An Indigenous Reframing of Art Education Historical Research: Acknowledging Native American Spiritual Values

Laurie Eldridge
Independent Scholar

ABSTRACT

Including historical art education curricula for Native American students in art education history has potential for assisting decolonizing efforts and expanding art education historiography with new insights. The 1934 art education curriculum framework titled "Art for the Schools of the Southwest: An Outline for the Public and Indian Schools," written by Mary-Russell Ferrell Colton, is an example of what the author calls salvage education, the underlying concept of which was to rescue Native American cultures. This is compared to efforts of early art educators Reel and Dunn to 'save and improve' Indian art through instruction to Native American students. These ideas are intertwined with the history of suppression of Native American religions. Colton's curriculum has not been previously examined in the field of art education history. This article continues to decolonize art education historiography through Indigenous reframing, particularly in reference to Native American spirituality.

KEYWORDS: Native American, Indigenous reframing, spirituality, Mary-Russell Ferrell Colton, art education history

AUTHOR NOTE: The author wishes to acknowledge the scholarly assistance of Dr. Mary Stokrocki and the reviewers of this article.
Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to the author at leldridge24@gmail.com

In June of 2017, I participated in the Cherokee ceremony known as Going to Water. I stepped in to the cool creek water in Tahlequah, Oklahoma. My feet hurt from the sharp stones in the creek bed. Led by Cherokee traditionalists, I stumbled my way through the motions as I prayed and symbolically washed away negative thoughts and feelings.

The history of art education has been repeatedly critiqued for lack of inclusion of diverse cultural voices (Acuff, 2013; Acuff, Hirak, & Nangah, 2012; Bey, 2011; Bolin, Blandy, & Congdon, 2000; Slivka, 2011). Early art education historians' primary task was to investigate information and corroborate the actions of prominent people in the field of the past (Daichendt, Funk, Holt, & Kantawala, 2013). This was in sync with other early historians' focus on the elite and powerful and events recorded by them (Burke, 2001). However, views on analyzing history have broadened since then. Influenced by postmodern thought, some twenty-first century historians of art education are using new frameworks for examining histories of art education. One such framework is Indigenous reframing.

Indigenous Reframing

In Linda Tuhiwai Smith's (1999) groundbreaking treatise *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, she states that Indigenous researchers are engaged in exploring themes such as cultural survival, self-determination, healing, restoration, and social practices through a diverse array of projects. In tune with Smith's (1999) categorization of Indigenous research studies, I found that for this study, I needed to concentrate on Smith's concept of *Indigenous reframing*. *Indigenous* centers on politics of Indigenous identity and Indigenous cultural action. *Reframing* occurs within the ways Indigenous people themselves write or engage with theories or accounts of what it means to be Indigenous. *Indigenous reframing,* therefore, is an effort to take greater control over the ways that Indigenous issues are discussed and conducted (Smith, 1999). I interpret the term *Indigenous reframing* as infusing Native knowledge and perspectives, including spirituality, into research about Native peoples.

Central principles of Native identity are multidimensional, can include notions of land, family, language, and spirituality, and are complex in that sacred and secular interests are often intertwined (Ballengee Morris & Staikidis, 2017; Mithlo, 2012). Because Native artists may work on several levels within one piece of work, including conceptual, realistic, and spiritual, it makes sense to view their works on these levels (Ballengee Morris & Staikidis, 2017). The distinction between secular and ceremonial objects is hard to make because the sacred/secular dichotomy is a Western imposition of thought on Native forms of thinking (Berlo & Phillips, 1998).

However, there is no one way of creating in Indian Country. I

personally know a Native artist who paints realistically in oils and prays over her works, and of Native artists who create traditional art forms but do not invoke higher power in the creative process. A multidimensional world view, however, can mean that artistic creation involves the use of materials in which spiritual power resides, including wood, stone, and pigments. When a person transforms these power-filled materials for another purpose, they are engaging in a relationship of reciprocity with these powers, which can make it impossible to divide the sacred and the secular (Berlo & Phillips, 1998).

