

Gebeten, Pflege des heimischen Altars und Niederwerfungen möglichst getreu zu wahren (181, 195). Die heutige zweite Generation hingegen, in Schweizer Schulen und Gesellschaft sozialisiert, hinterfragt die von den Eltern für selbstverständlich gehaltenen Praktiken und Glaubensvorstellungen. Sie fragen nach Erklärungen und Gründen und wollen gerade nicht wie ihre Eltern, so eine Aussage, "blindlings hinterher laufen" (182). Eigenes Nachfragen, Begründungen und Kritikfähigkeit stehen im Vordergrund und bestimmen den Zugang und das Verständnis von tibetischem Buddhismus und Tibeter-Sein. Während für eine junge Tibeterin Buddhismus vornehmlich eine Lebenseinstellung mit bestimmten Wertvorstellungen ist, definiert ein anderer Buddhismus für sich als Erkenntnislehre und eine dritte sieht sich aufgrund mangelnder Praxis und Glaubens nicht als Buddhistin (179–181). Eine bewusste Selbstidentifikation als Buddhistin oder Buddhist fiel den Befragten oft schwer, auch aufgrund selbst definierter hoher ethischer Anforderungen. Zugleich fühlen sich viele der in der Schweiz aufgewachsenen Tiberinnen und Tibeter buddhistischen Werten und Einstellungen wie Mitgefühl, Genügsamkeit, Gerechtigkeit und Weisheit verpflichtet und bemühen sich, ihr Verhalten daran zu orientieren. Die Autoren konstatieren bei der Untersuchungsgruppe eine deutliche Abkehr von traditionellen kollektiven Ritualen, volkstümlichen Vorstellungen und Besuchen klösterlicher Institutionen und dementsprechend stärker individualisierte, selbstreflektierte und intellektualisierte Religiositätsformen, zumeist im privaten Raum ausgeübt (203, 205, 209). Diese individualisierte Orientierung gleiche sich damit allgemeinen Trends in der Schweizer Mehrheitsgesellschaft an, in der ebenso eine starke Zunahme so genannter "Distanzierter" zu institutionellen und kollektiven Formen von Religionsausübung festzuhalten sei (233).

Die Forscher Kind, Lauer und Schlieter erhoben die aufschlussreichen und differenzierten Befunde zur Identitätsbildung als Tibeter/Tibeterin und Buddhist/Buddhistin methodisch mit dem qualitativen Repertoire der teilnehmenden Beobachtung bei Anlässen und biografisch-narrativen Interviews mit jungen Tibetern sowie ergänzenden Experteninterviews mit tibetischen Gruppenvertretern und Experten. Die Spannweite Interviewter aus der zweiten Generation ist mit einem Alter von 14 bis 45 Jahren sehr breit gesetzt und geht weit über das Alter hinaus, was üblicherweise vergleichbare Studien zur Zweitgeneration ansetzen (15 bis 29 Jahre). Es fällt dazu auf, dass die Studie sich konzeptionell eher dünn in den Forschungsstand zu Jugendlichen bzw. jungen Erwachsenen mit Migrationshintergrund kontextuiert und so einen Anschluss an ähnliche Forschungen kaum sucht. Auch ist bedauerlich, dass bei den instruktiven Zitaten von in der Schweiz sozialisierten Tibetern nicht das Alter und die Tätigkeit (ob in Ausbildung, Beruf, Bildungsstand) angegeben ist und so eine Einbettung jeweiliger Aussagen in die ungefähre Lebenssituation dem Leser nicht möglich ist. Denn es ist ein Unterschied, ob ein heranwachsender Teenager in der Schule oder ein berufstätiger Erwachsener von Anfang vierzig sich zur eigenen Wahrnehmung als Tibeter/Tibeterin bzw. zu buddhistischer Praxis und Werten äußert. Da-

rauf verweist die Studie selbst, wenn sie konstatiert, dass eine intellektuell intensivere Auseinandersetzung mit den tibetisch-buddhistischen Lehren gerade bei Interviewten im Alter von Ende 30 zu beobachten sei (238). Eine Auflistung zum Alter der 21 Interviewten und unter Voraussetzung der Wahrung der Anonymität ggf. auch zum Bildungsstand und Angaben, ob Nachkomme aus tibetischer oder bi-kultureller Partnerschaft, wäre hier hilfreich und zur besseren Einordnung der angeführten Aussagen sehr sinnvoll gewesen. Zudem wäre ein Index wünschenswert gewesen.

