Introducing the Multi-Sided Ethnographer

Anna-Maria Walter, Pascale Schild, Usman Mahar and Tim Burger

Blurred boundaries

Ethnographic fieldwork and its representation, often in the form of an ethnographic text, are two sides of the same coin. At least since the *Writing Culture* debate in the 1980s, reflexivity in relation to the ethnographer's positionality has been crucial for writing ethnography, thereby making anthropological knowledge more transparent. However, the same cannot be said about anthropologists' everyday life in the field, which is commonly – if not intentionally – ignored in ethnographic texts. While outmoded stereotypes of the lone anthropologist immersed in a distant society, studying mysterious native customs, have now been widely challenged by the reflexive, relational and engaged practices of anthropology, some assumptions around what ethnographers actually *do* in the field remain unquestioned. This volume aims to uncover sides of the anthropologist and their lives invisible in ethnographic publications and hopes to disrupt misleading images that persist of what they do or do not do in the field.

Since fieldwork tends to blur the boundaries between private and professional life, ethnographers appear to be always on duty, eliciting valuable encounters and lying in wait for that next moment of serendipity, revelation, epiphany or insight. Yet what happens when the recorder is off, when the notebook stays in the pocket? What lies in the gaps and the pauses of a busy fieldwork schedule? What concerns and commitments drive ethnographers beyond and amidst, because of – and in spite of – their fieldwork? And crucially, how do these ideas and

activities shape their work, future projects and academic careers? These are all questions we cannot neglect, even if answering them means revealing parts of our lives that may unsettle beliefs and convictions of what ethnographic fieldwork is and what it should be.

Our volume approaches these questions by exploring four dimensions of ethnographic multi-sidedness, pointing to the more-than-fieldwork qualities of (1) *leisure* activities, (2) *kinship* relations, (3) practices of *representation* and (4) *politics* in the field. Leisure comprises the hobbies and personal interests anthropologists take into the field, discover over the course of their fieldwork or utterly fail to find time for. Kinship encompasses modes of accompanied fieldwork as well as the forging of new (fictive) kin relations. Both leisure and kinship make for a valuable analytic with which to think through an ethnographic life in and beyond research and to challenge classic tropes of research methodology. Representation, i.e., written and visual accounts of fieldwork, reflects on the ways and possibilities of acknowledging a life beyond the heroic imagination of an independent ethnographer gathering data. Lastly, politics, not only as everyday micro-negotiations of power, but also as powerful interventions during fieldwork, speaks to matters of agency and surveillance as well as collaboration and activism. These four fields of inquiry all emerge from our contention that anthropology is not made up solely of a body of refined and published ethnographic writings, but also of what remains unsaid or at the edges in such accounts and in anthropology more generally.

Throughout his work, Martin Sökefeld has both pointed out and drawn on the ethnographic potential of what lies beyond an anthropologist's 'main' research questions and activities. Everything we encounter in the field is potentially meaningful and illustrative of social practices and their contexts. However, we simply cannot – or may not want to – write about 'everything', for various reasons. Recognising this notion, Sökefeld also encourages us to write precisely about what we might (want to) miss at first glance.

His article *Ethnologie der Öffentlichkeit und die Öffentlichkeit der Ethnologie* (Anthropology of the Public and Public Anthropology) (2009) teaches us a great lesson here. In the article, Sökefeld traces anthropol-

ogy's complicated relationship with the media and the public in general through his own example as an anthropologist and that of his research partners: Kashmiris who struggle for public, international recognition of their movement for the right to political self-determination and freedom from India (and Pakistan). The article details how he conducted fieldwork in Srinagar, the capital of Indian-held Jammu and Kashmir, for his research on the Kashmiri diaspora's transnational connections, at a time when political violence and protests had broken out. These demonstrations were met with curfews and state repression, and he was mostly unable to pursue his research as planned. Amid these tensions, he was contacted by a German journalist from *Spiegel Online* for an interview. The topic, however, was not Kashmir but rather an upcoming annual commemoration day of the Alevi community, which Sökefeld had previously researched for several years (see Sökefeld 2008). Journalists in Germany, India and elsewhere seemed to take little interest in the political events in Kashmir at the time.

