

**ISTINA, CIJELA ISTINA
I NIŠTA OSIM ISTINE
Vizualno-antropološka
propitivanja etike slike**

-

-
LEA
VENE

-

**THE TRUTH,
THE WHOLE TRUTH
AND NOTHING
BUT THE TRUTH
Visual anthropology's
inquiry into image ethics**

PREGLEDNI RAD

PREDAN: 18. 4. 2016.

PRIHVAĆEN: 2. 5. 2016.

UDK: 791.43:39

SAŽETAK: U eseju *The Ethics of Image Making; or, „They're Going to Put Me in the Movies. They're Going to Make a Big Star Out of Me”* Jay Ruby razmatra potencijalne etičke probleme koji proizlaze iz (ne)opravdanog korištenja ljudima i ljudskim sudbinama u cilju stvaranja naizgled realističnih i prepoznatljivih slika/reprezentacija Drugih. Donedavno su pasivni subjekti preuzimali isključivo fiksirane i nametnute pozicije kako bi bili transformirani u estetske objekte i objekte znanstvenih studija koje su mahom odobravane pod izlikom stručnih znanstvenih istraživanja za zajednički napredak ili umjetničkih projekata vrijednih estetskog uživanja i divljenja. S obzirom na to da je naivna pretpostavka o kameri koja nikad ne laže odavno napuštena, a dokumentarno ne podrazumijeva objektivno, kojim se vrijednostima i profesionalnim obvezama prema fotografiranima/snimljenima onda vode fotografi i filmaši? Imaju li umjetnici drugačije moralne ovlasti od znanstvenika ili fotoreportera? Kako objasniti raskol između reprezentacija Drugih i njihove vlastite slike o sebi? Ako se uzima nečija svakodnevnica kako bi se konstruirao osobni umjetnički stav, gdje je potrebno povući liniju između aktualnosti života subjekata i estetskih težnji umjetnika? Upravo su ova pitanja ključna za preslagivanje vlastitih motiva i namjera, metoda rada i reprezentacijskog konteksta te paralelno oslušivanje Drugog s kojim se nužno gradi uzajamni odnos.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: etika, slika, Drugi, reprezentacija, vizualna antropologija, fotografija, film

*Suosjećanje i disciplinirana introspekcija nužni su za istraživanje jedinstvenih karakteristika čovječanstva.*¹
Margaret Mead

Interes za temu etike slike razvio se iz ranijih istraživanja na polju vizualne antropologije, konkretno etnografskog filma. Pojava postkolonijalnoga etnografskog filma u koji su upisani novi glasovi i novi pogledi transformirala je konstrukciju antropološkog znanja. Filmologinja Etami Borjan ističe kako se umjesto jednosmjernog procesa etika vizualne *antropologije* naglasak sada stavlja na dijaloške prakse u okviru kojih se sučeljavaju znanja Drugih i zapadni pogled.² Antropolozi kontroliraju vlastiti otuđeni i depersonalizirani diskurs znanja i moći, a Drugi preuzima kontrolu nad proizvodnjom vlastite slike te se iz istraživanog objekta sada izdvajaju aktivni glasovi koji artikuliraju autonomna iskustva. Pojedini antropolozi i teoretičari intenzivno su promišljali relaciju mi-oni, odgovornost antropologa (autora) te mogućnosti autorefleksivnog djelovanja. Na tom tragu ovaj tekst slijedi pisanja vizualnog antropologa Jaya Rubyja i Sarah Pink te vizualnog semiotičara Garneta C. Butcharta, koji kroz vlastiti rad promišljaju navedene teme.

Američki antropolog Jay Ruby jedan je od značajnijih teoretičara i praktičara vizualne antropologije čiji su tekstovi o odnosu antropologije i filma, zatim uložili kamere u antropološkim

13

REVIEW ARTICLE

RECEIVED: APRIL 18TH 2016ACCEPTED: MAY 2ND 2016

UDC: 791.43:39

ABSTRACT: Jay Ruby, in his essay *The Ethics of Image Making; or, „They're Going to Put Me in the Movies. They're Going to Make a Big Star Out of Me.”*, discusses potential ethical issues that arise from the (un)justified use of people and human destinies as to create seemingly realistic and recognizable images/representations of the Others. Up until recently, the passive subjects could only take up fixed and imposed positions in order to be transformed into aesthetic objects and objects of scientific studies which was predominantly justified under the guise of expert scientific research ensuring overall progress or artistic projects worthy of aesthetic enjoyment and admiration. Given that the naive assumption about the camera that never lies has long been discarded and that documentary does not imply objectivity, what are the values and professional commitments towards those photographed/filmed that the photographers and filmmakers should adhere to? Do artists have different moral authority than scientists or photojournalists? How to explain the schism between the representations of the Others and their own self-image? If one takes the everyday lives of people and uses them to construct an artistic statement, where is the line drawn between the actuality of the subjects' lives and the aesthetic needs of the artist? These are the key questions for re-examining personal motives and intentions, work methods and representational contexts, all the while listening to the Other with whom a reciprocal relationship is inevitably built.

KEYWORDS: ethics, image, the Others, representation, visual anthropology, photography, film

*Empathy and disciplined introspection are essential to the study of unique characteristics of humankind.*¹
Margaret Mead

The interest in the topic of image ethics has been developed on the basis of earlier research in the field of visual anthropology, namely ethnographic film. The emergence of postcolonial ethnographic film that encompassed new voices and new perspectives transformed the way in which anthropological knowledge was constructed. Filmologist Etami Borjan notes that the ethics of visual anthropology, rather being a unilateral process, now focus on dialogic practices in which the knowledge of Others is being confronted with the Western gaze.² Anthropologists control their own alienated and depersonalized discourse of knowledge and power, while the Other takes control of the production of his own image, whereas the research object now emits active voices articulating their own autonomous experiences. Certain anthropologists and theorists have comprehensively examined the we-they dichotomy, the anthropologist's (author's) responsibility and the possibility of self-reflexive practices. Following the vein of such deliberations, this paper engages with the writing of Jay Ruby and Sarah Pink, the visual anthropologists, and Garnet C. Butchart, the visual semiotician, who have written and reflected upon the aforementioned topics.

istraživanjima te inzistiranja na primjeni autorefleksivnog pristupa i redefiniranju odgovornosti antropologa znatno pridonijeli konstruktivnoj izgradnji vizualne antropologije kao autonomne grane antropologije.³ U Rubyjevu radu posebno su inspirativna njegova propitivanja etičke proizvodnje vizualnog sadržaja započeta još sedamdesetih, kada je uredio publikaciju (uz Larryja Grossa i Johna Katza) *Image Ethics: The Moral Rights of Subjects in Photographs, Film and Television* te petnaest godina kasnije *Image Ethics in the Digital World*. Nezaobilazna je i njegova najutjecajnija knjiga *Picturing Culture: Essays on*

