29 *Paradigms Lost and Found: The "Crisis of Representation" and Visual Anthropology*

NANCY LUTKEHAUS AND JENNY COOL

The "paradigms lost" of our title refers to the "crisis of representation" that beset anthropology and other fields in the humanities during the 1980s. This postmodern, postcolonial, postfeminist erosion of paradigmatic authority posed significant challenges to anthropology—a discipline grounded in the Enlightenment project of rationality and objectivity and intimately bound up in the history of Western imperialism. Beginning with the critiques of Dell Hymes, Edward Said, Johannes Fabian, Clifford Geertz, James Clifford, and George Marcus and Michael Fischer, anthropologists have been called to task for their unself-conscious production of cultural representations.[1] Descriptions and analyses written from observations and field notes—the very heart of ethnography—have come into serious question, epistemologically as well as politically. Criticism has been made of anthropologists' naive assertions of objectivity in the construction of their ethnographic representations. Even more pointedly, Said and others have suggested that through their inability, or refusal, to appreciate sufficiently the discipline's imperial legacy, anthropologists continue to "act to shut and block out the clamor of voices on the outside asking for their claims about empire and domination to be considered."[2] The implications of this statement are several: that, on the one hand, anthropologists have systematically misrepresented social reality by presenting images of homogeneous cultural "wholes"; that hegemonic relations of authority and representation have silenced alternative visions and voices in favor of those toward which anthropologists, for whatever personal, professional, or political reasons, are most disposed; and that the very act of representing others not only bears with it moral responsibility, but, more sinisterly, is a form of domination.

Anthropologists, however, have not remained silent in the face of these attacks on the discipline. The most extreme response to the crisis of representation has been the stance that anthropology as a social practice in general and ethnographic film as a particular extension of it are colonialist enterprises that have no place in a postcolonial world. Those who take this view would put an end to anthropology's cross-cultural tradition, arguing that the most valid cultural representations are those made by indigenous ethnographers (or image makers) working *in* and *on* their own cultures.[3] Although we are sympathetic to the reasons underlying this view, we argue that it represents an unnecessary abandonment of anthropology's cross-cultural aims.[4] Far from heralding the end of anthropology, in this essay we show that the crisis of representation has given rise to both written and filmic ethnographies that incorporate critiques of Enlightenment thinking while still maintaining the moral, social, and epistemological validity of cultural representations made by "outsiders."

We begin with the premise that written and visual representations of culture have long shared a dialectical relationship of interaction and impact, each affecting the other, but seldom overtly referencing this interrelationship. Moreover, we assert that this cross-fertilization has played, and can continue to play, an important role in the revitalization and transformation of the creation of cross-cultural representations. In presenting a brief overview of the "new ethnography" (the experiments in anthropological writing catalyzed by the critique of the so-called realist representations characteristic of traditional ethnography), we also describe examples of their counterparts in ethnographic film—what might be called, in homage to ethnographic filmmaker Jean Rouch and his influence on French fictional film, "a new wave" of ethnographic film. The new ethnographies we refer to have not only influenced recent ethnographic films, but they in turn bear evidence of the impact of cinema in general, and ethnographic film to a lesser extent, on the writing of ethnography.[5]

The majority of the films and videos we discuss in this chapter are the products of filmmakers and anthropologists associated with the Center for Visual Anthropology (CVA) at the University of Southern California. This is no mere coincidence, as both of us are or have been associated with the center.[6] Nor is it simply a matter of self-promotion; rather, we feel that it is important to be able to write about the relationship between ethnography and ethnographic film from the perspective not only of film critics, but as practitioners of both anthropology and filmmaking. Both of us are trained as professional ethnographers, and we have both made ethnographic films. Lutkehaus, in her capacity as professor of visual anthropology at the CVA, has been involved in aspects of the production (i.e., research, filming, editing) of most of the films described in this essay. However, by limiting the films discussed here to those produced at the Center for Visual Anthropology, we do not mean to imply that these are the only ethnographic films and videos produced recently that reflect the changes in ethnographic film that we describe. More specifically, our decision to limit the range of films discussed reflects our desire to document a historical movement in the development of ethnographic film and visual anthropology that began at the University of Southern California during the late 1970s as the result of the intellectual and aesthetic

From *Collecting Visible Evidence*. Ed. Jane M. Gaines and Michael Renov. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1999. 116–139.

influence of anthropologist Barbara Myerhoff and ethnographic filmmaker Timothy Asch, two of the founding forces behind the creation of the Center for Visual Anthropology.[7] Through the examples of their own films, several of which we mention below, as well as their interest in developing an institutional space for the production and analysis of visual anthropology, Myerhoff and Asch helped to create the Center for Visual Anthropology as a site of experimentation and the rethinking of the genre of ethnographic film.

After a brief discussion of the dialectical relationship between written ethnography and ethnographic film, we describe two recent trends in ethnographic film that we interpret as a response to the crisis of representation in anthropology: first, the trend toward indigenous and autobiographical films, and second, the trend toward global/transnational films. Although at first glance these two trends appear almost to be diametrically opposed, we suggest that they are united by the common denominator that each involves a new relationship to the subject of ethnographic film. Finally, we present a detailed discussion of Jenny Cool's video *Home Economics* (1993) as one example of an ethnographic film that preserves the cross-cultural tradition, yet also successfully negotiates the epistemological and political minefield of contemporary anthropology.

The Dialectical Relationship between Ethnography and Ethnographic Film

New ethnographies are characterized by a rejection of the anthropological paradigm that posited the omnipotent authority of the ethnographic observer vis-à-vis his or her distanced object of observation. Although these ethnographies take a number of different forms, they share in a self-conscious effort to portray the socially constructed nature of ethnographic knowledge. They also attempt to portray new subjects of ethnographic investigation, such as contemporary Western society itself. And they share the assumption that ethnography can serve to enable intelligent dialogue across ethnic, class, and cultural lines, among individuals different from one another, but who nonetheless can benefit from attempts to convey their differences.

