process, in the next section, I articulate the theoretical and ethical dimensions of my methodology.
Critical Archival Methods

I was drawn to critical archival methods that look at the inseparable tie between knowledge and power. I have to admit that I am a little bit of a Foucauldian (Foucault, 1977; 1978b) and enthralled with the work of Saidiya Hartman (1997; 2007; 2008; 2016; 2019) which is to say that I was obsessed with thinking about how knowledge production is inseparable from power and that power relationships determine whose statements, voices, and truths are recorded in the archive. Furthermore, I was inspired by Hartman’s ethical concerns with archival work. It enabled me to ask the question, when the record of marginalized people shows only erasure, violence, and dehumanization, how is it possible to analyze the archive without reproducing its epistemic violence? When taking the history course based on the required overview of the intellectual movements and developments in AVCE, I was struck by the invisibility of Indigenous history, identity, and knowledge. Indigenous people were not merely absent and needed to be included in the curriculum for the history of art education; their intimate place within Enlightenment thinking and its influence on modernity was absent (Efland, 1990; Brown & Korzenik, 1993; Stankiewicz, 2001). Any student of Post-Structuralism would tell you silence is not an indication of lack; in fact, entire bodies of discourse form around what they avoid or cannot name (Foucault, 1978b). Foucault (1978b) writes about how in the history of modern sexuality silence about sex and the incitement to speak incessantly and in detail about sins of the flesh existed simultaneously. Such is the case in the history of art education. The absence of Indigenous experience in art education served to construct the field’s Enlightenment genealogy as neutral and the enrichment of the creative minds of children as benevolent. The history of Native American boarding school education as systems of enclosure, capture, assimilation, and violence troubles this neutral lineage of Enlightenment art education historiography. The violated
Indigenous child, deemed to be too unruly and too uncivilized, is the abject figure that makes possible the education of the Western settler child who makes art to fulfill natural impulses and the nourishing of creative souls.

Through writing this chapter, I employed a methodology to deconstruct the settler colonial genealogy of arts education and provide a perspective on archival materials that center the lives, experiences, and knowledge of Native people. These dual aims created a productive tension that I explore throughout the chapter. On the one hand, I deconstructed settler colonial structures of knowledge found in the archive that commit epistemic violence against Native subjects by continually defining them as uncivilized or disappeared. On the other hand, I realized that by analyzing the archive of settler colonialism I risk re-performing its violence and continuing to make invisible the lives of Native people.

To find the voices of Native people in an archive that represents them only in a dehumanizing manner, the researcher must betray the terms upon which the archive lays claim to historical truths. In an interview with filmmaker Arthur Jafa at the Hammer Museum in Los Angeles, Saidiya Hartman (2019) discussed giving authority to the voices and experiences of the enslaved. She said, “I think the difference between fiction and nonfiction has everything to do with power, and who has the power and authority to advance truth claims” (38:45). She also gestures toward her method of *critical fabulation*, which she devises as a speculative tool for imagining who a Black slave girl might have been when the archive only remembers her as an object or a piece of property to be recorded in a ledger.

Drawing from Hartman, I think in order to challenge the violent erasure and objectification of Native people in the archive I employed speculative and creative archival methodologies that imagine what the interior lives of Native people might have been. There was
a strong sense of impossibility in the recovery of voices that do not appear in the archive. However, it is by imagining the impossible that the researcher can begin to center Native lives and to glimpse into an otherwise of Native experience that is at the limits of archival knowledge itself.

**Settler Colonialism and the Afterlives of Slavery**

The structure of my methodological inquiry for this paper is divided in to two major areas: (a) Native studies and its disruption of theoretical genealogies and (b) Black feminist theories of the archive, which call into question the limitation of the official archival record. Between these two methodological axes, I weave in other interrelated critical theoretical approaches that help me to articulate the Critical Archival Methodology I devised, which uses creative, autoethnographic, and speculative archival practice to help me approach the archival research in Native arts education institutions and my own personal archival research from which I have generated creative collages in art education graduate courses.

For me, “decolonization is not a metaphor” (Tuck & Yang 2012) and I wanted to think about scholarship that actively aims to undo dominant settler colonial systems of knowledge and to return sovereignty and land to Indigenous peoples. Working with Saidiya Hartman, I asked critical questions about how archival research often performs anti-black violence and fails to center the lives of black women. Engaging with Alexander Weheliye’s (2014) concept of racializing assemblages, I articulated how anti-blackness and settler colonialism operate within interconnected, inseparable social processes. Therefore, my methods were not adapting Black feminist theories, which risked decentering them from Black women’s lives, but showing the
ways in which Black and Native lives are intimately connected through systems of power and modalities of social resistance.

I want to take a moment to discuss the complexity of engaging with Hartman’s work while centering the history of Native people and the archive of Chinese immigration. One of the ethical imperatives I had was to engage with Hartman without appropriating the work or removing the context of the history of slavery and anti-blackness. What I hoped to do was engage Hartman to show the relationality between the history of slavery and settler colonialism, seeing these two violent structures as inseparable.

Following the work of Alexander Weheliye, I desired to place Native histories in relation to the racialization of other groups. Weheliye (2014) argued, “black studies illuminates the essential role that racializing assemblages play in the construction of modern selfhood, works toward the abolition of Man, and advocates for the radical reconstruction and decolonization of what it means to be human” (p. 15). Radical black feminist theory, through its radical deconstruction of the power of whiteness and Western subjectivity, provides opportunities to work toward decolonization. In other words, anti-Blackness and settler colonialism are intimately related. Furthermore, Weheliye contended that theorizing racializing assemblages means seeing the relationality of settler colonialism and anti-blackness, refusing to see multiple forms of racialized oppression as separate, through the logic of comparison.

My turn to Saidiya Hartman’s (2019) critical archival work attempted to articulate the relationality between settler colonialism and the afterlives of slavery. In *Wayward Lives, Beautiful Experiments*, Hartman pushes the limits of the archive into crisis and through a speculative reconstruction of a chorus of Black women’s voices imagines otherwise their lives and acts of everyday rebellion. Hartman (2019) wrote, “*Wayward Lives* elaborates, augments,
transposes, and breaks open archival documents so that they might yield a richer picture of the social upheaval that transformed black social life in the 20th century,” (p. xiv). She described a method that refuses the terms upon which the official archive was created. She continued, “I prefer to think of this book as the fugitive text of the wayward, and it is marked by the errantry that it describes,” (p. xiv) announcing the method and form of her book will be rebellious, wayward, and fugitive.

Outlining what resonated with the methods of refusal, Hartman (2019) provided a multiplicity of definitions of wayward and stated, “It is the practice of the social otherwise, the insurgent ground that enables new possibilities and new vocabularies; it is the lived experience of enclosure and segregation, assembling and huddling together” (pp. 227-228). I want to highlight in this sentence that the fugitive possibilities of the wayward and of living otherwise occur within the spaces of enclosure, meaning that Hartman described rebellious forms of living that happen even though anti-Black structures have attempted to destroy Black life. This has some salience with the living otherwise of Native people who continue to fight against the settler colonialism and refuse the terms by which the dominant society has defined them. Such a view of the archive and of settler colonial oppression, does not negate suffering and damage, but it illuminates the desire to otherwise and reclaim one’s sovereignty as an Indigenous person.

My project engaged and resonated most strongly with Hartman’s whose work and its trajectory since her first book, Scenes of Subjection, have explored the limits of the archive, exposed the power relationships present in the archive of slavery, and imagined the impossible recovery of the lives of the enslaved. She gestured toward her method of critical fabulation, which she devised as a speculative tool in her essay, “Venus in Two Acts,” for imagining who a Black slave girl might have been when the archive only remembers her as an object or a piece of
property to be recorded in a ledger (Hartman, 2008, p. 11). Venus was a haunting figure who appeared in the archive of slavery with different names, remembered only as excess, aberration, and death in the ledger. Hartman (2008) wrote:

We stumble upon her in exorbitant circumstances that yield no picture of the everyday life, no pathway to her thoughts, no glimpse of the vulnerability of her face or of what looking at such a face might demand. We only know what can be extrapolated from an analysis of the ledger or borrowed from the world of her captors and masters and applied to her” (p 2).

Here Hartman (2008) ruminated over the impossibility of knowing anything about the interiority of this Black girl and the others like her. Further, she posed the question, “how does one revisit the scene of subjection without replicating the grammar of violence?” (p. 4). The statements in the archive of slavery record death, torture, and objecthood. Absent in the archive are the experiences of the enslaved, appearing only as silences or unintelligible screams. Hartman (2008) contended that “the archive is inseparable from the play of power that murdered Venus,” (p. 10) and later “my own narrative does not operate outside of the economy of statements that is subject to critique” (p. 13), which highlights the entrenchment of the language and knowledge of the archive in the violence/subjection of slavery.

The problem for Hartman was two-fold, that the archive remembers Black girls only through their death, denying any possibility of knowing who they were and that the excavation of these records risks performing the epistemic violence that erases her personhood from history.

Critical fabulation, according to Hartman, did not seek to “give voice to the slave,” but instead put pressure on and critiques the calculating system of knowledge that remembered the enslaved only as dead bodies, without identity and without personhood” (p. 12). Hartman further wrote, “it
[critical fabulation] is an impossible writing which attempts to say that which resists being said (since dead girls are unable to speak). It is a history of an unrecoverable past; it is a narrative of what might have been or could have been; it is a history written with and against the archive” (p.12). Critical fabulation gestures to an otherwise space where the reader of history can imagine who these girls might have been.

Speculative Reconstruction at the Limits of the Archive

My project deeply engages with Hartman’s developments of critical fabulation in Wayward Lives and aims to similarly alter the structure and form of historical narratives. I adopted Hartman’s critical fabulation as a critical tool for thinking through, within my grandfather’s immigration archive, the impossibility for recovering the life of Mon See Shee, my father Hong On’s mother, whose identity is called into question in my familial immigration archive. Since she was only remembered through death, which the United States immigration enforcement refused to see as verifiable, she is a figure rendered impossible to recover. The archive of my grandfather’s 1912 immigration trial includes a legal transcript of his interrogation when the immigration officials suspected him of violating the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. This U.S. act made Chinese immigration illegal after xenophobic, racist political movements mobilized around the threat of Chinese immigration by deploying rhetoric about Chinese stealing jobs and infesting urban areas. I needed a method that would allow me to understand my ancestors, or to imagine who they might have been, beyond how they appear in the clinical legal documents. The documents themselves revealed the terse, measured responses of my grandfather and other Chinese people who feared persecution by the state. Moreover, the immigration officials erased the presence of my great-grandmother, even when presented with her grave, and
deemed her existence to be an anomaly, turning her into a disappearing phantom. She was present only through her erasure. The repetition was haunting throughout the documents of “alleged mother” and references to her as “Indian” “dead.” She disappears repeatedly. Yet, the presence of her name and the discussion of her grave offered possibilities, if using Hartman’s approach. Though I could not have retrieved anything about her from the official record, I could have investigated the lives of Indigenous women, specifically Alaskan women who migrated down the Pacific coast, during the turn of the 20th century and speculate about who she/they might have been.

Hartman’s idea that archives of subjugated people reproduce violence and erasure also influenced the research, including my analysis, I did at the Institute of American Indian Arts (IAIA) in the Santa Fe and at the Heard Museum on the relationship between the legacy of boarding school trauma and art education in tribal institutions. One specific moment that reminded me of Hartman’s ideas was when I was at the Heard Museum in Phoenix and I sought to comb their archives for records and photos of art education in the federal boarding schools in the Southwest. I was motivated by my desire to show the complexity of trauma and cultural assimilation within art education classrooms (Lentis, 2017). My experience in the archive was challenging, since I was not allowed to photograph the materials, even for educational or research purposes, without first obtaining permission from the Heard’s rights and reproduction department. The materials I looked at were photographs and boarding school students’ art works. Since they are visual materials without written information included, I thought they would be most helpful for my research in visual form (as a photo taken with my phone or a scan). This ultimately led me to cease pursuing the Heard archive as a suitable collection for my project.
Beyond my difficulties with the parameters set by the institution, I struggled with the fact that the materials I encountered were products of institutional cultural genocide and obscured as much as they illuminated the history of boarding schools. I was searching for some vestiges of the interior lives of the children in the boarding schools. When I say interior lives, I do not intend to flatten or homogenize the interiority of the students. Interiority refers to the multitudinous thoughts, desires, actions, worldviews, and identities of the Native students.

