SIGN AND SYMBOL IN A MEDIATED CONTEXT:

THE TRANSITORY NATURE OF CRITIQUE

JAMES ANDERSON, PH.D.

JANUARY 2010

Sign and Symbol in a Mediated Context:

The Transitory Nature of Critique

In the last one hundred years, the United States has experienced a cataclysmic

Formalism as the Standard Evaluative Tool

At the turn of the twentieth century, the concept of formalism was still a widely held and much respected edict that served to dictate the standards by which 'quality' art was judged (Hutchens and Suggs, 1997, p. 8).   Throughout western art educational circles Kantian principals of "disinterested perception" held sway as the basis for aesthetic judgment. Critique was to "be neither personal nor relative" (Barrett, 1993, p. 13). By suppressing emotion and accentuating intellectual prowess, a well-trained critic was said to hold credentials capable of developing a qualified judgment of art, based on universal principles of beauty, form, and process (Hutchens and Suggs, 1997).

Despite persuasive arguments for the inclusion of the creative process as a sound rationale for evaluation as proposed by Dow (1899) and Lowenfeld (1952), formalism continued to find widespread support in the United States throughout the first half of the twentieth century (Hutchens and Suggs, 1997). Art critique, historian and educator Clement Greenberg's influence as a formalist and modernist shaped public opinion throughout the 1940's and 1950's, and formalism continued to be an extremely influential factor in critique throughout the third quarter of the century (Hutchens and Suggs, 1997, p. 8).

Greenbergian analysis became the standard operational mode for interpreting non-representational art in the 1960's, as "formalism became the basis of abstraction, the pursuit of form capable of evoking universal aesthetic experience" (Hutchens and Suggs, 1997, p. 8). In this regard, throughout the short-lived "cultural revolution" of the 1960's and into the 1970's, two highly visible art critics, Fry and Bell, continued to tout "significant form in a detached state" as the rule of thumb for critical analysis (Bell, 1973, p. 228).

Developments in Postmodern Critique

As the last quarter of the twentieth century emerged, translations of early works by Vygotsky, and other such visionaries, served as precursors to postmodern thought (McRorie, in Hutchens and Suggs, 1992, p. 107). As Danto notes, Greenbergian formalism became regarded as "too narrow" to arrive at how art achieves meaning (Danto, 1981). Subject and content finally began to override concerns for form and process on a more significant level throughout art educational circles, as the newly coined term "postmodernism" began to reflect the "economic, political, social, and cultural factors inscribed upon it" (Hutchens and Suggs, 1997, p. 7). The "hegemony of modernism" promoted through standard-issue art criticism (Hutchens and Suggs, 1992, p. 10) turned instead to a concern for "environmental responsibility" (Gablick, 1991), and a newly reformed recognition of "multiculturalism and parallel cultures" (Lippard, 1990).

Through this shift in the early 1970's, a budding, unstable postmodern movement served as a viable framework that found value in an "eclecticism of the art world", while referencing individual and group experiences particularized by class, race, gender, ethnicity, and sexual orientation that questioned the aesthetic "as the end of art" (Hutchens and Suggs, 1997, p. 14). This new emphasis then led to fresh definitions of 'quality' (as previously understood in the Greenbergian sense)-- now being redefined by the "heterogeneity of multiple voices" representing a new basis for critique (Hutchens and Suggs, 1997, p. 14). Modernism as a vehicle for hegemonic malpractice, then, came to be regarded by some critics as a blight-- giving rise to the notion that cultural monopoly is "never a harmless experience" (Ricoeur, 1965, p. 278). Rather, multicultural and sociocultural theorists saw in postmodernism a "pluralism of human possibility (and an) evident workability of numerous belief systems" (Dissanayake, 1988, p. 199).

It was within this process of de-centering that photography came to the forefront as a key medium in postmodern expression. "Quality", as previously defined through Cartesian / Kantian formulaic convention became a "compromised term that reveals the biases of a Western, patriarchal, heterosexual art establishment" (Hutchens and Suggs, 1997, p. 11), and the camera was instrumental in chronicling this process. Photography has, however, not gone unscathed during this transitional process of artistic upheaval. As "form and media become incidental-- evidenced by appropriation and recycling of image", the subversive uses of photography have come under attack by the late-modernist faithful (Hutchens and Suggs, 1997, p. 11).

