RJAH

Research Article

Section: History and Anthropology

"Objective realism," ethnographic cinema, and the classical model of visual-anthropological research

Igor Pecheranskyi [1]*, Zhanna Denysiyuk [2], Tetiana Humeniuk [3], Valentyna Diachuk [4], Olena Kosinova [5]
[1,3,5]Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Ukraine
[2,4]National Academy of Management Culture and Arts, Ukraine
*Corresponding author: ipecheranskiy@ukr.net
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1443-4646

Abstract
The article examined the emergence and evolution of approaches within the classical model of visual-anthropological research, known as "objective realism," which is closely associated with ethnographic cinema. The study investigated the origin of ethnographic cinema, the first theoretical programs in anthropology, and cinematographic experiences. The main aspects of Vertov's "Cine Eye" theory were explored in the context of objectivism and philosophical ideas of positivism that formed the foundation of visual-anthropological investigations in the early twentieth century. The article considered Bazin's theory of the cinematograph of reality, attempted to implement visualization without an image consistently, and led to utopian ideas within the framework of visual anthropological theory. The principle of the "detached observer" and the technique of autochthonous interpretations, exemplified by the works of Mead and Bateson, were also analyzed, ultimately forming the classical model in visual-anthropological research. The study entailed a thorough literature review and analysis of primary sources to understand the evolution of visual anthropology's approaches. The findings suggested that the classical model of visual-anthropological research, which emphasized detached observation and autochthonous interpretations, had influenced ethnographic cinema and visual anthropology. The results presented could be used to inform and develop the methodology of future visual-anthropological research. The research implications were significant for visual anthropologists and filmmakers alike, as they provided a historical and theoretical grounding for the practice of ethnographic cinema and visual anthropology, contributing to the further development of this field.

Keywords: Cine Eye, Classical model, Ethnographic cinema, Objective realism, Visual-anthropological research

Introduction

The advent of audio and video recording devices along with the rapid development in digital technology has led to the creation of a new audio-visual culture that is emerging in the 21st century. This new visual civilization is significantly different from the culture of the book and the graphosphere of the Gutenberg era, which was dominated by a linear and deterministic worldview.

The development of digital technologies and the widespread availability of audio and video recording devices have resulted in a rapid increase in the number of visual images that we are exposed to on a daily basis. These images are quickly becoming an integral part of modern life, to the point that they are now used in a variety of contexts and for a multitude of purposes.

According to Debray (2008), this marks a significant shift away from the culture of the book and the graphosphere of the Gutenberg era (p. 86). The graphosphere was dominated by a linear and deterministic worldview, which placed great emphasis on the written word as a means of communication and the book as a cultural artifact. However, the emergence of the video sphere and the autocentric, point-event-focused audio-visual culture marks a significant departure from this earlier era.

Sztompka (2005) notes that the culture of the 21st century is increasingly saturated with visual images, which are used for a variety of intended effects. These images are deployed in advertising, entertainment, news media, and other forms of communication and are designed to evoke specific emotional responses in the viewer. They also act as a means of communicating complex ideas and information in a quick and easily digestible format.

The emergence of this new audio-visual culture has also led to the development of new forms of technology, including artificial intelligence, virtual reality, and augmented reality. These technologies have the potential to create even more immersive and engaging experiences for users and can be used in a variety of contexts, from entertainment and education to healthcare and scientific research.

The widespread availability of audio and video recording devices and the rapid development of digital technology have led to the creation of a new audio-visual culture in the 21st century. This new visual civilization is characterized by an abundance of visually rich images that are used for a variety of intended effects. It has also led to the development of new forms of technology that have the potential to revolutionize the way we interact with the world around us.

The specific objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To trace the origins of ethnographic cinema in connection with the emergence of the first theoretical programs in anthropology and cinematographic experiments.

2. To reveal the main aspects of the theory of "Cine Eye" by Dziga Vertov in the context of the conception of objectivism and philosophical ideas of positivism that formed the foundation of visual anthropological studies at the beginning of the 20th century.

3. To expound the concept of film phenomenology by Andre Bazin, whose attempt to consistently implement it led to the emergence of the oxymoron "visualization without an image," and to investigate its influence on visual anthropological theory.

4. To analyze the principle of the "detached observer" and the technique of autochthonous interpretations (using the works of Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson as examples) that ultimately formed the model of absolute objectivity in visual anthropological research.

The *research hypothesis* is that the classical model of objective realism in visual anthropological

investigation, which was formulated in the first half of the 20th century, starting from earlier experiments in ethnographic photography and filmmaking and culminating in the conception of "detached observation" by Margaret Mead, is the initial and essential foundational stage from which visual anthropology as a branch of knowledge and sub-discipline of cultural and social anthropology began to develop.