Film and Anthropology, u kojoj, osim pregleda relevantnih autora na polju etnografskog filma, debatira o etici i politici preuzimanja kontrole nad kreiranjem vizualnih reprezentacija Drugih. U eseju *The Ethics of Image Making; or, „They're Going to Put Me in the Movies. They're Going to Make a Big Star Out of Me”* Jay Ruby razmatra potencijalne etičke probleme koji proizlaze iz (ne)opravdanog korištenja ljudima i ljudskim sudbinama u cilju stvaranja naizgled realističnih i prepoznatljivih slika/ reprezentacija Drugih. S obzirom na to da je naivna pretpostavka o kameri koja nikad ne laže odavno napuštena, a dokumentarno ne podrazumijeva objektivno, opravdano je pitati kojim se vrijednostima i profesionalnim obvezama prema fotografiranim/ snimljenima onda vode fotografi i filmaši? Imaju li umjetnici drugačije moralne ovlasti od znanstvenika ili fotoreportera? Kako objasniti raskol između reprezentacija Drugih i njihove vlastite slike o sebi?

Etika slike

U tekstu i raspravi o etici u etnologiji i kulturnoj antropologiji⁴ Sanja Potkonjak propituje moguće definicije i razlike između tzv. profesionalnog i osobnog etičkog djelovanja: „Je li antropološka zajednica ta koja donosi kriterije etičke kvalitete istraživanja i teksta, ili je to zajednica su-građana, ili antropolog osobno? Je li etičnost nešto što je jamac profesionalnosti i proizlazi iz nje (i

S OBIROM NA TO DA JE NAIVNA PRETPOSTAVKA O KAMERI KOJA NIKAD NE LAŽE ODAVNO NAPUŠTEN, A DOKUMENTARNO NE PODRAZUMIJEVA OBJEKTIVNO, OPRAVDANO JE PITATI KOJIM SE VRIJEDNOSTIMA I PROFESIONALNIM OBVEZAMA PREMA FOTOGRAFIRANIMA/SNIMLJENIMA ONDA VODE FOTOGRAFI I FILMAŠI? IMAJU LI UMJETNICI DRUGAČIJE MORALNE OVLASTI OD ZNANSTVENIKA ILI FOTOREPORTERA? KAKO OBJASNITI RASKOL IZMEĐU REPREZENTACIJA DRUGIH I NJIHOVE VLASTITE SLIKE O SEBI?

GIVEN THAT THE NAIVE ASSUMPTION ABOUT THE CAMERA THAT NEVER LIES HAS LONG BEEN DISCARDED AND THAT DOCUMENTARY DOES NOT IMPLY OBJECTIVITY, WHAT ARE THE VALUES AND PROFESSIONAL COMMITMENTS TOWARDS THOSE PHOTOGRAPHED/FILMED THAT THE PHOTOGRAPHERS AND FILMMAKERS SHOULD ADHERE TO? DO ARTISTS HAVE DIFFERENT MORAL AUTHORITY THAN SCIENTISTS OR PHOTOJOURNALISTS? HOW TO EXPLAIN THE SCHISM BETWEEN THE REPRESENTATIONS OF THE OTHERS AND THEIR OWN SELF-IMAGE?

American anthropologist Jay Ruby is one of the most important theorists and practitioners of visual anthropology whose writing on the relationship between anthropology and film, the role of the camera in anthropological research and insistence on the use of self-reflexive approach and the need to redefine anthropologists' responsibilities significantly contributed to the constructive establishment of visual anthropology as an autonomous branch of anthropology.³ In the context of Ruby's work, we should note his particularly stimulating inquiry into ethical production of visual content that began in the 1970s when he edited the publication (together with Larry Gross and John Katz) *Image Ethics: The Moral Rights of Subjects in Photographs, Film and Television*, and which

he continued fifteen years later in *Image Ethics in the Digital World*. We should also mention his indispensable and most influential book *Picturing Culture: Essays on Film and Anthropology* in which, in addition to giving an overview of seminal authors in the field of ethnographic film, he addressed the ethics and politics of taking control over the creation of the Others' visual representations. In his essay *The Ethics of Image Making; or, "They're Going to Put Me in the Movies. They're Going to Make a Big Star Out of Me."*, Jay Ruby discusses the potential ethical issues that arise from the (un)justified use of people and human destinies in order to create seemingly realistic and recognizable images/representations of the Others. Given that the naive assumption about the camera that never lies has long been discarded and that documentary does not imply objectivity, what are the values and professional commitments towards those photographed/filmed that the photographers and filmmakers should adhere to? Do artists have different moral authority than scientists or photojournalists? How to explain the schism between the representations of the Others and their own self-image?

Image ethics

In the text and discussion on ethics in ethnology and cultural anthropology,⁴ Sanja Potkonjak examines possible definitions and differences between the so-called professional and personal

koja je to etičnost poželjna? – ona koja traži objektivnost ili ona koja dopušta pluralne epistemologije i pluralne etičke svjetove), ili je pak treba promatrati kao oblik angažirane ‚komunitarnosti‘ (istraživanja kao akcijskog djelovanja u susjedstvu/zajednici koje se definira i kao asistiranje ‚marginaliziranima‘).⁵ Povučemo li paralelu s promišljanjima na polju etike slike, jednako tako možemo postaviti pitanje o tome tko formira etičke kriterije; primjerice, je li to fotografska struka i fotograf ili se formira kroz djelovanje/dijalog s fotografiranim. Upravo je ključno istaknuti riječ djelovanje koje direktno podrazumijeva primarnost praktičnog aspekta istraživanja iz kojeg se onda formiraju etički stavovi. Ranije spomenuti Garnet C. Butchart etiku vidi kao praktično i izvedbeno istraživanje koje otvara prostor za ne(s) poznato. Dodatno ističe da se etika dokumentarnog prikaza može promatrati i kroz performativni proces kreiranja slika.⁶ No u mnogim slučajevima gledatelju je onemogućen pristup procesima gledanja, komponiranja i pokazivanja pa je tako u prvom planu samo procjenjivanje sadržaja slike i priče koja se paralelno konstruira. Butchart apelira na to da se fokus stoga okrene prema samom činu stvaranja slike, što podrazumijeva kritičku refleksiju na ispričanu priču. Prije nego što se detaljnije osvrnem na koncept refleksivnosti, svakako je važno još kratko skrenuti pažnju na binarnu opreku između činova otkrivanja i činova zakrivanja. Otkrivanjem i

inkluzijom odabiremo sadržaj koji ulazi u okvire slika, dok bi se činovi zakrivanja mogli prepoznati u procesu zasljepljivanja, potiskivanja i modificiranja vizualnog sadržaja. Prema Butchartu, upravo se kroz razotkrivanje vlastitih metoda vizualnog istraživanja otvara prostor za preispitivanje vlastite etičke pozicije i postavljanje pitanja: „Što mogu učiniti slike? Što može učiniti medij?“⁷

