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Abstract

This article explores the macro-structural aspects of college campuses and environments to understand how higher education institutions have created, maintained, and justified hostile campus climates against Indigenous students. It uncovers the embedded racist and genocidal values that are often cherished through dominant campus tours. This includes addressing how an incomplete understanding of history leads to centering oppressive values that disenfranchise Indigenous students in higher education. Offered is an abbreviated interpretation of the concept of Power and Place (Deloria & Wildcat, 2001), centering critical Indigenous values in the assessment. The case study articulates the historical and contemporary aspects of space and place in higher education. The authors embark upon a virtual racist campus tour by re-articulating typical campus tour components: history, student life, academic life, and campus leadership through a critical Indigenous approach. Lastly, recommendations are offered who wish to engage in work that dismantles educational systemic racism.
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The ability to critically dissect the landscape of higher education is a recent topic amongst scholars of color. Meanwhile, the silencing and erasure of Native Americans within the histories, landmarks and understanding of contested traditions has been ongoing since the early colonial institutions were founded. Minthorn and Marsh (2016) brought to the forefront the need for photovoice and photo-elicititation to be used to better understand the lived experience of Native American college students. A part of this research was the important role landscape and place have for Native college students to find safe spaces. What was recommended was to begin to interrogate higher education institutions’ histories, symbols, and traditions and how they impact Indigenous students’ experiences on campus. We aim to explore the macrostructural aspects of college campuses and environments to understand how higher education institutions have created, maintained, and justified hostile campus climates against Indigenous students.

Like the title of the paper demonstrates, our conceptual contributions are modeled through a campus tour. By framing our contributions through a campus tour model, non-Indigenous administrators and staff who work on college campuses can begin to better connect to how Indigenous students may feel when seeing a campus that overtly glorifies colonial conquest narratives. Throughout the Colonized and Racist Indigenous Campus Tour, we do not highlight the colonialist triumphs of the institution, rather we uncover the embedded racist and genocidal values that are often cherished through dominant campus tours. To do this, we demonstrate the problem of how an incomplete understanding of history leads to centering oppressive values. This includes briefly demonstrating how existing campus climates and inclusivity models continue to disenfranchise Indigenous students in higher education. In our approach in this article, we seek to provide an Indigenous community narrative (Gilmore & Smith, 2005; McCarty, Romero, & Zepeda, 2006) to problematize how administrators and staff see their campuses and how they may be centering colonial histories while silencing Indigenous histories and students in the process. An Indigenous community narrative allows us to see narratives as a collective representation, rather than individual. We then offer our abbreviated interpretation of the concept of power and place (Deloria & Wildcat, 2001), which helps us center critical Indigenous values in our assessment. Next, we introduce the methodological approach used to ground our theoretical and conceptual contributions. Through one institution of higher education, we articulate the historical and contemporary aspects of space and place in higher education. To demonstrate our theoretical and conceptual contributions, we embark upon a colonized and racist campus tour by rearticulating typical campus tour components: history, student life, academic life, and campus leadership. Through a critical Indigenous approach, each campus tour component offers photos to substantiate our claims of the physical and visual oppression occurring on today’s campuses. In the final section, we offer recommendations for scholars and practitioners who wish to further engage in work that dismantles educational systemic racism.

An Incomplete History of Higher Education Institutions

For higher education campuses to be inclusive and inviting for all students, institutional leaders rely heavily on campus climate surveys (Cabrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella, & Hagedorn, 1999; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Rankin & Reason, 2005), engagement/involvement theory (Astin, 1984; Berger & Milem, 1999; Kuh, 1995), and models of diversity (Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, & Arellano, 2012; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1999) to assess college student experiences and perceptions. A significant amount of research has found that many non-White students, not just Native students, feel their campus to be hostile places that lead to emotional distress (Brayboy, 2004; Rankin & Reason, 2005; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009). When specifically analyzing campus climate, Hurtado et al. (1998) identified four areas of consideration: historical, structural (demographics), psychological, and behavioral. The latter three areas have been extensively studied and have informed surveys, theories, and models addressing issues of inclusion in the higher education space. Whether it is tracking enrollment patterns of students of color or identifying the variables that led to positive student outcomes, we find that existing research has only examined the role of history in informing campus climate for today’s college students through a lens

---

1 The interchangeable word use of Native American, Indigenous, and Indian will be used in this article. The preference of terms should be asked of each Native American person rather than assuming one term is sufficient for all.
that does not consider the role of settler colonialism (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Settler colonialism is not colonialism. Rather, settler colonialism is when the colonizer’s end goal is to eliminate Indigenous people but not before making use of their labor to extract resources for individual benefit. Settler colonialism is the systematic formation of a political order within the United States (Cavanagh & Veracini, 2013). The notions and ideals of settler colonialism pervade higher education institutions just as Frederick Jackson Turner’s thesis discusses American nationalism and exploited the Western frontier because the lands were underutilized, yet there were Indigenous nations who were already in existence and thriving (Romero, 2016). What follows is a discussion of what settler colonialism is within the higher education context.

