

Reflecting on *Factish Field*: Art and Anthropology Summer School

Organised by Collective Gallery
and LUX

Held at Collective Gallery
and University of Edinburgh
Monday 10 – Friday 14 June 2013

For five days during June 2013 twenty participants took part in a Summer School organised by Collective and LUX to discuss current practices in art and anthropology. The majority of participants were artists, some trained in anthropology, alongside other arts professionals working in curating, writing and craft.

Factish Field took its starting point from the French anthropologist Bruno Latour's concept of the 'factish', a combination of fact and fetish as a way of thinking about the relationship between facts and beliefs. Latour argues that there are no facts separable from their fabrication and suggests that fetishes, objects invested with mythical powers, are fabricated, and that 'facts' are not. (Latour 2010b)

The structure of **Factish Field** aimed to readdress a balance perceived as missing in some recent debate into the relationships between contemporary art and anthropology — namely that over the past two decades anthropologists have instigated and owned much of the questioning of shared ground between these disciplines. **Factish Field** brought together artists and anthropologists on an equal footing through a series of dialogues around their own work and working methods. Each session, introduced by Angela McClanahan (University of Edinburgh), began in the morning with a conversation between an artist and an anthropologist: Andrea Büttner and Richard Baxstrom, Wendelien van Oldenborgh and Rupert Cox, Mark Boulos and Amanda Ravetz, Duncan Campbell and Tim Ingold, Sven Augustijnen and Angela McClanahan.

Afternoon sessions involved further discussion, talks, presentations, fieldwork exercises and short lectures. In the evening, film works by the contributing artists were shown.

These were:

Andrea Büttner **Little Sisters: Lunapark Ostia** (2012, 42 mins)
Wendelien van Oldenborgh **Bete & Deise** (2012, 40 mins)
Mark Boulos **No Permanent Address** (2010, 28 minutes) and
All That Is Solid Melts into Air (2008, 15 minutes)
Duncan Campbell **It for Others** (2013, 50 minutes)
Sven Augustijnen **Spectres** (2011, 104 minutes)

A key aim of the Summer School was to create a unique opportunity for a small, dynamic group with unparalleled access to leading artists and thinkers in these fields. The curriculum focused on consideration of some of the 'big' questions surrounding both anthropological and art practice, and where they intersect. These included:

Context — where does it play out? In the field, studio, gallery, academia?

Fieldwork — how can artists and anthropologists share research methodologies?

Making — where are the links between theory and practice?

Public — who is the audience? And how is it distributed?

Ethics — who makes the rules and how are they imposed or regulated? Is it important that they are?

This paper summarises some of the discussion held during the week and reflects on current positions within the areas of work covered by **Factish Field**.

It traces aspects of the histories of each field, relating to both film and art in a wider sense; and brings together ideas shared by participants during the Summer School in a speculative way. By considering why looking at art and anthropology is particularly relevant just now, it offers thoughts on how art and anthropology can potentially work together in the future. The text combines researched references with the open nature of discussions held during the Summer School, therefore not all opinions are individually attributed.

1. Positioning Factish Field

Factish Field explored debates on art and anthropology from the past two decades and positioned this squarely in the context of the contemporary art field. Recent research projects, conferences and publications have tended to approach crossovers between contemporary art and anthropology from the perspective of anthropology's language and context, with ontological views being formed through presentations, conversations and texts, then published and distributed within the academic field.

¹ Use of the term 'practice' was discussed throughout the Summer School and criticised as a term applied to an artists' work, often as a notion taken to denote status borrowed from other professions. However, an alternative meaning of the word 'practice' is intended — the idea that one is always 'practising', either at making, thinking or processing work. Throughout this paper, and for want of a better term, 'practitioner' is used to mean either the artists or anthropologists being referenced or both.

Factish Field hosted practitioners¹ from each discipline 'in conversation' with the other over an extended period of time, not necessarily 'in collaboration' or in a 'productive exchange'. This shift takes a fresh approach to debates held at conferences such as Tate's *Fieldworks* in 2003 and *Beyond Text?* at Manchester University in 2007, and in anthologies such as *Contemporary Art and Anthropology* (2006) and *Between Art and Anthropology* (2010) edited by Arnd Schneider and Christopher Wright, all of which have set out to explore the 'speaking terms' between contemporary art and anthropology.

Somewhat critical, yet not addressed explicitly at the outset of the Summer School was the specific context of film — a layered, poly-vocal form of practice that explores trans-disciplinary territory and discourse — a form that resonates within both fields of art and anthropology.

The focus on artists' film brought engagement with a particular genre of work to Summer School participants; unlike, for example the 2000 publication *Site Specificity: The Ethnographic Turn*. This publication brought together artists and anthropologists to analyse the history of correspondences between art and ethnography through contemporary practices that includes engagement with collaborative group dynamics, land art, relational aesthetics and Sophie Calle's poetic 'projects curious'. Film operates very differently from, say, the visceral experience of a 'live' social exchange in a performance project or site specific encounter. Film allows us to view (the surface of) others as subjects whilst observing scenes of intimate detail; these subjects are held at a distance not directly relational to, or in encounter with the audience.

Watching artists' film as the shared point of reference between participants offered the potential exploration of the specifics of film, as well as the amorphous, broader term of 'art'. This developed a more focussed approach within which to recognise and acknowledge differences, and therefore to extrapolate more specifically the 'speaking terms' between anthropology and artist film within the wider context of cultural theory, aesthetics, film theory, visual culture and ethnography. The screening programme offered a selection of films with an ethnographic bent, while the participating anthropologists included examples of other forms of art making in their presentations. This must have affected the way we thought about anthropology during the week, the terms we applied to our discussion and the trajectory the discussion took towards specific issues.

Before considering the wider relationships between art and anthropology it may be worth considering first some specific aspects of the visual, its relationship to ethnographic work and artist film.

2. Visual Anthropology, Ethnography and Artist Film

In the late 1960s Visual Anthropology emerged as a specialist academic field, emphasising the role of vision in formulating types of anthropological knowledge and intertwining experiments with new technologies, technique and knowledge forms, with contemporary experience. The visual orientation of these anthropologists' work — usually in ethnographic film and participant observation — paralleled enquiries that were concerned with innovating anthropology and its application within particular social and political contexts of the post-war world. Around the same time many European and North American filmmakers were concerned with using this new technology to engage with social and political aspects of the contemporary as an everyday experience working to innovate new documentary forms.

However, since the work of most anthropologists and ethnographers was located within academic institutions (where the discipline was established as a social 'science') their pursuit of a certain legitimate, professional status 'resulted in very different trajectories from those characteristic of post war film-makers' who might be seen to have shared similar interests. (p.85 Grimshaw 2001) These anthropologists' were preoccupied with a more conservative reification of their predecessors' ideas and methods, rather than the creative exploration of experimentation with cinema; 'scientific ethnographers within the academy' were bound up 'in an attempt to legitimate their claims to a particular kind of scientific expertise.' (Ibid.)

The idea of the camera as an objective, scientific instrument became linked to this postwar academic consolidation of the field of anthropology, belying the fact that approaching any kind of camerawork involves a particular philosophy and experience which informs the visual encounter. 'Camera work, like drawing and other art practices, involves a certain engagement with the environment and a learned coordination of the senses, which is continuously negotiated and never simply a determination of the materials and technologies being applied.' (p. 119 Cox and Wright 2012) Criticism developed that the production of ethnographic work often illustrated an anthropological research concept, rather than enacting a process-based approach that acknowledged its own essentially visual form and engaged with the properties of film beyond mere 'pictorial representation.' (p.199 Grimshaw 2005)

Writing about the distinctions and convergences between film traditions in the 'age of video' in 1999, Catherine Russell applied the term 'experimental ethnography' to describe the transformative approach by anthropologists who were re-thinking the representation of culture and aesthetics within their work (she cites James Clifford, Stephen Tyler, George E Marcus, Michael Taussig amongst others). Russell's interest lay in the potential for new forms of ethnography to embody the formal experimentation and social theory of ethnographic work, whilst also harnessing the avant guard qualities of experimental film within an expanded field. 'Once ethnography is understood as a discursive structure its affinities with filmic ontologies of memorialization, redemption and loss become a rich source of allegorical possibility.' (p.xvii Russell 1999) Binding together the histories of film

and the problematics of the ethnographic field, Russell offers a powerful analogy from which the exploration of new areas of visual anthropology can emerge; centred on the idea of ethnography moving away from the documentation of culture towards a culture of experimentation. She advocates an 'experimental practice in which aesthetics and cultural theory are combined in a constantly evolving formal combination.' (P.14 Russell 1999)

As evidenced in recent theory, what has emerged since the 1990s is an expanded field of enquiry into the application of the visual within the discipline of anthropology, mainly categorised in 'two distinct poles — the first...the anthropology of the visual, the second, the visualization of anthropology'. (p.199 Grimshaw 2005) Despite its roots in documentary film, visual anthropology is now a much broader field, with practitioners pursuing areas related to the ocular, visual ways of knowing, non-textual methods of knowledge production and embedding criticism of ethnography itself within the production of work.