Literature Review

In the new reality of civilization, numerous anthropological projects are being reevaluated and reactualized. Scientific interest in various models of visual anthropology is intensifying, where the richness and complexity of this way of self-knowledge and the pluralism of competing approaches lead to the need for their philosophical and anthropological understanding. A growing number of articles and monographs, lively discussions at international forums and festivals (International Festival of Ethnographic Films, Nordic Anthropological Film Festival, Festival International Jean Rouch "Bilan du Film Ethnographique," Margaret Mead Film & Video Festival, Aspekty Film Festival of Visual Anthropology, etc.), and the functioning of huge scientific-research centers (The Film Study Center at Harvard University, the Center for Visual Anthropology at the Australian National University, the Granada Center for Visual Anthropology at the University of Manchester, etc.) only prove the popularity and importance of visual-anthropological research on the modern stage.

As is known, the theoretical problems and applied aspects of understanding visual anthropology began in the middle of the 1960s when it formed as an independent (sub) discipline in the frames of cultural anthropology. In particular, it is worth noting the works of American and European authors who at different times developed the theory and methodology of visual research, among them, Mead (2003), Ruby (1996), Heider (2006), Henley (2020a, 2020b), and others.

Nowadays, the theoretical-methodological developments in the branch of visual anthropology still continue. In a number of leading countries, universities contain departments for preparing specialists in the branch of visual anthropology, especially at the University of Tromso in Norway, at the University of Manchester in the UK, at the Temple University in the USA and other countries. Analyzing the latest research and publications, I especially want to single out the following ones. In the series of key texts on visual anthropology and material culture, Gray (2010) analyzes main topics connected with the history and theory of cinema and also with the processes of production, spreading, and accepting content. Sviličić (2011) thinks that the potential of visual anthropology significantly exceeds the usual audiovisual fixation on ethnological realities, and it would be appropriate for the term "visual anthropology" to change into another - "anthropology of the visual" that is more precise because it means a proactive interpretation of visual anthropology, where visual methods are needed to "provoke" the reaction of an individual or community.

The article by Schäuble (2018) is meaningful and conceptual, as the researcher pays attention to various aspects of (sub) disciplines such as image-based technologies and image analysis, ethnographic film, observational cinema, experimental film formats, participatory approaches, and beyond observational cinema. Luvaas (2019) presents interesting thoughts on visual anthropology, which is a result of the cooperation between an anthropologist and a camera in the context of a discussion about new materialism and objective-oriented ontology. In the article "Visual Anthropology," Jenny Chio, which was published in the Cambridge Encyclopedia of Anthropology, emphasizes that this branch pursues at

least two main goals: the creation of anthropological media and the anthropological analysis of media (including films, videos, photographs, drawings, etc.). As of today, the problems of visual anthropology include ethnographic filmmaking and theory, Indigenous and activist media, the study of visual culture, and multimodal anthropology. Thanks to technological advancements and digital media technologies, visual anthropology has managed to transform "understandings of power, authority, and meaning in media-making practices" (Chio, 2021). Other researchers focus on the evolution of visual anthropology, which has now transformed into one of the leading methods of anthropological research, although they mainly focus on ethnographic material, neglecting other components and stages of the classical model (Chakraborty et al., 2023).

This is far from a complete list of modern scientists engaged in the research of various stages and problems in the field of visual anthropology. We can also mention works by Durrington (2013), Grimshaw & Ravetz (2015), Friedman (2017), Groo (2019), Henley (2020b), Vannini (2020), Pavlova (2022), Srivastava (2022), and others. However, upon review and analysis of these and other works, we have come to the conclusion that there is a lack of comprehensive consideration of the classic model of visual anthropological research based on the specifics of visual communication within the Western academic discourse today, which actualizes this scientific search.

Methods

Incorporating interdisciplinary frameworks, visual anthropology, as a sub-discipline of social anthropology, is closely linked to the production of ethnographic films and, since the mid-1990s, to the study of new media. However, identifying it solely with ethnographic cinema may ultimately lead to its marginalization. As Pink (2006) argues, visual anthropology comprises both a research methodology for analyzing visual culture through audiovisual materials as a component of academic argumentation, and an applicable practice that can influence social reality.

The convergence of science (anthropology) and art, film, and text presents an intriguing means of generating anthropological knowledge through film and audiovisual tools that are embodied in several models: from the model of "objective realism" to the research models of "pluralistic realism" and "realism" in indigenous and documentary cinema, ethnographic semiotics, and postmodern criticism of the "detached observer" position within the current theory and practice of visual communication anthropology. Each model entails its unique interpretation of a human, has its theoretical and methodological foundations, and undergoes practical testing within visual anthropological research.

This study draws on Thomas Kuhn's historical-evolutionary approach, which regards the development of science as a holistic process that encompasses knowledge evolution, non-cumulative leaps, and scientific community member activities occurring within a single paradigm of scientific knowledge development (Kuhn, 1996; Marcum, 2015). Together with Hilary Putnam's belief that, despite the falsity of individual theories and facts, scientific knowledge still develops cumulatively in the sense that a reasonably approximated theory is usually correct and ultimately becomes a regular component of our knowledge foundations (Putnam, 1996), the methods of structuring, systematization, and description enable a conceptual interpretation of the genesis of visual anthropology and its empirical history, as well as an analysis of the classical (historically first) model of "objective realism" of visual anthropology.

