ILN JOURNAL:
INDIAN LITERARY NARRATIVES

https://doi.org/10.70396/ilnjournal.v3n3.a.06 | Volume 3, Issue 3, September 2026 | ISSN: 3048 6920

Fashioning Identity: Material Culture, Cultural Memory, and Self-Representation in Contemporary Indigenous Fashion

P. Antony Maria Jenobhar*

Abstract

Contemporary Indigenous fashion raises a question that cultural motifs alone cannot answer: who decides what clothing means? This article looks at how Indigenous designers use fashion to express belonging, renew traditions, and shape how they are seen in public. It focuses on Jamie Okuma's Adaptation II, Bethany Yellowtail's Indigenous Women Rise scarf, and pieces from Virgil Ortiz's Revolt Rising collection, using museum records and public statements. The study combines close reading of documents with analysis of garments, their titles, and their circulation. Stuart Hall's ideas about cultural identity and Jolene Rickard's work on sovereignty help frame the discussion. The main argument is that fashion expresses identity through how things are made, credited, worn, and understood, not through a fixed set of Indigenous symbols. The examples show three possibilities: changing materials can highlight creative authorship; coordinated dress can support group presence; and wearable stories can link cultural memory to imagined futures. However, markets and consumer views still shape these outcomes. The research article compares how tradition becomes visible without requiring everything to look the same. It also separates self-representation from the unproven idea that visibility always leads to community empowerment.

Keywords: Indigenous fashion; self-representation; cultural identity; cultural memory; material culture; visual sovereignty; Native American designers; cultural endurance

Submitted: 16.08.2026 Revised: 15.09.2026 Accepted: 25.09.2026 Published 30.09.2026

*P. Antony Maria Jenobhar, MA Literature, Dept. of English, St. Xavier's College (Autonomous), Palayamkottai - 627002, Tamil Nadu, India.

©2026 P. Antony Maria Jenobhar. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction, provided the original author and source are credited.

Introduction

A beaded high-heeled shoe may challenge a viewer's expectations before they know who made it. Jamie Okuma's *Adaptation II* (2012) transforms Christian Louboutin-designed shoes through beadwork, quillwork, and other materials. The Smithsonian American Art Museum identifies both designers. Its record asks viewers to recognise the artist's intervention alongside the shoe's earlier design history. Reading the object simply as cultural decoration would overlook the decisions that make it Okuma's work (Smithsonian American Art Museum).

Indigenous fashion is often discussed in terms of what makes clothing look Indigenous. This approach becomes restrictive when viewers judge belonging through familiar signs without considering a maker's purposes or relationships. The question then concerns who has the authority to define an identity. This article asks how designers shape the terms on which their work becomes visible. Self-representation includes making, naming, explaining, and circulating clothing, although its meaning can change when it enters a museum, wardrobe, photograph, or retail setting.

Three examples allow these processes to be compared. Okuma's footwear highlights material transformation. Yellowtail's Indigenous Women Rise scarf connects design with collective participation in the 2017 Women's March in Washington, DC. Ortiz's Po'pay 2180 Hoodie, part of Revolt Rising, brings historical storytelling into everyday apparel. Each work has identifiable authorship and public documentation, but each reaches audiences differently (National Museum of the American Indian, "Indigenous"; Ortiz, "Revolt Rising").

The designers' backgrounds remain important. Public records identify Okuma as Luiseño and Shoshone-Bannock, Yellowtail as Northern Cheyenne and Apsáalooke, and Ortiz as Cochiti Pueblo. Their practices do not belong to one interchangeable tradition. These United States examples cannot represent Indigenous fashion throughout North America or beyond it. The comparison follows particular makers and works while asking a shared question about cultural continuity. The argument is that fashion can sustain identity through changing materials and settings when its connections to people, practices, and histories remain meaningful. Appearance alone cannot establish those connections. The analysis considers how clothing is made, whom it addresses, and how it credits its maker. It also considers the limits of visibility. Recognition may support self-representation, but it does not establish community approval, economic benefit, or political change.

The comparison also asks what audiences need in order to recognise these relationships. Someone may identify a technique without knowing the artist, or recognise a garment's title without understanding its historical reference. Such partial readings are possible even when the work is widely visible. Following the connection between object and context helps explain where interpretation becomes uncertain. This approach keeps the discussion close to the evidence while allowing

the works to raise questions that their public records cannot fully answer.