I looked through artworks held in the Ivy O. Hendricks Collection at the Heard museums created by boarding school students in Albuquerque in the 1920s. As I held what seemed to be several drawings of artworks that were repetitions of the same theme, I was most struck by the drawings of wooden ships crossing the ocean. They evoked the history of conquest. My initial affective response included sadness and anger that the teacher forced the students to depict conquest. There seemed to be no joy in these color drawings including muted shades of gray, brown, and blue. This reminded me of the solemn style of the drawings Lentis (2017) analyzed of self-portraits of the boarding school students wearing uniforms and facing away from the viewer. After looking through the drawings, I was left with a flurry of questions about who these students were. What were they thinking and feeling when making these art pieces? If they were bored with the rote art activity, what were they daydreaming about? How did the trauma of living at the boarding school affect how they made art? What was the art teacher like, and why did she make the students draw the ships of conquistadors? These questions, following Hartman, ask the researcher to imagine that the students have lives beyond how they are recorded in the archive of cultural assimilation and the violence of the boarding school.
Attunement to Native Worldviews and Epistemologies

By turning to Native studies, I want to find methodological tools to deconstruct the discourses of modernity and modernization that create Native absence through settler colonial erasure. Chickasaw scholar Jodi Byrd (2017) articulated how settler subjects within the context of the liberal state make sense of themselves through a relationship to Native erasure. Drawing upon the work of Sara Ahmed, she argued that settler subjects orient themselves through creating Indigeneity as an object (Byrd, 2017, p. 217) and later states that settler identification “requires the Indian as the mode of refraction to perceive the self” (Byrd, 2017, p. 221). Settler society reproduces itself by disappearing native presence and claims to land sovereignty; therefore, it has been imperative in Native studies to find ways to assert their presence in the modern world that challenge the defeating narratives of genocide and tragedy perpetuated by the settler state.

Vizenor (1999; 2008; 2009; 2019) has theorized the concept of Native *survivance*, which asserts Native presence through stories, art, humor, and practices of freedom and resists the narratives of Native absence, focused solely on genocide and tragedy. Related to the concept of survivance, is *transmotion*, which Vizenor (2019) used to describe the rhythms and movements of Native life within natural, ancestral states. He described that movement of transmotion as:

> the migration of birds, aerial maneuvers of starlings, tease of ravens, dive of water ouzels in a cold mountain stream, shadows in the snow, shimmer of light on a wet spider web, blue shadows in the snow, traces of the seasons, and the tropes of native totemic animals and birds are unmissable scenes of natural motion in native creation stories, visionary dream songs, and literature (Vizenor, 2019, p. 37)

Survivance and transmotion represent methods for being attuned to Native worldviews and epistemologies that open-up possibilities for Native cultural sovereignty and freedom.
The question most germane to my project inspired by Vizenor’s (1999; 2008; 2009; 2019) ideas was, how do Native practices of survivance and freedom appear in the archive of the Institute of American Indian Arts? It was especially imperative to ask, how did IAIA confront and challenge the history of cultural genocide in education? These questions, motivated by my engagement with Vizenor, guided my methodological approach to my research at IAIA, looking for the philosophies and practices of Native freedom in the materials of Lloyd Kiva New whose ideas shaped the founding of IAIA. As one tool of Critical Archive Methodology, I employed discourse analysis of the IAIA archival materials to unpack the ideological underpinnings contained within the writings of New and the other actors who debated the possibility of opening IAIA. Furthermore, I paid close attention to the tensions contained in the archive in the correspondence between the Rockefeller Foundation, art administrators, and the Federal Government to illuminate how often the push for greater Native autonomy, survivance, and movement, were countered by the settler state’s changing demands for who and what Native artists at the middle of 20th century could become.

A Critique of Settler Epistemologies and Research Methods

This next section focuses on methodological theory that critically examines settler epistemologies that delimit how Native people speak within research. A central theme for this section is how settler methods in research for trying to capture who Indigenous people are fail or severely misrecognize them. Rather than simply stating that new methods that are sensitive to social difference should replace these methods, I think this group of scholars (Tuck, 2009; Tuck & Yang 2012; 2014) proposed that the structures of knowledge themselves are the problem in a
settler society and that strategies for refusal and decolonization within research should be inseparable from the political fight for sovereignty and self-determination in Indigenous politics.

Eve Tuck, a Unangax scholar of education, decolonization, and Indigenous thought wrote in a 2009 open letter entitled “Suspending Damage: A Letter to Communities” about the dangers of “damage-centered research” or what she defined as the tendency for Native researchers (also other marginalized groups) to focus on the damages caused to Indigenous communities by historical injustices and settler colonial violence (Tuck, 2009, p.409). This organization of knowledge around damage aims to appeal to the liberal state to have injustices recognized and have institutions fund or legislate solutions to rectify the broken lives of Native people. Tuck’s (2009) central critique stemmed from an understanding that systems of settler colonial knowledge already see Native peoples as inherently damaged and pathological in research that renders Indigenous people “overresearched but underseen” (p. 412). For Tuck, it was necessary for Native scholars to think critically about the audience and justifications for performing injury, in other words, to consider the effects of always presenting communities as problems to be fixed to the legal system of the settler state. She wrote, “do the material and political wins come through? And, most importantly, are the wins worth the long-term cost of thinking of ourselves as damaged?” (Tuck, 2009, p. 415). Moving beyond theoretical critiques such as Wendy Brown’s (1993) Nietzschean critique of individualism of liberal politics grounded in injury (pp. 390-410), Tuck centered the Native communities’ fraught relationship to the settler state and the potential impacts damage-centered approaches to research have on the sovereignty of Native nations and the everyday lives of Native peoples.

Building on the work in Tuck’s (2009) open letter, Tuck and frequent collaborator K. Wayne Yang critically interrogated the settler colonial norms of research that provide challenges
to decolonization. The essay began with the provocation, “Research is a dirty word among many Native communities” (Tuck & Yang, 2014, p. 223), which brought to bear the decades of colonial academic research and ethnography that sought to misrepresent Native peoples by labelling them backwards, primitive, or savage. In the Post-Civil rights era, they argued, “social science often works to collect stories of pain and humiliation in the lives of those being researched for commodification” (Tuck & Yang, 2014, p. 223). Inspired by Eve Sedgwick’s (1990) axioms at the beginning of *Epistemology of the Closet*, the authors listed three axioms as methodological provocations that critique research and offer possibility for refusal. They stated, “The axioms are: (1) The subaltern can speak, but is only invited to speak her/our pain; (II) there are some forms of knowledge that the academy doesn’t deserve; and research may not be the intervention that is needed” (Tuck & Yang, 2014, p. 224) These axioms highlighted the author’s methodological concern that the terms by which the academy expects Native people to produce research requires an incitement to express pain and trauma. Further, Native people should develop tools to refuse the terms of academia and consider who benefits from the research they are creating.

Tuck and Yang (2014) expanded upon their critique of damage-centered approaches and contended that “teleological trajectory of pain” is to move from broken to unbroken, fulfilling the false promise of liberal humanist ideologies and reinforcing the idea that Native people are “delayed on some kind of path to humanization, and now must catch up” (p. 231). As an alternative to damage-centered approaches to research, the authors proposed “desire-based frameworks,” which refused the progress teleology of settler time (p. 231). Desire for Tuck and Yang encompassed a wider range of possibilities for Native people who experience pain, but also through desire could imagine different ways of being, distilled from memory and anticipations of
different futures. For the authors, desire allowed ways of becoming and the possibility of an otherwise to settler ways of knowing. Along the same vein and resonating with their previous collaboration, “Decolonization is Not a Metaphor,” they posed desire for decolonization as generative because it propelled the struggle for Native people to fight for their land and sovereignty.

The methodological questions that Tuck and Yang offer provided unique challenges for my project. Through tracing the genealogy of settler colonial violence in art education, there was a risk that my thesis project could employ a damage-centered research approach. I think to counteract this problem my thesis focused on the discourses on the archive centered around modernizing and progress narratives that led to the founding of IAIA. Further, I think there are methods for talking about Native trauma and its legacy on Native education that do not flatten Native subjectivity into a one-dimensional understanding of Native people only in terms of genocide and tragedy.

My intention was to illuminate the historical contingencies that lead the settler state to reorganize its relationship to Natives through education and call into question the ideologies that promote art as having the potential to modernize the Native subject. In one sense, through applying a critical Native studies lens to these archival materials, I hoped to reveal that much of ideologies about Native education have nothing to do with the lives and desires of Native students. As historian of settler colonialism Patrick Wolfe (1998) stated, “invasion is a structure not an event,” which highlighted the ongoing settler colonial project as a structure that recreates itself in order to attempt to replace the original inhabitants of the land (p. 2). I wanted my project to understand the progress narratives of reform within the ongoing re-creation of settler colonial structure and put pressure on discourses of modernization.
Furthermore, the reforms of the termination era in the 1950s and 60s, which is the period in which IAIA was founded, represented the ongoing incursion upon Indigenous autonomy and sovereignty of land, in the name of modernization and progress. The U.S. government during the middle of the 20th century formed its federal Indian policy to terminate Native reservations, depriving them of federal recognition and sovereignty, to force Native people to assimilate into modern American society (Deloria 1988; Porter 2007). This part of my thesis aimed to place a mirror to settler colonial structures and propose that Native education, in contrast to the histories of forced assimilation, serves Native communities when it defies the terms set by the settler state. Responding to the work of Kahnawake scholar Audra Simpson (2007; 2014), Tuck and Yang (2014) asserted that refusing such terms is “theoretically generative, expansive” because refusal represents “a redirection to ideas otherwise unacknowledged or unquestioned” (p. 239). Simpson (2014) wrote that refusals “critique and move us away from statist forms of recognition” and invites the autonomy of Native thinking and governance, which might be necessarily unintelligible to knowledge production in settler societies (p. 113). In other words, Native people exercise their sovereignty when they refuse the frames of recognition imposed upon them by settler society. In terms of my research, refusal has an important place. In order for me to call into question the limitations of archival knowledge, I refused the idea to accept the version of truth perpetuated by the record keeping of settler colonial institutions. To speculate about other truths, ones that center the experiences of Indigenous people, is to perform refusal.

This chapter builds from the gaps in the research from the previous section, which offered Critical Archival Methodology as a way to center Indigenous people in research by decolonizing the archival knowledge systems within settler colonial institutions. I believe that I constructed my method based on the demands of the research, created by the silences I
encountered at IAIA, the Heard Museum, and the National Archives at San Francisco. Without Critical Archival Methodologies, including the speculative imagining of critical fabulation, the Indigenous subjects in these archives would have remained people recorded, so that they could disappear. In other words, the boarding school students would have stay successfully assimilated, any trace of their Indigeneity removed; the students in the early days of IAIA and the art education programs that preceded it would have existed only as emblems of ideological uplift and modernization. Lastly, my great-grandmother would have remained unverifiable, someone who the settler state did not care about and labels as non-existing, since she did not appear in their death records. Hartman (1997; 2007; 2008; 2016; 2019) told about a world that is constantly remade through the subjection of Black people. Her history of the present illuminated how the afterlives of slavery reconstitute themselves since the first slaves arrived in the land now called the United States in 1619. Slavery and settler colonization continue to create American society. The historical archive exists as a contested ground whereby the researcher confronts the ethical dilemma of operating within the violences contained in knowledge. My Critical Archival Methodology exposed the gaps in the archive and refuses the imperative to interpret them as total absences. Through employing speculation as a tool, combining critical fabulation with the concept of Indigenous survivance, I opened the possibility of imagining otherwise the people in my archival study. Further, the methodology laid out in this chapter opens the radical possibility that Native people in art education institutions were people with desires, not just vessels for assimilation or symbols of progress.
CHAPTER 4: THE IAIA ARCHIVE

In summer 2019, I visited the library and archives at the Institute of American Indian Arts in Santa Fe to investigate the origins of the institution and find materials on its relationship to the long history of forced cultural assimilation in Native American education. This chapter analyzes materials that I believe open conversation about the philosophical and ideological tenets of Native art education in the middle of the 20th century onward, and it examines critically the absences of student perspectives in the early archive of the institution.

My goal was not to reproduce an exhaustive account of IAIA history like the accounts written by Garmhausen (1988), Gritton (2000), and Flahive (2012), all of which were indispensable to my own research. Instead, my project approached the archive of IAIA with a different genealogical orientation, looking at the philosophical discourses and debates that informed the creation of the institution and the disciplining of Native art education subjects. I was more concerned about the imbrication of knowledge and power in the archive of statements about the institutional, social, and political demands of Native education in the mid-century place now known as the United States. In other words, I wanted to ask what Native art educators, BIA administrators, politicians, and those with money demanded of Native American students? How did these ideological debates orient their construction at the time new forms of art educational practice? In what ways did these practices depart from the genocidal pedagogies of the boarding school era? And importantly, even if these practices reformed the violent education of federal education, how did IAIA create new disciplinary restraints on art students to become modern and successful members of an American capitalist settler society?

These are the guiding questions for my discourse analysis of the correspondence and writings of IAIA’s founders and the pedagogical debates that informed the architecture of the
in institution. However, amid my discussion of educational philosophies and visions, I also traced the ghostly absences of Native students in this archive and mark the spaces they appear. What motivated this dual movement between educational discourse and the subjectivity of students is a deep question that arises in a genealogical or critical archival study of the education system about educational systems as disciplinary enclosures that attempt to produce subjects, faithful to the principles of philosophies of education. However, subjects in any institution, in this case Native American art students, refuse the terms set by the institution, which, in the case of federal boarding schools, meant becoming opaque to survive, finding small gestures of resistance to total cultural and psychic annihilation. While not subjecting students to violence and cultural assimilation, IAIA in its reform disciplined Native American students to the modernizing discourses of the time, becoming successful economic subjects and well-adjusted according to the discipline of psychology. Through looking for the absences and excesses of Native student artistic practice in the IAIA archive, I hoped to suggest alternatives to disciplinary education, which I argue is ultimately rooted in settler colonialism. Such alternatives might gesture to the possibility of radical Indigenous art education practices of freedom.