Apart from showing Sökefeld's versatile engagement as an ethnographer, the article explains how other-than-research activities during fieldwork can lead to new research themes and important social and political insights 'beyond research'. Rather than producing tunnel visions, ethnography, as Sökefeld reminds us, must respond to fieldwork encounters with a fundamental, epistemological openness. Therefore, instead of dismissing the interview as simply a frustrating encounter with a journalist, he takes it as an opportunity to reflect on the difficult relationship between anthropology and the public. How can we, as anthropologists, along with our research partners, participate in the public sphere and interact with the media in a more meaningful and politically transformative way? There are no simple answers in this regard, but it is the need and willingness to return to these and related questions of ethical and political engagement that shape, among other more-than-research activities, Sökefeld's multi-sided work as an anthropologist and ethnographer.

Inspired by his engaged scholarship and diverse interests, such as hiking, food, films, photography, politics and music, to say nothing of Pakistani truck art, the contributions to this book address matters of

commensality, various forms of (kin) relations, political activism as well as hobbies – taken to or brought back from the field – and other leisure activities. This Festschrift for Martin's 60th birthday is dedicated to him as an ever-learning student, teacher, colleague and friend. In all these roles, he has been adamant about the fact that 'the field' is not merely a place but a topos that needs to be understood as highly situational and contextual. This volume focuses on the shifting roles of the fieldworker within that social context. Probing the fuzzy boundaries between work and private life, it seeks to explore what anthropology can learn from the mundane doings of ethnographers beyond their immediate research questions and practices.

The fieldworker demystified

Examining the multifaceted lives of researchers in the field means challenging the long-standing imaginary of the highly professional, scientifically determined and emotionally detached ethnographer. This fanciful depiction results from a particular genealogy of the ethnographic method and continues to shape the making of anthropological knowledge. While it has been repeatedly pointed out that stubbornly adhering to classic principles of fieldwork is flawed at best, if not outrightly problematic (Amit 2000; Günel, Varma & Watanabe 2020; Gupta and Ferguson 1997; Stolz et al. 2020), we remain caught in a methodological myth of fieldwork that cannot do without the obligatory reference point of stationary, lonesome and 'data-gathering' ethnography.

Anthropological fieldwork has a lengthy history that can be traced back to the late 19th century (Stocking 1983). Before the emergence of the field as we know it today, anthropology was largely a theoretical discipline based almost exclusively on armchair speculation in which researchers would analyse from afar societies deemed as 'exotic', intentionally omitting any personal interaction. Dissatisfied with the 'unscientific' assumptions and stereotypes this methodology reproduced, a more intersubjective and immersive approach was advocated for in the early 20th century.

While Bronislaw Malinowski, in the early 1900s, was certainly not the first to realise the intellectual potential of spending time with the people one seeks to understand, he nonetheless championed the canonisation of modern fieldwork. His seminal work on the Trobriand Islands established the crucial disciplinary norms of long-term residence, language learning and participant observation (1979 [1922]: 24–49). Against the backdrop of the (natural) scientific context of the time, Malinowski professionalised ethnographic fieldwork as a core rational and objective method of social and cultural anthropology and, as such, also defined a clear separation from the researcher's emotions and private life. The posthumous publication of his diaries (1967) revealed not only this sharp distinction between 'rational' research (ethnography) and 'emotional' life (dairies), but also the presence of a racist and sexist fieldworker who faced a deep personal crisis because he did not live up to the empathetic and professional approach he himself had proclaimed. On the contrary, the diaries showed an academic who was deeply entangled with his research and research partners, but one who nevertheless consistently disregarded personal relationships and feelings in favour of a distanced ethnography. At the same time, the fact that Malinowski wrote diaries, which he had no intention of ever publishing, points to the existence of a private life during fieldwork – one that also involved activities beyond his research, such as reading novels or taking walks.

Malinowski's method of conducting ethnographic fieldwork became the standard for anthropologists and has served as a vocational rite de passage: "[I]t is fieldwork that makes one a 'real anthropologist'" (Gupta & Ferguson 1997: 1). While ethnography still relies heavily on first-hand encounters 'in the field', the originally rational, objective and holistic assumptions have had to make way for self-reflexive attention to the private, political and subjective circumstances of anthropological knowledge-making. This awareness of the researcher's "situatedness" (Haraway 1988), and the partiality of any knowledge produced, went hand in hand with enquiries into the textual strategies of creating ethnographic authority (cf. Clifford and Marcus 1986, Fabian 1983, Kuper 1988). Until the *Writing Culture* debate in the 1980s unsettled the production of anthropological knowledge more broadly, there had been

