DOI 10.17953/aicrj.43.4.mithlo

The Artist Knows Best: The De-Professionalism of a Profession

Nancy Marie Mithlo

A closing scene from the 2014 film *Boyhood* dramatizes the realization of mortality and loss. In it, a son is effectively ending his childhood as he leaves for college. His mother (played by Patricia Arquette, who won an Oscar for her performance) banters with the young man as he packs. As the son momentarily leaves the room, the camera pans out to show the interior of their modest apartment, and we see the mother sitting alone at a small table. In that moment of stillness, she slumps over sobbing. The son returns, "What?" he asks, almost irritated. "You know what I'm realizing? My life is going to go, just like that! This series of milestones." She rattles off marriages, kids, divorces, teaching her son how to ride a bike, getting the job she always wanted. Looking dazed, she laments, "I just . . . thought there would be more," dropping her head in despair.

I use this cinematic moment, even with its problematic depiction of women, to illustrate the concept of pain and disappointment after decades of unrecognized labor. This is a cumulative realization, one that exceeds passing minor events. I want to talk about what this kind of epiphany feels like, not just for an individual, but for a group—in this case, a group of scholars committed to calling out the systematic corruption of fine arts institutions as demonstrated in a specific case of ethnic fraud. The collective realization that events did not go as planned or promised over a lifetime is a phenomenon that deserves further recognition and examination, especially in contexts of historic and ongoing systematic oppression. I am terming this exercise *nonrecognition* and its impact *selective worth*. Similar to how women's domestic labor is devalued across a lifetime, the wholesale rejection of a body of scholarship indicates entrenched power dynamics that are largely unvoiced, but consistently enacted. This essay identifies selective worth as a mainstay of arts establishments that, under the

Nancy Marie Mithlo is a professor in the UCLA Department of Gender Studies and affiliated faculty of the American Indian Studies Center and Interdepartmental Program.

cloak of artistic rights and arbitrary notions of object-based quality, continue their oppressive practices of exclusion.

American Indian makers, curators and writers who were active in the great flurry of cultural revitalization activities of the 1980s and 1990s thought there would be more—more recognition that Native people are alive, more exercise of Native sovereignty and more incorporation of Native professionals as authorities. Yet in the three decades following national legislation that granted tribes rights over their cultural heritage—including the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act and the Indian Arts and Crafts Act, both in 1990, and, in the past two decades, the establishment of the Smithsonian National Museum of the American Indian—largely, these basic rights to self-expression are still not available in the arts. The evidence? The Jimmie Durham fraud case.

Despite the many findings and publications exposing Durham's false claims of Cherokee ancestry over the years, curators and academics continue to champion not only his work as Indigenous art, but also his writing as Indigenous thought.[1] This phenomenon is an exercise in the abuse of power, as well as simply poor scholarship. The acceptance (and even adulation) of Durham, exposed as an ethnic fraud, has created two generations (and counting) of flawed scholarship. This blatant violation of public trust, academic excellence, and codes of ethics demonstrate how historic fact and scholarly rigor can be sacrificed when institutional racism is at work.

At this moment in which Indigenous arts from New Zealand, Australia and Canada are gaining recognition globally, the production, circulation, and reception of US Native artists is undervalued. Curators, many of whom reside abroad, who include Durham in major venues (such as the National Gallery of Canada's 2013 exhibit *Sakahàn: International Indigenous Art*, which was described as "the largest-ever global survey of contemporary Indigenous art") stymie efforts to forward US-based Native artists.[2] It is a form of appropriation to selectively incorporate an individual artist who claims affiliation to a tribe that does not claim him; more specifically, this action abuses the cultural resources associated with the Cherokee heritage Durham claims.[3]

Why do writers, scholars and curators ignore the wishes of sovereign tribal nations who object to Durham's classification as Cherokee? While it is difficult to ascertain how a diverse group of theorists might answer this question, one may hypothesize that (a) the curator was unaware that Durham was not Cherokee; (b) the curator rejected the validity of researchers and/or tribal representatives who documented this lack of ancestry; (c) the curator considered the artist and the artwork as deserving of scholarly attention regardless of misrepresentation (this mirrors the debates in the #MeToo movement regarding whether artworks can be considered separately from their creator—public sentiment says no); (d) the entire project of Indigenous arts is considered as an exception to standard academic and artistic ethics, so values of accuracy are not relevant.