Results and Discussion

Near the Origins of Ethnographic Cinema: The First Theoretical Programs and Experiments

Many modern scholars highlight the co-evolution of the first theoretical programs of anthropology with the earliest cinematographic experiments in the 19th century, which reached their zenith in the 1920s (Grimshaw, 1999; Coover, 2009; Gray, 2010; Sviličić, 2011; Henley, 2020a). This parallel development was a response to the paradigmatic and socio-cultural changes at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries which led to a re-evaluation of one's self, others, and the world. Anthropology emerged as a system of knowledge about human beings, while cinema became a new practice that broke away from existing forms and conventions.

The first «film tests» produced by the Lumière Brothers, such as «La Sortie de l'usine Lumière à Lyon» and «L'Arrivée d'un train en gare de la Ciotat,» were undoubtedly anthropological. These films captured the daily actions, appearance, and behaviour of people (Totten, 2016). Although the Lumière Brothers did not initially aim to advance scientific research through cinematography, they believed in its potential for scientific study, captivating many anthropologists who were eager for «an unimpeachable witness» (Ruby, 1996, p. 1351).

The first scientific cinematographic work was conducted by the pathologist Felix-Louis Regnauld, who had an interest in anthropology. In 1900, he and his colleague, Ilit Azoulay, proposed creating an «audio-visual museum of a human being» by recording moving images of human behaviour, which would be studied and exhibited through serial photo shooting participation. While studying «savages,» Regnauld realised that those peoples resorted to gestures that preceded speech because their language was underdeveloped. In 1898, he had already produced several films about primitive people, considered the first ethnographic films. Regnauld saw these films as documents that, through careful scientific observation, revealed details of a «race» of people who lacked adequate means of self-expression. It is noteworthy that Regnauld's project of depicting «inarticulate savages» resonated with the goal of anthropological research which aimed to learn about non-Westernised peoples, leading to the view that anthropology, in the broadest sense, established itself as a Western academic discourse at the turn of the 20th century (Beattie, 2004, p. 44).

Referring to Paul Henly's article "Signs of Life: Teaching Visual Anthropology in Britain," we can point to another starting point in the history of ethnographic cinema, which dates back to 1898. It concerns filming in an open space during the British Ethnographic Expedition in Torres Strait between New Guinea and Australia, where the initiative belonged to the zoologist Alfred Cort Haddon. Haddon used photographic material, the Lumière brothers' camera, and wax cylinders of sound recording (Henly, 1989). Two years later, Haddon addressed a letter to the Australian scientist Balwid Spencer, calling the cinematograph "an integral part of the anthropological apparatus." It's worth noting that Jean Rouch, the director and founder of "direct cinema," considers Balwid Spencer's four-minute film dedicated to the rituals of the Australian Aborigines ("kangaroo dance" and howling rain), and filmed on April 4, 1901, as the starting point in the history of ethnographic cinema (Heider , 2006; Venbrux, 2014).

Robert Flaherty's film "Nanook of the North" is another significant milestone in the development of ethnographic cinema. The shooting began in 1913 during an Arctic expedition, where Flaherty studied the life of the Inuit (self-titled Eskimos). The screening took place on June 11, 1922, in a New York theater, which opened the world of ethnographic cinema to the general public. Despite the fact

that Flaherty, like Haddon, was not a professional anthropologist, his film marked the trajectory of the development of ethnographic cinema and formulated the basic principle of visual anthropology as an activity that seeks to establish a dialogue between cultures with respect for the members of communities that fall into the focus of the camera (Raheja, 2007; Skare, 2016).

Flaherty introduced several key ideas that eventually turned into the important principles of visual-anthropological research and still influence modern anthropologists. Flaherty's innovation includes a universal method of observation, where the uniqueness comes from maximally "getting used" to another culture, "immersing" in the life of the characters, and trying to show it "from the inside" as realistically as possible. Flaherty lived with his characters for a long time, trying to understand the customs of local residents. This approach is noticeable on the example of another of his visual and anthropological masterpieces – the film "Moana: A Romance of the Golden Age" (1926). Flaherty anticipated and predicted "reflexive turn in ethnography," which Jean Rouch will later mark as "shared anthropology," which is based on the idea of cooperation between the anthropologist and the "object" of research, whereby the works of scientists the "voice" of the other is heard, including his thoughts and interpretations. Flaherty also introduced the practice of "feedback," where in the process of work, Flaherty constantly showed the filmed material to the characters of the film, observing their reaction and listening to their advice, turning them into full-fledged participants in the process of creating a film. Flaherty's lack of special anthropological education can be considered as an obstacle to recognition of his innovation. Additionally, Flaherty's films were often criticized for a high level of freedom in terms of the reconstruction of the authentic life of peoples, which resulted in deliberate distortions of behavior and material culture (Heider, 2006).