The 'between place' of both artists' film (addressing both the context of the gallery and the cinema) and visual anthropology (combining the anthropology of the visual with visual forms of anthropology) offers an analogous place of negotiation for further collaboration and discourse.

3. Why is art and anthropology particularly relevant just now?

'Contemporary anthropology, which as we know is much fixated with questions of method, evidence and the [im]possibility of representation refers to current theoretical ideas on material culture to suggest that art often goes 'deeper' into the nature of human relations than anthropology but that the artist still needs the anthropologist to show how deep they are going.' (Irvine 2006)

Running throughout the Summer School was a consideration of the beginnings and endings of each field, as well as open questions around what these respective disciplines are for, and a myriad of examples of the contexts in which these discussions can take place.

The timeliness of dialogue between the disciplines locates itself in a wide number of conditions, found in both the macro and micro contexts of each field. These relate directly to the practitioners' work: their motivations to explore certain subject matter; specific narrative approaches to subjects; expectations of affect between the work and its audience; concerns with materiality and available technologies; as well as in the wider conditions within which work is produced including: institutional contexts; critical theories; funding systems; collaborative relationships; economic exchanges; social and political concerns.

The following section considers some of the groundwork that has informed the various conditions within which contemporary art and anthropology currently meet.

3.1 Contextualising Art and Anthropology's relationships

'Anthropology is defined as the 'traditional' party, therefore evoking the discipline's traditional engagement with art as an 'object of study' rather than as a resource with which to comprehend, reflect upon and better understand human behaviour and anthropological theories.' (Irvine 2006)

Factish Field took its starting point well beyond the roots of an anthropology of art as related to the study of primitivism or an academic concern with aesthetics. It looked at ethnographic elements within contemporary artists' film and forms of quasi-anthropological art making. Nevertheless, it is relevant to reflect on some of the historical trajectories of each field, from which areas of same-ness and differentiation have emerged.

3.2 Anthropology and Academia

Anthropology was founded in amateur and idiosyncratic endeavour, divergent to the folklorist. The discipline's 'profile as a professional mode of enquiry was dependent equally upon its intellectual and institutional consolidation to triumph over amateurism' in order to move from the realm of philosophy to science. (p.86 Grimshaw 2001) The roots of the term of 'amateur' lies in 'amare'; undertaking something for the love of it. As will be explored later, concepts of love resonated with much of the discussion during the Summer School in the ways that artists and anthropologists relate to their subjects, approach research and deal with ethical questions.

By the mid twentieth century, with ethnographers firmly established within academic institutions, two distinct areas of anthropology were pursued in relation to art. An anthropology of art as a specific sub-discipline focussed on art from 'other' places i.e. Primitivism and non-Western, and the ethnographic documentary film traditions mentioned previously. By the 1980s post-colonial and post-modern critique had made an impact on the breadth of work, methods and ideas undertaken in these academic contexts, although these were still tethered to the ideals of undertaking a 'scientific' endeavour.

Primary observation and firsthand experience of the subject was essential to the kind of knowledge that promoted anthropology from an amateur activity to a professional discipline. The observational doctrine based on the Malinowskian² tradition of the 'field of encounter', established fieldwork as the place in which to capture the imponderable truths about human existence and everyday life. In this respect, the act of seeing and the experience of 'being present' provided the anthropologist with validity for any further stages of knowledge production.

² British anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski (1884 – 1942) is often cited as the father of the functionalist school of anthropology and for his role in developing the methods and the primacy of anthropological fieldwork

The 'field' is fundamental to understanding anthropology, since fieldwork is critical in constructing the discipline's particular knowledge forms; it's essentially what 'doing' anthropology is all about. Fieldwork created a normalisation of practice in which the methods, site and context of anthropology are one and the same as the discipline itself. "The field' of anthropology and 'the field' of 'fieldwork' are thus politically and epistemologically intertwined: to think critically about one requires a readiness to question the other." (p.3 Gupta and Ferguson (eds) 1997)

Published in 1986 and associated with a body of academic enquiry *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* 'had two important effects: to make explicit the inadequacy of standard forms of ethnographic writing in dealing with the realities of fieldwork and, therefore, to encourage a critique of the actual process of research itself, of fieldwork.' (p. 24-25 Rabinow and Marcus 2008). Over the next decade or so, further critical and open explorations of anthropological practices have extended ideas about the representation of anthropological knowledge in dialogue with forms and methods of research in other fields of discourse.

The reliance of anthropology on the written form is seen as a barrier to broadening meaningful, co-productive research. Recent projects, conferences and publications plot various phenomenological approaches to the representation of ethnographic experience, signalling renewed interest in forms such as storytelling, performance, art and photography, film or drawing to shift the value attributions of both the ethos and methods of fieldwork and academic research. The 2007 *Beyond Text* conference and forthcoming publication (developed by Rupert Cox and others) aims to move anthropology further away from the connections to literary theory that permeated the field's engagement with identity politics and cultural theory in the 1980s. It raises questions about codifying particular kinds of knowledge production that rely on hermeneutics, looking instead towards a re-evaluation of text and critical writing in anthropology alongside visual, aural and other explorations.

Amanda Ravetz moves her practice between disciplines to circumvent what she sees as academic anthropology's shortcomings, bound by its deeply rooted context of text-orientated research and 'iconophobia'. She describes herself as *neither* an artist nor an anthropologist, but locates her work in the field of visual anthropology, using this as an ambiguous enough term to describe a broad range of work dealing with the visual. This circumvents problematics of keeping her practice in *movement* across the theoretical, territorialised nature of academic disciplines.

In his 1996 text *The Artist as Ethnographer* Hal Foster locates a key moment in developing cross-references between artists and anthropologists in the early 1960s-early 1970s; a time when art practices such as minimalism, the conceptual, performance, the body and site specificity led art to pass 'into the expanded field of culture that anthropology is thought to survey.' (p.184 Foster 1996) Foster characterises the development of a kind of 'artist-envy'³ in anthropologists that later manifested in artists and critics a reciprocal 'ethnographer-envy' as anthropological theory developed increasing prestige within contemporary art. In this analysis the alliances between the disciplines are bound to an understanding of ethnography as: primarily contextual; having culture as its object; arbitrating the interdisciplinary and being self-critiquing in its nature. (p.182 Foster 1996)

³ The reference to the term 'artist-envy' used by Foster stems from James Clifford's term associating the relationships between French anthropologists and surrealist artists in the 1920-30s, Clifford in turn being a major contributor to the move towards self-critique in the field of cultural anthropology in the late 1980s-early 90s.

Much of the work referenced during the Summer School was located in the current discourse about whether an anthropologists' work could be speculative or generative, in the way an artists' might. The consideration of unknown processual outcomes such as failure was also embraced:

Artists themselves have long known that failure is essential to the creative process but perhaps anthropologists also need to embrace failure as being fundamental to the processes of both fieldwork and writing.' (Irvine 2006)

A dominant theme during Summer School was the inextricable link between anthropology, the academy and institutional concerns, whatever the motivations and desires of the anthropologist as an individual. This

pervades recent discourse on art and anthropology. 'The academic environment', as Tim Ingold puts it, 'is profoundly hostile to the task of being alive.' (p.xiii Ingold 2011) The institutional context of anthropology has made it difficult to incorporate 'creative tension that generates new and multiple forms of thinking and writing rather than being an obstacle to a single 'truth'...how might one define its (anthropology's) central subject of the contemporaneous vis-à-vis art, material culture and aesthetic affects?' (Irvine 2006) This question reignites Foster's 'artist-envy' analysis.