Barrett (in Hutchens and Suggs, 1997, p. 28) notes that Lippard (1988, p. 184) has railed against the persistent claims of modernists that postmodern art forms, such as photography, are often simply "literary art" laden with "political intentions". Lippard states that critics and artists still influenced by modernism are likely to denigrate social art as "too obvious, heavy handed, crowd pleasing, and sloganeering" (1988, p. 184).

Walking Stick (1992, p. 15) insists that modernism, born of neo-liberalism, has promoted nomenclature such as "tribal art", "crafts", "folk art", and "fine art", which foster "cultural otherness and is an acquiescence to modern aesthetic ideologies that value certain media more than others" (Rushing, 1992). Additionally, May (1992) seeks a critique that "keeps things open to demystify the realities we create", while West (in Golden, 1993, p. 27) is interested in postmodernism's concern with issues of "extermination, empire, class, race, gender, sexual orientation, age, nation, nature, and region."

Pearse (1992, p. 249) notes that while the modernist artists viewed themselves as a "productive inventor", the postmodern creatist is more inclined to see her / himself as a bricoleur or collagist "who finds and arranges fragments of meaning" (Barrett, 1997, p. 28). Pearse adds that this method of artistic production is much like the "postman delivering multiple images and signs which he has not created, and over which he has no control" (1992, p. 249). Pearse's viewpoint highlights an important shift of artist from authoritative dispenser of fact and truth to messenger of unfixed and de-centered semiotic imagery.

Innovations in Image Theory

Crimp (1990) offers a slightly different slant to the 'demise' of modernism. He contends that the invention of photography was chiefly responsible for the modernists' downfall, brought about by the mechanical reproduction of images (Crimp in Barrett, 1997, p. 24). Through this process, there occurred a "stripping away from the work of art of its properties of uniqueness, originality, and location or place of origin" (Barrett, 1997, p. 24). Barrett informs us of Crimp's concern that any given photo be "made in any place in the world at any time and can now be seen over and over again in a myriad of contexts" (Barrett, 1997, p. 24). This particular stance

has direct bearing on how one views photographic imagery offered in the case study presented herein.

Such concerns about photography are not new to postmodernism, but rather were addressed by Benjamin in the 1930's, following shortly behind the release of Vygotsky's work involving his innovative theories concerning the psychology of art. A member of the Frankfurt School, Benjamin, along with Adorno, Marcuse, and other European scholars fleeing Hitler, developed critical theory, which challenged dominant capitalist ideology (Barrett, 1997, p. 24) . Barrett states that while traditional Marxists accepted the modernists' search for foundational truths, they rejected the modernists' separation of art from life (1997, p. 24). The neo-Marxist movement rejected this more traditional notion of "a strict and unwavering historical determinism" and its resulting predictability of the downfall of capitalism, preferring instead to accept that "culture influences history and that people can affect the future" (Barrett, 1997, p. 25).

This ability to influence the outcome of history then led postmodernists to view the chronicling of history as stories or "discourses fabricated by people" (Derrida referenced in Barrett, 1997, p. 25). This braiding of mixed media (i.e. photography with text), coupled with the destabilizing nature of radical relativism, served to unnerve ardent positivists and, in some cases, tip the balance of art critique in favor of a reliance upon, and acceptance of profound uncertainty and paradigmatic flux.

Catharsis as an Interpretive Methodology

Transubstantiation in Catholic mass is the process by which the priest performs ceremonies in which the bread and wine of the sacrament are transformed into the flesh and blood of Christ, then consumed by the faithful. In order to commune with their Savior, this act requires a transcendence of ordinary experience into that requiring a "leap of faith" in the Kierkegaardian sense (Collinson, 1987). Apparently, this 'leap' involves the employment of faculties above and beyond ordinary sense perception or conventional intellectual processing.