Review of Literature

Dress and embodied identity

Joanne Entwistle describes dress as a "situated bodily practice," connecting clothing with bodily action and social circumstances (325). Her approach helps explain why a garment cannot be understood as an isolated symbol. A scarf associated with a march acquires meaning through its setting and use. A museum photograph preserves its appearance but cannot recover everything that wearing it meant. Similarly, a materials list cannot establish how a pair of high-heeled artworks feels on a moving body.

Carolyn Jean Babula's review of scholarship on clothing in colonial and postcolonial Africa cautions against easy comparisons across societies (549–50). Its relevance here is methodological. Similar questions about dress do not mean that different communities share the same meanings. For this reason, the phrase cultural language describes communication through clothing rather than a fixed code of symbols. It directs attention to who makes an object, whom it addresses, and the circumstances in which it is understood.

Indigenous fashion scholarship

Jessica RheAnn Metcalfe's doctoral research already establishes a relationship between contemporary Native design, identity, tradition, and community. Its publicly available abstract identifies storytelling and the use of new materials as part of that inquiry (Metcalfe). The present study draws only on the abstract and does not attribute detailed arguments to unexamined chapters. Its contribution lies in comparing how different practices make identity public, rather than presenting the connection between Indigenous fashion and identity as a new discovery.

Designers and Indigenous commentators also shape this field of knowledge. Christian Allaire connects cultural clothing with young people's confidence in their identities and with the continuation of craft practices (Allaire). His account identifies aims and concerns within Indigenous fashion; it is not evidence that every garment produces those outcomes. Yellowtail similarly describes her label and the Collective through their relationships with Indigenous creators (Yellowtail). Her account suggests that representation depends partly on how fashion work is organised and whose contribution receives recognition.

Representation and cultural authority

In "Cultural Identity and Diaspora," Stuart Hall examines identity through history, memory, and representation (222–26). His work allows continuity and change to be considered together. However, its Caribbean context must remain distinct from Indigenous relationships to lands, nations, and collective responsibilities. The concept of historical positioning is useful here without reducing Indigenous nationhood to a symbolic identity or suggesting that appearance determines belonging.

Jolene Rickard shifts attention from cultural inclusion to the authority governing representation. Her discussion of Indigenous voices within institutions shows why visibility alone is insufficient (465–68). A museum can display Indigenous work while retaining control over the categories through which visitors encounter it. Applied to fashion, this approach requires attention to attribution, context, and the institutions that bring a garment to public notice.

Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang further limit this by insisting that decolonisation concerns Indigenous land and life, rather than any improvement in representation (1). Fashion may contribute to cultural expression without demonstrating changes in jurisdiction or institutional power. Maintaining this distinction allows artistic agency to be discussed precisely and prevents sovereignty or decolonisation from becoming general terms of praise.

Fashion and appropriation

M. Angela Jansen questions definitions that connect fashion exclusively with European modernity. Her article's abstract proposes a broader understanding of contemporary dress (Jansen). This matters when Indigenous clothing is classified as tradition while fashion is treated as something acquired from outside. A new material or commercial form does not, by itself, indicate cultural loss. Its significance depends on the relationships and decisions involved.

Richard A. Rogers distinguishes cultural exchange, dominance, exploitation, and transculturation (Rogers). These distinctions discourage treating all cultural movement as the same process. They also raise concrete questions: whose work is used, whether it is credited, what permissions apply, and who benefits. Together, these studies support an approach that follows clothing through production and circulation while recognising that public appreciation does not resolve questions of cultural authority.

Conceptual Framework

The framework distinguishes authorship, authority, and reception. Authorship identifies who designs or transforms an object. Authority concerns the relationships and permissions that support a particular cultural use. Reception concerns how audiences understand it. These dimensions overlap, but none can stand in for another. Naming an artist does not authorise that person to represent every community a viewer associates with the work. Equally, favourable reception cannot establish cultural legitimacy.

