

A Third Space: Advocating Radical Scholarship

Kwame Phillips*

kwamephillips.com

*kwame.petiri@gmail.com



Research Article

ABSTRACT

In this paper, I explore the underrepresented presence of the Black academic and how scholastic and societal forces affect being a Black academic, specifically a Black visual anthropologist. I highlight a tension between the responsibilities expected of scholarship and social justice. Using the theoretical leanings of participatory cinema and resilience, I advocate that to reconcile this tension requires the establishment of a resilient space, what I term a Third Space, capable of supporting a progressive vision and spirit, radical scholarship and communal empowerment, where applied anthropology intersects with social justice. I discuss the value of revisiting the aesthetics and politics of Third Cinema as an example of radical work and how a modern embodiment of the spirit of Third Cinema might be articulated, as well as my own engagement in this work through my film Studio Isis.

Keywords: Anthropology, Race, Resilience, Social Justice, Third Cinema, Third Space.

Link to Studio Isis: <https://vimeo.com/81119541>

Prologue

It was an early evening on a Sunday. Campus was unusually quiet. The only people around were poor bastards like myself who were in the midst of some infinite draft version of some chapter of their dissertation and faculty in their “leave-me-alone-students-it’s-the-weekend” clothes. It was the academic equivalent of *The Walking Dead* – human specters, infected by the curse of pursuing boundless knowledge, lumbering to and fro around buildings in Atlanta, looking for sustenance, inspiration and a magical space where typed words could flow freely from tired brains.

I lumbered over to the history department after leaving the writing lab, hoping that it might be open because I had to pick up some papers from outside a professor’s office. A woman, who I assume was faculty, was entering the building before me and used her card to enter. I motioned to follow in after her. Recognizing that I was trying to get in, she stood at the door and asked me if I had an access card. I had my student ID on me. The ID gave me access to the library, the anthropology building, the humanities building, the journalism lab, and often the odd surprise building that I previously had not been aware of. In fact, just the week prior, I had discovered I had access to a stats lab that I intended to use solely for the comfortable looking couches. So my honest answer to her was that I was not sure if I had access until I tried my ID card, but I added, “If you are asking me if I am a student here, then yes I am and I am just running to pick up something outside an office.”

Uttering the words, I felt ridiculous. Internally I began to question if I really was being required to prove my status as a graduate student. Did I not look like a graduate student? I had a requisite backpack on my back, sweatpants that had no real business being worn as public apparel, and the demeanor of someone who had been in a lab, sitting uncomfortably in front of an overheating laptop for 10 hours, surviving on Coca-Cola products and the kindness of snack-laden strangers. I felt a tinge of anger. I began to wonder if I looked angry. Was she correct for being cautious? She did not know me; I could be anyone. She had the right to feel safe. Am I being a good ally? Am I in the wrong here? This is obviously unfair to me. My parents marched in civil rights movements in London in the 1970s and 80s. I am militant. I should stand up for myself. Am I letting them down right now? Did I say the right thing? I have a London accent. Did I use it sufficiently? Did I sound like a graduate student?

In that briefest of moments, I felt as if I had a lifetime’s worth of judgments to consider. As the rash of questions swirled around my head, I felt an oncoming rush of discomfort, confusion, and powerlessness. And shame. And guilt. She began to

explain to me that technically I should not be allowed inside the building if I did not have access. And further shame for needing to have something so clearly obvious explained to me. I began to wonder if technically I was trying to break in. I began to wonder if I had complacently assumed the behavior of a criminal rather than a student. I replied to her that I understood that if I did not have access I should not enter and that really I was just passing by on the off chance that the department was open or that my card worked; I was more than happy to come back tomorrow, if she felt that was necessary. She proposed that she close the door and that I try my own card, and that if it did not work she would let me in but would have to follow behind me, watch me go to the office, and then leave the building because it would be “strange” and “uncomfortable” to be alone in a locked building while someone who is “not supposed to be there” was walking around. And further guilt.

She had the right to feel safe. I was acutely aware of how unsafe social spaces could be for her, even on a university campus, often especially on a university campus. Was I strange, as a Black body, swinging by a building in my southern institution? Did I feel safe? Why was I questioning myself? I earned my place here. It was MY place too. Was it right for me to be made to feel uncomfortable? Was I appearing indignant? What would I tell my friends? What would she tell her friends? Every feeling I had settled somewhere in my stomach and was causing me actual physical pain. It reminded me of my first year of graduate school when my German roommate at the time had asked me not to study in the shared living room because my presence made him ‘uncomfortable’ and unwelcome in the space. I segregated myself to my bedroom for the remaining eight months that we lived together and subsequently spoke to him only once after that, when I offered to help carry his boxes when he was moving out.