Otkriće fotografske slike odgovorilo je na zahtjeve za empirijskom objektivnošću koju pretpostavljaju pozitivističke znanosti, pa je tako, primjerice, dagerotipija opisivana kao dio prirode same. Fotografija se percipira kao neposredovana slika stvarnosti temeljena na jasnom opažanju i potpunoj istini. Dapače, informacije koje zahvaćaju kamere postaju superiorne ljudskom oku, a takva „čista“ slika oslobođena je interpretacije i ljudske intervencije.⁸ Neupitna istinitost fotografske slike i objektivnog izvještavanja dodatno je očvrstnuta pojavom pokretne slike i televizije te je ostala netaknuta gotovo stoljeće i pol.⁹ Nestabilna i ambivalentna priroda slike ipak često zbunjuje umjesto da informira, a slika s vremenom postaje neadekvatna i neuveljavljiva. Jay Ruby stoga izražava zabrinutost za promjenjiva moralna očekivanja od fotografa / filmskih autora, što posredno rezultira i nesigurnošću profesionalaca kada su u pitanju vlastita etička načela.¹⁰ Nadalje ističe kako je njihova moralna obveza otkriti ono nevidljivo ne tretirajući svoj rad kao objektivno zrcalo

ethical activities: "Is the anthropological community the one that lays down the criteria for ethical research and text, or does this fall into the purview of the community of citizens or the anthropologist him/herself? Does ethics guarantee professionalism or derives from it (and what kind of ethics is desirable? – the one that demands objectivity or the one that allows plural epistemologies and plural ethical worlds), or should it be regarded as a form of engaged 'communitarianism' (research as an action undertaken in the neighbourhood/community and defined as assisting the 'marginalized')." ⁵

In correspondence with the deliberations in the field of image ethics, one might also pose the question who lays down ethical criteria in photography: for example, is this a purely vocational matter or is it formed through action/dialogue with the photographed. It is essential to emphasize the word *action* that directly implies the primacy of the practical aspects of research on the basis of which ethical stances are formed. The abovementioned Garnet C. Butchart considers ethics as a practical and performative research that discloses the un(be)known. He further point out that documentary ethics can be observed through the performative process of image-making.⁶ However, in many instances, the viewer is denied access to the processes of looking, composing and showing, foregrounding the evaluation of images on the basis of their content and the story that is being simultaneously constructed.

Butchart urges us to direct the focus towards the act of image-making itself which entails a critical reflexion on the story that is being told.

Before I engage in a more detailed discussion of the concept of reflexivity, it is also necessary to briefly mention the binary opposition between the acts of disclosure and acts of concealment. With disclosure and inclusion we select the content which enters the image, whereas the acts of concealment can be recognized in the process of blinding, repressing and modifying the visual content. According to Butchart, it is the act of disclosing one's own methods of visual research that enables the address of one's ethical viewpoint and posing of the question: "What can images do? What can a medium do?"⁷

The discovery of photography answered the demands of positivistic sciences for empirical objectivity so, for example, the daguerreotype was described as being a part of nature itself. Photography was considered to be an unmediated image of reality, based on pure observation and total truth. Moreover, the information captured on camera was considered superior to the human eye, and such a "pure" image unburdened by interpretations and human interventions.⁸ The unquestioned realism of photography and objectivity of news reporting was further promoted with the discovery of motion pictures and television and was left undisputed for almost a century and a half.⁹ However, the unstable and

koje odražava istinite slike. S druge je strane neetičnost već upisana i u slike koje kreira dominantna kultura te ih servira kao reprezentativne slike svijeta.¹¹

Budući da se u okviru antropološke discipline mnogo raspravlja o profesionalnoj etičkoj odgovornosti prema onima koje se istražuje, Ruby vidi konstruktivnu dimenziju u sumiranju iskustava takvih rasprava. Stvaranje i upotreba slika prema Rubyju podrazumijeva četiri odvojiva, ali međusobno povezana moralna pitanja, koja u kontekstu profesionalne prakse postaju etičke pozicije. Onaj koji na sebe preuzima odgovornost kreiranja slike najprije ima moralnu odgovornost da stvori sliku kao preciznu refleksiju vlastitih autorskih intencija, zatim ima moralnu obvezu prema subjektima koje bilježi te institucijama koje podržavaju njegov rad i konačno moralnu obvezu prema publici kojoj je rad namijenjen.¹² S druge strane uvodni tekst knjige *Image Ethics: The Moral Rights of Subjects in Photographs, Film and Television* posebno razrađuje odnos prema subjektima koje se fotografira/ snima, uzimajući u obzir često zanemareno ili slobodno interpretirano pravo na privatnost. Autori uvodnog teksta izdvajaju četiri oblika ometanja privatnosti: narušavanje privatnog prostora, neprikladan uvid u privatnost koji javno sramoti fotografirane/ snimane, kreiranje lažne slike koja izvrće istinu stvarajući krive impresije o nečijem karakteru ili namjerama te aproprijaciju (prisvajanje tuđe slike).¹³

Donedavno su pasivni subjekti preuzimali isključivo fiksirane i nametnute pozicije kako bi bili transformirani u estetske objekte i objekte znanstvenih studija koje su mahom odobravane pod izlikom stručnih i/ili znanstvenih istraživanja za zajednički napredak ili umjetničkih projekata vrijednih estetskog uživanja i divljenja. Imajući na umu kontaminiranost medija, vizualnom istraživačkom procesu svakako prethodi preispitivanje i definiranje vlastitih etičkih pozicija u kojem se prvenstveno uzima u obzir često neravno prava odnos onih koji kreiraju vizualne reprezentacije i njihovih subjekata. Dodatna interpretacija i značenjska razina upisuju se u vizualno i kroz prateći tekst poput legende, kustoske i autorske izjave, ali i kroz kontekst u kojem se izlaže, te se posredno nadograđuje kroz stavove i mišljenja gledatelja kojima se obraća.

