

MARIJA KRSTIĆ

Department of Ethnology and Anthropology,
Faculty of Philosophy, Belgrade

Mind the Gap: The Use of Artistic Methods in Anthropological Research

A Critical Reading of Marcus

This paper presents an overview of several artistic approaches used within anthropological research in order to question a claim made by George Marcus. Marcus stated that visual experiments, due to their aesthetic elements, were not used in anthropology. In a collaborative work with the artist, scenographer and artist of the theatre, Fernando Calzadilla, Marcus remarked that, although anthropology after the 1980s lost its firm scientific ground, anthropologists did not use possible artistic tools (such as visual experiments) for its plausible and legitimate completion. This paper aims to critically discuss his claims through an analysis of several anthropological interdisciplinary works, looking at how anthropologists combine their methods of research with artistic techniques.

[artistic approaches, anthropology, George Marcus, science]

UDK 7.02:39.0]

izvorni znanstveni članak

primljeno 12.5.2011.

prihvaćeno 8.7.2011.

(Visual) experiments, touching upon the aesthetics of fieldwork, were something that anthropologists, operating between the critiques of the 1980s and the changing conditions of research in the 1990s onward, could benefit from, but which, because of the weight of the professional apparatus of power, authority, tradition, and self interest, they could not do in any coherent way. (Calzadilla and Marcus 2006:96)

The second half of the 20th century was a period in which, primarily due to feminist and postcolonial critiques, (male Western) scientific authority was questioned. Moreover, some anthropologists, including influential and talented writers such as Clifford Geertz, Victor Turner, Mary Douglas, Claude Lévi-Strauss and Edmund Leach, “blurred the boundary separating art from science” (Clifford 1986:3; see Marcus and Myers 1995). Pierre Bourdieu (1988) further researched the distinction between the scientist and the artist. Bourdieu pointed out that there is no great difference between artists and scientists, since scientists are also biased, emotional and fuelled by their own self interest. However, he argued that academic authority depends on the possession of institutional forms of cultural capital which guarantees a regular income and bureaucraticised career while writers and

artists belong to less institutionalised sectors (Bourdieu 1988:6,36).¹ The difference between anthropology and art was additionally questioned in the 1980s. After the crisis of representation² and the critiques of grand narratives, the replacement of ethnographic realism with more experimental ethnographies,³ the rhetorical⁴ and reflexive turn⁵ took place (see Marcus and Cushman 1982; Clifford 1986; Marcus and Fisher 2003; Миленковић 2003). At the same time, a new sensibility for anthropology and a new way of writing ethnographies emerged (Marcus and Fisher 2003:10). According to Clifford (1988:22), with the breakup of the colonial powers in the 1950s, and furthermore with the crisis of conscience in anthropology starting from the 1960s, it was realised that “with expanded communication and intercultural influence, people interpret others, and themselves, in a bewildering diversity of idioms”. Thus, it became clear that the West is not the only source of knowledge about others. To illustrate, Clifford (1986:2) stated that the articles in the *Writing Culture* volume reveal different understandings of culture and scientific authority. In particular, this volume (Clifford 1986:2) accepted that culture was composed of contested codes and representations and that the poetics and the political are inseparable in writings. As Clifford (1986:2) stated the situation: “academic and literary genres interpenetrate and (...) the writing of cultural descriptions is properly experimental and ethical”. In this respect, the focus is shifted away from participant-observation to text making and rhetoric in order to highlight their construction, artificial nature and ethnography as inven-

¹ Furthermore, the author (Bourdieu 1988:36-72) makes subtle distinctions between the social and natural scientist; professors and researchers, the prestigious and young professors in order to show how knowledge depends on authority and power.

² This crisis includes the critiques of representing cultures as coherent, natural and stable units (Миленковић 2003:33).

³ Milenković (2003:29) says that the “crisis of ethnographic realism” means gradually “losing faith” regarding the autonomy of ethnographic experience in relation to “objective” reality, and, at the same time, the crisis of recognition of reality defined in the ethnographies. Some other authors make a clear division between ethnographic realism and experimental ethnography. Ethnographic realism is defined as an unproblematic method of writing in order to represent the totality of one culture or society, while experimental ethnography is a reaction on it, considered to be one (of many other possible) interpretations, and includes the creativity and self-reflexivity of the author (Marcus and Cushman 1982).

⁴ Milenković (2003:70) explains this shift in the discipline when social sciences and social and cultural reality started to be perceived as a literary construction. “According to the rhetorical view, reality and truth are created through the representation and the interpretation of the writers and their audiences” (Миленковић 2003:70).