early interventions (mostly by women or anthropologists of colour) which highlighted the difficulties of ethnographic representation and experimented with alternative ways of researching and writing (cf. Hurston 1928, 1935; Powdermaker 1939, 1950). Feminist contributions, initially often unrecognised, pointed out the male bias distorting fieldwork practices and anthropological models of social life (cf. Ortner 1974, Rosaldo and Lamphere 1974, Strathern 1987). While such a genealogy displays a more complex, multi-faceted approach to fieldwork within the discipline, the predominant Malinwskian conception of ethnography continued to produce influential works and proponents throughout the 20th century. Edward E. Evans-Pritchard, for example, declared fieldwork that was not conducted on one's own and in isolation to be relatively worthless (1973). Similarly, Erving Goffman continued to argue for a rather martial understanding of ethnography with the imperative to "cut your life to the bone" (1989: 127) in order to find out anything meaningful to report about the Other. This single-minded, heroic and self-sacrificial devotion of the lone anthropologist in the pursuit of ethnographic data is what we identify as an enduring disciplinary norm in desperate need of alternatives. In this volume, we make the case for recognising the multi-sidedness and indeterminacy of fieldwork encounters and their value for anthropological knowledge-making.

Today, anthropologists continue to rely heavily on ethnography as a means of conceptual apprehension, disciplinary practice and critical theory-making. Fieldwork involves more than just 'collecting data', in that it requires building and negotiating relationships, engaging with social contexts and power structures and gaining trust within heterogeneous communities. The knowledge created through fieldwork is essential for anthropologists to comprehend, and provide insights into, human societies and ways of living.

Going beyond simplified understandings of ethnographic fieldwork, whereby we immerse ourselves in the 'culture' and context of our interlocutors, this volume aims to shed light on the complexities and messiness of fieldwork in post-colonial contexts. Instead of sweeping our concerns under the imagined rug of Malinowskian fieldwork, it reflects on the common dilemmas of ethnographic fieldwork in an effort to show

that the lens of multi-sidedness can help us acknowledge aspects that might, at times, be seen as 'limitations' and, in doing so, highlight their analytical and epistemological value. Gregory Bateson's story about Zen Buddhist training to overcome double binds comes to mind and helps illustrate our approach (Bateson et al. 1956 as cited in Gregory 2014; cf. Green 2014). In this anecdote, a Zen master holds a stick above a student's head and lists three options that the student seemingly has: to say that the stick is real, to say that it is not real or to say nothing. Whatever the student says will lead to them being hit. The only way out of such a dilemma is to take away the stick from the master. In our case, the metaphorical stick seems to be the many normative ideas about fieldwork, including the mythical ideal of an isolated lone hero who cuts their own life to the bare bone in order to understand their interlocutors or, better yet, adopts their way of life (cf. Evans-Pritchard 1973; Goffman 1989). Following Bateson's suggestion, in order to solve our double bind, we must challenge the premises of the debate by taking away the 'stick'. Our hope is that a discussion of ethnographers' versatility as multi-sidedness will allow us to take away the colonial, heteropatriarchal 'stick' of fieldwork standards and ideals that many of us try to live up to.

Before beginning his research, on one occasion, Usman Mahar rather unreflectively shared his ideal of fieldwork by mentioning Loïc Wacquant's boxing ethnography, "Body and Soul" (2004). Fascinated with this ethnographic research at a boxing gym in a black neighbourhood of Chicago's South Side, Usman conversed with a few colleagues. Discussing Wacquant's pugilist ethnographic engagement, i.e. his participation in amateur and professional fights to uncover the embodied aspects of masculinity at the gym, Usman exclaimed something along the lines of "Now that's ethnographic research!" Upon hearing this, Martin, who was within earshot, quickly pointed out to Usman that in the case of his PhD research this would mean living as an irregularised migrant or, worse yet, getting himself deported. Martin's often sharp and witty comments have remained with the editors of this volume and remind them of his dynamic and reflexive approach to 'the field' and life. His comments often make him take what Richard Rorty (1989: 74) calls the "ironist" position in opposition to the "commonsensical"

view of those who "unselfconsciously describe everything important in terms of the final vocabularies to which they and those around them are habituated." On the abovementioned occasion, Martin helped Usman take away the 'stick' of an idealised approach to ethnographic fieldwork. Ironically pointing out that total immersion and adopting one's interlocutors' way of life could not be a blanket ethnographic maxim applicable to all contexts, nor a maxim by which we have to live, he aided Usman in questioning his 'common sense' in the Rortian meaning of the term. On a more abstract level, his remark communicated to Usman how the context of research determines the participation of the observing researcher and how the researcher's subjectivity plays as much of a role as the lives of interlocutors in the fieldwork context. In most cases, the manifestation of the field takes place through the interaction between the two – not the disappearing of the former into the latter during fieldwork, only to reappear again during the writing-up phase. Thus, while Usman was able to live with his migrant, deportee and returnee interlocutors, Martin's comment was a constant reminder that 'living with' or even 'living like' does not equate to 'living as'.