Rather than have her follow me around a building of the university I attended, and rather than have her feel uncomfortable, I chose to go home. I lied to her and myself and told her it was okay and that I would come back tomorrow. I walked the mile and a half home with the multitude of emotions resulting in a raw numbness. I felt a little less than human, questioning my pursuit of boundless knowledge at an Atlanta university that that day was questioning my right to be there.

Introduction

Being a Black body in a predominantly and historically White academic space is a complicated matter. It is no doubt a privilege, but a privilege that is diluted by microaggressive social frustrations and often undermined by a lack of institutional

support. The National Center for Education Statistics' reports that of 1.5 million instructional faculty in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, of those full-time instructional faculty whose race/ethnicity was known, 79 percent were White (44 percent were White males and 35 percent were White females), 6 percent were Black, 4 percent were Hispanic, 9 percent were Asian/Pacific Islander, and less than 1 percent were American Indian/Alaska Native or two or more races. Among full-time professors, 84 percent were White (60 percent were White males and 25 percent were White females), 4 percent were Black, 3 percent were Hispanic, 8 percent were Asian/Pacific Islander, and less than 1 percent were American Indian/Alaska Native. (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). At my own alma mater, Emory University, the far-reaching departmental cuts instituted under the "The Emory College Plan" in September 2012, which saw the closure of such programs as the Division of Educational Studies (DES), the Journalism program, the Department of Visual Arts, and the Institute for Liberal Arts (ILA), has had and will continue to have a detrimental and disproportionate impact on diversity for students, faculty and staff. Approximately 25 percent of ILA students are minorities. The DES, with a 40 percent African American student body, had the highest minority population of any department in the university and produced more Black PhDs than any other program of its kind in the country (Student Revisioning Committee, 2013). In terms of faculty representation, minorities made up 14.8 percent of overall university faculty in 2009, but 45.5 percent of DES faculty (Offices of Community and Diversity, Equal Opportunity Programs, and Institutional Research, 2013). In my own department, anthropology, at the time of my graduation, there were no Black faculty and my cohort member and I were the last of the Black graduate students of not just our cohort, but the entire department. This is the context of being a Black academic. This is my reality.

And with this reality, comes a responsibility, one that is intimately connected to race. In this paper I will explore a consequence of that underrepresented presence of the Black academic, specifically how scholastic and societal forces result in tension between the responsibilities felt to scholarship and social justice. Using the theoretical leanings of participatory cinema and resilience, I advocate that to reconcile this tension requires the establishment of a resilient space capable of supporting a progressive vision and spirit, radical scholarship, and communal empowerment, where applied anthropology intersects with social justice. I discuss the value of revisiting the aesthetics and politics of Third Cinema as an example of radical work, how a modern embodiment of the spirit of Third Cinema might be articulated, and my own attempts to engage in this work through ethnographic film.

Privilege and pressure

PHILLIPS: I was born here (London, England), but I grew up in Jamaica.

FREDERICK: So you are one of them. Them over there. [...] Your parents decided you weren't going to go to secondary school in this country. That was the decision. I know it was. Some of us were there, baby! We know the decision because when you looked at what was going on in the education system, it was not helping us. It really wasn't. And people who could make that decision and go, went. Not many of us went because not many of us had any money to go anywhere, but I was very impressed by the people who went. But the rest of us who were left behind had to make the best of what there is. Back then there were things that we were angry about. We were angry about the lack of access to higher education. We were angry about unemployment. We were angry about poverty. We were angry about inequality. If you saw the housing and where we had to live, we were burning it down in '81, dear. We just decided we aren't doing it anymore. We burned it down. But in essence I think those issues are still there but I don't think people are as conscious of them. It's like people have absorbed that that's just the way it is and you have to find another way around it as opposed to looking at it and saying this isn't fair, this is not what we want, we want more¹ (Phillips, 2014).

The genesis for this paper began as a conversation one night outside my apartment building in the front seat of my friend's parked car. I was trying to articulate to her the sense I had coming into anthropology of feeling I never really had a choice but to study race and my own community. It was not so much a sense of burden, but one of almost innate expectation. The kind of anthropology where one would investigate a cultural group completely distinct from one's own, in an environment completely unfamiliar, did not ever occur to me as being an option I would or could take.

Before applying to graduate school, I asked a friend of mine to write a letter of recommendation for me. Before he handed it in, he allowed me to read it and in it, I read that I was a man who dedicated and would continue to dedicate his scholarship and academic career to the advancement of Caribbean issues and the Caribbean people. In his words, I could almost hear the voices of my family saying "make us proud." I could almost hear the voices of my friends, neighbors, teachers, colleagues, the bus driver, the man who sold us the Sunday newspaper, the Rasta we bought fried dumplings from, the woman down the road who was not really my aunt, all saying "you represent us now."

¹ Excerpt from an interview with Juliana Frederick, the Senior Community Development worker at the Oxleas National Health Service Foundation Trust.