⁵ In the 1970s and the 1980s, the anthropologists started to critique their own methods, motifs, and to accept the views of native communities and their representatives (Миленковић 2003:63).

tion and not the representation of cultures (Clifford 1986:2). Therefore, Pink (2006:14) reminded us that the crisis of representation impelled the use of other media, such as ethnographic film, photography, but also, performance anthropology and exhibition. As Clifford (1986:4) mentioned, anthropology may be considered as an “art”, due to the literary qualities of its ethnographies. However, different authors emphasised the important similarities and possibilities with art by showing that collaboration with artists should be considered a part of mainstream anthropology. In this regard, Marcus and Myers (1995:1) acknowledged that anthropology as a discipline is bonded with the art world, and that anthropology and its subjects are increasingly involved “in the production of art and the institutions on which art production depends” (1995:4). Similarly, in their edited volume, *Contemporary Art and Anthropology*, Schneider and Wright criticised the insufficient cooperation between artists and anthropologists and the creation of a radical distinction between art and science. The authors (Schneider and Wright 2006:4) claimed that anthropologists did not conduct scientific experiments but that scientific experiments are not even valued and encouraged within the discipline. Nevertheless, according to Schneider and Wright (2006:4) this lack of use of visual expression in anthropology can be overcome, “by a critical engagement with a range of material and sensual practices in the contemporary arts” since “the borders between anthropology and art have never been completely or rigidly demarcated” (2006:3). In a similar manner and with similar regrets, in the same volume, Marcus and Calzadilla (2006) remarked that, although anthropology after the 1980s lost its firm scientific ground, the anthropologists did not use possible artistic tools (such as visual experiments) for its possible and legitimate completion. This paper is divided in six sections which explore different aspects of the collaboration of anthropologists with artistic practice. The aim of the paper is to critically discuss the caption statement by discussing anthropological interdisciplinary works and answer the question of whether anthropologists successfully combine their methods of research with artistic ones.

Marcus’ and Calzadilla’s light at the end of the tunnel

Two decades after the publishing of the edited volume *Writing Culture* with Clifford, Marcus was still dissatisfied with the movement of anthropology and thus with anthropological engagement. According to him, while anthropologists have adopted the importance of the interdisciplinary approach, it stayed within the framework of social science collabora-

tion (Calzadilla and Marcus 2006:95). Consequently, Marcus stressed that the experiments which join up with aesthetical exploration and which would provide different ways of thinking, rhetoric and practice were “unacceptable to the boundary-keeping institutional and professional rules of order in the academy” (Calzadilla and Marcus 2006:95). Marcus’ vision is that “ethnography is much richer in possibility if it collaborates with the practices of other intellectual crafts that have a kinship and resemblance to it-as in the case of scenography in the theater” (Calzadilla and Marcus 2006:97). The author therefore sees in the artists possible help for the improvement of anthropology as a discipline and ethnographies.

Only artists, who understood the task of ethnography more deeply than most other artists (...) might, in pursuing their own license, show anthropologists something important about their methods that they could not see as clearly for themselves. (Calzadilla and Marcus 2006:96)

On this topic, Marcus described the example of the artistic multimedia workshop organised by the artist, art critic and cultural theorist Hernández and artist curator Angelini. This happening, named, *Arists in Trance*, occurred at Rice University, Houston, in spring 1997 (Calzadilla and Marcus 2006:97). Marcus gave special attention to the installation by Hernández and the artist, scenographer and artist of the theatre, Calzadilla, *The Market From Here* (TMFH). TMFH focused on the representation of a market, not through ethnography, but as “the creation of a sort of imaginary of the people involved in the marketplace (...) making intricate decisions about space, light, materials (...)” (Calzadilla and Marcus 2006:97). Hence, Calzadilla (Calzadilla and Marcus 2006:106-108) explained that their work is not a representation of a market but an evocation of market experience which includes the collective memory of the market place. Since the authors used an ethnographic approach and researched Venezuelan markets, talked to people and made it complementary to their creative and subjective process, Calzadilla finds that TMFH connected anthropology and ethnography with artistic practices (Calzadilla and Marcus 2006:101,109). According to Marcus, TMFH experimentally explores scholarly distance and active participation in one cultural setting (Calzadilla and Marcus 2006:99-100).

Marcus and Calzadilla (2006) showed how the preparation of one artistic installation can include anthropological research methods: interviews, participant observation, reading anthropological textbooks and how the exhibition can be seen and understood by a wider spectrum of the audience (non-anthropologists). Consequently, Marcus’ and Calzadilla’s “light” are visual experiments “at the end of the anthropological tunnel” since Marcus demanded a more innovative and flexible approach to an-

thropology.⁶ In the next sections I will show how novel this demand was, and the extent to which the approach can be described as innovative.

The complicities of anthropology

According to Clifford (1986:6), since ethnographic writing is determined by its social context, rhetoric, institution, genre, politics and history, the ethnographies produced are no more than fictions, systems of truth shaped by power and history. “Ethnographic truths are thus inherently *partial-committed* and incomplete” (Clifford 1986:7). On the contrary, Milenković (2003:60) suggested that the proponents of the crisis of representations confound the production (the research and writings of the anthropologists) with the product (ethnographies)⁷ and also the intentions of writers with the intentions of readers. Therefore, the crisis of representation was seen as a crisis of the subject and the crisis of the subject as a crisis of the status of the discipline (Миленковић 2003:60). Furthermore, there exist many different opinions regarding the scientific authority of anthropology and, therefore, its relationship with or existence as an art. For instance, Spiro defends the scientific authority of anthropology and its objectivity by saying that, although scientists are subjective, it is possible to neutralise or minimise it by using objective scientific methods and the norms of science as a social institution (1996:774).⁸ Correspondingly, Sangren (1988:406) defends the traditional authority of ethnography, and while he accepts that knowledge is related to power and authority, he also thinks that anthropology, as well as all other cultural systems, is to some degree realistic (1988:407). In this respect, Sangren (1988:420) makes a distinction between scientism as a form of theory or thinking that describes the world as it “really is” and the invocation of the authority of science as a selection criterion. In this respect, in his more recent article,