In terms of diversity and racial equity, the higher education history narrative often begins when desegregation and civil rights were at the epicenter of college campuses (Hurtado et al., 1998). Undoubtedly, that time in history is full of worthy examples needed to understand campus climate. However, to begin the historical narrative during the early to mid-1900s ignores the foundational values that informed the creation of the formal Westernized higher education models. To disentangle what values we speak of, one must see educational history through a critical Indigenous lens. History should not be internalized as a stagnant moment of time that happened years ago but rather seen as a continued force that informs everyday norms and operations (Weiss & Fine, 2012). In the case of understanding what role history has on campus climate for Native students through a critical Indigenous lens, one must understand that formalized Western education is rooted in settler colonialism, displacement, and assimilation (Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014). Although some may argue those troubling roots developed generations ago, we assert those values are still evident in today’s higher education system. There are numerous avenues to demonstrate the evidence of oppressive values found in postsecondary settings and for this paper, we focus on: (a) The usage of Indigenous students versus American Indian/Alaska Native students and (b) The importance of place and space in the lived realities of the Indigenous students and their communities.

Typically, when describing the student population that has connections to the land now known as the United States of America, the term American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN) has been ascribed by administrators, policymakers, and political leaders. We purposely avoid referring to this student population as AI/AN to push back on the colonial constraints of this term. By erasing the connotation of what it means to be Indigenous, the meaning of and the connection to the land that Indigenous students and communities have is ignored and replaced with oppressive value systems that are in place today. The term Indigenous is not meant to homogenize the unique aspects of each tribal nation, of which there are currently over 560 federally recognized tribes in the United States, rather there is recognition in the commonly held values of having a connection to the land. In relation to campus climate and inclusive environments, the use of the term Indigenous privileges the first peoples’ of this land connection to place and space. Evidence of this argument can be witnessed through Indigenous value systems and theoretical paradigms (Tuck & Yang, 2012). In the following section, we explore one such framework, called power and place, to name, criticize, and dismantle the oppressive system of modern higher education institutions through a more complete historical positioning.

An Indigenized Theory of Space and Place

In this section, we will highlight the theory on space and place broadly and how that is conceptualized and then provide an Indigenous thought on space and power. Highlighting this is essential in understanding how space specifically on college campuses impacts Indigenous student experiences.

Space and Place Broadly

Critical scholars in various disciplines have considered how place is central to understanding the experiences and realities of the communities that occupy and interact in physical, public spaces (Fraser, 1990; Giroux, Lankshear, C., McLaren, P., & Peters, M., 2015; Greene, 1982; Habermas, 1991; Lefebvre, 1976). Important to mention in this conversation is how space and place are often conflated to mean the same thing. In our view, space and place are relational. Space is primarily the physical location while place is the point of interaction and the ability to process the meaning of those interactions. At times, these interactions may be linked to a physical space, but not always. In relation to education, Gruenwald (2003) asserts that, “Claims of the primacy of place are revolutionary: They suggest that fundamentally significant knowledge is knowledge of the unique places that our lives inhabit.
—and, conversely, that to fail to know those places is to remain in ignorance” (p. 627). Sites of Indigenous genocide and assimilation within the United States, particularly the Southwestern part of the United States, are beginning to acknowledge how discursive spaces are central to understanding the unique historical and contemporary struggle of Indigenous populations, especially in relation to higher education settings. There is a growing body of research exploring the historical and present-day struggle over, and conceptualization of, Indigenous spaces within and outside of formal education.

Meanwhile, there is also a growing acknowledgment that space and place also inform the educational experiences of Native American college students. In Minthorn & Marsh (2016), a photo elicitation study that sought to understand the lived experiences of Native American college students found the experiences of Native American college students deeply connects place to emotions. This included positive and negative experiences, demonstrating the importance for campuses to understand how to create positive spaces and acknowledge the role of colonization in the narrative of higher education institutions.

Indigenous Lens—Power and Place

Indigenous scholars Vine Deloria and Daniel Wildcat (2001) articulate the relational aspects of the world through an Indigenous framework called power and place. In an abbreviated version of Deloria and Wildcat’s contribution, we articulate how power and place complicate and expand upon common higher education buzzwords like sense of belonging, campus climate, and inclusion.