Despite criticism, Flaherty's so-called distortions were deeply thought-out and intentionally made to achieve a realistic effect. Today, his films are considered classics of ethnographic cinematography and are often included in university anthropology courses. By sincerely appreciating representatives of other cultures and conveying his emotions in each frame through aesthetically-oriented production of documentary portraits of non-Western peoples, Flaherty sought to create his own cinematic style and "ethnographic dimension" in cinema. As a result, he found himself at the intersection of scientific anthropology and professional cinematography, discovering a new "aesthetic dimension" in ethnographic cinema through his unique screen language. Flaherty's films not only achieved success, but also secured his place in the history of visual anthropology as the author of the first true ethnographic film (Ruby, 1996; Stern, 2011; Skare, 2016; Schäuble, 2018).

Exploring the Concept of "Cine Eye" by Dziga Vertov in Relation to Objectivism Theory and Philosophical Ideas of Positivism

The concept of "Cine Eye" by Dziga Vertov has significant relevance to the theory of objectivism and the philosophical ideas of positivism. In 1922, Vertov declared his manifesto "We," calling for an abandonment of the "inauthentic film reality" of scripted films and a turn towards the film apparatus (Hicks, 2007; Miller, 2021). Though Vertov did not focus purposefully on social issues, his methods and interests are close to the goals and methods of ethnography, as exemplified in his film "The Sixth Part of the World" (1926) where his "Cine Eye" captured the ethnographic diversity of peoples, showcasing the observers of life in all its manifestations (Ruby, 1996).

In his theoretical works, Vertov formulated the concept of "Cine Eye" [ed. *Kino Eye*] (a film

with the same name was shot by him in 1924 together with cameraman Mikhail Kaufman). The implementation of these ideas in practice was carried out by the group "The Kinoks," which placed great emphasis on the technical capabilities of the film camera, which could overcome the imperfections of human vision (Penfold, 2013). The "magic" eye of the film camera captures real life out of the blue, without adapting it to the script. This is the essence of film truth, which can be achieved through a new method of shooting, where the film camera plays a decisive role, rather than the director-screenwriter. The use of a more advanced film camera as a film eye for "exploring the chaos of visual phenomena that fills space" formulates his concept as an independent expert in fixing the events of reality. Physiological determinism is replaced by mechanical determinism, which postulates the rejection of subjective observation (Michelson (ed.), 1984). The "Cine Eye" can record events impartially and reliably, opening the way to objective reality and appearing as a tool of ethnographic documentary, indicating the connection of this idea with the development of visual anthropology (Aleksandrov, 2018).

Based on the ideas of positivism, visual anthropologists at the early stages of the development of the field believed that new technologies (photo and film cameras) could directly reflect the data of reality on film. In this vein, Vertov based his theory on visual experiments with fast and slow-motion photography, which ultimately led to the idea of a "magic" film eye as a tool for mechanically "capturing" reality in time, rendering it as a kind of mediator between the culture represented in things and actions (object) and the anthropologist (subject) of observation. This interpretation of the "Cine Eye" as "an unimpeachable witness" (Ruby, 2000) in the process of researching another culture is why Jay Rouch called Dziga Vertov the "totem ancestor" of visual anthropology, pointing to the director's innovative approach to the technique of working with the camera, which, along with a person, becomes a participant in the events unfolding in front of him. Dziga Vertov's "cinematic truth" and methodology of interaction with the camera directly influenced the development of such trends in documentary filmmaking as the French "cinema verite" and "direct cinema" in the USA and Canada.

Debates on the pages of magazines in the 1920s, as well as contemporary criticism have emphasized that Dziga Vertov, in overcoming the limits of formal technical tasks, created a cinematic image of the Soviet Union as a new world in his film "The Sixth Part of the World". He achieved this through the experimental method of the "cinematic art camera", which lacked a ruling Communist head. However, this approach resulted in exaggerated aestheticism and departure from socialist ideology (Myslavskyi et al., 2020).

Vertov's methodology extends the concept of documentary reality as material for making "cinema truth" [ed. "*kinothruth*"], and he treated ethnicity in a similar way. He edited fragments of cultures into "a mosaic of film illustrations for a series of propaganda credits" (Golovnev, 2019, p. 1393). Despite this approach, even after a decade, "The Sixth Part of the World" remains one of the greatest achievements of documentary filmmaking. It holds a well-deserved place in the category of classics of world cinema and belongs to the visual and anthropological heritage.

Film phenomenology by André Bazin: Is it Possible to Visualize without an Image?

This question arises when considering the process of representing reality through a camera. French film critic and phenomenologist André Bazin provides insight into this inquiry in his program article, "Evolution of the film language." André Bazin introduces the concepts of the cinematography of reality and the cinematography of the image (Bazin, 2018). The former depicts reality purely, whereas the latter adds

something that was not present initially – the "imagery" of the object through its image on the screen.

Cinematography of imagery relies on montage as formulated by Eisenstein and deep mise-en-scène for expressiveness. However, expressiveness cinema retains ambiguity in the structure of the frame, allowing viewers to experience the time of the film as in reality. The imagery in cinematography corresponds to the director's interests since it arises due to the selective function of perception and interpretation, which is the author's subjectivity.