⁶ Though Marcus (Calzadilla and Marcus 2006) talks about artistic installations with anthropological elements, and his caption statement refers to the anthropologists working with artistic elements, this paper will not discuss further examples of artists using anthropological methods (for a better understanding of this approach, see Da Silva and Pink 2004; for a discussion on whether an artist can be an ethnographer, see Foster 1995).

⁷ Nevertheless, Milenković also agrees that the ethnographies cannot be treated as timeless and objective, but as a type of socially positioned textual praxis of the anthropologists themselves (2003:76).

⁸ Though Spiro is aware of the existence of human subjectivity, he is against “never-ending” interpretations and blurring the boundaries between fact and opinion, since it can cause multiple manipulations of the facts among scholars (Arendt 1968 cited in Spiro 1996:776).

Sangren draws attention to the following point. Although anthropology is a product of cultural and social processes, at the same time, the anthropologists assume that “at some (...) level of abstraction, general truths exist” (Sangren 2007:14). Thus, Sangren suggests that anthropology’s place should be in a liberal-arts curriculum. There are many different understandings of the notion that the boundary between art and anthropology is unclear. In that regard, as a response to the notions of the unreliability of the ethnographies and the ethnographic writings as fictions, Carrithers (1990) explained that anthropological knowledge, though not absolute, should be treated as reliable and useful, while admitting and recognising its limits. Furthermore, Carrithers (1990:272) assumed that ethnographic knowledge, though partly cultural and general, is personal since “it is (...) exercised by persons in respect of each other” in “actual circumstances”. Carrithers (1990:172) stated that ethnography offers reliability, because it is a “study of the variety of human sociality by means of human sociality itself” and not certainty. In addition to this point, Barry proposed that anthropology should be conceived as a science “in order to compare the forms of persuasion deployed in anthropology with those of natural sciences” (Carrithers et al. 1990:273). Barry remarked that now natural sciences are losing their authority as forms of knowledge and it ought to be possible to reexamine their connections with anthropology (Carrithers et al. 1990:273; see Latour and Woolgar 1986/1979; Latour 1987).

This brief introduction to one of the science studies debates should serve as a possible background for Marcus’ claim. In other words, the status of anthropology as a science has drastically changed since the 1960s, and new methodologies, strategies and practice are more palpable for being used. In this section it was revealed that even the opponents of *Writing Culture*, such as Sangren, agree that anthropology should have a more flexible place among the social sciences. It is more widely accepted than before that anthropology should use artistic tools, and that that approach would not make it less scientific.

“The Dark Age” of the 21st century?

Though Marcus’ concern for the further development of anthropology is important as it can serve as a way for its improvement, it can be noticed that other anthropologists have similar ideas and concerns.

The idea that the use of visual material should be used more in anthropology was thoroughly developed already. For instance, Ravetz (2005:78) also stressed the importance for greater experimentation in visual anthro-

pology, and, moreover, that visual anthropologists must engage with artists.

The new crossovers between fine art and other kinds of image-based practice provide plenty of scope for the extension of the anthropological imagination. Rather than threatening untruth, imagination is an essential part of the ethnographic task. (Ravetz 2005:78)

Grimshaw (2005:195) considers art and anthropology as analogous practices and, thus, she is interested in combining ethnographic inquiries with artistic practice. Furthermore, she stressed that in the last decade “at the same time, there has been a renewed engagement with anthropology by contemporary artists and other visual practitioners” (Grimshaw 2005:200). Furthermore, since Grimshaw (2005:217) accepts the idea that there is no clear boundary between art and anthropology and that anthropologists cannot ignore aesthetic issues, the author elaborates in detail their collaboration. She introduced the concept of “the visualisation of anthropology”, which represents “collaborative exchange with artists and other image-based practitioners that is not rooted in the juxtaposition of discursive positions but emerges through participation in shared projects” (Grimshaw 2005:201). Similarly, Grimshaw and Ravetz (2005:1-15) write about the experiments in anthropology, cooperation with artists, writers, photographers and film-makers, based at *the Granada Centre for Visual Anthropology*, at the University of Manchester. By using the term “visualising anthropology”, the researchers at *the Granada Centre* investigate the possibilities of image-based inquiry and are inclined to transform theoretical perspectives in their ethnographic work by using a camera, photography, ceramics and video installations in collaboration with fine artists (Grimshaw and Ravetz 2005:6). One of the prominent anthropologists who pleaded for innovative approaches to anthropological practices has already been mentioned, Sarah Pink. Pink (2001, 2004, 2006) for example, contrary to Marcus’ regret for the inertia of anthropologists, expresses satisfaction for the improvements in anthropology. According to Pink (2006:38), the crisis of representation, the reflexive turn, and the new technological developments enabled the visual anthropologists to “produce new, innovative, reflexive and theoretically informed projects using photography, video, drawing and hypermedia” (Pink 2006:38). Thus, Pink believes that the whole field of hypermedia is emerging since “visual and digital technologies and media are becoming more economically accessible and ‘user-friendly’” (2006:16,19; see 2004). Even though writing in the social sciences allowed professionals to produce descriptions, explanations and the codification of theories, academic writing remained without any new innovations or imagination (MacDougall 2006:44). Thus, David Ma-

