

FORTY-MINUTE FIELDWORK

There seem to be two schools of thought about second fieldwork. The first is that because one has done it before, everything will flow much more easily the second time around. The second is that because one has done it all before, one is less diligent the second time around. There are also two kinds of second fieldwork, each with two subdivisions (this being an article about twos). The first is second fieldwork conducted in the same place and with some of the same people, but some years after the original study (Scarlett Epstein's *South India: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow* [1973] is a good example of this). The second is fieldwork conducted in a different location (such as Geertz's shift from Indonesia to Morocco). For both, there is a subdivision, with the second fieldwork either being concerned with the same issues as the first (as with the Epstein book), or involving a complete shift in focus (as with, say, Martin Southwold's shift in interest from kingship in Buganda to his study of Buddhism in Sri Lanka).

There is another possible difference between first and second fieldwork: methodology. A change in methodology will inevitably dictate a change in the style of fieldwork; furthermore, the change may be imposed upon the anthropologist. For example, several anthropologists revisit the area of their first fieldwork to conduct a commissioned study, usually on behalf or together with some

Editors' Note: Dr Banks has carried out fieldwork amongst Jains in Britain and India. Since his doctoral research, which has resulted in a number of papers (see, for example, Banks 1984; in press), he has turned his attention to the field of visual anthropology, one result of which has been the film discussed in this article as an example of 'second fieldwork'.

development agency. Where their previous work may have been a detailed study of semiotics, entailing a lot of sitting around, chatting, and generally getting into the flow of things, the new fieldwork may consist of crawling around fields with a measuring tape and interrogating people about crop yields.

I mention all these possible variations (and there are presumably others) in order to contextualize in some way my own experiences. First of all, however, it should be pointed out that many of the contrasts I have highlighted are merely those that might lie between any periods of fieldwork - first and second, third and fourth, second and twenty-second. It seems to me that the crucial aspect of second fieldwork is not so much its 'secondness' as the fact that it is contrasted with one's first fieldwork, that crucial crucible of anthropological testing.¹

Even trying to distinguish first from subsequent fieldwork may be difficult. My first fieldwork - on lay Jain organisations - had actually been conducted in two countries with two (almost) entirely separate groups of informants.² I started first in the English city of Leicester and spent about eight months there before moving to the city of Jamnagar in Gujarat State, India. Did my work in Jamnagar therefore count as second fieldwork? Certainly it was easier: I had a rough grasp of the language; I knew vaguely what it was I was looking for; and I had letters of introduction from the Jains in Leicester, so making contacts was not a problem (as it often is in urban fieldwork). If I am honest, I think my work in Jamnagar was also sloppier. India was new and exciting, whereas Leicester had been rather dull and I had concentrated on my work more. Furthermore, while my study in Leicester had been confined, for the most part, to a single Jain organisation, in Jamnagar I was surrounded by them. And in every neighbouring town and village there were still more. The very abundance of data meant that I alternated between panic at the thought that I could never cope with it all, and a rather cavalier attitude that I only needed a few standard facts about a representative sample of them. Thus, if I were to consider my Leicester and Jamnagar experiences as first and second fieldwork, then the second time it did flow more easily but I do not think I did it as well.

¹ This seems particularly so in Britain where fieldwork is usually first encountered as a make-or-break, death-or-glory right of passage on the way to a doctorate. Anthropologists in other countries often seem to treat it far more lightly, shuttling in and out of 'the field' several times in the course of a year (to the veiled contempt of their British counterparts).

² Although there are groups of Jains in South India, the Jains today have their strongest presence in the states of Gujarat and Rajasthan. They are a strongly urban group and are often connected with trade and business in some way. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries many Jains migrated from Gujarat to East Africa, and from there to Britain in the 1960s and '70s.