This essay will explore the last two suppositions, that the curator considers the artwork and the artist's claims as superior to tribal sovereignty, and that the field of Indigenous arts is outside of the standards of other academic fields. I want the reader to understand how this delegitimizing is devastating to practitioners and theorists.

Indeed, at times anti-Durham argumentation is dismissed as simple jealousy or pettiness. The rejection of an entire body of scholarship results in a cumulative harm, not just to individuals, but also to collective movements that define Indigeneity as community-based knowledge.[4]

Indians and Museums: Historic Frames of Analysis

Part of the issue with the Durham fraud issue is the lack of a consensus as to what constitutes the field of American Indian art and who can speak as an authority. These references change over time and have a direct relationship to what is considered to be a norm in the field of museum studies. Because art history has marginalized American Indian art for so long, the discipline has not to date been particularly effective as a figurehead, but is nevertheless a participant in the conversation.

I am not advocating a unilateral consensus or even an authoritative control of what makes for great Native art, but I have noticed over the course of my own thirty-year trajectory in the field that if no authority is claimed, then opportunity exists for others to claim it. Fundamental wrong is enacted when the conversation of who belongs and what direction the Native art field should take is monopolized by those who have done the least to support the intellectual growth and development of the field. I suggest, at minimum, that conflicting intellectual standpoints in Native arts scholarship must be articulated. An embrace of this expansive inquiry-based model has proven to be difficult to sustain over time, however. From the late 1970s, which many consider to be the birth of the tribal cultural center movement, to the 2004 opening of the Smithsonian National Museum of the American Indian, the central orientation of Native arts scholarship has been a certain avoidance of stating conflicting agendas. In fact, a really worthwhile future study might address the legacies of central actors and pull to the fore their inherent opposing tendencies.

For example, as early as 1979, in "Indians and Museums: A Plea for Cooperation," Richard Hill wrote how Native peoples' emotional and intellectual well-being were intimately linked to the fulfillment of religious duties that required access to cultural items held in museum custody. His call for the return of sacred objects held in museums predated the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act by more than a decade and set the tone for what that cooperation might look like, beginning with the simple question, "Where are sacred materials located?"[5] Hill worked from a community perspective that championed tribal cultural centers as the mechanism by which tribal nations might assert authority through the ownership and use of cultural items in tribal contexts. This community-centered model was premised on cooperation from mainstream museums to return American Indian collections to their communities of origin.

By 1992, Nancy J. Fuller and Susanne Fabricius noted the success of American Indian museums and cultural centers for their "real contributions to their communities' sense of identity and self-esteem" and emphasizing the "equally significant" impact on museum practices nationally and internationally. However, complications were arising from conflicting worldviews about how Native arts and material culture were

to be interpreted in this larger frame of analysis. Fuller and Fabricius recognized the dangers implicit in "the imposition of museum policies and techniques that have been determined by a culture whose world views are exceedingly divergent from the native culture which is attempting to apply them." These authors exposed what they called the paradoxical tendency of Native American groups to emulate mainstream museums, citing a "loss of intellectual ownership of knowledge."[6]

In 2011, JoAllyn Archambault reported on the "positive, collaborative working relationships with native communities with regard to exhibitions, public programs, and research," citing the "enormous potential for collaboration and mutually beneficial projects." Archambault's statement that "while some Native Americans dismiss all museums as colonial institutions that should be destroyed, far more are willing to partake in collaborative projects with sensitive, informed curators who are committed to peer relations," reflects what I am terming a reformist agenda of professional practices.[7]