It is through these two concepts that a campus environment is no longer a collection of inanimate objects (e.g., buildings, parking spaces, dorms, libraries) but a space that consists of energies constantly interacting. The energies that animate and inanimate objects produce is what Deloria and Wildcat call power. Power, through their approach, is not about domination. Rather, it recognizes that all entities contribute a force to the human experience. Place is where those energies interact and engage with each other. Once again, Deloria and Wildcat do not recognize place solely as a physical space but as a space that considers the historical, emotional, and sociopolitical contexts that ultimately create and inform experiences. In terms of studying the context of higher education at the intersection of Indigenous student experiences, power and place offer an opportune lens for unpacking the implicit biases and domination of settler colonialism.

Inquiry

Scholars who engage in critical qualitative methods have provided a space to begin honoring the diverse perspectives that actively contends there is not one single truth, but multiple truths (Ladson-Billings, 2003). To ground our conceptual contributions, we have selected to use a critical Indigenous qualitative method of inquiry (CIQMI) (Kovach, 2010). CIQMI asserts as similar and powerful a voice as critical qualitative methods but extends this space by centering Indigenous epistemologies and worldviews as valid means of knowing the world around us. CIQMI employs culturally relevant norms to inform strategies to disrupt the normative values that are embedded within the effects of colonization through education (Tuck & Yang, 2012) and to value the research process as inquiry, not methods. Inquiry allows us to value the reciprocal nature of our study and to ensure that our inquiry builds capacity for Indigenous communities (Kovach, 2010). Along those same lines, we assert this inquiry as both a moral and a political stance against the oppressive systems of colonization that inform daily higher education practice (Denzin, Lincoln and Smith, 2008). There is a growing body of research that centers Indigenous epistemologies and critical inquiry in higher education (Minthorn & Shotton, 2018. This inquiry continues the existing work by demonstrating the need to critically evaluate the physical spaces of higher education.

Conceptually, we center our analysis on one institution of higher education. The motivation to develop this conceptual project has been directly influenced by our daily interactions with Indigenous students and witnessing their interpretations of their experiences on a university campus. Therefore, it is imperative to assert the value of Indigenous methods and emphasize storytelling according to Deloria and Wildcat’s definition of power (2001). Each portion of this paper holds energy that informs subsequent sections.

Site of Inquiry

We have identified the physical space to understand these interactions of energies (i.e., site of inquiry) as the University of New Mexico (UNM) in Albuquerque, New Mexico. We name the institution purposely to help contextualize and validate our approach to this inquiry and to hold structures of higher education accountable for the past and current
actions that continue to impact the lives of the Indigenous students. Depending on the narrative that you follow, New Mexico can be a state filled with rich cultures of the Southwest where you can easily visit one of the twenty-three federally recognized tribes and “appreciate” the beauty of tribal artifacts and foods. Or, New Mexico can be a story of trauma and resilience where the number of tribal communities who originated within the land base that is now New Mexico has dwindled to 23 from effects of Spanish and European colonization (Sando, 1998) and the living cultures of the Indigenous people have been commodified for tourist consumption (Fried, 2010). For this paper, we center the latter. This is not to say New Mexico is the only physical place to embody such an experience. Rather, we assert that each institution of higher education is on land that was held in stewardship of Indigenous people (Lipe, 2012). Thus, each institutional history needs to be individually contextualized through a presettler colonial lens.

Centering our Personal Inquiry

As Indigenous scholars, we center our cultural framing through family histories and experiences to inform the approach to our inquiry. We each offer a short narrative on how the case site is relevant to this case.

**Chris’s Experience.** My first experience with UNM was through a sixth-grade precollege STEM program. For one week, I resided in the Coronado dorm on UNM’s campus. I vividly remember the Pueblo-style structure of the building but being disturbed by the stark off-white walls and the dinginess of the rooms. At the time, I had no understanding that the land that I was on would be traditionally identified as Pueblo of Sandia land. Over the next 25 years, I would continue to be part of the UNM campus in different capacities, as a high school and college student, staff member, and most recently as faculty. When I returned to UNM as a postdoctoral fellow through the Division of Equity and Inclusion (DEI), the Indigenous student-led movement to challenge UNM administration on unbroken promises was at the forefront of my duties. As a new member of the DEI team, my duties were to support issues of inclusivity and diversity. Subsequently, I was transported back to my sixth-grade experience. I began to realize how at the young age of 12, I was being indoctrinated by settler colonialism and normalized to accept oppressive institutional values as the vibrant and beautiful history of New Mexico.