For Bazin, the cinema of imagery compromised itself by serving totalitarian regimes. Thus, he believed that "true" realism was crucial for cinema to serve a political and humanistic project. He associated the successful "revival" of cinema with Italian neorealism. Bazin (1996) believed that cinema should satisfy the "thirsty desire for reality," and he interpreted the phenomenon of "pure cinema" as the disappearance of the film medium itself as an intermediate link between reality and the viewer. However, since the immediacy of cinema is an ideal construct that cannot be wholly realized, both varieties of realism deal with mediation, possessing different degrees of intensity. Bazin's theory has a certain naïveté since it relies on the cinematographer to achieve factuality through a particular attitude towards the material and a realistic form of organization. The peculiarities of the audience's reception and subjective experience are parenthetical. According to Bazin (2009), for a film to be realistic, it is sufficient for everything to be done "as it should be" on the director's part.

Visual anthropologists and film phenomenologists held high expectations for the film camera's new technical capabilities in the 20th century as an independent expert capable of recording the dynamics and completeness of reality. The phenomenological concept endowed cinematography with the magical power to "discover" reality, which anthropologists hoped would reveal the objective state of the cultures under study. However, as it turned out, the camera's view was always limited to a certain shooting angle, and it was unable to reflect the full range of events in reality. The oxymoron of "visualization without an image," as revealed in A. Bazin's concept, proves the impossibility of cinema without a certain montage and interpretation of reality. The frame captured by "Cine Eye" is always interpreted and decontextualized, while the camera embodies the gaze of an anthropologist. As Angela Dalle Vacche pointed out, "Bazin's film theory acknowledges the equalizing impact of the camera lens, which is analogous to, but also different from, the human eye. In cinema, two different kinds of eyes coexist: one is mechanical and objective, and the other is human and subjective. By refusing to reshape the world according to an a priori thesis, Bazin's idea of an anti-anthropocentric cinema seeks surprise, dialogue, risk, and experiment" (Dalle Vacche, 2020, p. 191).

The Principle of the "Detached Observer" and the Development of "Objective Realism" in Visual-Anthropological Research

The next significant milestone in the history of visual anthropology's development is linked with Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson's names. During their expeditions to Bali and New Guinea, they established the use of visual and audiovisual technologies in field research, creating the groundwork for the systematic application of photo and film cameras in anthropological research. Mead, a professional anthropologist and one of Franz Boas's students, worked in Samoa from 1925 to 1926. Together with Bateson, they conducted research on the local population on the Sepik River region in northeastern New Guinea and continued their research on the island of Bali from 1936 to 1939. Bateson and Mead's Balinese project created new potential for the use of still and film cameras in professional ethnography

(Sullivan, 2002).

In 1942, the first collective book, "Balinese Character," was published, where the text of the research was accompanied by photo illustrations, creating a coherent story about the lives of the people of Bali. The book contains 759 photographs from a collection of over 25,000 taken throughout the expedition (Heider, 2006). Anthropologist Worth (1980) believes that it was during this period that the term "visual anthropology" appeared, primarily associated with the use of cameras by anthropologists for field research. Bateson and Mead also shot 22,000 feet (7,000 meters) of film, from which a range of films were subsequently edited in the 1940s and 1950s, directed by Margaret Mead: "Balinese Family" (1952), "Trance and Dance in Bali" (1952), "The First Years of Karba" (or "The First Years of a Child's Life in New Guinea" (1952)), "Bathing Children in Three Cultures" (1954), and "Children's Rivalry in Bali and New Guinea" (1952). The last two are the initial endeavor at a comparative analysis in ethnographic cinema. It should also be noted that anthropological film allows for the visual exploration of obvious cultural aspects. In field research, Bateson and Mead utilized the film camera to record events, making it an integral part of anthropological research.

Anthropologists of the early 20th century subscribed to the concept of culture as a "defined model," developed by Franz Boas and his school of historical ethnology. Special attention was given to historical processes in their natural dynamics. They believed that "detached observation" guaranteed objectivity, and a thorough account of unfolding events, in their entirety and duration, provided a precise representation of the events and laid the foundation of the scientific approach. Mead argues that materials that preserve genuine space-time relationships serve as a boundless source of new hypotheses and a basis for the development of a "positivist-empirical scientific-cinematographic style" in visual studies or "objective fixation" (Mead, 2003), which, within the framework of her field research, is consistent with the principle of cultural relativism (Pecheranskiy, 2022).

If we are discussing shooting techniques in this style, the ideal method would be a camera fixed on a tripod, continually working without altering its position, capturing all events in chronological order. In visual anthropological research, the emphasis is on the detached position of the anthropologist-operator during filming. This is because Margaret Mead preserved the research ideal of maximally objective observation and jealously guarded "scientificity" in ethnographic cinema. During the 1936 expedition to the island of Bali, she formulated several provisions regarding audiovisual techniques for recording material, which allowed for the most scientific ("objective") study and recording of the studied culture on film. These provisions include: (a) prioritizing the content of the film in the anthropological tradition over the form, (b) excluding any script or attempts to create one, (c) preferring full-length shots and interactive events from start to finish in real-time with the usual social distance, and (d) requiring the field anthropologist to record everything that happens, documenting the main actors and their actions throughout the filming (Henley, 2013; Alexander, 2017).