**Archival Methods and Selection of Materials**

As I have stated in Chapter 3, I developed Critical Archival Methodology because it addressed the practical and theoretical problems I encountered while studying the materials on the foundation of IAIA. Discourse analysis enabled me to dissect the rhetorical and ideological strategies used by the Rockefeller Foundation and Lloyd Kiva New. The materials I have chosen from the Rockefeller Foundation I believe demonstrate to the reader the ideological investment the institution made in modernizing Native students in the middle of the 20th century.
Furthermore, I selected the grant applications and finalized conference and art program materials to show the reader the final result of the discussions and ideological debates contained in the Rockefeller Foundation documents. For Lloyd Kiva New, I pulled newspaper clippings and letters from his life prior to the Rockefeller funded events to show the progression of his thoughts over time. The written materials of New I chose to show the ways in which he wrestled with the push for modernization, the Rockefeller Foundation’s position, and his own sense of justice for Native people who had been forced into cultural assimilation and socioeconomic oppression. The materials I have discussed so far, I analyzed with incisive close reading and discourse analysis. This allowed me to depict the complexity of ideological debates about Native art students. In the final section of the chapter, I selected the teaching observations where I felt New had possibly misinterpreted the experiences of his students and where there was the most room for speculation. I base my discussion of the lives of Native art students on the work I did noting every time an actual Native student is mentioned and the questions that arose from the gaps in information about these students. My practical working of my method allowed me to curate a mix of archival materials that highlight the juxtaposition of the ideological debates about Native art students and the lives of the students themselves.

**Situating the Push for Modernization**

The genesis of the Institute of American Indian Arts comes directly from a 1959 conference held at the University of Arizona called “Directions in Indian Art” and the art education program that stemmed from the conference called the Southwestern Indian Art Project. The key figures who were invested in envisioning new forms of Native American art education were the Rockefeller Foundation, which Gritton (2000) noted desired to invest in Indian art as an
extension of their mission to aid underdeveloped peoples and cultures globally, and Lloyd Kiva New a Cherokee art educator who formerly worked at the Phoenix Indian School and was a successful fashion designer, who sought to create an art school for Native students that would use art to rectify the social damages created by the legacy of the boarding schools, cultural assimilation, and the federal termination policies. Through my archival work at IAIA, I looked at internal correspondence among key players in Rockefeller foundation and the letters from Lloyd Kiva New. The dialectic between settler funding sources and Native art education created tension surrounding the purpose of Native art education at the time concerning how it would allow the Native artist to become modern, to make art that was not “mere” reproductions of craft traditions, and to improve the socioeconomic conditions of Native life.

I must spend some time to clarify the terms modern, modernity, and modernization and what the historically situated effects of modernization discourses for Indigenous peoples in the wake of the longue durée of Western colonization. According to Wilmer (1996), modernity has functions as a Western settler colonial vision of the world that positions Native people as primitive or backward. Byrd (2017) theorized through her critical deconstructive Native methodology that modern subjectivity, in the focus of her article sexual modernity, constructs itself through a foundational relationality to Native subjecthood, even as it attempts to erase the traces of Native sovereignty and land relationships from existence. To bring Native Americans into the fold of modernity through cultural assimilation has long existed as a settler colonial project. In his infamous speech that inaugurated the genocidal mission of the federal boarding schools and propelled the founding of the Carlisle Indian Industrial School, Captain Richard H. Pratt, who spent his military career fighting to destroy Native claims to land and further the push of Western expansion in the second half of the 19th century, proclaimed in 1892 “all the Indian
there is in the race should be dead. Kill the Indian in him, and save the man” (Pratt, 1892, p. 46). To become modern, the Indians according to Pratt must rid themselves of all traces of their savagery. Thus, federal Indian education was born with the explicit aim to further the genocidal mission of culturally destroying Native Americans and aggregating them into a singular racialized group irrespective of nation, culture, or language, all in the name of progress and modernization. Still today the “civilizing logic of modernity” demands that Native peoples give up their land and submit to cultural assimilation, so that global capitalism can spread, bolstered by the violence of Western settler colonial states (Mendoza, 2013, p. 5).

The disidentificatory performances of queer Cree multimedia artist Kent Monkman, as his two-spirit trickster drag alter-ego Miss Chief Eagle Testickle, a play on mischief egotistical, expose the hypocrisies of art historical research and queer erotic entanglements in re-imaginings of artistic styles. In a 2015 performance piece entitled “Casualties of Modernity,” Miss Chief appeared in a soap hospital melodrama, visiting all of the dying genres of modern art, appearing as hospital patients and the hospital doctor is an art historian. Her Indigenous presence revealed how settler colonialism structures modernity through its desire to create new forms (primitivism and appropriation) only to cast out these forms in search of others. I did archival research at the Institute of American Indian Arts and found it curious that in the official documents the founders of the school and those funding it expressed a desire to create modernized Native subjects through art education. Modernization in the middle of the 20th century was a continuation of settler assimilation, asking Native subjects to become modern urban subjects who are not stuck in tradition or backwardness. The campy and critical performance of Miss Chief illuminated how

6 Disidentification is a term used by José Esteban Muñoz (1999) to describe the performances of queers of color who inhabit hegemonic discourses as mode of a critique. Muñoz states that disidentification is a middle ground between assimilation to dominant ideologies or complete refusal of them, highlighting the cultural history of queers of color using inhabiting and critiquing majoritarian discourses as a mode of survival.
modern art in its appropriation Indigenous forms, repurposed and corrupted for the capitalist visions of the settler art world, has no place for contemporary Indigenous worldviews and cultural sovereignty. In other words, Monkman’s performances, by comedically mocking the civilizing discourses of modernity, gesture to an Indigenous artistic worldview that refuses the teleology of settler development and primitivist fetishizations.

At the IAIA archives, I looked primary at the Rockefeller Foundation internal documentation and correspondence surrounding the 1959 “Directions in Indian Art” conference, The Southwestern Indian Art Project, and the foundation of IAIA in addition to the archive of Lloyd Kiva New and what glimpses of student artwork I could find. I focused first on the discursive and ideological records of the Rockefeller Foundation’s investment in Native Art and the sometimes divergent ideas of Native American art educators. The guiding question of my analysis of these archival materials was, how does the ideological imperative set by the Rockefeller foundation to claim Native American art and artists for American modernization impact the institutional structure of IAIA and, therefore, the subject formation of Native American students?

Gritton (2000) poignantly noted in her monograph on the dialectics of modernization in the creation of IAIA that the Rockefeller Foundation and Museum of Modern Art invested in Native American Art as part of their larger project of engaging in the cultural sphere of the Cold War because to them Native artists were not corrupted by Communist ideology like abstract expressionists (p. 4) in New York and modernizing Native American culture coincided with the foundation’s neocolonial desire to develop Third World cultures in an effort to extend the sphere of American social and political influence (p. 7). In general description of the grant given to the University of Arizona for the conference within the Rockefeller papers of Charles B. Fahs, it
read, “In the development of our interest in the arts in the ‘underdeveloped’ areas of the world, the officers have been concerned lest we reflect the comparable problems of some of the less privileged groups of the United States” (Fahs, 1958b, p. 1). Anticipating critiques of the Rockefeller Foundation’s project to spread American influence through development, the authors of the description stated, “If we do so [neglect] the Native American population, we are not only illogical but we also hamper our relations with those interested in such problems abroad” (Fahs, 1958b, p. 1). The Rockefeller foundation used language that suggests the underdevelopment of Native communities was a problem that needed to be fixed. Parmar (2011) contended that the cultural investments of the Rockefeller foundation represented a malignancy at the heart of philanthropic ventures, which were cultural institutional tools for the spread of American global political hegemony and the spread of neoliberal capitalism (pp. 1-3). Therefore, I have to view with a critical lens the Rockefeller foundation’s investment in Native American arts, even as such investments led to the development of IAIA, when the central motivation of the foundation was to enact a project that furthers American imperialism as part of the cultural wing of the Cold War.

**The Directions in Indian Art Conference**

**The Rockefeller Foundation Ideology and the Construction of the Indian Problem**

Charles B. Fahs the Director of the Humanities at the Rockefeller Foundation documented the process by which he reached out the University of Arizona to plan a conference on Indian Arts, assessing the university was strong in Native American anthropology, but needed to invest significantly in the Native American arts, especially given that Arizona has such a large Indigenous population. After discussion with university administrators and art faculty, Fahs and
John P. Harrison the Associate Director of the Humanities at the Rockefeller Foundation recommended that the university consult Rene D’Harnoncourt, the director of MOMA and the general manager of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board within the federal government. Gritton (2000) noted that D’Harnoncourt was influential in promoting Native American arts as salable art objects in museums and galleries, instead of artifacts in anthropology museums (pp 18-19). In notes from an interview on September 24, 1958 of Rene D’Harnoncourt conducted by John P. Harrison contained in Fah’s official Rockefeller documentation of the conference planning, there is a summary of D’Harnoncourt’s critical response to the conference proposal and in one particular moment addresses the inclusion of Native American artists to participate as instructors. The notes stated that D’Harnoncourt placed emphasis on social significance” of creating programs for Indian arts in the Southwest and “from an aesthetic that precludes effective art emerging from other than a ceremonial nexus” (Harrison, 1958, p. 1), which although the syntax is somewhat confusing, suggests that D’Harnoncourt was invested in the ceremonial and traditional roots of Native art. The interview noted, “given this point of view, it is for him a tragedy that a man of Charles Laloma’s [sic] talent is associated with a Cherokee like Lloyd New” (Harrison, 1958, p. 1).7 The two Native artists were the two recommended to participate in the Directions in Indian Art conference, Loloma—a Hopi artist famous for incorporating new materials into Hopi jewelry—and New, a successful fashion designer and owner of a design center in Scottsdale. D’Harnoncourt, according to Gritton (2000), championed innovation within existing cultural traditions. Perhaps Lloyd New’s fashion designs were too modern and detached from the primitivism imagined from D’Harnoncourt whose aesthetic sensibilities demanded innovation within a specific cultural imagining of traditional Native art. I focused on this

---

7 The note taker misspelled the last name of Charles Loloma
interview summary to point out the ideological debates embedded within the planning of this conference, from the position of those with influence, wealth, and power in settler society. To place this in context, the director of MOMA deemed the future director of IAIA to have lesser aesthetic value as an artist than Charles Loloma based on his ideological perspective on what constitutes the proper modern Native art form and the extent to which it can deviate from what are seen as tradition crafts in the eyes of the settler art world. The irony was, as Gritton (2000) pointed out, that D’Harnoncourt and New shared a similar vision to have Native art create new, innovative forms, while still respecting the cultural traditions of the artist’s respective nation. These debates on tradition versus modernization evolved throughout the conference, the Southwestern Indian Art Project, and eventually the foundation of IAIA.

In a supplemental proposal submitted by the University of Arizona for the “Directions in Indian Art Conference,” three were outcomes listed as desired goals for developing Indian arts in the Southwest and they are “1. Education of the public in appreciation of this art, 2. The betterment of the economic conditions of the Indian craftsman and artist, and 3. Opportunities for education of the Indian artist in a period of transition” (“A Conference on Southwest Indian Art,” 1958). Embedded in these outcomes were the development ideology in accordance with the Rockefeller’s, on improving the socioeconomic conditions of the Native population, which was based on the assumption of Native underdevelopment and the profound impacts of termination era defunding of federal Indian social institutions. Vine Deloria, Jr. (1969) discussed the 1950s termination era policies when the U.S, defunded tribal institutions and terminated federal recognition of many nations. Deloria (1969) characterized termination as a solution to “the Indian problem” in American politics (p.55). The idea of the Indian problem is another way of stating the contested relationship Native people had been forced into with the federal government.
after the onslaught of westward expansion and genocide. Such policies also displaced Native people and “encouraged” them to move to urban areas away from communities and land.

Critical to understanding the creation of “the Indian problem” was also the epistemology of Native subjects being caught between two worlds, the indigenous world and the modern settler world. Deloria, Jr. (1969) critiqued the notion that the listlessness and alcoholism of Native people could be attributed to being caught between the Native world and modernity proposed by anthropologists, pointing instead to the violence of settler colonial expansion and the loss of land sovereignty and wealth. In Lloyd Kiva New’s handwritten notes in Figure 1 from teaching at the Southwestern Indian Art Project, he drew a spectrum between Indian and Non-Indian worlds. He employed the trope two worlds, to illustrate the cultural splitting of Indian students and the alleged difficulty being stuck in their Indigenous worldview might cause in helping students define their own artistic voice (New circa 1960 “The Problem”). The two-world framework had its origins in settler colonial thinking that positions colonized society at its center (Buss & Genetin-Pilawa, 2014). Therefore, it is important to question New’s desire for his students to overcome the problem being stuck in two worlds, since the two-world ideology ultimately devalues Indigenous perspectives. The Directions in Indian Art conference aligned with the Rockefeller Foundation’s Cold War era development and the pathologizing and patronizing discourses manufactured by the United States to name the Indians as problems that
needed to be fixed, even when settler colonial governance created the social circumstances of
Native people in the first place.