Some of the earliest examples of experimental ethnography focused precisely on the dialogical nature of ethnographic inquiry. Books such as Vincent Crapanzano's *Tuhami* and Kevin Dwyer's *Moroccan Dialogues* attempted to reproduce the dialogical relationship between ethnographer and informant(s) as part of their literary exposition.[8] These representations aimed not only to present the socially constructed nature of ethnographic knowledge, but also to present consciously the ethnographer and his or her "subjects" as specific individuals encountering one another within specific social contexts. Thus, in contrast to the disguised and distant voice of the narrator/anthropologist in traditional realist ethnographies, dialogical ethnographies sought to represent distinct voices engaged in conversation. (One might include yet a third work based on research in Morocco, Paul Rabinow's *Reflections on Fieldwork in Morocco*, as transitional, bridging the gap between the genre of fictionalized or disguised fieldwork narratives exemplified by Laura Bohannan's pseudonymous classic *Return to Laughter* and the "new ethnographies" that integrate the anthropologist as actor within the ethnography itself.)[9]

This practice of representing the ethnographer as a particular individual—rather than an omnipotent, authorial voice whose identity is disguised—has been referred to as "reflexivity."[10] Other reflexive texts include Jean-Paul Dumont's *The Headman and I*, Paul Friedrich's *The Princes of Naranja*, Tanya Luhrmann's *Persuasions of the Witch's Craft*, and Kamala Visweswaran's *Fictions of Feminist Ethnography*.[11] Visweswaran's book also represents another trend within anthropology—the overt development of new agents of investigation, such as anthropologists of mixed cultural heritage using their own cultural bifurcation as a means of empathy in their exploration of other cultural worlds.[12]

Through their very praxis, prompted in part by the development in the late 1960s of portable synchronous sound, ethnographic filmmakers experimented even earlier than ethnographic authors with this issue of voice. Thus, for example, in their African trilogy *Turkana Conversations*, shot in Kenya in 1973–74, David and Judith MacDougall allowed the recorded conversation to give dramatic shape and tension to their ethnographic films. In contrast to these films that sometimes have the quality of eavesdropping on other people's conversations, Jean Rouch, the French ethnographic filmmaker, working almost twenty years before, collaborated with his West African informants in producing innovative films such as *Les Maîtres Fous* (1955), *Moi, Un Noir* (1957), and *Jaguar* (1967). In these films Rouch lets his subjects speak for themselves, while his own voice is not an omniscient, anonymous narrator, but that of a distinct individual, the ethnographer/filmmaker. Even more experimental was Rouch's decision, as in *Jaguar*, to film semifictional sequences created by his collaborators. These films were also innovative in that they dealt with then nontraditional ethnographic subjects such as migration, urbanization, and indigenous responses to colonialism in West Africa. Both Rouch, with his cinema verité, and the MacDougalls practiced a form of "participatory cinema" in which the camera was acknowledged, indeed encouraged, to provoke action and responses in a manner we can now identify as a precursor to the notion of reflexivity in written ethnography; in both instances the presence of the ethnographer and/or camera is acknowledged as a significant participant in the event or interaction represented.[13]

Also focusing on the issue of voice, in the late 1960s Tim Asch began to shift his thinking about narration in his films. Like the MacDougalls, he thought that the filmmaker could present a "truer" representation of filmic subjects if they were allowed to speak for themselves on-screen without the presence of a narrator or voice-over. This shift also allowed for a shift in the content of his films, from a focus on observable behavior to a foregrounding of voice as a means of conveying cultural interpretation and indigenous meaning.[14] Asch and Myerhoff also produced early examples of ethnographic films that employed reflexivity to portray the process and personal dynamics through which ethnographic knowledge is obtained. These include

Asch and Chagnon's *The Ax Fight* (1975), Barbara Myerhoff and Lynne Littman's Academy-Award-winning documentary *Number Our Days* (1977) as well as their *In Her Own Time* (1985), and *Jero on Jero: "A Balinese Trance Séance" Observed* (1984) by Patsy and Timothy Asch, produced in conjunction with anthropologist Linda Connor.

The Ax Fight is a precursor to these other films. Unlike their explicit portrayal of the anthropologist in dialogue with ethnographic subjects, in *The Ax Fight* we are made privy only to Asch's voice, as cameraman, in conversation with the anthropologist Napoleon Chagnon. We do, however, hear Chagnon's speculation about the behavior we have witnessed on-screen. His explanation, which later proves to have been incorrect, provides the overall framework for the film: the discovery of how anthropological explanation is constructed through the process of fieldwork and analysis.

In subsequent films such as *Number Our Days*, the anthropologist plays an on-camera role. We see Barbara Myerhoff interacting with the subjects of her film—the elderly men and women who congregate at a Jewish community center in Venice, California—and hear her reflect upon her initial interest in these individuals. The product of ongoing ethnographic research, *Number Our Days* was not shot strictly as cinema verité, but was filmed after Myerhoff had been working for some time with the people at the Aliyah Community Center and thus knew which individuals she wanted to focus on in the film. Nevertheless, through Myerhoff's interaction with people such as Shmuel, a former tailor, and Rebekah, who had once been a seamstress and still loved to dress up in fanciful hats, we hear the dialogue the anthropologist engaged in with her informants and see their sometimes emotional responses to her questions.

In the film *In Her Own Time*, the concept of reflexivity and the nature of ethnographic inquiry is carried a dramatic step further. Here, in Myerhoff's last film, the anthropologist's increasingly deteriorating health—her ultimately unsuccessful fight against cancer—becomes the focus of her investigation into the beliefs and practices of a community of Hasidic Jews who live in the Fairfax district of Los Angeles. Through their efforts to help her in her struggle with her illness, we gain insight into the world of the Hasidim and their religious practices, as well as the meaning of spirituality in their lives and their belief in its power to help others. Part of the dramatic tension in this film lies in the ambiguity between Myerhoff's roles as distanced ethnographic observer and earnestly engaged participant. The anthropologist becomes as much the subject of this film as the Hasidim she is studying.[15]

In contrast, *Jero on Jero: "A Balinese Trance Séance" Observed* offers the viewer an opportunity to observe the anthropological subject—a Balinese woman named Jero who is a skilled masseuse and healer—view and comment on her own previously filmed performance documented in *A Balinese Trance Séance*. In *Jero on Jero* we see Jero watching herself on film and observe her responses to seeing herself possessed as she conducts a séance in which she converses with the dead relatives of her clients. We also hear the dialogue

she carries on with the anthropologist, Linda Connor, who poses questions to her as Jero watches the film on a small monitor.[16] The presentation of these multiple levels of reflexivity—of Jero witnessing her own performance, of the anthropologist questioning her informant—allows skeptical Western viewers the opportunity to evaluate this post-performance discussion of Jero's previous behavior.