The principles developed by Margaret Mead illustrate the ideas of anthropologists at the beginning of the 20th century about the possibilities and techniques of using a photo and film camera in the process of field research, and for many years, these principles determined their methods of working with the camera. An anthropologist acts as a "detached observer," observing events from the outside, or as David McDougall put it, becoming a "fly-on-the-wall." However, Mead (2003) notes that the focus of the camera always lies in the anthropologist's own view through its lens. A movie camera is a tool that allows the study of culture from a distance, and it cannot be an independent expert on reality because it

is controlled and coordinated by an anthropologist. In visual anthropological practice, this approach is referred to as the "observational approach."

Future Prospects of the Study

Visual anthropology is a rapidly growing field that explores the relationship between culture, society, and visual media. The classical model of visual-anthropological research primarily relies on the observation and documentation of cultures, and the production of ethnographic films, which are intended to capture the real, authentic lives of people.

One of the key concepts in this model is "objective realism," which refers to the idea that ethnographic films can objectively capture the reality of culture and society. However, the concept of objective realism has come under scrutiny in recent decades, as scholars have criticized the ways in which visual media can be manipulated to present a certain version of reality.

In response to this criticism, researchers have developed new approaches to visual anthropology that seek to address the limitations of the classical model. Participatory and collaborative filmmaking, for example, involve working closely with members of a community to produce films that reflect the perspectives, experiences, and knowledge of the community. This approach challenges the idea of the objective observer and promotes a more inclusive and collaborative approach to research. Additionally, technology has opened up new opportunities for ethnographic research, with the development of augmented and virtual reality technology. These technologies allow researchers to create immersive experiences that simulate the lived experiences of people in specific cultures, providing a new way to understand and connect with the subjects being studied.

The integration of new forms of media, such as social media and online platforms, has also provided researchers with access to large amounts of data that were previously unavailable. With the generation of massive amounts of digital content every day, researchers can now use machine learning techniques and artificial intelligence to analyze and make sense of this data, providing new insights into cultures and societies.

Looking to the future, the field of visual anthropology continues to evolve, with new technologies and methodologies opening up new possibilities for understanding cultures and societies. As the field of visual anthropology moves forward, it is likely that we will see exciting developments and breakthroughs in our understanding of the complex relationships between culture, society, and visual media.

Conclusion

This work demonstrates that the classical model of visual-anthropological research, which tends towards "objective realism," was the very model from which the becoming of visual anthropology as a branch of knowledge and (sub) discipline of social anthropology started. At the early stages, anthropologists returned to the film camera as a reliable means of maximum accurate reproduction and fixation of reality. This tendency was most clearly expressed in the conception of "Cine Eye" by Dziga Vertov. Visual anthropologists and representatives of ethnographical cinematography saw in this mechanical "Cine Eye" an "unimpeachable witness" capable of objectively recording reality as it opens up for the researcher.

The methodological basis of such work with a camera performed the philosophy of positivism and objectivism. In particular, the idea that reality is visible and comprehensible, and culture is observ-

able and fixed on film by a mechanically perfect apparatus, was actively exploited. Therefore, the "objective realism" of the classical research model consisted in the role of the film camera, which acted as a mediator between the anthropologist (researcher) and the culture (object), providing the most realistic reproduction of it.

Film phenomenology and the theory of reality by André Bazin largely correlated with the ideas of visual anthropologists of the beginning of the XX century, giving cinematography the ability to "represent" reality. However, as other researchers have proven, and as confirmed in this article, given the angle of shooting, the camera cannot reflect the fullness of reality. The oxymoron "visualization without an image" postulated by André Bazin rather testifies to the utopian nature of the idea of the cinematography of reality since representation of being is impossible outside of montage, and therefore interpretation.

The further formation of visual anthropological theory took place in the direction of the positivist and objectivist project. Although, in practice, Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson, supporters of the use of photo and film cameras in the framework of visual anthropological research, perfectly understood that the camera is a continuation of the scientist's view and clearly limited by the lens and the given shooting angle. Reorienting attention to the figure and position of the anthropologist, Margaret Mead developed a number of theoretical propositions that determined the methods of working with the camera of field anthropologists for a long time. The main principle was that the American anthropologist David MacDougall had to turn into a "fly-on-the-wall," taking the position of a "detached observer." In visual anthropological practice, such a research approach is referred to as the "observational approach" and is embodied in the shooting style of "observational cinema."