Vygotsky appropriated the term *transubstantiation* in his attempts to convey the reactive principle of recreatist (viewer) in relationship to that which is viewed-- the artwork. Certainly, Vygotsky had no intention of equating an artistic response with traditional forms of religious worship, but he no doubt considered the emotive nature of aesthetic response to be, in some way, akin to that experienced by the priesthood. Similarities include the processes through which an individual uses her / his core experiences as a filter with which to accommodate new cathartic understandings into an existentially personalized shift in consciousness (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1986).

In the Vygotskian mode, this reorganization of 'being' is facilitated by the dialectical process, which in turn offers a new paradigm with which to arrive at a new, more informed understanding of a given concept. It is this Vygotskian conceptualization of the process of dialectical change in one's persona that stands as a driving force in the rationale for the case study illustrated herein.

Semiosis as a Multi-Modal Investigative System

Involving the symbolic use of words, images, gestures, sounds and objects, the science of *semeiotikon* or "art of the signs" originally served as one of the foundational branches of medicine practiced in ancient Greece (Bouissac, 1998; Chandler, 1999). Through years of development and refinement, the field of semiotics has emerged as a potentially unifying factor within the meta-disciplines of science, while assisting in the formation of scientific inquiry as a cohesive unit (Kevelson, 1986). In its more recent configuration, semiotics has come to be viewed as a science that studies the "life of signs with society" due to a codification by its re-discoverer Saussure (1857-1913) (Saussure in Innis, 1986, p. 34-5). Saussure's life span coincided with the proliferation of the camera as an agent for historical recording and analysis.

The professional lives of Saussure and his elder contemporary, Peirce (1839-1914) coincided with the peak of modern industrialism in Europe and the United States. Early efforts in photo-journalism came to reflect a sociological interest in class structure, as a shift in populations seeking urban employment signaled significant demographic change in this country.

This shift from rural life to urban epicenters produced a plethora of material for semioticians. Whereas Saussure had concerned himself with theories of production and interpretation of meaning, Peirce concentrated on aspects of semiotics that were largely philosophical in nature (Lemke, 1999). Always rather far-reaching in the breath and scope of its application, semiotics, through the work of Peirce, moved toward understandings formulated through reasoning and logic derived from symbols, signals, and signs related to the natural sciences (Lemke, 1999).

Spring boarding off the work of Peirce, Morris (1901-1979) extended the boundaries of semiotics to include a generalized theory of sign systems, their comparative analysis, and a resulting classification within the framework of society (Sebeok & Umiker-Sebeok, 1986, p. ix). Morris' efforts resulted in the identification of three distinct features of semiotics: i) meaning of signs themselves, ii) syntactics to describe structural relations, and iii) pragmatics as a means of interpretation (Lemke, 1999). In doing so, Morris came to view these three areas of semiotic analysis to exist as forms of text-- not the least among them photographic imagery.

As is the case of many tools and procedures for academically oriented, investigative field work, the camera fell out of vogue as a prime force in conventional historical research. Within three decades of the turn of the twentieth century, photography had reached its saturation point in terms of novelty among academicians, but had continued as a popular implement in the hands of the 'lay' person. It was in the 1930's that Kodak coined the phrase, "Just shoot and we'll do the rest", which underscored not only the camera's technological advances, but its easier availability for mainstream applications.

After a brief lull in academic circles, photography was revived, in part, by the controversial work of Mead. Her groundbreaking findings in anthropological field studies during the heart of the twentieth century revolutionized how various populations were viewed through an investigative lens (Mead, 1962). Mead's research methodology greatly influenced the new historicism, as well as sociology and the cognitive sciences (Chandler, 1999). Sebeok (1986) notes that her efforts resulted in the semiotic classification of three sub-domains: i) anthroposemiotics, the interactive relationship between sign and symbol and human activity, ii) zoosemiotics, the effect of sign and symbol in the activities of animals, and iii) endosemiotics, involving the internal information coding and transmission within the body (Chandler, 1999).