While Martin would certainly not be against any kind of (full) immersion or adopting the interlocutors' way of life in the pursuit of ethnographic research, he was critical of conflating immersion with membership (see Cosan Eke's contribution in this volume, or Khosravi's auto-ethnography, 2010). Particularly in certain contexts where, despite all our immersion, we are ultimately temporarily present and at best guests engaged in a 'suspension of disbelief'. Therefore, we think it pertinent that ethnographers discuss in greater detail their own everyday lives in the field and unpick the particularities and subtleties of ethnographic immersion in all its complexities.

All that said, ethnographic engagement certainly still involves long-term contact with a group of people and, in many cases, a political commitment, even if from a distance. In a digitally connected world, we also take our political and social lives into the field and, similarly, remain connected with the politics therein, and our interlocutors, once we are back at "home" (Hughes & Walter 2021, Chua 2021). The mundane doings of

ethnographers beyond their immediate research question, we believe, are imbued with epistemological value and merit reflection.

The value of multi-sidedness

Living up to the methodological debates within anthropology, as well as to changing contours of the field in an increasingly globalised world, George E. Marcus (1995) introduced the multi-sited ethnography approach. What Arjun Appadurai (1996) analytically grasped as cultural *scapes*, Marcus sought to tackle empirically: Since, in the contemporary world, field sites can no longer be defined in the dichotomy of local and global but are more interconnected and mobile, a multi-sited ethnography acknowledges and follows the movements of and connections between people, goods and ideas, the circulation of meanings and identities between and across places and contexts. It would be nothing short of reductionist to limit oneself to a single *site*. Some anthropologists might have feared losing the depth of stationary fieldwork in multi-sited research, but it has shown to be a productive approach that very few modern-day research projects can omit. And with the advent of ubiquitous digital connectivity, ethnographic work has become even more hybrid (Pink et al. 2016, Przybylski 2021) as well as nonlocal (Feldman 2011).

While recent efforts by scholars advocate embracing the patchiness of research activities and anthropologists' private circumstances (Günel, Varma & Watanabe 2020) or work obligations as lecturers and professors (Dürr and Sökefeld 2018), we also notice the potential of an ethnographer's multi-sidedness. Why should we not analytically tap in to the multiple *sides* of the ethnographer instead of focusing only on their professional self? A discussion of the multi-sided ethnographer brings out their biographical, personal and emotional layers. Leaning on Marcus (1995), we may ask ourselves the following: as ethnographers with many sites, how do we traverse our many other sides, and vice versa?

After all, an anthropologist might be a daughter, a partner, a single mother, non-binary, of colour, passionate about music, sports or art,

a religious practitioner, a political activist, in a precarious career situation, an intensely sociable person or rather introvert and many more angles of the self that play out in ethnographic fieldwork. The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines "multi" as "having multiple and usually more than two sides" – just like a dice in a board game. But instead of implying some form of holism, the dice analogy alerts us to the different stakes each side holds, in that all sides make us move, albeit in different ways and directions. Some might immediately lead to more in-depth understanding, others might complicate the matter and only in the long run, if ever, unfurl their creative potential. Consequently, the multi-sided ethnographer is a researcher who draws on different registers of private and professional life to acquire diverse – possibly unconventional and surprising – perspectives on a particular social phenomenon.

The researcher seeks to generate a nuanced understanding of complex cultural contexts by drawing on a range of sources of knowledge and by engaging in sustained and meaningful dialogue with different groups of people. The approach means understanding how interlocutors experience, interpret and make sense of their social worlds, taking into account the diverse cultural and social practices, values and beliefs that shape their experiences by acknowledging the ethnographer's own human embeddedness in the research context – in the co-creation of knowledge, considering not only their interlocutors' points of view, but also the complexity of the researcher's self. With this in mind, how then could any researcher ever attempt to disavow or disregard all that they are and bring with them to their field?

