

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SCIENTIFIC AND THE ARTISTIC IN ANTHROPOLOGICAL FILM PRODUCTS — A QUESTION OVERCOME OR AVOIDED?

ALEKSEJ GOTTHARDI-PAVLOVSKY

Hrvatska televizija
10000 Zagreb, Prisavlje 3

UDK 7.097:572

Stručni rad
Professional paper
Prijhvaćeno: 01. 12. 2003.

This paper examines a number of answers offered to questions concerning the fundamental starting points and methodology of film anthropology as well as the relationship between art and science in the products of film anthropology. Anthropologists have presented the criteria which a certain film should satisfy in order to be considered ethnographic. However, the question is raised whether some of these criteria disregard the psychological effects of film language and dramaturgy or, in other words, the essence of film. Can a work whose basic means of expression is illusion ever completely satisfy the demands of ethnologic research and expression?

This paper concludes that film can never both satisfy the demands of the science of anthropology and preserve all its essential qualities. Due to this, anthropologists should analyse various potentials of film separately in order to discover the usability of each of them for anthropological purposes. In this process they ought to make use of the latest achievements of contemporary technology.

There has long been an idea prevailing in contemporary filmic anthropology¹ that the camera is actually “porous” in both directions, or in other words, that by each visual (as well as any other) ethnographic description and its scientific interpretation, an anthropologist, while directly presenting another matter, indirectly tells something about himself. An anthropologist inevitably begins each research from the position of the cultural pattern he belongs to and, proceeding from this position, he formulates hypotheses and questions used in

¹ In line with Claudine de France’s consideration I tend to label as filmic anthropology each anthropological work which is expressed by film, i.e. by motion picture distinguishing it thus from a broader concept of visual anthropology which comprises other visual products such as photographs, prints and drawings, or in other words, non-motion pictures. I include in the concept of “film”, in the technological sense of this word, any, either optic, magnetic or digital, bearer of motion picture and sound.

his field work. This means that neither an anthropologist nor the camera he handles will ever be able to be completely objective, at least not in the way demanded by positivist sciences. Thus, as the American anthropologist Professor Jay Ruby says: *We seem amenable to the idea that anthropology is at its best when we are telling the stories of our experiences to others* (1982:131). On top of that, any informant will always in his statements and acts, even before himself, let alone before an anthropologist and his tools (either a camera, or a notebook and pen), adjust his presentation of the culture he belongs to according to his own, often uncritical, image of it and to his desire to create such image in others. This is why many visualistic anthropologists² believe that the efforts to find a way to persuade people to do on film *exactly the same things they would do if the camera were not present*³ are absurd. Instead, they have expanded the focus of their scientific interest to include not only decoding of the rules of human behaviour through their own visual works, but also decoding of others' visual works. Part of anthropological interest has been shifted from creating visual expression about the object of research to the consideration of the visual expression created by the object itself. The object has consequently become the subject, moreover equal to the interviewer while anthropological research itself and the interviewer — the anthropologist — have become the objects of research.

In this way, film has become understood and recognized as a means of communication. Other visual products besides film, containing motion and still pictures, have become the matter of research. Anthropologists have since then considered and interpreted any visual expression, regardless of who created it, dissecting it to units - bearers of meaning, each of which has its own sociocultural reasons and rules of emergence and operation (Ruby 1982:123-124) The implicit understanding that any visual product is socioculturally conditioned has led to the relativization of the border dividing science and art in the visual expression of anthropologists. It is believed that an anthropologist is at any rate subjective. So, if an anthropologist estimates that it will make it easier for him to express what he intends to say, he is allowed to look for his means of expression among existing "art" conventions. On the other hand, if he avoided them it would not make him more "objective".

This means that film anthropology has surpassed the conflict between the artistic and the scientifically utilitarian aspects of film (... *These naive assumptions about the differences between the art of film and the science of*

² I use the term *visualistic* instead of *visual* because it would mean *the anthropologists who are visual, who can be visualised*, i.e. all of us while we inhabit this world.