I began my academic career with this kind of external expectation. I entered into anthropology, having been born in the capital of a colonial power (London, England), raised in a former colony (Jamaica), and college educated in the United States, and was now an ambassador of both my family and my people, charged with the task of setting right the world's wrongs to us and doing right on the world's stage. I was not going to escape race and ethnicity. I was not going to escape responsibility. I recognized I was in a privileged position.

The National Science Foundation's annual Survey of Earned Doctorates reports that universities in the United States conferred 52,760 doctorates in 2013. Of these, 2,652, or 5.0 percent, were earned by Black or African American students. In context, according to the 2010 United States census, of a total population of 308.7 million people, 42.0 million or 14 percent identified as Black (United States Census Bureau, 2010). In 2013, in anthropology, of the 552 doctorates conferred, 19 or 3.4 percent were earned by Black or African American students (National Science Foundation, 2014). So by the time my degree was conferred in 2014, I was likely to be one of about two dozen new Black anthropologists coming out of an American university and as best I knew, along with my father, I was one of two PhDs in the entirety of my familial bloodline. As a Black anthropologist then, I am not merely one in a million; I am one in 42 million.

If it is true that we stand on the shoulders of our ancestors, then certainly there was an expectation that I strengthen my back to help carry my community. In my department, the dissertations of Black anthropology graduates who came before me appeared to exclusively explore race in some way. Titles include "Who I Am and Whose I Am: Race, Class, Gender and Nation in an Afrocentric Church," "Still Uplifting the Race: Black Professional Wives and the Career and Family Debate," "The Social Production of Reproductive Health Disparities," and "The medical anthropology of type 2 diabetes at the intersection of race, class, and gender." Certainly there seems to be an instinctive sense that because of a perceived disproportionate lack of work on issues of race, that it was crucial when in the position to do so, that one should contribute such work to the academy. If we did not do such work, then who would?

In an article that surveyed the opinions of a number of British academics, Deborah Gabriel (2013) puts forward that academia is still dominated by a Eurocentricity "that excludes other cultural presentations of knowledge while masquerading as being neutral, objective and unbiased." Her respondents offered that what is required is for Black scholars to "raise the presence and impact" of their academic output as a means of developing Black cultural capital, and to seek "to make a positive contribution to the lives and opportunities of Black communities through research and academic

inquiry" (Gabriel, 2013). The Association of Black Anthropologists (ABA) was founded in 1970 with the specific aim of highlighting situations of exploitation, oppression, and discrimination and constructing more adequate theories to interpret the dynamics of oppression in a manner that ensured that people studied by anthropologists are not only objects of study, but also active makers and/or participants in their own history (ABA, 1970).

In light of recent race related injustices, such as the cases of Trayvon Martin, Michael Brown, and CeCe McDonald, to sadly name but a few, and the consequent activist movements such as Black Lives Matter that have been established in response, it becomes increasingly imperative that scholars use their positions of privilege to produce work that provokes an impact on the cultural groups to which they are intimately connected. Socially, politically, and institutionally, if there is no discernment made regarding the color of my skin and the content of my character, then there can be no distinction drawn between my pigment and my path as an academic. This is of course not to equate unpleasant microaggressions—those everyday verbal, nonverbal, and environmental offences that, intentionally or unintentionally, "communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative messages to target persons based solely upon their marginalized group membership" (Sue, 2010)—with the maximum violent aggression often perpetrated by the state. But they are connected in the same way the academic is connected to the communities at large to which they belong. A degree is not a protection from harm, and a degree should not be a disengagement from the harm of others. Ferguson cannot be separated from Foucault. That is the weight of academic privilege. This is perhaps an unavoidable unfairness and yet still an inharmonious union that I am unwilling to relinquish. This is the ongoing complexity of complexion.

Radical Responsibility

Academia provides a unique vantage point from which to respond to injustice, a position from which to influence theory, policy, and politics. That injustice is something Black academics (or for that matter any academic from a marginalized group background) actively share in suffering with communities outside of academia, provides an opportunity and an incentive to use their scholarship to address issues of social justice. My assertion is that this situation is more than just an incentivized opportunity; it is an imperative. This is a strong statement, and one that appears to restrict academic freedom in much the same way oppressive forces might. But considering privilege, self-interest, and justice, surely we as academics must dedicate work to addressing relevant social issues. Understandably, this position is asking the Black academic to weigh the burden of representing for the community against their own individual and personal scholastic pursuits. But the

tension that might appear between the existence as an academic and the existence as a community member, and potentially between the life of a researcher and an activist, need not necessitate perpetual conflict. This kind of Du Boisian double consciousness (Du Bois, 1903) may yet result in a single conscience – an integrated academic made up of diverging forces pushing towards a singular goal of scholarly work that matters. A radical responsibility.