Hall's account helps explain how inherited relationships can be renewed through forms with no exact historical predecessor. Clothing may express an existing connection to family or community, while making and wearing it can create occasions to revisit that connection. Rickard's emphasis on sovereignty keeps this interpretation grounded in questions of authority. The analysis concerns an act of self-definition without equating artistic recognition or commercial success with political sovereignty.

The term Indigenous gaze is used here to prioritise makers' accounts, purposes, and chosen audiences. It does not imply that all Indigenous people see in the same way. A work may address non-Indigenous consumers while remaining organised around its maker's concerns. What matters is whether those concerns remain available to audiences, rather than whether the work satisfies an external expectation of Indigenous appearance.

Cultural memory is considered through practical knowledge, public events, and storytelling. These are overlapping analytical distinctions, not a universal Indigenous classification. Beadwork can raise questions about knowledge sustained through making; a scarf can preserve a connection to a gathering; an apparel title can carry historical references into an imagined future. Continuity depends on these relationships, rather than on visual resemblance alone. An unchanged design may circulate without attribution, while a visibly altered object may retain a clear connection to its maker and inherited practice.

The framework avoids making hybridity its main explanation. Calling a garment a mixture can describe its appearance without explaining who chose its components or why their combination matters. It may also imply that Indigenous practice and modern fashion began as separate, complete worlds. The selected examples are better understood through specific actions: working materials onto footwear, connecting an accessory to a gathering, and bringing historical names into apparel. These actions reveal decisions that the general label of mixture would leave unexplained.

Methodology

This qualitative study compares a small, purposively selected group: *Adaptation II* (2012), the Indigenous Women Rise scarf (2017), and the Po'pay 2180 Hoodie within Revolt Rising. The selection reflects identifiable Indigenous authorship, public documentation, and different relationships between clothing and representation. It is not a representative sample of the industry. The findings concern these works and the possibilities they illustrate.

The research materials include museum collection records, an exhibition entry, a designer interview, an artist statement, and an apparel catalogue. I consulted public online records on 23 September 2026. Undated retail pages are treated as access-dated documents rather than evidence of a production year. The analysis reads the documented objects alongside their titles, attribution, and accompanying accounts. It does not involve physical examination, interviews, surveys, or participant observation.

Each reading identifies the work, describes relevant documented features, interprets them in context, and considers an alternative explanation. A luxury shoe may assert Indigenous authorship while retaining the prestige of an established brand. A scarf may support collective visibility without expressing every wearer's experience. This approach tests the argument against the limits of the evidence rather than assuming that each example produces cultural empowerment.

Sources are used according to what they can establish. A museum entry records an institution's description, not a complete object history. An interview presents a designer's account, while a retail page also serves a commercial purpose. Material descriptions and documented events are distinguished from interpretations of their significance. The study does not infer ceremonial meanings, consumer responses, community permissions, or economic outcomes where evidence is absent. Abstracts and bibliographical records support only the limited claims explicitly associated with them.

The comparison follows the movement from making to public encounter without assuming that meaning travels unchanged. A material description, event record, and retail title each preserve different information. Reading them together makes the gaps visible. These gaps matter because the study concerns both what designers can communicate through clothing and what their available documentation allows a researcher to claim responsibly.

Jamie Okuma and material authorship

The Smithsonian entry describes *Adaptation II* as beaded and quilled and lists leather, glass beads, porcupine quills, sterling silver cones, brass sequins, chicken feathers, cloth, deer rawhide, and buckskin. It also identifies the underlying shoes as Louboutin designs (Smithsonian American Art Museum). The work therefore involves a material intervention, rather than an image of a technique used as a visual reference. Its construction brings making into the object's interpretation.

This distinction matters because an audience can admire a surface without recognising the labour behind it. Okuma's intervention makes the shoe available as an example of artistic decision-making through material practice. She determines how techniques interact with an existing form and how that form changes. Beadwork is consequently part of the work's conception, as well as its execution. Treating it only as skilful decoration would obscure the choices that organise the finished object.

Attributing the work to both designers preserves this relationship. The original shoe remains recognisable within the artwork's history, while Okuma's processes establish a distinct contribution. Neither treating the base shoe as irrelevant nor placing her work beneath the commercial label adequately explains the object. Authorship can involve transforming something with an existing identity, provided the intervention and the person responsible remain clear.