³ Walter Goldschmidt as quoted in Ruby 1975:106

anthropology are slowly being replaced by a conception of film as culturally bound communication usable in a variety of discourses (Ruby 1996:1347)). An anthropologist can use all means of film description and expression in order to find the expressions most suitable for the articulation of the results of the analysis of ethnographic material. The only imperative he has to obey is that the methodology he uses is transparent and, at any rate scientific, anthropological, founded on a theory of culture. In fact, anthropologists should construct their own codes of filmic expression. Or, as Prof. Ruby puts it: *Such a theoretical structure would allow for the construction of an ethnographic **trompe l'oeil** for film: the development of filmic codes and conventions to 'frame' or contextualize the apparent realism of the cinema and cause audiences to 'read' the images as anthropological articulations. Once constructed, it will be possible to explore the consequences of transforming abstract thoughts, such as theories or models, into Images* (Ruby 1982:129).

In his famous article *Is an Ethnographic Film a Filmic Ethnography* (1975, pp.104, 109) Prof. Ruby had presented the arguments for the creation of specific anthropological film expression even seven years before the above quoted text was published. However, more than twenty years later in *The Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology*, in the text under the heading visual anthropology Ruby concluded that anthropologists still did not really use the camera as a research tool, i.e., that they did not apply suitable methods: *The lack of a method for extracting researchable data about cultural behaviour from film footage **continues**⁴ to inhibit the use of the camera as a research tool*, while in the concluding paragraph he didn't use a present or future tense, but a modal verb: *The promise of visual anthropology is that it **might**⁵ provide an alternative way of perceiving culture - perception constructed through the lens* (1996:1351).

It seems that film anthropology has not yet managed to construct its own film meta-language and that anthropologists, when using film as expression, still rely on existent conventions. Perhaps these conventions (i.e., the existent film language) are so deeply rooted in our consciousness that the members of the mainstream film anthropology, uncertain about the quality of results, estimate that their renunciation and construction of the new ones is too tiresome a task. Or, is it so that anthropologists, convinced that by *producing pretty pictures* (Ruby 1975:110) they produce a scientific paper, simply satisfy their own mental comfort mixing up the concepts of the scientific and the scientifically

⁴ Bolded by A. G. P.

⁵ Bolded by A. G. P.

useful? Or, may it simply be that the “good old” Western dichotomic perception of the world (1982:122,123) was, at least partially, right in its implicit inclusion of the difference between science and art - shall we not eventually acknowledge that a film work per se is not and cannot be a scientific work, which does not exclude the usability of film technology and various film forms of expression for the purposes of science?

The forms of cultural research which were initiated by Sol Worth a few decades ago and the directions of their development pointed out by Prof. Ruby are undoubtedly significant steps in the development of anthropological scientific thought. The discovery of a uniform system of visual expression which would be adequate to the aims of anthropology and at the same time based on the understanding of the rules according to which visual signs acquire their meaning, may be an epoch-making discovery for the field of anthropology. However, in my opinion, we can in the meantime improve the usability of film in anthropology by simply acknowledging the fact that “film” is a concept with many faces and uses. We could then appreciate scientific usability of each single possibility this medium and its technology provide us with.

A proof of the argument that anthropologists have never carried out a precise analysis of the usability of various characteristics of film is provided by the fact that they tend to label each film product as “an ethnographic film”, disregarding both the scale on which film tools are used in it and its form of narration. Audio-visual notes filmed in the field, most often by amateurs, and then simply put together are labeled “an ethnographic film” in the same way as the works of a professional production.

That man tends to label each film product as a film may to some extent be understandable since one really perceives each film product by the same principle - by the sluggishness of the eye and unconscious thinking processes which endow logical meaning to a series of pictures or frames at the moment of their perception. Furthermore, in spite of considerable changes film has undergone during history its name has remained the same - film. However, I think that we should not, in the process of scientific consideration of these problems, stop at this sort of lay spontaneity.

It is necessary to draw demarcation lines among anthropologically usable film products, particularly taking into account their methodology and appropriateness.