For a number of reasons, however, I do not think the Leicester experience by itself counts as first fieldwork. For one thing, I do not think eight months is really long enough to make it more than a taste (I subsequently visited Leicester a number of times, and indeed continue to do so). More importantly, I had no more than a few days' gap between Leicester and Jamnagar, and so had no time to reflect on the first before starting the second. Most importantly of all, both periods of fieldwork were conducted within the same research frame (gathering data for my doctoral dissertation). Although anthropologists often state in the introductions to their books that they spent a period of (say) eighteen months 'in the field', it often transpires (in conversation) that sometimes as much as half that period was spent in a state or regional capital - obtaining permission, consulting archives, learning the language, searching for the actual village to study. While I spent two out of my nine months in India similarly engaged in the state capital, there is a sense in which my Leicester fieldwork was a preparation for my Indian fieldwork.

Perhaps a better comparison lies between my first Indian fieldwork and a piece of work I conducted last year, also in the city of Jamnagar. I have in fact visited Jamnagar every year for a period of six to ten weeks between my original work (in 1983) and my most recent work. On the whole these visits have been social, in that I have been in India for some other purpose and have gone to Jamnagar to see friends. Until last year, any work I did as an anthropologist was simply tidying up loose ends from the original study and maintaining my contacts.

In 1987, however, I had the chance to make a documentary film with an anthropological bias on more or less any subject I chose, provided it was within my competence as an anthropologist.³ I ended up back in Jamnagar and made a film that is a portrait of one of my friends (one who hardly ever acted as an informant) and in which Jainism is mentioned only in passing. Thus my second fieldwork, following the categories outlined at the beginning of this article, was conducted in the same place, with some of the same people, on a completely different topic (if the film I made is 'about' anything in the conventional set of anthropological interests, it concerns marriage and boundary crossing), and with a completely different methodological basis. Given these differences, it is obvious that I cannot make a direct comparison between first and second fieldwork such that I can analyse the quality of secondness (or, as I pointed out above, not-firstness). Many of the differences between the two experiences I would attribute to methodology and I am thus unable to compare like with like. Nonetheless, the fact that I chose a different methodology is an indication that I approached this second piece of work differently.

³ From October 1986 to October 1987 I held an RAI/Leverhulme Film Fellowship at the National Film and Television School.

But would it not be fair to say that I had the opportunity to make a film and simply went to a place I knew well? If that were the case, then it is not so much that I chose to pursue a second period of fieldwork employing a different methodology as that I was presented with a ready-made opportunity which I simply accepted. The answer is, not really. I had already made a couple of short films and therefore, when presented with the opportunity, knew that I wanted to pursue a different kind of ethnography on film. Furthermore, there is a strong feeling amongst makers of ethnographic films that one should only shoot a film after conducting a significant period of research in the area first, so Jamnagar was a choice, but so was Leicester. Finally, until about a fortnight before flying to India I was actually going to make a completely different film. I withdrew from that (it was to have been a film about Jain initiation) when I realised that the methodology was, for my purposes, unsuited to the task.

My reasoning was that film, when its strengths and weaknesses are understood, is as useful a methodological tool for anthropological analysis as any of the other tools (open-ended questionnaires, participant observation etc.). To reach this argument I have to demonstrate that I chose to use film in this way for a period of second fieldwork, or at least, that I recognised this potential while I conducted the fieldwork. The assumption I wish to counter is that one simply shoots a film and that this should not count as 'serious' fieldwork. Some anthropologists are scornful of ethnographic film, often expressing the sentiment that 'anyone can point a camera'. Of course this is true, just as anyone can be a participant observer. It is to be hoped, however, that an anthropologist would point a camera with more care and forethought than just anybody, just as an anthropologist would observe and participate with more care and forethought. In the context of this particular article I also want to show that a certain tension exists in second fieldwork when a different methodology is applied. On the one hand, if the work is conducted in the same place and/or with the same people, there is a desire to use the new methodology to reach similar conclusions to those reached the first time around. On the other, there is a desire to let the new methodology lead the way, suggesting new channels of investigation. Thus, having already decided that I wished to use film as an anthropologist in a general sense, I was ready to return to Jamnagar to use film to explore a ritual I had already observed and documented in the standard way (through tape recordings, note-taking, pre- and post-event interviews etc.) twice before.