An accounting of isolated successful negotiations between the museum and tribal communities is an insufficient marker of inclusion. Fuller and Fabricius's 1992 assessment of direct conflict between intellectual paradigms does a more accurate job of delineating these patterns than Archambault's analysis of participation levels alone. For every example of "good Indians" working successfully in a mainstream museum context, there are dozens of unreported examples of practitioners who never enter the field, exhibits that were never mounted, or negative project assessments that were never authored or circulated. A full accounting and assessment of institutional representation of Native arts over decades has not, to my knowledge, been formally reported, but scholars can identify patterns and expose colonial mechanisms at work. As Anderson and Christen remind us, "In order to undo the ongoing realities of colonial projects, this necessarily requires making visible the embedded and often hidden practices of settler colonialism."[8]

Today, we witness major arts institutions bemoaning the lack of professionals working in the Native arts field who are available for hire in mainstream museums seeking to diversify their staff.[9] The standard excuse for not hiring or consulting with trained professionals from Native backgrounds is that there are not enough candidates in the field. This assessment fails to accord proper consideration to the complicated process of accreditation for arts professionals in curatorial fields. Studies show that the enrollment, retention, and graduation rates of American Indians are the lowest of any other ethnic group. While minority enrollment has more than doubled in the past thirty years, the retention and graduation rates of American Indian students have remained lower than other minority groups.[10] Indigenous thought is often marginal in the training of arts professionals in studio arts, art history, anthropology, or related fields.

American Indian art publications are diffused across several disciplines and in fewer numbers than those of other subfields. A scholarly journal devoted to American Indian arts does not exist to my knowledge, although professional organizations and funders have often bemoaned this fact and taken tentative steps toward this goal.[11] Often, potential candidates are discouraged from entering the field or are refused admittance, not because of intellectual inadequacy, but due to lack of engagement in Indigenous scholarship by employees in charge of training and hiring, or, in the case of

higher education, admissions.[12] While those amenable to the values of individualism are rewarded, candidates championing the rights of tribes to name their own members or to articulate their own intellectual traditions may be deemed unsuitable for employment, training, or scholarships.[13]

Here, I wish to remind the reader that I am addressing the role of an intellectual apparatus for understanding and legitimizing Native arts. My focus is not "art as an economic engine in Native communities," such as studies that demonstrate the number of artists who are producing art and their economic needs.[14] Organizations such as First Peoples Fund and the Native Arts and Cultures Foundation address economic features, but largely ignore educational support. The Native Arts and Cultures Foundation does report on leadership and education, but in reference to administrative arts leadership and arts studio practice, not the academic writing and theorization that places art within the realm of a scholarly analysis.[15]

My focus, then, is not on the production of arts, but the reception of the arts. The fact that this component of the total arts field is often not incorporated in heavily supported economic studies, or even charted by the organizations that support artists, is indicative of what I proposed in variable (d)—that the entire project of Indigenous arts is considered as an exception to standard academic and artistic ethics. Importantly, I am including Native-run arts organizations in my critique. Native organizations, Native professionals and Native scholars are equally capable of supporting a colonial impulse that enacts harm to the collective, generative, and deep knowledge domain of Indigenous arts as conceptualized in its entirety.

Fraud as an Artistic Register

Given this orientation into the status of Native arts as it developed over the past forty years, how does the Durham case exemplify art world tendencies that reward individual consumption, capitalism and control? The acceptance of fraud as a legitimized art historical platform has a history and this history is intertwined with the acceptance of Durham's performance as a Native artist. In other words, appropriation is viewed in art historical analysis as a necessary good, or even a neutral fact of life, rather than an exertion of power with capitalistic intent.

The 2017 essay "Forget the Issue of an Artist's Native American Bloodlines" by Jori Finkel attacks critics of the Durham legacy as engaging in "identity fundamentalism," while supporting the platform of artistic mimicry as an aesthetic norm. Finkel's analysis states that she is, "partial to the argument that white men poaching or voicing experiences not their own has historically been a good thing that broadens a society's worldview."[16] Appropriation is presented as an inherent good, rather than an ethical quandary. Finkel's curation of "*Identity Theft*: Lynn Hershman, Eleanor Antin, Suzy Lake: 1974–78," at the Santa Monica Museum of Art in 2007 profiled makers who toyed with their own identities as a form of feminist protest.[17] Finkel's acceptance of identity fraud in this context appears to inform her acceptance of Durham's work as legitimate "poaching," with no recognition of the historic and ongoing genocidal harms inflicted on Indigenous communicates who have been "poached" to extinction.