Besides dialogism and reflexivity, the new ethnography has been characterized by a conscious focus on the narrative structure of ethnography as a genre. Sometimes referred to as "the literary turn" in anthropology and other social sciences, this focus on ethnographic representation qua literary production has led scholars such as Marcus and Cushman, Marcus and Fischer, Clifford, Fabian, Geertz, and Strathern to look at the ethnographies of earlier anthropologists—Malinowski, Benedict, Frazer, Lévi-Strauss—and to analyze their narrative and rhetorical strategies.[17]

Anthropologists' self-conscious reflection on narrative structure has parallels in recent ethnographic films. Works such as Sylvia Sensiper's *Films Are Dreams That Wander in the Light of Day* (1989) and Wilton Martinez's *Viewing Cultures* (1991) series challenge our naive assumptions about the objectivity of ethnographic representations through their visual investigation of the sources and impact of cross-cultural images. Sensiper's video, for example, explores Hollywood's portrayal of Tibet as Shangri-La in classic films such as *Lost Horizons* in order to demonstrate the impacts such stereotypical representations have had on ethnographic films. Bringing herself into the picture—literally and figuratively—she also discusses the effects of these romanticized images on her own interest in Tibetan culture and their contrast with the political and social reality of contemporary Tibet. Creating an even more complexly dialogic film, Sensiper includes the representation of her friendship with a Tibetan refugee whom she accompanies on his return to his homeland for the first time since his departure as a child in the late 1950s. Through his words, we also learn the "native's" point of view, hear his thoughts in anticipation of his return to his homeland, view his reunion with his family, and are privy to his post hoc ruminations about the visit. The juxtaposition of the two perspectives, Sensiper's and the refugee's, as well as the video's "before-and-after" narrative structure provide an additional layer of irony and hindsight to the simplistic images and hopes presented at the beginning of the video.

Striking even closer to home, Martinez's series *Viewing Cultures* probes the academic world of teaching anthropology with film and attempts to represent aspects of the processes of film production, circulation (the use of ethnographic film by professors), and reception (students' responses to a variety of ethnographic films).[18] One of the only studies to document the reception of ethnographic film, and the only one to present such evidence visually, *Viewing Cultures* presents a complex message about the social process of film spectatorship as well as an analysis of genres of ethnographic film. Both Sensiper's and Martinez's films force us to reflect upon the social factors that contribute to visual stereotypes of the idyllic and exotic Other in

ethnographic and documentary film, as well as the effects of these stereotypes on viewers.

Montage in Ethnographic Writing and Ethnographic Film

Returning to the topic of written ethnography, although anthropological theory may have been influenced by postmodern discourse, Marcus reminds us that as textual strategies, these self-conscious experimental moves away from realist representation in the writing of ethnography are merely modernist in the classic literary sense.[19] Referring to the historical development of the modernist style, and following the literary critic Keith Cohen, who has written about the historical relation of film to modern fiction,[20] Marcus argues that there is a strong cinematic basis to the contemporary experiments in ethnographic writing. Both Marcus and Cohen consider the cinematic technique of montage—the physical juxtaposition of images in the editing of film—to have had primary influence in creating the transformations identified with classic literary modernism and, by extension, according to Marcus, with the new ethnography.

Montage provides a technique that allows a break with existing rhetorical conventions and narrative modes that in turn allows for the problematizing of the construction of space, temporality, and perspective or voice in ethnography. For example, Marcus points out that not only does Taussig's ethnography *Colonialism, Shamanism, and the Wild Man* explicitly draw upon the concept of montage to analyze shamanic performances, but aspects of Taussig's verbal representation of these performances also assume the effects of montage. By calling attention through the use of verbal montage to the essentially oral conventions and techniques of other cultures, ethnographers such as Taussig are better able to give voice to the qualities of oral genres of communication in performance.[21]

Whereas mundane montage provides the building blocks of narrative structure in film, intellectual montage—as distinguished by Eisenstein and exemplified in his films—has been used less creatively by ethnographic filmmakers. Its primary function—for example, in films such as John Marshall's *N!ai: The Story of a !Kung Woman* (1979)—has been to provide flashbacks to earlier events, either prior to the ethnographic present of the film or within the film itself.[22] More recently, however, ethnographic filmmakers have begun to break with the time-space convention of realist film practice to experiment consciously with montage as a means of conveying specific ideas; for example, to represent visually concepts such as memory, identity, and class differences. In their short film *Pepino Mango Nance* (1995), Bann Roy and Gillian Goslinga effectively use intellectual montage to portray the unequal relationship between a young urban male Chicano composer living in a loft in downtown Los Angeles and the illegal Latin American immigrant women fruit vendors whose street chants have provided inspiration for his avant-garde music. The juxtaposition of images eliminates the need for any narration to spell out the contrast in lifestyles, the gap of class differences that separate them, and allows the viewer to muse upon the irony of their uneasy—and unequal—relationship.

In another, lengthier example, in the film *Bui Doi* (Life of Dust) (1993), about a group of teenage Vietnamese gang members in Orange County, California, filmmakers Ahrin Mishan and Nicholas Rothenberg use montage as a means of exploring aspects of identity and memory. Undoubtedly influenced by Trinh T, Minh-ha's striking use of found footage in her documentary film *Surname Viet Given Name Nam* (1989), and unable to film in Vietnam themselves or gain access to any earlier footage of the youths' childhoods there, Mishan and Rothenberg used stock footage of the Vietnamese countryside and newsreel images of the war in combination with voice-over reminiscences by the gang members in order to provide dreamlike flashbacks to their former lives in Vietnam. These sequences are interspersed with actual footage of the gang members' everyday lives together. The mundane activities of eating, sleeping, and horsing around are eerily juxtaposed with images of the gang members casually fondling guns and striking macho poses with them. These images—as well as the youths' comments about the violent acts they perform to support their independent lifestyle—reverberate ironically with their statements that their life is "just like a movie." To what extent has the camera provoked their posturing? To what extent is it merely capturing on film an accurate projection of their own self-images? While far removed from the realist conventions of traditional ethnographic/documentary film—yet evocative of Rouch's earlier work—the stylized black-and-white format of *Bui Doi* evokes a sense of lost innocence, the poignancy and quiet desperation of alienation, and the thrill of crime and violence that infuses the communal life of the surrogate "family" the gang members have created for themselves.

New Ethnographic Subjects

In addition to experimentation with narrative structure, new ethnography also has been characterized by a shift in subject matter. Rather than the so-called exotic or primitive Other, contemporary ethnographers have increasingly turned to the study of their own society, or aspects of it, thereby "bringing anthropology home." Thus Tanya Luhrmann's *Persuasions of the Witch's Craft* looks at the phenomenon of contemporary witchcraft among the middle class in England; Faye Ginsburg, Emily Martin, Rayna Rapp, and Marilyn Strathern have explored the gender and class dynamics of the pro-choice/anti-abortion movements, the female body, and new reproductive technologies in Euro-American societies; Sharon Traweek, Bruno Latour, and Paul Rabinow have studied the culture of theoretical physicists, research scientists, and biotechnology, respectively; and George Marcus has turned an ethnographic eye on the lives and fortunes of American dynastic families and the institutions they beget.[23]

In a similar manner, ethnographic film has also been shifting its traditional focus away from the foreign and exotic toward the familiar and near. Both of Myerhoff's films, *Number Our Days* and *In Her Own Time*, are early

examples of an anthropologist's attempt to study her own culture. Although her previous work had fit the traditional cross-cultural model—she had studied the religious pilgrimages of the Huichol Indians in northern Mexico[24]—Myerhoff later turned her ethnographic gaze toward the elderly Jews of Venice Beach, California, partly out of a desire to know something more about the lives of these old people because, as she remarks in *Number Our Days*, she would someday be "a little old Jewish lady" herself.[25]

Although not all new ethnographic films that focus on American culture have turned so personally toward exploration of the ethnographer's own ethnic identity, ethnographic filmmakers have focused with increasing frequency on segments of their own society and on social classes other than those of the ethnic subcultures, deviants, or underprivileged that have characterized more traditional sociological and ethnographic films.