The reasons why I discarded the Jain initiation film are many and complex, and some of them stemmed from factors beyond my control. However, the more I thought about it, the more uneasy I felt. Simultaneously, the more I discussed my back-up project with friends and colleagues, the more certain I was of its strengths. My unease with the first project stemmed partly from the fact that I could not guarantee knowing any of the participants personally (I would just have to take whichever initiation occurred in the area while I was there), and partly from the fact that a film of such a complex event would demand either a very specialised audience

or a large amount of dense verbal explanation. Although I think that films with a heavy commentary are often useful, for example in classroom teaching, I find they rarely succeed as films, the reason being that the capacity of film to communicate visually and through authentic verbal narrative is suppressed and rendered subordinate to a mediating voice which interprets the events of the film to the audience. Such films are basically lectures with illustrative slides.

The implication of the above is that certain subjects do not make 'good' films. Far from it. Simply, the circumstances surrounding the making of the Jain initiation film were such that I would have been steered into making the kind of film I did not want to make. In other circumstances - for example, had I been living in Gujarat for some months prior to filming and found a suitable ceremony with articulate actors - a film on this topic would be more likely to live up to my expectations. More generally, in the period between my doctoral research and preparing for the film, I had increasingly begun to question the generalizations that characterize much traditional British anthropology. In planning the Jain initiation film I had unconsciously started from the standpoint that the one instance of initiation shown in the film could stand as a type, specifically of Jain initiation and more generally of Indian religious initiation. It would thus be a representative of the class or set 'initiation'. As I pressed on with the planning I realised the limitations of such an approach: I was going to subordinate the traumatic experience of a life-changing event to membership of an abstract, academic category.⁴ From my past experience I knew that the indigenous logic was actually the converse: after feeling some profound dis-ease with everyday life, or after some traumatic event (the death of a loved one, for example), the individual casts around for a solution, of which initiation as a Jain monk or nun is only one of several alternatives (the others being anything from suicide to marriage).

Thus, rather than 'initiation' being a set of which the events in this film would be a member, the set as perceived by the actors would be that of 'solutions to problems' of which initiation would be a member. Of course, if I was lucky I might find an initiate who could explain that they chose initiation as a solution to a moral or spiritual problem rather than to demonstrate a social process, but I still felt there was a danger of an audience seeing only the latter meaning. In England, the only solution to this dilemma that came to me was to film an initiation that *did not* happen, since only this would jar the audience out of whatever pre-conceptions they might be bringing to the film. (There is, by now, a small but significant body of non-event documentary films, of which the most famous is probably Michael Rubbo's *Waiting for Fidel* [1974], in which he fails to meet Castro.) Of course, the chances of finding such a (non-) occurrence were even less than those of finding an actual initiation.

⁴ No one should doubt that Jain initiation is traumatic, since it involves renouncing all family ties, possessions etc., and thereafter living a life of self-discipline and deliberate discomfort.

I have digressed for too long in describing the film I did not make to the exclusion of the one I did. In itself, however, this reveals the (fairly obvious) fact that once one has conducted fieldwork it is much easier to predict the nature and course of subsequent fieldwork.

The back-up film was one that I had had in mind for a year. In 1986 I went to Jamnagar to conduct preliminary research for the Jain initiation film. A Jain friend of mine, Raju, kept me company while I visited people at home, interviewed Jain monks and nuns, and called in at temple offices. In between trips Raju took me to his home and arranged meetings with friends of his I had met on previous visits. When I was conducting my first fieldwork I had always felt a slightly guilty pleasure about being with this group of people (actually, several groups, with Raju as the common member): pleasure because I enjoyed their company, guilt because it meant time away from the Jains, my objects of study (some of these friends were in fact Jains but we rarely talked about Jainism).

The idea for the film came to me in a narrow street in the Muslim quarter of Jamnagar. Raju and I had just left a Muslim house where we had taken tea with a group of women friends, and I was discussing with him the unusual nature of his many friendships - with Muslim women, postmen, wealthy traders, bicycle menders and tea-stall boys and, of course, with a foreigner. It was the time I had spent with Raju and his friends that I remembered most fondly from fieldwork, and it was memories from these experiences that I would most often use when telling non-anthropologists about India. I also found myself drawing on these memories when trying to counter stereotypes and illusions: about caste, the position of women, Islam, poverty and so on. What more natural, then, than to conduct fieldwork, in this case using film, that drew on friendship, personal experience, a sense of place and belonging? Moreover, these seemed to be qualities which were ideally suited to the medium of film. Film can show, in a way words never can, a person's familiarity with a street, a doorway, a room; the laughing glances exchanged between friends, the teasing banter, the gestures of hands - these things cannot be described, only demonstrated.