The title *Adaptation II* also directs attention towards change. It does not identify a single tradition or translate the meaning of every material. Instead, it supports a reading in which an established practice enters a new arrangement. A search for cultural purity would divide the object into authentic and external components before considering the artist's decisions. Following those decisions provides a fuller account of why the components belong together in this work.

The shoe's luxury associations nevertheless remain relevant. Okuma's work can challenge the marginalisation of Indigenous practices while drawing on the prestige

of a familiar brand. The case shows an artist acting within a hierarchy of value; it does not establish that the hierarchy has disappeared. The evidence cannot determine whether viewers respond chiefly to the artist, the materials, the brand, or the museum's endorsement. Recognition of her authorship remains essential, no matter which element first attracts attention.

The case also clarifies the relationship between memory and making. Repeating a technique need not mean reproducing an earlier object. Applying knowledge to a different surface can require fresh judgements while sustaining practical skills. Beadwork and quillwork make this interpretation relevant to *Adaptation II*, but the record does not establish Okuma's teachers or a specific ceremonial lineage. The strongest claim concerns the relationship visible in the documentation: a named artist exercises material knowledge through a transformed fashion object.

This reading also questions the division between the designer who invents and the craft worker who carries out an idea. In *Adaptation II*, what can be imagined depends on what material knowledge makes possible. Technique is not merely a finishing stage. Its application helps determine the work's identity and the questions it presents to viewers. Recognising that relationship gives artistic judgement a place within the discussion of skill, without requiring the researcher to reconstruct processes that the collection entry does not describe.

Bethany Yellowtail and collective presence

The National Museum of the American Indian identifies Indigenous Women Rise as a printed and sewn cotton scarf measuring 55 by 54 centimetres. Its record links the commission to Native Americans in Philanthropy and participants in the Women's March in Washington, DC, on 21 January 2017 (National Museum of the American Indian, "Indigenous"). These details establish the object and occasion examined here. They should not be generalised to every related scarf or every participant's experience.

A scarf can connect an existing outfit to a shared occasion without replacing the wearer's other choices. This makes it useful for considering how dress supports association while allowing individual variation. The object's form enables such coordination, although the collection record does not establish every way it was worn. Its significance emerges from the relationship between an accessory and a gathering, rather than from an assumed universal meaning in its design.

The title Indigenous Women Rise names a collective presence and an action. It frames the scarf through women occupying public space together. The title is contextual language and should not be assumed to appear as printed wording on the textile. Reading the object with its documented title and commission makes its political setting clearer than a description of its fabric alone could do.

Yellowtail remains the named designer, but commissioning, distribution, and participation also contribute to the scarf's public meaning. This shows how self-representation can involve several people and roles. A maker provides an object

through which others express an association, and its meaning develops through use. Shared clothing need not erase differences among wearers. Yet an observer may still mistake coordinated appearance for a single, uniform Indigenous identity.

The march also broadens the settings in which fashion can be studied. Clothing shapes public appearance beyond runways, retail campaigns, and seasonal collections. Here, the documented relationship to a gathering matter more than recognition within a conventional fashion institution. The scarf offers a way to examine collective visibility, but the record does not establish changes in public attitudes, institutional decisions, or the lives of Indigenous women. Political effect would require separate evidence.

Yellowtail's interview places her design work within a history of learning to sew and make regalia from her grandmother and aunt (Yellowtail). This account connects received knowledge with later creative decisions. It does not imply that each product repeats a family garment. What continues may be a skill, a responsibility, or the ability to judge how inherited knowledge enters new work. This makes cultural transmission relevant to contemporary design without requiring an unchanged pattern.



Fig. 1. Bethany Yellowtail and two versions of her scarf design. Image credits: Mel Melcon / Los Angeles Times / Native Americans in Philanthropy. Source: Paniogue.

Yellowtail's interview places her design work within a history of learning to sew and make regalia from her grandmother and aunt (Yellowtail). This account connects received knowledge with later creative decisions. It does not imply that each product repeats a family garment. What continues may be a skill, a responsibility, or the ability to judge how inherited knowledge enters new work. This makes cultural transmission relevant to contemporary design without requiring an unchanged pattern.