**OTKRIVANJEM I INKLUZIJOM ODABIREMO
SADRŽAJ KOJI ULAZI U OKVIRE SLIKA,
DOK BI SE ČINOVI ZAKRIVANJA MOGLI
PREPOZNATI U PROCESU ZASLJEPLJIVANJA,
POTISKIVANJA I MODIFICIRANJA VIZUALNOG
SADRŽAJA. PREMA BUTCHARTU, UPRAVO SE
KROZ RAZOTKRIVANJE VLASTITIH METODA
VIZUALNOG ISTRAŽIVANJA OTVARA PROSTOR
ZA PREISPITIVANJE VLASTITE ETIČKE POZICIJE
I POSTAVLJANJE PITANJA: „ŠTO MOGU UČINITI
SLIKE? ŠTO MOŽE UČINITI MEDIJ?“**

ambivalent nature of images more often confused than informed, and the image eventually became inadequate and unconvincing. Therefore, Jay Ruby expresses his concerns about the shifting moral expectations put before photographers/film-makers and the consequent ambivalence that professionals feel about their own ethical principles.¹⁰ He further points out that they are morally obliged to reveal the covert and never treat their own work as an objective mirror that reflects true images. On the other hand, the images created and presented as representative of the world by the dominant culture are already deeply-seated in an unethical base.¹¹ Considering that, in the context of anthropology, the professional ethical responsibilities towards those being studied have been widely discussed, Ruby believes that summing up the experiences of such debates would prove to be constructive. According to Ruby, making and using images involves four separable yet related moral issues which, in the context of a professional activity, become ethical positions. The one who takes on the responsibility to produce an image has to first have a moral responsibility to produce an accurate reflection of his/her intentions as an author, then, a moral obligation to the subjects being filmed and to the institutions that support his/her work and, finally, a moral obligation to the intended audience.¹² On the other hand, in the introductory text to the book *Image Ethics: The Moral Rights of Subjects in Photographs, Film and Television*, the relationship towards

**WITH DISCLOSURE AND INCLUSION WE SELECT
THE CONTENT WHICH ENTERS THE IMAGE,
WHEREAS THE ACTS OF CONCEALMENT CAN BE
RECOGNIZED IN THE PROCESS OF BLINDING,
REPRESSING AND MODIFYING THE VISUAL
CONTENT. ACCORDING TO BUTCHART, IT IS
THE ACT OF DISCLOSING ONE'S OWN METHODS
OF VISUAL RESEARCH THAT ENABLES THE
ADDRESS OF ONE'S ETHICAL VIEWPOINT AND
POSING OF THE QUESTION: "WHAT CAN IMAGES
DO? WHAT CAN A MEDIUM DO?"**

the subjects who are being photographed/filmed is thoroughly elaborated by taking into account the often neglected or freely interpreted right to privacy. The authors of the introductory text mention four categories of invading one's privacy: intrusion into one's private space, inappropriate intrusion into the subjects' privacy which leads to their public embarrassment, creating an image which distorts the truth and creates false impressions of one's character or intentions, and appropriation (of one's image).¹³ Up until recently, the passive subjects could only take up fixed and imposed positions in order to be transformed into aesthetic objects and objects of scientific studies which was predominantly justified under the guise of expert scientific research ensuring overall progress or artistic projects worthy of aesthetic enjoyment and admiration. Bearing in mind the contaminated nature of the

U tekstu *Transfer Media: Ethics, Semiotics and Documentary* autor Granet C. Butchart također nastoji sumirati etičke izazove u okviru dokumentarističke prakse pa tako iznosi tri osnovna problema: pristanak sudionika (fotografiranih/snimanih), prividnu objektivnost dokumentarnog te pravo publike (gledatelja) da se informira o pojedinim temama.¹⁴ Pristanak sudionika podrazumijeva njihovu kontrolu nad produciranim vizualnim sadržajem, dok prividna objektivnost dokumentarnog aludira na konstruiranu neutralnost u samom vizualnom prikazu. Konačno, pojedine teme procjenjuju se kao važne za širu zajednicu (kao teme od širega javnog interesa) pa autori preuzimaju ulogu medijatora čija slika progovara o temama, ali neizbježno ugrađuje i stav autora.

Kontaminirane slike

Niz primjera iz povijesti fotografije svjedoči o kontaminiranom i konstruiranom fotografskom pogledu koji nakon određene vremenske distance baca potpuno drugačije svjetlo na pojedine *fotografske klasike* poput onih Walkera Evansa, Dorothee Lange ili Lewisa Hinea. Promatramo li navedene fotografije isključivo u muzejskom kontekstu gdje pred nama stoje savršeno uramljene i osvijetljene, lako će nam, zbog primarnoga estetskog doživljaja, iskliznuti njihov stvarni i svakodnevni kontekst iz kojeg su zapravo izdvojene. Fotografije Lewisa Hinea koje prikazuju djecu u

tvorničkim pogonima nemaju umjetničke pretenzije niti su nastale za umjetnički kontekst, već su funkcionirale kao propagandni plakati u borbi protiv izrabljivanja djece.¹⁵ Serija fotografija *Let Us Now Praise Famous Men* Walkera Evansa koja bilježi život siromašnih obitelji u ruralnom predjelu Alabame izazvala je bijes fotografiranih nakon što su navedene fotografije završile u medijima iako je obiteljima obećano sasvim suprotno.¹⁶ S druge strane gospođa Thompson, poznatija kao *Migrant Mother* na fotografiji Dorothee Lange, javno je izrazila nezadovoljstvo zbog masovne aproprijacije vlastitog lica bez mogućnosti da na temelju toga osobno profitira.¹⁷

„AKO SE UZIMA NEČIJA SVAKODNEVICA KAKO BI SE KONSTRUIRAO OSOBNI UMJETNIČKI STAV, GDJE TREBA POVUĆI LINIJU IZMEĐU AKTUALNOSTI ŽIVOTA SUBJEKATA I ESTETSKIH TEŽNJI UMJETNIKA? KOLIKO JE FIKCIJE I INTERPRETACIJE DOZVOLJENO?“ (...) UPRAVO SU OVA PITANJA KLJUČNA ZA PRESLAGIVANJE VLASTITIH MOTIVA I NAMJERA, METODA RADA I REPREZENTACIJSKOG KONTEKSTA TE PARALELNO OSLUŠKIVANJE DRUGOG S KOJIM SE NUŽNO GRADI UZAJAMNI ODNOS.

medium, questioning and redefining ethical positions by taking into account the often one-sided relationship between those creating visual representations and their subjects should necessarily precede any visual research process. Additional interpretation and the level of meaning is inscribed into the visual through the accompanying text such as wall labels, curatorial and artist statements, but also through the context in which the work is being displayed, as it is also indirectly supplemented by the views and opinions of the intended audiences.