Figure 1 Photo from IAIA Archives of Lloyd Kiva New’s Teaching Notes from Southwestern Indian Art Project circa 1960-1963, Gustav Meuschke, 2019, personal photograph
The Ideas of Lloyd Kiva New

I focused the analysis on the involvement of Lloyd Kiva New in the Directions in Indian Art conference, the Southwestern Indian Art Project, and his eventual founding of the Institute of American Indian Arts. The analysis looked at the ideological development of New’s educational philosophy and it’s convergent and divergent relationship to the Rockefeller Foundation’s agenda. Further, New’s ideas opened the door to my discussion about the disconnects between philosophical ideas for Native uplift through art education that created IAIA and the subjective desires of students, which appear in my archival research only through disciplinary teaching notes by New and other instructors and what exists of the poetry and arts from IAIA students from New’s collection of objects saved at IAIA’s archive.

Figure 2 shows a photo of Lloyd Kiva New in the Scottsdale Daily Progress in 1965, after IAIA had opened, but the article highlights New’s multiple identities. It talks about his
history as an educator at the Phoenix Indian School, his successful ventures as a designer and owner of a design center, and his position as the director of IAIA (Wilson, 1965, p. 10). New’s position as an economically successful Native designer and artist and his deep commitment to Native education shaped his involvement in the beginnings of IAIA. Before his involvement in the conference and the Southwestern Indian Art Project, New had visions of improving the education of Native students, which he believed would uplift their socioeconomic status and improve the psychological turmoil of their lives during the termination era. In a draft of a letter dated April 9, 1957 addressed to Mrs. J. L. Mills of Winnebago, Minnesota (figure 3), who seems to have sent a letter to New inquiring about “the Indian problem,” New characterized federal Indian policy as “misguided benevolence.” He also critiqued the idea that there was a singular Indian problem, given the multiplicity of Native cultures and nations (New, 1957, p. 1). He argued, “Until the bulk of Indian people are truly educated, little progress can be made in any direction,” implying that a major solution to the so-called Indian problem would be investment in education (p. 2). Referring to the looming effects of the termination policies, New wrote, “to suddenly withdraw support from the Indian program, however, bad it has been, would result only in a catastrophic destruction of a group who may have a strong contribution to make” (p. 2). He appealed to the potential productive contributions Native artists could make to American society and its capitalist economy.
Indian who in some manner or another has become so acculturated he no longer identifies himself with his own group emotionally or by manner of living. Since the "problems" are so variant, then, sensible answers must also be variant. Any attempt to work out a program for solving these problems must by necessity allow for these variances. But, generally speaking, these are my ideas about the situation:

First of all—Normal health conditions must prevail before peoples or individuals can face their various problems. Financial aid should be extended to provide services from the welfare type—those who find themselves lost at this point—to aid to groups and individuals who can profit by such aid in the betterment of their economic problems; grants and loans equivalent to those made to foreign countries would seem in order.

Second—A continuous and unrelenting drive to offer educational opportunities on every level is an inescapable expense in working out the "Indian problem". Until the bulk of Indian people are truly educated, little progress can be made in any direction that is good.

This is a long, long road. To suddenly withdraw support from the Indian program, however bad it has been, would result only in catastrophic destruction of a group who may have a strong contribution to make. It would be similar to saying, "Progress is so slow in reaching a balanced economy in the United States that we must do away with publicly supported institutions, and put these people on their own!" Their constituents.

To sum up—the assets of Indian groups, wherever they lay, land grants, cultural values, tribal propierties, traditions, religion and so on, should be protected in every way and be allowed to disappear only when it is replaced by something as solid. When Indian health is the same as American standards, in general, then do away with medical service entirely.

Figure 3 Photo from IAIA Archives of Lloyd Kiva New Letter Draft to J.L. Mills 1957, Gus Meuschke, 2019, personal photograph
Figure 4 shows an example of the midcentury modern Native fashion designs that Lloyd Kiva New created and garnered him commercial success in Scottsdale and around the country. This is who he was when Charles B. Fahs approached him in January of 1958 to discuss involvement in a conference focused on the future of American Indian arts in the Southwest. Within Fah’s Rockefeller documentation of his interview of New, he wrote, “New and Loloma also dream of the establishment of a special small school for Indian arts,” soliciting Fahs and the Rockefeller Foundation for financial support of the school (Fahs, 1958a, p. 8). New’s vision for the creation of a school for Native American arts and crafts motivated his participation in the conference and the Southwestern Indian Art program.
Figure 5 Photo 1/2 of Directions in Indian Art Conference Schedule from the IAIA archives, Gus Meuschke, 2019 personal photograph
00 to 12.00 Noon
The Economics of Southwest Indian Art - Dr. John Adair, Cornell University
Discussants: Tony Reyna, Dealer, Indian Arts and Crafts, Taos, New Mexico (Taos Indian)
M. L. Woodard, Dealer, Indian Arts and Crafts, Gallup, New Mexico
Tom Bohle, Dealer, Southwest Indian Arts and Crafts

12.00 Noon
Luncheon, Upstairs Lobby, Fine Arts Building

1:30 to 4:00 P.M.
Library, School of Music
New Education Directions in Southwest Indian Art - Chairman: Dr. Edward B. Damas, Director, Museum of Northern Arizona, Flagstaff
The Indian as an Artist - Andrea S. Andersen, Head of Department of Art, The University of Arizona
Discussants: Lloyd King, Owner-operator, Craft Center, Scottsdale, Arizona (Plains Indian)
Pablita Velarde, Santa Clara Pueblo artist
Acquisition and Preservation of Indian Art - Dr. Bertha P. Dutton, Curator of Ethnology, Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe
Discussants: Laura Gilpin, photographer, Santa Fe, New Mexico
Martin Vigil, Chairman, All Pueblos Council, Rio Grande Pueblos, Tesuque, New Mexico (Teseque Pueblo Indian)
Education on the Pre-College Level - Margaret Handlong, Art teacher in Phoenix Public Schools, Phoenix, Arizona
Discussant: Fred Kabotie, Indian artist, also teacher in Oraibi (Hopi)
High School and in Hopi Silversmith Cooperative Guild (Hopi Indian)
Museums, Art Galleries, and Public Relations - Robert Church (See above)
Discussant: H. Thomas Cain, Director, Heard Museum, Phoenix, Arizona

4:00 - 4:30 P.M.
Summary of Conference - Clara Les Tanner, Associate Professor, Department of Anthropology, The University of Arizona

7:30 P.M.
Banquet, Arizona Inn
Projections in Indian Art Education - Lloyd King
According to Gritton (2000), the conference’s major achievement was to gain the attention of the University of Arizona and the Rockefeller Foundation, inspiring them to host and fund the Southwestern Indian Art project, which lasted from 1960-1963 and was directly responsible for the foundation of IAIA. The conference additionally performed the ideological function of critiquing the art educational approaches to Indian art from the past and creating space for new ideological movements, helmed by New and his art world supporters. Dorothy Dunn’s, a painting teacher at the Studio, connected to the Santa Fe Indian School, appeared the conference, which can be seen in page one of the conference schedule (figure 4). According to Gritton (2000), Dunn’s pedagogy represented outdated form of Indian arts education, because, according to conference attendees, it implemented a stereotypical, non-traditional Native art style (p. 38). Dunn’s outdated style of art teaching did not encourage Native students to experiment with form and self-expression. This critique illuminated the perception that for Native art education to become modern and progressive it ought to promote freedom of expression and aesthetic innovation. New, D’Harmoncourt, and the Rockefeller Foundation’s mission was to construct new Native American art education institutions, which would then uplift Native American subjects.

Figure 7 Letter from Lloyd Kiva New to Charles B Fahs September 28, 1958, IAIA archives, Phone Scan, 2019 Gus Meuschke

In two letters written to Charles B. Fahs and John Harrison, the two most senior administrators of the Rockefeller Foundations Humanities wing, Lloyd Kiva New argued that in
the wake of the *Directions in Indian Art Conference* it was clear to him that the only way to improve the state of Native American arts would be to open an institute solely dedicated to training young Native artists. In the letter to Fahs, shown in figure 7, New expressed that the school would nourish the talents of Indian artists, allow them to work in their traditional art forms, and assist them in adjusting to the modern world. Part of this adaptation to modernity, as New made clear, was the training of Native artists to become successful financially, so that they can earn enough to make a living in American capitalist society (New, 1958, p. 6). New trenchantly appealed to the capitalist sensibilities of the Rockefeller foundation and envisioned Native artists who were financially responsible and self-regulating, which ultimately appeared to be a sketching of an ideal liberal economic subject.

In conjunction with imaging the school creating proper economic subjects, New, in the letter to Harrison, expressed the desire to teach Native students to have a “personal creative approach,” which would allow them to “find [themselves] as a creative artist” (New, 1960a, p. 3). In using the discourse of creativity as freedom of expression, while still honoring traditional forms, New desired for “Indian artists to find themselves, socially, culturally, and artistically” (New, 1960, p. 3) and used the language that implied self-actualization in the modern American society. Economic success and personal expression, to New, were the ideological tenets of the school he envisioned. Would these ideals, when put into practice, fulfill their promise to uplift Native artists or would they impose a burden to modernize and evolve in ways that ran counter to the desires, feelings, and wills of the Native students in the middle of the 20th century?
The lives of Native students in the Southwestern Indian Art Project

To return to a question from earlier, what was the consequence of the push to modernize on Native students who were the potential casualties of modernity? By casualty I mean that Native students in boarding schools and at the Southwestern Indian Art Project were supposed to be malleable subjects. There were forced to assimilate during the early boarding school days and now they are expected to modernize in the middle of 20th century. In the final section of this chapter, I zoomed in on the notes of Lloyd Kiva New made about Native students, their identities, and their behavior during his time teaching. I ended with an analysis of art and poetry created by IAIA students in the first decade of its opening. The purpose of this analysis was to focus on the lives of the students who, according to the ideological debates and educational philosophies I overviewed above, would become the beneficiaries of the uplift of the Southwestern Indian Art Project and then IAIA. In other words, these were the students New and the Rockefeller believed could find personal expression through art, create with modern sensibilities while exploring their traditions, and becoming well-adjusted economically functioning individual artists in society.

In a 1960 letter stating recommendations for future iterations of the Southwestern Indian Art Project, Lloyd New decried what he saw as the paucity of teaching about the vast Native American art traditions. These were the traditions he thought would enrich the artistic lives of Native American studies. While this seems consonant with his overall philosophy of encouraging the study of traditional forms and encouraging personal expression, New diverges from his noble theorizing on the future of Native students in his evaluation of specific students’ performance and commitment to the program. Throughout the letter, he described many of the students who did not seem interested in art and whose talents were not developed to his standards as “woefully
immature” (New, 1960b, p. 1). At a few points in the letter, he believed the program could sift out the immature, less talented, and uninterested students in the admittance process.

Throughout his evaluation of students in the letter, beyond maturity level and interest, New measured the value of students based on his judgment of their talent on a specific artistic skill. What interested me about his evaluative method was that it seemed somewhat contradictory to the social motivations in his educational philosophy. Native American students, some who no doubt went to federal boarding schools and were institutionalized, may not have had the opportunity to learn artistic skills, may have experienced violence in those institutions, or may have been dissuaded from learning about traditional arts in the name of cultural assimilation. While New seemed to understand, on an abstract level, the social problems facing Native students in the termination era, he showed less understanding when confronted with underdeveloped skill sets and behaviors that he deemed pathological.

Within the student observations written by New in the first year of the Southwestern Indian Art Project, there was evidence of the psychological and artistic rubrics by which New judged individual students. However, there were also glimpses into the ways the students existed outside of New’s understanding. In my assessment, he was not attuned to their subjective experiences, saw obstinacy in their refusals instead of resilience, and in some cases simply was ignorant. While I only had New’s account of students through brief discursive observations, these accounts contained moments that might allow the reader to speculate about other possibilities for who these students were or who they could have been.

In an observation of a student named Ruth Ella Morris, New recounted a conversation he had with Ruth about her behavior and stated, “I then told her that I was interested to know this[how things were going in generally] because I had heard a number of reports from the
faculty that she was a little difficult to work with” to which she responds “I know I am. I’m spoiled” (New, 1960c, “Ruth Ella Morris”). New took her words at face value and warned that she might be asked not to return since there were students who were more cooperative and more interested in art than she. In the official letter, she was also listed as one of the students New believed was not committed to art. I wondered about Ruth Ella Morris saying immediately that she knew she was difficult and that she was spoiled, considering the particular ways in which children, especially girls, may internalize beliefs that they are too willful or too opinionated, when they are in fact not and their willfulness is appropriate (Ahmed, 2014). Further, the focus of New’s report was almost entirely disciplinary. It made no mention of the possible generative ways that the girl named Ruth may have been uncooperative, taking artistic risks, or doing things her own way. There was no evidence in this account that New attempted to look beneath her behavior and see if she had frustrated, pent up creative energy from being told she was too much and refused to follow rules. Evidently, students for New, and for the Rockefeller foundation, were supposed to explore innovative and modern personal expression, only if their personal demeanor reflected certain disciplinary standards.

