

INTRODUCTION

LINES OF FLIGHT

Julie Laplante, Willow Scobie, and Ari Gandsman

Methods are the guarantors of objectivity, put in place to ensure that research results should not be contaminated by too close or affective an involvement of researchers with those they study. For anthropology, however, such involvement is of the essence.

—Tim Ingold, *Anthropology*

As the opening quote indicates, methods are inherently paradoxical to the contemporary practice of anthropology. Nonetheless, the inherent contradictions of methods that distance and objectify even as anthropology rejected this conception of their field of study continue to haunt the discipline. Anthropology departments replicate stock approaches to teaching found in other disciplines, offering discrete *Methods* courses that are taught separately from “theory.” Graduate student training is comparable to other disciplines and remains unchanged from previous decades in which a separate “methods” section is integral to any thesis or grant proposal or academic article. While anthropologists have moved away from seeing their work as a process of sorting or ordering according to codes, structural grids, or templates for revealing underlying structures, *Methods* continue to carry the baggage of this legacy. They direct us to think about our research in terms of applying or discovering a hidden order. The kind of anthropology that *Methods* produces may no longer be viable for most anthropologists, but *Methods* are still very much alive and with us. The purpose of this volume, therefore, is to help reorient the process of anthropological inquiry away from *Methods* and toward engagement with open-ended, creative ways of co-responding with the world.

Research approaches premised on the idea of “guarantors of objectivity” come from a reified idea of method. Even where objectivity is not presumed to be a relevant factor, *Methods* are understood to be

systematic procedures that predetermine a research journey. *Methods* become prescriptive, a worrisome trend in ethnography, in particular when taken up by other disciplines. Where scholars undertake “ethnography” as though it is a matter of procedure, they are proceeding as though ethnography and anthropology are two separate moments in research (Ingold 2014, 2017): one of extracting data from the world in the former while analyzing it in the latter. This distinction posits ethnography as anthropological method—as adopted by other disciplines, presented in qualitative methods texts/courses, as an approach to interviewing, and so on. Although some scholars propose replacing ethnography with either “praxiography” (Mol 2002) or “phenomenography” (Piette 2011), the problem of *Methods* persists under new etiquettes.

Rather than shifting the terminology, this volume engages with the possibilities that anthropology opens up by following the distinction proposed by Tim Ingold (2014, 2017): ethnography seeks to document the world by reflection backward, while anthropology moves forward in order to learn from the world to know it. It is important to note that the distinction outlined here is not intended to be teleological—anthropologists may refer to “ethnography” or the qualifier “ethnographic” (as is the case in some of the chapters in this volume) without invoking a procedural aspect of the discipline. Instead, the emphasis is on using an approach to anthropology that moves forward and collapses the distinction between method and theory.

An example of this tradition can be found in Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s ([1945] 2002) phenomenology of perception. Merleau-Ponty invites us to follow in the steps of a world in the process of being made rather than as something to document, classify, typologize, and compare; the level of abstraction given to the thinking mind as preceding action is dissolved to become a single interlacing of “eye and mind” (Merleau-Ponty 1964). Ingold further leads us to understand knowledge—and culture—as the ability to engage in the world in a way that is always in a process of renewal. Knowledge thus becomes not the result of measurable data analysis subject to replication, rather it is an ability to engage effectively within these processes; understood as “knowing from the inside” (Ingold 2013)—an idea also alluded to by the great poet but lesser known botanist Johann Wolfgang von Goethe ([1791] 2009) who describes a form of delicate empiricism. Research appears in a looping movement—one that is generative, relational, temporal, and continuously improvised (Ingold and Hallam 2007), in which we learn from becoming human and more-than-human in

skilled ways, yet we also move beyond what is currently imagined or imaginable.

The movements inherent in the process of doing anthropology are also reminiscent of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's (1987) concept of lines of flight. Lines of flight are the third of three types of lines: the first is a solid molar line of hard segmentarity, the second a soft molecular line slightly bending the first yet easily returning to it, and the third is the line of flight. Translated from the French word *fuite*, it refers not only to escape, elude, or flee from others but also to let something flow, leak, disappear in the distance, and to ward off hardened standards. Lines of flight are creative becomings, bringing new levels of complexity by virtue of new knowledge or meaning. The three lines continuously intermingle, offering endless vital lines to draw and to draw from, as well as to embark on: "if the line of flight is like a train in motion, it is because one jumps linearly on it" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 198).