The scarf's later collection history introduces another form of memory. A garment associated with participation becomes an object through which people absent from the march can encounter that occasion. Preservation keeps the connection available, while also separating the accessory from the bodies and circumstances that gave it meaning. The record cannot recover every wearer's experience. Its value lies in maintaining a specific link between a design, a commission, and a public event.

The move into a museum also changes the audience. Participants may have recognised the scarf through a shared experience, whereas later viewers depend more heavily on the accompanying record. The object can connect these encounters without making them equivalent. A collection entry's account of a commission and donation offers a route back to the event, but leaves many people and actions outside its frame. Remembering through clothing therefore involves attention to what the archive preserves and to what remains beyond it.

Virgil Ortiz and imagined futures

Ortiz's Revolt Rising collection brings apparel into a narrative organised around 1680 and 2180. Its listings include the Po'pay 2180 Hoodie, Countdown 1680 Hoodie, and Blind Archer garments (Ortiz, "Revolt Rising"). The analysis follows these titles rather than reconstructing undocumented graphic details. Naming places the items within a story before a consumer encounters the clothing itself.

Ortiz's artist statement explains that he develops a futuristic version of material from the Pueblo Revolt to make the story accessible, including to children and people unfamiliar with it. He connects this project with protecting culture and maintaining artistic relevance (Ortiz, "Prelude"). The statement supplies context for the collection. It does not establish what every purchaser learns or whether a hoodie communicates the complete history without explanation.

Pairing a historical date with an imagined future gives continuity a forward direction. The past supplies material for stories that extend beyond the present. In this reading, Indigenous identity is not confined to an image of what has already happened. Ortiz claims room to imagine new settings for inherited concerns. The connection depends on the artist's narrative and authorship, rather than resemblance to historical clothing.

The title *Po'pay* brings a specific name and chronology into a familiar category of garments. A viewer unfamiliar with the reference may be prompted to ask about it. That possibility matters, even though curiosity and learning cannot be assumed. The everyday form lets the story circulate beyond the artist's statement, while the title gives a point from which its context can be sought.

The catalogue invitation, "Wear the story. Own the origin. Join the uprising," links purchase with participation (Ortiz, "Revolt Rising"). Its language deserves scrutiny. Buying clothing cannot confer ownership of a people's history or permission to speak for them. The invitation offers consumers a relationship to the project, but that relationship is limited. Commercial language can make a narrative appealing

while blurring the difference between acquiring an object and acquiring cultural authority.

Selling apparel also allows Ortiz to circulate work under his own name. Its commercial setting does not automatically cancel the cultural purpose he describes. However, purchasers may value the item for its appearance, its connection to the artist, or reasons unrelated to the narrative. These are possible responses, not documented findings. The case shows how wider circulation can extend an artist's reach while reducing control over interpretation.

Ortiz's work, therefore, makes imagination part of the discussion of cultural continuity. A living practice needs room for forms that outsiders do not already recognise. Historical specificity and an invented future can coexist within the same project. The unresolved question is how well their relationship survives when the garment moves beyond the artist's own presentation. This question concerns the conditions of reception, rather than whether futuristic clothing is sufficiently traditional.

The comparison with Okuma clarifies the difference. Her documented techniques establish a relationship through the object's material construction. Ortiz's titles and statement establish one through narrative. Both readings depend on named authorship, but the evidence operates differently. This prevents cultural memory from becoming an explanation applied identically to every work. It also shows why the researcher must follow the information available for each case instead of expecting a single method of visual decoding to explain footwear, a scarf, and a hoodie.

Cultural memory and changing forms

The cases reveal different ways of maintaining relationships through change. Okuma's material intervention connects practical knowledge with a transformed object. Yellowtail's scarf connects design with a shared public occasion. Ortiz's apparel carries historical references into an imagined future. These distinctions describe the selected works; they do not assign each designer permanently to one category. Their practices may overlap in ways that the chosen examples do not capture.

This comparison helps distinguish preserving an object from sustaining the capacity to make and interpret further objects. A museum can care for clothing without securing the teaching relationships or working conditions behind it. Likewise, a public record can retain an event's date without preserving participants' full experiences. Cultural memory depends on people who continue practices and on contexts that keep historical connections understandable. The surviving garment provides evidence of these relationships, but it cannot stand for all of them.