Mary Morez was a Diné student who “spent her early years in an orthopedic hospital in Chicago.” According to New, she said that she did not feel welcome in her home and managed to flee her family situation by going to the Phoenix Indian School (New, 1960d, “Mary Morez”). After graduating she was adopted by a non-Indian family in Phoenix. I read trauma into New’s observations of her and the ways in which he spun euphemisms into her life narrative, referring to her father’s “grumpiness and being mean,” so much so it led her to enroll in a federal boarding school and become adopted to another family, which although I could not confirm it, suggests violence in her biological family (New, 1960d, “Mary Morez”). When evaluating her artistic
interests, New observed that when she tried to make a Navajo dress in a design class, she proclaimed, “I can’t do Indian art.” From this, New suggested that he introduce her to Navajo art forms and believed that she could immerse herself in these techniques. “I can’t do Indian art” says so much about her possible trauma within her family and the pain of having to leave her community, disconnecting her from their artistic traditions. New proclaimed flatly, “the various frustrations she seems to be encountering because of the particular personal history that she has” (New, 1960d, “Mary Morez”). Recovering traditions was not simply a matter of attending lectures and practicing techniques. Since New is not Diné, could he proficiently teach these traditions? Traditional ways of making were not simply techniques that can be deconstructed and taught. They were tired to Indigenous people and their culture. Morez’s story revealed that ways in which severance from cultural traditions came from trauma and the painful ways in which family can be the ones to cause you the most harm. I wonder if she was able to learn how to make Navajo textiles or if she found other Diné people who would nurture, not hurt her.

Given the richness held in these observations, it seemed reasonable to wonder, what lies beneath the cursory judgments about supposedly rebellious behavior, lack of motivation, and underdeveloped skill? Roger Tsabetsaye was another student who New mentioned little about his personal life and focused entirely on his aptitude for design and silversmithing. New stated, “after discussing the situation with both Roger and Mr. Loloma, it was my opinion that he was suffering from lack of knowledge of the basic concepts of design and [form],” since he refused to change a “very unsatisfactory design” for a silversmithing piece (New, 1960e, “Roger Tsabetsaye”). There was no explanation for what Roger recalcitrantly held onto in his design. New offered as the antidote, “it would be my recommendation that next year we spend an early part of the session dwelling upon the universal elements of design and principles of art” (New,
1960e, “Roger Tsabetsaye”). I did not know if the “unsatisfactory design” was something of sentimental, cultural, or personal significance to student, since New understood his refusal as immature stubbornness. There was no evidence I could find that he looked further into why someone might not immediately jettison their vision for a piece that they had imagined or might be something to which they are attached.

Ernest Whitehead was a student New described as wanting to paint Apache, Kiowa, and sometimes Plains dancers (who New dismissingly states “with whom he has had no real contact”) (New, 1950f, Ernest Whitehead). New claimed that Ernest “has established a local reputation as an artist,” which suggested to me that others may have liked seeing his paintings of movement and dancers. In New’s observations, I saw the misrecognitions fraught within any classroom, whereby there is a possible disconnect between the teacher’s ideological viewpoints and their judgments of individual students, which favored deficit thinking and pathologization of Indigenous social backgrounds (Valencia, 1997; 2012; Klaehe & Acuff, 2013).

The last observation I analyzed was that of a student named Tom Yazzi, a Diné painter that New described as quiet and “the most pure Indian type” (New, 1960g, “Tom Yazzi”), referring perhaps to the fact that English was not his first language and whatever markers New interpreted as signifiers of pure Indianness. New described him as an intuitive painter who got lost in abstract forms and worked with an intense flow. What New was most impressed by was how Yazzi used perspective in his painting and his creation of surrealist, abstract form. Even though he described Yazzi as a “pure Indian,” New described his work as lacking the traditional pastoral imagery of Navajo painting, noting his interest in “strange motifs, such as swastikas and floating eyes” (New, 1960g, “Tom Yazzi”). What New seemed to ignore or misrecognize was that Yazzi was most likely not painting swastikas and was painting whirling logs, a Diné symbol
with significant mythological and ritual importance, which appears in sandpaintings (Wilson, 1896; Gill, 1979). What New saw as modernist abstraction could have had deep connections to traditional symbols.

The futures of IAIA

To conclude my discussion of IAIA’s archive, I focused on “Using Cultural Difference as a Basis for Creative Expression,” New (1968) a formal essay on his philosophical vision at the beginning of IAIA and “The Institute of American Indian Arts: Some of Its Goals, Problems, and Successes” written when he retired (New 1979). Lloyd Kiva New expressed his relatively unchanged educational philosophy that balanced the honoring of art traditions with preparing Native students to thrive in the modern world. The circumstances changed from the start of IAIA, of course, and the institution evolved during New’s time as president to eventually become an epicenter for contemporary Native American arts with a 4-year program with expanded curricular offerings. In pointing out the core philosophical and ideological investment of New in contrast to my speculative engagement with the traces of his students from the Southwestern Indian Art Project, I have shown that when doing archival research on the history of Native American arts education researchers have to be critical about the power they give specific people and institutions. From the discursive position, New and the Rockefeller Foundations espoused ideas about the uplift of Native students through synthesizing tradition and modernity and the ascendency into socioeconomic security. However, even as students became disciplinary subjects to the institution, fashioning themselves in its image, they had the capacity to refuse and conceal, appearing in the archive through absence. Within these silences exists the opacity of Indigenous students’ subjecthood, disciplined into modern artists yet not entirely; the students were more than and in excess of the norms placed upon them (Butler, 2005).
Through imagining the trauma and the life circumstances of the Southwestern Indian Art Project, and by extension IAIA, I have attempted to illuminate some of the complexities of being a Native person, subjects who were deemed exemplars of “the Indian problem” in need of fixing because of identity loss and displacement. New labeled students as having disciplinary problems or artistic failings; however, with through my speculative reconstruction of IAIA’s archive with an attunement to Native perspectives these students may be seen as having refused to become molded into a neoliberal subject and having had reservations about settler concepts of personal expression, creativity, and artistic talent. Figure 8 shows a drawing and short poem from New’s collection of student poetry from 1969. The work by M. Gerard (Blackfeet) showed a Native person in traditional regalia. The poem mediated any attempt to see a true reflection or image of a Native person. The reflection was disrupted, and the image remade itself in the poem. It ended with “I am the image of myself… I am an Indian,” which suggested the ongoing process of searching for the sense of self and identity, which was not simply looking at a singular image in the mirror (Gerard, 1969, “The reflection of myself was in the pool”). This specular reperforming of Native identity served as a metaphor for New’s vision of Native subjects and the possibility of other ways for Native art students to be in the world.

Throughout this chapter, I have traced the ideological origins of IAIA, analyzing the contested ideological discourses of the Rockefeller Foundation and Lloyd Kiva New. My research demonstrated how the IAIA archive meticulously documents the construction of a new Indian problem in art education, inspired by the supposed stagnancy of Indian arts and crafts and the existence of Native students who were not equipped to succeed in the modern world. In the middle of the 20th century, the loss of identity and socioeconomic peril experienced by Native students was a result of the termination policies, which attempted to force assimilate Native
communities by terminating their federal status. Through a discourse analysis of the Rockefeller Foundation’s correspondence, I have shown how Charles B. Fahs worked with Lloyd Kiva New to fund the *Directions in Indian Art Conference* and the Southwestern Indian Art Project, with the hope that these new initiatives would promote development and uplift for Native art students. Art for New and the Rockefeller had the potential to thrust Native students into modern, capitalist American society. I focused on these events since they led directly to the foundation of IAIA. Further, the ideological motivations of the conference and the art program transferred into IAIA’s structure. My use of Critical Archival Methodology in this section took on two forms and mirrors the two-part structure of the chapter: discourse analysis of the Rockefeller correspondence and Lloyd Kiva New’s letters and a speculative reconstruction of the lives of Native students in the Southwest Indian Art Project. The speculative turn in the second part of the paper stemmed from the absences of student perspectives in the ideological discourses from the first section. Lloyd Kiva News teaching observations revealed the disconnect between ideology and experience. In addition to misrecognizing the students’ life experience, New also potentially omitted or overlooked the point of view of the students themselves. In other words, the omissions begged the question, who were the students outside of their position as Native students expected to modernize and uplift themselves through art? By reading into the traces of trauma and desire left in New’s observations, I speculated about who these students could have been. The questions left by the archive have persisted and will persist beyond this study. New projected upon to the students the possibilities contained in modernization of Native art. IAIA has had multiple futures: the one dreamed by its founders and the one that could unfold. This will all be contingent upon a radical centering of Native students and their visions.
Figure 8 Page from 1969 poetry book by M. Gerard Drawings and Poetry from Lloyd Kiva New's collection at the IAIA Archive, Gus Meuschke, 2019, personal photograph
CHAPTER 5: THE FAMILIAL ARCHIVE

While the previous chapters have focused on the political implications of Indigenous archives of art education, this one locates similar power dynamics within a personal, familial archive. On one level this serves to situate my positionality within my study of the archive. Furthermore, by turning toward the political and legal archive of my grandfather’s immigration trial, I wanted to make an argument that larger systems of power affect people in intimate and personal ways. Put differently, I could separate myself from my production of knowledge. Rather, who I was and the historical circumstances of my family, shaped how I approached research and the ways in which my writing refracts through the prism of my identities. For every life that appears in the sparse prose of administrative record keeping within classrooms, prisons, and institutions of enclosure, there exist stories that the archive cannot tell. These stories live within people in family stories, trauma, and memory. If they have been lost, then they are ghosts and I believe it is the ethical imperative of the researcher to conjure them.

This chapter of my thesis examined the erasures within the historical archives of Chinese American immigration and uncovers how Native identity in the case of my mixed-race grandfather was scrutinized by the legal system. In this section, I situated my own identities and experiences, so that I could articulate my relationship to Indigenous genealogies of trauma in art education. Kraehe (2015) contended that through writing about one’s stories, against the prescribed narratives of the self, one can create “counter-narratives” that “supply alternative sense-making structures” (p. 201). Furthermore, Acuff et al. (2012) asserted that marginalized identities can share their experience to dismantle master narratives told within the field of AVCE. Bey (2016) provided a self-reflexive method in AVCE whereby he articulates his own experiences in relation to community and discusses how to be self-aware about ethical concerns.
of his ethnographic research. In a similar manner, I want to examine my relationship to the Indigenous archive of boarding school trauma as someone who is both Indigenous, but also given the hybridity of my identities also an outsider to certain Native American lineages, which I will expand upon in this section.

**In Search of Our History at the National Archives**

In 2011, my twin sister Claire and I went to the National Archives for the Pacific Region-San Francisco, which is located in San Bruno, California just a couple of miles from where we grew up, to do research on our family history. Our mother is the bearer of her family’s stories and she transmitted them to us. She was the direct connection to our lineage. However, my sister and I were searching for concrete evidence of our history. Perhaps, we were reacting to a society that privileged documentation in written language over oral histories. In any case, my mother did not pressure us to do the archival research and the idea of doing the research at all seemed for her too difficult of a task emotionally. The stories she carries haunt her because they are inextricably linked to the trauma she experienced growing up with an abusive father and, also bearing the trauma she inherited from her ancestors. My sister and I were looking for proof, but we were also trying to make sense of past events that seemed fragmented by trauma. We walked into The National Archives, which was housed in a nondescript dull concrete block of a building that blended into the gray fog that lay low in the sky. We were prepared to find nothing and would not be disappointed if the archive revealed no new information. This is because we understood the extent to which violence and tragedy endured by our ancestors from our mother’s stories.
Hong On\textsuperscript{8}, as he is referred to in the archive, our grandfather became an orphan when he was only 5 years old left without parents and nothing but faint memories of a mother whose name and identity had been erased.

We were searching for information on our grandfather On Hong who we knew from our mother had been detained on Angel Island for suspicion of violating the Chinese Exclusion Act in early 20th century in San Francisco. Though we went to archives knowing we would ask about our grandfather, we had an ulterior motive hidden in our inquiry, which was to search for information about our great-grandmother an Alaska Native woman whose identity and tribal affiliation we had lost. Dan Hong,\textsuperscript{9} my grandfather's English name, told my mother growing up of his memories of his parents, his father Hong Wing was murdered in Chinatown and his mother the Alaska Native woman died of poverty. Dan was sent to an orphanage, a Catholic Mission, in Oakland and later moved with distant relatives to Hong Kong. When he returned to San Francisco when he was 17 in 1912, he was detained by immigration authorities for suspicion of being a non-citizen and held on Angel Island. One can visit Angel Island today and see the barrack-like structures where the Chinese immigrants were held and see the poetry they carved into the wooden walls, expressing their grief, frustration, and anger of being detained. These were the stories that mother passed down to us from her father and the only vestige of our lineage and our great-grandmother that we had. My sister and I had a certain hunger for official confirmation of our grandfather’s stories, wanting more than the ghosts we inherited. We entered the National Archive dubious that we would find anything and with an attachment to the idea that physical proof was necessary of our family lineage.

