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The Atchison & Topeka was chartered by the Kansas legislature in 1859 and renamed the Atchison, Topeka, & Santa Fe Railway in 1863. It was popularly referred to as "The Santa Fe." Fred Harvey, an Englishman who moved to the United States in the early 1800s, pitched the idea of opening a trackside eating house in Topeka, Kansas, to the Santa Fe Railway in 1876. The Santa Fe Railway obliged, and when the restaurant proved to be wildly popular, the Railway started building "Harvey Houses" down the rail line, introducing luxury hotels and eventually cultural attractions, the first of which was built in the Albuquerque depot in 1902. Fred Harvey establishments were considered an advertising venture for the Railway and never proved to be very profitable on their own, although they were successfully drawing customers and tourists to the Santa Fe line. For a thorough history of the Harvey-Santa Fe advertising partnership see T. C. McLuhan, *Dream Tracks* (1985), and for a complete history of the Fred Harvey Company, see Stephen Fried, *Appetite for America* (2010).

In 1903, the Fred Harvey Company distributed the *Indian and Mexican Building and Indian Museum booklet* to passengers aboard the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway, advertising its new cultural attractions in the Albuquerque, New Mexico train station. The booklet informed travelers that the “largest and finest collections of Indian and Mexican goods in this country” awaited them in the Indian Building’s “Modern Blanket Room,” “Old Blanket and Pottery Room,” and “Spanish and Mexican Room” (n. pag.). The Modern Blanket Room doubled as a demonstration area where travelers could witness “Navaho [sic] squaws weaving blankets; Indian *quirt* makers and silversmiths at work with their crude instruments; Pueblos moulding and decorating their pottery; and not the least interesting, Pomo and Apache women busily engaged in making baskets” (n. pag.). While living artisans from multiple tribes were grouped indiscriminately together in the “modern” room, the goods they produced were clearly demarcated in the adjacent Indian...
Museum, where “are shown many ethnological specimens, classified by tribes, illustrating the life and customs of the western Indians, past and present” (n. pag.). These artifacts of “past and present” were on display in the museum’s Pacific Islands Room, featuring “war clubs, spears, arrows and bows, idols, [and] carved prow heads used half a century and more ago,” and the “Spanish and Mexican Room contain[ed] old tapestries and altar cloths, having been in use from two to three hundred years” (n. pag.). East and West, past and present, Native American artisan and white tourist converged—and were subsequently sorted and classified—in highly controlled spaces orchestrated by the Fred Harvey Indian Department, a cultural endeavor of the Harvey trackside hotels and restaurants along the Santa Fe Railway.

Shortly after the Harvey Company established the Albuquerque trackside museum in 1902, the company began expanding its cultural attractions down the Santa Fe line and built more spaces where white tourists could encounter Native American tribes in seemingly authentic arenas. While the collections in the Albuquerque Indian and Mexican Building and Indian Museum were broad in geographic scope, most Fred Harvey attractions focused on southwestern Native American tribes, such as the Hopi House built in 1905 on the grounds of the Harvey Company’s famous El Tovar Grand Canyon hotel. As in Albuquerque, the Hopi House museum included Native American artist-demonstrators, dubbed “Harvey Indians,” who performed domestic chores and made traditional Native American pots, blankets, and jewelry inside “an exact reproduction of the curious two and three-story stone buildings of the Hopi Indians” (Hopi House n. pag.). The Harvey Company promised tourists a close encounter with the Hopi tribe, who “have been seen by comparatively few white people” and are “[w]ithout exception the most primitive Indians in the country, devoting much of their time to arts and ceremonies that have been practiced by their ancestors for hundreds of years” (n. pag.). The Fred Harvey Company—acting as museum curator, trained ethnographer, objective archivist, and knowledgeable scientist—made sense of the Southwest to rail travelers by declaring it to be America’s birthplace, thereby establishing the company’s own reputation as the host who “introduced America to Americans” (Waters 109).

Through staged scenes of Native American life, the Harvey Company crafted a narrative of Anglo-Americans—not Native Americans—earliest, most noble roots. Through peaceful scenes of industrious, hardworking Native Americans, the company celebrated middle-class Anglo-American values. Additionally, the Native Americans’ deliberately staged preindustrial artisanal and domestic work presented them as living relics of a bygone past, signaling an incompatibility with industrialization that relegated them to a lower status than that of the “modern” Americans arriving in the Southwest by train. According to the Harvey Company’s scripted formulations, Native Americans were the genesis of
American exceptionalism that Anglo-Americans embodied. Joel Dinerstein offers insight relevant to the Harvey Company’s construction of premodern scenes in his analysis of American “techno-fundamentalism,” in which technology “structures the American sense of power and revenge, the nation’s sense of well-being, its arrogant sense of superiority, and its righteous justification for global dominance” (569). By emphasizing southwestern tribes’ preindustrial qualities, staged Harvey Company scenes ranked Native Americans below the implicitly more modern white tourists, whose rail travel signaled their ability to adapt to new technologies and use them to their advantage. Staged scenes of Hopis living in huts and of seated Diné / Navajos making pottery and blankets by hand ultimately cast them “as risk averse and enslaved to obsolescent ideologies—that is, as not progressing—[which] sentences them to second-class status with regard to the future” (Dinerstein 572).

