Against the common impulse to define disciplinary boundaries, Marcus Banks and Jay Ruby’s *Made to be Seen: Perspectives on the History of Visual Anthropology* elegantly traces the history of the visual in anthropology, and suggests a number of untraveled routes and potential experimentations. Rather than cataloguing definitive works in ethnographic film, photography, and text, the editors provide a glimpse into what the discipline of visual anthropology could become: a cross-disciplinary field engaged in a wide range of visual and media-making practices, productive theoretical engagements and proposals, experimentation in visual and media forms, and innovation with collaborative methodologies, ethics, activism, and cultural rights.

The history of the visual in anthropology may begin with still photography being put to anthropological use in the late nineteenth century; or, following Ruby’s definition of ethnographic film as that which is produced by anthropologists with anthropological intent, may begin post World War II. The editors point out that an anthropological model of visual communication was not formally articulated until the 1970s, emphasizing the relative immaturity of the discipline and the need for ongoing interrogation and theorization of the role of the visual in anthropology. Accordingly, the contributors to the volume exceed Banks and Ruby’s challenge to trace genealogies of the visual in their respective fields of study; instead, as the editors write in their introduction, “The essays in this volume all point to the inescapable entanglement of the visual in all areas of life, from the spontaneous act of seeing to the deeply considered artifice of film and art. While the book was originally conceived as an exploration of the history of the visual in a variety of anthropological fields, our contributors have gone far beyond this brief, not only highlighting past instances but also laying the groundwork for new engagements and new possibilities (Banks and Ruby, p.16)”.

This history of the visual in anthropology is necessarily wide ranging, and as the contributors to the volume show, has been shaped and re-shaped by the ideological, intellectual, and technological contexts in which practitioners, scholars, and ethnographic subjects have brought meaning to the visible. For example, in her contribution entitled “Skilled Visions”, Christina Grasseni identifies a persistent “constructivist” attitude towards visual representations and looks to ethnographers of science, such as Bruno Latour, to understand visual artifacts as manifestations of socially constructed and context-specific knowledge rather than objective actualities. Her interdisciplinary approach to theorizing practices of vision is approached from another angle by Sandra Dudley, who, in “Material Visions”, shows how textiles and clothing have been represented in visual media and argues that this under-studied domain, entangled with issues of identity, consumption, and temporality, should be understood as visual media in their own right. Roxana Waterson, similarly, details the history of engagements with vernacular architecture in anthropology, where built forms are seen as expressions of cultural identity, social relations, cosmology, and power—visual media in their own right—and suggests that the future of this domain of study will benefit from collaborations between anthropologists and architects.
The contributors are united in their identification of, and continued support for, cross-disciplinary collaboration and experimentation. Arnd Schneider looks back at the parallel histories of anthropology and the disciplines of art, art criticism, and art history to mine both productive examples and failed experiments of disciplinary border crossings, and to chart a way forward for anthropologists as creative agents. Here, the work of Maya Deren, for example, highlights moments of artistic, methodological, and technological synergy, just as Kathryn Ramey’s exploration of the interconnections between experimental films and “films made with anthropological intent” illustrates potential for contemporary anthropologists to incorporate new approaches into their media production practices. Elizabeth Edwards’ contribution on the history of photography in anthropological practice details historical and contemporary “entanglements” with cross-cultural interaction, agency, and power, and their visual evidences, much in the way that Brenda Farnell theorizes the body as a component of visual culture that necessarily crosses the boundaries of biological and social being, and which also accounts for the invisible forms of cultural knowledge that bring embodied meaning to that which can be seen and experienced with the senses.

Visual mediums in anthropology are also historicized, contextualized, and projected into the future. Matthew Durington and Jay Ruby challenge the singular equation of visual anthropology with ethnographic film, and argue against the perception of ethnographic film as useful only as a teaching aid or research tool. Rather, ethnographic film should be seen as a powerful tool for self-expression, and should embrace possibilities associated with new digital technologies, hypermedia, and the Internet to represent ethnographic knowledge in new forms. Sarah Pink furthers this provocation in her review of practices in digital visual anthropology, showing how these emergent forms are both modeling and problematizing collaborative practices, ethical considerations associated with the circulation of ethnographic media, and issues of decontextualization, while experimenting with the potential of new technologies to bridge the enduring representational divide between textual and visual anthropology. Faye Ginsburg builds on these discussions with her chapter “Native Intelligence: A Short History of Debates on Indigenous Media and Ethnographic Film”. From controversies over the protection of Aboriginal cultural property in digital environments like Second Life, to celebrations of Indigenous television and film productions—from the Aboriginal Peoples’ Television Network in Canada to the Camera D’Or at Cannes—she traces ongoing concerns in the field of Indigenous media, including questions of cultural difference, control of cultural representation in digital form, the negotiation of the right to self-representation, and Indigenous media practice as cultural and political activism. Ginsburg’s re-invocation of the dynamic she has called the “parallax effect”—where Indigenous and non-Indigenous productions are brought into dialogue to offer a fuller view of the complexities of culture and media representations—suggest that Indigenous media are already shifting relations of power between anthropologists and Aboriginal communities and within settler states. Ginsburg’s assessment of the negotiations of Indigenous media-makers as both receivers and producers reinforces Stephen Putnam Hughes’ argument for greater attention in anthropology to media audiences and reception and to the study of media-related
practices as the investigation of “how people actually argue, construct, and contest the media worlds in which they live and why they do or do not matter” (Hughes, p. 311).

As Michael Herzfeld points out in his postscript, the contributors to the volume have not attempted to present an evolution of visual anthropology as a discipline, but instead have chosen to highlight risks taken, paths untraveled, and paths resumed. This presentation of the visual in anthropology, and the effect of this volume in general, is the creation of genuine opportunity for reflection on the goals of the discipline. Banks and Ruby’s book makes visible the dynamism, experimentation, and intellectual rigor associated with the cross-disciplinary exploration of the visual in anthropology. While the volume itself is still limited to primarily textual exposition (surely a hypertext version was imagined as well), it should be tremendously inspiring for anthropologists who identify as working within the discipline and for those outside who have taken up visual media as a natural extension of ethnographic documentary practice. New forms, methods, collaborations, and ethical frameworks await.