Likewise, Anne Ellegood, curator of *Jimmie Durham: At the Center of the World*, also had previously exhibited an artist who adopts fraud as an artistic strategy. Ellegood's 2011 Venice Biennale Australian pavilion exhibition *The Golden Thread* by artist Hany Armanious features resin likenesses of everyday objects, which she describes as "a cast, an exact replica of that thing."[18] Armanious forges works by other artists such as Picasso along with everyday objects that are also casts. Ellegood's involvement as curator to this project indicates her acceptance of fraud as an accepted aesthetic practice.

While 1970s feminist artists may exert a strategy of alter ego for empowerment, and contemporary artists adapt mimesis as a critical aesthetic statement, wholesale adoption of artistic fraud as a universal application is misguided. Researchers knowledgeable of the long history of fraud and appropriation in American Indian contexts would more likely be sensitive to the dangers and inapplicability of mimesis as an inert artistic tool of societal critique and less likely to apply an ahistorical lens to their analyses. Laurie Ann Whitt terms this type of fraud "cultural imperialism" stating, "Whether or not it is conscious and intentional, it serves to extend the political power, secure the social control, and further the economic profit of the dominant culture."[19]

In the two examples outlined above, the curators and the audience know the artist is pretending to make Picasso sculptures and know that the feminist artists are making a statement. The obvious difference in the case of Durham is that the curators appear to believe that Durham is Native and so do their audiences. Why then is pretending to be Native so acceptable? In America, this question may seem transparent. In America, anyone can claim to be Native without repercussion because American Indians are perceived only as fictional characters, not real people.[20] A litany of literature serves to support this national pastime, but for the purposes of this article, I wish to shift to the authority of the artist, a phenomenon that combined with the "playing Indian" pastime creates a particular form of white privilege.

The Assertion of the Artist as Authority

While public commentary concerning the lack of Durham's credentials had been widely known since at least 1993, it was the exhibition of *Jimmie Durham: At the Center of the World* at the Walker Art Center in 2017 that forcibly brought the debate to light following the public furor of artist Sam Durant's sculpture *Scaffold*.[21] Durant's work was dismantled after the Dakota community and their allies protested this reproduction of a hanging gallows similar to the one used in 1862 for a mass execution of Dakota leaders known as the Mankato hanging. The *At the Center of the World* exhibition opened at the Walker Art Center shortly afterwards, prompting a new debate concerning Durham's identity and the objections of scholars to his identification as Cherokee. A statement by curator Ellegood in the wake of these controversies made apparent the art world value of artist as authority: "The Hammer Museum recognizes that Durham is not an enrolled Cherokee. . . . Curatorially and in the field of contemporary art, we allow for self-identification . . . We have just operated from the position that this is Jimmie's history." [22]

The total dismissal of decades of scholarship by curator Ellegood and multiple authors who supported the Durham exhibit is simply not professional practice. The statement "in the field of contemporary art, we allow for self-identification" is an insular and uninformed perspective that ignores the professional fields of American Indian Studies and American Indian law, tribal mandates and even professional standards of scholarship. The American Alliance of Museums' (AAM) Code of Ethics for Museums states: "programs, [including exhibits] are founded on scholarship and marked by intellectual integrity."[23]

The 2017 *Indian Country Today* essay "Dear Unsuspecting Public, Jimmie Durham Is a Trickster" essay authored by ten Cherokee professional leaders states, "That scholars writing about Durham repeatedly fail to fact-check any of Durham's claims is egregious, especially when a multitude of research and resources are available." These authors conclude, "Self-representation is a fundamental human right, and we, as Cherokees and Indigenous Peoples, demand the right to speak for ourselves."[24]

Decontextualization of the Arts as an Object-centered Analysis

Until the art industry's inherent values of capitalism and the private market (based on individualism, competition and object-based worth) are centrally recognized as taking precedent over other registers such as education, cultural survival and even simple enjoyment, Indigenous arts workers are misguided in their attempts at inclusion and equity in this field. Even worse, those entering the field who dismiss or downplay this central power mechanism may be indoctrinated into an anti-sovereign platform and become complicit in its colonial desire for control.