By creating living archives of America’s past in the Southwest, the Harvey Company scripted white modern Americans as the rightful inheritors of the lands that “vanishing Indians” occupied, ultimately reifying the myth of manifest destiny. The Harvey Company’s live displays of Native American artisans simultaneously produced and recorded America’s manifest destiny, functioning as an archive that, as Jacques Derrida sets forth in Archive Fever, “produces as much as it records the event” (17). For example, the process of grouping together living Native Americans with no regard to their tribal or regional identity in roped-off demonstration areas showcased the importance of the authentic wares they produced—and that were on sale in trackside gift shops. By contrast, the Indian Museum adjacent to the demonstration areas, which painstakingly classified ancient relics by tribe, signaled that tribal identity was important only in terms of studying the past. The resulting narrative cast the Harvey Company as a reliable custodian of the region’s history and, implicitly, a trustworthy steward of the Southwest’s ironic future as white America’s ancient birthplace.

The Harvey Company and Santa Fe Railway used advances in photography and print technologies to produce and circulate promotional materials that reinforced these narratives of American exceptionalism on display in trackside spaces. The commercial print archive in the Southwest, which advertised the Harvey Company and the Santa Fe’s new vision of the American Southwest as a profitable space for American tourism and expansion, “[took] place at the place of originary and structural breakdown of the said memory” (Derrida 11). Print advertising campaigns involving railway calendars, illustrated booklets, and Harvey Company postcards carried out the familiar story of manifest destiny, but with Native Americans recast as white Americans’ benevolent ancestors, rather than as foes, which conveniently erased from memory the violence of Euro-American westward expansion. As Walter L. Hixson explains, “[i]n order for the settler colony to establish a collective usable past, legitimating stories must be created and persistently affirmed as a
In 2013, as an advanced graduate student in Southern Methodist University’s Department of English, I initiated a partnership with the DeGolyer Library and the Norwick Center for Digital Solutions (nCDS) to digitize the Fred Harvey Company materials and make them available through SMU Libraries Digital Collections. Although such partnerships with advanced researchers were outside of the SMU Libraries’ established workflow, the library staff created a tailored practicum in which I curated the digital Fred Harvey Company collection and learned the basics of metadata creation using the nCDS Filenaming, Workflow, and Metadata Guidelines. In this article, I reflect on this productive partnership, and offer recommendations for American Studies researchers who pursue similar partnerships, or who use digital collections as a starting point for digital humanities projects. Special thanks to Cindy Boeke, Assistant Director of nCDS, and Russel Martin, Director of the DeGolyer Library, for their mentorship and collaboration on this project.

The commercial print archive in the Southwest established a new settler-colonial dynamic, which beckoned to white travelers and settlers by fabricating a peaceful story of Indigenous benefactors and deserving white inheritors. This essay is interested in the ways that digital technologies, specifically web publication and metadata creation, are complicit in the repackaging and circulation of such settler-colonial logic. I examine a digital collection that I curated in collaboration with special collections librarians and digitization specialists, The Fred Harvey Company Materials at the DeGolyer Library, a subset of Southern Methodist University’s digital U.S. West Photographs, Manuscripts, and Imprints collection, to explore the ways that knowledge systems, information organization, and digital technologies unwittingly reproduce colonial logic in the pursuit of open access and objectivity. Digital collections aid in the preservation of deteriorating physical collections and improve access to rare cultural heritage items, both noteworthy pursuits. However, the curation and creation of these digital collections is often the work of academic librarians and archivists, both predominately white professions in the United States. In this context, we risk replicating the conditions of the creation of the early twentieth-century railway archive, in which white advertising executives and tour guides told the history of Indigenous peoples through mythologies of inevitable westward expansion and technological progress.

In seeking to understand and rectify the ways that digital computation has created racialized spaces and boundaries in our current academic practices, this essay offers potential contributions at the intersections of digital humanities and American Studies methodologies. Critiquing the narratives and legacies created by commercial archives of the Southwest, I ask how scholars’ rush to preserve and publish these rare and fragile materials via digitization replicates the patronizing logic employed in Harvey Company cultural attractions toward southwestern Native populations. As Miriam Posner posits, in digital environments “it makes more sense to define race not as a data point in itself but as the product of a set of relationships of power; in that sense, it is both imaginary and constitutive of our reality” (35). Examining the digitization and metadata creation of obviously problematic collections such as the Harvey Company / Santa Fe commercial archive can, I believe, draw our attention to more subtle, but no less harmful and reductive, violations committed in present-day attempts to generate a more inclusive politics of representation on our screens. This essay therefore addresses Posner’s call to go beyond creating “projects so that they feature marginalized communities more prominently” and shift our energies toward “ripping apart and rebuilding the machinery of the archive and database so that it does not reproduce the [reductive] logic that got us here in the first place” (35). The practices of American Studies enable us to critique not only the history but also the transmission of historical metanarratives through the cre-
ation of the archive, its fetishization and solidification through the circulation of print materials, and—the central focus of this essay—the role of technology in reproducing both this narrative and this practice. Through such a critique, American Studies can offer new ways to theorize and create digital environments that resist harmful logic and that inform the ways we adopt and adapt knowledge systems and develop information technologies premised on flexibility and multiplicity.