We should first clarify the fundamental question of which type of product to label a film i.e., what makes a certain visual product a film.

Each time one places an eye at the eye-piece of the camera his consciousness starts a process identical to the one accompanying the watching of films, the only difference being that one can take active part in his own film, he can create it and not only be a passive watcher of a film show. Whenever one starts composing a filmshot, he has in a way started creating film expression. It is a fact that any film product must undergo processes of shooting and editing, which are not only technical but intellectual as well. In this sense any film product is a sort of expression; it is an interpretation articulated at least by the selection of what has been filmed and shown.

One may ask himself: doesn't it mean that any film product is actually a film, and, in that context: doesn't it mean that any visual work done by an anthropologist is an ethnographic, i.e. an ethnologic/anthropologic film. I would say not.

In my opinion, a film is a conceptive whole expressed with moving pictures or moving pictures and sound which, by using film language and a (photographic) message of a take, tries to show both a phenomenal level and a natural and/or social and/or spiritual context of what is presented (i.e. subtle, immaterial links among the prevented subjects, or between the subjects and the context of their action). It is important to note that the primary intention or purpose of creating film product, i.e. of using film means, is to express the author's questions, attitudes and emotions towards the presented while its secondary purpose is to describe and document. In other words, to be a film, a visual work has to express the author's point of view and subordinate a film medium to this view.

When perceived at the phenomenal level, what makes a visual work a film is the purpose of and the way in which film "language" is used (a shooting script, length of takes, rhythm of editing, usage of cuts, blendings, shadings, the usage of sound). What counts when we talk about the potential uses of ethnographic documenting and describing on film for anthropological purposes is not the aesthetic but the technical quality of the filmed material. However, in any film expression, even anthropological, the aesthetics of a take (i.e., composition, light and movement of the camera) becomes a bearer of a message because each shooting plan, composition and length of a take, each rhythm of montage, or a certain combination of all these elements, has a different psychological effect on the perception of a viewer. At the very beginning the author must have a clear picture of what he wants to do: if he wants to use the camera to record a certain phenomenon and describe it for the purposes of his research and then later, having examined and analysed the filmed material at

peace, state his opinion on the phenomenon, he will make an audio-visual record. If he starts filming with the intention of expressing his questions, attitudes and feelings towards a certain subject he will produce a film. If the latter is the case he must apply the laws of film language, i.e. the aesthetics of a take, from the beginning of production. However, at this point we have stumbled again over the problem of the conflict between film art and scientific utility of film which we considered to be overcome.

If we use the composition of a shot to convey a certain message, this shot should be carefully arranged photographically. To achieve this we should pay much attention to the light. When filming at daylight we should pay attention to the fact from which side of the camera the sunlight comes, i.e. our decision which scene to shoot will depend on the period of a day. We might ask a protagonist of our film to perform his activities at some other place, more suitable for the composition of our take than the place where he usually performs them. Moreover, the change of setting makes it possible for us to convey our message to the viewers in a more expressive way than if we filmed the protagonist at places where he usually performs his actions. The scenes filmed under lighting will require more staging; whenever a cameraman sets up lighting (interiors or night scenes cannot be filmed without it) he begins to create the atmosphere of a scene or a take. This atmosphere can be close to reality, but it can also "supplement" it.

As far as the action that we want to film is concerned the rule we have to follow is, although at first glance absurd, completely true: the photographic message of the take should be subordinated to the meaning of the action filmed, i.e. to the reason why we film it at all, but to be able to do this the very action, its organisation and performance, should be subordinated to this very same photographic message of the take. In short: almost any action on film (the only exception being massive scenes shot "live", which can't be controlled) must be staged - that is directed - if we want it to seem realistic. In addition, film expression should be quick and unambiguous because a take follows after a take, a sequence follows after a sequence and at the moment of perception a viewer has no time to reflect what point the author wants to make. Thus, film tends to forfeit some details of reality for the sake of its final intention. Each film is, in principle, affirmative. The problem, however, lies in the fact that a film cannot always be both affirmative and objective, or authentic, because this can make the logic of dramaturgical development more difficult. Because of this a film will sometimes use a small lie at the expense of truth (or of what is, in the author's opinion, truthful) in order to affirm its general message. To make things even worse, the conditions of production bear direct influence on the

