Navajo community. The version of white, mainstream culture available to the Navajo man is also adjudicated by the market, although his relation to commodity culture is mediated not only by the market but also by his everyday experiences in the community in which he lives.

As with exoticism, appropriation has to do with who decides what is interesting enough to commandeer and reproduce, usually someone from the more powerful group who is in a position to select and use whatever happens to catch her eye. When an outsider decides which aspects of a cultural and aesthetic tradition to take up and emphasize and which to ignore, these decisions may have nothing to do with the internal meanings of the dances, art forms, and ceremonies within the culture in which they were created. As with exoticism, fragments are taken up and manipulated, although there are some differences between appropriation and exoticism. Exoticism evokes a sensibility and uses objects to construct a conceptual line of escape out of Western culture into a titillating, yet manageable other. Appropriation incorporates the objects and sensibilities into the dominant, Western-based culture, sometimes by domesticating and sometimes by erasing the origins of these objects. Although exoticism does the same and to some extent exoticism and appropriation are overlapping concepts, with appropriation it is the taking up that is important.

**Authenticity and Cultural Integrity**

Authenticity is a tricky concept because of the way the term can be manipulated and used to convince people they are getting something profound and substantial when they are just getting merchandise. A marketing expert has decided in advance which variant of difference will sell best and has attempted to promote this version as the most real and desirable. This commodification of authenticity raises another problem. Any notion of cultural authenticity carries with it a notion of inauthenticity, against which the former is evaluated. This distinction seems somewhat artificial, and it is neither possible nor particularly desirable to draw a clear line between the real and the counterfeit in order to decide which aspect of culture is authentic and which is not. Any clear demarcation between the two categories that is decided in advance would have to be based on a universalized—which in this day and age means market-driven—notion of what traditional looks like. It would also presuppose the existence of someone doing the deciding, who presumably is able to stand above the action and choose the good, someone who is likely to be our old friend, the Western subject.

An abstract notion of authenticity can be used as a political tool to legitimize or delegitimize actual people and communities. This is especially obvious when the term is deployed against people who are seen as a source of exotic, authentic, and highly marketable images, yet who also occupy resource-rich land coveted by governments and resource companies. In a recent land rights trial in British Columbia the question of cultural authenticity revealed the extent to which the discussion takes place within a colonial context, with colonial-style authorities continuing to reserve the right to designate a people as authentic or not. Marcia Crosby writes:

> In 1989, government lawyers, in disputing Gitksan-Wet'suwet'en land claims, attempted to establish that Indians who eat pizza, drive cars and watch television—that is, no longer live as "traditional" Indians residing in some timeless place—did not meet Eurocentrally established criteria for authenticity under which, the courts assert, Indian "rights" were established.

The term *authenticity*, then, becomes a definition imposed from the outside on a living culture so that the community will never be able to live up to the way it has been defined. Deploying a notion of authenticity gives a twentieth-century colonist an appearance of liberality that overt self-interest cannot. The colonist says sadly, "Gee, we really would support your claim if only you were authentic, but unfortunately ...." The motives for...
this deployment are clear when we bear in mind the agenda of those evoking authenticity in this particular context. Colonial wars are always propaganda wars. The provincial government’s logic seems to be that if a particular community is deemed inauthentic, it can then be stripped of treaty privileges and treated like everyone else, which is to say, as if it has no right to exist on its own terms.

In the marketplace authenticity is no more than a merchandising device. I prefer to use the more flexible idea of cultural integrity to refer to autochthonous cultural traditions and to the possibility of aesthetic, social, and ceremonial meanings able to exist outside of the system of capitalist exchange, at least for the most part. Integrity retains an idea of cultural wholeness and of a relatively unbroken connection between the image or object and the culture in which it is made and used. A visitor to Victoria might purchase a Kwagiulth button blanket and hang it on the wall. The same blanket could also be draped around a dancer during a potlatch. Whereas authenticity is dependent on the external form of the object, integrity takes into account how and where the object is used. In other words, I am using the word integrity to suggest connection to a social and ceremonial matrix. Certain objects are more connected to their cultural source than others, precisely because of how they are used and the contexts in which they occur. But herein lies a paradox because the appropriated forms of culture tend to be marketed as authentic, which can cause confusion even in the minds of the well-intended.

Questions of cultural authenticity and integrity can become very complicated because any cultural object or practice can still manifest integrity among the people who respect and treat it as such, even if aspects of the form or practice have been appropriated and inserted into a market economy. Someone belonging to the killer whale clan might purchase a $2, mass-produced key chain with a killer whale emblem on it and carry it precisely because it is traditional, which in this context is to say that the design is executed in a traditional style that refers to a traditional clan structure. The clan member has a personal connection to the object. Correct ideas do come from practice, as someone once noted, and there is never a nice sharp line between unequivocally authentic culture and market-driven, commercialized culture. Powwows, which can be quite culturally mixed and even play with notions of authenticity, are another case in point because at some profound level culture—whether traditional, contemporary, or mixed—often has very little to do with the market, despite the hopes and dreams of eager MBAs.

Appropriation, like exoticism, is dependent on a rhetoric of origins. This can generate anxiety on the part of the consumer about whether an object or event is authentic, and this anxiety is especially common among collectors of ceremonial items. For instance, I recall visiting a collector of African art who made a point of announcing proudly that his masks "had been danced." For this collector, the authenticity and value of the object were precisely dependent on its having been removed from its formerly meaningful social context. The obvious question was, "if people were using the mask, why do you have it?" But this was already framed as irrelevant and, perhaps worse, impolite, which means that there was no preexisting place in the discourse of art appreciation for such questions to be raised. Christopher Steiner makes the point that worries about ceremonial authenticity on the part of collectors of West African art have led to elaborate definitions and subdefinitions of authenticity that circulate in this market and are skillfully manipulated by African art producers and merchants.

The point of owning a ceremonial object seems to be to display ownership or, more precisely, to display the ability to possess something of value to someone else. It is as if the collector imagines himself to have usurped the mask’s cultural integrity, which was formerly dependent on the community in which it was danced. That the object is valuable to someone else is precisely what makes it valuable to the collector, who has at some level vanquished the previous owners through the possession and display of the object or, rather, the display of power.

Collectors are much like the tourists who want to experience an authentic ceremony and feel cheated by a noticeably inauthentic event or performance. Consumers want their purchases to be authentic, and tourists want their experiences to be real, even though at some level it must be clear to all concerned that this is not the case, that a genuine, pristine, authentic tradition is an impossible dream in a market driven by capital (if indeed authenticity was ever possible in any society). At some level they must know that precisely because they are in a position to witness the event or purchase the object, it has lost some of its spiritual efficacy. Because of this subterranean comprehension of what appropriation involves, such consumers find the explicit recognition of both the impossibility of authenticity and the unequal power relation inherent in the exchange too unpleasant and go to a great deal of trouble to ensure that the question never comes up. A bargain is struck; a pact of silence is enforced. The organizers of tourist events, much as the carvers of masks for the tourist market, take pains to assure their customers that they will achieve a glimpse, an almost-memory, of traditional, non-market-driven culture. This is why the marketed version of culture explicitly refers to the unmodified version through a rhetoric of authenticity.

There remains another question: What are the effects of appropriation in the Western culture of the mainstream, which is to say, on the people who haunt the shopping malls and tourist agencies and long for sanitized but believable authenticity? A definitive, programmatic answer may be impossible, but it is important to pay attention to the oddities that lie beneath different kinds of appropriation and to what these say about the culture in which appropriation occurs.