This is a responsibility I have chosen to undertake in my own work as a visual anthropologist. As it relates to visual work, where historically given and economically driven structural violence constrains agency and creates limited choices by factors like racism, sexism, political violence and poverty, it is necessary for scholars to utilize methodological tools that avoid passive forms of representation that may reinforce existing power hierarchies and social inequality (Kleinmann, 1997). Kleinman (2012) argues that biography, ethnography, and documentary film can be used as a powerful ontological line of analysis by scholars to investigate what is an entirely different way of being in the world for subjects faced with pain and suffering caused by social forces such as global and local economics, politics, social institutions, social relationships, and culture.

Participatory visual methods have long attempted to challenge traditional methodologies, in order to manifest “new future visions, unanticipated strategies, and policies that improve the lives and health of individuals and their communities” and better provide opportunities to hear subjects’ voices (Lorenz and Kolb 2009). The innovative histories of filmmakers such as Rouch and MacDougall align with modern visual approaches that make “reflexivity, collaboration, new approaches to ethics and new technologies necessary themes in any ethnographic methods text and especially in visual ethnography texts” (Pink 2001; Banks 2001). Participatory visual methods aim to challenge patterns of power and control, and by giving participants a greater degree of control over the outputs, build their self-confidence, stimulate their enthusiasm for being involved, and contribute to a sense of solidarity and the possibility for countering negative representations (Wheeler, 2009). The challenge is to ensure that the visual work produced makes apparent the nuanced complexities of subject communities and provides a measure of reflection of the researcher’s position, assumptions, presentations of the other, and effects on the research. The potential for this is present in participatory methods because participants have active control of the media and are enabled to present themselves and their voices, encouraging the researcher to question their presentation of others, and potentially encouraging a “more collaborative, inter-subjective building of knowledge” (Bennett, 2012). The use of film in participatory ethnography has the ability to communicate resistance in a form that circumvents closed media channels and has resonance in a form that has its own power and, as intimated by bell hooks (1990), can be part of a process of finding ways to construct and portray self

and identity that are oppositional and liberatory. As Biella (1993) states, “ethnographic film presents profound, compassionate views of people and cultural worlds which are otherwise unimaginable; it combats racism more effectively than argument.”

In my film, *Studio Isis*, members of a men’s group at Family Health Isis, a London-based Caribbean mental health drop-in center, recorded their thoughts and feelings. The film was a product of negotiating with the subjects about what they wanted and how they wanted to be filmed. We settled on having them record themselves as if on a webcam, a method that they would be familiar with and would encourage their participation. It was also a method that would subvert what might be considered more traditional subject representation in ethnographic work. The camera was attached to a laptop and set right in the main social area of the center, almost as if it was a natural part of the room, observing members and providing them opportunities to interact with it. In the film, while members speak to the camera, the audience can see other members in the background talking, eating, and sometimes looking on. You can hear the chatter and the music that is commonplace in the center and Caribbean centers like it. The camera operates to place the audience in the heart of this community. My role as a researcher is not hidden in the film as my own physical presence and voice are included and I wander in and out of frame clearly as a both a part of the filmed community and as a facilitator of the process. My only instruction to them beforehand was to “say something.” Everything shown in the film is their own interpretation of what that means, their own inclinations of what to present of themselves, and their own identities being performed.

The film gives the members a greater measure of control over their presentation. Rather than having to wait to see themselves on screen, there is greater immediacy, as they are able to see themselves during the recording, which in the case of one subject allows him to groom himself. The laptop screen on which they can see themselves operates as a contained safe space from which they take the opportunity to treat the filming as a broadcast, speaking out to an audience, presenting an identity and their thoughts, and for another subject, a number of songs. The film is a deliberate effort to share the authority of the camera rather than documenting events that have been pre-judged to be culturally significant. The decision was made to subtitle the film, not because I felt the members were incapable of being understood, but because I felt it was vitally important to physically demonstrate that every word they spoke was important and should be shown, particularly because they are accustomed to being figuratively and literally silenced by institutions and authorities because of their medical diagnoses and their race. The subtitles themselves are visually located in close proximity to the speakers to demonstrate their ownership of the words. The audience is allowed to hear and see subjects speaking in their own language and understand what they are saying, rather than having events interpreted for them and relayed by an authoritative voice, thus demonstrating “a definite

shift in voice and authority” (Ruby, 2000). The aim is that the members are able to make decisions about what is shot, and how they are presented. The aim is to allow them access to their voice and to speak from their experiences.