MacDougall (2006) reminded us that after the crisis of representation, ethnographic films and photography are able to aid the improvement of ethnographies. However, MacDougall also pointed out that the advantages of film were not used. "When film is invoked, it is generally to adapt its structures to writing, not to question writing as a method" (MacDougall 2006:43). Furthermore, MacDougall (2006:267) also agreed that the innovations introduced by visual anthropologists have not been recognised by mainstream anthropologists. Similarly, Grimshaw (2005), for instance, is dissatisfied with the development of visual anthropology. She admitted that although visual anthropology⁹ emerged in the 1970s as a new subdiscipline of anthropology, the textual tradition, nevertheless, remained for anthropologists a primary source of their intellectual legitimation (Grimshaw 2005:198,199). Nevertheless, the lack of use of the audiovisual medium did not mean that anthropologists did not use it at all. For example, MacDougall claimed that in spite of the fact that most anthropologists did not know what to do with the visual, and that "vast archives of recorded footage remain unseen and unused" (1997:283), the author stresses that activities in visual anthropology are increasing. There are many examples in the history of anthropology which support this claim. I will mention only a few of the most important.

Since the early beginnings of anthropology, its proponents used visual methods in order to most objectively document reality. A physician, Félix-Louis Regnault, according to De Brigard, was the first ethnographic filmmaker, who in 1895 filmed a Wolof pottery making method. Consistent with Regnault, the camera was a tool for cross-cultural studies and ethnographic filming was "a scientific activity concerned with ethnographic subjects" (De Brigard 1975:15,30). Thus, in accordance with the emergence of anthropology in the late 19th century, visual equipment was used as a part of anthropological methods. Banks and Morphy (1999:6) further noted that Haddon in the Torres Straits expedition starting in 1898, and later Spencer and Gillen in Australia used photography and early camera in their ethnographic research (see also De Brigard 1975:16; Pink 2006:3-20; Banks 2010; for the example of how Boas experimented with the use of different artistic techniques, such as drawing, painting, lithography, photography, exhibition, dioramas, and film, see Glass 2009). It was considered that ethnographic films "reveal something about primitive cul-

⁹ MacDougall (1988:61) defines visual anthropology as a research technique, field of study, teaching tool, mean of publication, and another approach to anthropological knowledge. Similarly, for Westermann (2005:x) visual anthropology critically analyses visual methods of anthropological documentation and research into the visual production of cultures.

ture (...) which can be grasped in no other way" (De Brigard 1975:13). As a result, anthropology was defined as a descriptive science while newly gathered data were explained within an evolutionary framework (Morphy and Banks 1999:6). At this stage, through field photographs, ethnographies claimed their authenticity (Pink 2001:123).

Later on, in the US anthropological tradition, Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson in their research in Bali tried to interrupt this chain of using film and camera only as book illustrations. In *Balinese Character* (1942), they indicated that only through photography can certain aspects of Balinese culture be cross-culturally translated and "the wholeness of each piece of behaviour can be preserved" (Morphy and Banks 1999:10; Bateson and Mead 1942:xi-xii). Nonetheless, as Pink (2003:182) revealed, Mead and Bateson used photography as "an observational visual-recording device", intended to be neutral scientific documents within the colonial discourse framework. Mead and Bateson

failed to achieve the move from visual anthropology as a mode of representation by anthropologist to visual anthropology as a study of people's own visual worlds. (Morphy and Banks 1999:13)

Beside Mead and Bateson, during the mid 20th century, other key figures in visual anthropology believed that visual methods enabled a more scientific approach to anthropology. For Collier, photography is "a precise document of material reality" serving the purpose of improving note-taking and participant observation methods (1967). Similarly, Karl Heider considers ethnographic film as a tool and ethnography as its goal. In other words, films serve the "pursuit of truth" and for describing certain aspects of ethnography more effectively (Heider 1976:4,7,125). In later decades, this scientific-realist approach was re-evaluated. It was not only suggested that "visual truth" does not exist but also that, in most cases, the series of ethnographic photos cannot be used as a relevant narrative of the event (Pink 2001:97-99). As a result, visual practices were not abandoned but became part of a reflexive approach. It was acknowledged that their meanings are arbitrary, subjective and context-, viewer-, researcher-, method- and theory-dependent (Pink 2001). As Pink explained, the purpose of an analysis shifted from translating "visual experience" into "verbal knowledge" to an exploration of the connection between visual and other possible knowledges (2001:51-52,94-95).