In this essay, I agree with and draw upon Tara McPherson’s observation that

[t]he object […] supplanting the archive is the database, particularly if we understand the database, following [Kenneth] Price, in both a technical and metaphorical sense. While physical archives obviously continue to exist (and to decay much faster than they can be digitized), the database ingests, supersedes, and obsolesces the archive. (487)

I read the Harvey Company’s physical archive at SMU’s DeGolyer Library and the digital collection of Harvey Company materials that I helped to generate and that are currently maintained by SMU’s Norwick Center for Digital Solutions as an illustration of the perils and opportunities of digitalizing special collections materials, particularly those with problematic narratives and images that would go unnoticed if left in their archival boxes. With the Harvey Company materials, I follow McPherson’s call to view the digital’s eclipse of the archive as a productive post-archival moment. Specifically, I will use the Harvey Company’s digital and physical materials to imagine a post-archival, flexible interface, and use the post-archive as a useful rubric through which we can rethink current organizational structures—both institutional and informational—to avoid replicating the damaging ideologies that created archives such as the Harvey Company’s, and that continue to insidiously and powerfully inform information retrieval and scholarly publishing.

**Weaving Past and Present in the Twentieth-Century Southwest**

Advancements in technology and the commerce it facilitated were at the heart of the story that the Harvey Company told about the Southwest and the Native Americans in the region. The typical formulation of the Harvey promotional materials scripted new technologies onto traditional methods to reinforce the techno-deterministic narrative that Native Americans were stubbornly locked in the past, thereby proving them unworthy of the land they occupied. Diné / Navajo weaver “Elle of Ganado,” often the centerpiece of such stories, gained celebrity status through the Harvey Company’s showcasing of the blankets she wove, and was one of the few “Harvey Indians” referred to by name in promotional materials. Three pages of *The Indian and Mexican Building and In-
Indian Museum are dedicated to Elle, “the most famous weaver of the Navahos [sic],” praising the blanket she wove for President Roosevelt’s 1903 visit to Albuquerque (n.pag.). Elle’s blanket brought national exposure to the Harvey Company, as six national newspapers covered Roosevelt’s visit and his meeting with Elle (cf. Pardue and Howard 170-71 and Fried 188-90). Capitalizing on the publicity, the Harvey Company reprinted two of these newspaper articles in the promotional booklet alongside photographs of Elle next to the famous blanket. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat stated that Elle “was highly elated with the important task to which she had been appointed” (qtd. in Indian and Mexican Building n.pag.), and the Albuquerque Journal-Democrat described the exchange between the President and Elle as an exchange between benevolent colonizer and grateful colonial subject, reporting that he “gave her a hearty shake and told her how much he appreciated the work. The little speech was interpreted and pleased the Indian woman beyond expression” (qtd. in Indian and Mexican Building n.pag.). Reassuring readers of Elle’s gratitude, both newspapers reported that Elle understood the significance of the meeting despite her lack of English-language fluency.

The Harvey Company commissioned Elle to weave a message into the presidential blanket in place of the patterns traditionally woven into Diné / Navajo blankets. Scripting their commercial influence onto Diné / Navajo art, the blanket read: “THE PRESIDENT | HONORARY MEMBERSHIP CARD | COMMERCIAL CLUB | ALBUQUERQUE | MAY 5, 1903.” The Indian and Mexican Building includes pictures of Elle standing next to the finished blanket, as well as a picture of her next to the blanket-in-progress on the loom, with the caption “The President’s Blanket and Its Maker” (n.pag.). The spectacle of a Diné / Navajo woman literally weaving a company’s message of commercial influence into the fabric of the blanket “unashamedly declared the link between Indian art and turn-of-the-century capitalism,” signifying a “cultural crossroads” in which Native American artisans were “entering into new kinds of economic relationships that would affect their work and their communities in profound ways” (Moore 22). Elle became a Harvey Company celebrity by weaving the blanket, but as the caption referring to her as “its maker” proves, her status was valued insofar as she was linked to the commodified blanket and, by extension, the Harvey Company. Elle’s cheerful endorsement of the new economic relationship was the true subject of the promotional narrative, authorizing the Harvey Company’s appropriation of Diné / Navajo art for commercial gain (Figure 1).

Such narratives naturalized the settler-colonial presence of corporate influence through Native Americans’ alleged endorsement and played an important role in not just the appropriation of Native American art and culture, but also of Native American territory. Elle’s artisanal labor and her handmade blanket seemed to come from the “exotic pockets of the nation where industrialization, urbanization, and bureaucratization
of the era had not yet [...] taken hold” (Moore 23). This absence of technology was used to draw tourists to this “exotic,” ancient area, but also reinforced the settler-colonial dynamic between white capitalists and Native American artisans in the area. There is no picture of Elle standing with Roosevelt, although the booklet does tell us that “she fully understood the importance of the ‘Great Father,’ and asked permission to be present when the blanket was presented to him. Her request was granted” (n. pag.). The spectacle of Elle’s blanket and its presentation to the “Great Father” illustrates the American “notion of necessary ‘progress’ in contrast to the ‘sideways or backwards’ vectors of an invention-free society, [which] is key to understanding the relationship among law, technology, commerce, and ideology in America” (Vaidhyanathan 558).

Roosevelt, the paternalistic “Great Father,” was granted a traditional Dîne / Navajo blanket that doubled as “membership card” to the local Chamber of Commerce, signaling the importance of white American intervention in this seemingly preindustrial region. This exchange is indicative of the Harvey Company’s participation in a larger turn-of-the-century trend that Elizabeth Hutchinson terms “the Indian Craze,” in which “Native American art allowed people of the United States to combine these nationalist and colonialist interests, by appropriating the material culture of subjugated indigenous people as an expression of national aesthetics” (Hutchinson 26).