Trotz dieser Monita ist nachdrücklich zu würdigen, dass die Studie ausführlich Tibeter und Tiberinnen zu Wort kommen lässt und zudem in gesonderten Kurzeassays tibetische Experten und Expertinnen sowie Vertreter und Vertreterinnen tibetischer Jugendorganisationen ihre Sichtweisen in eigenen Worten äußern können. Diese Aussagen geben eindrücklich wieder, wie in der Schweiz sozialisierte Tibeter die Vermittlung tibetischer und buddhistischer Tradition in ihrer Biografie erlebten und wie je im biografischen Kontext etwa eine Distanz zur "abergläubischen" Vorstellung der Eltern (193) gezogen und "eigene Vorstellungen einer tibetischen Identität" (165) verwirklicht wurde. Diese Aussagen unterstreichen und bereichern die Analysen und Resultate der Studie nachdrücklich. Aufschlussreich sind zudem die ausführlichen Darstellungen zu den wichtigsten Organisationen Schweizer Tibeter, so u. a. der Tibetergemeinschaft Schweiz und Liechtenstein, den Tibeterschulen zur Vermittlung von Sprache und Kultur, dem Tibet-Institut Rikon, dem Rabten Choeling Kloster bei Lausanne sowie dem Verein Tibeter Jugend in Europa. Gerade Letzterer fördert das politische Engagement junger Tibeter und Tiberinnen, um über die Situation in Tibet zu informieren und über die eigene Gruppe hinaus zu sensibilisieren. Insgesamt gelingt es der Studie überzeugend, die Veränderungen tibetisch-buddhistischer Religiosität von der ersten zur zweiten Generation facettenreich zu dokumentieren und im Theorierahmen von Individualisierung, Intellektualisierung und Identitätsaushandlung zu analysieren. Das allgemein verständlich geschriebene Buch dürfte daher über den Kreis von Buddhismus- und Religionsforschenden hinaus ebenso für Migrations- und Minderheitsforschende und Kulturwissenschaftler von großem Interesse sein.

Martin Baumann

**Schneider, Arnd, and Caterina Pasqualino (eds.):** *Experimental Film and Anthropology*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014. 205 pp. ISBN 978-0-85785-443-8. Price: £ 19.99

"Experimental Film and Anthropology," a collection of eleven essays initially presented as conference papers, sets itself against what the editors call the "realist-narrative paradigm" hitherto dominating the field of visual anthropology. Writing in their introduction, Pasqualino and Schneider articulate an ambitious framework for the volume intended to provide a rich and expansive context for contemporary anthropological film practice. At its center is the notion of "experiment." This is understood not

in narrowly positivistic sense. Instead, it is a term used by Pasqualino and Schneider to describe a commitment to formal innovation in which attention to the distinctive qualities of the film medium is foregrounded over matters of content. By claiming a subversive agenda for their book, the editors seek to challenge established conventions of visual anthropology – proposing, for example, “radical shock therapy” for ethnographic film – and to make a case for a serious, sustained engagement with the tradition of experimental cinema.

The ten essays that follow are focused around examples of practice. In some cases, this means detailed discussion of the work of selected figures – for example, Robert Fenz (Brenez), Robert Ascher (Ramey); in others, it entails a description of particular approaches – photofilm (Schneider), asynchronicity (Heuson and Allen), memory work (Grossman), visual media primitivism (Nicoletti). Additionally, there are essays that explore the convergence of experimental film, trance, and states of altered consciousness (Pasqualino), the ethical and aesthetic issues raised by experimental practice pursued in conjunction with cultural protocols of Aboriginal Australia (Glowczewski), the representational possibilities of digital programming (Wanono), and a dialogue about “cinematic shocks” (Willerslev and Suhr).