creation of “dramaturgical shortcuts”: the shorter the period of filming, the more economically organized the filming should be. Automatically, since there is no time to wait for the things to “happen”, it is logical to expect that the scenes will be more often staged and more “shortcuts” used, which is completely legitimate in film. However, the canons of any science cannot tolerate this.

We have come to the key determinative factor which makes any film a film. Film “language” is a tool which serves to the purposes of film narrative, or simply put, of film story, and its strongest weapon is film illusion. We are wrong if we think that film illusion is a characteristic exclusively of feature films. It is a characteristic of documentaries and even scientific films. For example, in their film *Chronicle of One Summer* (1961), Jean Rouch and Edgar Morin, enter a private apartment with the camera and find in it a man who lives there. We are not to think that they really just dropped on the man without his previous knowledge of that, are we? That scene must have been staged in advance in order to be technically correctly shot at all. Or another example: we are watching a take in which a man takes refuge from rain in a hut, sits down, takes a tin of sardines and a piece of bread out of his bag, opens the tin slowly, eats; it is raining outside, the whole atmosphere is gloomy and somehow desperate; the man continues to sit, eat slowly and think. It looks as if he were alone in the world.⁶ The man is a non-professional actor and in this scene he performs the same things he does every day. The scene is convincing, and consequently, authentic. However, this is only an impression. Actually it is not authentic because at the moment of filming the man was not alone at all; there was a whole film crew, of course at the other end of the camera, in the hut. The scene just created the illusion of the loneliness of its protagonist. We can only suppose that he was doing the same things “he would have done if the camera had not been present”, but we can never be absolutely sure. Consequently, the maximum the film can achieve concerning the issue of authenticity is make people and events appear as they would appear if the camera were not present. However, the advantage of film is that it can do it very convincingly.

Due to the above mentioned reasons, I take the view that a film cannot be considered a scientific work, not even when its director is an anthropologist. Instead of being a scientific work a film can be a useful illustration of the results of scientific research, in the same way in which artists’ drawings on the basis of archeological data render the appearance of a certain archeological site in the

⁶ The scene described is from the documentary film *Shoer of Cormorants* whose director is Branko Ištvančić and script-writer Davor Šišmanovi. The film was produced by the Documentary Programme of Croatian Television in 1997.

period from which the data originate. Having classified film in this way I do not intend to state that anthropologists should abandon the production of such ("artistic") ethnographic films. Their production is a field incredibly suitable for plastic representation of ethnographic material in its natural, social and spiritual context and therein lies its direct anthropological use. Because of this, an anthropologist can be not only a script writer but, provided he has been properly trained, a director, a cameraman and an editor of such films. If, however, he has not acquired the necessary knowledge he should inevitably cooperate with professionals.

What should a film which satisfies all the criteria of anthropological science be like? While looking for the answers to the above question let us first have a look at the already existent ones. Let us remind ourselves of the four criteria which Jay Ruby, in the already-mentioned article from 1975, presented as fundamental starting points of ethnographic work and analogously, of ethnographic or anthropological film:

1) The primary concern of an ethnographic work is a description of a whole culture or some definable element of a culture.

2) An ethnographic work must be informed by an implicit or explicit theory of culture which causes the statements within the work to be organized in a particular way.

3) An ethnographic work must contain statements which reveal the methodology of the author.