To claim their corporate territory, the Harvey Company leveraged technologies of print, photography, and rail to further U.S. efforts of westward expansion and imperialist enterprises such as the Spanish-
American War. Roosevelt toured the Southwest in 1903, making stops to receive the presidential blanket in Albuquerque and to deliver a speech at the future site of the Harvey Company’s Grand Canyon hotel, El Tovar. Roosevelt, who crafted his public persona through displays of rugged masculinity in the American West, first publicized Harvey Company attractions in 1899 when he hosted the reunion of the “Rough Rider” cavalry at Harvey’s Castañada hotel in Las Vegas, New Mexico. According to Harvey historian Stephen Fried, the event was “one of the first instances of corporate sponsorship in history,” in which the railway covered all costs of the Rough Riders’ rail transportation and lodging in Harvey Hotels to advertise its growing hospitality services (155-56). Because of Roosevelt’s 1903 appearances, Fried explains, “the two cornerstones of Fred Harvey’s Southwest—the Indian Building and the Grand Canyon—were suddenly in the consciousness of most Americans” (192). These cultural attractions also happened to be the two main Harvey attractions featuring Native American artist-demonstrators, thus creating an archive of Indigenous art and labor—Elle’s weaving and the Commercial Club blanket in particular—that linked the commodification of southwestern Indigenous tribes to American westward expansion.

Web Platforms and Metadata Markup

Elle was featured in Harvey Company materials such as postcards, playing cards, and booklets from the early 1900s through the 1930s. One of the Harvey Company’s most widely circulated booklets, *American Indians: First Families of the Southwest*, first published in 1913, featured a depiction of Elle sitting outdoors and weaving a blanket on a loom. A vignette accompanying an image of Elle at her loom appeared in the 1920 edition of *American Indians* and was captioned “Elle of Ganado, Who Practices the Art Undefiled.” The emphasis on Elle’s “undefiled” art seems ironic when remembering the considerable coverage of “The President’s Blanket and Its Maker” seventeen years earlier, which boasted of her blanket’s commercial function and mentioned nothing of the centuries-long Diné / Navajo art of blanket-weaving. *American Indians* obliquely references the presidential event, acknowledging, “[n]o Indian, man or woman, has spoken to more whites than Elle of Ganado,” but reassures readers that this contact has not “defiled” her art by pointing out the ancient tools she uses: “the loom used today by the Navaho [sic] Elle and for centuries before by her ancestors resembles closely that of the ancient Egyptians” (n. pag.). The ancient loom assures readers that Elle’s blankets are authentic and, implicitly, that they are as valuable as the price tag in the Harvey Company gift shop indicates.

Both *The Indian and Mexican Building and Indian Museum* and *American Indians: First Families of the Southwest* have been digitized and are web-accessible through SMU’s digital U.S. West collection. The primitivist narrative of Elle’s technologies is now made widely available...
through digital technologies, thus risking a re-inscription of this story of the prehistoric Southwest in a new medium. As Joan M. Schwartz and Terry Cook have argued, “the choice of what to record and the decision over what to preserve, and thereby privilege, occur within socially constructed, but now naturalized frameworks that determine the significance of what becomes archives” (3). In this case, the repetition of the Harvey Company’s “place” in the U.S. West—first its geographic location in the early twentieth century and now its virtual positioning in SMU’s digital U.S. West collection, naturalizes the technologies of the railway and its archive as inevitable progress. The web interface of the digital collection, however, provides options to ensure that the booklets are presented in a way that retains important commercial contexts and that augments the collection with information that is absent from the original archive. SMU’s digital Fred Harvey Company collection was originally built using CONTENTdm digital collection management software, which provides a compound-object display option in which a page (the individual object) can be nested in the information about and presentation of the booklet (the compound object) in which it originally appeared. As a result, the digitized version of American Indians: First Families of the Southwest appears on the screen only as a book, and never as an isolated page. Additionally, the metadata describing each page is nested under the larger object description (Figure 2).

This presentation of the visual artifact and of the librarian’s metadata mitigates the possibility of the book being read outside of its commercial context. By contrast, displaying this book in a web-publishing platform

---

**Figure 2.** Screenshot of object- and page-level metadata for American Indians: First Families of the Southwest, 1920.
such as Omeka, which does not provide the compound object option, runs the risk of the page being discovered outside of the contextualizing information of the promotional publication in which it originally appeared. The authoritative, scientific-sounding tone of booklets such as *American Indians* created the impression of Fred Harvey as a reliable anthropologist, rather than an advertising branch of the Santa Fe Railway. This authoritative impression could be easily replicated and conveyed if an individual page was discovered in a list of search engine results of ethnographic resources, rather than its appropriate place inside the Harvey Company tourism literature.

The web interface also provides an opportunity to push against the techno-deterministic logic of the Harvey Company’s corporate archive through object- and item-level metadata. In the metadata for much of the digital Fred Harvey Company collection, I provided American Studies insights that resist the 1903 *Indian and Mexican Building* booklet’s depiction of Elle as a subservient Indian lacking the intellectual and technological tools to participate in the emerging consumer economy of the Southwest. Instead, the metadata suggests that we see beyond the reductive representation by the Harvey Company and outside of present-day tendencies to understand these relationships between white and Native American as completely one-directional. Sascha Scott argues that twentieth-century paintings and illustrations of Pueblo people “do more than evince objectification and exploitation—these pictures are stronger than that. By probing these works’ ability to surprise, frustrate, and unsettle, one gains a deeper understanding of early twentieth-century paintings of Pueblo Indians and the fraught context in which they were created” (6). The digital environment gives present-day librarians and researchers the space to examine and bring attention to this “fraught context” that is also present in twentieth-century commercial representations of Native Americans.