Written for anthropologists (rather than filmmakers), this edited collection brings into view an exciting range of innovative practices that have hitherto lain outside the established disciplinary discourse. Although often considered to be more closely aligned with “art” than academic enquiry, it offers new ways of thinking about and, crucially, *doing* anthropological work. A consistent thread emerges through the volume and links many of the essays – namely, that formal experimentation is not conceived abstractly or pursued for its own sake but develops in a somewhat piecemeal manner as a response to specific problems encountered in research. In one of the most informative contributions, Grossman provides a richly detailed account of her 2011 collaborative project, *Memory Objects, Memory Dialogues*. It reveals experimentation as a form of “improvisatory practice” (Ingold). She explains: “Rather than adhering to a particular formula or given set of shooting and editing conventions, I allowed material objects themselves to direct my research, thereby supplementing *and* transforming its direction, form, contents, and theoretical implications” (132; original emphasis). The final work was a dual-screen projection that brought together ethnographic interviews about selected memory objects with 16 mm stop-motion film animation of objects themselves.

Grossman’s narrative documents the exploratory process by which this project took shape, its particular formal qualities emerging during the course of the work itself as new insights and understandings were generated. As the author makes clear, the project’s final form is conceptualized as something open rather than closed, less a reflection or summation of anthropological ideas and more of a point of departure or catalyst for generating them.

While immensely valuable as an account of what creative possibilities of experimental practice, Grossman’s

account only takes us so far. The narrative ends without fully engaging the implications of this kind of work for existing anthropological debate about memory and materiality. This raises a problem that recurs throughout “Experimental Film and Anthropology” – and it is one of the more general issues associated with Schneider’s work. It is not difficult to find examples of alternative forms that have the potential to extend the scope of the anthropological imagination. But what is much more difficult is to find ways of effectively articulating such alternatives with established practices and disciplinary expectations. By this, I refer to the challenge of creating an expansive, critical language that can encompass different modes of anthropological work without eliding their formal distinctiveness. For without such a language, as the case of visual anthropology has long demonstrated, nontraditional approaches end up being marginalized and their advocates are reduced to talking among themselves. This kind of professional marginalization is not always a result of active resistance or skepticism toward experimental ways of working. All too often it is simply a reflection of confusion – of an inability to know how to bring nontraditional work into broader anthropological debate.

Not surprisingly, given its origins, “Experimental Film and Anthropology” is an uneven collection and some of the conference presentations have translated more effectively into articles than others. The book is part of the broader project that Schneider has pursued over many years (often in collaboration with Wright). Central to it is a concern with the possibilities of a more generative engagement between the fields of art and anthropology. Visual anthropology has served as a useful foil in much of Schneider’s writing, but in “Experimental Film and Anthropology,” he puts his critique at the front and center of the argument. I have always felt at odds with what can seem like his caricature of the field.

There is a sense in his writing that the use of certain techniques (in particular what he seems to suggest is a blind faith in the “realist-narrative paradigm”) is out of ignorance rather than a self-conscious choice by ethnographic filmmakers. This can get in the way of constructive dialogue and leads him to overlook moments in visual anthropology that may serve as points of connection with the kind of experimental work he advocates.

For example, in Schneider’s own essay in the book he examines the anthropological potential of the photofilm. But he fails to ground his discussion in existing work by visual anthropologists that engages precisely the questions he raises – namely, Pinney’s writing on the convergences of film and photography and MacDougall’s formally inventive, “Photo Wallahs.” Something similar happens in Pasqualino’s essay. If there is one experimental work in the field of visual anthropology, it is “Les maitres fous” – Jean Rouch’s cinematic exploration of the phenomena of possession and trance. His film probes into those very interior spaces that Pasqualino claims are overlooked in anthropological studies of ritual – and yet her essay contains no acknowledgement of this classic intervention.

Advocates of experimental work usually claim a radical break with what has gone before, but, as I indicated

above, it is perhaps a more accurate to think of it in terms of improvisatory practice. That is, it is tied to and grows out of existing work and the much more difficult task is to create a bridge between the old and the new and to argue clearly for the specific contribution the latter makes to extending or reconceptualizing the former.

Despite these limitations, “Experimental Film and Anthropology” is an important volume that will enrich the discipline and offer valuable models for innovative projects. It is a pity, however, that the book itself does not include a DVD of works cited by the different authors. The reader needs to see the work that is described, since its effect is precisely that which exceeds descriptive language. I found myself searching YouTube (Kevin T. Allen), websites (dickblau.com), and even faculty pages (John Haviland) in order to check writers’ claims against my own observations. If prohibitive in terms of cost, at the very least the contributors might have been encouraged to provide web links for work that is available. Of course, some of it is unavailable. And all too often this is the very simple reason why anthropologists fail to engage with experimental practice.