\textsuperscript{8} With Chinese names the surname (Hong) is placed before the first name (On). I later refer to him as On Hong, using English name order

\textsuperscript{9} I use my grandfather’s English name Dan because that is how my mother referred to him when telling me stories about him
In the archives, we spoke to an employee, an assistant archivist who took the information from our mother that we could obtain: our grandfather’s name Hong On, his birthdate, and the years that he left the United States for China and our best guess of the dates that he returned to the U.S. We know from our mother that he had been detained in Angel Island, just off the coast from San Francisco, for an immigration trial, even though he was born in the U.S. and a citizen. This piece of information led us to believe that maybe there was a record of these proceedings. Our mother told us that her father told her that the detained Chinese immigrants carved poetry into the walls of the detention building and covered the austere wooden surfaces with calligraphy. We would later see these engravings and try to imagine what it was like to be there, detained, over 100 years ago. These inherited memories busied our minds as the archivist gazed at the microfilm records, using technology neither of us had ever seen before in our lives. In what seemed like not a very long time, the archivist said, “I found something.” I thought that she must be skilled at her job and she retrieved the information with ease. There existed a whole catalogue of organized information about the lives of Chinese immigrants, manifesting the efficiency of the information gathering institutions, especially when concerning the lives of people who needed to be managed and controlled. White Americans considered Chinese immigrants to be a foreign threat. Xenophobic discourse even depicted Chinese people as vectors of disease and contagion Shah (2001). In my grandfather’s case, the immigration officials treated him with further suspicion because he was Native, half belonging to the peoples that through settler colonial expansion white people wanted to replace, exterminate, displace, and erase. The archivist hurried away to a different room and then brought back with her a paper file, which she happily opened for us to reveal a photograph of Hong On staring back at us. For a moment, the pain and memories of trauma subsided, and my sister and I felt a sense of awe at the beauty of
recovering something tangible from the archive. Within our grandfather’s immigration archive, we found a record that our Alaska Native great-grandmother existed and began our task of attempting to recover our erased Indigenous ancestors.

Our Great-grandmother, Hong Mon See Shee

We had only heard stories about our great-grandmother. Finding information about her in the archive was significant and haunting. In the birth certificate on the fourth line down from the top (Figure 1), there existed the absent presence of my great-grandmother who is listed as “Unknown (Indian)” (“Immigration File and Certificate of Identity: Hong, On,” 1912, p. 3) and later on in the document as “an Indian woman” (“Immigration File and Certificate of Identity: Hong, On,” 1912, p. 10) There are descriptions of her that mentioned her existence, but erased any trace of her identity, her culture, her name. The document merely made note of her existence and identified her in relation to her husband Hong Wing. In the stenographic account of the legal proceedings of my grandfather’s immigration trial (Figures 2 and 3), when my grandfather was interrogated about his citizenship status while being detained, Hong On responded to the question of the immigration inspector “What is your mother’s name?” and he replied “She is an Indian,” and then said that she dies (“Immigration File and Certificate of Identity: Hong, On,” 1912, p 28). In the context of my grandfather’s detention, perhaps in order to survive the experience of being policed and questioned, he deflected suspicions about his mixed-race answers with short responses. Throughout the documents there were letters from immigration officials attempting to identify Hong On’s mother, treating her erasure (presence as “Unknown (Indian)” as an anomaly, something that made his file suspicious (“Immigration File and Certificate of Identity: Hong, On,” 1912, p. 3). This to me is ironic because, ultimately, she was
killed and erased by settler colonial violence, yet it was the white settler immigration officials who sought to identify and make sense of her.

Figure 9 Photocopy from the National Archives in San Bruno California, My grandfather On "Dan" Hong's birth certificate as part of his Immigration file 1912
UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION SERVICE
CHINISE DIVISION
ANGEL ISLAND, CAL., AUGUST 2, 1912

No. 335, HONG ON
Native (Vinaad)
Ex. S. Korea, 7-15-12

Repr. .... C. R. Rice
Tesor. .... Chris Jack
Steno. .... F. E. Field

STATEMENT OF APPELLANT
---------------------------------
Applicant speaks Sam Yup dialect - Interpreter speaks Sec
Vip dialect originally, qualified in Sam Yup

--- 000 ---

Q. What is your name? A. Hong On; Hong On Lung; no other name; not married
Q. How old are you? A. 17
Q. When were you born? A. K. S. 21-2-26, in San Francisco, 33 Ross Alley
Q. Who told you that? A. My grandmother told me
Q. Have you any documentary evidence to produce in support of that statement?
A. I don't know; I have no anything
Q. What is your father's name? A. Hong Peak Wing; I don't know his marriage name
Q. Did you ever hear him called by any other name at all? A. No
Q. Do you know what his milk name was? A. This is his milk name
Q. Where is your father now? A. He died
Q. When and how? A. K. S. 25 - Sullivan Alley
Q. What caused his death? A. I don't know, but he had been sick I don't know how long
Q. Didn't you ever hear what caused your father's death? A. No
Q. What is your mother's name? A. She is an Indian
Q. Where is she? A. She died
Q. When and where? A. K. S. 25 also in San Francisco, I don't know the address
Q. How long have you lived in San Francisco? A. I departed from China K. S. 26,
I was born in K. S. 21; I have stayed in China until now
Q. What were you doing while you were living in San Francisco? A. Nothing, never went to school in San Francisco
Q. With whom did you live while you were in San Francisco? A. Brother of my grandmother, Ng Wing, also known as Ng Sik Huang
Q. Where did you live with him? A. 6th street, Oakland, I don't remember the number
Q. Do you know how long you lived with him? A. I don't remember how long - ever since my parents died
Q. Who took you to China? A. My uncle, Ng Wing
Q. Have you lived with him all the while since you were in China? A. No, I was living with my paternal grandmother, Ng Wing returned to the U. S.
Q. What is your paternal grandmother's name? A. Ng Shoe
Q. Have you any brothers or sisters? A. No brothers, two sisters, one died
Q. and one is married
Q. What was the name of the sister that died? A. Hong Jung So
Q. Didn't you ever hear that you had had a brother? A. I never heard about it
Q. Your sister, Jung Cty, says that you had a brother who was given away by
your mother in his infancy? A. I never heard about it
No. 135, Korea, 7-15-12
STATEMENT OF APPLICANT - 1 2

Q. Do you remember at what address you lived with Ng Wing in San Francisco? A. No, I don't know.
Q. Then how do you know you lived with him? A. He took me to China. I went to him after my parents died.
Q. Don't you remember anything about the place where he lived? A. To my best recollection it was on the 2d floor over So Chung & Co., Dupont Street.
Q. Do you remember any of the other streets of Chinatown, San Francisco? A. I could not remember such a long time.
Q. Do you remember any important events that happened when you were living in San Francisco? A. Nothing.
Q. Do you know where your sister Jung Ho died? A. No.
Q. What was your father's business? A. I don't know, he died when I was only 5 years old.
Q. In what village did you live while you were in China? A. Moy Chun village, Now Gong, Nam Hoy district.
Q. Did your sister write to you any while you were in China? A. No.
Q. Did you write to her any? A. Yes, I wrote to her before I came.
Q. What have you been doing in China? A. Student.

Note (Identifies all photographs)
Q. Have you anything further to state? A. No.
Q. Have you understood the interpreter? A. Yes.

Signed:

8-6-12

Figure 11 Photocopy from the National Archives in San Bruno, California My grandfather's immigration trial transcript from 1912 2/2
Hong On’s Trauma and Mixed-Race Identity

While in the archive, we found the complete legal proceedings of my grandfather, listed as his Chinese name Hong On. This dossier included a transcription of my grandfather’s trial, the correspondence between immigration officials, clerks, and Chinese interpreters, and Hong On’s birth certificate. After combing through the trial transcripts, it became clear that the central issue in the legal proceedings is that my grandfather’s identity was deemed suspect because of his mixed-race identity and their inability to verify or understand the life of my great-grandmother. She was repeatedly referred to as the “alleged mother” and the immigration inspectors did not believe her existence even when they went as far to ascertain the location of her grave from Chinese record keepers from the institutions created in Chinatown by Chinese immigrants (“Immigration File and Certificate of Identity: Hong, On,” 1912, p. 4). Suspicious of the Chinese records and organizations, the immigration officials could not prove the existence of the alleged mother even when presented with her grave and her name, Mon See Shee. She was referred to as the “Indian woman” or just “Indian” and “the alleged mother.” As my grandfather’s sister was being interrogated about their mother, her responded using few words, describing her only as “Indian” and “Died.” Curt refusals permeated the legal interrogations like “I don’t know” and I read into those refusals the desire for Chinese to deny the state access to their inner lives.

The archive provided concrete proof of my grandfather’s stories, but in some ways created more questions than answers. The legal documents are haunted by the erasure of my great-grandmother and Hong On’s mixed Alaska Native Chinese identity. I cannot help, but to still feel a sense of loss about this part of my history and identity. I think it is important to

---

10 Immigration documents from 1912 for Hong On from the National Archives in San Bruno, California
contextualize this erasure as a product of settler colonial violence and the racist anti-immigrant sentiment in American society during the early part of my grandfather’s life. I also wonder how much of his mixed identity he buried within himself to prevent Chinese people from rejecting him. He told my mother that in Chinatown people called him “Injun On” pejoratively and that to them he was not fully a part of their community. Yet, he had no real connection to Alaska Native culture and was dislocated from it to the point where we as his descendants are still searching. There are no definitive answers. The political definition of indigeneity locates indigenous identity in political relationship to land and nationhood. I must acknowledge that to many in Native studies Native communities have sovereignty to decide who belongs outside of biological definitions of race and standards of blood quantum. Under these definitions, I am not Indigenous, since I have lost connection to Indigenous communities. This is fair, but I also believe that there needs to be space for those who have been disconnected through historical violence. I feel a strong obligation to do justice to my ancestors and learn as much as possible about them. I am willing to accept that I am descended from Indigenous people even if that means not taking up the political identity of Indigenous. Even while having an identity that is uncertain or yet to be defined, I can support Indigenous communities political fight for sovereignty and self-determination. I have ambivalent feelings about my identity. I want to acknowledge the privileges I had growing up in an urban environment and being read as mixed and mostly Chinese/White. My experiences are very different from Natives growing up on their land or on reservations and people who are fighting to preserve their culture and protect their sovereignty and land. I have a desire to learn about the struggles of Native people and think about ways to fight anti-Native racism and settler colonialism. I also want there to be space for mixed-race Native people to understand themselves and see their experiences as valid.
My grandfather never experienced the trauma of being a boarding school student in federally run residential schools and his experiences being mixed demonstrate how the entanglement of anti-Chinese xenophobia and settler colonialism impacted his life. He went to an orphanage after his parents died, was converted to Catholicism, and experienced dislocation. There are resonances between his experience and the boarding schools, even though they are distinct. Doing this archival work with my sister had a profound impact on my life. I think it inspired me to continue to work in archives and employ genealogical tools, looking for what the official record omits/ignores as much as what it says. I have a lot of frustration about the erasure of my great grandmother, the loss of tribal identity in my family, but I also need to contextualize my experiences with contemporary Native politics. Native people today face ongoing settler colonial violence, attempts to destroy their land, lack of access to clean water. My family history and identity issues are important to me, but I think it’s necessary for me to think about the larger issues that Indigenous people face in my research. I suppose finding a balance between working through my own experiences and being critical about the privileges I have, what I might be ignoring because of those privileges, and thinking about the most pressing issues that contemporary Native people face.
On Photography

There were only two photographs in Hong On’s immigration trial documents, the first on his birth certificate when he was around 5 years old and the second taken when he was 17 years old and detained at Angel Island. Figure 5 shows a copy of the birth certificate included in the immigration file with a photograph of Hong On when he was 5 years old. This photo is haunting
and striking because it shows our grandfather after the death of his parents. He looks so vulnerable and afraid, incapable of processing the events in his life, being moved across the world and then back to San Francisco as a result of trauma and then being detained and interrogated about his citizenship. Figure 6 shows the portrait of Hong On captured by immigration officials as he was detained, interrogated, and dehumanized. Between the two photographs, there existed an almost unfathomable endurance of trauma. The man who would become Dan Hong, my mother’s father, experienced the death of his parents, relocation, and subjection to the violence of the U.S. state. This man, my grandfather, would grow up to be an alcoholic and an abuser. The photograph traced the psychological destruction of Dan Hong whose life and actions caused my family so much pain. When I tried to understand the violence enacted upon my grandfather, I could not separate this archive from the violence enacted by him upon my family.

Roland Barthes (1981) in *Camera Lucida* discussed the relationship between time and death in photography. He argued that the image of a person who has passed away creates a wound in the person viewing the photograph that he described as a “catastrophe” (p. 96). Referring to the photographer of a prisoner waiting to be executed, Barthes (1981) wrote, “But the punctum [wound] is: he is going to die. I read at the same time: This will be and this has been; I observe with horror an anterior future of which death is the stake” (p. 96), which put simply means that the image shows a person to viewer who is present in the photograph, someone who will die in the future, but who the viewer knows is already dead. The photograph uses the strange tense of the anterior future or the future perfect, which in grammar indicates not just what will be (the future) what will have occurred. When I saw the photograph of my grandfather, I saw him as a child staring back at the camera over a century ago with fear in his
eyes, unsure of his fate barely able to process the events occurring in his life at the time. His future uncertainty was frozen in the photograph (what will become of him?) At the same time, I saw Dan Hong, and the events of his life that have already happened, a man who married my grandmother Shirley a woman over 20 years younger than him who entered an arranged marriage to allow her to flee her the aftermath of the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong during World War II where she starved and saw babies murdered. I saw in the childhood photograph of my grandfather a man who became an alcoholic and a violent abuser. I confronted the strangeness of witnessing for the first time in the photograph my grandfather as a child, the shock of which almost tricked me into forgetting all of the events that I know will occur in his life and instead just saw a terrified child whose future is uncertain.