The aim of this section was to discuss different view points and possible strategies about the use of visual methods and experiments among the anthropologists. It was shown that Marcus' assertion that visual experiments should be utilised is *nihil novo*. As other anthropologists also demanded the better implementation of visual practices in anthropology,

in the next section I discuss whether they were actually used in contemporary practice.

“The light in the tunnel”

Though Marcus (Calzadilla and Marcus 2006) does not mention any collaborative projects between anthropologists and artists or the use of artistic practice by anthropologists themselves, they vividly exist. In this respect, Pink explained her own experimental CD-ROM hypermedia project, *Women's Worlds*, based on the sensory home (2006:72-78). Pink defined “hypermedia”, as types of interactive media publications which comprise written words, CD-ROM, the Internet, still and moving images and sound (2001:156). The project itself consisted of informants' stories, their experiences and performances and includes video clips and informants' discussions about their homes, “showing visually the art, images and material objects and technologies they implicate verbally” (Pink 2006:74). Therefore, Pink's project included not only anthropological perspectives but combined and implemented the elements originally used only in artistic practice.

To propose such a project is to recognise the renewed engagement with anthropology by contemporary artists and other kinds of visual practitioners. (Grimshaw and Ravetz 2005:6)

Furthermore, Heller (2005), for instance, explained how in her research on people's interaction with city spaces in Sheffield, she used ethnographic and artistic methods. During her fieldwork, she used photography, sculpture, bodily movement and different forms of text (Heller 2005:134,135). As an anthropologist, Heller participated in social activities (played football in the park, became part of a community allotment and talked to people about their experiences of Sheffield). In order to be more creative, she joined a community art workshop project. In her project she looked at the different utilisation and possibilities of the park space through the use of photography, sculpture and creative writing. She had the opportunity to collaborate with artists, project workers and participants (2005:136). For her complementary methods, the author herself (Heller 2005:140) said that the “interactive possibilities of the art” enabled her to expand her ethnographic methods of participant observation, her field notes and the theoretical analysis. In other words, anthropologists themselves were using and are using artistic possibilities as part of their research technique and method. Nevertheless, there are many other diverse interdisciplinary

engagements of anthropologists who apply different techniques in their fieldwork, which do not have to be designed in the way that Marcus and Calzadilla proposed. For instance, Morphy, the anthropologist and curator, (2006) wrote about the exhibition “Yingapungapu” organised for the opening of the First National Gallery in the National Museum of Australia in Canberra. This exhibition represented a collaboration between anthropologists and the indigenous Yolngu people. The native community used art and ceremonial performance to show off their culture, more specifically, yingapungapu sand sculpture.¹⁰ At the same time, according to Morphy (2006:483), the anthropologists’ role was to design and explicate their sand sculpture and explain their usage in ritual context, since the Yolngu use art and performance to persuade the outsiders of the value of their culture (2006:478). The exhibition reconstructed the coast line of Blue Mud Bay and the audience could “visit” more places and find out more about Yolngu’s myth and history through displayed paintings, photographs and sculpture (Morphy 2006:484). Before the grand opening, the Yolngu constructed a sand sculpture in a semi private ceremony, where only the staff of the museum, international media and a few distinguished visitors were present. This was followed with connected rituals which included dancing, tapping of a clap sticks, singing, and using the coffins and spears for the ritual (Morphy 2006:488-489). As this example shows, improvements do need not be necessary as concerns the artists. The original approach may represent a combination of approaches: the application of anthropological theories, exhibition, native art and the collaboration and performances of native communities.

One of the possible innovations within anthropological writing is the use of drawings and sketches in it, as a method of recording personal memories and at the same time, as a method of refreshing somebody’s memory. This method was described by Ana Isabel Alfonso who worked with anthropologists and the graphic illustrator, Manuel João Ramos, in a village near Lisbon, looking at villagers’ nostalgic memories regarding the illegal crossing of the border with Spain (Alfonso and João Ramos 2004:77). Since there was no visual documentation, after they had collected ethnographic details, they showed the drawings to the villagers who were able to recall their memories and to give more details in addition to their previous information (Alfonso and João Ramos 2004:77,78).

All the examples mentioned had the purpose of showing that although the use of visual material and visual experiments are not part of main-

¹⁰ Yingapungapu sand sculpture is “an elliptical form (...) used in mortuary rituals to contain pollution associated with a burial ceremony and to cleanse people after the burial” (Morphy 2006:477).

stream anthropology, they are becoming more and more accepted within the discipline itself as the anthropologists are aware of the advantages of the interdisciplinary approaches and collaborative projects with artists.

“The tunnel at the end of the light”

In this paper, several issues were raised: the use of visual elements in the anthropological practice, interdisciplinary approaches and collaboration with artists, which all have roots in one larger problem—what makes anthropology a science, or to rephrase it, is anthropology less scientific if it uses artistic elements in its actualisation?