In his seminal article *Debating Self, Identity and Culture in Anthropology*, Sökefeld (1999) identifies a tendency towards othering in the way anthropology used to refer to identity. For groups, the term was often readily associated with "sameness of the self with others" (Sökefeld 1999: 417), i.e., implying sharing many characteristics with others and thus portraying our research partners as part of a collective identity instead of being their own personal (or psychological) selves. In contrast, 'we' ethnographers typically do not want to see ourselves reduced to collective markers but instead depict our subjectivity as being actively shaped by us in the process of learning and performing. Sökefeld argues that 'selfsameness'

as congruency of a singular personality only exists in the Cartesian tradition of thought. As an alternative, we should consider all human beings as rich and competent selves who creatively juggle and enact competing identities; people can discern between their own conscious self and others in the group and use this ability to manoeuvre their own actions and motivations. Depending on the situation and network to which a person relates in a certain moment, the image they project and have of themselves varies. Hence, exposure to and interaction with different frames of reference also restructure their own self-perception. While we combine multiple identities within ourselves that can coexist, overlap and partly contradict at the same time, Sökefeld points us to a person's inner narrative of coherence and continuity that they construct and flexibly adapt to manage diverse identities.

This conceptual approach can be empirically illustrated by recent research which challenges the idea of parallel identities for an update (Chua 2021, Walter 2021). Enquiring into the consequences of constant connectivity afforded by mobile phones and online media demonstrates that different contexts cannot be held separately (anymore) but potentially render themselves present at any time. More than a serial representation of one's selves, these different roles are suddenly (or perhaps always, already) 'there', creating friction with one another, rendering inconsistencies cruelly visible, deflating the careful efforts of self-curation in which everyone strives to perceive themselves as a sensible whole – not a static or a bounded one but one in which splits are reconciled. Direct and immediate connections demand instant positionality, and a compartmentalisation of the self's different roles and emotions à la Malinowski is no longer possible – if it were ever more than an illusion. Consequently, people increasingly work to streamline their persona and realise that any experience recalibrates the whole.

The contributions to this volume arrive at a similar conclusion: ethnographers have many sides, bring different interests and liabilities to the field and adjust themselves to various contexts and situations. However, the field and the home, the private and the professional, the personal and the public are not disconnected but mutually shape each other. Boundaries are extremely blurry, and any interaction affecting

the person of the ethnographer consequently also has an impact on the subject(ivity) of the ethnography. Fieldwork, as James Clifford (1997) observed, is a "disciplining practice" that provides anthropology scientific credibility and distinction from other disciplines while at the same time forcing anthropologists to adhere to certain standards and conventions (see Burger/Burger in this volume), such as the conception of the 'field' as a distant place into which the researcher enters and exists. An 'anthropology at home' has called this divide into question and broken down the epistemological distance between researcher and interlocutor.

In his piece *Feld ohne Ferne* (Field without Distance), Sökefeld (2002) similarly muses on the artificial separation of a naïve outsider versus an insider's lack of objectivity and acknowledges the need for (self-)reflection. Whether doing anthropology at home or somewhere else, the ethnographer's background and circumstances are an intrinsic part of their everyday life during fieldwork. Moreover, the researcher is not a static entity but a responsive and permeable being changing and transforming often over time. While supposedly private aspects of leisure and kin relations or emotions and difficulties encountered during fieldwork (Schild 2021) are often neglected in ethnographies, possibly even muted or remain untapped altogether, they are nevertheless crucial in shaping ethnographers' works and lives. Since the anthropologist is the prime instrument of ethnography, Ian Pollock (2018), in a blog post about his emotional disturbance after a terror attack, asked himself, "Maybe if I played this tragedy right, I could have turned it into data after all."

This collection of essays strives to bring to the fore some of the frequently ignored motivations and contingencies of researchers' interactions, findings and interpretations. How, for example, would Sökefeld ever have published an illustrative photo essay on Atabad Lake (Gilgit-Baltistan) without his passion for hiking? And would he ever have discovered the Alevi movement in Germany had he not lived with his family next to a community centre in Hamburg when his children were still young? Rather than a project of navel-gazing, the multi-sided ethnographer makes the case for recognising the anthropologist as an indivisibly complex human being that is inseparable from their work.

Outline of the book: Ethnography as more than field*work*

We have identified in this collection four domains of (private) life and multi-sidedness that seem to play out most prominently during fieldwork: leisure or private hobbies; (fictive) kinship relations; practices of documentation and (self-)representation; and politics and ethical engagements.