The Growth of Semiosis as Sociocultural Theory

Mead's iconoclastic endeavors broke ground for a third generation of semioticians, typified by the work of Hall, who sought investigative methodologies in which sign systems were physically and semiotically integrated with cultural artifacts (Chandler, 1999; Lemke, 1999). As a meta-discipline, semiotics expanded to include sociocultural theory under its umbrella of influence (Wertsch, 1998). This dual role of semiotics as a socioculturally relevant mode of research came to emphasize the interconnectedness of hermaneutic behaviors, systems, and the experiences of humans (Vygotsky, 1986). Neo-Vygotskian theorists' explorations in the mediational aspect of sociocultural theory further expanded the notion of meaning making as a sociolinguistic process (Fisk & Hartley, 1978; Lemke, 1999; Wertsch, xxxx; Cole, xxxx).

The repression of Vygotskian thought in Stalinist Russia severely impaired the spread of his innovative research. Decades later, a less oppressive regime under Khruschev allowed for the disemmination of Vygotsky's work outside Russia (CITE xxxx). Unfortunately, hostile relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States further delayed this process between 1956 and 1962 (cite, xxxx). The relationship between sociocultural theory and the value of socially mediated understanding produced insights which directly affected new directions taken in art theory, anthropology, biology, cognitive psychology, linguistics, philosophy, etc. (Kevelson, 1986). Slowly, neo-Vygotskian scholars introduced novel perspectives, which have affected and bolstered the connection between meaning-making systems and their respective societies. Post-structuralist thought has thus provided new understandings within crucial, postmodern historical, political, and sociocultural contexts (John-Steiner, 1999).

As touched upon earlier, the semiotic aspects of sociocultural theory were rooted in Vygotsky's theory of catharsis (Vygotsky, 1925). This cathartic phenomenon is achieved through internalized thought processes, which must sort a vast quantity of stimuli (Van Oers, 1999; Vygotsky, 1925). Connery states that the "multi-model physiology of the body renders the human species as agents capable of symbolic agency" (Connery, 2001; John-Steiner, 1995). It is through this semiotic process that individuals are engaged in activities which simplify, interpret,

and categorize elements of lived reality (Sapir, 1971; Weir, 1985; Werner & Kaplin, 1963, in Van Oers, 1999).

Utilizing semiotic means is largely achieved through the dialectical transformation of decoded, recoded, and encoded information received from symbolic activities and artifacts (Connery, 2000; Van Oers, 1999; Lemke, 1999; Wertsch, 1991). Regarding this process, new knowledge is achieved using imagery as a vehicle for new understandings. As Vygotsky (1981) reminds us, imagery is a means-- not an end: "It's the meaning that is important, not the sign. We can change the sign, but retain the meaning" (in Van Oers, 1991, p. 1).

The Sociopolitical History of the Sign

Peirce's division of 'sign' into three classifications assists in the understanding of how visual imagery affects new understandings. Referential gestures, demonstratives, and personal pronouns are examples of Peirces's first type of sign, *index* (Chandler, 1999). Sign as index, is limited in semiotic meaning, until it is fused with meaning through some form of causal relationship (Chandler, 1999). A case in point is illustrated through the provided image of a building in various states of decay. The moldy plaster, broken windows, and the crumbling roof simply assist in describing the characteristics of a human-made structure in need of repair.

Additional information, such as the new knowledge that this particular building is part of the housing in a leper colony in India, aids the viewer in better understanding the photographic image-- exemplifying Peirce's second type of sign, the *symbol* (Chandler, 1999). The building in question now has an extended meaning associated with the circumstances surrounding its creation and usage. Issues of national economic prioritization, caste considerations, political intrigue, population numbers, and a host of other factors change the semiotic meaning associated with the photograph. Much like ink markings on paper (index) are understood through their conversion into recognizable words (symbol), the significance of symbol refers to the governing principle or association between an object or entity and the perceived implications associated with its image (Chandler, 1999).

To place this mental activity within the scope of sociocultural theory, one can consider Peirce's injunction that 'index' is defined by referential and associational qualities that 'engage' an object on one hand, and the sensory and memory abilities of the interpreter on the other (Connery, 2000; Peirce, 1893, 1895, 1902, 1903; Smith, 2000). The association between an object and what it represents (symbol), in Peircean terms, presupposes the ability to imagine a representative object in the mind's eye, thereby associating the symbol with the image (Connery, 2000; Peirce, 1910). This brings into play the important notion that verbal or visual "language is not a copy but a symbol of reality" (Sapir, 1985, p. viiii, in Innis, 1985). Referring again to the image of the leper colony as a prime example, Volosinov saw signs as social forces involved in dialogical, ideological, and subjective, context-based processes (Connery, 2000; Innis, 1985).