Third Cinema

My research found that the continual struggle of many Caribbean people in the UK to situate where they can call “home,” and the struggle for Caribbean service users to unify identity in an environment of repression and social suffering, forced conflict between self-perception and how they might be perceived by the more powerful, external world, where often the internalization of anti-black sentiment and mental health stigma shaped experience (Phillips, 2014). In this British context, where there is a perpetual othering of Blackness and foreignness, the question of community and identity and its constant transformation, especially when considering mental illness, “results in a specific and distinct doubling of identity and community” (Murdoch, 2012). For service users, like those seen in *Studio Isis*, this doubling was a constant dance between performances of illness behavior and language in medical contexts, and performances of a Caribbean communal identity and the consequent rejection of medicalized models outside of these medical contexts. For the subjects of the film, there was a constant attempt at reconciliation that was fostered in resilient spaces. Given the chance to express themselves, to reconcile a fractured self, they take the opportunity to establish visible personalities outside of the invisible illnesses by which they are often, in various ways, restricted. *Studio Isis* is a subject-generated rejection of othering and an affirmation of positive, resilient identity; it is an overt attempt to produce participatory ethnographic work with an explicit social and political agenda.

In this way, the film finds a connection with the work found in the explicitly radical “Third Cinema” as a tradition that serves as an example of academically relevant work that imbues itself with a definitive social conscience and is a potential source of inspiration for Black visual producers. Third Cinema is an aesthetic and political project that began in the 1960s and 1970s and occurred alongside revolutionary struggles of the period. Taking its name from the designation “Third World,” which referred to African, Asian, and Latin American countries where “historical encounters with colonial and imperial forces shaped their economic and political power structures,” the movement developed in response to the Hollywood movies and capitalist values of First Cinema and the European art house aesthetic of Second Cinema (Solanas and Getino in Dennison & Lim, 2006). Third Cinema overtly aimed to subvert cinematic codes, embrace revolutionary ideals, and contest the passive film-watching experience of commercial cinema.

Kim Dodge (2007) states that by explicitly “incorporating cultural and political critiques and challenging viewers with new compositional structures and genre juxtaposition, Third Cinema harnesses the power of film to increase social consciousness about issues of power, nationhood, identity, and oppression around the world.” For this audience, Third Cinema aims to illustrate historical and social processes of oppression and present instances for transformation in a manner that eschews sensationalism or romanticism. Aesthetically, this often manifests itself in innovations such as the mixing of genres and visual forms to create diverse filmic products that all belong to the tradition. Examples range from the *La Hora de Los Hornos* (1968), Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino’s four-hour pro-revolution documentary, to the newsreel shorts of Cuban director Santiago Álvarez, to Ousmane Sembéne’s narrative film *La Noire de...* (1972) that investigates the effects of colonialism, racism, and identity in post-colonial Africa and Europe. What is consistent is a commitment to questioning structures of power, particularly colonial power, and being in dialogue with history to challenge conceptions of the past and to demonstrate legacies on the present, with the aim to liberate populations oppressed on the basis of gender, class, race, religion, or ethnicity. Third Cinema facilitates interaction among intellectuals and the masses by using film as a tool of dialogue and education.

A Third Space

Third Cinema is one example of radical work that can be done and one that relates specifically to my own field, visual anthropology. But what is most essential is that the spirit of the Third Cinema perspective persists. In the original manifesto, “Towards a Third Cinema” penned by Argentine filmmakers Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino in the late 1960s, states:

The intellectual must find through his action the field in which he can rationally perform the most efficient work. Once the front has been determined, his next task is to find out within that front exactly what is the enemy’s stronghold and where and how he must deploy his forces... The anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples of the Third World and of their equivalents inside the imperialist countries constitutes today the axis of the world revolution. Third cinema is, in our opinion, the cinema that recognizes in that struggle the most gigantic cultural, scientific, and artistic manifestation of our time, the great possibility of constructing a liberated personality with each people as the starting point- in a word, the decolonization of culture (Getino and Solanas, 1969).

Those particular struggles have changed but the need for revolutionary work with a

“constant and methodical exercise of practice, search, and experimentation” that sees valid militant expression in everything from pamphlet films to didactic films, remains as relevant today as it did 50 years ago (Getino and Solanas, 1969). I advocate a movement away from the “desire for the invisibility of the imagination” and viewing the camera as a “secret weapon in the pursuit of knowledge” (MacDougall in Hockings, 2003). Representativeness is not passive and secret. Resistance is active intervention. Though participatory methods can be effective in challenging and critiquing oppressive social and institutional forces, the Third Cinema perspective necessitates and demands this challenge and critique. If the philosophy of participatory ethnography is to be extended to maximize political efficacy, then there is no hiding place for the academic. There is no neutral position from which the eye of the ethnographer can dispassionately oversee. The community is looking at you. The community is looking for you. For the Black visual anthropologist, this recontextualizes what representation means. On the one hand, there is the academic task of representation in the classical sense - that of portraying subjects visually in a particular way. On the other hand, there is the colloquial sense of representation, where one “represents” or “reps,” a proud acknowledgment and exemplary standing up for a particular community.