Paul Hockings has recently claimed (1988) that film has an essentially phenomenological character as opposed to the deductive and empiricist character of conventional anthropological analysis. I would dispute this as a general statement on the grounds that certain shooting and editing techniques can subvert this character, but I would agree that the 'observational' style of documentary shooting and cutting is most likely to preserve the phenomenological character. Meaning is seen to arise from the casual and unscripted interaction between people and between people and objects. Nancy Munn has also recently demonstrated, through the linked concept of 'experientiality', that casual and formal interactions are located by actors (and thus for analysts) in a grid of space and, more importantly, time.⁵ These seem to be obvious truisms, but it

⁵ Munn outlined her argument in a seminar paper entitled 'Kula

is crucial to realise that events take place not as representatives or examples of abstract categories ('marriage payments', 'dispute settlement'), but as contingent phenomena where the status of the person with whom one interacts, one's previous contact with them, one's predictions of future contacts and a whole constellation of related factors may singly or together be far more important than the label which is attached (by analyst or actor) to the interaction.

In my first fieldwork, framed as it was within the context of a doctoral dissertation and preceded by theoretical courses in anthropology, I was looking for labels and categories. Indeed, I would get a mild thrill of pleasure when I found myself observing rules of purity and pollution, or finding a mother's brother helping a sister's son. I think if I had made the Jain initiation film, especially if it had been with strangers, I would still have been looking for categories and labels. Instead, by making the film about Raju and his friends (in which, as a friend of Raju's, I was involved as a player as well as a documenter), I knew that everything I saw and heard had no simple explanation, that because I had my own experiences and knew many of theirs any attempt to generalize or to single out a statement or event as 'typical' or representative would have to be endlessly qualified.

At one point in the film, for example, Raju explains that he had wished to marry a Muslim woman but that family pressure had prevented it. Fine, an example of India's well-known rigidity (the 'caste system' being the archetype): different religious groups rarely interact and certainly never intermarry. But the event is more complex and is not time-bound. Raju, for example, goes on to explain that he and this woman still meet, that they both feel tied to each other and would help each other in times of trouble. He shows us gifts she has given him (rings, a watch) and points out that some of them have (popular) Islamic significance. Elsewhere in the film we see him in interactions with members of his family which are intended to demonstrate (from an editorial point of view) that the family is not authoritarian and repressive. We also see him with another Muslim woman, not his ex-fiancée but one who, in a sense, stands for her. All these events or phenomena (*described* weakly in words, as here, but *demonstrated* in the film) reveal that the marriage would merely have been one strand in a complex web of relationships between Raju and his family, between Raju and his ex-fiancée, between Muslims and non-Muslims, and so on, which stretch across apparent boundaries of time, space, gender, religion, kinship. To try and capture such data in writing needs great skill and an intensity of description that only the truly devoted could bear. Film, on the other hand, is a medium almost ideally suited for such ethnographic reportage. I would not claim that film

Exchange, Witchcraft, and Gawan Local Events: Some Aspects of the Experiential Construction of a Regional World', presented in Oxford in May 1988. This built upon many of the ideas contained in Munn 1986.

produces *better* ethnography, merely that it produces a *different* ethnography.⁶

But film has its limitations too, one of which is reflected in the title of this article. The medium of film (fiction as well as documentary) has its own conventions, some of which relate to length. Conventions may, of course, be broken, but they need to be understood. With regard to this film, I was faced with budgetary constraints which meant that I could not really afford to go beyond forty minutes in total length (each of those minutes costing approximately £250). So the problem was, how to fit an entire fieldwork experience into forty minutes?