This type of photographic imagery is often used to describe Peirce's third category of sign, the *icon* (Peirce, 1910; Innis, 1986). Religious iconography, for instance, provides a "direct, communicative link" with their interpretants as the icon signifies that which it portrays (Peirce, 1910, in Innis, 1986). Thus the use of a physical tool such as the camera to capture the image of a dying leper (as icon) illustrates how utensils are externally directed to control outside processes in the material world (Kozulin, 1986; John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996).

By the same token, there is a relationship between the photographer's physical tools and *psychological* tools-- those mental mechanizations that are internally directed and employed to control individual cognition and behavior (Kozulin, 1986; John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). In this respect, image theory is supported by cognitive pluralism to explain the symbolic codification of information, understandings or meanings into visual, aural, kinesthetic, tactile, olfactory and verbal forms as "re-presented thought" (Chandler, 1999; Connery, 2000; John-Steiner, 1997, p. 4).

This correlation between image theory, sociocultural theory, and mediated, collaborative meaning making combines to "sculpt" the forms within which they are engaged (Connery, 2000; Wertsch, 1991; John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). Mediation serve as a conduit between the imagery presented and its cultural meanings, and it is through such reflection that "extention of self beyond mind occurs" (Connery, 2000; Geertz, 1973). As such, semiosis can be defined as a

social construct derived from the internalized understanding of external texts (Connery, 2000; Wertsch, 1998, p. 11-17).

The Evolution of Collaborative Meaning-Making

During the 1940's and 1950's, the pioneering work by the French cinematographer, Jean Rouch, served as the prototype for ethnographic, image-based research (Henley, in Prosser, 1998, p. 46). Along with Flaherty and Vertov, Rouch broke new ground with what had emerged from his fellow cinematographers' work in Russia as a form of *kinopravda*, which came to be known as "*cinema verite*" (Henley, in Prosser, 1998, p. 46). This novel form of photographic 'absolutism' was soon modified to a methodology, which "captured life unaware" (Henley, in Prosser, 1998, p. 46). Shortly thereafter, Rouch renamed his work a "truth of everyday reality", and finally by the 1960s his work became a revised precursor to postmodern relativism referred to as "ethno-fiction" (Henley, in Prosser, 1998, p. 46).

This rapidly changing consideration of how to judge Rouch's approach flew in the face of conventional forms of standard research procedure. With ever increasing suspicion of the "old guard" as performing "salvage ethnography", Rouch's work served to expose the modernist viewpoint as one which "silently conspired to emphasize some idealized notion of the 'traditional' past" (Henley, in Prosser, 1998, p. 45). For anyone who has experienced the outer reaches of so-called 'third-world' countries, there is the stark realization that "once largely autonomous communities are developing hybrid cultural forms as a means of dealing with integration into a world economic and social system" (Clifford, 1986; Morris, 1994). The notion of pure-form societies living in virtual isolation from western influence is, sadly, a thing of the past.

In order to place the evolutionary process of photographic ethnography into some historical and philosophical context, some backtracking to the days of classical positivism is in order. Henley notes, for instance, that with the rise in popularity of the camera as an investigative tool, visual data aimed "exclusively at documentation, i.e. the collection of visual data in the most objective possible manner" (Henley, in Prosser, 1998, p. 44).

Its use was considered to be the anthropologist's version of the scientists' microscope, an instrument of pristine neutrality-- impersonal, dispassionate, and distant (Sorenson & Jablonko, 1995; Fuchs, 1988). The camera as utensil was variously described as a "window unmarked by the photographer's finger prints" (Winston in Prosser, 1998, p. 66), and photography as a "death mask"... "physically forced to correspond point by point to nature" (Peirce, 1965, p. 143-159).