What evoking this spirit of radicalism means is adopting a perspective for ethnographic work that supports multiplicity and diversity of ethnographic forms and that explores all available technological and aesthetic opportunities to best use film to forward a challenge to institutional oppression. In terms of form, Cinema has moved beyond the cinema, and now includes digital media, video, music, computer programs, and video games. This proliferation of new forms serves to match the reality of cultural heterogeneity and the diversity of academic interests, pursuits, and goals, while maintaining a concern with cultural and political contexts. The multicultural and polyvocal strengths of the Third Cinema aesthetic serve to multiply modes of resistance rather than imply a loss of political commitment. Gabriel (1982) states, “the idea of a third vision becomes powerful, needed and useful, for in stressing heterogeneity, mixture, multiplicity, irony, differences, it enables us to see and conceive of our relationships to one another and to the world in ways that are not dependent simply on binary oppositions.” Not every work needs to be a four-hour pro-revolution documentary or a 10-minute webcam style ethnographic film. What it does mean is that all academics, while being mindful to be respectful and responsible of and to their subjects, should be encouraged to be imaginative, creative, boundary-pushing, and system-challenging.

Whilst the problematic framework of First, Second and Third Worlds has given way to a framework of global capitalism, there is not a requirement for a new oppositional force to be located or “new enemies to be found, or invented” (Gabriel, 1982). Oppressive institutional structures that impact race, gender, sexuality, health, and class are still

very much present. Data from the Black Lives Matter organization website highlights a number of disparities. The median wealth for single White women is \$42,600, while for Black women it is \$5,001. The infant mortality rate for Black mothers is more than double that of White mothers. Twenty-two states have passed new voter restrictions since 2010, disenfranchising as many as 34 million Americans. Blacks and Latinos are about 31 percent of the US population, but 60 percent of the prison population. The life expectancy of a Black trans woman is 35 years (Blacklivesmatter.com, 2015). There are plenty of old enemies.

What liberatory cinema methods provide is a space, connected but discrete, from the space of the academic and the space of the community member. Rather than specifically advocating for all visual anthropologists to turn to Third Cinema, I propose the establishment of what I am calling a “Third Space,” a resilient space that reconciles the responsibilities of academic and non-academic communities. This alternative Third Space, akin to the space presented in Studio Isis, allows for imaginative media forms that look to convey narratives of the disenfranchised, the under-represented, and the marginalized in a manner not bounded by tradition or even the cinematic frame. This Third Space is a space that emboldens media producers to include social context in their work. And, as a relational art form, it allows the audience to create new possibilities of engagement with works in varied forms. It is a space that allows for a variety of approaches, styles, and projects. It is a space that embraces new technology, new movements, new explorations, and old struggles against persistent injustices. It is a space that looks back at history and forward at creating progress.

As it relates to this resilient Third Space, modern articulations of resilience stress interplay between the individual and the broader environment including environmental factors such as perceived social support and a sense of connectedness (Rutter 1987; Werner 1993, Masten 1994). Key to the evolution of resilience theory has been the increased focus on the community as a source of protective factors (Van Breda 2001). Sonn and Fisher (1998) argue the community itself can be resilient, developing the capacity to cope positively with hardship and foster resilient individuals who draw positively from cultural values, norms, memories, stories, myths, and histories.

For Studio Isis, the production of the film, and the presentation of the film showing the resilient community, involved an affirmation and continuing reinforcement of a resilient communal identity. The service users were able to show who they were and also see who they were. The resilient space, in that way, transmits into and out of the medium of film, both in production and in content. The film, in engaging in participatory and experimental documentary form, develops a shared body of knowledge through liberatory identity presentation, creating opportunities to hear service user voices and bring their

experiences to the understanding and awareness of the audience (Lorenz and Kolb 2009). The film then both presents resilience, and the process of creating it is a resilient action.

This concept of resilience is the theoretical foundation for why this Third Space is viable as a space of strength and shared experience and a creative basis from which scholarship can emerge. If, as research clearly shows, there is an existing and ongoing issue of institutional racism that affects the lives of the academic inside and outside of the academy and that affects the lives of the broader communities to which academics belong, and we can agree that ignoring this issue is not an adequate response, then there has to be a safe and empowering space from which academics can react and counteract. If it is recognized that this situation can potentially lead to tension for the academic because the responsibilities to the academy and those to broader communities may come into conflict, then there has to be a space that addresses this conflict by both reconciling the tension and disturbing the status quo environment that brings it about.