**Robin’s Experience.** I have had experience being on the UNM campus prior to my arrival at UNM as an assistant professor. UNM was one of my dissertation sites and I was able to be on the campus acknowledging the pueblo architectural influence. I didn’t quite know the history until I began my assistant professor position five years ago. I noticed when going into the library the murals before they were brought up and before I became the Kiva Club advisor and how there were no facial features for the people of color on the campus. It was when Nick Estes had created the alternative representation of the UNM presidential seal that I really connected the colonization that UNM stood for in its symbolism. I became the Kiva Club advisor three years ago and have stood alongside the students in their plight to abolish the racist seal. A year before this, I also began serving on the UNM Provost’s Diversity Council. I was then asked to sit on the seal redesign committee. The story of decolonizing UNM and holding the institution accountable to Indigenous people needs to be told.

### The Colonized and Racist Indigenous Campus Tour

The notion to conceptually develop the Colonized and Racist Indigenous Campus Tour is inspired by the ongoing fight to have the university presidential seal rebranded at UNM (University of New Mexico). In the push to rebrand the seal, the opposition articulates the seal, which highlights a frontiersman and a conquistador, as celebrating the rich history of New Mexico. Similar disputes regarding oppressive messaging through imagery can be seen at other U.S. college campuses (e.g., Confederate statues and flags) (Brasher, Alderman, & Inwood, 2017; George & Williams, 2017). Though the movement to remove symbols of oppression has gained some momentum (Price, 2017; Watkins, 2017), the oppressive symbols that affect Indigenous people are not being addressed. By appropriating the modern college campus tour, we offer an Indigenous community narrative that highlights the oppressive messaging embedded in daily rituals like a campus tour. Campus tours are not merely a college recruitment tool but also a method that exemplifies the norms and values held by an institution.
The Colonized and Racist Indigenous Campus Tour begins to overtly name the systemic and oppressive values that college campuses perpetuate at the expense of Indigenous students and other students from communities who have a troubling past with colonization and genocide. Each subsequent section offers a mock narrative that describes a stop that may occur on a campus tour at the UNM college campus. Although hypothetical, the campus tour stops are substantiated by historical resources and images found on the UNM campus. At each stop, we offer a critique by centering perspectives that challenge settler colonial values and genocidal undertones. The following conceptual model (see Figure 1) demonstrates how we link each stop to specific disciplines relevant to student affairs and the study of higher education.

The outer ring represents the larger higher education fields covered in this paper. The next inner ring specifically names the location or imagery highlighted on this campus tour. The next inner layer identifies questions associated with each location and how Deloria and Wildcat’s definition of place is understood. At the center are the colonial and settler norms that often guide the portrayal of each stop. The aim of this model is to disrupt the centering of colonial and settler norms by offering an Indigenous community narrative to each documented stop.

Stop 1: “Welcome to Hodgins Hall, UNM’s First Building”

Good morning! Welcome to the University of New Mexico! I will be your tour guide today! … UNM was founded on February 28, 1899. UNM has a great history here in the Albuquerque area. Prior to the founding of the university, there were “no roads or houses, nothing but sand, saltbush, and desert critters, no water, trees, or vestiges of civilization” (Davis, 2006, p. 1). We begin our tour at Hodgins Hall, the alumni building and the oldest building on campus. Imagine this building and a few others standing on this “uninhabited mesa … [while Hodgins Hall is] a modified pueblo [it is] more beautiful than any of the pueblos we know” (Hughes, 1989, p. 7). Prior to UNM being built “the territory was desperately poor. There was almost no industry, only some farming and ranching, mostly on a subsistence level, and logging in the northern counties” (Hooker, 2000, p. 3).

During a typical campus tour, a tour guide often parrots the date and founder(s) of the institution. By building an institutional legacy, campus tour attendees can begin to sense the pride in attending this university. Additional facts deemed relevant by campus administrators would further establish the long-standing nature of the institution. From the mock narrative, evidence of settler colonialism is demonstrated as the institutional history removes any evidence of Indigenous people who occupied this land prior to when the first institutional building was erected. Instead, there are various phrases that are used to describe the land as being unoccupied and underdeveloped before the founding of the institution. Within these descriptions, there is a lack of inclusion or acknowledgment of the Indigenous
peoples of the area. When the energies embodied by Indigenous communities are stifled and ignored, it can create an imbalance that not only harms contemporary Indigenous students but harms Indigenous communities that remain and thrive near and on campus (Deloria & Wildcat, 2001).