The question brings up another difference between first and second fieldwork. In my first fieldwork I had the luxury of time and the handicap of inexperience. So little was known about the Jains (and nothing at all about the Jains in England) that while I gained a frisson of excitement at stepping into virgin territory, it was extremely difficult to know exactly what I should study. In the end, in common with many other graduate students, I blundered around for my allotted time and then constructed a thesis out of what I had. I exaggerate, of course; I did work to plans (constantly changing) and set myself goals and objectives (rarely achieved), and I know in general that I was trying to fit the Jain organisation I had studied in Leicester into some kind of typology of Indian Jain organisations. But I had no clear sense of the way in which the data I collected (from interviews, conversation, eavesdropping, documents, inscriptions, observation) related either to each other or to the written synthesis I produced.

In contrast, film stock is expensive, delicate, cumbersome and limited. Most importantly, although the image, once recorded, can be altered in numerous subtle and not so subtle ways, it stands in some sort of iconic relationship to its source (its relationship to the viewer is far more complex and subject to change). Thus, in shooting the film, I had to be constantly aware of what was being recorded, what had gone before and what might possibly follow, in order to achieve the objective of forty coherent minutes. I also had to consider simultaneously the internal narrative of the film and the wider context within which the film was located (the budgetary constraints, the fact that someone else needed the equipment after I had finished with it, the fact that I had to fulfil a contract). Neither of these factors, the internal and external narratives of field research, had really bothered me during my first Indian fieldwork.

The internal and external narratives of fieldwork each have two perspectives: the view of the fieldworker and the view of those he

⁶ Hockings (1988) would claim that this kind of ethnography would, or should, bring about a change in anthropological theory. This is a claim I support (Banks 1988), and hope to argue for in greater detail in the future.

or she works with. Most writing on fieldwork seems to consider only the fieldworker's perspective and is usually concerned only with the internal narrative (that is, how the work is done and how it hangs together). Of course, in certain types of fieldwork - for example, surveys undertaken for a development organisation - the external narrative (why the work is done and what will happen as a result of it) and the view of the informants are intimately linked, which presumably explains why these aspects are ignored together.

With regard to my first fieldwork, I looked on it as something akin to detective work; the internal narrative was that of the detective story. I took as my model not Agatha Christie's Durkheimian world - a bounded and tidy social universe disrupted by inevitable violence (Christie makes frequent allusions to the 'presence' of evil and the fact that some individuals are inherently evil) and restored again after a period of catharsis - but the complex experiential world of Ross MacDonal, one of the *genre noir* writers along with Chandler, Hammet and others. In MacDonal's world, the 'crime' itself is rarely unproblematical, the past casts a constant shadow over the present (young people are often trying to break out into the future but must know the past before they can do so), characters often unknowingly hold vital information which, when revealed, brings the responsibility of more autonomy in their lives, and the detective merely pulls the pieces together in a way that is rarely pleasing to anyone. Often the detective is used (and abused) by the other characters.

In order to be as objective as possible I tried never to be seen to be working during my first fieldwork. With each individual or group I tried to pretend that my presence at that moment was accidental and that I was 'off duty'. In this way, I felt, people would be off their guard and treat me as a friend or, at least, as a harmless interloper. Sometimes I even staged unnecessary interviews, pen and notebook at the ready, to gain an introduction to someone I wanted to meet. Casual meetings, where the real work was done, could then follow. Throughout, however, I was convinced that I was on the track of something (the solution to the puzzle) and that to reveal my quest would spoil my chances of attaining it.

Shooting the film four years later I found myself in a contrary situation. With a 16mm camera and 1/4" tape recorder, the difference between working and not-working is all too evident. Every time the cameraman lifted the camera to his eye or I placed the headphones over my ears, the subjects we intended to shoot were alerted to our intentions. Practitioners of observational cinema have numerous techniques to desensitize the subjects to the equipment, but none can be wholly successful. In this case, although we could familiarize the subjects with the equipment, the huge crowds we drew every time we attempted to film outside were a constant reminder of our activities. Thus, I embarked on a strategy of revealing as much as I possibly could about what I was doing and what I wanted to achieve. I also constantly questioned the subjects about their feelings and thoughts. In place of the detective approach of my first work, I was devising a strategy where, instead of the documenter embarking on a quest for some hidden object of desire, subject and documenter collaborate to create that object.