> ***When the ceremony is finished, you are supposed to walk away from the running water without looking back. As I turned in the water and walked to the bank of the creek, I felt lighter in spirit. However, because of the interruption of the boarding school experience in my family, it was a shame that I had not been able to share this experience with them. My father had been in the Murrow Indian Orphanage from the age of five. He attended Bacone Indian School in his younger years and Chilocco Indian Boarding School for middle school and high school. A quiet man, he rarely talked about his youth, and when he did, it was with bitterness at his educational and life experiences at these institutions. He had been separated from his Cherokee culture and family, and therefore was not able to pass on many traditional Cherokee teachings to his children. This sorrow over the loss of culture and the mistreatment of family members is deep within me. It will take more than one immersion in cleansing waters to ease this generational trauma.***

I feel a personal obligation to assist in the reframing efforts of Indigenous people and also address my obligations to my family and larger Native community who continue to suffer the effects of boarding school experiences. I utilize mainstream historical research methods as a background for my presumption that some Native American people would like to practice spiritual ceremonies in the creation of art forms, and that these practices have historically been severely limited in the United States by education and Indian policy.

In a brief overview of four art education efforts from 1901 to 1937, I include government policy concerning education of Native students and the practice of Native religions. I attempt to bring a narrative of the past that has been largely overlooked in art education history to light through an Indigenous lens that emphasizes the importance of spirituality in the creation and use of Native art forms.

Three of these art education efforts were selected due to their significant historical influence on the art education of Native American students. One curriculum, written by Mary-Russell Ferrell Colton and published in 1934, has not been examined in historical art education literature previously. As little has been written about historical art education curricula in the Southwest, I am choosing to bring Colton's work to the attention of the field now.

Indian Policy Focused on Native Religions and Education of Native Students

The United States has a history of overt and covert policies designed to destroy or impede the practice of Native religions and their intertwining with Native art forms. American society's ignorance of and animosity toward Native religions is longstanding and multilayered. The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) from its inception turned to Anglo churches for administrative, personnel, and financial support in their efforts to acculturate Native people (O'Brien, 1995). Shared assumptions that Christianity and civilization coexisted helped forge strong alliances between Christian missionaries and federal officials. They thought that conversion of Native Americans to Christianity and civilization would happen simultaneously (Heise, 2017). In 1819, the U.S. government established the 'Civilization Fund' to fund Christian missionary schools within Indian Territory. This was before the majority of the western territories became states and before much of the public school system that we know was created. The goals of the missionary boarding schools focused on civilizing and Christianizing Native students as much as their education (Noel, 2002).

In 1865, a Congressional Committee recommended the creation of boarding schools away from Indian communities (Noel, 2002). These residential schools were designed to take Native children from their families and villages, train them for marginal participation in the labor market, and turn them into industrious Christian citizens (Cervera, 2014; Lentis, 2017).

When children arrived at the boarding schools, they faced de-Indianizing treatment (Noel, 2002). Boys' long hair was cut and

traditional clothing of all genders was often burned (Adams, 1995). Richard H. Pratt, who established the first off-reservation boarding school in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, insisted that the best way to civilize the Indian was to "immerse him in civilization and keep him there until well soaked" (Utley, 1964, xxi). Indian boarding schools were fundamental to the process of cultural genocide against Native people and were designed to physically, ideologically, and emotionally remove Indian children from their families, homes, and tribal affiliations. Students were not allowed to express themselves culturally, artistically, spiritually, or linguistically in any way that was considered to be Indian (Archluleta, Child, & Lomawaima, 2000). In many cases, children were punished severely for any act or comment that would associate them with their ethnic identity. The academic training was substandard; children attended school less than half the day and spent the larger half laboring to maintain the facilities and grounds, often providing much of the necessary income needed to support the schools (Adams, 1995; DeJong, 1993; Lomawaima, 1994; Marker, 2000). As part of the training thought necessary to create willing workers, the schools were organized into military units with students participating in marching drills, militaristic rules, harsh discipline, and compulsory attendance (Adams, 1995; DeJong, 1993; Lomawaima, 1994; Noel, 2002).

The schools did not entirely meet their stated goals of saving Indian children from their cultural practices; Indians continued their traditions and religions in secret, often against the law. Interior Secretary Henry Teller promulgated the Code of Indian Offenses in 1883, which squarely attacked Native religions, banning traditional dances, healing rites, and other rituals (Heise, 2017). This did not completely stop Native people from practicing their traditions and religious rites, so in 1892 Thomas Morgan, Commissioner of the BIA, directed the Indian Courts of Federal Offenses to enforce a series of laws outlawing religious practices, including dances and ceremonies by medicine men, among other cultural expressions. Violators were punishable by imprisonment or denial of rations (O'Brien, 1995).