3.3 Art and Academia

'Although there are important overlaps in the fields of anthropology and art history...the emergence of the academic disciplines over the course of the last century hinged upon their separation and specialisation. Anthropologists and art historians pursued their interests differently through the creation of distinctive objects of study, techniques of inquiry, and theoretical frameworks. However, the practices of contemporary art, specifically the turn towards the ethnographic, call into question many of the established divisions between art history and anthropology...' (p.217 Grimshaw 2005)

Grimshaw's 'meeting point' aligns art history to anthropology before art practice, and omits reference to more radical differences between the art of the academy and the art beyond it. From solid nineteenth century academic foundations, the mid twentieth century saw art education overturn authorities in the expansion of experimental sites for art training and new critical thinking.

Instrumentalising, indexing, audit culture permeates all contemporary fields and sets the parameters of academic frameworks. As 'research-based' art education increases, so do questions about the processes by which art practices are validated through assessment criteria. Many participants in the Summer School had recent experience of practice-based research such as PhDs and were preoccupied with ontological questions, whilst others didn't register such a concern. For some artists, theory is useful as an applied knowledge for their practice, undertaken on a purposeful, individual basis, and not as a subject of interest in and for itself.

Art stands apart from a field like anthropology in that no prerequisite academic or professional standards or qualifications are necessary before you can practice. However, academic contexts demand that artists articulate their research and knowledge in particular ways. The application of '-ologies' to non-scientific fields was discussed from the outset of Summer School with Andrea Büttner's assertion of a use of methods but not methodologies in making art. Büttner spoke of her interest, not in a discipline per se, but in the *specifics of a human context*, criticising how research-driven training in art is often counterintuitive to processes of art-making.

The artists in the Summer School all derided the notion of a defined methodology informing their practice; stressing the improvisatory nature of filmmaking. The importance of chance — whether in their initial approach to a subject through reading and research, or during the process of making, as something drawing on skills and situations, containing and enabling things to happen — ran as a common thread throughout the artists' conversations. This was echoed in some of the ethnographic work referenced, including the contemporary work of Michael Taussig exploring the elementary nature of chance and experience within fieldwork and Jean Rouch's ethno-fiction films of the 1940-50s. Rouch was consciously subverting the prevalent intellectual position of contemporaries working in cinema by using the mobile, embodied position of the camera along with improvisatory and constructed potential that was 'driven by his own film-making practice...the very nature of his work, in its particular location (Africa) and subject matter (the migrant experience).' (p.79 Grimshaw 2001)

Critique of the academisation of art remained a hot topic throughout the week. Academia tends to assume that a piece of work (research) should be capable of being picked up by someone else and built upon. This is based in the scientific premise that an experiment should be repeatable. Tim Ingold discussed how too much importance is often placed on making meaning through methods, focusing on technique over the content and personality of the work itself.

These challenges question the understanding of knowledge production through art that is based in theoretical research in other fields, and is one of the reasons why anthropologists like Amanda Ravetz and Angela McClanahan are involved in teaching and supervising within art schools and university courses. They look for new ways to work in response to an individual artists' practice that utilises their own anthropological knowledge and experience of regulatory frameworks.

In a recent discussion around the definition of terms for cross disciplinary knowledge to contribute to the design of an 'anthropology of the contemporary' George E Marcus asks whether 'anthropological research offer(s) a distinctive sensibility about things that are already known or equivalently known in other discourses and disciplines of inquiry?' (p.61 Rabinow and Marcus (eds) 2008) This question is just as pertinent to the discussion of particular academic contexts for the production of contemporary art as a knowledge practice.

Perhaps contemporary critique about expanding professionalisation across art's vocational and academic environments could be seen as analogous to the trends in professionalising anthropology as a discipline in the 1950s? This concern about professionalisation has been driven partly by the accountability context of contemporary audit culture, and partly perpetuated by growing capital and public interest in art and holds relevance far beyond academia.

A key question during Summer School was how to locate discourses predominantly founded on academic concerns back into the practice-based context of art production?

4. Art worlds and anthropology

In reviewing the selection of artists included in the 2006 anthology *Contemporary Art and Anthropology* Andrew Irvine writes that according to the logic of anthropology 'all art that is currently being made and produced in different parts of the world needs to be understood as 'contemporary art', and if not then by what criteria and on whose authority are the multiple and various forms of art currently being produced declared 'traditional'?' (Irvine 2006) He questions whether anthropologists should buy into 'this language and form of representation, for whenever processes of categorisation, temporalisations of difference and restrictions of the interpretative multiplicity of art occur we have to look at the power operating behind the scenes, which in this case is the western art-world/ industry whose terms...anthropologists cannot accept uncritically'. (Ibid)

Though restricted, the artworlds considered in this paper, and in the Summer School in general, are those most closely affiliated with the organisers Collective Gallery and LUX. The wider implications of institutional contexts surrounding them are also considered when suggesting how art and anthropology currently relate.

4.1 Making and audiences

Fieldwork, like filmmaking, encompasses notions of time, temporality, experience and distance.

'The 'field', as in 'fieldwork', is actually a meeting place of worlds, a interzone consisting of fieldworker and field creating therein a collage or intertext. The anthropologist is not presenting a picture of another reality so much as inhabiting a switchback by which one reality is pictured in terms of the other, which, in turn, provides a picture of that which pictures it!' (p.145 Taussig 2011)

Conventionally the ethnographer derived their own original and distinctive form of research from a long process of pre-planning before entering the field 'belatedly'. Fieldwork becomes the site in which their pre-formulated research proposal is challenged and/or illustrated. As exemplified by the title of George E Marcus' 2003 essay *On The Unbearable Slowness of Being an Anthropologist Now: Notes on a Contemporary Anxiety in the Making of Ethnography*, anthropology is, by nature, a slow process. As with art, the processes involved are often slower than funding and administrative support structures acknowledge.

Fieldworkers who 'work with a strict plan of investigation, which is what the granting agencies insist they manifest *before* they even go into the field' tend to use their research notes as 'devices to eliminate chance... (However,) fieldwork is essentially based on personal experience and on storytelling, not on the models of laboratory protocols. Although few actually believe in the ritual of the laboratory.' (p.48 Taussig 2011)

As with the processes of filming and editing, relationships of distance and proximity to a subject emerge in the processes between taking notes/filming in the field, adapting this information through rationalizing processes of writing/editing and the reader/viewer's reception of them. These are philosophical prerequisites to the way in which most artists, and some contemporary anthropologists approach their work.

Wendelien van Oldenborgh stated that after some reading, her making process *is the research*; that, through observation, relationships with people become an important part of this process. The willingness *or not* of subjects or audiences to participate becomes a part of the work — importantly they alter the artist's control of the material. Situations she sets up create content whilst editing constructs form, moving between the visual and aural, textual and material. Like Büttner she takes a long time to get to know the subjects in preparation for filming and producing the work. This process might include using different personalities to represent positions in historical narratives. By doing so, the film itself can perform, out of the material. As Augustijnen puts it, the film is not a research document; 'the film is made by the people who appear in it, who act in it.'

Is desire of an unknown outcome a condition of the artist? This approach to open-endedness demands a sense of self-awareness without self-consciousness where the artist is able to navigate the complexities of their attraction to a particular subject. For Büttner this is an essential part of her working process — being open to her own insecurities and going into fields of the unknown. Taking a position like this in the 'field' requires conviction and confidence in order to work with whatever emerges. Whilst these artists' projects usually begin with an awareness of a question in the social sphere (such as van Oldenborgh's interest in the Netherland's colonial past), Rupert Cox spoke of the need for a research project in anthropology to start with a question of public consciousness to avoid an individual, open approach.