In this volume, the authors (both graduate students and professors alike—some rendering their first fieldwork experience while others reflect on as much as fifty years of research) offer multiple lines readers can pull, bend, or take by the middle in order to trace new ways forward. In *Search after Method*, we thus activate a sense of research that emerges beneath, during, or after a journey; it calls attention to letting the journey occur before we close in on it, even leaving the way open as elements continue to emerge through recording, editing (see also Boudreault-Fournier 2017), writing, and eventually to reading, if we have succeeded in breathing life into text. Stretching an understanding of fieldwork and writing as similarly lively processes, the contributions in this collection bring particular attention to these aspects of anthropology, as they are paradoxically the most important and least often addressed (Taussig 2015: 1–2).

Anthropology is a vibrant science in continuous flux and transformation as it connects to, delves into, and moves between human and nonhuman worlds. Its reliance on lived experiences "to know" remains relatively stable, even as the epistemological, phenomenological, and ontological grounds of what constitutes knowledge and how we know what we know has multiplied in the last few decades. Drawing insights from both classical and more recent cutting-edge propositions in anthropology, the chapters in this volume describe variously the processes of research, of being in the middle of things, of feeling unsettled, or balancing on the point of becoming something else: all common threads through the proceeding contributions.

Echoes

In *Decolonizing Methodologies*, Linda Tuhiwai Smith invokes a sense of method or methodology as process ([1999] 2008: 128-9). Along this line, Athena McLean and Annette Leibing's *The Shadow Side of Fieldwork* (2007) sheds light on some of the opacity in-between life and anthropological research, doing so throughout the situated studies. In their *Ethnographic Fieldwork: An Anthropological Reader*, Antonius Robben and Jeffrey Sluka (2012) also explicitly express what it feels like to do research through situated studies rather than discuss research techniques per se. Sarah Pink's *Doing Sensory Ethnography* (2015) pries open some of the boundaries of methodological dictates across the disciplines, for instance by pushing beyond an anthropology of the senses (which has fallen into an agenda of making maps and orchestrations of the senses by taking the cultural model as a starting point) toward exploring through more sensorial ways of doing research. Pursuing this idea, *A Different Kind of Ethnography: Imaginative Practices and Creative Methods* edited by Denielle Elliott and Dara Culhane (2017) similarly points toward co-creative, artistic, and collaborative approaches in anthropology. The latter two works respectively qualify "ethnography" as sensorial and imaginative, and as such do not fully problematize the critique of "ethnography" understood as a method preceding anthropology, even explicitly aiming to foster "ethnographic methodologies" (Elliott and Culhane 2017: 3). Both works also sustain a claim of "representation"—of either multi-sensory experiences, situations, or places—from which this volume distances itself. While our book differs on these last two points, we move in a similar direction toward ways of doing anthropology as an improvisatory joining in with formative processes.

Within the anthropological classic texts, there are elements of approaches with which contemporary anthropologists may still contend. Bronislaw Malinowski's famous work *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* (1922), for instance, served to systematize methods for fieldwork in anthropology for generations that followed. Franz Boas's *Ethnology of the Kwakiutl* (1921) meant to salvage a culture, rather paradoxically partook in depleting it of life: first by presenting it as something that was already dissolving, and second by turning it into data. Claude Lévi-Strauss's *La pensée sauvage* (The savage mind), stresses at length that there are two distinct modes of scientific thought. "These are certainly not a function of different states of development of the human mind but rather of two strategic levels at which nature is accessible to scientific enquiry: one roughly adapted to that of perception and

the imagination: the other at a remove from it" ([1962] 1966: 15). That is to say that making sense of the world can "be arrived at by two different routes, one very close to, and the other more remote from, sensible intuition" (Lévi-Strauss [1962] 1966: 15). While all three of these anthropologists pursued a remote route of knowledge as a result of their absence or distance in these studies, there is also evidence that they relied on (sensible) intuition. Sensible intuition, at least in Henri Bergson's version of intuition as a relaxation of intelligence, is one that is steeped in duration (lived time) (in During 2008: 399–400).

Further, Marcel Mauss's (1923–24) oceanic metaphor, as highlighted by Tim Ingold (2015: 11), infers that we inhabit a fluid reality in continuous motion and through which we interweave in an ever-extending meshwork. Relatedly, Gregory Bateson merges scientific with artistic methods to bring attention to "tone" in cultural life ([1936] 1958: 2). Furthermore, it is only after surrendering to the context, which Bateson rightfully states should be the first step in all anthropological study, that it must be decided which tool, concept, or kind of analysis is relevant. He argued that concepts (i.e., ethos) that emerged in-between a study with the Iatmul and himself "offers no proof that it can be useful in other hands or for the analysis of other cultures" (Bateson 1972: 107). In his research in Bali emerged a new notion of schismogenesis, since they rather privilege interactions through a continuing plateau of intensity, by continual non-progressive change. This required adjusting attention to very different dimensions; in this case toward balance and motion to maintain this balance. As such neither "method" nor "theory" is necessarily transposable across contexts, both needing to adjust and emerge through, along, and from them as ways of composing and improvising affective worlds.