The field, theoretical-methodologically, and philosophical principles mentioned above essentially formed the classic research model, which we propose to call "objective realism." This model characterizes visual anthropology as a field in its early stages of development. Criticisms of this approach and the appearance of new models and approaches (the "Harvard School," "anthropology of complicity," indigenous and biodocumentary cinema, "direct cinema," etc.) have helped to further develop this field and form it into a full (sub) discipline of social anthropology in the modern stage. This could be the subject of further systematic and thorough research.

Biographies

Igor Pecheranskyi: DSc in Philosophy, Professor, Department of Philosophy and Pedagogy, Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts.

Zhanna Denysiyuk: DSc in Cultural Studies, Vice-Rector for scientific work and international relations, National Academy of Management Culture and Arts.

Tetiana Humeniuk: DSc in Philosophy, Professor, Department of Theory and History of Culture, Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts.

Valentyna Diachuk: PhD in Cultural studies, Associate professor, Department of Art Management and Event Technologies, National Academy of Management Culture and Arts.

Olena Kosinova: Honored Artist of Ukraine, PhD in Pedagogy, Department of Cinema and Television Arts, Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts.

Authorship and Level of Contribution

Igor Pecheranskyi provided a historical perspective on the evolution of visual anthropology, tracing its roots to the classical model of visual-anthropological research.

Zhanna Denysiyuk explored the nuances of "objective realism" and its impact on visual-anthropological research, highlighting its strengths and limitations.

Tetiana Humeniuk examined the role of ethnographic cinema in the development of visual anthropology, highlighting its unique approach to representing culture and society.

Valentyna Diachuk offered a critical perspective on the classical model of visual-anthropological research, pointing out gaps and limitations in its emphasis on objectivity and accuracy.

Olena Kosinova provided a contemporary perspective on visual anthropology, examining the ways in which digital technology has transformed the field and the possibilities it offers for new modes of representation and research.

Together, their contributions enriched the understanding of visual-anthropological research and offered a comprehensive view of its development, challenges, and possibilities.

References

Aleksandrov, E. (2018). The role of documentary filmmaking. *EtnoAntropologia*, 6(1), 63-100. https://rivisteclueb.it/index.php/etnoantropologia/article/view/276.

Alexander, N. (2017). *Margaret Mead Film Festival: Four Decades of World Picture(s)*. In M.-P. Peirano & A. Vallejo (Eds.), Film Festivals and Anthropology (pp. 165-178). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Bazin, A. (1996). *Bazin at work: Major essays & reviews from the forties and fifties*. In B. Cardullo & A. Piette (Trans.), Routledge.

Bazin, A. (2009). *The Evolution of the Language of Cinema*. In L. Braudy & M. Cohen (Eds.), Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings (7th ed., pp. 41-53). Oxford University Press.

Bazin, A. (2018). *André Bazin: Selected Writings 1943-1958*. In T. Barnard (Trans.). Caboose books in Montreal, Quebec.

Beattie, K. (2004). *Constructing and Contesting Otherness: Ethnographic Film*. In Documentary Screens (pp. 44–62). Palgrave.

Chakraborty, M., Das, K., & Mukherjee, K. (2023). Visual Anthropology: A Systematic Representation of Ethnography. *Athens Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(1), 95-110.

Chio, J. (2021). *Visual Anthropology*. In F. Stein (Ed.), The Open Encyclopedia of Anthropology. https://www.anthroencyclopedia.com/entry/visual-anthropology.

Coover, R. (2009). On Vérité to Virtual: Conversations on the Frontier of Film and Anthropology. *Visual Studies*, 24(3), 235-249.

Dalle Vacche, A. (2020). André Bazin's Film Theory: Art, Science, Religion. *Artium Quaestiones*, (31), 191–207.

Debray, R. (2000). *Introduction à la médiologie*. PUF, 240. ISBN: 978-2-13-050105-3.

Durrington, M. (2013). *Ethnographic film*. In J. L. Jackson Jr. (Ed.), Anthropology: Oxford bibliographies online. https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199766567/obo-9780199766567-0110.xml.

Elsaesser, T., & Hagener, M. (2015). *Film Theory: An Introduction through the Senses* (2nd ed.). Seans Publ.

Friedman, P. K. (2017). *Do we even need to define ethnographic film?* Savage Minds (blog). https://savageminds.org/2017/07/20/do-we-even-need-to-define-ethnographic-film/.

Golovnev, I. A. (2019). Visual Anthropology of Dziga Vertov. Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History, 64(4), 1386–1403.

Gray, G. (2010). *Cinema: A Visual Anthropology*. Berg.

Grimshaw, A. (1999). *The Eye in the Door: Anthropology, Film and the Exploration of Interior Space*. In M. Banks & H. Morphy (Eds.), Rethinking Visual Anthropology. Yale University Press.

Grimshaw, A., & Ravetz, A. (2015). The ethnographic turn – and after: A critical approach towards the realignment of art and anthropology. *Social Anthropology [Anthropologie Sociale]*, 23, 418-434.

Groo, K. (2019). *Bad film histories: Ethnography and the early archive*. University of Minnesota Press.

Heider, K. G. (2006). *Ethnographic Film: Revised Edition*. University of Texas Press.