For example, Elle was one of the few Native Americans referred to by name in Harvey Company booklets, but the company abruptly stopped including her name in booklets published in the late 1920s. While absences and erasures in the archive are difficult to represent on the screen, page-level metadata describing the essay “Elle of Ganado, Who Practices the Art Undefiled” in *American Indians* offers a possible solution. The description field tells us that Elle died in 1924, at which point Harvey Company promotional literature stopped featuring Elle by name, although they [sic] continued to include her picture. For example, the 1926 edition of *First Families* changed the title of this article from “Elle of Ganado, Who Practices the Art Undefiled” to “A People Made Famous by the Art of Weaving,” although the after-photo painting of Elle accompanying the article remained the same.

This erasure of Elle’s name from the Harvey Company archive after her death, in contrast to the bulk of the archive that credits her work by name, is indicative of Elle’s active role in determining her portray-
al in the advertising materials. Although the company scripted her as voiceless in the 1903 *Indian and Mexican Building* booklet, this comparison of her representation in promotions published before and after her death offers convincing evidence of Elle’s participation in commercial exchanges in the Southwest not depicted in promotional materials or represented in the Harvey Company archive.

While the virtual library interface of the CONTENTdm web platform allows the researcher or digital collections librarian to augment an individual object through metadata creation, it does little to link the information contained within each booklet to other materials in the digital collection. In this case, the 1926 edition of *American Indians* that excludes Elle’s name is not included in SMU’s digital Fred Harvey collection, but it is referenced in the 1920 edition’s page-level metadata, although it remains largely disconnected from the 1903 *Indian and Mexican* booklet.

While the descriptive metadata could have included information linking it to the 1903 publication, this contextualization is not the intended function of metadata. The Dublin Core guidelines define the Description element as “[a]n account of the content of the resource. Description may include but is not limited to: an abstract, table of contents, reference to a graphical representation of content or a free-text account of the content” (Hillmann; emphasis added). In short, descriptive metadata is intended to describe the content—not the context—of the object. Additionally, according to these guidelines, the current descriptive metadata that I wrote about “Elle of Ganado, Who Practices the Art Undefiled” includes information on later *American Indians* editions that arguably extends beyond the stated function of Dublin Core metadata fields, as it describes the content of a later edition rather than that of the 1920 edition.

However, expecting page-level metadata to inform our interpretation across the range of the promotional materials in the digital Fred Harvey collection is asking metadata to behave like a scholarly monograph—or, at least, asking audiences to read the metadata fields as they would read sustained arguments and interpretations in a scholarly monograph. It is therefore imperative to see metadata as a productive starting point for adding nuance to the physical archive, rather than as the end goal in generating new knowledge systems or interpretive frameworks. As Johanna Drucker reminds us, “putting texts into digital formats with markup that identifies content […] might be an interpretive exercise, but introducing ambiguity at the level of markup is untenable, not merely impractical” (88). This work of “introducing ambiguity” back into an archive such as Fred Harvey’s, which established a techno-deterministic certainty about corporate enterprise and westward expansion, must therefore be done outside of the structure in which that archive was created.

An often overlooked yet straightforward way to move outside of the structure of the archive is to avoid replicating its physical presence on the screen. Turning-the-pages animation in digital collections platforms
attests to ongoing efforts to replicate the structure, look, and feel of books on the screen, although the digital environment provides opportunities to enter the archive through multiple pathways, none of which involve opening a book, turning its pages, or discovering it on a shelf. McPherson sees the potential of digital humanists’ work “[i]n an era of connected data” to provide “interpretations [that] might live within the digital archive, curating post-archival pathways of analysis through its datasets or framing the archive via multiple points of view” (497). These “post-archival” pathways out of the digital Fred Harvey Company collection can begin with the interpretive act of writing descriptive metadata, which, as we have seen, can perform a critique of the company’s “unidirectional” misrepresentations, appropriations, and commodifications of Native Americans’ culture, art, and religious practices. This critique, however, remains in the context of the Harvey Company archive, as writing page-level metadata is akin to writing notes in the margins of a physical book. To fully answer Posner’s challenge to rebuild “the machinery of the archive and database,” American Studies scholars must think beyond the (virtual) bookshelf by reconceptualizing the digital collection as more than a collection of physical items and rather as a dynamic layering and entangling of voices, materials, perspectives, and histories.