As for concepts, "method" can be an afterthought or a process abstracted after-the-fact, in this way maximizing attention to what is going on in everyday life during research. Gregory Bateson and Margaret Mead's (1942) pioneering work in visual anthropology explained that their anthropological research was "not about Balinese or Javanese 'custom,' yet more directly about the way in which they, as living persons, moving, standing, eating, sleeping, dancing, and going into trance, embody that abstraction which (after we have abstracted it) we technically call culture" (Bateson and Mead 1942: xii). As with "culture," "method" is not a beginning point, yet something we technically call that after we have abstracted it from the way we found to correspond within living contexts. As such, practices may point to a realm beyond the reach of method such as Jeanne Favret-Saada's (1977) "getting caught" or to become affected and to affect,

as discussed at length by Bernhard Leistle in the closing chapter of this volume.

More recently, John Law's (2004) *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research* points to the elusive, ephemeral, and fluid realities that mostly escape current research methods. He thus suggests that we need "to live more in and through slow method, or vulnerable method, or quiet method. Multiple method. Modest method. Uncertain method. Diverse method" (2004: 11). Law hopes to see these versions of method grow in and beyond the social sciences, moving transversally across the natural and social sciences, as also suggested by Latour (2004: 215) and evident in the work of numerous anthropologists (i.e., Ingold and Palsson 2013; Tsing 2015): Law seeks to make method fractal and multiple by taking from science, and technology studies (STS) and sociology, suggesting that we need to imagine different forms of presence, and manifest absence, as part of research. In this description, however, the researcher's presence or absence is mostly left implicit. Coming from anthropology, our collection contributes to Law's work by explicitly discussing ways of becoming more or less (co)present or (co)absent, offering to understand "mess" as what makes the world alive. We also explore anthropology as a process needing to remain in flux through written accounts, as well as based on the potential of developing certain skills of improvisation, flexibility, and openness. The difficulty of making such supple and subtle ways of doing research legitimate comes from the hardening of methods as fixed pre-designed research models to execute.

Even though experience and experiment are derived from the same Latin term and were often used interchangeably through the Middle Ages, the development of the modern laboratory contributed to their separation to the point where an experiment is only deemed successful if it can be demonstrated independent of experience (the domain of human causation and human error). These endeavors are still experiences, however, and attempts to erase our (necessary) presence in experiments (paradoxically) creates a double bias—we are still present yet pretending that we are not. The cleavage between the experimental and the experiential persists to the present day. From Claude Bernard's "control experiment" outlined in his *Introduction à l'étude de la médecine expérimentale* (Introduction to the study of experimental medicine) (1865) and familiar to generations of scientists (Pickstone 2000: 13), the experiment has become the highest mode of investigating life in positivist science. "Controls" facilitate staging an experiment to observe the operation or mechanism of interest as well as work as a means of gaining control over living processes (2000: 144). In this

“operationalist view of science the ability to control was the measure of knowledge” (Pauly 1987 in Pickstone 2000: 145). This ability to control through the demonstration of a pre-designed procedure is still the measure of knowledge in empirical practices, as is evident in randomized double-blind control trials (RCT)—the sciences’ current gold standard. Imported into the social sciences, it becomes a means of establishing “controls” to collect data from the world, usually verbatim, in order to provide a representation of the world through analysis. As Law makes clear, however, “method is not . . . a more or less successful set of procedures for reporting on a given reality. Rather it is performative” (2004: 143); it produces realities. Law further specifies that it is not that standard research methods are straightforwardly wrong, as they can offer insights into causal relations, however they are “badly adapted to the study of the ephemeral, the indefinite and the irregular” (2004: 4).

An extension of the critique of a standardizing ethnography as method prior to research is evident in Law’s delineation of a “method assemblage” (2004: 104). Law takes up the notion of “assemblage” (*agencement*) from Deleuze and Guattari (1987) and uses it to qualify what he means by “method.” Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of assemblage refers to “an increase in the dimensions of a multiplicity that necessarily changes in nature as it expands its connections” (1987: 8). It also owes a debt to the anthropologist Gregory Bateson who proposed it to map the relationship between stasis and change. While Law is aware of what is lost in translating assemblage from the more fluid French term *agencement* (a term more easily used as both noun and verb, 2004: 41–42), he sometimes fixes the continuous work of assembling as if “method” could be of a particular “nature” and thus no longer alive to its connections. At the very least it should be “methodological assemblage,” thus nuancing a particular assemblage rather than nuancing method, which is thus left intact. This in turn may explain how he simultaneously states that “there can be no fixed formula or general rules for determining good and bad bundles” (Law 2004: 42) while leading us, for the purpose of illustration, toward fixing such bundles with a reification of “Aboriginal method assemblage” on one side and a “Euro-American method assemblage” (2004: 133) on the other.