Anna Grimshaw

**Schneider, Arnd, and Christopher Wright** (eds.): *Anthropology and Art Practice*. London: Bloomsbury, 2013. 168 pp. photos. ISBN 978-0-85785-180-2. Price: £ 19.99

This volume continues Arnd Schneider and Chris Wright’s exploration of the relationship between art and anthropology. In their previous collections they set out to stimulate new dialogues, and to reveal the shared discursive ground between these two fields. Here they focus on “ways of working.”

Their argument is that “the way we work” defines the kinds of creativity harnessed, the possible collaborations, and the outcomes that result. In looking into ways of working they want to engage artistic practices anthropologically, but also to approach creativity and meaning as emergent. Their overarching goal is “to push forward theory and practice in both fields and to clarify what can be gained from juxtaposing this kind of work.” How close do they come to achieving this?

They begin by identifying several contemporary moments that are pertinent to achieving a better understanding of the value of the art/anthropology relationship. For example, they point out how the framing by artists of social forms of collaboration as works in themselves, makes it possible to see how anthropological practices might also be framed in this way. They identify the desire in both fields to shift attitudes of the “viewing public,” and they write of the emergence of “transmateriality” – the idea that transitory phenomena leave material traces that link backwards and forwards to similar events – as significant affinities.

A number of chapters do a good job of grounding these themes. Craig Campbell, Jennifer Deger, Rupert Cox and Angus Carlyle, Brad Butler and Karen Mirza, Christina Lammer, Kate Hennessy, and Juan Orrantia, each reveal some of the generative possibilities of combining artistic

and academic modes of making, reflection, and dissemination. The research they “perform” on the page, as well as report on, is infused with the kind of productive friction that I am more familiar with from craft collaborations, where different ideas, techniques, and processes are brought together in ways that stimulate material ways of seeing and thinking. In Campbell’s chapter, for example, his writing and art practice seem to fuse into one discursive movement, rather than becoming a linear naming of parts, or a submersion of materials in theory. One implication of these chapters is that anthropology might learn to conceive of its preoccupations with people, phenomena, and ideas in terms of experiences brought to audiences, rather than through the abstraction of data into a kind of intellectual monoculture.

Less successful, from an anthropological point of view, are those chapters that rely on existing anthropological concepts and theories, or which refuse the challenge of speaking to anthropological theory. Ruth Jones, in her investigation of ritual enactment through art practice, relies on Turner’s notion of *communitas* without acknowledging its subsequent contestation by writers such as Michael Taussig. Anthony Luvera, admitting that as an artist he does not aim to contribute to anthropological theory, points to a potential stumbling block for anthropologists wanting to be convinced of the value of art to anthropology. In my experience, if anthropologists, sceptical of the intrusion of art into the field, require one thing, it is to be convinced that creative practice speaks to, and can be constitutive of, theory. From an art perspective, however, these chapters appear differently, showing what anthropology offers art in the way of framing ideas, or providing useful examples of “socially-engaged” methodologies.

The negotiation around these possible readings raises questions of readership and context. Is this book for artists and anthropologists, already converted to the cause, who simply want more examples? Or is it aimed rather at artists needing to understand the nuances of anthropological collaboration? Although it is clear that various audiences are being targeted by the editors, there is a slipperiness about which chapters are targeted at which audiences, or the double nature of the modes of address, and the lack of discussion about this seems symptomatic of the way other important questions are passed over.

First is whether anthropology is, or should be, a discipline committed to making and co-production. This is not a foregone conclusion, and at this stage of the art and anthropology debate, it is an argument that needs to be made in different ways by different authors. Yet the language used by the editors about creativity, collaboration (rather than fieldwork), and outcome (rather than analysis or ethnography), is weighted firmly to art rather than to anthropology. Second, what are the resistances to the art/anthropology alliance from the non-believers in both fields, and what are the counterarguments and the difficulties in making these counterarguments? Knowing more about this would clarify for the reader what is at stake here, and for whom. While there is much in the introduction and the individual chapters that hint at these contestations, I would have liked this territory to be laid out more