In the artists' films shown during Summer School the geographic setting depicted (the 'field'?) often wasn't the 'real' place of encounter being implied by the artists' narrative approach. A counter-intuitive, perhaps anti-anthropological approach was being brought into play, whereby Sven Augustijnen's film set in the Congo was actually about Belgium and Boulos' depiction of the Marxist New People's Army in the Philippines alluded to his desire to navigate his own place within the capitalist western world, combined with French feminist theory! Whether or not the audience engages with this circumvention, is inherent to how we experience images of others. As Foster puts it alterity is imbricated with our own unconscious since the 'other' is always associated with 'elsewhere.' (p.178 Foster 1996), and this is at its most conspicuous in a form such as ethnographic film. The artists' own awareness of these pitfalls resonates with Taussig's assertion that all fieldwork, wherever it takes place, and the resulting material it produces 'is about experience in a field of strangeness' (p.120, 2011)

One repeated point made by practitioners during the Summer School was an acknowledgement within the making process/fieldwork/research of what

others noticed about them as well as what they noticed about others. This implies that the work being discussed had an audience embedded within the making process.

'Much of anthropology, certainly most that is funded, thus turns out to be telling other people's stories without realising that's what you are doing.' (p.49 Taussig 2011)

To counter accusations of anthropology's failure to create the conditions for consensual, active participation by ethnographic subjects various methods have been developed including a kind of 'feedback loop' described in Rupert Cox's research. He plays his initial field recordings back to the subject in situ before further stages of work are developed alongside their responses to the primary material. This differs significantly from the working methods of the participating artists who wouldn't necessarily disclose footage to subjects during the making process. Although their subjects are implicated in the process, it's through their relationship to the artist; they don't necessarily become 'public' within the work until after the film is fully edited.

The importance of the particularities of an architectural space in relation to the commissioning of work was mentioned by Duncan Campbell, Mark Boulos and Wendelein van Oldenborgh. How they articulate their responses to an exhibition space as the site of distribution, and the nature of the audience's engagement in a specific space, can also be critical in forming the work. As van Oldenborgh put it, the art world is a partial world but it has an engaged public. A certain kind of intimacy can be 'lived out' anywhere in the public realm but it's important how the work is shown in a *particular* setting and its temporal relationship to that place. The goal is to have an *affect* on audiences but it's important that people themselves chose whether to be engaged *or not* with the work.

In a presentation at the Tate conference *Fieldworks* in 2003 Susan Hiller related the artist to 'the culture of the audience and of the audience to the artwork'. She highlights, in the making of art, a 'profound knowledge of the cultural context out of which it is produced and in which it is subsequently placed' whether or not it 'makes visible to its audience the constructed-ness of aspects of that context.' This contributes to an understanding of what might otherwise appear to be an illogical, mystified and overlooked aspect of art making when approached by the anthropologist, namely 'the labour of (not always conscious) cultural analysis which precedes the making of an artwork' (Bowman 2003)

4.2 The Future of Narrative

A recent issue of *Frieze* art magazine set out to explore the nuances of objects and words (a popular subject in contemporary anthropological discourse). Poet and novelist Ben Lerner articulated that although theory has contributed to the understanding of language as a material, i.e. we know 'that it can be thingly, that the book is a specific medium, and so on', he is continually drawn to more tactile forms, considering that 'a work of visual art – even a photograph or film installation – is more real, more actual, than a machine made out of words.' (Lerner 2013)

One might also consider this relationship of words to 'post-internet' art in our contemporary engagement beyond material culture. While web platforms and digital tools have shifted nodes of content production and distribution — relocating ideas of power and agency as well as mixing up terms such as amateur, artist, user, consumer, producer, professional and social — roles have become more complex and intermingled. Digital technology, and to some extent contemporary art, has affected notions of journalistic practice, resonating in the discussion of documentary forms explored by artists contributing to the Summer School. Artists can work inbetween the lines of fact, fiction, theory and reality without obligation to any sense of idealised journalistic integrity. Meanwhile the form of factofiction expounded by reality television has become ubiquitous. It has moved far from 'straightforward truth, showing us that when we look sideways at it, it begins to become indistinguishable from fiction — which isn't necessarily a bad thing.' (Lange 2013)

Ideas about narrative form are linked to an evolving world of information distribution and software as language. In response to being asked to predict the future of storytelling forms artist Ian Cheng writes, 'now it's 2013, and there's the feeling that the straight story can no longer normalise the complex, unpredictable forces of reality that intrude with greater and greater frequency, let alone the incessant stream of big data reporting on these complexities...Specialists turn to non-intuitive technologies like quantitative analysis, simulation modelling and probability...But for the rest of us, this kind of non-human storytelling is counterintuitive...We receive it, but we don't feel it, so we can't embody it. Anxiety takes hold when embodied narration fails...To be ready for the future is not to imagine outlandish cure-all technologies, but to do the work of developing formats to integrate intuitive and non-intuitive technologies.' (Cheng 2013)

4.3 Sociology and the Social in Art

In *The Artist as Ethnographer* Foster outlined a decoding of art and its situation by citing projects that implied a quasi-anthropological intention, but usually paid little attention to the participant-observation principle that underpins anthropological fieldwork. His criticism addressed site specific projects that aimed to be politically engaged or institutionally transgressive but by their very relationship to commissioning and funding institutions

acted more as franchises, becoming social outreach, economic development or a form of public relations within communities. (p.196 – 198 Foster 1996) Contemporary theorising of the political and apolitical agency of working in specific sites and contexts continuously diverges and evolves, particularly in recent analysis of working 'with' not 'on' communities. This is prompted by artistic or theoretical interests in the potential for exploratory and multi-authored processes of making, alongside the availability of public funding for participatory and publicly sited art in the UK.

In social contexts of art making, one finds co-productive connections with anthropological work. For instance, Tim Ingold and Jo Vergunst's departmental research at the University of Aberdeen under the title *Culture from the ground: walking, movement and placemaking*, is based around the simple concept of 'sharing ground' with others in the same community; exploring what it means to walk on the same ground and share the same viewpoint. Their work is focussed on the locales ('field') in which the anthropologists themselves live and work, and is aligned to conversations with arts organisations based in these communities who are also engaged in their own research around social processes in art making. In Aberdeenshire this research has influenced the conceptualising of a Walking Institute at Deveron Arts⁴ and explorations of participatory production and distribution of art in the curatorial programmes at Scottish Sculpture Workshop in Lumsden. In these cases academic research becomes embedded organically into the work of arts organisations over time and contributes to new understandings of place and audience in relation to the work they produce.

⁴ See <http://www.deveron-arts.com> As a concept The Walking Institute grew from a project with artist Hamish Fulton.

When questioned about the ethical nature of his collaborations with the subjects of his films Mark Boulos responded that he couldn't make a film about someone he didn't love. Echoing this, Sven Augustijnen said of his subjects in the film *Spectres* 'I feel, you can feel that I love those people' whilst Andrea Büttner cited the important process of befriending the subjects of her films.

Trust, friendship and affect were recurrent themes at Summer School and relate to other considerations of the ways in which we work and organise ourselves. Artist Celine Condorelli recently wrote (in relation to self organised practice in the arts), 'I have been engaging with what I call support, which I consider essential to cultural production...Friendship is a fundamental aspect of personal *support*, a condition of doing things together that deserves substantial attention...Friendship, like support, is considered here as an essentially political relationship of allegiance and responsibility. One of the best definitions of cultural production is perhaps that of 'making things public': the process of connecting things, people, contexts. Friendship in this way is both a set-up for working and a dimension of production.' (p.63 Hebert & Karlsen (eds) 2013)

These ideas of allegiance and responsibility relate back to the generative potential of the co-optive nature of interdisciplinary endeavour (in this case, art and anthropology). Work could be undertaken based upon notions of friendships formed between fields rather than through pseudoscientific adopting of 'methodological strategies'.