Section One explores the forms and possibilities of leisure in the field. Drawing on their early fieldwork experiences in Mitla (Mexico) and Nilgiri (India), Eveline Dürr and Frank Heidemann discuss 'leisure' in the field. They unpack the fuzziness of work-life boundaries in our discipline over the years through ideas related to their positionality, specific conditions in their respective fieldwork sites and certain challenges, such as being closely watched and intimately connected with the lives of the interlocutors with whom they worked. Other contributions demonstrate that anthropologists do indeed have and maintain hobbies during fieldwork, which sometimes even turn into important research activities. In her chapter on hiking ethnography, Sabine Strasser traces diverse forms of 'walking-talking' in ethnographers' lives. Relying on the experiences of four ethnographers, as well as her own hiking experience with Martin Sökefeld in the high mountains of Pakistan, her thoughts on walking and conversing open up a path for the reader to reflect on the affective and embodied sides of research practices.

Beatrice Odierna's chapter further underlines such leisure-related connections, showing how sewing, especially patchwork, helped her to (re-)connect with her research partners through a shared hobby during the Covid-19 pandemic and its lockdowns. At the same time, patchwork became an important metaphor for her research practices and a way to rethink her positionality in fieldwork at home. Finally, Alessandro Rippa demonstrates how a side-interest can serendipitously develop into a central research perspective. More specifically, he traces how his search for carpets for friends in Europe, and his interest in carpet craft and design, deepened his understanding of transnational trade relations between China, Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Shifting the perspective from leisure activities and private hobbies to social belonging and relationships, Section Two examines the role of kinship and family and religious ties in fieldwork. Drawing on her experience as both an Alevi member and a researcher of Alevi religious practices in Germany and Turkey, Deniz Cosan Eke shows how the ethnographic field and its constituent research partners not only open up to the 'insider', but also hold special challenges for them. The 'insider' has to prove herself, which in turn makes her an 'outsider' again. The social constitution of the field through the researcher's personal relationships is also the theme of Menahil Tahir's chapter discussing the role of her parents in her fieldwork among Afghan immigrants in Pakistan. The author shows how the presence of the anthropologist's family in the field helps build trust and enables research partners to emotionally draw connections between their lives, experiences and histories and those of the researcher. Sometimes, however, it is not so much the kinship relations that anthropologists bring into the field but rather those that they take with them from the field that continue to shape their future research. Stephen Lyon's chapter shows that an anthropologist's fictive kinship ties can also close down possibilities of research and even lead a researcher to give up their professional work because of the social obligations that come with the assigned role of son and brother in a local family.

While all contributions understand 'the field' as constructed by the researcher's social relationships, Section Three extends this perspective to those practices of living and (visually) representing the field that often do not make it into published ethnographies. Lisa Burger and Tim Burger reflect on their experiences of accompanied fieldwork, showing how couples, in particular couples with children, may differ in terms of their understanding of events in the field and how to respond to them. However, as in their case only one partner was a fully funded researcher, only his version was to eventually find its way into a PhD thesis. Anthropological (writing) conventions tend to produce tunnel visions of both fieldwork and ethnography, marginalising a wide range of experiences and personal circumstances – as Martin Saxer argues in the introduction to his photo essay, which provides us with the visual by-product of

his professional life as a researcher on the move and at home with his family in various parts of the world. In his contribution, Magnus Treiber traces the rarely discussed transformation of field notes into ethnography as a crucial epistemological and analytical process in the making of anthropological knowledge.

The last section introduces anthropologists' complicated political entanglements in and with the field. Pascale Schild draws on her experience with state surveillance during fieldwork in Pakistan-controlled Kashmir. Her contribution points out that suspicion is not merely a sideshow of ethnographic research, but also offers the possibility to think through both the politically intimate and intimately political workings of coloniality and military nationalism in the lives of researchers and the people with whom they live and interact within the field. In his chapter, Azam Chaudhary extends on the conditions of coloniality, discussing state surveillance in Pakistan from the perspective of the 'local' (Pakistani) anthropologist collaborating with foreign researchers. Chaudhary points to the post-colonial researcher's distinctive positionality and their vulnerability to suspicion and mistrust from the state and society, due to their collaboration with suspect but privileged foreigners. Finally, Usman Mahar examines altruistic engagement as not only an ethical requirement, but also a complex and an affective side of the ethnographer. This leads him to probe the politics and ethics of what he terms *qurb\ani* (nearness as a path to altruism) as a way in which researchers can engage with research partners as collaborators despite persistent constraints.