Incorporation of Indigenous bodies in the museum enterprise does not indicate the incorporation of Indigenous thought. Our early cultural activists who rallied for inclusion in the museum system may have succeeded in establishing Native presence in numbers, but our intellectual authority continues to be eclipsed by art systems that not only marginalize but actively minimize Indigenous intellectual authority. This essay identifies how the field of American Indian arts writing of the past twenty years may productively be classified as reformist or radical.[25] These frames of analysis make evident how complicity in object-driven scholarship permits the anti-sovereignty displayed in the Durham spectacle.

Only a radical agenda can ensure that the intellectual worth and authority of Indigenous arts is recognized and sovereignty incorporated in practice. By radical I am referencing a perspective that does not take as a primary good or outcome the perpetuation of the museum as an institution nor the inevitability of art as primarily an economic commodity. Instead, I am proposing the health and vitality of Indigenous communities as a primary outcome. This health and vitality is dependent on letting go of the emulation of the object as primarily a status symbol and the recognition of the powerful spiritual and intellectual aspects of all components of the artistic practice implicated in the world of Native arts. The intellectual control of Indigenous artistic practices is necessary to ensure Native arts are interpreted accurately and ethically.

Current professional standards in museum and art organizations mandate incorporation of what is known as cultural diversity, but their words are empty promises, given the evidence of selective worth reflected upon here. The Durham issue exposes the failure of art history and the museum industry to ensure equity in Native arts scholarship and related museum exhibition practices.

Equity in Native arts scholarship demands the legitimization of the Native art cultural workers (including scholars and practitioners) whose writing and curation is situated in the values of Native and Indigenous professional organizations, (such as the Native American Indigenous Studies Association, the Association of Tribal Archives, Libraries and Museums, the Native American Rights Fund, the Association of American Indian Affairs and others whose missions articulate and prioritize the sovereign control of Native resources, including land, languages and culture). These professional organizations, while not consistently operating in accordance with progressive mandates (what I am terming here "radical" thought) still exert an authority that minimizes the isolation and attack on individuals for their scholarly and professional output.[26]

Selective Worth

This essay identifies *selective worth* as a mainstay of arts establishments that continue oppressive practices of exclusion under the cloak of artistic rights and arbitrary notions of object-based quality. By "selective worth," I am referring to the self-articulated standards fine arts establishments made in the case of the Durham exhibition that defy the professional standards their institutions claim to abide by. I have suggested in my introduction that "the entire project of Indigenous arts is considered as an exception to standard academic and artistic ethics, so values of accuracy are not relevant." I want to return to this premise and clarify this orientation by referencing the professional standards articulated by our Native professional organizations.

The Native American and Indigenous Studies Association is the central interdisciplinary and global professional organization for scholars, independent researchers, students and community members working in the field of Indigenous studies. Their statement on "Indigenous identity fraud" states, "Falsifying one's identity or relationship to particular Indigenous peoples is an act of appropriation continuous with other forms of colonial violence. The harmful effects of cultural and identity appropriation have been clearly articulated by Native American and Indigenous Studies scholars over the past four decades, and it is our responsibility to be aware of these critiques."[27]

Similarly, in 2017, the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) adopted a resolution titled "Misappropriation of Native Identity in Film & Television" (Resolution #MKE-17-029).[28] The NCAI is the largest, and one of the oldest and most representative, American Indian and Alaska Native organizations in the country. This organization's stand on fraud in the creative sector is a significant development that speaks loudly to the museum community's lack of attention to this issue. The Durham ethnic fraud issue thus finds relevance not only in the fine arts, but also in

related centers of power, such as the academy and the film industry, where arbitrary judgments of belonging are exercised.