To avoid that end, we look to lines of flight, which are forever in the process of being drawn. Lines of flight are immanent to social fields, according to Deleuze and Guattari (1987), animated by all sorts of decoding and de-territorializing movements affecting “masses,” following speeds and differing allures; “the earth asserts its own powers of deterritorialization, its lines of flight, its smooth spaces that live and

blaze their way for a new earth” (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 423). They are not contradictions, but potentials to create new forms and to proliferate life. Science has its own lines of flight, making them act and create, or turn into a line of destruction or failure, this being a line of flight as well. Hence while Law suggests (2004: 10) method is not just a set of techniques but a way of being, this volume explores “method” more specifically as a way of becoming something else, as per the (trans)(de)(re)formative powers of learning from experience, and thus moving beyond “method.”

In her summary of contemporary methodological possibilities, Annemarie Mol (2002: 152–57) describes three genres or general ways of attending to methods in research; the legislative kind (clinical trials, for instance), the critical kind (proposing new legislation), and the mingling kind (leading to new methods that might be taken up by the critical kind). These three genres are standard methods or methods that aim “to faithfully represent some object *as it is*” (Mol 2002: 158, emphasis in original). Mol opens up a fourth way of attending to method, one that seeks “worthwhile ways of *living with* the real” (2002: 158, emphasis in original). She adds, “we need to abandon the methods section of the library and move to the shelves that tell about the politics of academic work” (2002: 158–59).

Mol’s (2002) example of scholarship that emphasizes the way things are written points to George Clifford and James Marcus’s (1986) *Writing Culture*, namely the core text that highlights the reflexive literary turn marking the crisis of representation in anthropology. This text was swiftly critiqued and rebuked in Ruth Behar and Deborah Gordon’s (1995) *Women Writing Culture* on the basis that women were not represented and it therefore fell right back into the crisis from which it aimed to emerge. While this volume is not explicitly engaged in the politics of academic work, it emerges from these debates. The research described here “is not about writing other lives, but about joining with them in the common task of finding ways to live” (Ingold 2018: 14); engaging with people and things in search of livable worlds. Hence while debates about “methods” are not new, the originality in these chapters involves showing ways of inhabiting research, and perhaps more broadly, science and academia.

Motions

The book is organized through the overlapping motions or three folds of knowing processes: (1) sensing as a vital process (similar to breath-

ing or growth) that one can practice, hone, or train; (2) moving as physical mobility through space and time yet also as moving and being moved affectively by our own movements; and (3) imagining as giving form to the ephemeral or elusive, both virtual and actual. Each section is composed of four chapters throughout which are interspersed seven vignettes, or fieldwork encounters, by other anthropologists whose work resonates with the content of the chapter. The afterword, also composed with a vignette, reverberates with all three motions in an effort to rejuvenate the discipline, to keep it alive. The book itself is rhizomatic rather than linear. It is a triptych on many levels and the sections, chapters, and vignettes are designed to resonate with each other in the hope of creating a living sense of searching after method in anthropology.

While all of the chapters engage in some way with the ideas of sensing, moving, and imagining as knowing affectively, they do so in different ways. Nowhere is sensing defined physiologically, nor does it refer to psychological introspection, rather it suggests a vital process similar to procreation, breathing, or growth (Merleau-Ponty [1945] 2002: 10). Particularly in the first section of the book, sensing is discussed as event—as verb more than noun. It is thus to the subtle, almost imperceptible aspects of experience to which it brings attention. Within this section we see that beginning as an apprentice anthropologist, healer, martial artist, drummer, or falconer from a position of not knowing can be a way to become more aware, able to correspond with what is going on. The seven anthropologists involved in this section offer ways of expressing sensing as it stems from research done with people, plants, animals, and elements in Java, Colombia, Canada, Iran, Cameroon, Serbia, and Italy, thus taking us into everyday practices occurring in Europe, America, Africa, and Asia.

