

Summary

This is the first thematic collection of Visual Anthropology texts in Finnish, a series of theoretical, historical and methodological analyses tracing the history and the present state of visual anthropology in Finland. The volume's approach is multidisciplinary. The writers approach the thematic from various directions ranging from professional filmmaking to artistic research, and more, yet each text anchors in visual anthropology, which appears as a crossroad of different skills and competences in research practice.

A crosscutting theme of the volume is the question concerning the nature of visual knowledge in relation to logocentric and textual knowledge, which is analysed in several contributions. Another shared theme is the marginalised status of visual anthropology within mainstream anthropology and documentary film, which seems to have been aggravated with the advancement of digital media. Indeed, the digitalisation of audio-visual technology has brought about considerable adjustments in visual anthropology documentation, analysis and publishing practices. Digitalisation in visual anthropology is analysed in the different texts, which provide fresh approaches and methods to deconstruct divisions such as text and image, linguistic and visual, art and research, or aesthetics and ethics. The attempt is motivated by the need to identify renewed epistemological and methodological ways to study visuality in culture and society.

The book is divided into three sections, which offer perspectives into theory, history and contemporary methodology in visual anthropology. The opening article by Jari Kupiainen outlines recent theoretical debates in the field and defines key concepts discussed throughout the volume added with a critical discussion of ethics in research. The article positions visual anthropology within the multidisciplinary field of research into cultural visuality, as boosted by developments in digital communication technology.

Ilkka Ruohonen (1958–2016) contextualises anthropological film as being research and simultaneously aesthetically oriented documentary film. The two orientations position differently during the various phases of the history of visual anthropology, and the

article analyses and deconstructs this process. The contradiction between the two orientations, and the resulting marginalisation of anthropological film, evidences in the critical and reflective analysis of Robert Flaherty's film *Nanook of the North* (1922) and author's own professional career as anthropological filmmaker, which concludes the article, and the argument.

Jouko Aaltonen analyses the relationship between documentary film and visual anthropology in the different periods of film history. Anthropology has contributed much to documentary filmmaking, and changes in the field of documentary film have accordingly influenced visual anthropology to the effect that documentary film and visual anthropology interconnect. As a professional filmmaker, the writer also positions anthropological and ethnographic filmmaking as a profession outside of the professional filmmaking practice in the present, because no funding for anthropological film productions is available in Finland.

Liisa Häkkinen continues Aaltonen's argument that film is part of culture and society and film also represents them. Häkkinen concludes the first section of the volume and discusses the emergence of research into visual culture as a more recent approach to study visuality in society. Visual culture research, media research and visual anthropology share many similar interests, research methods and background theories. This provides grounds for a new multidisciplinary base to incorporate the study of visuality in its diversity within the social and cultural sciences.

Mirja Metsola opens the second section with the history of anthropological and ethnographic film in Finland. Metsola points out that visual anthropology and ethnography cover a number of academic disciplines "like an umbrella". The text analyses the practice of filmmaking in relation to anthropology. The influential career of ethnographic filmmaking pioneer Sakari Pälsi and the production company, Kansatieteellinen Filmi Oy (Ethnographic Film Ltd.), are discussed in detail, yet the article also provides a kaleidoscopic view into the wider history of Finnish documentary filmmaking. An important contribution of the article is the reflective analysis of documentary filmmaking practice within the Finnish Broadcasting

Company, where the writer has made a long career as documentary director and producer.

Sirkku Dölle relates her extensive career as developer of image archiving at the National Museum of Finland in her contribution that details the history of museum related visual documentation of Finnish culture. The article discusses the position of photography in the documentation practice especially in the context of joint projects with the museum and academic researchers. The article emphasises the importance of thorough knowledge of existing image collections and a developed sense of visual perception in the research of historical image collections.

Mervi Löfgren (f. Autti) delivers a model of gender sensitive case study in the analysis of private collection historical photographs taken in the early Twentieth century and depicting her female relatives. Löfgren deconstructs the gaze and cultural norms and gendered orders embedded in historical photos, such as in family albums, and their viewing. She argues for a feminist oriented approach in visual studies, a necessity in the analysis of gendering in images.