What is important to note, though, is that historical narratives only mention Indigenous peoples, including the Pueblo tribes and the Navajo and Apache Nations, when buildings were being structured and artwork was being considered. Tony Hillerman, a well-known author of investigative novels and nonfiction books of the Southwest, only acknowledged the Indigenous peoples along with “the Spanish conquistadors and Franciscan missionaries and then the Mexicans” and says, “these were finally engulfed by the westward sweep of the Anglo-Americans” (Davis, 2006, p. 3). The land base had always been inhabited and used by the surrounding southern Pueblos and Navajo people. Meanwhile, the historical narrative of land purchase was described as being bought for “$5 per acre, and the land was literally dirt cheap” and in 1889 when UNM was founded, “the Territory of New Mexico was still a wild frontier” (Davis, 2006, p. 1). When campus tours continue to glorify the historical founding of UNM on barren land while describing a need for higher education institutions to serve, the needs of the people becomes an oxymoron for those whose complex history is enfolded in this colonized narrative. Often the people who were sought to serve left out the Indigenous populations and people whose connection to these lands were there for centuries prior to colonization. This is a settler narrative of UNM and one that continues to impact the Indigenous students and communities today.

Stop 2: Viewing the Dorm

The University of New Mexico currently has seven residence halls and 15 living and learning communities. Nearly 2,000 UNM students call our campus home. Our most established and largest residence hall is Coronado Hall (see Figure 4). At Coronado Hall, you will have quick access to Johnson field, which hosts many activities throughout the year. The Laguna-DeVargas Hall (see Figure 3) offers suites, where you will be afforded more space while still maintaining a close connection with your fellow classmates. UNM also recently partnered with a private company to offer Casa del Rio and Lobo Village. At these locations, you will be able to call the Jemez or Gila Halls your home (see Figure 2).

A natural stop during a modern campus tour would include student housing. This experience is often the selling point of the campus tour and is meant to entice young people and their families with the wonderful amenities offered on campus. However, it is during this stage of the campus tour where appropriation and misuse of Indigenous tribal names are normalized and strip the Indigenous community of their ability to assert agency on college campuses.

In the case of UNM, the current and historical practices normalize genocide and colonization and this is evident through the Indigenous appropriation of building architecture and names. When President William George Tight was in his administrative office (1901–1909), he was interested in the pueblo-style architecture (particularly the Hopi villages in Arizona). He photographed the pueblos as he traveled in hopes of replicating the building authentically on UNM’s campus (Davis, 2006), but what he was actually engaging in was cultural appropriation of pueblo homelife and culture. It is not known if he received permission to photograph or if he received permission to replicate in this style from those communities, but from historical documentation between settler colonialists and Pueblo communities, it would not be uncommon for outsiders to take pictures and imagery without permission (Sando, 1998).

In addition to not seeing any formal protocols honoring tribal consultation, the problematic nature of appropriating Indigenous tribal names is not the full extent of oppressive practices. Many of the building names reflect the names of conquistadors that have been historically linked to the genocide of the Indigenous people (Romero, 2016). The naming of the buildings, like Coronado and Oñate (see Figure 4), valorizes individuals who have single-handedly murdered the ancestors of current UNM students who
come from Southwestern Indigenous communities. Another student housing worth mentioning is Laguna Hall (a Pueblo tribe) and DeVargas Hall (a Spanish conquistador) (see Figure 3). Even though separate buildings, they are commonly referred to as one by their initials, LDV, on UNM’s campus. The initials flow nicely together but when analyzed they are two names paradoxically joined together. The joining of the two buildings blatantly disregards the deadly relationship Don Diego de Vargas had with Pueblo communities. Diego de Vargas was the governor of the Spanish settlement and was credited with the resettlement of Santa Fe after the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 (Cajete, 2010). Although colonial-friendly history positions the resettlement of Santa Fe as bloodless, it led to waves of encounters that led to Indigenous people of the Pueblos being killed or enslaved. It is thought that during the span of New Mexican colonization, 90% of the Pueblo population was lost (Cajete, 2010).

The blatant disregard of honoring the first peoples of this land and the continued oppressive practices are a symptom of not embracing a decolonized version of history. This includes not viewing these buildings and their names as holding energies that are destructive to the well-being and sense of belonging of Indigenous students (Romero, 2016). In order to create inclusive campus spaces, universities, like UNM, need to critically assess the messages they are conveying and how those messages are hostile to student well-being.

The messaging conveyed through campus housing tours should be inclusive and not steeped in colonization, removal, and genocide. However, as demonstrated in this colonized and racist campus tour, it becomes evident that student life has a large shadow cast over it and what should become clearer is that colonization still occurs today and that institutions of higher education are participating in those actions. Unfortunately, as the campus tour continues, mounting evidence reveals that oppressive practices can also be found in the academic life of college.
campus tour a library visit would be highlighted. However, upon further investigation, there continues to be a trend of spaces being hostile toward Indigenous students. The UNM Zimmerman library is no exception.