Course of Study for Indian Education: Estelle Reel

It was only eight years later that Estelle Reel designed a uniform course of study in 1901 that was indicative of Indian policy at the time. Reel attempted to revive basket weaving among Indians as a way to salvage what was considered a dying art and bring much needed income to Native communities; she recommended the same rationale and treatment for weaving, pottery, and beadwork (Slivka, 2011). Reel thought that the guidance of an "intelligent white teacher" (Reel, 1901, p. 57) was needed to make decisions regarding authenticity and the use of modern designs for the market. The idea that a Native teacher would be used was not considered.

Reel saw herself as someone who permitted Indian students this small area of cultural expression – an expert on Indian art and the reasons behind making it. She did not see herself as a colonizer who divorced Native art forms from their emic, internal meanings for Native people. Because the teaching of Native art forms in Indian schools was emptied of their intrinsic epistemologies, the use of Native art forms in schools was an attempt to colonize the consciousness of the students and make them fit into dominant society (Lentis, 2017). If the art forms were dying, Indian schools' assimilation practices had caused this disruption of intergenerational teachings, including the prayers and ceremonies as well as the construction and use of traditional objects.

However, children and adults resisted assimilation in hundreds of creative and subtle ways, finding private corners away from Anglo surveillance to affirm their identity, epistemology, cosmology, and history (Marker, 2000). Dances and ceremonies were held sub-rosa, which in turn prompted BIA Commissioner Charles H. Burke to issue Circular 1665 in 1921, amended in 1923, urging the suppression of Native dance and ceremony (Heise, 2017). These acts of resistance comprised an early form of Indigenous reframing.

Course of Study: The Department of the Interior

In 1922 the Department of the Interior, Office of Indian Affairs issued another uniform course of study for Indian schools; the mention of using Indian teachers for traditional craft education was not included. Discussion of "native industries" was limited to two short paragraphs, mentioning that "Indian methods of hand weaving" should be used for seat work instead of paper weaving.[1] This course of study recommended that native industries be developed for economic gain or as a way of keeping Native people busy "during odd moments of time" (Department of the Interior, Office of Indian Affairs, 1922, p. 8). Instead of recommending courses of study in traditional crafts, a plan for art training was now in place. The curriculum included drawing, imaginative drawing, paper cutting, pasting, clay-modeling, weaving, and picture study, among other

1 Seat work included spool knitting and braiding, rug and mat making, and mechanical drawing for seventh through twelfth grades.

activities, with a decided focus on European art and American themes. The rationale was not salvaging dying Native art forms, as it had been earlier, but instead to primarily develop manual dexterity in preparation for vocational courses.

Art was believed to train the head and the hand, instilling a sense of dominant society aesthetics and teaching order, industriousness, and self-sufficiency (Lentis, 2017). By refocusing art education away from traditional Native arts, Indian education policymakers possibly hoped to circumvent any sub-rosa activity on students' parts of passing on traditional worldviews and values to one another.

The Effects of the Meriam Report

The Problem of Indian Administration of 1928 (commonly called the Meriam Report) came about from pressures from Indian advocacy groups (Watras, 2004).[2] It stated that Native Americans endured harsh conditions, and the report blamed the federal government for these abuses (Watras, 2004). The education section of the report stated unequivocally that the U.S. Department of the Interior, which oversaw Indian policy, had to change its prevailing policy of education and adopt a more progressive view that children should be raised within the natural settings of home and family life. The Meriam Report stated that the education branch should adopt a more modern understanding of human growth and development; thus, education should focus upon activities that the child was familiar with at home (Adams, 1995). Therefore, the report recommended the establishment of more day schools. This brought about a reduction in the number of boarding schools, an increase in day schools, and greater numbers of Indian students enrolled in public schools, which was about 48,000 by the end of 1932 (Watras, 2004).

The Meriam Report did note that some traditional arts instruction happened in the Indian schools, mostly in the Southwest, where the production of rugs and pottery and the drawing and painting of traditional designs was encouraged by teachers. However, they found such instruction scattered and sustained by a few individuals and not the result of any educational policy (McLerran, 2009).

The Meriam Report found that traditional handcrafts flourished in places where Native religions were strongest, but these places were few (McLerran, 2009). Traditional religious practices and ceremony had waned due to the vigorous efforts of the government and missionaries. Consequently, the creation of the arts interconnected with these practices had also decreased. Early Christian reformers had justified the suppression of traditional arts because traditional spiritual practices were important in the production of Native arts, which they thought should be discouraged.