In his text *Transfer Media: Ethics, Semiotics and Documentary*, the author Granet C. Butchart also endeavours to summarize ethical challenges in the context of documentary practice so he enumerates three main problems: participant consent (of those photographed/filmed), the illusionary objectivity of documentary and the audience's (viewer's) right to be informed about certain topics.¹⁴ The participant consent entails their control over the produced visual content, whereas the illusionary objectivity of documentary alludes to the constructed neutrality of visual images. Finally, certain topics are deemed relevant to the wider community (i.e. topics that are in the public interest), so the author takes over the role of a mediator whose images speaks about these issues but also inevitably embed the author's perspective.

“IF ONE TAKES THE EVERYDAY LIVES OF PEOPLE AND USES THEM TO CONSTRUCT AN ARTISTIC STATEMENT, WHERE IS THE LINE DRAWN BETWEEN THE ACTUALITY OF THE SUBJECTS' LIVES AND THE AESTHETIC NEEDS OF THE ARTIST? HOW MUCH FICTION OR INTERPRETATION IS ALLOWED?“ (...) THESE ARE THE KEY QUESTIONS FOR RE-EXAMINING PERSONAL MOTIVES AND INTENTIONS, WORK METHODS AND REPRESENTATIONAL CONTEXTS, ALL THE WHILE LISTENING TO THE OTHER WITH WHOM A RECIPROCAL RELATIONSHIP IS INEVITABLY BUILT.

Contaminated images

A number of examples from the history of photography attest to the contaminated and constructed photographic gaze which, in hindsight, casts a completely different light on some *classic works of photography*, such as Walker Evans', Dorothea Lange's or Lewis Hine's. If we view these photographs solely in a museum context where they are perfectly framed and lighted, it is easy to lose sight, due to their initial aesthetic appeal, of their real everyday context from which they were actually extracted. Lewis Hine's photographs that show children in factories have no artistic pretensions nor were they incurred for an artistic context, but they are rather

Dok primjer Lewisa Hinea demonstrira znatan gubitak interpretacijskog konteksta kao rezultata institucijske apropijacije, slučaj Walkera Evansa i Dorothee Lange primjer je eksploatacijske apropijacije proizašle iz potpuno zanemarenog dijaloga i međusobnog povjerenja između fotografa i subjekta. Pristanak fotografiranih uzima se zdravo za gotovo te postaje okidač za daljnji autonomni autorski rad bez osvještavanja aktivne uloge fotografiranih. U ovakvim primjerima itekako je upitna odgovornost autora prema vlastitim subjektima, ali i publici. Kao da je sam čin odabira pojedinca ili njihovih životnih sudbina već sasvim dovoljan autorski doprinos tom dijalogu. Još uvijek mnogi fotografski projekti samo su naizgled inkluzivnog karaktera, a zapravo perpetuiraju kronično nerazumijevanje uzajamnog odnosa koji se u konačnici može i detektirati u samoj slici.

„Ako se uzima nečija svakodnevica kako bi se konstruirao osobni umjetnički stav, gdje treba povući liniju između aktualnosti života subjekata i estetskih težnji umjetnika? Koliko je fikcije i interpretacije dozvoljeno?“ pita se Jay Ruby.¹⁸ Upravo su ova pitanja ključna za preslagivanje vlastitih motiva i namjera, metoda rada i reprezentacijskog konteksta te paralelno osluškivanje Drugog s kojim se nužno gradi uzajamni odnos.

Refleksivnost u vizualnoj praksi

Refleksivnost kao dio vizualne prakse za Jaya Rubyja razvija se iz promišljanja koncepta *stražnjeg plana* (prema sociologu Ervingu Goffmanu). Naime, refleksivnost je rezultat spremnosti da se otvoreno progovori i o poziciji proizvođača (autora) i strukturi proizvoda (vizualni produkt).¹⁹ Od autora se kroz refleksiju očekuje da će razotkriti vlastite istraživačke i epistemološke pretpostavke te izvršiti sistematsku analizu i razotkrivanje vlastitih metoda rada koje su posredno važne za osvještavanje etički pristup. Te pretpostavke podrazumijevaju prihvaćanje i pozicioniranje prema subjektivitetu antropologa, fotografa ili umjetnika, zatim subjektivitetu istraživanih (fotografiranih/snimanih) i prema publici.²⁰ Kroz vizualne naracije direktno možemo iščitati misli, osjećaje i stavove koji kreiraju osobni, ali i fotografski habitus. Koje su granice autorskog samootkrivanja, kada se napušta sigurna pozicija promatrača kako bi se uzdrmao uspostavljeni autoritet i redefinirala motivacija za okidanje? Citirajući Goffmana, Ruby zaključuje kako je u ideju *stražnjeg plana* utkana i potreba da ostane nevidljiv jer uništava iluziju pomno konstruirane slike koja se reprezentira publici.²¹ Upravo suprotno, konačni proizvod trebao bi jasno prenositi odnose između autora, procesa konstrukcije i proizvoda kao cjeline. Jednako tako refleksivan pristup uključuje niz kolaborativnih i participativnih metoda, što podrazumijeva da autor i njegovi

propaganda posters in the struggle against the exploitation of child labour.¹⁵ Walker Evans' series of photographs *Let Us Now Praise Famous Men* which documents the life of impoverished families in the rural part of Alabama enraged those photographed after the photographs ended up in the media even though the families were promised otherwise.¹⁶ On the other hand, Mrs. Thompson, better known as *Migrant Mother* in Dorothea Lange's photograph, publicly expressed discontent over the mass appropriation of her image without receiving any financial compensation.¹⁷

While Lewis Hine's example testifies to a significant loss of interpretive context due to institutional appropriation, Walker Evans' and Dorothea Lang's photographs are instances of an exploitative appropriation resulting from a lack of dialogue and mutual trust between the photographer and the subject. The consent of the photographed is taken for granted and becomes a trigger for further autonomous authorial work without taking into account the active role of the photographed. In these cases, the authors' responsibility towards their subjects but also towards the audience becomes very questionable. It is as though the act of choosing individuals and their life stories is, in itself, a sufficient contribution to that dialogue. Many photographic projects are still only seemingly inclusive, while actually perpetuating the lack of understanding of a reciprocal relationship which can ultimately be detected in the photograph itself.

“If one takes the everyday lives of people and uses them to construct an artistic statement, where is the line drawn between the actuality of the subjects' lives and the aesthetic needs of the artist? How much fiction or interpretation is allowed?”, Jay Ruby wonders.¹⁸ These are the key questions for re-examining personal motives and intentions, work methods and representational contexts, all the while listening to the Other with whom a reciprocal relationship is inevitably built.