The volume closes with a personal letter to Martin Sökefeld by his former Master's and PhD students Anna Grieser, Anna-Maria Walter, Sohaib Bodla, Jacqueline Wilk and Clarissa Leopold. They reflect on their experiences of falling in love and getting married as a consequence of their fieldwork, challenging one of anthropology's firmest taboos, namely that of 'going native'. Even though the myth of the ethnographer's objectivity has long been disenchanted, the professionalism of anthropologists is still doubted in the face of emotional entanglements.

Drawing on the notion of 'living the field beyond research', the contributions collectively offer diverse and nuanced discussions of fieldwork

as well as ethnographically informed perspectives on the meanings and possibilities of practices and positions 'beyond research'. Some authors point to the embodied experience of fieldwork and their near-complete immersion in a social context, with their private lives and personal relationships often inseparable from research (Dürr/Heidemann; Schild; Cosan Eke; Tahir). Others, in contrast, focus on the way private hobbies and interests discovered during the course of fieldwork inform new research questions (Odierna; Rippa) and on how new personal relationships fundamentally change their role and positionality as professional researchers (Grieser et al.; Lyon; Chaudhary; Mahar). At the same time, some fieldwork experiences will forever remain on the margins of published work (Burger/Burger; Treiber; Saxer). However, they remind us that no anthropological research is possible beyond a researcher's multiple positions, passions and relationships within local and global power structures. It is indeed this recognition that is at the heart of our claim about the multi-sided ethnographer: while there certainly is life beyond research, there can be no ethnographic research beyond life.

References

Appadurai, Arjun (1996): Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Amit, Vered (2000): Constructing the Field: Ethnographic Fieldwork in the Contemporary World. London, New York: Routledge.

Bateson, Gregory/Jackson, Don D./Haley, Jay/Weakland, John (1956): "Towards a theory of schizophrenia." In: Behavioral Science 1, pp. 251–264.

Chua, Liana (2021): "Selfies and Self-Fictions." In: Social Analysis 65/1, pp. 151–161.

Clifford, James/Marcus, George E. (eds.) (1986): Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dürr, Eveline/Sökefeld, Martin (2018): "Zeit im Feld: Feldforschung als Paradigma und als Praxis." In: Philipp Zehmisch/Ursula Münster/

Jens Zickgraf/Claudia Lang (eds.), Soziale Ästhetik, Atmosphäre, Medialität: Beiträge aus der Ethnologie. Münster, Lit-Verlag, pp. 229–250.

Evans-Pritchard, Edgar E. (1973): "Some Reminiscences and Reflections on Fieldwork." In: Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford 4/1, pp. 1–12.

Fabian, Johannes (1983): Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object, New York, Columbia University Press.

Feldman, Gregory (2011): "If ethnography is more than participant-observation, then relations are more than connections: The case for nonlocal ethnography in a world of apparatuses." In: Anthropological Theory 11/4, pp. 375–395.

Green, Sarah (2014): "Anthropological Knots: Conditions of Possibilities and Interventions." In: HAU Journal of Ethnographic Theory 4/3, pp. 1–21.

Gregory, Chris (2014): "On Religiosity and Commercial Life: Toward a Critique of Cultural Economy and Posthumanist Value Theory." In: HAU Journal of Ethnographic Theory 4/3, pp. 45–68.

Goffman, Erving (1989): "On Fieldwork." In: Journal of Contemporary Ethnography 18/2, pp. 123–132.

Günel, Gökçe/Varma, Saiba/Watanabe, Chika (2020): "A Manifesto for Patchwork Ethnography." In: Fieldsights, June 9. https://culanth.org/fieldsights/a-manifesto-for-patchwork-ethnography [last accessed 23.05.2023].

Gupta, Akhil/Ferguson, James (1997): "Beyond Culture: Space, Identity and the Politics of Difference." In: James Ferguson/Akhil Gupta (eds.), Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology. Durham, Duke University Press, pp. 33–51.

Gupta, Akhil/Ferguson, James (1997): "Discipline and Practice: 'The Field' as Site, Method and Location in Anthropology." In: Akhil Gupta/James Ferguson (eds.), Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, pp. 1–46.

Haraway, Donna J. (1988): "Situated Knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective." In: Feminist Studies 14/3, pp. 575–599.