By the third quarter of the twentieth century, this type of positivism came under closer scrutiny. Such concepts as 'total objectivity' were regarded by critics as "methodological philistinism", and they were quick to "abandon notions of aesthetics which are formed by the ethnocentric assumptions of the Euro-American art cult" (Gell, 1992, p. 42). Such reservations led to what has been described as a "representational crisis", pitting western positivists "against the world" (Henley in Prosser, 1998, p. 52). This 'crisis' centered around accusations that certain ethnographers were "pretending that indigenous people have 'voice', when they are actually 'bit players' in the self-interested western construction of the world" (Henley, in Prosser, 1998, p. 52, referring to Farris, 1992; Moore, 1994).

By the 1980s, ventures into the 'new' ethnography sought to structure field work along a story line, while seeking to edit according to narrative conventions (Nichols, 1983; deBromhead, 1996), which required " not distorting the material so much as using the medium to its best effect to evoke an understanding of the situations portrayed...(This was considered) no different... from ethnographic monographs, which routinely call on ... conventions of textual representation to communicate their understandings (Hammersly & Atkinson, 1995, p. 239-262).

For ethnographic filmmakers, the camera served as a catalyst, which provoked certain events, situations, and relationships "that are revealing precisely because of their a-typicality"... and "therefore achieves an understanding that is inaccessible to those who insist on remaining neutral and distant" (Rouch, 1995, p. 89-90). It is this very process that serves to generate "revelatory epiphanies" (Denzin, 1989, p. 15-18).

After a lifetime of work in the field, Rouch combined his efforts with those of MacDougal and Young to further explore the construction of meaning, which resulted in a trio of articles collectively titled Principles of Visual Anthropology (Rouch, 1975; MacDougall, 1975;

Young, 1975; MacDougall, 1978). In a division of duties, Rouch emphasized the role of the filmmaker as a provider of action, Young underlined the importance of allowing the viewers enough latitude to construct their own personalized meanings, while MacDougall advocated for the importance of involving the protagonists in the construction of the meaning derived from the investigative effort (Henley in Prosser, 1998, p. 50).

A gradual shift toward collaborative forms of mediated meaning making entailed realigning emphasis away from a behaviorist and social structuralism "undergirded by the goal of a "natural science of society" (Marcus & Fisher, 1986, p. 26). Instead, meanings, symbols, and language needed reconsideration, allowing that social life be "conceived as the negotiation of meanings" (Marcus & Fisher, 1986, p. 26). The process of ethnographic field work was then recognized as one that, from its inception, underwent an "editing stage" which was subject to "cultural bias, idiosyncratically personal factors of gender, age, relationship of the subject, political interest, aesthetic taste, and so on" (Henley in Prosser, 1998, p. 43). The very nature of transforming a three dimensional world into a two-dimensional artifact, in the form of a photographic print, was indicative of procedures which altered any possible universal or objective perspective (Henley in Prosser, 1998, p. 42). Such considerations nullified any "claim upon the real" that might be implicit in an ethnographic document (Winston, 1995 in Prosser, 1998, p. 42).

Sekula (1986, p. 18) underscores the limitations of photography by emphasizing " an acute recognition of the "inadequacies" and limitations of ordinary empiricism". Winston (in Prosser, 1998, p. 64) concurs, while noting that photography "offers, at best, partial evidence despite the richness of the data it presents". This reflects the fact that "opportunities for manipulation are too great to allow a photograph to stand, of itself, as evidence of the external world" (Winston, in Prosser, 1998, p. 60). Like new forms of historicism, "instead of maintaining a single train of thought as in a linear textual medium", interpretive ethnography will need to "establish a structure that allows for multiple points of access" (Seaman & Williams, 1992, p. 310). In order to move ethnographic film from documentary to document, Morphy (1994) suggests that the visual text be combined with written text in order to enrich the anthropological process-- likening the procedure to "sifting through field notes" (Henley, in Prosser, 1998, p. 54).

This consideration is seconded by Rabinger (1987, p. 57-68), who sees a distinct advantage in New Ethnographers' predilections for combining a "particular range of techniques" to enhance the field project in question. An added incentive is to engage the viewer (the re-creatist, as neo-Vygotskians would say) to form new understandings through the benefits of cognitive pluralism, which would draw from multiple sensory processes. Additionally, a crucial aspect of collaborative knowledge-building are the benefits of co-participation, cooperative learning, joint discovery, and the elevation of an existing knowledge-base-- all components of mediated, socially constructed understanding (John-Steiner, 2000).