Reflexivity in visual practice

Jay Ruby develops reflexivity as a part of a visual practice on the basis of the *backstage* concept (borrowed from sociologist Erving Goffman). Namely, the reflexivity results from the willingness to speak openly and depends on the position of the producer (author) and the structure of the product (visual product).¹⁹ Reflexivity demands from the authors to reveal their research and epistemological assumptions and to undergo systematic analysis and disclosure of their work methods which are indirectly pertinent to the more cognizant ethical approach. These assumptions imply acceptance and positioning towards the subjectivity of an anthropologist, photographer or artist, then, the subjectivity of the researched subjects (photographed/filmed), and, finally, the audience.²⁰ Through visual narrations we can directly read thoughts, feelings and attitudes which constitute the personal but also photographic habitus. What are the limits to self-exposure, when one abandons the safe position of being an observer in order

subjekti, ali i njegova publika, svjesno zajednički rade na produkciji slikovnog materijala, a ujedno i kolektivnog znanja. U ovom trenutku može se povući paralela s ranije spomenutom težnjom da se s Drugim gradi uzajamni odnos te da se revidiraju vlastiti motivi, namjere i metode rada.

Na polju etnografskog filma ta je tendencija vidljiva u pojavi i produkciji tzv. autorefleksivnoga etnografskog filma, koji može zamijeniti otuđene i neutralne zapadnjačke reprezentacije te ujedno subvertirati opservacijski tip dokumentaraca kao dominantu praksu.²²

SARAH PINK ZAKLJUČUJE DA JE ZADAĆA REFLEKSIVNOG ANTROPOLOGA OSVIJESTITI VLASTITU UMJEŠTENOST TE VLASTITU ULOGU U KONSTITUCIJI MJESTA. S OBZIROM NA TO DA NE MOŽEMO DIREKTNO PRISTUPITI TUĐIM OSJETILNIM ISKUSTVIMA, INDIVIDUALNIM I KOLEKTIVNIM SJEĆANJIMA NI IMAGINACIJAMA, MORAMO RADITI NA USKLAĐIVANJU VLASTITIH TIJELA, RITMOVA, OKUSA I NAČINA GLEDANJA S NJIHOVIMA. TAKAV PRISTUP VODI NAS PREMA TZV. KREATIVNO KONSTRUIRANIM USUGLAŠAVANJIMA IZMEĐU NAŠIH I NJIHOVIH ISKUSTAVA.

SARAH PINK CONCLUDES THAT THE TASK OF A REFLEXIVE ANTHROPOLOGIST IS TO BECOME AWARE OF ONE'S OWN EMPLACEMENT AND ONE'S ROLE IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF PLACE. CONSIDERING THAT WE CANNOT DIRECTLY ACCESS OTHER PEOPLE'S EXPERIENCES, INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE MEMORIES OR IMAGINATIONS, WE SHOULD WORK ON ATTUNING OUR BODIES, RHYTHMS, TASTES AND WAYS OF SEEING WITH THEIRS. SUCH AN APPROACH LEADS US TO THE SO-CALLED CREATIVELY CONSTRUCTED CORRESPONDENCES BETWEEN OUR OWN AND OTHER'S EXPERIENCES.

to challenge the established authority and redefine motivation for creating an image?

Quoting Goffman, Ruby concludes that the idea of *backstage* also entails the need to keep it invisible because it destroys the illusion of a carefully constructed image presented to the audience.²¹ On the contrary, the end product should clearly communicate the relationships between the author, the process of construction and the product as a coherent whole. Likewise, the reflective approach is comprised out of a series of collaborative and participatory methods which entail that the author and his subjects, but also the audience, deliberately work together on the production of visual material, all the while also producing collective knowledge. This can be compared to the corresponding aforementioned tendency of establishing mutual

Butchart također, pišući o odnosu etike i slike, nudi vlastitu interpretaciju refleksivnost uvodeći tzv. tehnike samotumačenja koje objašnjava kao oblik etičke odluke kojom autor odlučuje izložiti sebe i proces/izvedbu konstrukcije vizualnog. To podrazumijeva otvaranje slike i unošenje komentara na samu sposobnost gledanja i bilježenja te potom iznošenja tih komentara pred samu publiku.²³ Ove tehnike stoga upućuju na jedan oblik samopromatranja i samoregulacije, a ono što bi inače u slici ostalo nevidljivo ili zaboravljeno izlazi na vidjelo upravo kroz navedeni komentar. Na taj se način direktno propituje autoritet i legitimitet onoga koji ima kontrolu nad vizualnom reprezentacijom. Butchart dodatno naglašava kako navedene tehnike umnažaju poglede (vlastiti dvostruki pogled, ali i uzvraćeni pogled Drugoga).²⁴

Tijela, prostori i osjetila

U vezi s promišljanjima o refleksivnosti treba istaknuti i principe senzorne etnografije kako ih u svojoj knjizi *Sensory Ethnography* objašnjava antropologinja Sarah Pink. Pišući o senzornoj etnografiji autorica kreće od pretpostavke da su naša tijela i tijela drugih centralna u izvođenju terenskog rada. Zajednički lociramo vlastita fizička tijela u prostornom kontekstu terena iz kojeg nadalje vršimo istraživanje. Senzorna etnografija ističe važnost isprepletenosti osjetilnih iskustava istraživača i istraživanih. Subjektivno osjetilno iskustvo ujedno je alat kojim pristupamo drugima te pokušavamo razumjeti iskustva drugih.

relationships and revising one's motives, intentions and methods. Within the field of ethnographic film, this tendency is also evident in the emergence and production of the so-called self-reflexive ethnographic film which has the power to replace the alienated and neutral Western representations and also subvert the observational type of documentaries as the dominant practice.²²

Writing on the relationship between ethics and image, Butchart also provides us with his own interpretation of reflexivity, the so-called technique of self-commentary which, as he explains it, is an ethical decision of an author to expose himself/herself and the process/performance of constructing the visual. This entails opening of the image and commenting on the capacity to look and record and, subsequently, presenting these comments to the audience.²³ Therefore, these techniques imply a form of self-observation and self-regulation, and what would otherwise remain invisible or forgotten in an image is brought to light precisely via this commentary. This is how the authority and legitimacy of the one who has control over the visual representation is directly put in question. Furthermore, Butchart notes how these techniques redouble the visual mode of address (one's double visual mode but also the reciprocated look of the Other).²⁴

Bodies, spaces and senses

Upon examining reflexivity, we should also mention the principles of sensory ethnography specified by anthropologist Sarah Pink in her book *Sensory Ethnography*. Writing about sensory ethnography, the

Osnovni principi senzorne etnografije objedinjuju nekoliko kategorija: percepciju, mjesto, znanje, memoriju i imaginaciju. U kontekstu ovog rada čini mi se važnim zadržati se na kategoriji mjesta. Naime, Sarah Pink posebno ističe koncept umještenosti kao osjetnog odnosa koji kao istraživači gradimo u međuodnosu tijela, uma i okoliša.²⁵ Ključna je riječ u ovom konceptu upravo mjesto kao fluidna kategorija koja zahvaća protok lokacija, ljudi i stvari. Jednako tako, mjesta su u konstantnom procesu konstituiranja te ovise o nizu međuodnosa koji proizlaze iz mnogostrukih simultanih priča.