A range of ethical issues arises when an institution fails to incorporate community representation, a standard of best practices for museums. American Indian educators have told a generation of students that they can, with hard work, sacrifice, and dedication, earn a role as a professional, as a leader making contributions that will benefit their tribal nation and our society at large. *Jimmie Durham: At the Center of the World*, sponsored and supported by both private and federal funds, actively negates these promises by perpetuating false scholarship and violating ethical standards of community involvement.

The impacts of this misinformation campaign are substantial—hundreds of thousands of individuals, from museum visitors to those simply reading the exhibit catalogue, art news, or press materials—are misinformed, not only about Cherokee people but about Indigenous people more generally. Museum employees are mandated by their professions to provide accurate information to the public. The Durham performance illustrates the evolution of elite cultural institutions masquerading as educational institutions. The Durham exhibit host locations—the Hammer Museum, the Walker Arts Center, the Whitney Museum, and the Remai Modern in Saskatchewan—have demonstrated their allegiance to the art system of sales, prestige, and power rather than civic good.

Conclusion

A recent essay by Karen Lawford and Veldon Cobum, "Research, Ethnic Fraud, and the Academy: A Protocol for Working with Indigenous Communities and Peoples," asserts that "Indigenous Peoples and communities must also be attentive to potential for harm . . . to Indigenous nations and their communities by opportunistic, exploitative, and unscrupulous settler-researchers. While universities, colleges, and other research institutions embrace notions of Indigenization and decolonization, there are considerable concerns about settler-colonial ethics and how they continue to dominant research design and direction."[29] This assessment is applicable to the concerns presented here, concerns that address the inclusion of Native content without concern for Native intellectualism.

The abuse of power evident in the Durham fraud case is unacceptable, not only by Indigenous research standards, but also by the professional standards that the museums that hosted the exhibit and the professionals who supported the exhibit with their writing and curation claim to operate under. Indigenous researchers are no fools. We witness this infraction and are rewriting the histories that the settler-colonial logics of fine arts systems are currently enacting. We understand our inherent rights, our vast histories, and our knowledge systems that are crucial for the survival of our planet. In the future, when our ways of knowing are requested, even demanded, we know what institutions are capable of respecting our sovereignty and what institutions are simply enacting the age-old appropriation tactics on display in the Durham performance.

As the field of Native arts matures, we have vast resources of knowledge to rely upon in creating our shared futures. Our makers and our dreamers play critical roles in transmission of knowledge and expansion of our collective wisdom. The road we have traveled since the emergence of the tribal cultural center movement of the 1970s is rich with experiences, documentation, and oral histories. This current moment of unbridled fraud and abuse of power is but one of many developments that have occurred over time. History demonstrates that the legitimacy of these ways of knowing is not a linear development, but a journey that has starts and stops. Exposure and censure of this current abuse of power is essential for our children, and their children, to craft strong futures.

If we consider the Native arts field in terms of Native American encounters with the institution of the museum in twenty-year increments, from the 1970s through to the 2010s, what narratives might we find: empowerment, then institutionalization? What of considering individuals' journeys away from the belief that museums can be reformed, and toward the radical belief that museums are hopelessly colonial and cannot be redeemed? Patricia Arquette's mother figure in the film *Boyhood*, shared at the beginning of this essay, certainly reflects this kind of turning as a loss of innocence. Alternately, is it possible to think of beginning with a radical orientation of nonrecuperability, whether of an era or individuals, that then alters to gradual belief in transformation or reformation? The point here is the need to nuance these orientations, and to apply their frameworks to the ongoing theorization of Native arts scholarship.

As Edmund Carpenter wrote in 1977 for a National Gallery of Art exhibition:

> To experience the unfamiliar in tribal art, we must step outside the patterns of perception of our culture and explore new worlds of images, new realities. We must study alien perceptions and codifications by experiencing them. Anything less merely confirms previous convictions.
>
> To study tribal art, we must first ask: What did it mean to the people for whom it was originally intended? To experience it, we must first accept its rules governing thinking, feeling, sensing. We cannot—rather we should not—borrow and apply rules from our own culture. We demean our subject, and deceive ourselves, when we call such imperialism "scientific."[30]

The modesty and the wisdom of this early assessment have been forgotten, as Native arts are commodified by fine arts institutions that remain ignorant of our centers of wisdom and our intellectual leaders. These perspectives remain, however, and can return, given an honest and radical assessment of this colonial moment in which we now function.