Chapter 1 unfolds in three ways. It opens with a vignette by Daniel Alberto Restrepo Hernández who poses questions about our presence as researchers and some of the sensitivities that are required therein. In his case, an attempted entry into a plant-milieu to work with indigenous healers in Colombia seemed to illicit an inhospitable response, yet also provoked reflection which clarified a previous calling. The main text by Julie Laplante pulls this thread through to explain an answer to a recent calling presented to her by a Bantu healer in Cameroon. Focusing on events that linger, stir, and transform in healing and research across people, plants, and elements, she reveals telling moments through the course of more than twenty years of fieldwork as processes of opening and increasing possibilities of attunement. Drawing from the healer's explanation that his practice is one of in-

stilling joy, she connects these words with Spinoza's *Ethics of Joy*. This further leads her to address sensing through a Deleuzian notion of sense as event, having neither a physical nor a mental existence. She explores sensation as a wave that passes through us, an insistent feeling that is the way the healer both works and heals, more precisely by creating sonorous sensations, something anthropologists can also do. The chapter ends with a vignette by Boyan Atzev set in the context of mindful meditation in a classroom setting in Montreal, Canada. The vignette suggests that solace or healing occurs only once we exceed the bounds of organic and mental activity or let something leak. What weaves these three texts together is the idea that doing anthropology is a process of opening rather than closing.

The second chapter by Jaida Kim Samudra brings us into the "thickness of sensing," into the continuous micro-adjustments needed to sense "feeling" as per the extensive *pesilat* (martial artist) training she has been undergoing for the past thirty-five years. She explains that in Persatuan Gerak Badan (PGB, Body Movement Unification, based in Bogor, Indonesia) terms, "awareness" means sensing external stimuli from beyond your skin, mostly by using sight and hearing; however, being aware of your surroundings (and possible threats) also includes noticing sensations such as vibrations through the floor through your feet or movements of air or temperature changes on your skin that would indicate someone is approaching. She explains that unlike body movements labeled "feeling," the sensations and deployment of "feeling" cannot be observed; such subtle somatic phenomena can only be grasped through direct experience in the fieldworker's own body. Subtle sensing or the salience of "feeling," sensation, sense, or "rasa" (as per Sanskrit evoked in Javanese and Indonesian martial arts), also include an aspect of "adhering to something" we might understand as reaching common ground or air.

Chapters 3 and 4 draw attention to sound and wind as sensing, respectively, through drumming and weathering. Nima Jangouk's chapter explains that his research involved learning new drumming rhythms in order to join zar practitioners in their healing on Qeshm Island in Southern Iran. The "taming wind or affliction" of the zar practitioners "unsettled" affected people. Taking us through his own process of appreciation of the ritual through the lens of phenomenological approaches in anthropology, he locates his experience in a context of (academic) institutional resistance. Angeline Antonakos Boswell's vignette is embedded within this chapter, describing how a "back-to-the roots" movement in Serbia was unexpectedly therapeutic. Together they show the importance of knowing and embrac-

ing our tendencies to join people, rhythms, and tempos. Chapter 4 by Sarah Asu Schroer extends this argument, showing the need to open up an earthbound perspective of conventionally “grounded” fieldwork to consider the aerial world of birds of prey, where weather and air currents play a crucial role. Through stories and drawings presented in collaboration with artist Aina Azevedo, she brings attention to the textuality of air as it emerges between falconer, bird, and weather environment in a relation of trust and a sense of companionship; falconers need to develop “a feeling for birds of prey.” She describes developing a sensitivity to the forces and intensities of the wind, a common thread passing through many of the contributions in this volume.

Overall the contributions in this section thus point us forward, illustrating how doing anthropology brings into being new compositions and seeks to reach common ground or air (such as ways of breathing together). Where the first section focuses on attunements, the next section—Moving—offers a counterpoint. In the second part of this volume, political structures are resisted or are used to produce new possibilities. Reflections on attunement are still present, but in terms of broader adjustments that we make as we travel/move along space and time, de-re-territorialize pasts, presents, and futures, (re)mapping grounds and skies. Knowing as movement applies to vital bodily processes across and in-between leaky bodies (as discussed above), yet it also applies to going along virtual and actual routes or paths as we (web) surf, walk, migrate, map, or haul water. The authors in this fold take us to Northern Canada, Mongolia, South Africa, Singapore, and China, yet also beyond those borders as worlds intermingle through cyberspace as well as through dreams, spiritual forces, and ecologies.