Named after the late UNM President James Zimmerman in 1961 (Davis, 2006), the building architecture is clearly appropriated from pueblo-style homes (See Figure 5). Although problematic, the more disturbing aspects of this location are murals located inside the building (See Figure 6). The Three Peoples Murals is best described by Dr. Alicia Romero (2016), “UNM is replete with images that celebrate the myth of tri-cultural harmony that erases colonialism and valorizes white supremacy” (para. 3). The image in the top left represents the Indigenous people. Upon closer analysis, the faces of the individuals are nonexistent, as if their identity has been stripped of their livelihood. It is also important to note that in that same image there is a teepee in the top left corner. Teepees are generally traditional homes of tribal communities found in the plains and northern regions. The inclusion of a teepee further trivializes the Indigenous people of this land, which ultimately diminishes any sense of agency for Indigenous communities.

It is important to note that the protests of these murals have been waged not only by Indigenous people but also by other communities of color and women for their disparaging imagery (MacNeal, 2016). For example, the women portrayed are either seated in meek positions or not front facing with any expression. We highlight the campus library, the symbol of learning on most college campuses, to emphasize the ingrained nature of colonization and genocide in everyday life. Furthermore, like the previous two stops, the power and energies of marginalized communities are being controlled and manipulated by settlers who continue to perpetuate colonialism in modern higher education settings. For Indigenous students, this translates to them entering a space, what is supposed to advance their knowledge, that reeks of oppression. They, like all students, should be able to enter a library without having to confront the murals that perpetuate stereotypes and romanticize a time in history when Indigenous people of the Southwest were being displaced from their traditional homelands. To date, it has been largely Indigenous leaders that have pushed back upon these oppressive structures, and in the next stage of the campus tour we explore the concept of leadership in these movements.

Stop 4: Visiting the President’s Office

On our last stop, we like to highlight Scholes Hall. Built in 1934, Scholes Hall is home to the Office of the President (National Register of Historic Places, n.d.). Our president is considered our “visionary and cooperative leader who can lead the campus community and various stakeholders throughout the state in building a better future for the University while championing the University’s current successes and significant positive impacts on the citizens of New Mexico” (University of New Mexico, n.d., p. 1). UNM has had 21 presidents since 1891 (University of New Mexico Office of the President, n.d.), and as you become familiar with prominent buildings on campus, you will see the presidential legacies represented in buildings like Popejoy Hall and Zimmerman Library.

Throughout a campus tour, it may be common for the tour guide to mention institutional leaders to draw upon the sense of pride and prowess an institution embodies. Commonly known as an organizational saga, this phenomenon affirms normative behaviors through historical figures and events (Clark, 1972). In the case of UNM, there is not an absence of this phenomenon. Evidence of this has been established by previous campus tour stops (e.g., building names, absence of Indigenous presence). This section continues the thread of erasure of energies and power through colonialism; but rather than focus on how the dominant narrative has removed and appropriated Indigenous energies and power, we focus on the actions Indigenous students have taken to reclaim an Indigenous community narrative that pushes back on
the organizational forces that are imbued in colonial and racist tendencies. We highlight the experiences of two Indigenous UNM students. The first student is Larry Casuse who was a member of the Kiva Club, a student-led club that was “first chartered in 1952. [With] the purpose … to encourage student and community involvement with Native American issues and events on the University of New Mexico campus and in the surrounding communities …” (Kiva Club, n.d.). The second student is Nick Estes (Kul Wicasa Sicangu Tintonwan), who has connections to many of the Kiva Club leaders and at the time of this research a doctoral student who helped co-found the Red Nation, a community-organizing group based out of Albuquerque.

We first center Larry Casuse’s story to demonstrate how his actions left a long-lasting impact that drives the current student-led opposition to remove the long-standing and controversial UNM presidential seal (See Figure 7). Casuse’s story also points to the realities of Indigenous students at UNM and demonstrates how a continuation of colonial and racist practices harm the livelihood of the Indigenous community. Nick Estes’s role in the abolishing the UNM presidential seal (See Figure 8) demonstrates the colonial and racist actions still in practice by modern institutions of higher education. Nick helped start a conversation through the modification of the seal that then encouraged Kiva Club leaders and members to push for its abolishment at UNM. It is through these stories that we, the authors, acknowledge and honor the energies and power that assert Indigenous voices to bring healing and agency to past, current, and future Indigenous college students.