After the Meriam report, changes in policy did allow more Native cultural influences in schools; however, only those cultural aspects perceived as nonthreatening, such as art forms unconnected from their ceremonial or spiritual aspects, would be incorporated into school life (Cervera, 2014).

The Indian New Deal

In January 1934, John Collier (then U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs and long-time Indian advocate) began a campaign to obtain passage of the Indian Reorganization Act, also known as the Wheeler-Howard Act. This act, which became the basis of what was called the Indian New Deal, was signed into effect in June 1934 and profoundly changed Indian policy. The act ended a system of individual allotment of Indian lands, and it gave Native Americans the right to organize into self-governing bodies. The original proposal called for appropriation of funds for schools to teach Indian children and adults about Indian tribal cultures and as well as traditional arts and crafts; however, the final act only provided funds for vocational education. Collier brought anthropologists into the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs beginning in 1935 to assist in helping American Indians understand and profit from the Indian Reorganization Act. Additionally, the anthropologists helped White teachers in the Indian schools to better understand the cultures of their students (Watras, 2004). Although Commissioner Collier ended the BIA's overt repressive policies, mainstream society's failure to understand the tenets and needs of Native religious practices caused persecution to persist (O'Brien, 1995).

The Johnson-O'Malley Act, also passed in 1934, provided additional educational assistance to Native Americans. It also provided other social reforms and was central to the drastic reduction of the number of boarding schools and the total elimination of boarding school education for younger Indian children (McLerran, 2009). Although the Meriam Report, Indian Reorganization Act, and Johnson-O'Malley Act prescribed changes to Indian policy and education, there were

2 Lewis Meriam of the Brookings Institute was selected to head the investigation into schools and hospitals (Adams, 1995), and the report is commonly named after him.

detractors, and things were slow to change.

In the late 1940s, policy focused on termination, which heralded a return to efforts to end the separate status of Native Americans by assimilating them into mainstream society (Watras, 2004). After World War II, Indian education shifted more to public schools. Efforts of Native American activists in the 1960s and beyond have resulted in a number of previous boarding and day schools now being tribally controlled, and Haskell (a former BIA boarding school) is now Haskell Indian Nations University (Lomawaima, 1994). Actions of Indian activists and their allies also resulted in the passage of the American Indian Religious Freedoms Act in 1978. This act, and its amendment, provides protection for Native Americans to believe, express, and exercise their traditional religions through ceremonials and traditional rites (American Indian Religious Freedoms Act, 1978).

Dorothy Dunn

From 1932 to 1937, Dunn taught painting and drawing to Native students at the Santa Fe Indian School. Hundreds of artists, authors, anthropologists, tourists, tour promoters, arts patrons, and social activists arrived in the Taos and Santa Fe areas after World War I, bringing with them a primitivist view of Indigenous art. Enchanted by the "primitive" way of life of Native peoples, these individuals looked to Native American cultures as a source of societal and spiritual renewal (McLerran, 2009). Many began promoting Native American arts as a way to salvage a supposedly dying Indian culture and bring much needed money into Native communities (Eldridge, 2001). Dunn also promoted the primitivist idea that Indian art needed to be preserved so it could serve as a basis for a new American aesthetic (Eldridge, 2001). For a thirty-year period beginning in 1919, Pedro DeLemos echoed this aim in his editorial work and writings in the publication of *School Arts Magazine* (White, 2001).

Dunn's art teaching, exhibition of her students' works, and publications helped to codify ideas about Native American identity as well as Native American painting and its authenticity for both Native peoples and non-Natives (Eldridge, 2001). She did not make room for her students' views on spirituality, ceremony and prayer, as she seemed to see these important aspects of Native American life as traditions of the past and not part of the creation of new art forms. However, she was not the only educator working with Native students at that time.

Mary-Russell Ferrell Colton

Mary-Russell Ferrell Colton, with her husband Harold Colton, was instrumental in creating the Museum of Northern Arizona (MNA). She taught art at Flagstaff High School from 1928 to 1931, and also taught night classes for adults at the museum. Colton was involved in several projects to promote Native American art and art education. These included the Hopi Craftsman Exhibit, the Junior Art Show and other art shows for students, a travelling exhibit of Hopi and Navajo art titled *Craftsmen of the Painted Desert* which was sent to schools and museums nationally, and "treasure chests" that were smaller versions for the public and Indian schools in Arizona (Eaton, 1994). Additionally, her treatise, *Art for the Schools of the Southwest: An Outline for the Public and Indian Schools*, was published by the MNA in 1934 (Colton, 1934).[3] Colton believed that Hopi arts were the least valued of the Pueblo groups, and wanted to use MNA resources to 'save and improve' Hopi art forms and encourage innovation in traditional Hopi designs with new uses (Eaton, 1994). Like Dunn and Reel, Colton took the position that there was a 'right' way for Native American arts to be taught (Eaton, 1994).