Ovakva definicija mjesta nudi proširen pogled na početnu točku odnosa/dodira istraživača i istraživanih. Osvještavanje međusobne ovisnosti važan je okidač za usvajanje refleksivnog pristupa u vlastitoj vizualnoj praksi, a paralelnost iskustva (istraživača i istraživanih) revidira odnose moći. Poništavanje nadređenih i podređenih pozicija, narativa ili pogleda otvara prostor za započinjanje dijaloga, za kolaborativni rad. Sarah Pink zaključuje da je zadaća refleksivnog antropologa osvijestiti vlastitu umještenost te vlastitu ulogu u konstituciji mjesta. S obzirom na to da ne možemo direktno pristupiti tuđim osjetilnim iskustvima, individualnim i kolektivnim sjećanjima ni imaginacijama, moramo raditi na usklađivanju vlastitih tijela, ritmova, okusa i načina gledanja s njihovima. Takav pristup vodi nas prema tzv. kreativno konstruiranim usuglašavanjima između

naših i njihovih iskustava. Nadalje produbljujemo znanje o tome kako drugi artikuliraju (ne nužno verbalno) sjećanja ili imaginacije utemeljene na njihovoj vlastitoj umještenosti.²⁶

Osnove senzorne etnografije kompatibilno nadopunjuju načela refleksivnog pristupa, a zajednički otvaraju put prema redefiniranju etike slike uzimajući u obzir mogućnost kreiranja mnogostrukih pogleda, uvođenje metoda samopromatranja i samokorigiranja te provođenje kolaborativnih procesa rada. Iskustva iz područja vizualne antropologije (proširena i kroz područje senzorne etnografije) daju važan doprinos za kritičko sagledavanje procesa konstrukcije vizualne naracije. Svakako bih spomenula selekciju tekstova objedinjenih u zborniku *Made to Be Seen: Perspectives on the History of Visual Anthropology*²⁷ koji dodatno nude produbljeni pogled na prošireno polje vizualnoga kao neizostavnog elementa kulture svakodnevice. Senzorna etnografija rastvara dominaciju oka i inzistira na holističkom osjetilnom i fenomenološkom iskustvu koje je potrebno osvještavati i ugrađivati u vlastiti autorski rad (bilo znanstveno bilo umjetničko istraživanje). Primjer i tekstovi iz navedenih područja također mogu poslužiti kao okosnica u (re)formiranju metodologije rada na terenu s pojedincima ili zajednicama čije životne priče i življeno iskustvo posređujemo te prenosimo široj publici.

Translation from Croatian: Dunja Opatić

author's initial premise is that our bodies and the bodies of others are central in doing fieldwork. We together locate our physical beings in a spatial context of the field within which we conduct research. Sensory ethnography emphasizes the importance of the interwoven sensory experiences of the researcher and the researched. The subjective sensory experience is also a tool with which we approach others and attempt to understand their experiences.

Basic principles of sensory ethnography encompass several categories: perception, place, knowledge, memory and imagination. In the context of this paper, I find it important to focus on the category of place. Namely, Sarah Pink emphasizes the concept of emplacement as a sensory relationship that we, as researchers, construct based on the interrelationship of the body, mind and the environment.²⁵ The key word in this concept is place as a fluid category that affects the flow of locations, people and things. Likewise, places are in a constant process of being constituting and depend on a number of interrelationships arising from multifaceted simultaneous stories. Such a definition of place enables a broader perspective on the initial relationship/contact between the researcher and the researched. Becoming aware of mutual interdependence is an important trigger for adopting a reflexive approach in one's visual practices, while the simultaneity of experiences (of the researcher and the researched) revises power relations. Nullifying superior and subordinate positions, narratives and views, opens up a space for initiating dialogue, for collaborative work.

Sarah Pink concludes that the task of a reflexive anthropologist is to become aware of one's own emplacement and one's role in the construction of place. Considering that we cannot directly access other people's experiences, individual and collective memories or imaginations, we should work on attuning our bodies, rhythms, tastes and ways of seeing with theirs. Such an approach leads us to the so-called creatively constructed correspondences between our own and other's experiences. Furthermore, we deepen our knowledge on how others articulate (not only verbally) memories and imaginations based on their own emplacement.²⁶

Fundamentals of sensory ethnography can supplement the tenants of the reflexive approach, and together they pave the way to redefining image ethics by taking into account the possibility of creating multiple perspectives, introducing the methods of self-observation and self-correction and engaging in collaborative work practices. Experiences in the field of visual anthropology (expanded by sensory ethnography) provide an important contribution to the critical evaluation of the construction process of visual narration. I should also mention the collection of texts in *Made to Be Seen: Perspectives on the History of Visual Anthropology*²⁷ that offer an in-depth perspective into the expanded field of visual culture as an essential element of the culture of everyday life. Sensory ethnography dethrones the supremacy of the eye and insists on the holistic sensory and phenomenological experience that authors' need to be made aware of and incorporate it into their work (be it scientific or artistic research).

¹ Usp. Jay Ruby, *Picturing Culture: Explorations of Film and Anthropology*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 2000., 166.

² Usp. Etami Borjan, „Rethinking the traditional in ethnographic film: Representation, Ethics and Indigeneity“, u: *Etnološka tribina* 36, vol. 43, 2013., 27.

³ Vizualna antropologija stoga ne predstavlja isključivo sredstvo i metodu antropološkog istraživanja, već ima mogućnost kreiranja vizualnih (fotografskih, filmskih i hipermedijskih) interpretacija jednako relevantnih kao i akademski i stručni rad u pisanoj formi.

⁴ Usp. Potkonjak u Tvrтко Zebec et al., „Etika u etnologiji / kulturnoj antropologiji“, u: *Etnološka tribina* 32, vol. 39, 2009., 15–53.

⁵ Usp. Ibid., 28.

⁶ Usp. Garnet C. Butchart, „Transfer Media: Ethics, Semiotics, Documentary“, u: *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies* vol. 9, br. 1, 2013., 2.

⁷ Usp. Garnet C. Butchart, „Transfer Media: Ethics, Semiotics, Documentary“, u: *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies* vol. 9, br. 1, 2013., 5.