One of the conditions of the ambiguous construction of the artworld (in comparison to more regulated professional or academic fields) is an invisible, and often overlooked, reliance on the gift economy. Unpaid labour, reputational capital and collaborative tendencies underpin a great deal of the artworlds' hierarchies. Marcel Mauss' exploration of gift economies in publications such as *The Gift* (1954) is often cited in relation to the exchange of burden and indebtedness that accompanies the giving of gifts, whereby they construct and reinforce non-egalitarian systems. Applying a feminist analysis to bodies of research into the power relations of non-monetary exchange by scholars such as Mauss and Malinowski, Marilyn Strathern's *The Gender of the Gift*, 1988 resonates with on-going artworld debates about inherent power relations. Just as in conventional capitalist economies, those who produce 'gifts' are usually separated from those who exchange them, and thereby fail to benefit to the same extent from the personal and professional status gained through the value transformations created by gift commodification within a given market.

In discussing the analogies between open source software and models of exchange in the artworld, artist Simon Yuill takes the term 'isomorphism' from an ecological context, a concept by which two entities are indistinguishable given only a selection of their features. He uses 'organisational isomorphism' to describe a tendency for 'alternative' structures contributing capital within the artworld (such as artist-led institutions) to end up defining themselves through structures and values replicated from their relationships to external agencies (including government, private philanthropists and property developers) with whom they engage to secure funding. Often these agencies transfer risk onto artists, while their work remains unpaid. In the same way, the mitigation of risk can be seen as a rationale behind nepotistic practices that can emerge out of the 'friendship' based social and professional exchanges of the artworld.

4.4 Understanding Conditions of Art Production

The ubiquitous contemporary reference to 'global culture' presupposes an understanding of complex social determinants that are difficult to systematise. According to Marilyn Strathern this would require conceptual 'relocations and dislocations of concepts inherent to the practice of making knowledge'. (p.153 Strathern (ed) 1995) Before the 1990s culture was generally understood in reference to 'local forms or expressions' through gender, kinship, ritual, structures, domain, etc, unlike accounts of globalism which by the mid 1990's were predicated on 'the presumption that cultures manifest a universal form of self-consciousness about identity' through which 'global culture appears to constitute its own context' and conceals 'the relational dimensions of social life'. (p.157 Strathern (ed) 1995)

Strathern addresses how the concept of globalisation has become a stand-in for a kind of circumvented specific; 'a global phenomenon summons no further exemplification: it is a macrocosm, a complete

image, and requires no theoretical underpinning...Local affords a different use. This is a relational epithet, for it points to specificities and thus to differences between types of itself — you cannot imagine something local alone: it summons a field of other 'locals' of which any one must only be a part. In this regard 'global-local relations' functions as a localising rubric in so far as it points to co-ordinates which in specifying limits thus define (confine) a field.' (p.167 Strathern (ed) 1995)

This aligns with the art context under discussion here — firstly in the totalising tendencies for identity formation that public policy supports in the production and distribution of contemporary art (described in more detail below); and secondly in the mimetic and re-referencing tendencies of contemporary art. These tendencies, in turn, sit awkwardly alongside a prevalent narrative about individual exceptional-ness that fuels the necessity of the contemporary art market for the ever-new, ever-novel, ever-unique.

Anthropology, like sociology and other related fields, offers analytical tools to better understand the circulation of art and artists alongside the social, economic and cultural conditions of their work. The agency of an individual artist and the agency of the artwork are both in circulation in the artworld. They have variable capital, not always linked to one another, and control over their agency is mutable, especially as the transactional life of the artwork moves further from its maker or originator. As Alfred Gell sets out in his question over the need for an anthropological theory of visual art, the conditions of status for the art object are unstable and temporal. The complex set of questions of social relations and settings that denote the 'art object' as such, either at the site of origination, or reception, or both, reflect why "a purely cultural, aesthetic, 'appreciative' approach to art objects is an anthropological dead end." (p.5 Gell 1998)

In contemporary anthropology the complex flux of people and things in the global market is often analysed through a focus on objects and their network agency. Cross disciplinary thinking about globalisation, cultural anthropology, economics and shifting contexts of ecology plays an increasing role in relation to analysis of the art market, through works such as Arjun Appadurai's *Social Life of Things* which deals with the fetishism of commodities — whereby objects or things takes on a social life of their own through the exchanges and different uses that are applied to it — or Bruno Latour's review of contemporary attempts to tackle ecological problems by connecting the tools of scientific representation to those of art, anthropology and politics. In a recent paper Latour explains complex ideas about forms and action potential of networks using the visual complexities of an artwork by Tomas Saraceno. (Latour 2010a)

Material anthropology, its relation to contemporaneity and concern with the 'thingness' of objects holds much interest for contemporary artists. Whilst the writing and lectures of leading contemporary figures such as Latour or Gell have transferred into use in many other contexts, it is worth considering the broader contexts of the fields from which their work and thinking has developed, as well as the resistance to those ideas from those within the field itself.

Tim Ingold has explored the use of the term materiality in recent anthropological and cultural studies. In his 2007 essay *Materials against Materiality*, he reacts against a prevalence in the field of anthropology to deal with the life of objects at the expense of material itself (Ingold 2011). For Ingold it is critical to investigate materiality as fundamentally the study of the 'stuff' of things, with the source being the primary 'thing' before it takes form as an object. Materials have a life of their own and happen to come together temporarily as a 'thing', just as humans are created temporarily by bringing together materials into form. His argument pushes for a more elementary understanding of the world, full of things and stuff rather than finished objects. The fluidity of his way of thinking about the world relates back to his ideas of understanding art through making; this interest lying in what motivates the different ways we 'do' things. Ingold sees a way out from the problematics of an anthropology of art by joining in with the practice of art making. This creates a first-hand experience, seeing what emerges from the learning process rather than analysing an art object as a fixed entity.

4.5 Art and Public Policy

The determination of an articulation of public purpose and value of art has been formed in the UK policy context through the participatory agenda of the New Labour administration (1997 – 2010), then confounded in service to divergent streams, both in the recent austerity rhetoric bound to Westminster budget cuts and to Scottish, Welsh and Northern Irish independence/devolution contexts as a part of anti-colonial, cultural identity rhetoric.

In his essay *I don't want to be us* (to accompany Duncan Campbell's film *It for Others*) Daniel Jewesbury writes about current trends of capital and policy in cultural production: 'The mass of humanity is thus disaggregated into sects and sub-cliques, demographic and socio-economic niches. The market beckons us into an introspective search for the soul of our ethnos, and we stagger through one convulsive celebration of our ever-more nuanced difference after another: cities of culture, capitals of design, Olympic Games, Commonwealth Games, world cups, European cups, historical commemorations, all pass by one after another.' (p.4 Jewesbury 2013)

As Jewesbury highlights, public funding for art is increasingly linked to the totalising intentions of identity marketing through 'national celebrations' of arts and culture, which are promoted within the structure of these festivals and thematically-led projects. The profiling and production of large-scale arts projects has become increasingly linked to government agendas with the commodifying intention of this enhancing a publicly orientated 'search for the soul of our ethnos' (ibid).

This context affects the production and distribution of art in the UK — especially outside London, where the structures of the art world are dependent on public capital. Traces of anthropological theory have trickled through management studies to influence thinking behind cultural policies. Meanwhile contemporary audit culture has forced all disciplines into increasing self analysis of their methods, purpose and audiences, often without first developing adequate, nuanced, appropriate evaluation terms, thus rendering much of this work superficial and unconstructive. Tracing ideas back to their source and engaging in discussion about influences on public policy can empower artists and art institutions to define new fields of reference that are relevant to them, and anthropology can offer a number of ways to approach this.

4.6 Discussion of Ethics

The notion of a code of ethics is more common to the institutional or academic mandates surrounding anthropology than art practice. The ways people might have been 'used' or 'manipulated' within the making of work was questioned throughout Summer School. Questions arose about the contractual and consensual agreements between researcher or filmmakers and subjects, payment rights for their participation and how permissions were negotiated at different stages of the working process. Anthropologists spoke of sharing their work in progress with subjects and consideration of the social contexts in which they were portrayed, whereas artists tended not to assume this was critical, even though they often developed close relationships during the course of making work.