In *Gang Cops* (1989), for example, Toby Fleming and Daniel Marks follow a special unit of the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department as they patrol the turf of gang members in South-Central L.A. In traditional ethnographic fashion, for more than a year Fleming and Marks were participant observers, accompanying the officers on their patrols, hanging out with them during off-hours and in their barracks, attending their public appearances as spokesmen for law and order, to present a compelling and insightful portrait of the symbiotic relationships among cops, gang members, and neighborhood residents.

In yet another portrait of middle-class Americans—ironically titled *Natives* (1993)—Jessie Lerner and Scott Sterling focus their camera on the activities of participants in the Light Up the Border movement in San Diego, allowing audiences not only to see the protesters' picket lines, but also to hear the point of view of these staunchly conservative, predominantly white Americans who see it as their patriotic duty to keep illegal aliens from entering the United States from Mexico. Although there is no voice-over narration that comments on the opinions and activities of the individuals shown, the odd camera angles sometimes used to shoot the interviews, the expressionistic use of sound in repeated sequences showing close-ups of a border fence in the process of being locked, and the use of intellectual montage serve to create the film's distinct point of view.

More recently, Gillian Goslinga, curious about the human dimensions of the new reproductive technologies, used a video camera to record and analyze the social dynamics of the relationship between a gestational surrogate and the biological parents of the infant she was carrying in *The Baby the Stork Brought Home* (1997). We watch as the pregnancy unfolds, witness the birth of the baby girl, and see the bitter disappointment of the surrogate as she is left alone, feeling like "a breed cow," after the parents—no longer wanting to acknowledge the surrogate's role in the birth process—have achieved their goal: a healthy baby girl. Aside from the documentary value of the film, which allows us to get to know both sets of partners in the relationship—the surrogate and her husband and the biological parents—over a nine-month period, *The Baby the Stork Brought Home* is enriched by a companion thesis that analyzes surrogacy as a new form of social and kinship relationship, questions traditional feminist critiques of surrogacy and motherhood, and probes the class dynamics of the new reproductive technologies.[26]

Subjects: Two New Trends in Ethnographic Film

In addition to these examples of changes in the traditional subject matter of ethnographic films—epitomized in the past by either the portrayal of exotic and/or visually resplendent rituals or the exact opposite, the lengthy recording of prosaic, everyday activities—the homeward turn in ethnographic writing is paralleled in visual anthropology by two other seemingly unrelated, but paradoxically kindred, trends. The first is found in the production and analysis of indigenous media and "autobiographical" films, the second in explorations of the signifying practices and transnational nature of postmodern consumer society. We will first briefly characterize these trends, then identify the source of their kinship in their radically altered conception of the relationship between ethnographer and subject. Finally, we explore the impact of this changed relationship on the practice of ethnographic filmmaking with a detailed discussion of the video *Home Economics*.

The First Trend

The fact that indigenous filmmakers from the Amazon to the Arctic and Aboriginal Australia have begun to produce their own filmic representations of their cultures has not only created a new corpus of visual representations, it has generated new subject matter for anthropologists and documentarians to explore. Thus, on the one hand, an increasing number of films and videos are made by indigenous filmmakers, working either independently or in collaboration with outside anthropologists.[27] On the other hand, just as an increasing number of studies by anthropologists, and other media scholars, aim to document and analyze the cultural products and social organization of indigenous media production,[28] there is also a new genre of ethnographic film and video that documents indigenous film- and videomakers' use of filmic images as a political and cultural tool. Thus we have films such as *Kayapo: Out of the Forest* (1987), by the American anthropologist Terence Turner, made in conjunction with British TV, and *Taking Aim* (1992), by Brazilian ethnographic filmmaker Monica Frota, that document the use the Kayapo Indians have made of video images in their struggle against outside encroachment in the Amazon.[29]

The inverse of this trend to put the camera into the hands of the proverbial non-Western Other—whose focus is often social in character, looking at group experience rather than that of the subjective individual—is the production of autobiographical films and videos that make the Self the focus of the camera. Michael Renov has recently explored this burgeoning genre of new ethnographic "life history" films. Both developments, as different forms of self-representation, alter the social distance between the observer and observed by conflating it. Work produced under the rubric of ethnographic

film that fits this category includes So Yun Roe's *My Husband's Families* (1994) and Ju-hua Wu's *Worlds Incomplete: From Nation to Person* (1997). A step removed from a purely autobiographical voice, yet clearly still speaking from the filmmaker's own experiences, in the video My *Husband's Families* recently married Korean American visual anthropologist So Yun Roe uses her camera to allow the multiple members of her new husband's two families of origin—one the Swiss-German/Italian family in which he was raised through adoption, the other his Korean birth family—to speak about the meaning of kinship and family. In order to do so, the video moves from Europe to the United States and then to Korea. Ultimately, this exploration of cross-cultural adoption is not only a comment on the nature of the post-modern family, but also a means for the filmmaker to explore the complexity of her husband's personal background and her relationships to the individuals who make up her new, extensive set of in-laws.[30]

In *Worlds Incomplete: From Nation to Person*, Ju-hua Wu uses video footage of her Chinese father in Taiwan and China in combination with personal narrative in the form of a voice-over commentary that reflects upon her transnational identity, her feelings of filial betrayal evoked by her marriage to an American, and her father's return to China to visit his home village forty-six years later—only to find it submerged beneath a lake that was created by a dam. Her commentary questions the nature of identity and the roles that the cultural construction of the nation and national identity play in the determination of personal identity. Wu creates a personal narrative that transcends the simplistic formula of "one can only know oneself" as an ethnographic subject to probe personal memories and kinship relation in order to understand more fully the complexity of the relationship between personal and political identities.[31]

The Second Trend

Less well-known is the second trend in ethnographic film that has responded to Marcus and Fischer's clarion call for a postmodern ethnography, one that in the manner of such theorists as Jameson, Harvey, and Baudrillard explores contemporary societies through the crossing of national boundaries and covers the vast global culture of consumerism and transnational identities.[32] Recent examples of this type of film that break out of the insular time-space frame of traditional ethnographies and ethnographic films that remain bound to a single community, locale, or event include *Transnational Fiesta: 1992* (1993) by anthropologist Paul Gelles and Peruvian filmmaker/anthropologist Wilton Martinez, *A Chief in Two Worlds* (1993) by Micah van der Ryn, *For Here or To-Go?* (1997) by Bann Roy, and *In and Out of Africa* (1992) by anthropologist Christopher Steiner and ethnographic filmmakers Ilisa Barbash and Lucien Taylor.