⁸ Usp. Jay Ruby, *Picturing Culture: Explorations of Film and Anthropology*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 2000., 44.

⁹ Usp. Larry Gross, John Stuart Katz i Jay Ruby, „Introduction: A Moral Pause“, *Image Ethics: The Moral Rights of Subjects in Photographs, Film and Television*, ur. Larry Gross, John Stuart Katz i Jay Ruby, Oxford University Press, New York, 1988., 3–4.

¹⁰ Usp. Jay Ruby, *Picturing Culture: Explorations of Film and Anthropology*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 2000., 138.

¹¹ Usp. Jay Ruby, *Picturing Culture: Explorations of Film and Anthropology*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 2000., 140.

¹² Usp. Jay Ruby, *Picturing Culture: Explorations of Film and Anthropology*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 2000., 141.

¹³ Usp. Larry Gross, John Stuart Katz i Jay Ruby, „Introduction: A Moral Pause“, *Image Ethics: The Moral Rights of Subjects in Photographs, Film and Television*, ur. Larry Gross, John Stuart Katz i Jay Ruby, Oxford University Press, New York, 1988., 8.

¹⁴ Usp. Garnet C. Butchart, „Transfer Media: Ethics, Semiotics, Documentary“, u: *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies* vol. 9, br. 1, 2013., 2–3

¹⁵ Usp. Larry Gross, John Stuart Katz i Jay Ruby, „Introduction: A Moral Pause“, *Image Ethics: The Moral Rights of Subjects in Photographs, Film and Television*, ur. Larry Gross, John Stuart Katz i Jay Ruby, Oxford University Press, New York, 1988., 10.

¹⁶ Usp. *ibid.*, 10.

¹⁷ Usp. *ibid.*, 14.

¹⁸ Usp. Jay Ruby, *Picturing Culture: Explorations of Film and Anthropology*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 2000., 144.

¹⁹ Usp. *ibid.*, 156.

²⁰ Usp. *ibid.*, 156.

²¹ Usp. *ibid.*, 156.

²² Usp. Etami Borjan, „Rethinking the traditional in ethnographic film: Representation, Ethics and Indigeneity“, u: *Etnološka tribina* 36, vol. 43, 2013., 27.

²³ Usp. Garnet C. Butchart, „Transfer Media: Ethics, Semiotics, Documentary“, u: *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies* vol. 9, br. 1, 2013., 10.

²⁴ Usp. *ibid.*, 10.

²⁵ Usp. Sarah Pink, *Doing Sensory Ethnography*, Sage Publications, London, 2009., 26.

²⁶ Usp. *ibid.*, 40.

²⁷ Usp. Marcus Banks i Jay Ruby, *Made to Be Seen: Perspectives on the History of Visual Anthropology*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 2011.

The examples and texts from the abovementioned fields can also be used as a framework for (re)forming fieldwork methodology where we encounter individuals and communities whose life stories and lived experiences we mediate and convey to a wider audience.

¹ Cf. Jay Ruby, *Picturing Culture: Explorations of Film and Anthropology*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 2000, 166.

² Cf. Etami Borjan, „Rethinking the traditional in ethnographic film: Representation, Ethics and Indigeneity“, in: *Etnološka tribina* 36, vol. 43, 2013, 27.

³ Therefore, visual anthropology is not only a tool or a method of anthropological research but it also has the ability to create visual (photographic, film and hypermedia) interpretations which are as relevant as written academic or expert works.

⁴ Cf. Potkonjak u Tvrтко Zebec et al., „Etika u etnologiji / kulturnoj antropologiji“, in: *Etnološka tribina* 32, vol. 39, 2009, 15-53.

⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, 28.

⁶ Cf. Garnet C. Butchart, „Transfer Media: Ethics, Semiotics, Documentary“, in: *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies* vol. 9, no.1, 2013, 2.

⁷ Cf. Garnet C. Butchart, „Transfer Media: Ethics, Semiotics, Documentary“, in: *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies* vol. 9, no.1, 2013, 5.

⁸ Cf. Jay Ruby, *Picturing Culture: Explorations of Film and Anthropology*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 2000, 44.

⁹ Cf. Larry Gross, John Stuart Katz and Jay Ruby, „Introduction: A Moral Pause“, *Image Ethics: The Moral Rights of Subjects in Photographs, Film and Television*, eds. Larry Gross, John Stuart Katz and Jay Ruby, Oxford University Press, New York, 1988, 3-4.

¹⁰ Cf. Jay Ruby, *Picturing Culture: Explorations of Film and Anthropology*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 2000, 138.

¹¹ Cf. Jay Ruby, *Picturing Culture: Explorations of Film and Anthropology*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 2000, 140.

¹² Cf. Jay Ruby, *Picturing Culture: Explorations of Film and Anthropology*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 2000, 141.

¹³ Cf. Larry Gross, John Stuart Katz and Jay Ruby, „Introduction: A Moral Pause“, *Image Ethics: The Moral Rights of Subjects in Photographs, Film and Television*, eds. Larry Gross, John Stuart Katz and Jay Ruby, Oxford University Press, New York, 1988, 8.

¹⁴ Cf. Garnet C. Butchart, „Transfer Media: Ethics, Semiotics, Documentary“, in: *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies* vol. 9, no.1, 2013, 2-3

¹⁵ Cf. Larry Gross, John Stuart Katz and Jay Ruby, „Introduction: A Moral Pause“, *Image Ethics: The Moral Rights of Subjects in Photographs, Film and Television*, eds. Larry Gross, John Stuart Katz and Jay Ruby, Oxford University Press, New York, 1988, 10.

¹⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 10.

¹⁷ Cf. *ibid.*, 14.

¹⁸ Cf. Jay Ruby, *Picturing Culture: Explorations of Film and Anthropology*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 2000, 144.

¹⁹ Cf. Jay Ruby, *ibid.*, 156.

²⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, 156.

²¹ Cf. *ibid.*, 156.

²² Cf. Etami Borjan, „Rethinking the traditional in ethnographic film: Representation, Ethics and Indigeneity“, in: *Etnološka tribina* 36, vol. 43, 2013, 27.

²³ Cf. Garnet C. Butchart, „Transfer Media: Ethics, Semiotics, Documentary“, in: *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies* vol. 9, no.1, 2013, 10.

²⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, 10.

²⁵ Cf. Sarah Pink, *Doing Sensory Ethnography*, Sage Publications, London, 2009, 26.

²⁶ Cf. Sarah Pink, *ibid.*, 40.

²⁷ Cf. Marcus Banks and Jay Ruby, *Made to Be Seen: Perspectives on the History of Visual Anthropology*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 2011.