Innovation is therefore neither automatically protective nor necessarily destructive. Its significance depends on what remains connected when a form changes. A new design may exercise inherited knowledge; a repeated image may conceal the maker from whom it came. This is why documentation matters alongside

appearance. A name, date, material description, and public account can help audiences recognise an authored work without pretending to explain every aspect of its cultural significance.

Entwistle's emphasis on the body adds a practical dimension to these differences. Shoes imply movement, a scarf can be folded or displayed, and a hoodie belongs to everyday clothing. These possibilities shape how an object enters social life, but they are not records of actual use. Keeping that distinction matters because the temptation to supply a wearer's feelings is strong when the object appears familiar. The analysis can discuss what a garment enables while leaving the experience of particular wearers open.

Markets and unequal recognition

A garment's visibility can increase while recognition of its maker weakens. Photographs may circulate without attribution, or viewers may admire an aesthetic feature without seeking its context. These are risks raised by the comparison, not documented events involving the selected items. They suggest that self-representation depends partly on whether names and histories travel with images. Circulation alone offers no guarantee that they will.

Yellowtail's account of the Collective adds an organisational question: whose work becomes accessible through a fashion enterprise? Her stated aim of supporting Indigenous creators directs attention beyond a prominent designer's public image (Yellowtail). The present evidence does not independently establish income or employment effects. It does, however, show why credit and the presentation of other makers belong within an account of representation.

Commercial sale should also be distinguished from reducing a work entirely to its exchange value. Selling clothing can support creative practice while encouraging simplified cultural branding. The relevant questions concern attribution, control, compensation, and the conditions under which work continues. Neither commercial success nor absence from the market proves cultural legitimacy. The three formats also reach audiences differently, but their relative accessibility cannot be established without information about prices, distribution, and use.

Authenticity presents a related difficulty. A familiar appearance may be mistaken for legitimacy, rewarding designs that meet an audience's expectations. Yet Indigenous authorship alone does not allow an outside researcher to certify that every cultural use has collective approval. A careful account identifies the maker, the stated affiliation, and the documented work, then leaves questions of permission open where evidence is missing. This preserves the difference between recognising an artist's agency and granting that artist a representative role that the sources do not establish.

Specificity and interpretive limits

Accurate attribution changes what audiences can ask of an object. Instead of deciding whether it looks Indigenous, viewers can consider a particular artist's

choices and the work's documented setting. This does not prevent misunderstanding, but it makes interpretations answerable to evidence. Museum records assist this process while remaining partial accounts shaped by institutional categories. They should not be treated as the final authority on cultural significance.

Favourable stereotypes can be restrictive too. Automatically calling Indigenous design spiritual, sustainable, communal, or timeless assigns qualities that may not be established. The National Museum of the American Indian's educational discussion emphasises diverse clothing traditions rather than a generic Native appearance ("Native American Cultures"). The works examined here provide no basis for assigning them a shared ceremonial function or environmental outcome. Their differences are necessary to understanding them.

Some meanings may be familiar to particular audiences and unavailable to others. A responsible reading can acknowledge that uneven access without inventing an explanation for every feature. Public context can support recognition without requiring unrestricted disclosure. Designers may also pursue pleasure, experimentation, or everyday style. Requiring every work to resist colonialism or explain an entire culture would impose another narrow expectation on Indigenous creativity.

This approach changes the task of criticism. It asks how an interpretation stays accountable to a specific work rather than how quickly it fits into a general image of Indigenous culture. A useful reading can identify a connection without claiming complete access to it. It can also recognise commercial or institutional constraints without assuming that the artist has no room to act. The three cases require both kinds of attention because their public meanings emerge through choices made within particular settings.

Conclusion

Contemporary Indigenous fashion expresses identity through relationships that appearance alone cannot establish. *Adaptation II* makes material practice visible as an artist's intervention. Indigenous Women Rise links clothing to collective participation and remembrance. The Po'pay 2180 Hoodie connects an everyday garment with historical storytelling and an imagined future. Each case shows a different way in which cultural inheritance can remain active through new forms.