By 1912, the number of Native children in public schools was larger than in government schools; by 1930, there were 707 Indian schools nationally in 24 states, both boarding and day schools (Noel, 2002). Colton developed the *Outline* at the request of the Indian Service for a curriculum for arts and crafts that could be used by teachers at the Indian day schools, and also in reply to requests from teachers at rural county schools for the same. A brief discussion of the role of museums and Indian traders also appears in Colton's *Outline*, but her main focus was teaching general art education to all students, including minorities, with a special emphasis on teaching traditional arts to Hopi and Navajo children.

Colton sympathized with the difficulties of teachers in small schools. She stated that one or two teachers did all the work; their training had probably been limited to a general course in teaching primary art, which they found difficult to teach and usually lacked adequate texts, time, or funds. She noted that students in the area included those of Mexican, southern European, Chinese, and African American backgrounds. Instead of seeing art as only for majority students, she advocated for art training for students from all cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds. She wanted teachers to use her

3 I found this curriculum when browsing the Heard Museum's Billie Jean Baguley Library and Archives in Phoenix, Arizona.

framework (reprinted from Lemos, 1933) as a guide on which to build art instruction for all students.

However, Colton saw these children as stereotypically "precocious in the handicrafts" and "beyond the average artistic ability" (Colton, 1934, p. 6). In her framework for teaching art and crafts, she thought that some teachers might think the work too advanced for their students, but felt that they were dealing with "unusual" conditions in the Southwest, such as the "many peoples" she mentions (Colton, 1934, p. 7). Even today, the stereotypes that "all Indians are artistic" and that "Mexicans are good with their hands" still persist.[4]

Colton went on to address the "special problems presented by the Indian schools" (Colton, 1934, p. 19). She was well aware of the current changes in policy and varying attitudes towards Indians and observed that "very slowly the clumsy and antiquated machine that has been the Indian Bureau is being overhauled and brought up to date" (Colton, 1934, p. 19). This remark is indicative of her disdain for previous Indian policy and the difficulty faced by reformers. Colton stated that many Indian schools were making serious efforts to encourage Native art forms, but thought that the efforts were sporadic and unorganized, and therefore ineffectual (Colton, 1934).

In her discussion on the application and teaching of Indian art, Colton advocated that Native art should be taught by Native teachers, and focused on the Hopi and Navajo peoples. This in and of its self was a radical notion for the time. However, Colton was a romantic primitivist, like many artists and Indian advocates of her time. Colton argued that Indian art should remain "pure" and that modern methods of pottery firing should not be introduced, because the "charm of a native art lies in its contrast to modern mechanical methods and its wonderful primitive invention and utilization of the natural materials at hand" (Colton, 1934, p. 22).

Colton demonstrated familiarity with the informal, non-institutional teaching of crafts by elders and the social customs of working together in Hopi life. She suggested building upon these social customs by having boys and girls work with a Native teacher in "working parties," with a male teacher for teaching boys knitting, weaving, and embroidery and a female teacher for educating girls in pottery and basketry. She also discussed the problems that students had in returning to their homes after years in school, "unable to repay social obligations in the form of ceremonial gifts" (Colton, 1934, p. 24) and unable to fulfill their part in producing family income due to lack of training in traditional crafts. Colton was aware of some of the deeper teachings and social meanings of certain art forms for Hopi people and she recommended that the traditional arts be taught from the collection of raw material to completed articles, but she was still not able to bring herself to mention the outright teaching of Native religions or world views.

Indian art education efforts previous to Colton denied the importance of ceremony in the creation and use of traditional art forms. This contributed to the colonization of Native Americans in that their ways of knowing and belief systems were seen as decidedly "less than" those of mainstream America. Colton seemed to grasp the effect this had on Native American students' identities. However, she did not make room for use of ceremony and prayer in the creation of these art forms, thus continuing colonizing effects on Native American life ways.