Henley, P. (2013). From Documentation to Representation: Recovering the Films of Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson. *Visual Anthropology*, 26, 75-108.

Henley, P. (2020a). *Beyond Observation: A History of Authorship in Ethnographic Film*. Manchester

University Press.

Henley, P. (2020b). *The Long Prehistory of Ethnographic Film*. In Beyond Observation: A History of Authorship in Ethnographic Film (pp. 28-76). Manchester University Press.

Henly, P. (1989). *Signs of Life: Teaching Visual Anthropology in Britain*. In P. Chiozzi (Ed.), Teaching Visual Anthropology (pp. 41-53). II Sedicesimo.

Hicks, J. (2007). *Dziga Vertov: Defining Documentary Film*. St. Martin's Press.

Kuhn, T. S. (1996). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Luvaas, B. (2019). The Camera and the Anthropologist: Reflections on Photographic Agency. *Visual Anthropology*, 32, 76-96.

Marcum, A. J. (2015). *Thomas Kuhn's Revolutions: A Historical and an Evolutionary Philosophy of Science?* Bloomsbury.

Mead, M. (2003). *Visual Anthropology in a Discipline of Words*. In P. Hockings (Ed.), Principles of Visual Anthropology (3rd ed., pp. 3-10). Mouton de Gruyter.

Michelson, A. (Ed.). (1984). *Kino-Eye: The Writings of Dziga Vertov*. In K. O'Brien (Trans.). University of California Press.

Miller, T. (2021). *Intervals of Transition: Dziga Vertov's The Man with a Movie Camera*. In S. W. Klein & M. V. Moses (Eds.), A Modernist Cinema: Film Art from 1914 to 1941 (pp. 143-152). Oxford University Press.

Myslavskyi, V., Chmil, G., Bezruchko, O., & Cherkasova, N. (2020). From "The Eleventh Year" to "The Man with a Movie Camera": conceptual search of Dziga Vertov. *Media Education*, 60(3), 507-514.

Pavlova, O. (2022). Visual Anthropology: Formation Stages and Basic Elements of Analysis. *NaUKMA Research Papers History and Theory of Culture*, 5, 47-53.

Pecheranskyi, I. P. (2022). Cultural relativism as a methodological approach within the American anthropological tradition of studying culture (late 19th century - 1970s of 20th). *Issues of cultural studies*, (39), 78-91.

Penfold, C. (2013). *Elizaveta Svilova and Soviet documentary film*. University of Southampton, Faculty of Humanities, Doctoral Thesis.

Pink, S. (2006). *The future of visual anthropology: engaging the senses*. Routledge.

Putnam, H. (1995). *Philosophy and our Mental Life*. In P. K. Moser, & J. D. Trout (Eds.), Contemporary Materialism: A Reader (1st ed., pp. 127-137). Routledge.

Raheja, H. M. (2007). Reading Nanook's Smile: Visual Sovereignty, Indigenous Revisions of Ethnography, and "Atanarjuat (The Fast Runner)". *American Quarterly*, 59(4), 1159-1185.

Ruby, J. (1996). *Visual Anthropology*. In D. Levinson & M. Ember (Eds.), Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology (Vol. 4, pp. 1345-1351). Henry Holt and Company.

Schäuble, M. (2018). *Visual anthropology*. In H. Callan (Ed.), The International Encyclopedia of Anthropology. https://www.anthro.unibe.ch/e40416/e96353/e96354/files735749/Visualanthropology2018_ger.pdf.

Skare, R. (2016). «*Nanook of the North» From 1922 to Today*. The Famous Arctic Documentary and Its Afterlife. Peter Lang.

Srivastava, S. (2022). Visual anthropology: Changing roles in fieldwork. *International Journal of Modern Anthropology*, 17(2), 843-871.

Stern, R. A. (2011). Collaborative ethnographic film: A workshop case study. *Portland State University McNair Scholars Online Journal*, 5, 235-256. https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1112&context=mcnair.

Sullivan, G. (2002). Margaret Mead, Gregory Bateson, and Highland Bali. Fieldwork Photographs of Bayung Gede, 1936-1939. *History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences*, 24(3/4), 548-548.

Sviličić, N. (2011). History and future of visual anthropology. *Collegium antropologicum*, 35(1), 187-192.

Sztompka, P. (2005). *Socjologia wizualna: fotografia jako metoda badawcza*. Wyd. Naukowe PWN.

Totten, P. (2016). *History, Form, and Relevance in Ethnographic Film*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328828120_History_Form_and_Relevance_in_Ethnographic_Film.

Vannini, P. (Ed.). (2020). *The Routledge international handbook of ethnogrpahic film and video*. Routledge.

Venbrux, E. (2014). A history of art from the Tiwi Islands: The source community in an evolving museumscape. *Les actes de colloques du musée du quai Branly Jacques Chirac*, (4).

Worth, S. (1980). Margaret Mead and the Shift from "Visual Anthropology" to the "Anthropology of Visual Communication". *Communication*, 6(1), 15-22.