The challenge remains that of reframing the Harvey Company archive through multiple points of view, as McPherson suggests, which requires going beyond description of the single story, ideology, or viewpoint that created the archive. This act of description, Sarah Whitcomb Laiola offers, acts as a metanarrative, and is therefore at risk of “operat[ing] as a closed, universal master lens of interpretation—an operability that evokes a discursive connection to colonialist, racist, heteropatriarchal ideologies” (569). Scalar, a web publishing platform designed to circumvent retelling stories through such “a closed, universal master lens” offers a potential model for taking the Harvey Company archive out of its current structure to retell the story of the Southwest. Offering options to create pathways through content, which in turn flatten out hierarchies that privilege the creator of the original material, it is possible to decenter Fred Harvey’s prominence in this archive. For instance, the metadata for “Elle of Ganado, Who Practices the Art Undefiled” in First Families, names “Fred Harvey (firm)” as the creator and includes Harvey manager J. F. Huckel and artist Oscar E. Beringhouse as contributors. The metadata replicates the Harvey Company’s instrumentalization of Elle and other Indigenous artists by including her name only as a keyword, rather than as an actor in this network. A Scalar exhibit, by contrast, allows the generation of comments, tags, annotations, and paths in content that can all serve as starting points from which to interrogate, examine, and remix the material. In the case of the Harvey Company collection, this interface would allow us to generate a pathway through the content that focuses on Elle’s role in determining her representation in the Harvey Company’s promotional materials. She
would not be relegated to the position of an optional keyword in the Harvey Company’s content, nor would she be erroneously named as a “creator” in an effort to include her side of the story. Instead, the pathway through the content that is carved out by her story would highlight the techno-deterministic myth of the twentieth-century Southwest. In this formulation, the metadata of the Harvey Company archive would break out of the closed system and, as Laiola argues, could function as a “metafiction” in which “metadata would turn a self-aware lens on its own totality to fragment it, thereby provoking a ‘patchwork’ or ‘expanded field’ of interpretation for its dataset” (571-72).

Creating a self-aware metafictive Harvey Company archive is challenging due to the pervasive metanarratives of white indigeneity such as the “first families” refrain that circulated in American Indians: First Families of the Southwest. To construct this narrative, the company also deliberately erased its ties with locales outside of the Southwest to signal its rightful presence in the region. For example, the 1903 Indian and Mexican Building booklet identifies the Railway’s Chicago headquarters on the cover, but by 1904, in the booklet’s thirteenth edition, the corporate location is no longer named; “Albuquerque, N. M. | Fred Harvey” stands in its place. Therefore, as part of SMU’s U.S. West—Photographs, Manuscripts, and Imprints digital collection, the Fred Harvey Company materials are virtually re-located in the region and under the faulty rubric of belonging that the company generated through its cultural attractions and promotional materials over a century ago. Simply nesting the Fred Harvey Company collection in the U.S. West digital collection replicates and naturalizes this organizing logic. Scalar allows us to circumvent this logical fallacy by providing a flexible format that is not necessarily linked to the library’s holdings. In other words, in Scalar one would not be required to designate a top-level collection (U.S. West) and to include the Harvey Company archive as a subset, but instead could choose a number of narratives under which to reframe the Harvey Company’s physical and ideological presence in the Southwest.

The (Indian) Detour Still Leads to the Original Destination

While Scalar provides a solution for reframing the Harvey Company archive itself, digital humanists and American Studies scholars are well-positioned to attend to the dominant ideologies and knowledge systems that structure the creation of the original archive. Rather than stopping at remixing existing corporate archives in a digital format, it is imperative to interrogate the ways our current environments—academic, informational, and virtual—both inherit and replicate the frameworks of knowledge used by the very organizations that we critique. The Harvey Company’s 1926 Indian Detours tourism venture offers a powerful illustration of the ways that power and authority were structured in the Southwest, and bringing those materials into a digital environment pro-
vides an opportunity to examine the ways that we may replicate these patterns in our roles as information professionals or scholarly experts.

The Fred Harvey Company was well aware of the subversive potential of allowing patrons to create their own pathways through the archives, as evidenced by the highly controlled and prescriptive museum and cultural spaces that it created in its trackside locations. As the company looked to the living pueblos, ancient ruins, and landscapes beyond the rail lines as a potential source of income, it was faced with the challenge of stepping outside of the deliberately orchestrated spaces that cast the company in the role of knowledgeable historian and local expert. The solution was to create the “Indian Detour” service, in which tourists took “Harvey-car” automobiles on excursions outside of the walls of Harvey Company museums, hotels, and replicas of Hopi dwellings. The experts that led tourists through the Southwest were “Indian Couriers,” white women hired as tour guides, who donned the traditional squash blossom necklace and silver concho belt worn by southwestern tribes. As a result, images of Native Americans, Elle of Ganado among them, were replaced by images of white women “playing Indian” in tourism literature.

In the Harvey Company’s Southwest, leaving the walls of the railway station did not challenge the narratives of white exceptionalism and manifest destiny created in these trackside spaces, but rather reinforced them. The white “Indian Couriers” donned the dress of the Native American artist-demonstrators and used the scripts written about the trackside museums to impose the same organizing logic on the landscapes and tribes of the Southwest. Examining Harvey Company Indian Detours and Indian Couriers can help us better understand how digitizing the Harvey Company archive and writing metadata about the promotional literature replicates twentieth-century corporate deterministic narratives about technology and progress. Leaving the premises and using the same guidebook does not change the narrative, but rather expands the reach of that narrative. This effect is amplified in a virtual context.

Indian Courier women replicated the organizing logic of the Harvey Company’s physical spaces by guiding tourists through the region’s past and present, promising travelers an exotic trip down “Roads to Yesterday,” the Detours’ slogan. Because the Harvey Company Indian Detours constituted, as one promotion read, “days of leisurely comfort spent in visiting the ancient Indian pueblos and pre-historic cliff dwellings of the New Mexico Rockies,” travelers did not have to choose between modern comforts and exploring the “new-old land far from the beaten path” (“The Indian Detour” 23). Tourists could rely on Indian Courier guides to do the work of interpreting this seemingly inscrutable ancient land.