Notes

1. See, for example, Roy Boney, "Opinion: Jimmie Durham is not Cherokee," *Cherokee Phoenix* November 3, 2017, https://www.cherokeephoenix.org/Article/index/11731; Anne Ellegood, "Curator Anne Ellegood on Understanding the Complexities of Jimmie Durham's Native Identity," *ArtNet*, August 2, 2017, https://news.artnet.com/opinion/anne-ellegood-jimmie-durham-1033907.

2. SAKAHÀN: International Indigenous Art, https://www.gallery.ca/for-professionals/media/press-releases/sakahan-international-indigenous-art-0.

3. There are three federally recognized Cherokee tribes: the Cherokee Nation (Tahlequah, OK), the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians (Cherokee, NC) and the United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians (Tahlequah, OK). See http://firstamericanartmagazine.com/facts-resources-jimmie-durham/.

4. Holland Cotter, "Coming Face to Face with Jimmie Durham," Arts Review, *The New York Times,* November 2, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/02/arts/design/jimmie-durham-review-whitney-museum-cherokee.html.

5. Richard Hill, "Indians and Museums: A Plea for Cooperation," *History News* 34, no. 7 (1979): 181–84, https://www.jstor.org/stable/42649016.

6. Nancy J. Fuller and Susanne Fabricius, "Native American Museums and Cultural Centers: Historical Overview and Current Issues," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie,* Bd. 117 (1992): 223–37, https://www.jstor.org/stable/25842250.

7. JoAllyn Archambault, "Native Communities, Museums and Collaboration," *Practicing Anthropology* 33, no. 2 (Spring 2011): 16–20, Collaborative Museum Ethnography, https://www.jstor.org/stable/24782025.

8. Jane Anderson and Kimberly Christen, "Decolonizing Attribution: Traditions of Exclusion," *Journal of Radical Librarianship* 5 (2019): 113–52, https://journal.radicallibrarianship.org/index.php/journal/article/view/38/45.

9. American Alliance of Museums, "Facing Change; Insights from the American Alliance of Museums' Diversity, Equity, Accessibility, and Inclusion Working Group," (2018), https://www.aam-us.org/2018/05/01/facing-change-a-new-report-from-the-american-alliance-of-museums-working-group-on-deai/.

10. Charles F. Harrington and Billie G. Harrington, "Fighting a Different Battle: Challenges Facing American Indians in Higher Education," *Journal of Indigenous Research*, 1 no. 1, Article 4, (January, 2012), https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1008&context=kicjir.

11. The Native American Art Studies Association 2015 conference held a meeting to discuss this issue, https://naasa.files.wordpress.com/2016/02/naasa-21-1-jan-2016.pdf.

12. William Mendoza, "Emotions Run High at 43rd Commencement Ceremony," News & Events, Diné College, May 10, 2012.

13. Because personnel actions are so tightly protected in terms of privacy, and studies that might track these employment trends for American Indians in the arts have not been substantially undertaken, I am basing my assertion concerning selective hiring practices on my thirty-five years in the field of Native arts, my role as an academic who produces professionals in the field, my many letters of reference for arts industry jobs, and my serving in the capacity as a participant, juror and selector for major arts awards including the Ford Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation, the Mellon Foundation, the Andy Warhol Foundation, the Native Arts and Cultures Foundation and other arts organizations.

14. First People Fund, "Establishing a Creative Economy: Art as an Economic Engine in Native Communities," (2013), https://static1.squarespace.com/static/57be24e9d1758e95b6146331/t/57c9d010c534a5aa98846fce/1472843798529/document-market-study.pdf.