Thus the film that resulted is not a piece of pure observational cinema (because it contains interviews, monologues to camera and pieces of action that Raju himself instigated), but it is, I would say, an attempt at collaborative cinema.

Despite the differences between working and not-working in the two situations, there was a common problem: what, in the eyes of the subjects, was I actually doing? Anthropology in general is a difficult enough subject to explain and, paradoxically, the fine details seem even more inexplicable. Most anthropologists have a fund of (often humorous) travellers' tales about the natives' attempts to understand and explain what it is the anthropologist is doing. But the problem is a serious one and becomes more serious if one returns somewhere.

During my first fieldwork I was faced with the problem that there was a very obvious explanation for what I was doing: I was studying Jainism and would write a book that would explain and describe the religion. The difficulty was, why had I come to Jamnagar, a backwater city of no obvious Jain significance? Surely I would have found my work easier at one of the major pilgrimage centres or in a big city such as Bombay. Eventually, most people decided that I had come to Jamnagar because of its links with Leicester and that I had known Jains there because it was my home. Of course, some of my informants understood that I was studying them, not their religious tradition, and that I had chosen Jamnagar *because* it was a backwater, where I would find ordinary people, not religious specialists or those whose awareness was heightened by pilgrimage. But when I tried to explain this to others, their eyes glazed over, much as my own did when I had to listen to long religious discourses instead of being able to ask questions about money, family history and the like.

Shooting the film, I was faced with a similar problem. Raju and his family and friends decided early on that I was making a film about 'ordinary' people. I was preparing a kind of catalogue of activities - getting up, going to work, having lunch, meeting friends - that I would use to show my students back in England what everyday life in India was like for what Raju called 'medium-class' people. But my decision to be open (together with the fact that I was working with a small group of people, many of them close friends) enabled me to circumvent the misunderstanding. For example, one day Raju took us to visit another friend at his shop where Raju wanted to use the telephone. I was using a highly directional microphone and, as we filmed the telephone call, I heard Raju say *sotto voce*, 'It's Raju speaking; listen, don't take any notice of what I'm going to say. They're making a film about my shop [Raju sells suitcases and tin trunks] and I'm pretending to give you an order.' Then, in a much louder voice he said, 'Hello, is that the Raj Tin Factory? I'd like to order six trunks...' Afterwards, I challenged him with this. He was embarrassed and a little shocked, but explained that we needed the call to establish a reason for going to the factory the next day but that he needed no more stock. Still, we had to show how the business ran, didn't we?

I was touched by his forethought and concern but tried to

explain that we wanted to film things naturally, without contrivance. If I used the sequence at all, I said, I would include the *sotto voce* section. This Raju forbade, feeling it made him look foolish, but it was the start of a closer understanding. The real breakthrough came a few days later when he explained the circumstances of his engagement and the failure of his marriage plans. Afterwards, as we descended from the roof where we had shot the scene, he said, 'I think I know now why you wanted me for this film; it's because I'm not ordinary, because I've done things other people haven't.' This was true; I explained to him that I thought by showing the unusual, people would understand more clearly what is usual and taken for granted. From then on, Raju behaved entirely in character, exhibiting the quirky traits that endear him to his friends, such as arranging a surprise picnic and horse-cart ride for ourselves and a couple of other friends, an event which forms the final sequence of the film.

While informants like Raju may, during the course of fieldwork, come to understand the methodology and aims of field research, the use that is made of the data afterwards may be more obscure. My first fieldwork, like that of so many others, was directed towards gaining a doctoral degree. On one level, this was fairly comprehensible to my informants, though they thought it was fairly useless. The mercantile ideology of Jains in western India is so strong that few could believe I had no ambitions to go into business, and several, seeing the opportunity I presented, offered to set up import-export schemes with me. On the whole, however, they were pleased with the perceived topic of my research, feeling that any attempt to communicate the principles of Jainism to a wider audience should be encouraged. They were less clear about why I should be the one to do this, but several people came up with explanations that involved a previous link in past lives. My return, to make the film, caused few problems, I think because many of my former informants saw it as a purely private project involving me, Raju and my cameraman, and unconnected with my research.