In this manner, investigative procedure involving image-based research could be a less cumbersome process, freed from the rigidity of hierarchical, lock-step thinking reminiscent of science-based, ethnographic procedures. Image-based theory could then be expanded to embrace a fluidity vital for field work in an educational domain undergoing a transition-- reflective of a planet whose communications system is experiencing an unprecedented growth spurt. As a result of this frenzied expansion, informed media critics fear that technology has created an educational entity whose growing pains result from a cyberbody of electronic nerve impulses far outpacing the development of a healthy, ethical, and ideological central nervous system. It could be argued that the New Historicist / Ethnographer, camera in hand, has the capacity to produce imagery that can either counterbalance, contradict, or confirm popular mythologies produced through visual narratives.

End Notes

 Banks, M. (1988) "The Non-Transparency of Ethnographic Film" in Anthropology Today, Vol. 4, p. 2-3.

Banks, M. (1990). "Experience and Reality in Ethnographic Film" in Visual Sociology Review. Vol. 5. p. 3-33.

Banks, M. (1994). "Television and Anthropology: An Unhappy Marriage?" in Visual Anthropology, Vol. 7. p. 21-45.

Banks, M. & Morphy, H. (1997) (eds.) Rethinking Visual Anthropology. London & New Haven: Yale University Press.

Barrett, T. (1993). Criticizing Art: Understanding the Contemporary. Mountain View, Ca.: Mayfield Publishing Co.

Bell, C. (1973). "Significant Form" in Rader, M. (ed.) A Modern Book of Aesthetics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.. p. 228-236.

Clifford, J. (1986) "On Ethnographic Allegory", in Clifford, J. & Marcus, G.E. (eds.) Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. Berkeley, Los Angeles, & London: University of California Press. p. 98-121.

Clifford, J. & Marcus, G.E. (1986) Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. Berkeley, Los Angeles, & London: University of California Press. p. 98-121.

Collinson, D. (1987)

Crimp, D. (1993). "The Boys in My Bedroom" in Hertz, R. (ed.) Theories of Contemporary Art. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall. p. 157-161.

Danto, A. (1981). The Transfiguration of the Commonplace: A Philosophy of Art. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Danto, A. (1992). Beyond the Brillo Box. New York: Farrar, Strauss, & Giroux.

deBromhead, A. (1996). Looking Two Ways: Documentary's Relationship with Cinema and Reality. Hojbjerg: Intervention Press.

Denzin, N.K. (1989. Interpretive Interactionism: Applied Social Research Methods. Vol. 16. Newbury Park, London, Delhi: Sage.

Derrida, J. (1978). Writing and Difference. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Dissanayake, E. (1988). What Is Art For?. Seattle, WA.: University of Washington Press.

Dow, A. (1899). Composition. New York: The Baker & Taylor Company.

Fairthorne, R. (1980). "The Principles of the Film" in MacPherson, D. (ed.) Traditions of Independence. London: BFI.

Faris, J.C. (1992) "Anthropological Transparency: Film, Representation and Politics" in Crawford, P.I. & Turton, D. (eds.) Film as Ethnography. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Fuchs, P. (1988). "Ethnographic Film in Germany: An Introduction" in Visual Anthropology, Vol. 1. p. 217-233.

Geertz, C. (1988). Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author. Stanford University Press.

Gell, A. (1992). "The Technology of Enchantment and the Enchantment of Technology" in Coote, J. & Shelton, A. (eds.) Anthropology, Art, and Aesthetics. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Golden, (1993) "What's White?" in Bicentenial Exhibition Catalogue (1993). New York: Whitney Museum of Art.

Greenberg, C. (1961). Art and Culture: Critical Essays. Boston: Beacon.

Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. (1995). Ethnography: Principles in Practice, 2nd ed.. London & New York: Routledge.

Henley, P. (1985). "British Ethnographic Film: Recent Developments" in Anthropology Today . Vol 1. p. 5-17.

Hockings, P. (1995). (ed.) Principles of Visual Anthropology (2nd ed.). The Hague: Mouton.