As one Courier described the qualifications of the job, “[w]e must know the ethnology, the geology, the botany of that country as well as the history in order to give our visitors the most comprehensive idea possible, for the country means little to them without preparation” (“Couriers Lose Ballyhoo Jobs”). The tour guides also conflated living pueblos with
ancient ruins. As one article explains, because travelers would presum-
ably view ancient cliff dwellings as “holes in a stone wall,” the Courier
guides organized the trip to first “see the Indians, who are our friends,”
and then guided the group to ancient dwellings, which enabled “tourists
[to] understand it after they [had] seen the Navajo and Hopi Indians of
today” (“Couriers Lose Ballyhoo Jobs”). In short, the tour guides’ pair-
ing of living pueblo dwellings with ancient ruins reinforced the notion
of southwestern Native American tribes as living relics of the past.

Publications advertising the new tours also reinforced the company’s
authority by emphasizing the Indian Couriers’ neo-native status. The
Santa Fe Magazine—a publication for employees of the Santa Fe Rail-
way—introduced Indian Courier “Miss Anita Rose of Santa Fe,” who
comes “from our Last Frontier—which, curiously enough, also is Oldest
America” (“Here and There” 31). The article continues, using race as a
biological marker to assure readers of Rose’s expertise:

Contrary to any conclusions that might be drawn from the location of her
homeland in the Far Southwest, Miss Rose is neither Indian maiden nor
Spanish senorita. She is a happy example of present-day American fem-
inity, sufficiently civilized to have spent two years at the Chicago Art
Institute. In her present contacts she is bringing railroad representatives
into pleasingly personal touch with an enterprise which is bridging a gulf
of three thousand years, and in which modern young women are playing a
striking part. (“Here and There” 31)

This racist equating of white with educated and “sufficiently civilized”
builds on the Harvey Company’s legacy of generating narratives of
American exceptionalism by positioning white patrons, visitors, and
Harvey Company employees as experts on the “vanishing Indians” of
the past who are unable to find a way into the present. Recall Elle’s pres-
dential blanket, on which she stitched a message of commercial capi-
talism in a language she did not speak. This educated Indian Courier,
by contrast, “bridg[ed] a gulf of three thousand years”—a feat that Elle
implicitly was unable to accomplish. According to this logic, the Indian
Courier is therefore the rightful inheritor of the Indigenous costume
she wears and appropriate guardian of the region’s culture and history.

While it is tempting to critique the racist and patronizing ideologies
that governed the Indian Detours venture and sanctioned the “playing
Indian” by white women acting as experts on Indigenous culture, we
might examine how current scholarly and institutional practices rep-
licate this white expert dynamic, and how digital humanities pursuits
in particular may repeat the techno-deterministic narratives that un-
critically adopt digital methodologies on the premise of innovation.
The digital Harvey Company collection—and many corporate archives
like it—is maintained by the digital unit of the special collections li-
brary that houses the original materials. Librarians—a field that the
2017 American Library Association Demographic Study reported to be
81% female and 86.7% white—are responsible for preserving and recir-
culturating such materials, thereby replicating the racialized practices of the Harvey Company that positioned white women’s training as more reliable and trustworthy than the experiences and knowledge of the Indigenous communities that they introduce their audiences to (Rosa and Henke). Just as stepping off Harvey Company grounds did not free Indian Couriers from the settler-colonialist logic constructed inside Harvey House walls, neither does digitizing the Harvey Company corporate archive and displaying it in a virtual environment change the manifest destiny metanarrative of the now-digitized pages.

In their study “Providing Cognitively Just Subject Access to Indigenous Knowledge through Knowledge Organization Systems,” Heather Moulaison Sandy and Jenny Bossaller helpfully point out that Knowledge Organization Systems (KOSs) “that information professionals use today were built based on a Western, positivist worldview, which excludes the vast universe of indigenous and traditional knowledge. By only using established categories for classification, we are left drowning in our own discursive formations, oblivious to alternative possibilities” (134). Acknowledging the impossibility of making progress within existing KOSs is a crucial first step, but important work remains to be done in this pursuit, namely decentering librarianship and information professionals’ training. While the KOS expertise of metadata and cataloging professionals is indispensable in the discovery and access of digitized materials, Sandy and Bossaller’s recommendation to provide “reliable, or professionally mediated, access to recorded indigenous knowledge through the use of classification and controlled vocabularies” is reminiscent of the Harvey Company’s insistence on locating a white expert to introduce and explain southwestern Indigenous culture (129; emphasis in original). The Harvey Company is only one organization among many in the long history of “professionally mediated access” to Indigenous cultures, and libraries must recognize their complicity in the symbolic violence done when stories are conveyed by “mediated access” that frames Indigenous history in terms of white Americans’ manifest destiny. Librarians, archivists, and scholars adding Indigenous voices to the archival record is not enough to combat these now-solidified narratives. Additionally, as Schwartz and Cook remind us, “some do not wish to be ‘rescued’ by mainstream archives and some will feel their naming by archivists as being ‘marginalized’ only further marginalizes them” (17).

The Harvey Company’s archive provides an opportunity to reanimate a relatively untouched archive whose power has been uncontested through its dormancy. The solution lies beyond the traditional archive and library collection, and outside of customary notions of dependable access to information through existing hierarchies. Sandy and Bossaller suggest that we begin by identifying and creating Knowledge Organization Systems in conjunction with Indigenous communities, which promises to disrupt master narratives (and metanarratives) through the inclusion of multiple voices. However, the contention that these
knowledge systems “be applied by knowledgeable information professionals for the access to be reliable” replicates the pattern of the white expert making accessible and reliable implicitly chaotic knowledge that falls outside of our dominant classification systems (Sandy and Bossaller 144; emphasis added). Additionally, calling on Indigenous people and other marginalized groups to create knowledge that is then “applied” by trained professionals risks replicating a “native informant” dynamic in online environments. In short, the information these marginalized groups provide ultimately ends up in the service of metanarratives that reify the power and entitlement of those in power.