If nothing else, an increased collaboration with the subjects of field research should bring about a heightened sense of responsibility on the part of the fieldworker. This is particularly so when one considers the wider context of the research, a context which includes knowledge of the end state desired. In my case, returning to make the film, I was contractually obliged to produce a forty-minute visual document. My personal obligation was to try and synthesise one man's life and a four-year friendship in a way that suited my aims as a filmmaker. Raju wanted to please me and to cooperate (sometimes in conflict with my own wishes, as with the telephone to the tin trunk manufacturers), but was at the same time conscious of his own responsibilities. For example, after he had told us about his ex-fiancée and we were packing up to leave, he called the camera back and asked to be able to say something more. He then asked for the name of the woman to be deleted so that she should not be embarrassed if the film were ever shown in Jamnagar (as it will be). Raju realised, of course, that her name is still preserved on the original sound tape (and indeed that I knew the name all along), but he trusts me to do as he wished.

In summary then, for my 'second' fieldwork I chose a new methodology and rejected a plan for working on a topic related to my first fieldwork but involving strangers in favour of a new topic involving people well known to me. Even without a methodological shift I would have thought it likely that second fieldwork brings about a shift in attitudes on the part of the fieldworker, away from 'detached' observation and generalization and towards the personal and individualistic (see, for example, Southwold's very personal study of Sri Lankan Buddhism [1983]). Part of this shift may be due to the fact that one has greater confidence to experiment and less to prove - certainly no examination to pass. Paradoxically, however, I found (and I think many others have done so too) that although one may be more self-indulgent on second fieldwork, one is also more aware of the political and social context of one's work - what I earlier termed the external narrative. I found myself having to contend with a number of different demands - to be fair, honest but discrete in portraying Raju, to distil what I wanted to say into forty minutes, to explore and exploit the richness of film as an ethnographic medium. These had to conform with the internal narrative of the work, the actual events and day-to-day interaction.

Although he has not yet seen the final version of the film, Raju seems pleased with it. I sent him cassettes of earlier versions and consulted him frequently by letter during the editing.⁷ For me, one of the greatest benefits of working with film has been the access to my work that it has allowed my subjects. There are a couple of copies of my doctoral thesis in Jamnagar (in English, obviously), but I doubt if anyone has ever looked at them. I imagine they will gather dust, while the tape of the film wears out through use.

MARCUS BANKS

⁷ As this article goes to press I have just returned from India where I showed the final version to Raju and obtained his comments. I hope to write about this in the near future.

REFERENCES

Bibliography

- BANKS, Marcus 1984. 'Caste, Sect and Property: Relations in the Jain Community of Jamnagar, Gujarat', *Cambridge Anthropology*, Vol. IX, no. 3, pp. 34-49.
- ... 1988. 'The Non-Transparency of Ethnographic Film', *Anthropology Today*, Vol. IV, no. 5, pp. 2-3.

- ... forthcoming. 'Orthodoxy and Dissent: Varieties of Religious Belief among Immigrant Gujarati Jains in Britain', in Michael Carrithers and Caroline Humphreys (eds.), *The Assembly of Listeners: Jains in Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- EPSTEIN, T. Scarlett 1973. *South India Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow: Mysore Villages Revisited*, London: Macmillan.
- HOCKINGS, Paul 1988. 'Ethnographic Filming and the Development of Anthropological Theory', in Paul Hockings and Yasuhiro Omori (eds.), *Cinematographic Theory and New Dimensions in Ethnographic Film* [Senri Ethnological Studies, no. 24], Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- MUNN, Nancy 1986. *The Fame of Gawa: A Symbolic Study of Value Transformation in a Massim (New Guinea) Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SOUTHWOLD, Martin 1983. *Buddhism in Life*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Filmography

- BANKS, Marcus 1988. *Raju and His Friends*, National Film and Television School / Royal Anthropological Institute.
- RUBBO, Michael 1974. *Waiting for Fidel*, National Film Board of Canada.