Hutchens, J. and Suggs, M. (eds.) (1997). Art Education: Content and Practice in a Postmodern Era. Reston, Va.: National Art Education Association.

Levi-Strauss, C. (1968). Structural Anthropology. Jacobson, C. & Grunfest Schoef, B. (eds.). London: Alan Lane, The Penguin Press.

Lippard, L. (1990). Mixed Blessings: New Art in a Multicultural America. New York: Pantheon Books.

Lippard, L. (1998). referenced in Hutchens, J. & Suggs, M. (eds.) (1997). Art Education: Content and Practice in a Postmodern Era. Reston, Va.: National Art Education Association.

Lowenfeld, V. (1952). Creative and Mental Growth. Revised Ed.. New York: The MacMillan Company.

Mac Dougall, D. (1975). "Beyond Observational Cinema" in Hockings, P. (ed.) Principles of Visual Anthropology, 2nd. ed.. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. p. 13-44.

MacDougall, D. (1978). "Ethnographic Film: Failure and Promise" in Annual Review of Anthropology, Vol. 7. p. 405-425.

Marcus, G.E. & Fischer, M.M.J. (1986). Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

May (W. (1992). "Philosopher as Researcher and/or Begging the Question(s)" in   Studies in Art Education. Vol. 33., p. 226-243.

Mead, M. (1995). "Visual Anthropology in a Discipline of Words", in Hockings, P. (ed.) Principles of Visual Anthropology, 2nd ed., Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. p. 3-10.

Mead, M. & Bateson, G. (1942). "Balinese Character: A Photographic Analysis" in Special Publications of the New York Academy of Sciences, Vol. 2. New York.

Moore, H. (1994). "Trinh T. Mionh-ha Observed: Anthropology and Others" in Taylor, L. (ed.) Visualizing Theory: Selected Essays From Visual Anthropology Review 1990-4. New York &

London: Routledge. p. 115-125. Originally published in 1990 in Visual Anthropology Review, Vol. 6.

Moore, H. (1994). "Marketing Alterity" in Taylor, L. (ed.) Visualizing Theory: Selected Essays From Visual Anthropology Review 1990-4. New York &   London: Routledge. p. 126-139. Originally published in 1992 in Visual Anthropology Review, Vol. 6.

Morphy, H. (1994). "The Interpretation of Ritual: Reflections on Film on Anthropological Practice" in Man, Vol. 29. p. 117-146.

Peirce, C. (1965). Collected Papers: Vol. 2. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belnap Press at the Harvard Press.

Rabiger, M. (1987). Directing the Documentary. Boston and London: Focal Press.

Ricoeur, P. (1965). Civilization and National Cultures, History, and Truth. (Kelbley, C.A. (trans.)). Evanston, Il.: Northwestern University Press.

Rouch, J. (1975). "The Camera and Man" in Hockings, P. (ed.) Principles of Visual Anthropology, 2nd. ed.. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 79-98.

Rushing, W. (1992). Editor's statement. "Critical Issues in Recent Native American Art" in Art Journal, Vol. 51. p. 6.

Sekula, A. (1986) "The Body and the Archive" in The Observer (1966). Oct. Vol. 39.

Seaman, G. & Williams, H. (1992). "Hypermedia in Ethnography" in Crawford,   P. & Turton, D. (eds.) Film as Ethnography. Manchester: Manchester University Press. p. 300-311.

Sorensen, E.R. & Jablonko, A. (1995). "Research Filming of Naturally Occurring Phenomena", in Hockings, P. (ed.) Principles of Visual Anthropology, 2nd. ed.. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 147-159.

Young, C. (1975). "Observational Cinema" in Hockings, P. (ed.) Principles of Visual Anthropology, 2nd. ed.. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 99-113.

Walking Stick, K. (1992). Editor's statement. "Native American Art in the Postmodern Era" in Art Journal, Vol. 51, p. 15.

Waugh, P. (ed.) (1992). Postmodernism: A Reader. New York: Routledge.

West, C.. referenced in Golden, (1993). "What's White?" in Bicentennial Exhibition Catalogue (1993). New York: Whitney Museum of Art.