Transnational Fiesta: 1992 follows a group of Peruvian immigrants currently living in Washington, DC, as they return to their former home, the Andean village of Cabanaconde, to sponsor an annual fiesta in honor of the village's patron saint. Afterward, we return with the Peruvian sponsors—and, in some cases, their American spouses—to their homes in Washington, DC. We see them at their daily jobs, learn of why they left Peru, and listen as they discuss their reasons for continuing to return to Peru and to sponsor the village ritual. In seeing the same individuals first in their home village in Peru and then in their suburban houses in Washington, DC, not only do we hear them talk about their multiple identities as Peruvian villagers and American immigrants, we are also privy to the social and cultural contexts, experiences, and relationships that produce these identities. In a second example of this genre, *A Chief in Two Worlds*, working-class Samoans in Los Angeles parlay their wages into chiefly titles that assure them access to land back in Samoa. In this case prestige—in the form of chiefly status—can be acquired only in Samoa, in exchange for goods and money more easily acquired by wage earners in Hawaii, the mainland United States, and New Zealand. Finally, in *For Here or To-Go?* filmmaker Roy, himself from India, focuses on the story of Amitabh, an Indian graduate student studying architecture in Los Angeles. The film cuts back and forth between interviews with Amitabh in L.A. and with his father, girlfriend, colleagues, and mentor in India. Through the juxtaposition of these various dialogues, we gain insight into the complex set of issues concerning home and identity that many foreign students face when they are given the opportunity to study abroad. As Amitabh says, "The FI [student visa] becomes the beginning of a new way of life for many," but not without conflicts over where one's loyalties and heart lie and how one creates a bicultural identity.

Whereas it is people who cross national boundaries in *Transnational Fiesta: 1992*, *A Chief in Two Worlds*, and *For Here or To-Go?* it is objects (and people) that travel between different worlds in *In and Out of Africa*. The video moves between Côte d'Ivoire and the United States, visually exploring the creation and transformation of value in cultural artifacts as so-called indigenous art moves from its source of production and distribution in Côte d'Ivoire to its circulation in the art markets of New York and Los Angeles.[33] Here objects are transformed by their location in different social contexts, their fluctuating value dependent upon the particular set of social relations in which they are embedded. The video documents the activities and attitudes of the traders who facilitate the transport of the objects from one cultural milieu to another, for they are the middlemen who, through their knowledge of the different social contexts, profit from the fluctuating values of the different spheres of exchange. All four of the videos discussed here as examples of the second trend focus on an inherently anthropological topic—exchange and the creation of value—with a decidedly postmodern twist: the visual representation of transnational forms of consumption and the circulation of goods and people.

Although the first trend discussed above, a turn toward self-representation, stands in contrast to the second, which looks at global social processes and phenomena, the two share certain views on the relationship between filmmaker and filmed, certain views about the *connectedness* of groups on either

side of the screen.[34] Both recognize the political, situated nature of representation, and both posit a more intimate relationship between knower and known than is assumed in the Enlightenment scheme. Both genres recognize, and here we crib from Geertz, that "one of the major assumptions upon which anthropological . . . [work] rested until only yesterday, that its subjects and its audience were not only separable but morally disconnected, that the first were to be described but not addressed, the second informed but not implicated has fairly well dissolved."[35]

The indigenous, autobiographical, and reflexive works of the first trend tend to handle this dissolution by asserting an identity of subject and author, whereas those of the second handle it in a more typically anthropological way. They engage in research and representation across lines of cultural difference, not in an effort to produce totalizing depictions of "how the [fill in the blank] live," but in an attempt to *enable conversation* across those lines. Such attempts, moreover, rest on the conviction that because difference proliferates—even as the world's peoples are drawn ever more tightly into each other's affairs and into the vast transnational processes of postmodernity—working toward mutual understanding and the construction of some common ground is a valid anthropological endeavor. Here the connection between author and subject takes the form not of a given identity, but of an affinity that must be constructed during the fieldwork and filmmaking process.

Home Economics

Researched and produced between 1990 and 1994 at the Center for Visual Anthropology, Jenny Cool's video *Home Economics* draws on both the critical insights of "new ethnography" and the legacy of the "new wave" in ethnographic film that was passed to a generation of visual anthropologists trained at the center that Myerhoff and Asch helped to found in the late 1970s. Though its choice of subject and approach to representing that subject in film are clearly informed by the "crisis of representation," *Home Economics* looks at the ideal of home ownership in suburban Los Angeles County and makes a quintessentially anthropological argument—it seeks to show the logic and validity of a particular way of life, that of petit bourgeois, suburban home owners, and it turns this showing into a critique of contemporary American society. As Marcus and Fischer have argued, this two-step process of critiquing the Self via a detour through the Other has been a mainstay of anthropological writing from the outset.[36]

Subtitled *A Documentary of Suburbia, Home Economics,* like a number of recent ethnographic works discussed in this essay, deliberately eschews the exotic, spectacular otherness of classical anthropology in favor of the domestic and the everyday.[37] Anthropologist/filmmaker Cool and the video's three subjects are all white American women deeply concerned with the social costs of the American Dream of home ownership. Yet the film is neither autobiographical nor the work of an indigenous suburbanite—the identities shared by author and subject are divided and crosscut by class difference and

A homeward turn in anthropology, Home Economics *(1994) bursts the bubble of the suburban American Dream.*

by the division between expert and lay inherent in any attempt at anthropological representation. Like the films discussed above that explore the transnational circulation of goods and people, *Home Economics* recognizes the multiple, fluid, and overlapping identities of the postmodern subject. Cool's video negotiates the multifarious relationships of otherness and connectedness between anthropologist/filmmaker and informants/subjects in two important ways, which we discuss in detail below because they represent Cool's strategy for responding to postmodernist critiques of anthropology without abandoning that discipline's cross-cultural mission.