Augustijnen answered a question on his responsibility to the potential disappointment of subjects who are edited out of a final work, with the response that these are difficulties that are simply part of the process. He navigates this through respect for others, whereby it's more respectful to follow the work to his idea of its natural conclusion, than to try to pre-empt another person's feelings. Büttner challenged the idea of the moral charges implied by certain terms such as voyeurism. For her, 'ethics' has become a normative term describing wider trends and undercurrents that come from, often conflicting, outside contexts.

Amanda Ravetz discussed a clear distinction that emerged during her 2007 workshop *Connecting art and Anthropology*, in the sense of responsibility to ethics in each field. Artists tended to prioritise the work whilst the anthropologists prioritised the people involved in the work. Behind this lies a complex set of implications about judging circumstances on behalf of the needs of others. The responsibility an artist takes in relation to the people they work with could be based more on their conduct as a person in the world than a professional ethical code of practice. The need for codes of conduct is more explicit in the world of anthropology since people are so clearly foregrounded and 'othered' by the author/researcher in that discipline.

The notion of empathy between participating artists and the subject of their films was also explained as an ethics of love for the people they work with. Rather than ask whether the artist stands outside of the moral codes of other spheres, should we ask instead what the artist's approach to the subject has to do with the process of making and the relation of affect to the work's audience? Often the assumption that an artist sees art as exempt from ethical responsibility comes from a process of miscommunication; ambivalence and ambiguity do not automatically equate to exploitation.

5. Key issues and future research

5.1 Summary

In setting out the common ground between the two disciplines at the start of the Summer School Angela McClanahan cited the interconnectedness between the practitioner and their experience of the lived world. This was followed through in the artists' and anthropologists' common motives of seeking to better understand the world around and beyond their immediate experience; whether located in Tim Ingold's rationale of making as the process to understand things; Mark Boulos' interest in particular subjects for his films being linked to his exploration of self within the complexities of social, political and cultural difference in societies; or Wendelein van Oldenburg's exploration of the post-colonial relationship of the Netherlands to Brazil.

This urge to communicate 'human' experience of the world links anthropology and art in both representational or sensual forms, whether politically inflected or self-reflective. Common amongst participants in the Summer School was an interest in the experimental, the improvised and the generative in terms of how research or art could make impacts on our understanding of the self and societies. Overlaps between fields were seen in the exploration of modes of documentary form; the relationships between practitioner, publics and subjects; and investigating materiality through translatability. A number of distinctions also remained, often linked to value systems, vocabulary and terminology. This is unsurprising:

'It would be naïve to imagine that along with the borrowing of constructs goes the borrowing of the understandings that produced them. It is important to know the way such borrowings recontextualise the conceptual intent with which the constructs were once used.' (p.154 Strathern (ed) 1995)

Questions over the use of language, both within and across the disciplinary discourses, kept returning during the Summer School. The key to recognising or understanding specific terms (practice, fieldwork, ethnography, film as public art, site specificity, etc) seems to come through establishing the content and context inferred by their use, in order that the listener or reader is keyed into a more detailed analysis. This might not matter so much in the discussions about individual work (since disparities abound between practitioners within the same disciplines anyway) but more in the discussions surrounding the production of the work — contexts such as academic, gallery-based, biennale, commission, etc — which conceal disciplinary codes and institutional hierarchical meaning. What claims could we make for the usefulness of a new vocabulary to determine future discourse and criticism? And how does this relate to compliance with institutional support structures?

Problematics also occur when comparative transposition is attempted, or rather forced, in the form of collaboration. Recognising what makes and keeps things separate and distinct is also important. The long, established histories of difference between the fields is an area to mine in and for

itself. In relation to re-imagining the field of visual anthropology Amanda Ravetz and Anna Grimshaw have advocated not an expansion of theories of the 'visual' but an extension of 'the scope of image-based forms of ethnographic inquiry by means of a fuller engagement with artistic practice itself' (p.195 Grimshaw 2005). The films shown and discussions held during the Summer School contributes much to this sense of a fuller engagement.

Whereas some crossovers between art and anthropology can be gleaned through examples of research as practice/practice as research, others are coincidental, experiential or unintended. Often strategies applied by an artist are only apparent to them after the work is made rather than being conspicuous before and during the making process. Therefore the contexts around the work tend to come about through long-term engagement with making; in aspects of the world that the artist takes into themselves, absorbs and processes over time. This leads to further questions about the relation of working processes to conditions of temporality and contemporaneity.

Being a maker means you can operate between things. Artists' film can layer and conflict meanings, without explicitly directing the audience to this. Anthropology usually demands a specific kind of information to be disclosed, such as the filmmaker's discoveries in the field or a new knowledge about the subject that the film has produced.

Despite the application of art methods within their work, anthropologists like Ingold and Cox don't express a desire to transfer into the other discipline — to move from 'artist-envy' to 'artist'. They are motivated by a desire to reshape anthropology away from its writing-based bias towards what Ingold calls a 'graphic anthropology' or in Cox's case, the immersive potential of sound. They use processes of making akin to art in order to explore research subjects and reach new conclusions; conclusions that might involve the importance of failure within process, embrace non-knowledge, not knowing, transference to further research, and so on.

What motivates anthropologists to work at edges of their discipline and incorporate art research and practices into their work? Are they driven by a desire for new audiences or a more generative process of knowledge production? In settling out new approaches to the discipline how does an interest in art practices impact on the anthropologists' understanding of the subject, the form or the intention of their work? As Angela McClanahan posed at the beginning of the week, how do these factors impact on the territoriality of the disciplines and the possibility for new ontological understanding? What would a potential new understanding be based on? What conditions does it require to function progressively? Who sets this up, and for whose understanding?

A number of areas could be explored further in relation to these questions: the parallel histories between anthropology and art in relation to the cinema, ethnographic and artist film; the problematics inherent in an anthropology of the contemporary whereby it destabilises the discipline's 'privilege of being out of time' (Tobias Rees. p.55 Rabinow and Marcus (eds) 2008) as analogous to the speculation on future narrative structures

in art; or the disparities between work outside the academy and within, addressed through an exploration of the concept of amateur anthropology, beyond the institution.

Any attempt to coherently summarise the five long days of discussion that took place during Summer School will inevitably fail. Other approaches could be pursued, such as drawing on the artists/anthropologist conversations that took place each day to extrapolate and expand on their nuanced approaches to particular themes. By using the narrative qualities inherent in these conversations, consequential contexts of exploration would be firmly rooted in the lived experiences of the practitioners themselves.

5.2 Ending

Let's return to Latour's concept of the 'factish': facts inseparable from their own fabrication, combined with fetishes — objects invested with mythical powers. He pursues this as a 'critique of critique, or the possibility of mediating between subject and object, or the fabricated and the real, through the notion of 'iconoclasm,' making productive comparisons between scientific practice and the worship of visual images and religious icons.' (Latour 2010b)

The use of fiction as a form of reality has gained increasing validity as a way of understanding our complex contemporary culture. It allows us to stay within the troubled nature of staged encounters in order to understand our place within them. In the same way performance within documentary is not by nature inauthentic; a person who is subject of a film is acting even if they are not 'performing' in a particular way. In the films screened during Summer School, there seems no more 'real' a depiction of any particular subject however they are portrayed — whether in the performance of a monologue doctrine to camera by a man in the Niger Delta in Boulos' film; in the self promoting but tentative interplay between Jacques Brassinne and Patrice Lumumba's family in Augustijnen's film; or the staggered choreography of interactions between the two female leads in Van Oldenborgh's work. Duncan Campbell's work over the past few years has approached the representation of particular histories from the perspective of a particular individual, using archive material to circumvent the sense that a representational reality of that person is being created. Instead, he makes a more explicitly constructed and contextual reading of them.

Ambiguity towards the 'real' feeds alternative ideas of what reality is. It contradicts the allusion that a 'wholeness' can be created around a particular subject or depiction — often the desired outcome of anthropological work. Cox discussed the need for everything (research, new learning, intention, etc) to be present and contained within a work and implied that this offers audiences a clearer reading. However, this notion is contested within contemporary art practice where the work is rarely being directed towards a specific, resolved state. Stages of completion might be seen as a more common form of resolution in art, but the question

remains whether the intention for resolution exists in the work itself or in its relationships in the world? Does the desire for sense of resolution find itself located in the subject or with the materiality of the work, or both? For many artists their role as the work's maker isn't a prerequisite for them to resolve the meanings of the work for themselves. According to Campbell it's often the unresolved nature of a work that gives it its agency, gives it the potential to act in a world of further encounters. Often the only demand for a work to be finished, or at least to appear finished, is from its status as a commodity in the market.