There are already spaces where Black scholars and Black scholarship do exist and prosper, although given the present statistical information presented in this paper, this kind of resilient academic community is relatively restricted because of the present institutional restraints. Resilience as a theory itself is predicated on dynamic adaptability within the context of significant adversity. So, while championing and supporting these occurrences of resilience, it is this significant adversity that must continue to be fought against because despite microaggressions, major disadvantages, and ontological violence, that academic space is our space too. No amount of overzealous policing of that space can change that basic fact. And the fact remains; ideologically the concept of a Third Space is necessary to continue to combat this adversity. The advantage of a Third Space is that it is a space that supports, a space that creates, that responds, that inquires, that challenges, that disrupts. That is the reconciliation. Synchronously, the space can at once enact and embody resilience, at once transmit and absorb, at once ask and answer.

Conclusion: Third Vision

During my defense on Friday, they asked me how my work contributes to the academy. I rambled something unsatisfactory. It has been bothering me since. Today I saw my friend Emiko and others get arrested protesting for equal access to university education for undocumented students. I realized that part of what has been bothering me is that I am not that concerned about how my work contributes to the academy as much as I care about how my work contributes to the community. If I am not contributing to raising awareness of or achieving social justice, then I am wasting my time and my place in the

academy. I want my work to be situated right on the front line with my people where it can make a difference. If it gets back to the academy after that... #peoplefirst #gotalittlepreachytoday (Facebook post, 2014).

What I have classified as a radical responsibility is not just linked to Blackness, but also to the position of privilege as an academic, which is of course inseparable from Blackness. This is seen in the case of Martese Johnson, a Black University of Virginia student who required 10 stitches for cuts to the head after being arrested by Alcoholic, Beverage and Control officers in Charlottesville, Virginia on St. Patrick's Day. This is seen in the case of Harvard professor Henry Louis Gates Jr., who was arrested in 2009 in his own home on suspicion of breaking and entering. As West Savali (2015) writes, "[Black] achievements and accomplishments are not a shield against a racist system." And as Laymon (2014) details in his essay highlighting the numerous instances of racial bias that he has witnessed during his time as a faculty member at Vassar, the university ID card is not a shield either, something I learned first-hand on that Sunday evening at Emory when I tried to enter the history department.

With no shield, the only possible response is resistance. The Association of Black Anthropologists was founded with the specific aim of highlighting and theoretically challenging exploitation, oppression, and discrimination. If after nearly 50 years, academia is still dominated by Eurocentricity "that excludes other cultural presentations of knowledge while masquerading as being neutral, objective and unbiased" (Gabriel 2013), the only possible response is resistance. If after more than 50 years since the height of the Civil Rights Movement, the communities to which we belong are still plagued by a vast myriad of structural, social and institutional oppressions, the only possible response is resistance. The form this resistance takes is for the individual scholar to decide.

Black scholars are able to recognize the duality of their position as both holding privilege and suffering prejudice, and to perceive the pressure of balancing academic pursuit and social responsibility. From this position, a vision that holds true to the spirit of Third Cinema dictates a radicalization of scholarship and the creation of work that actively engages with a social conscience and seeks to provoke systematic change. Knowledge is not colorblind. As filmmaker Raymundo Gleyzer is credited with saying, "revolutionary cinema... must be a summons for action. It must appeal to our people's capacity for tears and anger, enthusiasm and faith... We think of film as a bullet that ignites consciousness. We must therefore serve as the stone which breaks silence, or the bullet which starts the battle... a tool to transform the world."

Such a battle requires a foundation upon which to lean and a space from which to produce, a space of radicalism and resilience. This is why the Third Cinema can serve as

an inspiration for ethnographic filmmakers because it is a perspective that necessitates creative scholastic and artistic responses to social injustice. It is a perspective that eliminates the artificial boundary between art and politics, that champions multivocality and heterogeneity of ideas and forms, and that carries with it “an art, a science, and a cinema of subversion” and rebellion (Getino and Solanas, 1969). This is why the Third Space, operating with the soul of social justice and the interests of the historically disenfranchised, with the heart of intellectual pursuit and the energy of innovation, and with the resolution of resilient community, can serve as a base from which the Black academic can flourish. It is a space of sustenance, of inspiration, a space where vital work revitalizes a revolutionary spirit.

Acknowledgements

The People. The Academy. The Third.