Subjects Addressed, Not Described

Home Economics contains no voice-over narration, but consists of "real-time takes" (i.e., single runs of the camera uninterrupted by cutaways) in which the video's three subjects give lengthy responses to Cool's short prompts and questions. Shot in the subjects' kitchens, living rooms, and backyards and recorded with a camera carefully set up on a tripod and left to run unattended for long periods of time, the interview portions of *Home Economics* take on the tone of "kitchen conversations" rather than interviews proper. These dialogue sections run from two and a half to five minutes in length and are connected by much shorter montage sequences of the surrounding landscape that alternately illustrate and comment upon each woman's words. Although

Cool's preoccupation with the meaning and value of home ownership conveys an implicit critique of consumerism in late-twentieth-century America (as the video's title ironically signals), her filmmaking technique serves to foreground her subjects' experiences as home owners, to reveal the meanings that home ownership holds for them, and to present their perceptions of the logic and contradictions of their lives and social relations.[38]

This avoidance of voice-over narration and the impulse to present subjects who speak for themselves in real time have a long history in documentary and ethnographic filmmaking that begins in 1960 with the development of portable synchronous sound.[39] As Erik Barnouw has written in his history of the nonfiction film:

> The documentarist's conquest of synchronized sound decisively influenced the makers of ethnographic films. . . . Such works as *Tidikawa and Friends* (1971), made among the Bedamini of New Guinea by Jef and Su Doring; *Last of the Cuiva* (1971), made by Brian Moser in eastern Colombia; *Kula* (1971), made by Yasuko Ichioka among the Trobriand islanders of the Western Pacific; and *To Live With Herds* (1973), made in northern Uganda by David MacDougall, gave audiences—whether the language was understood or not—a sense of immersion in the societies they portrayed. . . .
>
> Synchronized sound affected editing style. The silent film editing tradition, under which footage was fragmented and then reassembled, creating "film time," began to lose its feasibility and value. With speech, "real time" reasserted itself. . . . This resulted in long films depicting long rituals, as in [Roger] Sandall's *Gunabibi* (1971), made in Australia; sometimes in short episodic films such as *Dedeheiwa Weeds His Garden* (1971) and *Dedeheiwa Washes His Children* (1971), and numerous others of the same sort made by Napoleon Chagnon and Timothy Asch among the Yanomamo Indians of southern Venezuela.[40]

Subjects addressed: intimate portraits from suburbia. Home Economics *(1994).*

Cool's technique in *Home Economics* of presenting long, uninterrupted shots of speaking subjects owes as much to the films the MacDougalls and the Asches made during the 1970s and 1980s as it does to the dialogical mode of textual production characteristic of "new ethnography." *Home Economics's* rhetorical power as ethnography and as social documentary draws heavily on the persuasive power of its subjects, its characters, and on the immersive sense of "being there" that the video constructs. Yet it moves beyond observational cinema to situate the anthropologist/filmmaker within the video and to acknowledge the authored nature of the representations it presents.

Authorship Acknowledged

Influenced by the cinema verité of Rouch, by the MacDougalls' "participatory cinema," and by the reflexivity practiced by Myerhoff, Asch, and their students at the CVA, *Home Economics* openly acknowledges its own constructed nature. Cool appears on camera several times, and when she is not in the shot, either her voice is heard asking questions from just outside the frame or her presence there is indicated by her subjects' gestures. In *Home Economics* Cool acknowledges her authorship but does not present herself as a subject in the text, in the manner of more intensely reflexive films and writings. Instead, the video's quiet reflexivity and straightforward narrative structure serve to remind the audience that *Home Economics* is presenting an ethnographic argument. As Cool explains:

> Making *Home Economics*, I tried to close the strange distance between expert and lay person, representor and represented, by talking to—rather than watching—my informants; and by taking their words—not as raw data—but as the interpretations and insights of reasoning social actors who might well have something to teach me about the world I sought to represent. In keeping with ethnographic tradition, I looked upon my informants' discourse as expressing a specific cultural logic and worked to demonstrate its rationality. . . . In *Home Economics* I do not claim to be telling my informants' stories, rather I give them room and time to emerge as expert witnesses whose thoughts and experiences corroborate, but also enlarge, my own story about the nature of the society in which we live together.[41]

In addition to reflexivity, *Home Economics* uses montage sequences to break free of the real-time dialogue and create an overarching "film time." Cool edits her subject's interviews so that they present a clear narrative arc. The ideals and expectations driving the American Dream of suburban home ownership, built up in the first half of *Home Economics*, are eroded in the

Kitchen conversations and relaxed reflexivity: the "key witness," center, talks to the anthropologist/filmmaker, at right. Home Economics *(1994).*

second half by stories of "latchkey kids," stressful commutes, racism, and social atomization that reveal the deep human costs of suburbanization. Cool's rhetorical aim in acknowledging her authorship and craft was to avoid creating a documentary that might be read in observational or realist terms as "a slice of life." By representing the anthropologist/filmmaker as a voice in dialogue with—but distinct from and *external to*—the film's subjects, *Home Economics* creates a place from which to advance its anthropological critique, namely, that home ownership in contemporary, suburban America is often achieved at the expense of the very values a home is said to represent.

Reviewed in *Variety* as "a pure use of the documentary format and a model of how to evoke the general from the particular," *Home Economics* consciously works to negotiate between the particularities of its subjects' testimony and the generalities of its author's argument, and thus to incorporate each informant's voice—as the voice of an active, rational social agent—into the anthropologist's interpretive narrative.[42] In this way, Cool responds to critiques of Enlightenment modes of representation while still maintaining the moral, social, and epistemological validity of cultural representations made by "outsiders."

Conclusion

Recently, visual anthropologist Jay Ruby sounded an alarm. "To survive," he asserts, "ethnographic film must find a new relationship to its subject, perhaps find a new subject, and abandon its slavish attachment to the realist conventions of the documentary and broadcast journalism."[43] We have argued here that in some arenas this is exactly what has been going on within ethnographic film: new subjects have been found (from middle-class white Americans in suburbia to art dealers in Manhattan and surrogate mothers at high-tech fertility clinics), and new relationships of mutuality and interconnection have been developed between filmmaker and subject.

While acknowledging that these new conceptions of the relationship between ethnographer and subject owe much to critiques of the traditional anthropological paradigm, we have also suggested that the sort of recognition about ordinary human actors that Cool and others have emphasized in their films has actually been central to the ethnographic paradigm since it emerged in anthropology.[44] From Evans-Pritchard's classic explanation of Zande witchcraft as natural philosophy to Lévi-Strauss's resplendent account of the science of the concrete, anthropologists have long sought to demonstrate the existence and validity of "other" cultural logics.[45] It is this sense of human agency, this apperception of a certain empirical quality among all humans, be they expert or lay, tribesmen or citizens, that the filmmakers of the second trend we have described work to evoke. What makes it empirical rather than ethical is that its apperception does not rest on assumed identity but on evidence and insight gathered in the fieldwork and filmmaking process.