The opening chapter by Willow Scobie describes traveling through layers of time, landscapes, media, and Inuitness across the Inuit homeland. The contemporary tactics that Inuit use to “story themselves into being” (Jackson 2006) create new opportunities for anthropologists (and sociologists) to explore the ways nomadic subjectivities illuminate the coexistence of pasts, presents, and futures in layered strands. Being attentive to the ways Inuit youth contend with colonial logics involves mobilizing an indigenous epistemology that opens lines of flight where everything is always possible. Scobie’s chapter includes a vignette by Meg Stalcup who writes of untimeliness, or a need to stay in time with one’s fieldwork, notwithstanding the speed of the internet. Moving and being moved with and through internet techniques involves finding a relationship to the present unaffected by reigning norms, opinion, or academic fads. A second vignette by Carly Dokis

explains how by both thinking with water and hauling it, she learns its importance for the Dene community in Behdzi Ahda First Nation. Maintaining their relationship with water, and by extension their relations with each other, was prized above adopting a water treatment facility. Together, this triptych shows the importance of attending to smooth space, or maximizing its creation with an understanding of how space and time are striated or could be striated otherwise.

In the sixth chapter, Giovanni Spissu draws inspiration from South African writer Alex La Guma's 1962 novel *A Walk in the Night and Other Stories* in which he describes District Six in Cape Town during the apartheid era. Spissu applies a similar approach to observe resignification processes of the urban territory by walking with its residents in post-apartheid Cape Town. He argues that La Guma's work can be conceived as a particular form of a literary sensorial map, giving meaning to the city's urban space as an empathic territory alive with the inhabitants' memories and imaginings for their futures. In this there are endless possibilities of re-territorialization. In chapter 7 we follow Nicolas Rasiulis becoming an anthropologist as he cohabitates with the Dukhas, nomadic reindeer herders in the alpine tundra and boreal forests on the Mongolian side of its borderland with the Russian Republic of Tuva. He describes the struggles and successes of learning everyday life as he joins migratory movements between West and East Taigas, as well as how one's presence is both affected by and affecting place, people and spirits. The core of his chapter takes us into deeply transformative manifold processes of (re)turning and (re)knotting, and most crucially of moving through and across ontologies and shaman-ish practices through continuous micro-adjustments and improvisations.

Bringing some order yet also showing how things stretch and bend, chapter 8 by Elisabeth Hsu and Chee Han Lim compares two styles of martial arts training that the authors learned in different places: Singapore and Kunming, Yunnan province, People's Republic of China. One style is the Hong Fist (*hongquan* 洪拳) version of the *Yijin jing*, the other was taught as a form of *qigong* 氣功. Together, they reflect on how comparative auto-ethnographic practices can enrich the repertoire of ethnographic field methods. In particular, they find that the intentionality underlying both *Yijin jing* styles of expanding the self into the universe predispose the ethnographer to recognize the importance of this trope in other cultural modalities, for example, in historiographic texts or healing rituals. Moving or stillness are discussed in minute detail, such as the requirement to remaining unmoved, learning "to let go and be a pine tree," and understanding how the pine tree

stands for the pinnacle of martial excellence—“remaining unmoved is the tree’s way of striking back.” Moving thus co-exists with unmoving (minor, rounded, bodily, martial or suitable, pulling, pushing, naming, opening, doing; sometimes choreographed, administered individually, taught, enskilled, enacted, aligned, performed, reproduced, involved, long, and drawn out). Moving can also be a rationale or a string of movements flowing into each other, as illustrated in this chapter’s phenomenology of the movements learned.

The Moving section thus offers endless possibilities of expressing or being un/re/moved through both space and time, yet also through extending and stretching space and time via bodily adjustments of human and more-than-human worlds. This can be understood through *qi* as “thing-y,” tangible, resistance-offering, and even sentient, like winds that can be tamed or attuned to (sensing). Along this line, the Imagining section pays closer attention to the ways these winds and words, violence, loss, failure, and silence can be brought into writing. They do so based on research performed in Australia, Sri Lanka, Bosnia, Western Canada, the United States, and in literature.

It begins with a final triptych that considers the interview and the archive not as static and closed artifacts circumscribed by pre-existing questions or material documents but as living and breathing processes. Ari Gandsman’s text takes us into the difficulties encountered in persuading ethics boards to understand how the interview is fieldwork, underlining how often the most telling aspects are what spill out unexpectedly or remain unsaid. Taking us through the interview component of a study on “right to die” activism in Melbourne, Australia, we get a sense of the anxiety leading up to, and during the interview process, and how this is intensified by the recording machine (and lessened once it is off). This encounter ends with a line that disappears into the distance, a vanishing point that leads us to imagine so much more than the interview. Embedded within this chapter, the vignette by Larisa Kurtović also reflects on the interview process, offering insight into the possibility of disappointment when we expect certain answers. Situating us in the context of her doctoral fieldwork on a grassroots activist initiative in postwar Bosnia-Herzegovina, she explains that it was only much later on after the interview was done that she fully grasped the strength of a corporeal and affective response, while she had at the time wished for a more political or discursive one. She thus points to the importance of listening for the unexpected. Adding complexity to the classical methodological approach of archival research, Thushara Hewage’s vignette takes his study of the Sri Lankan political to show how it leads to reconsidering