In their research about laboratory practice, Latour and Woolgar (1986) drew attention to processes relating to the construction of scientific facts. They show that even natural sciences depend on matters of luck, historical opportunities, bureaucracy, political influence, the different strategies of the scientists, and financiers’ needs. Even laboratory sciences are not objective ones but represent the outcome of linked possibilities and advantages (Latour and Woolgar 1986; see also Knorr-Cetina 1981). In this respect Latour’s claim that science represents “the science in making” (1987) is noteworthy. Latour and Woolgar (1986:31) admitted that science is a creative activity, but a type of activity in “which knowledge is constructed”. Therefore, not only social science lost its scientific and thus objective status, also, the natural sciences lost its firm ground. Nonetheless, Marcus (Calzadilla and Marcus 2006:100) is rather dissatisfied with the lack of performative elements in anthropology. While according to him “the idea of collaboration, shared authorship, and ‘the dialogic’ stood for these tendencies in the 1980s and the critiques could (dared) not go beyond the conventional notions of fieldwork”, the examples shown reveal quite the opposite. In fact, he is not the only anthropologist who drew attention to the necessity of collaboration with artists and the use of artistic elements. In that respect, Grimshaw claimed that “anthropologists have not gone very far in pushing beyond existing conventions”, and that “anthropology, art and other forms of visibility have been marginalized and suppressed by a text-oriented discipline” (2005:203,217). Similarly, MacDougall (2006) wrote of the insufficient use of aesthetic practice in anthropology and the need for new methodology. Nevertheless, these anthropologists also stress that there were some shifts in applying art within the social sciences.¹¹ For example, Grimshaw (2005) confirmed that important

¹¹ The existence of artistic influences in anthropology is more detectable in ethnographic films and should not be overlooked. As a result, Banks underlines two important aspects

examples of visual ethnographic experimentation exist and that collaboration between art and anthropology and art history and anthropology should be part of the mainstream disciplinary approach, while MacDougall (2006:219) wrote about the necessity of using visual media, such as film, video and photography in anthropological work in order to change significantly the ways in which anthropologists define their knowledge.

Artistic practice within anthropology

The aim of this paper was to critically discuss Marcus' (Calzadilla and Marcus 2006) claim about the lack of use of visual experiments within anthropology due to institutional constraints. This statement entails questions concerning the scientific authority of anthropology. In the following manner, I understood Marcus' quotation to pose the following problematic: there is a fear among anthropologists that, if art becomes part of anthropological methodology, what will become of the discipline? On the contrary, the examples shown revealed that anthropologists *do* use visual experiments and encourage further investigations with them. Marcus (Calzadilla and Marcus 2006) writes about the "new" path of anthropology, which is not new at all. Morphy and Banks (1999), MacDougall (2006), Pink (2001, 2003, 2004, 2006), Grimshaw and Ravetz (2005) etc., like Marcus, stress the importance of cooperation with artists,¹² but they, unlike Marcus, also reveal that there are anthropologists who undertook some activities in that field. While the authors mentioned here write about the use of visual media in anthropology, on the other hand, Marcus writes

of ethnographic film: its documentary or ethnographic and the artistic or cinematographic aspect (2010:292). Many films by anthropologists, such as Jean Rouch, Robert Gardner and David and Judith MacDougall (originally trained in film-making), are renowned also for their cinematographic qualities (Banks 2010:293; MacDougall et al. 2000-2001). Jean Rouch, for example, is one of the most famous and most controversial visual anthropologists. His ethnographic films, according to MacDougall (2006:55) highlight "the difference between the uses of film and writing" and at the same time express the intellectual and stylistic possibilities of the ethnographic films (2006:254). Therefore, MacDougall (2006:94) mentions Rouch's films as an "alternative way of representing social experience". Barsam (1992:301) reminds us that Rouch's films were called "ethnographic fictions" since he used the *cinéma vérité* approach and experimented with traditional techniques, such as the interview, biographical format. At the same time, Rouch used a kaleidoscopic portrayal of city life and recorded ordinary people doing daily things (Barsam 1992:301).

¹² Morphy and Banks (1999:14) claim that visual methods should not be used in all context but "that they should be used where appropriate, with the rider that appropriateness will not always be obvious in advance".

about visual experiments. At the same time, Marcus does not define what he means by that term but only offers the example *The Market From Here*.

As a result, this paper showed that anthropologists have worked with video media, drawing, used other different artistic mediums, worked with artists and called for more developed engagements with them. At the same time, Marcus does not explain in detail how “the weight of the professional apparatus of power, authority, tradition, and self interest” disabled cooperation with artists or the use of artistic methods in anthropology (Calzadilla and Marcus 2006:96), nor did the authors mentioned complain about this matter. Therefore, his claim remains unclear.