We have also suggested that the relationship between ethnographic film and written ethnography has not simply been one-way, nor have the changes in ethnographic film simply been derivative, mere applications of insights from written to filmic representations. Although many of the recent ethnographic films we have described have indeed been influenced by the self-conscious critique of written representations of culture, creating new subject matter and new relationships between ethnographers and their subjects, ethnographic filmmakers foreshadowed and experimented with some of the same issues of representation—in particular those concerned with dialogism, reflexivity, and narrative structure—that later came under scrutiny by critics of the realist conventions of written ethnography.

Rather than abandoning anthropology—whether textual or visual—in the wake of the crisis of representation, we argue that critiques Enlightenment ways of knowing and representing can provide a new understanding of the relationship between ethnographers and their subjects. This new understanding should, in turn, serve to deepen and extend the most valuable aspects of the ethnographic enterprise: our knowledge of ourselves and of others.

NOTES

1. Dell Hymes, *Reinventing Anthropology* (New York: Vintage, 1974); Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon, 1978); Edward Said, "Representing the Colonized: Anthropology's Interlocutors," *Critical Inquiry* 15 (1989): 205–25; Johannes Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983); Clifford Geertz, *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1988); James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988); James Clifford and George E. Marcus, eds., *Writing Culture: The*

Poetics and Politics of Ethnography (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986); George E. Marcus and Michael M. J. Fischer, *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).

2. Said, *Orientalism*, 219.

3. For example, visual anthropologist Jay Ruby's comments from the first Visible Evidence conference in 1993 are representative of a less extreme version of this position. Although Ruby sees three possible roles the visual ethnographer can play now that "the natives speak for themselves," he is skeptical of the first two—ethnographers as facilitators and cultural brokers for indigenous media makers or collaborators with them—and thus finds the third alternative—the filmic exploration of the ethnographer's own culture—ultimately to be the most viable. Jay Ruby, "The Moral Burden of Authorship in Ethnographic Film," *Visual Anthropology Review* 11, no. 2 (1995): 77–82. For a provocative critique of indigenous media as a panacea for ethnographic film, see Rachel Moore, "Marketing Alterity," In *Visualizing Theory*, ed. Lucien Taylor (New York: Routledge, 1994), 126–39.

4. For a similar point of view specifically with regard to ethnographic film, see Terence Turner, "Representation, Collaboration and Mediation in Contemporary Ethnographic and Indigenous Media," *Visual Anthropology Review* 11, no. 2 (1995): 102–6.

5. See George E. Marcus, "The Modernist Sensibility in Recent Ethnographic Writing and the Cinematic Metaphor of Montage," in *Fields of Vision: Essays in Film Studies, Visual Anthropology, and Photography*, ed. Leslie Devereaux and Roger Hillman (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 35–55.

6. Nancy Lutkehaus is currently codirector of the Center for Visual Anthropology as well as associate professor in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Southern California. Cool is a graduate of the center's master's degree program in visual anthropology.

7. Myerhoff died in 1984 and Asch in 1994.

8. Vincent Cropanzano, *Tuhami: Portrait of a Moroccan* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); Kevin Dwyer, *Moroccan Dialogues* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982).

9. Paul Rabinow, *Reflections on Fieldwork in Morocco* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977); Elenore Smith Bowen [Laura Bohannan], *Return to Laughter* (New York; Harper & Row, 1954).

10. Jay Ruby, ed., *A Crack in the Mirror: Reflexive Perspectives in Anthropology* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982).

11. Jean-Paul Dumont, *The Headman and I* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978); Paul Friedrich, *The Princes of Naranja: An Essay in Anthropological Historical Method* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986); Tanya Luhrmann, *Persuasions of the Witch's Craft: Ritual Magic in Contemporary England* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989); Kamala Visweswaran, *Fictions of Feminist Ethnography* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994).

12. See also Lila Abu-Lughod, "Writing against Culture," in *Recapturing Anthropology*, ed. Richard Fox (Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, 1991), 140; Lila Abu-Lughod, *Writing Women's Worlds: Bedouin Stories* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); Ruth Behar, *Translated Woman: Crossing the Border with Esperanza's Story* (Boston: Beacon, 1993).

13. See David MacDougall, "Beyond Observational Cinema," and Jean Rouch, "The Camera and Man," both in *Principles of Visual Anthropology*, ed. Paul Hockings (Chicago: Aldine, 1975). Rouch's best-known work outside of anthropology is probably *Chronicle of a Summer* (1960), filmed in Paris during the period of the Algerian War. Not only did Rouch's work influence documentary filmmakers, his cinematic style—which came to be known as cinema verité—was of crucial influence on the Parisian "New Wave" feature filmmakers of the 1960s, who had in turn been influenced by aspects of modernist fiction.

14. Patsy Asch, personal communication, May 1995.

15. For further discussion of Myerhoff and her films, see Gelya Frank, "The Ethnographic Films of Barbara G. Myerhoff: Anthropology, Feminism, and the Politics of Jewish Identity," in *Women Writing Culture*, ed. Ruth Behar and Deborah A. Gordon (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 207–32; Riv-Ellen Prell, "The Double Frame of Life History in the Work of Barbara Myerhoff," in *Interpreting Women's Lives: Feminist Theory and Personal Narratives*, ed. Personal Narratives Group (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 241–58.

16. See Patsy Asch and Linda Connor, "An Exploration of Double-Voicing in Film," *Visual Anthropology Review* 10, no. 2 (1994): 14–28.

17. George E. Marcus and Dick Cushman, "Ethnographies as Texts," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 11 (1982): 25–69; Marcus and Fischer, *Anthropology as Cultural Critique*; Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture*; Fabian, *Time and the Other*; Geertz, *Works and Lives*; Marilyn Strathern, "Out of Context: The Persuasive Fictions of Anthropology," *Current Anthropology* 28, no. 3 (1987): 251–81.

18. See Nancy Lutkehaus and Wilton Martinez, "The Visual Translation of Culture" (unpublished report to the Spencer Foundation, 1990); Wilton Martinez, "Who Constructs Anthropological Knowledge: Toward a Theory of Ethnographic Film Spectatorship," in *Film as Ethnography*, ed. Peter Ian Crawford and David Turton (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992), 131–61.

19. Marcus, "The Modernist Sensibility," 40.

20. Keith Cohen, *Film and Fiction: The Dynamics of Exchange* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1979).

21. Marcus, "The Modernist Sensibility." 47; Michael Taussig, *Colonialism, Shamanism, and the Wild Man: A Study in Terror and Healing* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

22. Jean Rouch's use of montage is more complex. For example, in *Lea Maîtres Fous* he also uses montage didactically to illustrate a relationship between the ritual participants' practice of cracking an egg on the symbolic head of the colonial governor and the plume on the hat of the actual governor.