4) An ethnographic work must employ a distinctive lexicon-an anthropological argot (Ruby 1975:107)

I entirely agree with Prof. Ruby concerning the estimation of the elements of a scientific ethnographic work. However, I am afraid that only the first two criteria could be applied to ethnographic (or-whatever-we-call-it) film while the third and the fourth are in conflict with the essence of film suggestiveness. Thus, film reveals to us another essential difference between scientific and artistic expression: each scientific work must explicitly state its whole content, material, theses and their argumentation while only long known or self-evident ideas may be stated implicitly. This principle is reversed in the field of art. What kind of a novel or a film would it be were the author to incessantly explain to his audience, even indirectly, what he wanted to say? A work of art achieves explicitness of expression by means of implicitness. Marked explicitness disturbs the power of any work of art and consequently of a film of whatever genre.

Ethnographic film would be most truthful in terms of science if an anthropologist revealed his own presence and the presence of his camera. In that

way the methodology of his work would become transparent: protagonists wouldn't have to pretend that the camera was not present while the anthropologist's method would be transparent in their behaviour. But for such a product to be completely truthful and credible the above mentioned procedure should be applied from the beginning to the end. Only if carried out from the first to the last scene this procedure would be scientifically consistently applied. If an anthropologist's intention to express his attitudes and opinions were displayed and carried out by means of film "language", the product would have the legitimate right to be called a film. However, such a film would be very probably rather boring, particularly if it were full of various anthropological terms. What it would lack is the very film illusion. But paradoxically, the larger the amount of film illusion in a certain film (of course, supposing that it is completely skilfully achieved) the film will look more convincingly, that is, more authentically. *Nanook of the North* by Robert J. Flaherty is such a convincing and strong film because each scene in it has been staged and adapted according to the laws of film shooting.

What can, after all, be done? Is it possible to construct a scientific counterpart of an "artistic" ethnographic film or, in other words, a form of film expression which would satisfy all the criteria of the science of anthropology? One of the possibilities lies in the direction suggested by Prof. Ruby - to direct our efforts towards constructing a specifically anthropological code of film expression. However, I would say that anthropologists have additional possibilities at their disposal.

First of all, his own audio-visual records filmed during field research can be more useful and valuable to an anthropologist than any film, however perfectly made. Such records can render what the anthropologist found on the field so faithfully, particularly with contemporary video technology, that no one among us should walk around without a camera.

The technological aspect of the whole problem is of great importance because the development of technology has introduced into film anthropology changes in our way of thinking. We should bear this fact in mind whenever we think about various stages in the development of the theory and practice of film anthropology. Large, awkward, hard to move and noisy cameras of the past used to create a different mental framework for anthropological film methodology than the smaller, silent and easy to move cameras of today. Contemporary video technology enables an anthropologist to come nearer to his "ideal" tenet - that both informants and the anthropologist forget for a moment the presence of the camera and that the methodology used becomes transparent. These days an

anthropologist can place several cameras at different points in the space in which he is going to film his conversation with informants or some other event. In this way, cameras will record both the presence of the anthropologist and the reactions of his informants to his presence as well as what is going on during filming beyond the eyeshot of the anthropologist, all of this being very useful for the further analysis of the filmed material.

There is, however, another vital moment. If a cameraman-anthropologist does not keep his eye all the time on the camera's eye-piece he can, at least, to some extent, avoid certain distortions in the behaviour of filmed persons which are due to technical or organisational manifestations of his work. The anthropologist, avoiding to keep his eye incessantly at the camera's eye-piece, will not be under pressure to create film images, i.e. to compose takes, and thus to give more importance to their creation than to his primary task - documentation and ethnographic description. Of course, it will never be possible to avoid entirely watching through the camera's eye-piece because certain takes - close-ups of certain details, situations which should be shot "live" - can be filmed only in this way.

The camera, as we have pointed out at the beginning of this paper, can never be an entirely autonomous, "objective" medium of recording, independent of the person who directs it. But, who knows where the development of technology will take us? A camera which can be hidden in a coat button or in the rims of glasses may one day become part of an anthropologist's video equipment. Won't then the differences between "science" and "art" in visual expression, or in other words, the differences between an image - observer and an image - creation or author's expression become more obvious?