Michael Taussig's critique of the problematics of desiring resolution within fieldwork and the distribution of anthropological work resonates with this:

'as for the story-laden character of anthropological knowledge and hence its notebooks, is it not the ultimate betrayal to render stories as "information" and not as stories...The next step in this betrayal is the instant translation of the story into a fact, or what is called "Data", and along with that the storyteller is translated into an "informant". Once these steps have been achieved (and the process is rapid fire and unconscious), the philosophical character of the knowing is changed. The reach and imagination in the story is lost.' (P.145 Taussig 2011)

Transformative relationships involved in art production and the art market are complex. McClanahan reveals ways in which anthropology can deepen our understanding of value attribution within the exchange systems of art. She cites contemporary anthropologists such as Taussig and David Graeber whose analyses of economy, capital, labour and value systems highlight the belief systems that have become essential to maintaining the power hierarchies of capitalist markets and western political systems. It's a kind of *magic* that ensures continuing validity of otherwise abstract notions. By describing the art world as a form of politics Graeber's theory shows how magic and scam both play a part in the construction of its value systems. Taussig's ideas promote the understanding of magic metamorphosis or transformative value that objects can gain through exchange. 'Central here is the argument that capitalist politics and economics, like all systems of belief, are largely based on principles of *faith*. If you are in possession of enough economic or political capital, claims you make about certain things can become true *because you say they are*.' (McClanahan 2013) If magic qualities are intrinsic to the institutionalised exchange systems of art that create inherent value, then the art produced within this system can also hold or subvert its own form of magic.

One of the expressions most commonly used by artists throughout the Summer School was '...or not.' This usually followed a detailed, articulate statement about their work in answer to a question posed by someone else. It seems the 'or not' has a location of magic agency; a kind of ambiguity that can extend infinite possibilities. The artist's use of the '...or not...' situates them in a different place and time in relation to a narrative subject. It holds potential as a way to continue addressing questions about the relationships between art and anthropology.

6. Contributors' Biographies

Artists

Sven Augustijnen (°1970 in Mechelen) studied at the Royal Academy of Fine Arts in Antwerp, the Hoger Sint-Lukas Instituut in Brussels, and at the Jan van Eyck Academy in Maastricht. His work concentrates mainly on the tradition of portraiture and the porous boundaries between fiction and reality, using a hybrid of genres and techniques to disorienting effect. His films have been included in exhibitions and festivals in Athens, Basel, Fribourg, San Sebastián, Siegen, Rotterdam, Tunis, Tel Aviv, Tokyo and Vilnius, among others. In 2007 he participated in the documenta 12 magazine project, in collaboration with A Prior Magazine. In 2011 he received the Evens Prize for Visual Arts. He lives and works in Brussels.

Mark Boulos currently lives and works in Geneva, Switzerland and Amsterdam, Netherlands. Boulos received his BA in Philosophy from Swarthmore College and Deep Springs College, USA, his MA from the National Film and Television School, Wendelien van Oldenborgh (2010), AR/GE Kunst Galerie Museum, Bolzano (2010), and the Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam (2008). Group shows include: the CCA Wattis Institute, San Francisco (2012), Frankfurter Kunstverein, Frankfurt (2011), New Frontier at Sundance Film Festival (2011) and the Witte de With Centre for Contemporary Art, Rotterdam (2010). Boulos' work has also been exhibited at the 6th Berlin Biennale for Contemporary Art (2010), the 2nd Biennale of Thessaloniki (2009), the Biennale of Sydney (2008), the Centre for Contemporary Arts, Glasgow, the Bloomberg Space, Hayward Gallery, the Barbican Gallery, and the Institute of Contemporary Art, London. He has received awards from the Netherlands Film Fonds, the Fonds BKVB, Film London, the British Documentary Film Foundation, and Arts Council England.

Andrea Büttner was born in Stuttgart, Germany, in 1972 and studied art, art history and philosophy. In 2010, she completed a PhD on shame and art at the Royal College of Art, London and was awarded the Max Mara Art Prize for Women. Recent solo exhibitions include *Andrea Büttner*, Milton Keynes Gallery, Milton Keynes (2013); *Andrea Büttner*, MMK Museum für Moderne Kunst, Frankfurt am Main (2013); *Andrea Büttner*, International Project Space, Birmingham (2012); *Moos/Moss*, Hollybush Gardens, London (2012); *The Poverty of Riches*, Collezione Maramotti, Reggio Emilia, Italy and Whitechapel Gallery, London (both 2011); and *Three New Works*, Artpace, San Antonio, Texas (2011). She participated in Documenta 13 (2012) and the Bienal de São Paulo (2010). She teaches at the Academy of Fine Arts, Mainz and lives and works in London and Frankfurt am Main.

Duncan Campbell lives and works in Glasgow and produces films that look at representations of the people and events at the heart of very particular histories. Combining archive material with his own footage, his work questions the authority, integrity and intentions of the information presented. Recent solo exhibitions include the Carnegie Museum of Art, Pittsburgh (2012), Belfast Exposed (2011); Artist's Space, New York (2010); Tramway, Glasgow (2010); Chisenhale Gallery, London (2009); Ludlow 38,

New York (2009); Kunstverein Munich (2009); Scottish National Gallery of Modern Art, Edinburgh (2009); MUMOK, Vienna (2009); Tate Britain, London (2009); Baltic, Gateshead (2008); ICA, London (2008); and Art Statements, Art Basel 38 (2008), where he was awarded the Baloise Art Prize. Group exhibitions include Manifesta 9, Genk, Limburg, Belgium (2012), 'British Art Show 7' (2010); Gwangju Biennale, South Korea (2010); 'Fight the Power', Museo Nacional Centro de Reina Sofia, Madrid (2009). Duncan will represent Scotland in the 55th Venice Biennial.

Wendelien van Oldenborgh is an artist based in Rotterdam, the Netherlands. She received her art education at Goldsmiths' College, London during the eighties and lives in the Netherlands again since 2004. Her practice explores social relations through an investigation of gesture in the public sphere. Van Oldenborgh often uses the format of a public film shoot, collaborating with participants in different scenarios, to co-produce a script and orientate the work towards its final outcome, which can be film, or other forms of projection. The double screen installation *La Javanaise* (2012) was shown at the Berlinale Forum Expanded 2013, *Bete & Deise* (2012) premiered in the International Film Festival Rotterdam, *Supposing I love you. And you also love me* (2011) was first shown in the Danish Pavilion of the Venice Biennial 2011, *Pertinho de Alphaville* (2010) at the 29th São Paulo Biennial 2010. Van Oldenborgh has also participated in the 4th Moscow Biennial 2011, the 11th Istanbul Biennial 2009, at the Oberhausen Short Film Festival, Images festival Toronto 2010 where she received the Marian McMahon Award. She has exhibited widely, including at the Generali Foundation, Vienna, the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam, Museum Sztuki Lodz, Van Abbemuseum Eindhoven, Muhka Antwerp. She was awarded the Hendrik Chabot Prize 2011 from the Prins Bernhard Cultuurfonds, the Netherlands. Wendelien van Oldenborgh is represented by Wilfried Lentz Rotterdam.

Anthropologists

Richard Baxstrom is Lecturer in Social Anthropology at the University of Edinburgh. He is the author of *Houses in Motion: The Experience of Place and the Problem of Belief in Urban Malaysia* (Stanford University Press, 2008), the co-author of *Evidence of Forces Unseen: Benjamin Christensen's Häxan* (Fordham University Press, forthcoming 2014), and the co-editor of *anthropologies (Creative Capitalism, 2008)*. He has also published work on urban anthropology, cinema, and art in such publications as *Crossroads*, *Focaal*, *Republics of Letters*, *Parachute: review d'art contemporain, esse: arts + opinions*, and *Rue Descartes*, and is currently completing his latest book entitled *Film and Anthropology* for the new Routledge series *Critical Topics in Modern Anthropology*.