**Searching for the “Alleged Mother”**

I know much more about my grandfather than I do about my great-grandmother. A central motivation for me in processing my grandfather’s archive and working through the familial trauma is to try to access the identity of Hong Mon See Shee. My project takes as its central problem the refusal for the official record and archive of my grandfather’s immigration to acknowledge the existence of my Alaska Native great-grandmother Mon See Shee and the subsequent repetition of her disappearance through the disqualification of Chinese records and knowledge. My project desires to illuminate the violence contained in the official record, showing the state’s interrogation of my grandfather as a suspicious, unintelligible mixed-race Chinese foreign threat and the impossibility of verifying his alleged mother, and to put pressure on this archive by stripping it, cutting it, rearranging it, erasing it, and repurposing it to envision who Mon See Shee might have been and refusing the terms of her negation in the archive. In this
process, I have learned that the state in its copious and meticulous record keeping maintains the archive of its violence, which is inseparable from the ongoing settler colonial violence and attempts to erase Native people. My desire is no longer to ask the official archive to present to me what it cannot, which is the account of my great-grandmother’s life as a person. The problem as I see it is to imagine an otherwise to these genocidal records, not one that erases the violence of the past, but refuses to participate in the reproduction of settler colonial subjection and in term speculatively reconstructs the interiority of Mon See Shee and the countless figures like her.

Hong Mon See Shee was mentioned over fifty times in the immigration trial proceedings. She was omnipresent, haunting the document, even as the state immigration official narrated the terms of her disappearance (see figure 6 for all the instances of her being mentioned or named). The immigration inspectors named her often as “the alleged mother,” highlighting how they cannot acknowledge her existence, since she does not appear in San Francisco death records (“Immigration File and Certificate of Identity: Hong, On,” 1912, p. 4). Death permeated the discourses surrounding her as the state named her death while simultaneously relegating her to the oblivion of being unknown and unverifiable. Even when Chinese record keepers and graveyard workers presented to the state officials her grave and records of her death, they refused to acknowledge her existence. I must call attention to ways in which the immigration official obsessed over verifying her identity, treating her Indigenous identity as an anomaly. The irony was that the state invested in erasing Indigenous people and did not care to make death records for them. In the trial, the immigration official used her as a mechanism to disqualify the identity of the grandfather and to mount a case against him to prove that he is indeed not a citizen of the United States. Every measure is taken to try to prove that Hong On had false documents and that his narrative about who he was and where he came from was false.
What do I make of the constant naming and narrating of my great-grandmother’s appearance and disappearance in these archival materials? The archive did not satiate my hunger for knowing who Mon See Shee was or where she came from. It did not articulate the community she was born into and the people who claimed her as kin. These documents exhumed the dead identity of great-grandmother and made manifest the loss of identity that haunts my family today. It was not all lost. To have her name is significant, for to be a person means having a proper name. At minimum the archival presence of her proper name signifies the possibility that Mon See Shee was a person whose life was more than the sum of fifty misnaming in an immigration archive. I dream often about who she might have been. I imagine what it must have been like to leave her ancestral lands and to travel with a Chinese man Hong Wing to a city thousands of miles away. Mon See Shee probably did not speak English and before her death must have learned some Cantonese. After her husband Hong Wing was murdered in Chinatown, she was left alone to care for my grandfather and his siblings. This left my great-grandmother to face extreme poverty and vulnerability. As the immigration archive mentioned, she tried to enter a women’s shelter, a Christian women’s home, but was denied because she had children who were male. She died of being poor. She died trying to save her children from starvation. These are the speculative imaginings I have constructed from family stories, newspapers, and what exists in the immigration archive. This is all I have of her and I long to know more.

This project is for people whose histories have been erased by settler colonial disposessions and for those who feel bereft of knowing who their ancestors were. It is also a project of multi-racial and Indigenous people who wish to engage in genealogical work but reject the bio-genetic and bio-essentialist notions of race and lineage. I think many people especially racialized people feel a disconnect between their stories that narrate their kinship and history vs.
what the historical record says (or doesn’t say) about who they are. My thesis offers a mode for refusing the terms of the official record and providing agency to those wishing to do similar personal archival work. I hope that my study offers a mode of confronting erasure and living with ghosts. My archive approach refuses the notion that I am nothing because history has attempted to expunge the identities of Indigenous people and of Chinese immigrants. I hold onto the traces of my ancestors who I found in the gaps within the archive, and who I conjured through my speculative visions and ceremonies for those who are gone.

“our mortuary records fail to show the death of the alleged mother”

“the name of the mother, whom, it is claimed was an Indian, was not known to the applicants or the witnesses”

“Interpreter McClymot, however was taken to the cemetery near Colma, where a headboard was pointed out to him containing the name of a woman interred there, which it was alleged was the applicant’s mother”

“it was placed there at about the time it is said the alleged mother died”

“The name of this headboard is not contained in our mortuary records, but it would seem that the grave itself is the best evidence of the death of the woman” (4)

“There is no record of any female dying” (5)
“there is no testimony in this case that the applicant, his sister, or his witness have every claimed that Hong Mon See Shee was the mother of applicant.”

“for verification of death of alleged mother”

“They called her ‘Jew’” (7)

“The death of Hong Mon See Shee, female”

“The alleged mother” (8)

“grave of the alleged mother” (9)

“The name on the heard board is ‘Hong Mon See Shee’”

“an Indian woman having been buried” (10)

“Verification of the death of the alleged mother cannot be made on account of the inability of the witnesses to give sufficient data for an intelligent search”

“The grave of the alleged mother” (12)

“verification of death of alleged mother”
“witnesses failed to remember her name” (13)

“the alleged mother”

“the alleged mother” (14)

“this Association does not make a record of the names of females”

“the alleged mother was an Indian woman”

“the alleged mother”

“It would same rather unusual if the alleged mother was interred in the Chinese cemetery”

“alleged mother” (19)

“he can also point out the mother’s grave if necessary” (23)

“the latter having been an Indian woman” (25)

(Interrogation of my grandfather, Hong On)

Q What is your mother’s name?
**A She is an Indian**

Q Where is she?

A She died (28)

“This alleged mother was an Indian woman, name unknown, tho [sic] the Chinese sometimes called her ‘Jew.’ She died at the age of 40 on Gibson alley, off Sacramento St., above Stockton St., cause of death unknown—she had been sick a long time; was also buried in Nam Hoy cemetery; date of death: KS 25-2” (30)

“The boy’s mother died when he was 4 or 5” (33)

Where did this boy’s mother die?”

Q What was the cause of her death

A Sickness for half a year

Q What was her name and nationality?

A I don’t know her name; she was an Indian woman; we called her Jew”

“The mother at the time of her death”

“left by his mother in some mission” (34)

Interrogation of Hong Jung Oy (Edith Hong) the alleged sister

“Q What is your mother’s name?”

A I don’t know
Q What was her nationality?
A Indian

Q Where is she now?
A Died

Q When and where?
A I don’t know when; on the alley where the Methodist mission home was

Q How old were you when your mother died?
A I don’t remember” (35)

A My mother told me (36)

“My mother and children went to the mission home several times; the last time my mother had to take the baby out” (37)

Second interrogation of Hong On

“Q What nationality was your mother?
A An Indian” (38)
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

Returning to the Research Questions and Problems

There are few histories written about Native Americans in education and only a handful exist in my field and many of them are dated (e.g., Eldridge, 2001; White, 2001). Compounding this gap in knowledge is the fact that most historians of art education are retiring, which has created a crisis in the field of art and visual culture education. The central research question guiding my thesis research was, What does the history of trauma in Native American boarding school education teach us about the structural inequities experienced by Native Americans today within the education system and how can the discipline of art and visual culture education account for this history in curriculum and teaching practices. A secondary question building from the first was, How have educational institutions such as the IAIA in the time since the boarding school era transformed Native American art and visual culture education to counteract the traumas of the past and empower Native students to intervene in those histories through culturally relevant arts practice and pedagogy that addresses pressing social and political experiences of contemporary Native people?

The research problem that has guided my thesis is, why has AVCE as a field ignored and erased the experiences of Indigenous people? Further, in various iterations of the historical narratives of the field’s emergence, why do researchers perform this historical erasure of Indigenous people? Returning to these questions, I want to highlight that erasure and avoidance are not equivalent to Native absence. Instead, they are crucial settler colonial machinations that allow systems of knowledge to produce the illusion that American society is created by dispossessing Native people of their land and their sovereignty.
Land Acknowledgements and Decolonial Praxis

Land acknowledgments are an example of the kinds of gestures that seek to intervene in this illusion. Such an acknowledgement often includes naming the Indigenous people whose land and institution resides upon, for example The University of Arizona resides on the ancestral lands of the Tohono O’odham people. Some land acknowledgments include more critical statements about ongoing settler colonial violence against Indigenous people, while others seem to be rote and performed out of obligation (Tuck & Yang, 2012; Robinson et. al, 2019). However perfunctory they may seem in some sectors of academia, serve the critical purpose of reminding people whose Indigenous land we stand upon and what sense of ethical obligation they have toward those peoples. Of course, acknowledgement should also be accompanied by action. I believe the parallel to land acknowledgments and accompanying actions is that art and visual culture education must contest the genocidal, anti-Indigenous terms by which historical and archival methods have existed in the field. In this study, I have argued for a decolonial praxis in art education that centers the lives of Native people in AVCE historiography and pedagogy. To center Native people, AVCE would need to construct a genealogy of Native art education by examining the boarding school period and the foundation of IAIA. Throughout my thesis, I have argued for a critical revaluation of archival research because of the way in which institutions construct historical knowledge to make absent Indigenous peoples.

Summary of Findings

Chapter 4: The IAIA Archive

My dual-site study looked at two archives, one focusing on the formation of IAIA and the other on my own positionality through the material record of my grandfather’s immigration trial.
Within Chapter 4, I situated the development of IAIA in the context of the boarding school era trauma, termination policy, and the Rockefeller’s Cold War agenda to develop and modernize Indigenous people through funding the arts. I traced the inception of IAIA through the Rockefeller funded Southwestern Indian Art Project and dissected the ideological and discursive debates on Indian art education, which propelled the funding of the new institution. All actors both Native and non-Native involved in the early stages of IAIA’s development argued that Native students must, through education, be brought into the modern world. Nothing would be funded unless it adhered to the development project of the Rockefeller foundation, which sought to spread the influence of American democratic ideals during the Cold War by “helping” those living in underdeveloped societies. Although never used, “primitive” is the word that lacking in development appears to signify. This project of uplift contained in the ideology of the Rockefeller sponsored Southwestern Indian Art Project relied on a colonial vision of the world that views Indigenous peoples as being not as advanced or evolved.

Lloyd Kiva New, the first president of IAIA, sought to reconcile the demands of modernization with a desire to nurture the traditions of Native Americans. New wanted students to adapt to the exigencies of modern American capitalist society, while still respecting their ancestors and allowing their cultures to survive genocide. The discourses surrounding what should be the best art education system show the ideological demands to uplift Native students, but do not take into consideration the desires, thoughts, and life experiences of Native students. Even New, when observing his students, placed upon them an ideological gaze and demanded that they make art according to certain standards. Doing so in the name of uplift, he overlooked the complexity of their whole beings, their life stories, and their desires for art.
Chapter 5: The Familial Archive

Chapter 5 recorded the archive of my grandfather’s immigration trial and the erasure of my great-grandmother. This chapter juxtaposed the violent legal archive with the intergenerational trauma experiences in my family. One of my central aims was to locate my own relationship to Indigenous archives and situate my positionality. However, my focus on my grandfather’s immigration trial was not a bracketed positionality statement that exists separate from the knowledge created in this thesis. Rather, I presented my personal relationship to archival materials as inseparable from my work on the archives of Native art education. In the process of disentangling the workings of settler colonial power with historical archives, I wanted to show how radically contingent the production of historical knowledge is. What the reader sees as given or true becomes uncertain in the light of erasures and silences. My Alaska Native great-grandmother, who was named Mon See Shee, was mentioned over fifty times by the immigration officials as they attempted to disqualify her existence, saying there was no official record of her death or life. The immigration transcript produced a haunting iteration of my great-grandmother’s appearance and disappearance. Even as the state enacted the violence of their language, saying she could not be verified, the Chinese community testified to her existence, pointed to her grave, named her, showed the officials the records they had in their own language, and contested Mon See Shee’s total negation. There, between the legal discourse in the archive, she continues to lie suspended, in the present tense, as I continued to search for her and find language for her being. This material record of Indigenous erasure is intimate to my life story and subject formation. By turning to the trauma of my grandfather’s detention and immigration trial, I gave flesh to my speculative archival method and illuminated how intertwined I am with my thesis’s production of knowledge.
The Archives in Conversation

The two archives were intertwined. As I have stated, the familial archive was not just my positionality statement. My approach to both archives involved calling into question the terms upon which settler colonial records have come into being. Through the process of doing archival research at the both sites in tandem, my research questions became more developed. My thinking made connections across time and space, making historical linkages about settler colonial power and the production of archive knowledge. In other words, my study examined the questions: 1) how was it possible that art education institutions were built based on discourses of modernization and uplift, with the notable absent account of Indigenous student desire? 2) what does my grandfather’s immigration records reveal about the state’s discursive investment in disqualifying and expunging the existence of my great-grandmother? In both archives, I searched for ghosts and my thesis’s findings highlight the ways in which, through critically speculating about the gaps within the archive, I might imagine alternative possibilities for the personhood of Indigenous people subjected to state violence. From a theoretical and epistemological perspective, my approach to both archives began from the spaces created by disappearance.