An anthropologist can, of course, film edit his ethnographic audio-visual records into an integral visual work and supplement them with a commentary, i.e. a scientific interpretation of presented material. Such a work may be labeled an ethnologic or anthropologic film (depending on the traditional use of the name of the science), but certainly a scientific film. However, such a film will not be able to disregard certain laws of film production, such as logic and intelligibility of narration, or a requirement that the complete length of a film should be determined by its dynamics and the way of filming. If the anthropologist, afraid that these laws may damage his scientific approach and methodology, disregards them he may create a monotonous or confusing film which will be of no use for anthropological purposes. If, on the other hand, he responds uninhibitedly to the challenges of film art he may use some solutions which are desirable, or even obligatory, in film art but whose results can not be accepted by science as relevant.

Having in mind the above presented limitations we may come to the conclusion that anthropologists using a camera should reach an exclusive decision: either to make films, together with all their attributes, or to create only audio-visual records and present them in fragments. However, even such exclusive decisions wouldn't solve the problem if we didn't precisely define in which way an anthropologist should film his audio-visual records and strictly obey scientific methodology.

In short, anthropological film recording and expressing must either be creative or not be at all. This sounds quite well but the problem still hasn't been solved. How should we explain to the viewers, i.e. to those for whom a film product has been produced, all the limitations and deviations of the reality which took place during filming. If we fit all these explanations into a film we shall very probably make it very tiresome. On the other hand, if we don't fit them in, we may lead the viewers to the wrong conclusions. However, the solution to this problem was offered long ago.

In the 1970's the American anthropologist Karl G. Heider stated in his book *Ethnographic Film* the opinion that an anthropologist should supplement a film with a written work (Heider 1976:127). Both a film and a written work have their limits and advantages. A film is a more graphic medium than a written text while a text is more comprehensive and more adequate for presentation of concepts and theories. Apart from this, length is not a problem for a book in which an anthropologist can discuss an issue on two, three or five hundred pages. For a film, the issue of length is a major problem. No one is going to watch a film lasting three or five hours - particularly not a scientific film or some semi-professional or amateurish audio-visual records filmed during field work. Selection in films is more rigorous than in written texts.

Claudine de France, in her article published in 1993, expressed her regret at the fact that many anthropologists, when they started making films, completely gave up writing thus depriving themselves of the possibility of serious analytical consideration of their work. (De France 1993:4-5)

While I agree entirely with the opinions of Prof. Heider and Mrs France, I must admit that I can understand the acts of these anthropologists. A film is a work which should be watched "in one piece". It would be very impractical to interrupt the projection in order to explain something. In the same way, we cannot read a book and watch a film simultaneously. A visual work, which is meant to convey its messages "in one breath", must subordinate its length - in order not to be tiresome - and narration - which should be very simple, like a children's story - to this requirement. If authors disregard these factors, their

work, whether science or art, will fail to convey all their messages to the audience. Besides, the creation of films is a passion hard to resist for anyone who has once discovered it. Due to all the above mentioned reasons many anthropologists have happened to produce conventional documentary films thus provoking complaints that there is nothing specifically anthropological about their products. Such a situation has brought about the idea that a unique anthropological film "language" should be constructed.

All these limitations and difficulties ensued from the fact that there was no possibility for a motion picture and a written text (of the length of an article or a book) to be available to the recipient at the same time, i.e. to occupy the same medium. Logically, the considerations and efforts of anthropologists were locked in the framework of the creation of visual works and written texts separately, the latter being the only possibility. Today this is no longer the case: digital technology, computers and CD ROMs have appeared. There has emerged the very possibility for a picture to be closely accompanied by a text which helps us to understand its meaning or explain the circumstances of its filming. Instead of wasting their efforts on reconciling the requirements of scientific truth and artistic freedom within an integral visual product, anthropologists can now present their visual works in fragments or fit their textual interpretation into an already existing visual work which is the subject of analysis. In this way problems due to the length or narration of a film have been eliminated in a scientific work. Of course, the notion that an anthropologist's camera can never be completely objective and that his creation of reality starts the very moment his eye is placed on the eye-piece is still relevant. However, CD ROM offers an anthropologist the opportunity to immediately and simply explain any condition concerning his work. The discovery of specific anthropological film "language" is still an inspiring direction for reflection and activity. But regardless of whether it will bring fruit or not anthropologists have digital technology at their disposal as an easier and very useful tool.