The Legacy of Larry Cause. Since the 1970s, the Kiva Club’s oral history and historical narrative speak to the efforts of those within their organization and the university itself promoting a change to the University’s presidential seal. These efforts were not recognized, and minimal traction was made within the university or community. Although, the spirit of Larry Casuse demonstrates how one student, committed to standing up for the public good of higher education and his own community, gave his own life. In 1973, Casuse kidnapped the mayor of Gallup, Emmet Garcia, in hopes of addressing the mistreatment of Navajo peoples in the border town of Gallup, New Mexico, and the conflicting roles Garcia had as a pending Board of Regent for UNM. Casuse and other Kiva Club members argued that Garcia’s partial ownership of the Navajo Inn created a conflict of interest. The conflict arose in the fact that, at the time, the Navajo Inn had the highest liquor sales in the Gallup area and sold a large amount of liquor to Navajo people (Horn, 1981). It is important to note that the Kiva Club and Casuse sought conventional methods of protest by working with the UNM student government to communicate the conflict of interest. A resolution was passed noting the conflict with Garcia’s roles in regard to ownership of the Navajo Inn and as Board of Director on the Alcoholic Rehabilitation Center in Gallup. An editorial was also released noting this conflict in the Daily Lobo that had urged the governor to “reconsider Garcia’s appointment” (Horn, 1981).

Despite public disapproval of Garcia, the UNM Regents held a meeting where the swearing-in would take place. The conflicts of interest and the role that Garcia had in the pandemic of alcoholism within the Navajo Nation led to the kidnapping and acts of resistance by Casuse. Casuse ended up being murdered by police officers at the age of nineteen for standing up against injustice and his advocacy for action that would bring some sort of healing to his people and community. After his death on March 1st of 1973, there were memorials and marches that attempted to honor the legacy left by Casuse. A part of this was also to mobilize the Kiva Club with the larger community to establish demands to humanize and meet the needs of Indigenous students on the UNM campus.

Steps toward abolishing the racist UNM presidential seal. Fast-forwarding over 40 years, the spirit of resistance and resilience of Casuse guided the ongoing movement to abolish the racist UNM presidential seal, which is specifically used for official presidential operations. The revitalization of this movement stems from a picture that then-doctoral UNM student, Nick Estes, created. Copies of the
picture were placed in the UNM architecture building to begin a grassroots effort to enact movement toward changing the seal (See Figure 8). The controversy was then brought to the attention of the UNM Diversity Council and other university-related offices to find out who had created and disbursed the image and what actions needed to be taken.

From this, a university-wide program was initiated by the UNM Diversity Council and College of Education faculty entitled “Race, Power and Representation” to discuss the imagery that is found across UNM in artistic representation and the presidential seal. Charlene Teters, who is widely recognized for her activism to remove the Chief Illiniwek from the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign as a racist mascot, was asked to speak along with Nick Estes. Nick Estes, a then-doctoral student at UNM, was the person who brought attention to the UNM seal through a very prolific and attention-grabbing approach. The resulting conversations and movements inspired the Kiva Club to begin the movement to “Abolish the Racist Seal” and to create a list of eleven demands. These were made in conjunction with the feedback and work of the Red Nation (a newly formed community organization which many Kiva Club members are also a part of).

Since the movement to abolish the racist seal at UNM, the university has begun to take responsibility and action. Momentum experienced an upswing as the university president left and the interim president, Chaouki Abdullah (previously the provost of UNM), made sure there was the formation of a seal redesign committee early in 2017. Once the seal redesign committee met, there was a formal action taken by the committee to abolish/retire the UNM presidential seal and to temporarily adopt the commercial seal. This significant change also meant phasing out of the Spring 2017 graduation gowns that had the prior presidential seal on it. The current plan is that the former seal will be completely phased out of the graduation gowns by the end of Fall 2017. UNM leadership still have to address the removal of the seal that is currently on the UNM diplomas and signage at graduation. However, as of Spring 2017 commencement, the seal has been removed in the background decoration and on the lectern.

In good faith, other actions have been taken to begin to address the Kiva Club’s list of eleven demands, including the formation of a committee at the UNM library to begin investigating the murals in Zimmerman library and the presentation of history within the library itself. There have also been discussions with the interim president and other upper administration regarding the adoption of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) document as a formal UNM policy, as well as revisiting the movement of replacing Columbus Day with the Indigenous Peoples Day of Resistance and Resilience.

Unfortunately, significant progress was temporarily halted in the spring of 2017 due to budgetary issues within the state. Regardless, the current interim president has been intentional in meeting with the Kiva Club to provide updates and to be transparent in his efforts on how to implement and support the list of eleven demands by discussing the prioritization of which demands to focus on in the near future. As a result, the retelling the UNM history and representation to include Indigenous peoples’ narratives and perspectives has been accomplished.