I must acknowledge, nonetheless, that the archives originated from vastly different historical contexts, geographic locations, and social institutions. These differences enriched my study and provided specificity to my critical approach to the archive. In other words, I am invested in examining the archives at the micro level. Micro here refers not just to the smallness of geographic scale, but akin to what Foucault (1977) in Discipline and Punish calls the “micro-physics of power” (p. 26). This term is what he uses to describe how institutions develop complex strategies for disciplining the bodies of prisoners, to make them docile and malleable, by devising administrative rules, using a network of relations between actors. Put another way, what
Foucault argues is that power operates in infinitesimal ways within institutions, through shifting relationships and networks, and that our analysis of power should not just consider the prohibitions of the law enforced by violence. Therefore, when analyzing the micro level of power dynamics within both archives, I hoped to convey the openness of experiences not captured by the official ideological discourses. The particularities of each archive and the social institutions they represent manifest the specific power relationships at the micro level, contingent upon the individual actors, even as they are embedded within larger systems.

In the IAIA archive, Lloyd Kiva New crafted pedagogical and disciplinary language around his students based on his desire to uplift them and to have them represented. Yet, his own account revealed small moments of discursive slippage where the possibility for other interpretations, beyond being disobedient students, of who the students were and what they could have desired emerge. At the micro level within my grandfather’s immigration trial, there existed small moments of contestation where the Chinese being interrogated refused to accept the narrative that Mon See Shee did not exist and in short responses, in repetition, left open the possibility to imagine who she might have been.

The two archives documented the material vestiges of institutions that I, throughout my findings, describe as spaces of enclosure. The verbiage of enclosure originates from Foucault’s (1977) genealogy of disciplinary institutions and the ways in which prisons, classrooms, asylums, and hospitals spatially organize themselves to discipline the bodies of different subjects. It also draws heavily from Hartman’s (2019) necessary intervention in historical genealogies, which posits that the spaces of enclosure and racial segregation terror for Black subjects in the afterlives of slavery are unique from other disciplinary institutions because of the driving forces of racial terror and anti-Black subjection.
The racial and colonial dimensions of spatial enclosures were the focus of my archival inquiry. The modern classroom as a public institution for those unaware of Indigenous history perhaps has neutral or even sentimental connotations. The classroom in the context of boarding school education is more akin to a detention center. Violent cultural assimilation organized the federal boarding school system and the purpose of education was to eliminate any traces of savagery and Indigeneity. Moreover, that is why in my study the comparison between art education classroom and immigration detention center was not so stark. Even as Lloyd Kiva New and the Rockefeller Foundation reformed and reorganized the disciplinary institution of Indian education, they were always haunted by the violence of the federal boarding school era. The federal boarding schools began with the Carlisle Indian Industrial School founded in 1879 and the days of the most stringent, violent cultural assimilation existed until reforms starting in the 1920s (Lomawaima & McCarty. 2006). However, although the institutions had changed quite a bit since the 19th century, there were Federal Indian schools in existence when New and the Rockefeller Foundation laid the foundations for IAIA.

My suspicion about the driving ideological forces behind modernizing Native art students came from this omnipresent ghost of cultural assimilation. This is not to say that there were not critical differences between IAIA and the immigration holding center of Angel Island, where my grandfather On Hong was detained under the suspicion that he had violated the Chinese Exclusion Act. Immigration detention centers of course commanded the force of law and had the ability to commit violence against people whose status as non-citizens or questioned citizenship status, suspended any fictions of human protection included in U.S. law and policy. Nonetheless, I should note the status of Indigeneity provoked the immigration officials to ramp up their interrogation tactics against my grandfather and used his mixed-race status to call into
question the validity and truth of his personhood. Whether in education or immigration, the settler state has long been invested in policing, managing, and eradicating Native presence. This anti-Indigenous force is the through line that connects both institutions from separative archives and from different times.

There was a productive point of disjuncture between the two archives in relation to my identity. I have stated throughout the study that my positionality reflected in my discussion of my grandfather’s immigration archive should be intertwined with the rest of the study and not seen as separate. However, there was something qualitatively different about studying my grandfather’s archive, which is intimately tied to memory both personal and ancestral, and trauma. As a result, I think it is okay that the autoethnographic study of the archive had a different texture in my study. The narrative forms in that chapter moved between theory and first-person experience. Without even being aware of it, I think my writing of chapter 5 was suffused with affect in a way that is distinct from chapter 4. However, I believe that throughout the study I was personally invested in looking for erasure and absence within the archive. In a certain sense, following Hartman (2019), I know there is risk of projecting onto the absences within the archive in wanting the record to show what it refuses to. For example, in New’s teaching observations, I saw glimpses of the Native students’ first-person narratives. I was particularly haunted by Mary Morez, a Diné student, who was adopted into a non-Indian family because of implied trauma and abuse in her history. There is so much that is unknown about who she was and the pain that she endured. Also, what remains open is what art making did for her and how she might have reconnected with her culture. Speculation here was tricky and fraught with my projections and desires as a researcher. The desire is akin to the one I felt when searching for Mon See Shee, my great-grandmother, wanting her to be more than as the
immigration officials designated her an unverifiable being. She represents the outside or the impossible limit of the archive. The fullness of her life will never appear and cannot be recovered, yet she was, she existed. My project flourished within the spaces of ontological uncertainty. I want Indigenous people and those subjected to the worse of colonization to be more than the violence that was inflicted upon them.

**Responding to and Critiquing the Literature**

The findings in Chapters 4 and 5 built upon the existing literature calling for an Indigenous-centered historiographical revaluation of AVCE scholarship and refutes the dominant historical paradigms found in research on the history of art education. Lentis’ (2017) research opened the door for my project and illuminated the glaring absence of Indigenous perspectives in the history of AVCE. The position of Lentis (2017) is technically “outside” of AVCE in Native American studies. Even if AVCE has porous and flexible boundaries between the multiple disciplines within the field, it has a dearth of Indigenous scholars, especially those who are interested in challenging the colonial architecture of historical narratives within the field. Lentis’ (2017) monograph begins the work of calling into question the Eurocentric histories crafted by leading historians in the field Efland (1990), Brown and Korzenik (1993), and Stankiewicz (2001). Their work, when not completely ignoring Indigenous experiences and the boarding school era, discusses race and indigeneity as ancillary components to the larger history of art education, which discusses Rousseau’s Enlightenment legacy and examines Industrial Drawing in schools in America during the 19th century. Furthermore, building on the work of Ballengee-Morris and Staikidis (2017), my thesis contended that AVCE also ignores Indigenous knowledge and worldviews as legitimate. My thesis extended Lentis’ (2017) project of illuminating absent
histories in AVCE and builds a critical repertoire to deconstruct how settler colonial historical knowledge undergirds the field in the first place.

The IAIA archive illuminated understudied historical research, but my research on it focused on the absences created by the ideological discourses centered in the archive and which forged the institution based on promises of uplift and modernization. Courtney Elkin Mohler (Santa Barbara Chumash) (2017), when discussing classroom pedagogy and teaching about Native American history in AVCE, stated that she stresses to her students the difference between history and historiography (p. 93). My thesis extended her pedagogical practice of teaching students that history does not necessarily equal fact. Within my analysis of both archives, I identified the manifold ways in which the discourse contained within the IAIA correspondence and my grandfather’s immigration trial transcript attempted to construct truth and knowledge through erasing Native people. The state was invested in disappearing my great-grandmother because it needed to eliminate any trace of the original people to attempt to naturalize the presence of settlers. The social world of the 1950s and 60s in America did not know what to do with the “Indian problem” and the presence of wayward, displaced Native subjects. My work on the IAIA archive is in conversation with Povinelli’s (2011) theorizing on the settler governance of the social ills of Indigenous people, which always abandons Indigenous life, since the state can only regulate or discipline the original people of the land whose dispossession is the foundation of the settler state itself. The Rockefeller’s ideological disposition toward development produced outliers in Native American art education, since it only wanted to develop and resuscitate Native youth deemed to be pathological to reify American settler society and its claim to be civilized. There is no escaping the political battles, which have laid the ground for the creation of settler colonial history. In the absence of decolonization, settler knowledge
production will always disavow rebellious Indigenous subjects who live and practice freedom. However, Native peoples persist and survive their erasure in historical narratives and their attempted elimination through genocide.

Methodological Recommendations

My study opened new possibilities for historical methods used in AVCE. Through my sustained engagement with the work of Saidiya Hartman, I interrogated the constructions of archives through racialized violence and epistemic violence they commit upon people whose subjecthood is negated. Hartman (1997; 2007; 2019), in her three monographs developed questions surrounding the ethical implications of doing research on Black subjects when the archives themselves commit anti-Black violence, through recording ledgers of property and dehumanizing subjection. In her recent work, Hartman (2019) put into practice the method she described as critical fabulation (Hartman, 2008), or speculative narratives about who Black women in the archive might have been. Throughout my thesis I leaned toward the speculative and used fabulation to stretch the archives to their limits, showing where there were erasures and speculating about the possibilities of Native agency and desire. By crafting a critical archival method inspired by Hartman, I offer to historical scholars in AVCE methods for critically examining the limitations of historical archives in the context of structures of power and producing creative, speculative narratives about what lives within the absences.

To me it seems intuitive that scholars of history in AVCE would be amenable to critical fabulation and speculation, especially considering arts-based research within the field. Yet, AVCE historical research relies heavily on the epistemological constraints of history as a discipline, limiting knowledge to what exists in the material record, passing the burden of proof
for having ontological certitude. My suggestions for researchers interested in marginalized histories, especially with Indigenous and Black identities, is that they commit to becoming undisciplined in their approach to archival research. What I mean by this is to allow researchers to betray the violent terms upon which archives originated, refusing to see settler colonial and anti-Black erasures as the end point. There is so much power in refusing to say that one’s ancestors are not just defined by the violence enacted upon them, that it eclipses their whole being. Speculative archival praxis allows the researcher to imagine personhood when the archive excludes it.

This methodological shift is not just a resource for researchers working in the history of art education. History and the present social problems are inseparable. By looking backward and searching for agentic practices of freedom within the archive, the art educator can in turn, envision teaching practice that approaches justice and centers itself in the demands of Indigenous social life. Histories live within the people whose lives are directly affected by settler colonial violence. My excavation of my grandfather’s immigration trial shows how intimately present the trauma of immigration detention lives on in my life and through my family.

**Implications for Art Education Curriculum**

Art educators when designing curriculum can take into account the implications of my study in a couple of ways. First, through critically examining the violence embedded in historical knowledge production, art educators can construct decolonial curricula that actively fight Native erasures and centers the lives of Native people in the present. Second, art educators can incorporate critical archival practice in the art curriculum, which might ask students to do creative work on familial archives or archives related to the formation of racialized identities. A
pedagogy based on my critical archival research may empower students to pose problems about the ways in which historical narratives erase their identities and deny them access to the lives of their ancestors. Rather than accepting dominant historical truths, Black and Indigenous students through critical archival art practice could imagine alternative narratives that center their lives and their experiences.

**On the Subjectivity of Children**

To conclude, I want to focus on the implications that my study has on the study of children and youth artistic development in our field. One problem that circulates through my work is the violent refusal for art education institutions to consider the desires of Native students and who they want to become. Chapter 4, in particular, provided insight into the disparity between ideological demands placed on Indigenous art students and their desires, which are informed by their life experiences. New’s teaching observations, I argued, indicate that the experiences of youth extend beyond our perceptions. In other words, children, especially Indigenous children so deprived of personhood and agency in the boarding school era, are much more complex than many people think they are. Trauma is a painful example of this. The boarding school era radically shifted the trajectories of those Native students, left to negotiate the pain of abuse and cultural assimilation. In many cases, trauma becomes intergenerational as it transfers between parent and child. I think of my grandfather’s trauma being subjected to the violence of state and the profound impact that has had on my life. By ignoring the agency of children, researchers and art educators risk subjecting their students to violence of ideological discourse. Examples of this include the horror of forced assimilation within the boarding schools, but also the insidious benevolent ideas of uplift and modernization within the Rockefeller foundation funded workshops that led to the creation of IAIA. I also think about the state
violence committed against my grandfather and the disregard for his well-being. Further research must be done, using critical archival methods, to investigate the lives of Indigenous children, lives that remain opaque in history because they are not afforded the status of historical actor or subject. Through critiquing the ideological burden placed on Native children through historical art education institutions, I hoped to allow people to envision art teaching practices that nurture Native students and allow them to define themselves.
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