the distinction between ethnography as method and anthropology as theory. Once the archive is no longer considered factual in the postcolony, it becomes useful to apply an idea of the discursive archive in Foucauldian terms, namely as an immanent system of dynamic relations in which we need to position ourselves critically. Leading us through three key moments of its constitution, he shows us its movement and its depth, or how an embedded concept of ethnicity performs through time in the archive.

Chapter 10 by Bradley Dunseith takes failure as a starting point, asking what it means to learn in the field. He describes how failing to learn to shoot a gun during the course of his fieldwork in the state of Georgia in the United States offers imaginative and creative ways to think more broadly about the environments people inhabit and what it means to inhabit them. More specifically, by juxtaposing learning to shoot a gun with learning how to do anthropology, he suggests that disproportionate attention to learning skills as a straightforward process and repetitive technique can also shed light on how un-tuning ourselves and awkwardness can be revealing, opening up space for one's imagination to unfurl. Next, the chapter by Kristen Anne Walsh brings us to the tops of the Rocky Mountain range in order to learn with alpine lookout observers. She explores the wonder involved in the deep probing of the sky and of the wind, such as in differentiating a "spook" or false plume from a real one. Her chapter evokes a heightened imagination to what is out there, a broadened awareness in sensing winds laterally and through the skin. She tells her process of becoming both an anthropologist and a lookout observer as she turns to drawing, walking, and listening in order to write from the movements at the mountain tops.

Chapter 12 by Bernhard Leistle brings forth that which is often elusive within the grasp of *Methods* (as well as teaching *Methods*), what he describes as "getting caught," and how this constitutes a sophisticated aesthetic-artistic maneuver. By leading us through a classic work by Jeanne Favret-Saada, he invites us to think of anthropology as bewitchment, a realm beyond method. More poignantly, he calls our attention to the way things are written and how they can "get to us" affectively, highlighting an aspect that is not only "after method," but eludes the grasp of method. It can be understood as a marriage of form and content close to artistic creation—exploring the aesthetic-artistic dimensions of ethnographic writing by moving beyond understandings of "neutral objectivity." The afterword takes up the idea that writing produces (rather than describes) experience as it explores the relation between silence and method. Anchoring his

thoughts in more than ten years of fieldwork in and across novel ecologies, David Jaclin takes us on the road and brings the road home as he grasps the liveliness and open-endedness of meta-odos. This enables him to problematize “data,” as well as reflect on double mechanical modes of the inscription of fieldwork (writing/reading/multimedia recordings) with some of the organic ones often less considered (moving/infering/transducing/becoming more-than-one). Composed in dialogue with a vignette by Everett Kehew, together they propose an infra-linguistic argument to rejuvenate the practice of anthropology, a semiotic consciousness for working the field. Jaclin does this from the perspective of a loss, while Kehew draws from yoga as well as from Georges Bataille’s invitation to embrace writing as productive and not descriptive of experience. This interestingly brings him to discuss inner experience of both ethnographic yoga and writing as a means of breathing life into the practice of anthropology. A brief epilogue pulls out some of the threads that move through the manuscript, not as prescriptive models but rather as invitations.

Julie Laplante is Professor in Anthropology at the University of Ottawa. She works in phenomenological approaches in anthropology with interests in indigenous and humanitarian medicine, attuning to bodily, clinical, sensorial, and sonorous abilities in healing with plants or molecules. Her fieldwork in the Brazilian Amazon and at two edges of the Indian Ocean (South Africa, Java Indonesia) has more recently moved to Cameroon. She produced the anthropological film *Jamu Stories* (2015) and is the author of *Pouvoir guérir* (2004) and *Healing Roots* (2015, 2018).

Willow Scobie is an Assistant Professor in the School of Sociological and Anthropological Studies at the University of Ottawa. She began working with Inuit youth in 2007 on projects related to YouTube, Twitter, Facebook, and Isuma.tv. She is currently working with youth and young adults in Inuit communities documenting their responses to mining projects operating in the Inuit Nunangat. Her most recent publication, “Diversions, Distraction, and Privileges: Consultation and the Governance of Mining in Nunavut,” with Kathleen Rodgers, was published in *Studies in Political Economy* 100 (3): 232–51.