Hughes, Geoffrey/Walter, Anna-Maria (2021): "Staying Tuned: Connections Beyond 'the Field'." In: Social Analysis 65/1, pp. 89–102.

Hurston, Zora Neal (1978 [1935]): Mules and Men. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

— (1997 [1928]): "How it Feels to Be Colored Me." In: Alice Walker (ed.), I Love Myself When I am Laughing … and Then Again When I am Looking Mean and Impressive: A Zora Neal Hurston Reader. Old Westbury: Feminist Press, pp. 152–155.

Vergunst, Jo Lee/ Ingold, Tim (2008): Ways of Walking: Ethnography and Practice on Foot. London: Routledge.

Khosravi, Shahram (2010): 'Illegal' Traveller: An auto-ethnography of borders. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kuper, Adam (2005 [1988]): The Reinvention of Primitive Society: Transformations of a myth, London and New York: Routledge.

Malinowski, Bronislaw (1979 [1922]): Argonauten des Westlichen Pazifik: Ein Bericht über Unternehmungen und Abenteuer der Eingeborenen in den Inselwelten von Melanesisch-Neuguinea, Frankfurt am Main: Syndikat.

— (1967): A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term. London: Athlone Press.

Marcus, George (1995): "Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-sited Ethnography." In: Annual Review of Anthropology 24, pp. 95–117.

Ortner, Sherry B. (1974): "Is Female to Male as Nature is to Culture?" In: Michelle Rosaldo/ Louise Lamphere (eds.), Woman, Culture, and Society, Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 68–87.

Pink, Sarah/Horst, Heather A./Postill, John/Hjorth, Larissa/Lewis, Tania/Tacchi, Jo (2016): Digital Ethnography: Principles and Practice. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, Singapore: Sage.

Powdermaker, Hortense (1951): Hollywood, the Dream Factory: An Anthropologist Looks at the Movie-Makers, London: Secker and Warburg.

— (1939): After Freedom: A Cultural Study in the Deep South. New York: Viking Press.

Przybylski, Liz (2021): Hybrid Ethnography: Online, Offline, and in Between, Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Rorty, Richard (1989): Contingency, Irony and Solidarity, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rosaldo, Michelle/Lamphere, Louise (eds.) (1974): Women, Culture and Society, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Schild, Pascale (2021): "Reciprocal Vulnerability in the Face of Patriarchal Violence." In: Allegra Lab, July 7. https://allegralaboratory.net/reciprocal-vulnerability-in-the-face-of-patriarchal-violence/ [last accessed 01.08.2023].

Sökefeld, Martin (1999): "Debating Self, Identity, and Culture in Anthropology." In: Current Anthropology, 40/4, pp. 417–447.

Sökefeld, Martin (2002): "Feld ohne Ferne: Reflexionen über ethnologische Forschung 'zu Hause' – in Hamburg zum Beispiel." In: Ethnoscripts 4/1, pp. 82–96.

Sökefeld, Martin (2008): Struggling for Recognition: The Alevi Movement in Germany and in Transnational Space, Oxford, New York: Berghahn Books.

Sökefeld, Martin (2009): "Ethnologie der Öffentlichkeit und die Öffentlichkeit der Ethnologie." In: Ethnoscripts 11/2, pp. 39–52.

Stocking, George W. (1983): "The Ethnographer's Magic: Fieldwork in British Social Anthropology from Tylor to Malinowski." In: ibid. (ed.), Observers Observed: Essays on ethnographic fieldwork. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, pp. 70–120.

Stolz, Rosalie/Metzmacher, Katja/Haug, Michaela/Braukmann, Fabienne (2020): "On Being a Parent in the Field: Practical, Epistemological, Methodological and Ethical Implications of Accompanied Fieldwork." In: Fabienne Braukmann/Michaela Haug/Katja Metzmacher/Rosalie Stolz (eds.), Being a Parent in the Field: Implications and Challenges of Accompanied Fieldwork, Bielefeld: transcript, pp. 9–36.

Strathern, Marylin (1987): "An Awkward Relationship: The Case of Feminism and Anthropology." In: The University of Chicago Press Journal 12/2, pp. 276–292.

Wacquant, Loïc (2004): Body and Soul: Notebooks of an Apprentice Boxer, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Walter, Anna-Maria (2021): "The Self in a Time of Constant Connectivity: Romantic Intimacy and the Ambiguous Promise of Mobile Phones for Young Women in Gilgit, Northern Pakistan." In: American Ethnologist 48/4, pp. 446–461.