Comparing the Educational Aims of Reel, Dunn and Colton

It was during the progressive era that student-centered, studio-based learning was first integrated into U.S. schools (Heilig, Cole, & Aguilar, 2010). Dunn was a proponent of this, as was Colton. Dunn wanted to make sure that her efforts were seen as separate from vocational training, yet Reel wanted her efforts to be seen as a precursor to manual training. As Native Americans were often seen as rural and poverty-stricken by policymakers, the use of manual training was viewed as a way to 'improve' their condition (Slivka, 2011). Colton did not see art education necessarily as career training, but instead as an increased ability to "see beauty in the world around you and a facility for creating things with your hands; these things are a great asset and add immensely to our joy in life" (Colton, 1934, p. 3). She believed that art training helped to create a pleasant environment in and around the home. She perceived art education as a basic necessity, not a "cultural frill" (Colton, 1934, p. 4) and promoted art for all instead of a few. Additionally, she saw a need for economic development and preservation of culture in teaching Native crafts to Native students.

Reel, Dunn, and Colton could be considered *salvage educators*, using schools to save and improve Native art forms. However, they

4 Over my almost thirty years of teaching art in public elementary schools, I have heard a few of my students express these stereotypes about themselves. I do my best to encourage them to see themselves in a positive light beyond such stereotypes.

were dualistic in their salvage efforts, as they disparaged outside influences on traditional art forms, yet saw that Native artists could, with 'guidance,' apply Indian designs to objects of a modern type or manufacture if that was desirable from an economic point of view (Eaton, 1994). None of these art educators of the past saw the need to preserve the many facets of Native spirituality that are often intertwined in the creation of traditional art forms.

The art education work of Dorothy Dunn and her Studio has received attention in Native American art history and the field of art education. Colton's work expands and further illuminates the kinds of ideas that surrounded art education for Native peoples during the early twentieth century. Colton, like Dunn and Reel, very much saw herself as an arbiter of what was acceptable as art students' products. She accepted and did not contest the stereotype that minority students had certain dexterity with crafts. Colton was a salvage educator saving Native craft forms from outside influences through the instruction of children in traditional forms and techniques. She constrained the students to preindustrial forms of production, yet did not ensure the continuation of Native American spirituality. Although her intentions were sincere, her *Course of Study* was ethnocentric and written from an Anglo viewpoint.

Although Colton had constructed views on race, tradition, and modernity, she was progressive for her time. She wanted art education to be taught to all children, not just those of Anglo descent; she saw value in non-Anglo students' work and wanted them to value their work and themselves. Colton may not have reinforced Hopi and Navajo cultural traditions, but she did demonstrate cultural sensitivity by advocating art making activities that the students' families valued. By encouraging teachers to enlist community members to help carry out these lessons, it is possible that lessons of resistance were perhaps subtly communicated by the Indian teachers, as well as traditional life ways and world views.

Discussion

I do not have photographs of the Going to Water ceremony, or recordings of the words, as that is considered by Cherokee spiritual leaders to be important information that should only be carefully shared with others who are not Cherokee, or who are not approaching ceremony with good intentions.

Native American knowledge and history have long been transmitted from one generation to the next through ceremony, storytelling, and material arts (Neylan, 2003). Archuleta and Strickland (1991) attribute the failure of cultural genocide of Native people to the power of Native art. The determined efforts of Native artists have left legacies that have made possible a preservation and understanding of many cultural traditions (Archuleta & Strickland, 1991).

When Native teachers teach traditional art forms to Native students, they should be able to share the teachings of prayers and ceremonies that go with the gathering of materials, creation, and use of these art forms. Native peoples are not of one mind on when to share such precious knowledge that could have so easily been lost. Some feel that only through continued sub-rosa activities will the knowledge be preserved. Others think that all should be shared so the knowledge is not lost when the knowledge keepers walk on.

I do not advocate the replication or appropriation of traditional or ceremonial art forms or objects in art classrooms. I do believe that the spiritual aspects of such art forms need to be acknowledged in discussion of these works, and can be acknowledged without violating some Native religious adherents' belief in the need for privacy.

Colton, like Dunn and Reel, had no room for ritual or the interconnection of art, beliefs, and the natural world. They only saw art in terms of materials that represented a shallow view of culture, not deeper worldviews. I believe they lost an opportunity for cross-cultural learning between Anglos and Natives, and their educational aims can be viewed as less significant for that loss.