The comparison places authorship and context at the centre of interpretation. Designers make and frame their work, while museums, markets, and wearers influence its later meanings. Self-representation therefore involves an ongoing effort to keep choices and relationships recognisable as clothing circulates. It offers opportunities for cultural expression without guaranteeing agreement, understanding, or measurable empowerment.

The study's limits remain clear. Three United States examples cannot represent Indigenous fashion generally. Public sources provide uneven information about production, community protocols, and reception. Further research with makers and wearers, built through appropriate relationships, is needed to examine lived and

economic effects. Within its documentary scope, the study shows why continuity should be understood through the capacity to sustain and reinterpret relationships, rather than through a requirement that Indigenous clothing always look the same.

Works Cited

Allaire, Christian. "Christian Allaire on the Power of Style." Interview by Sacha Brown. *Council of Fashion Designers of America*, 17 June 2021, cfda.com/news/christian-allaire-on-the-power-of-style/. Accessed 23 Sept. 2026.

Babula, Carolyn Jean. Review of *Clothing and Difference: Embodied Identities in Colonial and Post-Colonial Africa*, edited by Hildi Hendrickson. *American Anthropologist*, vol. 100, no. 2, June 1998, pp. 549–50. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1998.100.2.549.

Entwistle, Joanne. "Fashion and the Fleshy Body: Dress as Embodied Practice." *Fashion Theory*, vol. 4, no. 3, 2000, pp. 323–47. https://doi.org/10.2752/136270400778995471.

Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, edited by Jonathan Rutherford, Lawrence & Wishart, 1990, pp. 222–37. University of Warwick digital copy.

Jansen, M. Angela. "Fashion and the Phantasmagoria of Modernity: An Introduction to Decolonial Fashion Discourse." *Fashion Theory*, vol. 24, no. 6, 2020, pp. 815–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/1362704X.2020.1802098.

Metcalfe, Jessica RheAnn. Native Designers of High Fashion: Expressing Identity, Creativity, and Tradition in Contemporary Customary Clothing Design. 2010. University of Arizona, PhD dissertation. Abstract reproduced in Smithsonian Libraries and Archives catalogue record. Accessed 23 Sept. 2026.

National Museum of the American Indian. "Indigenous Women Rise." Smithsonian Institution, collection no. 27/34, americanindian.si.edu/collections-search/object/NMAI_412933. Accessed 23 Sept. 2026.

---. "Native American Cultures and Clothing: Native American Is Not a Costume." *Native Knowledge 360°*, Smithsonian Institution, americanindian.si.edu/nk360/informational/cultures-and-clothing. Accessed 23 Sept. 2026.

Ortiz, Virgil. "Prelude: ReVOlution Is Coming." *Virgil Ortiz Creations*, www.virgilortiz.com/revolution-is-coming. Accessed 23 Sept. 2026.

Paniogue, Tara. "L.A. Designer Bethany Yellowtail Creates a Silk Scarf for Women's March on Washington." *Los Angeles Times*, 21 Jan. 2017, https://www.latimes.com/fashion/la-ig-bethany-yellowtail-20170120-story.html.

---. “Revolt Rising.” *Virgil Ortiz Creations*, www.virgilortiz.com/store/Revolt-Rising-c190186298. Accessed 23 Sept. 2026.

Rickard, Jolene. “Visualizing Sovereignty in the Time of Biometric Sensors.” *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, vol. 110, no. 2, 2011, pp. 465–86. https://doi.org/10.1215/00382876-1162543.

Rogers, Richard A. “From Cultural Exchange to Transculturation: A Review and Reconceptualization of Cultural Appropriation.” *Communication Theory*, vol. 16, no. 4, 2006, pp. 474–503. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2006.00277.x.

Smithsonian American Art Museum. “Jamie Okuma’s *Adaptation II*.” *Hearts of Our People: Native Women Artists*, americanart.si.edu/exhibitions/native-women-artists/online/jamie-okuma. Accessed 23 Sept. 2026.

Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. “Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor.” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2012, pp. 1–40. University of Edinburgh digital copy.

Yellowtail, Bethany. “Bethany Yellowtail on Supporting Community & Culture.” Interview by Sacha Brown. *Council of Fashion Designers of America*, 10 June 2021, cfda.com/news-and-insights/industry-insights/bethany-yellowtail-on-supporting-community-culture/. Accessed 23 Sept. 2026.