Nevertheless, the question of artistic elements within anthropology can further shake its already shaky scientific ground. What will be left of anthropology then? Ivan Brady offers one possible solution and defines anthropology as “artful science” since it operates between art and science. Brady holds the opinion that the distinction between art and science is not easy to make, since clear divisions between value and fact, the true and the beautiful, the real and the fantastic, and the subjective and the objective cannot be sustained any more (Carrithers et al. 1990:273). Therefore, there are possibilities for anthropology which Marcus overlooks. New media and everyday more developed technologies influence the possibility of expanding the framework of anthropology. This shift can be understood as the retention in anthropology of the internalist position, or as its improvement from the externalist position.¹³ Between these two polarities there are a lot of possibilities for anthropologists, which were discussed in the previous sections. The problem with the utilisation of the artistic elements is not thus, the question of whether they will blur the boundaries between art and anthropology. It is rather the question of whether the combination of artistic and anthropological methods will explain the material more thoroughly, provoke significant feedback, add some relevant information to anthropological surveys or just include an aesthetic dimension. These issues would provide fascinating themes for a further paper on this topic.¹⁴

¹³ Milenković explains that the proponents of the internalist approach in science, see science as an objective, auto-corrective, systematic and methodical activity which poses a scientific method, while, on the other hand, externalists favour a more relativistic and flexible approach to the understanding of science (2003:17-19).

¹⁴ An older, unpublished, version of this paper was submitted to the University Oxford, as part of the course obligations for the M.Sc. in Visual Anthropology. This version is a result of work in the framework of the project *Identity Politics of the European Union: Adaptation and Application in the Republic of Serbia (177017)* organised by the Ministry of Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia. I am indebted to my friend, Andrew Hodges, who proof read and commented on several versions of this paper.

References

- Alfonso, I. Ana and Manuel João Ramos. 2004. "New Graphics for Old Stories. Representation of Local Memories Through Drawings". In *Working Images. Visual Research and Representation in Ethnography*. S. Pink, L. Kürtl and A. I. Alfonso, eds. London, New York: Routledge, 72-89.
- Banks, Marcus. 2010. "Film". In *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. A. Barnard and J. Spencer, eds. London, New York: Routledge, 292-295.
- Barsam, M. Richard. 1992. *Non-Fiction Film. A Critical History*. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Bateson, Gregory and Margaret Mead. 1942. *Balinese Character. A Photographic Analysis*. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1988. *Homo Academicus*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Calzadilla, Fernando and George E. Marcus. 2006. "Artists in the Field. Between Art and Anthropology". In *Contemporary Art and Anthropology*. A. Schneider and C. Wright, eds. Oxford, New York: Berg, 95-115.
- Carrithers, Michael, Andrew Barry, Ivan Brady, Clifford Geertz, Roger M. Keesing, Paul A. Roth, Robert A. Rubinstein, Elvi Whittaker. 1990. "Is Anthropology Art or Science [and Comments and Reply]". *Current Anthropology* 31/3:263-282.
- Clifford, James. 1986. "Introduction. Partial Truths". In *Writing Culture*. J. Clifford and G. Marcus, eds. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1-26.
- Clifford, James. 1988. *The Predicament of Culture. The Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge, Mass.; London: Harvard University Press.
- Collier, John Jr. 1967. *Visual Anthropology. Photography as a Research Method*. New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Atlanta, Dallas, Montreal, Toronto, London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.
- Da Silva, Olivia and Sarah Pink. 2004. "Anthropology and Photography". In *Working Images. Visual Research and Representation in Ethnography*. S. Pink, L. Kürtl and A. I. Alfonso, eds. London, New York: Routledge, 157-165.
- De Brigard, Emilie. 1975. "The History of Ethnographic Film". In *Principles of Visual Anthropology*. P. Hockings, ed. The Hague, Paris: Mouton Publishers, 13-43.
- Foster, Hal. 1995. "The Artist as Ethnographer?". In *The Traffic in Culture. Refiguring Art and Anthropology*. G. E. Marcus and F. R. Myers, eds. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 302-309.
- Glass, Aaron. 2009. "Frozen Poses. Hamat'sa Dioramas, Recursive Representations, and the Making of a Kwakwaka'wakw Icon". In *Photography, Anthropology and History. Expanding the Frame*. C. Morton and E. Edwards, eds. Farnham: Ashgate, 89-116.
- Grimshaw, Anna. 2005. "Art and the Visualization of Anthropology". In *Anthropologies of Art*. M. Westermann, ed. Williamstown, Massachusetts: Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, 195-220.
- Grimshaw, Anna and Amanda Ravetz. 2005. "Introduction". In *Visualizing Anthropology*. A. Grimshaw and A. Ravetz, eds. Bristol, Portland: New Media Intellect, 1-15.
- Heider, Karl G. 1976. *Ethnographic Film*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Heller, Roanna. 2005. "Becoming an Artist-Ethnographer". In *Visualizing Anthropology*. A. Grimshaw and A. Ravetz, eds. Bristol, Portland: New Media Intellect, 133-141.
- Knorr-Cetina, Karin. 1981. *The Manufacture of Knowledge. An Essay on the Constructivist and Contextual Nature of Science*. Oxford, New York, Toronto, Sydney, Paris, Frankfurt: Pergamon Press.
- Latour, Bruno and Steve Woolgar. 1986/1979. *Laboratory Life. The Construction of Scientific Facts*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