Dr Rupert Cox is a Visual Anthropologist at the University of Manchester. His doctoral research focused on issues of vision and visuality in the representation and practice of the Zen arts in Japan, and has developed into a diversity of research projects and publications on 16th century

folding screens, 19th century automata and modern aircraft — linked by interests in the relationships between technology and the senses and in media practice as a means of conducting sensory anthropology. He has also recently conducted research with an artist and academic at University of the Arts, which combined different media in conjunction with an art installation to produce outcomes that are intellectually meaningful, artistically exciting and have a social impact. It is a project driven by the experience of working on an installation with the sound artist and anthropologist Steven Feld which resulted in an exhibition at the Whitworth art gallery (2007) that coincided with a major conference (Beyond Text) at Manchester University.

Professor Tim Ingold is Chair of the Social Anthropology at the University of Aberdeen. His distinguished career began in the 1970s with ethnographic fieldwork among the Skolt Saami of northeastern Finland, which examined the ecological adaptation, social organisation and ethnic politics of this small minority community under conditions of post-war resettlement. His current research explores three main themes, all arising from his earlier work on the perception of the environment, concerning first, the dynamics of pedestrian movement, secondly, the creativity of practice, and thirdly, the linearity of writing. Starting from the premise that what walking, observing and writing all have in common is that they proceed along lines of one kind and another, the project seeks to forge a new approach to understanding the relation, in human social life and experience, between movement, knowledge and description. At the same time, he is exploring connections between anthropology, archaeology, art and architecture (the '4 As'), conceived as ways of exploring the relations between human beings and the environments they inhabit.

Dr Amanda Ravetz is a visual anthropologist with expertise in the theories and practices of observational cinema; and the interdisciplinary connections between anthropology and art. She trained as a painter at the Central School of Art and Design, London and later completed a doctorate in Social Anthropology with Visual Media at the University of Manchester. She has edited and written for widely cited texts on Visual Anthropology and its relationship to art, including the widely cited 2005 volume *Visualising Anthropology*, with Anna Grimshaw. Her current research projects concern artistic epistemologies; improvisation, play and reverie in art and anthropology; and collaborations through craft.

Dr. Angela McClanahan (summer School Leader) was initially trained in the 'four field' approach to anthropology in the US, which holds that cultural anthropology, archaeology, biological anthropology and linguistics together form a holistic approach to studying culture and cultural change. She subsequently gained a PhD in Archaeology from Manchester University, and lectures in Visual Culture in the School of Art at Edinburgh College of Art. Her primary research interests include examining how people engage with and construct meaning from the material world, and she is currently examining 'contemporary' ruins and processes of ruination, as well as in ethical and sensual dimensions of ethnographic research and art practice.

7. References

Appadurai, A., 1988. *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, Cambridge University Press.

Bowman, G., 2003. 'Anthropology As Art, Art As Anthropology: Fieldworks: Dialogues Between Art and Anthropology: Tate Modern, London, 26 – 28 September 2003'. Available at: http://www.academia.edu/265161/Anthropology_As_Art_Art_As_Anthropology_Fieldworks_Dialogues_Between_Art_and_Anthropology_Tate_Modern_London_26-28_September_2003 [Accessed July 17, 2013].

Cheng, I. (et al), 2013. Future Fictions. *Frieze*, June 2013 (Issue 156). Available at: <http://www.frieze.com/issue/article/future-fictions/>.

Clifford, James and Marcus, G.E., 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, University of California Press.

Coles, A. (ed), 2000. *Site-Specificity: The Ethnographic Turn*, London: Black Dog Publishing.

Cox, Rupert & Wright, C., 2012. 'Blurred Visions: Reflecting Visual Anthropology.' *In The SAGE Handbook of Social Anthropology*. Sage Books, pp.116–129.

Foster, H., 1996. *The return of the real: the avant-garde at the end of the century*, London : MIT Press.

Gell, A., 1998. *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grimshaw, A., 2005. 'Reconfiguring the Ground: Art and the Visualization of Anthropology.' *In Anthropologies of Art*, Clark Art Institute.

Grimshaw, A., 2001. *The Ethnographer's Eye: Ways of Seeing in Anthropology*, Cambridge University Press.

Gupta, Akhil & Ferguson, J. (eds), 1997. *Anthropological Locations. Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*, University of California Press.

Hebert, Stina and Karlsen, A.S. (eds), 2013. *Self-Organised*, Open Editions.
Ingold, T., 2011. *Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description*, London and New York: Routledge.

Ingold, T., 2013. *Making: Anthropology, Archaeology, Art and Architecture*, London and New York: Routledge.

Irvine, A., 2006. 'Contemporary Art and Anthropology (2006). Edited by Arnd Schneider and Christopher Wright.' *Anthropology Matters, North America*, 8. Available at: <http://www.anthropologymatters.com> 2003. [Accessed June 17, 2013].

Jewesbury, D., 2013. *Duncan Campbell*, Glasgow: The Common Guild.

Lange, C., 2013. 'Sifting fact from fiction.' *Frieze*, June 2013 (Issue156).

Latour, B., 2010a. Networks, Societies, Spheres: Reflections of an Actor-network Theorist. Keynote speech for the INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR ON NETWORK THEORY: NETWORK MULTIDIMENSIONALITY IN THE DIGITAL AGE 19th February 2010, Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism Los Angeles. Available at: <http://www.bruno-latour.fr/sites/default/files/121-CASTELLS-GB.pdf> [Accessed June 19, 2013]

Latour, B., 2010b. *On the Modern Cult of the Factish Gods*, Duke University Press

Lerner, B., 2013. 'The Actual World.' *Frieze*, June 2013 (Issue 156), p.152–. Available at: <http://www.frieze.com/issue/article/the-actual-world/>.

McClanahan, A., 2013. 'Notes on Contemporary Art and Anthropology. Part 1: Magic, Value, Gifts and Scams.' *Map*, August 2013. Available at: <http://mapmagazine.co.uk/9658/angela-mcclanahan/> [Accessed August 19, 2013]

Rabinow, P. & Marcus, G.E. (eds), 2008. *Designs for an Anthropology of the Contemporary*, Duke University Press.

Russell, C., 1999. *Experimental Ethnography: The Work of Film in the Age of Video*, Duke University Press.

Schneider, Arnd & Wright, C. (Eds), 2010. *Between Art and Anthropology: Contemporary Ethnographic Practice*, Berg.

Strathern, M. (ed), 1995. *Shifting Contexts: Transformations in Anthropological Knowledge*, London and New York: Routledge.

Taussig, M., 2011. *I Swear I Saw This: Drawings in Fieldwork Notebooks, Namely My Own: Drawings in Fieldwork Notebooks, Namely My Own (Google eBook)*, University of Chicago Press.

2003. *Fieldworks: Dialogues between Art and Anthropology*. Available at: <http://www.tate.org.uk/> [Accessed July 17, 2013].

Colophon

The Or Not...

Reflecting on Factish Field: Art and Anthropology Summer School
Kirsteen Macdonald

Published in the UK in 2013 by Collective, City Observatory & City Dome,
38 Calton Hill, Edinburgh EH7 5AA & LUX, Shacklewell Studios, 18
Shacklewell Lane, London E8 2EZ

www.collectivegallery.net
www.lux.org.uk

On the occasion of Factish Field, a series of exhibitions, commissions and
workshops exploring the relationship between Art and Anthropology.

Copyright 2013
Text Kirsteen Macdonald
Publication Collective & LUX

Factish Field was supported by the Creative Scotland Quality Production
Programme and the Fluxus Fund and presented in collaboration with the
University of Edinburgh.

Collective is supported by Creative Scotland and
The City of Edinburgh Council

LUX is supported by Arts Council England

COLLECTIVE



• EDINBURGH •
THE CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL



THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH
Edinburgh College of Art



Supported using public funding by
**ARTS COUNCIL
ENGLAND**