References

- Aaanet.org. (2015). About Us | ABA | Association of Black Anthropologists. Retrieved 1 April 2015, from <http://www.aaanet.org/sections/aba/about-us/>
- Allen, E. (2003). Du Boisian Double Consciousness: The Unsustainable Argument. *Black Scholar*, 33 (Summer 2003), 25-43.
- Banks, M. (2001). *Visual Methods in Social Research*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Bennett, C. (2012). What is it, participatory? Retrieved 31 August 2015, from <http://ukvisualanthropology.com/2012/07/17/what-is-it-participatory/>
- Biella, P. (1993). Beyond ethnographic film: Hypermedia and scholarship. *Anthropological Film and Video in the 1990s*, 131-176.
- Blacklivesmatter.com. (2015). Black Lives Matter | Not a Moment, a Movement. Retrieved 1 April 2015, from <http://blacklivesmatter.com/>
- Ciccariello-Maher, G. (2007). A Critique of Du Boisian Reason: Kanye West and the Fruitfulness of Double-Consciousness. *Journal Of Black Studies*, 39(3), 371-401. doi:10.1177/0021934706297569
- Dennison, S., & Lim, S. (2006). *Remapping world cinema*. London: Wallflower Press.
- Denzin, N. (2003). *Performance ethnography: Critical pedagogy and the politics of culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Documentaryisneverneutral.com,. (2015). Documentary Is Never Neutral: A political documentary helping hand. Retrieved 1 April 2015, from <http://documentaryisneverneutral.com/>
- Dodge, K. (2007). Third (World) Cinema: What is Third Cinema?. [Thirdcinema.blueskylimit.com](http://thirdcinema.blueskylimit.com). Retrieved 1 April 2015, from <http://thirdcinema.blueskylimit.com/thirdcinema.html>
- Du Bois, W. (1903). *The souls of black folks*. A.C. McClurg & Co.
- Gabriel, D. (2013). Race equality in academia: time to establish black studies in the UK?. Higher Education Network. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/blog/2013/jul/25/race-equality-academia-curriculum>
- Gabriel, T. (1982). *Third cinema in the third world*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI Research Press.
- Getino, O. and Solanas, F. (1969). Toward a Third Cinema. *Tricontinental*, 14, 107-132.
- Here2Slay, K. (2015). Dear white anthropologists, I don't believe you: When will #BlackLivesMatter & #BlackMindsMatter in Anthropology departments? Decolonize All The Things. Retrieved from <http://decolonizeallthethings.com/2015/01/13/dear-white-anthropologists-i-dont-believe-you-when-will-blacklivesmatter-blackmindsmatter-in-anthropology-departments/>
- hooks, bell. (1990). *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Kena, G., Aud, S., Johnson, F., Wang, X., Zhang, J., Rathbun, A., Wilkinson-Flicker, S., and Kristapovich, P. (2014). *The Condition of Education 2014* (NCES 2014-083). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC.
- Kleinman, A. (1997). “Everything That Really Matters”: Social Suffering, Subjectivity, and the Remaking of Human Experience in a Disordering World. *H. Theolo. Review*, 90(03), 315-336. doi:10.1017/s0017816000006374
- Kleinman, A. (2012). Medical anthropology and mental health: five questions for the next fifty years. *Medical anthropology at the intersections*, 178-196.
- Laymon, K. (2014). My Vassar College Faculty ID Makes Everything OK. <http://gawker.com>. Retrieved from <http://gawker.com/my-vassar-college-faculty-id-makes-everything-ok-1664133077>
- Lorenz, L., & Kolb, B. (2009). Involving the public through participatory visual research methods. *Health Expectations*, 12(3), 262-274. doi:10.1111/j.1369-7625.2009.00560.x
- MacDougall, D. (2003). Beyond Observational Cinema in P. Hockings (ed.), *Principles of visual anthropology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Masten, A. S. (1994). Resilience in individual development: Successful adaptation despite risk and adversity.
- Phillips, K. (2014). *Rivers of Blood and Babylon: An ethnography of social suffering and resilience among Caribbean service users in London (Doctoral Dissertation)*. Emory University, Atlanta.
- Pink, S. (2001). *Doing Visual Ethnography: Images, Media and Representation in Research*. London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Ruby, Jay. (2000) *Picturing culture: explorations of film & anthropology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Rutter, M. (1987). Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 57(3), 316.
- Student Revisioning Committee. (2013). No oversight: Fact sheet on race at Emory. Stop the cuts at Emory. Retrieved from <https://stopthecutsemory.wordpress.com/2013/02/21/no-oversight-fact-sheet-on-race-at-emory/>
- Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in Everyday Life: Race, Gender and Sexual Orientation*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Thorkelson, E. (2009). Race and white dominance in American Anthropology. Academic Culture. Retrieved from http://decasia.org/academic_culture/2009/11/race-and-white-dominance-in-american-anthropology/
- Werner, E. E. (1993). Risk, resilience, and recovery: Perspectives from the Kauai longitudinal study. *Development and Psychopathology*, 5(04), 503-515.
- West Savali, K. (2015). 'I Go to UVA,' Martese Johnson's Cry of Millennial Disbelief. *The Root*. Retrieved from http://www.theroot.com/articles/culture/2015/03/_i_go_to_uva_martese_johnson_s_cry_of_millennial_disbelief.html
- Wheeler, J. (2009). 'The Life We Don't Want': Using Participatory Video in Researching Violence. *IDS Bulletin*, 40(3), 10-18.