The third section focuses on present methods and methodological concerns in visual anthropology research practice. Jari Kupiainen discusses photo elicitation as ethnographic field research method. His observations from Solomon Islands provide a critique of limitations of photo elicitation in information documentation, if the focus is only in what informants narrate in speech. Instead, field researchers should focus much more onto what is not verbalised but expressed differently, and bypassing the domain of language altogether. The article contextualises the interpretation of photographs by research informants in the wider sociocultural dynamics of the relevant community and identifies different strategies and trajectories of image viewing by participants. The article concludes with a discussion of immaterial property rights and ethics related to image based research in the present.

Elina Paju continues the discussion of ethics in her analysis of image-based research, and the presence of camera, in the study of children in day-care. The text details and discusses the various consequences that cameras and their use bring to social settings of the

study and documentation. The article introduces applicable models for addressing the emerging ethical issues that image-based research among children typically produces.

Lea Kantonen and Pekka Kantonen introduce their research method of generational video in the study of Setu musical traditions in Estonia. The objective is to produce a visual "research-text" of an ethnographic topic. The method of generational video is influenced by Jean Rouch's ideas of a shared anthropology in that previously shot videos have been screened to informants while documenting this in the new video. Then the next generation video is screened again to them and other audiences, and new videos are made. The resulting study is multiply reflective and polyphonic analysis of its theme, combining elements from the study of a musical tradition, visual anthropology and artistic research.

Asko Lehmuskallio discusses image and visual space activism in Berlin. The text highlights the concepts of gaze, image and the hegemonies of visual ordering in the analysis of urban visual space and the struggle between companies and citizens in its sharing. The article deconstructs the hierarchies related to the visual space through narratives of activists doing visual interventions into corporation occupied public visibility in urban space.

The volume concludes with three interrelated texts offering views into present visual anthropology practices and developments in the context of Viscult 2010 Film Festival of anthropological and ethnographic documentaries. First, Jari Kupiainen introduces the theme of anthropological film festivals in visual anthropology and contextualises the Viscult festival within the international scene of anthropological film festivals. It also introduces the Viscult 2010 Panel Discussion on the theme, "Where is Visual Anthropology?" and edited into this volume.

Among the audience during the Viscult 2010 Panel Discussion was Professor Yevgeny Aleksandrov from Moscow State Lomonosov University, who did not participate in the discussion but provided a background paper for discussants. This article, "Consonant Camera: Ethics and Aesthetics of the Anthropological Filmmaking", is translated in this volume by Jari Kupiainen. The text argues for the

anthropologist's need to capture the natural ambience and document the persons in images as unobtrusively as possible. The text explains the documentation practice in detail and issues ethical concerns in the visual documentation and representation of cultural practices.

The *Viscult* 2010 two-hour Panel Discussion on the theme, "Where Is Visual Anthropology?", was chaired by Dr. Jari KUPIAINEN and the discussants were Professors Peter I. Crawford, Faye Ginzburg, Jay Ruby, Anjali Monteiro and Dr. Steef MEYKNECHT (1951–2015). After introductions, the discussion proceeded to discussant perspectives on defining visual anthropology and anthropological film within wider contexts of anthropological practice and documentary filmmaking through references into the history and theory of visual anthropology. Touching the relationship between visual culture research and visual anthropology, the topic then shifts to the relationship between "fact" and "fiction", or fictive elements, in anthropological and ethnographic films with one highlight on "ethno-fiction" developed by Jean Rouch and others. Here, the focus is on ethical concerns and ways of addressing them. The discussion concludes with a debate on the relationship between visual anthropology productions and the mainstream media industry and television, and the discussants provide divergent strategies for organising such interactions.

This book is dedicated to the memories of Steef Meyknecht (1951–2015) and Ilkka Ruohonen (1958–2016).