- Latour, Bruno. 1987. *Science in Action*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- MacDougall, David. 1997. "The Visual in Anthropology". In *Rethinking Visual Anthropology*. M. Banks and H. Morphy, eds. New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 276-295.
- MacDougall, David. 1998. *Transcultural Cinema*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 61-92.
- MacDougall, David, Judith MacDougall, Ilisa Barbash and Lucien Taylor. 2000-2001. "Radically Empirical Documentary. An Interview with David and Judith MacDougall". *Film Quarterly* 54/2:2-14.
- MacDougall, David. 2006. *The Corporeal Image. Film, Ethnography, and the Senses*. Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Marcus, E. George and Dick Cushman. 1982. "Ethnographies as Texts". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 11:25-69.
- Marcus, E. George and Fred R. Myers. 1995. "The Traffic in Art and Culture. An Introduction". In *The Traffic in Culture. Refiguring Art and Anthropology*. G. E. Marcus and F. R. Myers, eds. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1-51.
- Marcus, E. George and Michael M. Fisher. 2003. *Antropologija kao kritika kulture*. Zagreb: Breza (translation of: Marcus, George E. and Fisher, Michael M. 1986. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press).
- Миленковић, Милош. 2003. *Проблем етнографски стварног. Полемика о Самоу у кризи етнографског реализма*. Београд: Српски генеалогски центар (Milenković, Miloš. 2003. *The Problem of the Ethnographic Real. The Samoan Controversy in the Crisis of Ethnographic Realism*. Belgrade).
- Morphy, Howard and Marcus Banks. 1999. "Introduction. Rethinking Visual Anthropology". In *Rethinking Visual Anthropology*. M. Banks and H. Morphy, eds. New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1-35.
- Morphy, Howard. 2006. "Sites of Persuasion. Yingapungapy at the National Museum of Australia". In *Museum Frictions. Public Cultures/Global Transformations*. I. Karp, C. A. Kratz, L. Szwaja, T. Ybarra-Frausto with G. Buntinx, B. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett and C. Rassool, eds. Durham, London: Duke University Press, 469-499.
- Ravetz, Amanda. 2005. "News from Home. Reflection on Fine Art and Anthropology". In *Visualizing Anthropology*. A. Grimshaw and A. Ravetz, eds. Bristol, Portland: New Media Intellect, 69-79.
- Pink, Sarah. 2001. *Doing Visual Ethnography*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Pink, Sarah. 2003. "Interdisciplinary Agendas in Visual Research. Re-Situating Visual Anthropology". *Visual Studies* 18/2:179-192.
- Pink, Sarah. 2004. "Introduction. Situating Visual Research". In *Working Images. Visual Research and Representation in Ethnography*. S. Pink, L. Kürtl and A. I. Alfonso, eds. London, New York: Routledge, 1-12.
- Pink, Sarah. 2006. *The Future of Visual Anthropology*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Sangren, Steven. 1988. "Rhetoric and the Authority of Ethnography [with comments]". *Current Anthropology* 29/3:405-435.
- Sangren, Steven. 2007. "Anthropology of Anthropology. Further Reflection on Reflexivity". *Anthropology Today* 23/4:13-16.
- Schneider, Arnd and Christopher Wright. 2006. "The Challenge of Practice". In *Contemporary Art and Anthropology*. A. Schneider and C. Wright, eds. Oxford, New York: Berg, 1-28.
- Spiro, Melford. 1996. "Postmodernist Anthropology, Subjectivity, and Science. A Modernist Critique". *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 38/4:759-780.

Westermann, Mariet. 2005. "Introduction. The Objects of Art History and Anthropology". In *Anthropologies of Art*. M. Westermann, ed. Williamstown, Massachusetts: Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, vii-xxxi.

Mind the Gap: uporaba umjetničkih metoda u antropološkom istraživanju. Kritičko čitanje Marcusa

Sažetak

U radu se razmatra kritika nedostatne uporabe umjetničkih metoda u antropološkim istraživanjima Geoga Marcusa (Calzadilla i Marcus 2006). Marcus tvrdi da vizualni eksperimenti, zbog svoje estetske dimenzije, nisu korišteni u antropologiji. Međutim, nedostatak uporabe audio-vizualnih medija ne implicira da ih antropolozi uopće nisu koristili. Isto kao i Marcus, neki drugi antropolozi naglašavaju važnost suradnje s umjetnicima. Također, ti društveni znanstvenici misle da takva vrsta kooperacije treba postati dio *mainstreama* socio-kulturne antropologije. U radu se skreće pozornost na nekoliko suvremenih antropoloških radova koji primjenjuju umjetničke metode, kao što su radovi Sare Pink, Anne Grimshaw i Amande Ravetz, Roane Heller, Ane Alfons i João Ramos Manuela i Howarda Morphyija. Također, u radu se daje kratak povijesni pregled uporabe vizualnih metoda, prije svega fotografije i kamere u antropološkim istraživanjima u Americi i zapadnoj Europi. Svi spomenuti primjeri imaju za cilj pokazati da, iako uporaba vizualnog materijala i vizualnih eksperimenata ne predstavlja dio vladajućeg tijeka socio-kulturne antropologije, nasuprot Marcusovom mišljenju, oni postaju sve više prihvaćeni unutar discipline. U skladu s tim, antropolozi su svjesni prednosti interdisciplinarnih pristupa i projekata suradnje s umjetnicima.

[*umjetnički pristupi, antropologija, George Marcus, znanost*]