15. Native Arts and Cultures Foundation, "Strengthening the Bones" A Report and Follow-up on the National Native Arts Convening, (2011), http://www.nativeartsandcultures.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Strengthening-the-Bones-Report.pdf.

16. Jori Finkel, "Forget the issue of an artist's Native American bloodlines," *The Art Newspaper,* October 23, 2017, https://www.theartnewspaper.com/comment/forget-the-issue-of-an-artists-native-american-bloodlines.

17. Sarah Valdez, "In the Land of Make-Believe," *Art in America* 95, no. 10 (2007): 119–21, https://search.proquest.com/docview/1320294407?accountid=14512.

18. You Tube, "Hany Armanious at the Venice Biennale," June 17, 2011. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NzBXyDkrm8g.

19. Laurie Anne Whitt, "Cultural Imperialism and the Marketing of Native America," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 19, no. 3 (1995):1–31, https://doi.org/10.17953/aicr.19.3.75725415011514r1.

20. Aleksandra Sherman and Nancy Marie Mithlo, "Seeing American Indians: Self, Other and the Role of Visitor Mindsets in Museums." Research: Art Works program at the National Endowment for the Arts (2015–2018): Grant # 15-3800-7003, (2019), https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/Research-Art-Works-Occidental.pdf.

21. See the series of Durham essays in this special issue, pp. 25–40, reprinted from *First American Art Magazine*, no. 16 (Fall 2017): pp. 84–89, including essays by Nancy Marie Mithlo, Roy Boney Jr., America Meredith, and James Luna.

22. Anne Ellegood, quoted in Euan Kerr, "Walker Faces New Native Art Controversy," MPR News, June 23 2017, https://www.mprnews.org/story/2017/06/23/walker-faces-new-native-art-controversy.

23. American Alliance of Museums, "AAM Code of Ethics for Museums," accessed August 28, 2018, https://www.aam-us.org/programs/ethics-standards-and-professional-practices/code-of-ethics-for-museums/.

24. Cara Cowan Watts, Luzene Hill, America Meredith et all, "Dear Unsuspecting Public, Jimmie Durham Is a Trickster," *Indian Country Today* June 26, 2017, https://newsmaven.io/indiancountrytoday/archive/dear-unsuspecting-public-jimmie-durham-is-a-trickster-Rk7_oZ6TPk-mIlQLNJN-gPw/.

25. Susan Arndt, "Perspectives on African Feminism: Defining and Classifying African-Feminist Literatures," *Agenda: Empowering Women for Gender Equity*, no. 54 (2002): 31–44, http://www.jstor.org/stable/4548071.

26. See Ashley Holland's description in this issue that identifies actions that are, "aggressively demeaning to the continuing struggle faced by Native peoples for sovereignty and self-determination."

27. Native American and Indigenous Studies Association, "NAISA Council Statement on Indigenous Identity Fraud" Approved by NAISA Council, September 15, 2015, https://www.naisa.org/about/documents-archive/previous-council-statements/.

28. National Congress of American Indians, "Misappropriation of Native Identity in Film & Television, 2017, http://www.ncai.org/resources/resolutions/misappropriation-of-native-identity-in-film-television.

29. Karen Lawford and Veldon Coburn, "Research, Ethnic Fraud, And The Academy: A Protocol For Working With Indigenous Communities And Peoples," Indigenous Peoples. August 20, 2019, https://yellowheadinstitute.org/2019/08/20/research-ethnic-fraud-and-the-academy-a-protocol-for-working-with-indigenous-communities-and-peoples/?fbclid=IwAR1oIhoY4S00d8UF6GykryCkeWIcunMnWc-mBWP4lCSo7ePQdMy2VvkUt30.

30. Edward Carpenter, "Some Notes on the Separate Realities of Eskimo and Indian Art," in *The Far North* by Henry B. Collins, Frederica De Laguna, Edmund Carpenter, and Peter Stone. Catalog of an exhibition held at the National Gallery of Art, March 7–May 15, 1973. Issued as an exhibition catalog by the National Gallery of Art, 1973; published by Indiana University Press in association with the National Gallery of Art, 1977.