23. Luhrmann, *Persuasions of the Witch's Craft*; Faye Ginsburg, *Contested Lives: The Abortion Debate in an American Community* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989); Emily Martin, *The Woman in the Body* (Boston: Beacon, 1987); Rayna Rapp, "Constructing Amniocentesis: Maternal and Medical Discourses," in *Uncertain Terms: Negotiating Gender in American Culture*, ed. Faye Ginsburg and Anna Tsing (Boston: Beacon, 1990), 28–42; Marilyn Strathern, *Reproducing the Future: Essays on Anthropology, Kinship and the New Reproductive Technologies* (New York: Routledge, 1992); Sharon Traweek, *Beamtimes and Lifetimes* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989); Bruno LaTour, *The Pasteurization of France* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989); Paul Rabinow, *Making PCR: A Story of Biotechnology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996); George E. Marcus, ed., *Elites: Ethnographic Issues* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1983); George E. Marcus, with Peter Dobkin Hall, *Lives in Trust: The Fortunes of Dynastic Families in Late Twentieth-Century America* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1992).

24. Barbara Myerhoff, *Peyote Hunt: The Sacred Journey of the Huichol Indians* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1974).

25. See also Barbara Myerhoff and Jay Ruby, "A Crack in the Mirror: Reflexive Perspectives in Anthropology," in *Remembered Lives: The Work of Ritual, Storytelling, and Growing Older*, ed. Barbara Myerhoff (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992). (This paper appeared originally as the introduction to Ruby, *A Crack in the Mirror*.)

26. Like the other CVA-produced films mentioned thus far, Goslinga's film—while able to stand on its own as a visual text—is enhanced by the existence of a written text that describes the filmmaker's research, her involvement with her research subjects, and her anthropological interpretation of her research results. It is this dual product—a film/video and a written text to accompany it—that Tim Asch, in particular, has asserted is essential to ethnographic film. Timothy Asch, "Using Film in Teaching Anthropology: One Pedagogical Approach," in *Principles of Visual Anthropology*, ed. Paul Hockings (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), 385–420.

27. See Pat Aufderheide, "The Video in the Villages Project: Videomaking with and by Brazilian Indians," *Visual Anthropology Review* 11, no. 2 (1995): 83–93; Sarah Elder, "Collaborative Filmmaking: An Open Space for Making Meaning, a Moral Ground for Ethnographic Film," *Visual Anthropology Review* 11, no. 2 (1995): 94–101; Jacqueline Urla, "Breaking All the Rules: An Interview with Frances Peters," *Visual Anthropology Review* 9, no. 2 (1993): 98–106.

28. See Aufderheide, "The Video in the Villages Project"; Faye Ginsburg, "Indigenous Media: Faustian Contract or Global Village?" in *Rereading Cultural Anthropology*, ed. George E. Marcus (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1992), 356–76; Debra Spitulnik, "Anthropology and Mass Media," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 22 (1993): 293–815.

29. Some of Vincent Carelli's material on the Kayapo also falls into this category as well. See Aufderheide, "The Video in the Villages Project"; Vincent Carelli, "Video in the Villages: Utilization of Video-tapes as an Instrument of Ethnic Affirmation among Brazilian Indian Groups," *Commission on Visual Anthropology Newsletter*, May 1988, 10–15.

30. For a detailed discussion of adoption and the postmodern family, see SoYun Roe, "My Husband's Families: Kinship in an International Korean Adoptive Superextended Family" (master's thesis, University of Southern California, 1994).

31. For a theoretical discussion of the relationship between the anthropology of the self and the nation-state, see Ju-hua Wu, "Worlds Incomplete: From Nation to Person" (master's thesis, University of Southern California, 1997).

32. Fredric Jameson, "Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism," *New Left Review* 146 (July-August 1984): 53–92; David Harvey, *The Condition of Post-modernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989); Jean Baudrillard, *For a Critique of*

the Political Economy of the Sign, trans. Charles Levin (St. Louis, MO: Telos, 1981); Jean Baudrillard, *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Wirings*, ed. Mark Poster (Cambridge: Polity, 1988).

33. Christopher B. Steiner, *African Art in Transit* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

34. Given that the filmmaker Roy is himself a graduate student from India, his film *For Here or To-Go*? contains a submerged autobiographical theme—Amitabh is to a great extent his alter ego. Thus Roy's film bridges the two trends we discuss here.

35. Geertz, *Works and Lives*, 132.

36. Marcus and Fischer, Anthropology as *Cultural Critique*.

37. Cool's focus on everyday life reflects the impact of cultural studies and the work of contemporary theorists such as Bourdieu, de Certeau, and Jameson rather than the continuation of anthropology's traditional description of the quotidian practices of a particular culture transferred to a postmodern venue. See Pierre Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1980); Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984); Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984); Jameson, "Postmodernism." For an analysis of the different dimensions of "the everyday" as a prominent ideological construct of academic writing about the social, see George E. Marcus, *Everything. Everywhere: The Effacement of the Scene of the Everyday* (Brasília: University of Brasília, 1993). Marcus suggests that there are three distinct discursive functions of the construct: as a site of moral order, as a site of resistance, and as a site of the experientially real and mundane (4). It is this last function that attracts Cool's attention, for she attributes everyday life with providing her informants with the experiential basis for moral insights.

38. As she describes in detail in her master's thesis, "The Experts of Everyday Life: Cultural Reproduction and Cultural Critique in the Antelope Valley" (University of Southern California, 1993), Cool ascribes to her subjects the status of "experts of everyday life" and finds them paradoxically to be simultaneously critical and perpetuating of dominant middle-class American ideologies. Cool's ethnographic data show that the requirements of home ownership, which her informants have wholeheartedly embraced, conflict with the very ideals of family and community that home is said to represent.

39. For further discussion of the crucial role played by portable synchronous sound in observational cinema, direct cinema, and cinema verité, see Erik Barnouw, *Documentary: A History of the of the Non-fiction Film* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974), 234–41.

40. Ibid., 251.

41. Jenny Cool, "Automatic Borders," unpublished research notes, 1994, n.p.

42. John P. McCarthy, "P.O.V. Home Economics," *Variety* (Los Angeles ed.), July 17–23, 1995, 28. *Home Economics* was broadcast nationally in the United States in July 1997, on the Public Broadcasting Service's independent documentary series *POV*.

43. Ruby, "The Moral Burden of Authorship," 77–78.

44. For a similar statement regarding ethnography, see Marcus and Fischer, *Anthropology as Cultural Critique*, 129.

45. E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic among the Azande* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976); Claude Lévi-Strauss, *The Savage Mind*, 2d ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966).