Conclusions

The focus of art education history is slowly expanding to include the histories of art educators and students of color. The importance of works such as *Remembering Others: Making Invisible Histories of Art Education Visible* (Bolin et al., 2000) cannot be overstated. Several art education historians are expanding this discourse to include 'other' voices and histories in the literature (Acuff, 2013; Acuff et al., 2012; Ashton, 2010; Eldridge, 2001; Slivka, 2011; Stankiewicz, 2013; White, 2001). Mary Stokrocki (2000) rightly calls for more inclusion of female and Native American voices, and Peter Smith (1999) calls for attention to be paid to the art education histories of the American Southwest. However, more work is needed, as art educators, students,

and researchers of color are left with questions about the relationship between what is written about American art education history and what art education has been and which forms it has taken for people of color (Acuff, 2013).

Overall, the history of art education for Native Americans assists in decolonizing the history of art education in several ways. Perhaps most obviously, it emphasizes a largely overlooked group by adding Native Americans' schooling experiences to its narrative. Mainstream histories of art education have reduced much of Native American education to schooling, thus overlooking other forms of education (Cervera, 2014). Although Zastrow (1978) and McCollister (2000) have offered views of Native American community education, there is a great deal that we do not know about Native American traditional education (Cervera, 2014).

In an Indigenous reframing of art education, bringing forth important ways of knowing and being of Native peoples that are part of art making processes will present issues. Issues of what knowledge remains only within Native communities must be addressed if this type of education is to be taught and investigated. What remains private with Native individuals or groups (especially regarding ceremony and medicine), and what can be made public (Eldridge, 2009, Willis, 2001-2002) will have to be discussed and negotiated by individuals within tribal groups and nations and with researchers who keep in mind the relational aspects of doing Indigenous research. Art educators from the past can be studied to understand their contributions and what still needs to be done to decolonize and Indigenize art education theory and practice.

The wallpaper on my home computer is a photograph of the creek in Oklahoma where I last participated in the Going to Water ceremony. It pictures the current as it winds through tall green trees in a public park. As I currently live in Phoenix, there is a dearth of natural running water locally. Instead, through this photo I can mentally Go to Water if not physically. I try to think of all my relationships, including my family, friends, students, ancestors, the natural world, and the peoples in it as I concentrate on leaving negative thoughts and feelings behind. Howa, osda![5]

5 The rough translation of this Cherokee phrase to English is "it is good."

References

Acuff, J. B. (2013). Discursive underground: Re-transcribing the history of art education using critical multicultural education. *Visual Inquiry: Learning & Teaching Art, 2*(3), 219-231.

Acuff, J. B., Hirak, B., & Nangah, M. (2012). Dismantling a Master Narrative: Using culturally responsive pedagogy to teach the history of art education. *Art Education, 65*(5), 6-10.

Adams, D. W. (1995*). Education for extinction: American Indians and the boarding school experience 1875-1928*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press.

American Indian Religious Freedoms Act of 1978, 42 U.S.C. §469 (1978).

Archuleta, M. L., & Strickland, R. (1991). *Shared visions: Native American painters and sculptors of the twentieth century*. Phoenix, AZ: Heard Museum.

Ashton, L. (2010). The 'Other' side of the easel: Questioning art education through a postcolonial frame. *International Journal of Education through Art, 6*(2), 243-259.

Ballengee Morris, C., & Staikidis, K. (2017). Introduction: Osiyo: Cherokee word for welcome. In C. Ballengee Morris & K. Staikidis (Eds.), *Transforming our practices: Indigenous art, pedagogies and philosophies* (pp. ix). Alexandria VA: National Art Education Association.

Berlo, J. C., & Phillips, R. B. (1998*). Native North American art (Oxford history of art).* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Bey, S. (2011). Aaron Douglas and Hale Woodruff: African American art education, gallery work, and expanded pedagogy. *Studies in Art Education, 52*(2), 112-126.

Bolin, P. E., Blandy, D., & Congdon, K. G. (2000). *Remembering others: Making invisible histories of art education visible.* Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Burke, P. (2001). Overture. The new history: Its past and its future. In P. Burke (Ed.), *New perspectives on historical writing, second edition* (pp. 1-24). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Cervera, Y. L. (2014). Negotiating the history of education: How the histories of Indigenous education expand the field. *History of Education Quarterly, 54*(3), 362-383.