Ari Gandsman is a cultural and medical anthropologist and associate professor at the University of Ottawa in the School of Anthropological and Sociological Studies. His research examines the intersection of new technologies and rights-based claims. He has conducted field-

work in Argentina, Australia, and Canada, working on long-term research projects on medical aid-in-dying and post-dictatorship human rights movements. His work has been published in a wide range of anthropological and interdisciplinary journals including *Death Studies*, *Anthropologie et Sociétés*, *The International Journal of Transitional Justice*, *Anthropologica*, *The Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology*, and *Ethos*.

References

- Bateson, Gregory. 1972. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind: A Revolutionary Approach to Man's Understanding of Himself*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- . [1936] 1958. *Naven: A Survey of the Problems Suggested by a Composite Picture of the Culture of a New Guinea Tribe Drawn from Three Points of View*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bateson, Gregory, and Margaret Mead. 1942. *Balinese Character: A Photographic Analysis*. New York: Academy of Sciences.
- Behar, Ruth, and Deborah A. Gordon, eds. 1995. *Women Writing Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bernard, Claude. 1865. *Introduction à l'étude de la médecine expérimentale*. Paris: Garnier-Flammarion.
- Boas, Franz. 1921. *Ethnology of the Kwakiutl*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Boudreault-Fournier, Alexandrine. 2017. "Recording and Editing." In *A Different Kind of Ethnography: Imaginative Practices and Creative Methodologies*, ed. Denielle Elliott and Dara Culhane, 69–90. North York: University of Toronto Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus*, trans. by Brian Massumi. London: University of Minnesota Press.
- During, Elie. 2008. "Trois lettres 'inédites' de Henri Bergson à Gilles Deleuze." *Critique* 732: 398–409.
- Elliott, Denielle, and Dara Culhane, eds. 2017. *A Different Kind of Ethnography: Imaginative Practices and Creative Methodologies*. North York: University of Toronto Press.
- Favret-Saada, Jeanne. 1977. *Les mots, la mort, les sorts*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. [1791] 2009. *The Metamorphosis of Plants*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Ingold, Tim. 2013. *Making: Anthropology, Archaeology, Art and Architecture*. London: Routledge.
- . 2014. "That's Enough about Ethnography!" *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 4(1): 383–95.
- . 2015. *The Life of Lines*. Oxford: Routledge.
- . 2017. "Anthropology Contra Ethnography." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 7(1): 21–26.

- . 2018. *Anthropology: Why It Matters*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ingold, Tim, and Elisabeth Hallam. 2007. "Creativity and Cultural Improvisation: An Introduction." In *Creativity and Cultural Improvisation*, ed. Elisabeth Hallam and Tim Ingold, 1–41. New York: Berg.
- Ingold, Tim, and Gisli Palsson, eds. 2013. *Biosocial Becomings: Integrating Social and Biological Anthropology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jackson, Michael. 2006. *The Politics of Storytelling: Violence, Transgression and Intersubjectivity*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Latour, Bruno. 2004. "How to Talk About the Body? The Normative Dimension of Science Studies." *Body & Society* 10(2–3): 205–29.
- Law, John. 2004. *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. London: Routledge.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. [1962] 1966. *The Savage Mind (La Pensée Sauvage)*. trans. by Weidenfeld and Nicolson Ltd. The Garden City Press: Letchworth, Hertfordshire.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. [1922] 2005. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*. London: Routledge.
- Mauss, Marcel. 1923–24. "Essai sur le don: forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques." *L'Année sociologique* 1: 30–186.
- McLean, Athena, and Annette Leibing. 2007. *The Shadow Side of Fieldwork: Exploring the Blurred Borders between Ethnography and Life*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. [1945] 2002. *La phénoménologie de la perception*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- . 1964. *L'œil et l'esprit*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Mol, Annemarie. 2002. *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Pauly, Phillip J. 1987. *Controlling Life: Jacques Loeb and the Engineering Ideal in Biology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Piette, Albert. 2011. *Fondements à une anthropologie des hommes*. Paris: Hermann Éditeurs.
- Pickstone, John V. 2000. *Ways of Knowing: A New History of Science Technology and Medicine*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Pink, Sarah. 2015. *Doing Sensory Ethnography*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Robben, Antonius C. G. M., and Jeffrey A. Sluka, eds. 2012. *Ethnographic Fieldwork: An Anthropological Reader*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. [1999] 2008. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. New York: Zed Books.
- Taussig, Michael. 2015. *The Corn Wolf*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. 2015. *The Mushroom at the End of the World: On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.