Does it mean that ethnographic and anthropological films should not be produced any more? Certainly not. A film remains an unsurpassable medium of the convincing rendering of human lives and destinies to other people. But we must make it possible for a film to show all its abilities, i.e. to employ all the available means, and it will then be at its strongest and most useful - in other words, to remain within the sphere of art. I don't understand science and art as two strictly separate areas of human mental activity, but as two manifestations of the same human consideration - similar in many ways, but different in their activities. That is why I don't think (at this point I agree entirely with Prof. Ruby) that anthropology could bring about regulations and prescriptions whose

following would make film recording and expression a procedure completely satisfying to its demands and canons. I don't think so because, in my modest opinion, the ways of the development of film anthropology are not in the equation of the expressive abilities of science and art but in the recognition of their differences. These differences recognized, the profession of anthropology will direct its considerations towards the best usability of both. This is my answer to the question posed in the title of this paper.

After all, Robert J. Flaherty said the same in his way a long ago: *Films are a very simple form and a very narrow form in many ways. you can't say as much in film as you can in writing, but what you can say, you can say with great conviction* (Ruby 1980:448).

Translated by Snježana Veselica-Majhut

BIBLIOGRAPHY

DE FRANCE, Claudine (1993): Filmic Anthropology: A Difficult but Promising Birth. *Visual Anthropology*, Vol.6, No.1, pp. 1-2.

HEIDER, Karl G. (1976): *Ethnographic Film*. University of Texas Press, Austin.

RUBY, Jay (1975): Is an Ethnographic Film a Filmic Ethnography? *Studies in the Anthropology of the Visual Communication*, Vol.2, No.2, pp. 10-111 (also on <http://www.temple.edu/anthro/ruby/jayruby.html>).

*** (1980): A Re-Examination of the Early Career of Robert J. Flaherty. In: *Quarterly Review of Film Studies*, Fall, pp. 431-457 (also on <http://www.temple.edu/anthro/ruby/jayruby.html>).

*** (1982): Ethnography as Trompe l'oeil: Film and Anthropology (1). In: *A Crack in the Mirror: Reflexive Perspectives in Anthropology*, Philadelphia, pp. 121-132 (also on <http://www.temple.edu/anthro/ruby/jayruby.html>).

*** (1996): Visual Anthropology. In: *Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology* (ed. D. Levinson, M. Ember), Vol.4, A Henry Hall Reference Book, New York, pp. 1345-1351.

ODNOS ZNANSTVENOG I UMJETNIČKOG
U FILMSKIM ANTROPOLOŠKIM PROIZVODIMA —
NADIĐENO ILI ZAODIĐENO PITANJE?

Sažetak

Ovaj rad preispituje neke od ponuđenih odgovora na pitanja o osnovnim polazištima i metodologiji filmske antropologije i, u okviru njih, o odnosu znanosti i umjetnosti u njezinim proizvodima. Antropolozi su, naime, ponudili kriterije po kojima bi se određeni film mogao smatrati etnografskim, no pitanje je ne ignoriraju li zapravo neki od tih kriterija psihologiju filmskog jezika i filmske dramaturgije, tj. suštinu samog filma. Može li uopće djelo čije je osnovno izražajno sredstvo iluzija u potpunosti zadovoljiti zahtjeve etnološkog istraživanja i izražavanja? Zaključak je rada kako film ne može zadovoljiti svim zahtjevima antropološke znanosti, a da pritom ne izgubi neke od svojih suštinskih kvaliteta. Stoga antropolozi moraju raščlaniti njegove mogućnosti, sa svrhom otkrivanja antropološke iskoristivosti svake od njih. Pritom bi se trebali poslužiti i suvremenim dostignućima svjetske tehnologije.