Colton, M.-R. F. (1934). *Art for the schools of the southwest: An outline for the public and Indian Schools.* Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona Society of Science and Art.

Daichendt, G. J., Funk, C. Holt, A., & Kantawala, A. (2013). Editorial: Critical re-framing of art education histories. *Visual Inquiry: Learning & Teaching, 2*(3), 197-200.

DeJong, D. H. (1993). *Promises of the past: A history of Indian education*. Golden, CO: North American Press.

Department of the Interior, Office of Indian Affairs. (1922). *Course of study for United States Indian schools.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Eaton, L. B. (1994). The Hopi Craftsman Exhibition: The creation of authenticity. *Expedition, 36*(1), 24-33.

Eldridge, L. (2001). Dorothy Dunn and the art education of Native Americans: Continuing the dialogue. *Studies in Art Education, 42*(4), 318-332.

Eldridge, L. (2009). Ruthe Blalock Jones: Native American artist and educator. *Visual Arts Research 35*(2), 72-85.

Heilig, J. V., Cole, H., & Aguilar, A. (2010). From Dewey to No Child Left Behind: The evolution and devolution of Public Arts Education. *Arts Education Policy Review, 111*, 136-145.
Heise, T. (2017). Religion and Native American assimilation, resistance and survival. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion*. Retrieved February 3, 2018 from http://religion.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378.001.0001/acrefore-9780199340378-e-394.
Lemos, P. J. (1933). *Applied art: Drawing, painting, design and handicraft.* Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association.
Lentis, M. (2017). *Colonized through art: American Indian schools and art education, 1889-1915*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
Lomawaima, K. T. (1994). *They called it Prairie Light: The story of Chilocco Indian School*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
Marker, M. (2000). Review essay: Ethnohistory and Indigenous education: A moment of uncertainty. *History of Education, 29*(1), 79-85.
McCollister, S. (2000). Gloria Dillard and the Traditional Indian Arts Program in Blackfoot, Idaho 1976-1981. In P. E. Bolin, D. Blandy, & K. G. Congdon (Eds.), *Remembering Others: Making invisible histories of art education visible* (pp.149-163). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
McLerran, J. (2009). *The New Deal for Native art: Indian arts and federal policy 1933-1943*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
Mithlo, N. M. (2012). No word for art in our language?: Old questions, new paradigms. *Wicazo Sa Review, 27*(1), 111-126.
Neylan, S. (2003). Unsettling British Columbia: Canadian Aboriginal historiography, 1992-2012. *History Compass, 11*(10), 845-8578.
Noel, J. (2002). Education toward cultural shame: A century of Native American education. *Educational Foundations, 16*(1), 19-32.
O'Brien, S. L. (1995). Freedom of religion in Indian Country. *Montana Law Review, 56*(2), 451-484. Retrieved on April 17, 2018 from http://scholarship.law.umt.edu/mlr/vol56/iss2/4.
Protection and preservation of traditional religions of Native Americans, 42 USC § 1996. Retrieved April 18, 2017 from https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/42/1996.
Reel, E. (1901*). Course of study for the Indian schools of the United States: Industrial and literary.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
Slivka, K. (2011). Art, craft and assimilation: Curriculum for Native students during the boarding school era. *Studies in Art Education, 52*(3), 225-242.
Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.
Smith, P. (1999). The unexplored: Art education historians' failure to consider the Southwest. *Studies in Art Education, 40*(2), 114-127.
Stankiewicz, M. A. (2013). Negotiating historical interpretation and White privilege in histories of art education. *Visual Inquiry: Learning & Teaching Art, 2*(3), 207-218.
Stokrocki, M. (2000). Historical research in the Southwest: Ignored and undervalued. *Studies in Art Education, 42*(1), 83-86.
Utley, R. (1964*). Battlefield and classroom: Four decades with the American Indian, the memoirs of Richard H. Pratt*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Watras, J. (2004). Progressive education and Native American schools: 1929-1950. *Educational Foundations, 18*(3/4), 81-104.
White, J. H. (2001). Imaging (Native) America: Pedro DeLemos and the expansion of art education (1919-1950). *Studies in Art Education, 42*(4), 298-317.
Willis, S. (2001-2002). Clarity of perception: Intercultural understanding from a Native American perspective. *Journal of Cultural Research in Art Education, 19 & 20*, 81-93.
Zastrow, L. (1978). American Indian women as art educators. *Journal of American Indian Education, 18*(1), 6-10.