**Recommendations**

Through the colonized and racist campus tour, it is evident that the representations on campus are powerful, yet oppressive. As institutional leaders strive to make postsecondary institutions more inclusive, it is imperative that the process begins with a relationship between place and space. Though many of the buildings and images are inanimate from a Western viewpoint, an Indigenous lens demonstrates that each of these items carries energy. That energy, influenced by colonialism and genocide, impacts the daily lives of students. We posit that Deloria and Wildcat's definition of place allows one to understand that a campus tour stop is
more than a collection of images and location, but a lively interaction of energies that have created a space where the energies and power of Native students are being subdued. To continue challenging and changing how campus environments are portrayed, we offer several recommendations directed toward higher education administrators, staff, faculty, and researchers.

**Acknowledging Settler Colonialism Within Higher Education Historical Narratives**

Recent work on campus climate has begun to challenge the dominant norms. Museus’s (2014) culturally engaging campus environments (CECE) model acknowledges the importance of understanding individual student’s cultural heritage and values and how those perspectives often challenge the Western paradigms that influence daily campus operations. Many scholars have relied on critical theory (e.g., critical race theory) to formulate arguments about racism and oppression. Continuing this line of work is imperative, but we encourage casting a wider net to encompass settler colonialism (Tuck & Yang, 2012). As demonstrated throughout the colonized and racist campus tour, college campuses are filled with dangerous assumptions about who were the original stewards of this land, when institutional history truly begins, and how campus architecture and names should be designated. One can go back through the four stops provided in the previous section to see how campus tours are viewed from a dominant perspective as well as from a student affairs perspective. We encourage administrators, practitioners, and researchers to familiarize themselves with settler colonialism paradigms to expand when historical analysis begins on their respective campuses. In terms of campus tours, we recommend that each campus evaluate the (un)intended messages embedded in history and lore told during prospective students’ first experience on their campus.

**Acknowledging Indigenous Populations in the Historical Narrative and Requiring Accountability to the Present Indigenous Communities**

It is imperative that each higher education institution begin to formally acknowledge the Indigenous populations that reside within the proximity of their campuses and to also acknowledge those whose lands traditionally occupied these spaces in ceremonies, events, and activities held by the institution, particularly when physical and visual representation is absent from the campus and surrounding community. This act of acknowledgment will encourage the institutional administrators, student affairs leaders, and student leaders to be mindful of the Indigenous populations of today and to be held accountable for how they are working alongside them on a consistent basis. This is often a piece that is missing: formal acknowledgment at campus events and accountability to Indigenous populations on a consistent basis that instills a reciprocal relationship. Acknowledgment of Indigenous peoples also creates a space to discuss the level of visibility of Indigenous peoples and their traditions on campus. For example, at nearly all public events acknowledgments are given to honorary guests or contributors of the event. It is during this time that campus leaders, both employees and students, can incorporate an Indigenous acknowledgment. These intentional actions allow campuses an opportunity to decolonize the institution’s historical narrative and understand the role institutions may have played in the displacement of Indigenous peoples. Some institutions are engaging in this activity (Blackhawk et al., 2014; Clemmer-Smith et al., 2014), and although it may be an uncomfortable process, it demonstrates a move toward true inclusivity and diversity.

**Revisit Building Name Policies and Existing Names That Promote Colonialism**

Institutional policy needs to be rewritten to formalize the role of community voice when developing and amending campus building names. A formal process would create consistency and honor an institution’s commitment to be inclusive of Indigenous communities. For example, the process for approval from Indigenous and tribal communities is not well documented for UNM and little is discussed on the residential hall website. Meanwhile, there is a process for naming buildings set under the Section 2.11 of the Regent’s Policy Manual adopted in 1996 and amended in 2001 and 2005 (UNM Policy Office, 2018). The process to receive permission on naming buildings only goes as far as receiving permission from the president, board of regents, and other upper administration but does not take into account the process of receiving community approval and permissions to name buildings after respective communities, specifically tribal communities. The failure to institutionalize processes and protocols allows institutional leaders and administrators, particularly those in student residential life, to continue the oppressive practices that are rooted in settler colonialism. For institutional leaders to tout inclusivity, we recommend that policies that are related to physical campus space be assessed for inclusivity of Indigenous peoples. After all, all institutions of higher education reside on traditional Indigenous land.
Conclusion

In conclusion, we offer this piece as an entryway to beginning to tell the untold stories of Indigenous peoples within the historical narrative, symbolism, and present-day stories. There is an intimate connection that Indigenous peoples hold value to in regards to space and land that is not tied to ownership rather it is a connection that is ancestral and spiritual. We hope in bringing the perils of history and current stories of UNM to light that it will encourage others to investigate how settler colonialism pervades almost every aspect of institutional memory and life. Let us not forget that what seemed to be “barren and desolate” actually held centuries of connections to plants, medicines, creation stories, and other meaningful connections that are forgotten in the told stories of our higher education institutions.
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