**Conclusion: Double-Conscious Screens**

The Harvey Company corporate archive provides invaluable illustrations of the insidious nature of settler-colonial metanarratives, and the Harvey Company materials’ web re-publication reminds us of the power of the digital environment to reproduce such ideologies through metadata creation. Technological systems are often invisibly working behind the scenes of user-friendly interfaces, which makes the task of examining the content of corporate archives such as the Harvey Company’s and their transition and translation onto our screens even more urgent if we expect to call attention to and dismantle these systems. McPherson urges us not just to notice how the “digitization of archives has upset this careful hierarchy” in the stewardship of physical archives, but to imagine the interpretive possibilities that might result. She continues, “[a]mateur and expert might build archives together. We might begin to imagine the post-archive itself as a site of creation, change, and emergence” (497). To take her suggestion a step further, we might reconsider or even flip the notion of amateur and expert. In this way, the “knowledgeable information professional” that Sandy and Bossaller call for takes on a variety of roles and may even reside outside of an information professional career path. To achieve the post-archive, “amateur” is a title that highly-credentialed academics and librarians must be willing to embrace.

Our screens are powerful conveyers of information and often carry the authoritative heft of an archive, but they also have the potential to disrupt the power that we assign. This tasks American Studies scholars with the responsibility of encouraging digital practices such as crowdsourcing—allduded to in McPherson’s call for “amateur and expert” to build archives together—and in “participatory folksonomies,” which Laiola cites as a possible way to disrupt and rethink established taxonomies (584). Furthermore, the Harvey Company physical archive and digital collection show us the importance of representing resistance that is not always documented or even capable of being documented—for instance, Elle of Ganado’s insistence that she be named in the archive, which only becomes evident upon noticing the erasure of her name after her death. Deloria reminds us that, despite one-dimensional, reductive
representations of Native Americans in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, “increasing numbers of Indians participated in white people’s Indian play, assisting, confirming, co-opting, challenging, and legitimizing the performative tradition of aboriginal American identity” (8). The digital environment holds the potential to reveal the roles Native Americans played in resisting “white people’s Indian play” and, importantly, to move beyond the colonial perspective by telling stories that de-center white Americans’ experiences. The goal is not simply to represent a multiplicity of voices indiscriminately or simultaneously on a screen, but instead to create something more akin to a relational database that holds accountable the voices that perpetuated metanarratives of manifest destiny by linking them to the voices they erased and silenced.

Remarkably, a conceptual prototype for this post-archival database can be found in Leslie Marmon Silko’s *Ceremony* (1977) and her depiction of the medicine man Betonie, who is called upon to perform a healing ceremony for the novel’s main character, Tayo, a mixed-race Native American and white World War II veteran suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder. Betonie is not a traditional medicine man in that his ceremonial practices mix old and new traditions. His house in Gallup, New Mexico, seems to manifest the irresponsible unorthodoxy that many accuse him of, containing a jumble of department store shopping bags, old newspapers and phone books, animal skins, and traditional herbs (119-20). Tayo immediately notices Santa Fe Railroad calendars that had Indian scenes painted on them—Navajos herding sheep, deer dancers at Cochiti, and little Pueblo children chasing burros. The chills on his neck followed his eyes: he recognized the pictures for the years 1939 and 1940. [His deceased Uncle] Josiah used to bring the calendars home every year from the Santa Fe depot; on the reservation these calendars were more common than Coca-Cola calendars. There was no reason to be startled. This old man had only done the same thing. (121)

Tayo locates in Betonie’s mess a shared experience of collecting the Santa Fe calendars emblazoned with images that are at once reductive and representative of his experience growing up on Laguna Pueblo. These objects tell the multiple and conflicting stories of his life: of the calendars that commodify and oversimplify his Indigenous heritage, but that once also hung on the wall to keep time—and that now stand as a reminder of the past.

When Tayo says that he remembers the two calendars, Betonie responds, “‘[t]hat gives me some place to start,’” informing him, “‘I’m one of their best customers down there. I rode the train to Chicago in 1903’” (121). Tayo is skeptical, wondering “if they even let Indians ride trains in those days” (121). Betonie’s house and his stories function as what Laoila terms “metadata that misbehave,” and create the possibility of “resist[ing] the imposition of metanarrative on a data set, and so allow for the inclusion of humanistic values of ambiguity, historicism,
and relativism into hostile computational infrastructures” (584). Betonie introduces the chaotic jumble of his life—the metadata—into the hostile environment of Tayo’s past and present, using the “ambiguity, historicism, and relativism” of the Santa Fe calendars to initiate what turns out to be Tayo’s healing journey. When Tayo finally discovers that his illness returns only when he tries to untangle things—for instance, to separate the symbolic violence of the railway calendars and their nostalgic resonance in tender memories of his deceased uncle—he begins to heal.

Through Betonie, Tayo discovers the Du Boisian “double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness” (Du Bois 9). Our current post-archival moment asks us to move the physical archive into a digital environment that honors such two-ness without echoing the voice of the oppressor that created it. This two-ness has the potential to change our “home screens” from mere reflections of longstanding settler-colonial logic to vehicles that radically change our perceptions of home and belonging in the United States.
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