

looking at both anthropology and art studies structurally as prompted by her writing, an implicit ethicality is surfaced. Even so, Docot's own creative and intellectual lineage appear to pull her into looking to technology alongside agency, that is, with an assumed dialectic constituting both context and interplay of modes of asking to keep the sensing and thinking going on.

Perhaps what could also be said is that Docot's surfacing of the possibility of a flexible itinerary through ethnographic conceptualism need not foreclose its practice among only those identifying with the Global South, particularly owing to the realization that neither the Global South nor the North are monoliths and have within them nuances such as enclaves of power and effusive sites of resistance. Her "Failings" and "Relationality" sections could be seen as acute renderings of such a multifaceted predicament. Although not being privy to the presumably many other considerations that propelled the completion of this recent writing, I would say that she perhaps could have gone even farther in her furtherings. There is much earnest and soul-wrenching work that evidently went into looking back at her dealings with compatriot artist Jong Pairez, for instance, but it appears to me that she held back in probing the relational precarities of submitting her work to the privileged voice (seemingly oblivious to the violence wrought by his presumed positionality) that was Luis Camnitzer's. Much more could have been done, perhaps, or could still be done elsewhere in trawling through the tropes of class, race, gender, and accumulated cultural capital in the global art world most certainly. We could maybe then extend Docot's citation of mask-wearing as manifest in shifting subject positions that pervade the work of research- or practice-based art researchers as well as anthropologists like herself. As negotiations of positionality enable even more such mindful work to proceed, artists may occasionally step back from taking the lead in a participatory art project, just as anthropologists should downplay perceived academic expertise—neither merely asking nor merely concluding in belabored gag reflex.

Christian Suhr

Department of Anthropology, Aarhus University, Moesgaard, 8270 Højbjerg, Aarhus, Denmark (suhr@cas.au.dk). 19 XI 18

Dada Docot takes us into a world where certain human beings must carry so-called "alien cards" to be able to demonstrate their legality when the gazes of other human beings—undercover police officers—single them out as potential "illegal migrants," or subjects for detention or deportation. Her film is recorded at the Shinagawa railway station in Tokyo, but the world depicted is not confined to this locality. It is our world: a peculiar place in which human existence has been separated into categories of legal and illegal, separations that more often than not trail the markers of skin color, dress, or other signs of perceived racial, ethnic, cultural, or religious difference.

Docot's film provokes us to reflect upon the extent to which we have come to live in such a world. It draws our attention to the ways that national borders are enacted within cosmopolitan cities and what it means to have the privilege and freedom of mobility or to be deprived of it.

In her article, Docot courageously analyzes how her film materialized in a political and aesthetic disagreement between herself and her cameraman, Jong Pairez, who initially hoped to be involved as a collaborator or coauthor. She details how the urge to "own" the project and appear as authors of the film prevented the recognition of their "shared identity" and "unity," both attempting to confront the challenges of being Filipino migrants in Japan. Docot's discussion highlights how we need to carefully consider the struggles we want to invest ourselves in and who we want to conceive of as our opponents.

If the struggles we have with each other over intellectual and aesthetic preferences do not enhance but rather obstruct our ability to address issues of wider concern—issues such as the brutality of the system of surveillance, control, and illegalization that Docot critically addresses in her film—then they are not trivial but rather deeply problematic.

This insight also struck me as significant when considering how Docot framed her article in relation to previous works in visual anthropology—including an article I wrote with Rane Willerslev (2012)—which she perceives as an effort to "simply recognize visibility and invisibility in practices of representation." I was surprised by her reading, and I disagree with the message that Docot associates with our article, namely, that "the only interpretations that can be conjured are necessarily bound to the visual, as if vision is the only available sense through which we could extend our perception, understanding, and experience of the image."

But perhaps there is more in our work that is shared than what sets it apart. Docot's concept of "ethnographic meta-commentary" as a "method of expanding our thinking beyond what is representable on-screen and in our writing," shares the ambitions of anthropologists whose work inspired several ideas in Willerslev's and my article (see, e.g., Connor, Asch, and Asch 1986). Her point about bringing "the explicitness of social realist aesthetics" into dialogue with a conceptual approach as well as her recognition of the productive insights generated by "failures of collaboration" were also central in our work (see also Asch in Ruby 2000; Suhr 2018; van de Port 2018).

Docot proposes "that we take the long route of ethnographically writing up our visual and other creative projects," which is a long and laborious mode of writing that unpacks cultural production, deepens contextualization, and "fleshes out ruptures in the filmmaking process that are often concealed from the audience, and even from the filmmakers." But perhaps Docot underestimates how film can provide such a metacommentary. A key value of film recordings is the way that they almost inevitably "bear the scars of the encounters that produced them" (Castaing-Taylor 1996:79). If we carefully attend to the recordings of cameras, they often provide deep insights into the ruptures of their making.

Raised in the Philippines and at the time of filming finishing her studies in Japan, Docot brings herself into her film as a subject to immigration control. Docot also shows how she, as an educated artist and anthropologist, is by no means exempt from racial profiling.

The anxieties provoked by such profiling are in Docot's film emphasized by slow motion, blue-greenish colors, and the accompanying soundtrack *Your Empty Lives* that evoke the "surveillance culture at a time of increasingly atomized urban lives." As she states "I have been living in Japan for almost four years now. And I wonder. How long does it take for one to belong?"

One might object that the authorial control Docot exercises over how we are to perceive the scene through editing, framing, colors, and music leaves little space for the contextualization and analysis that can be provided by film. Docot's autoethnographic reflections are insightful and strong, but even in this short format I would like to dwell more on the interactions: the peculiar tasks of "spotting" and "stopping" that are carried out by the police officers, their questions, the tones of their voices, how their bodies perform the little bow (*ojigi*) that Docot describes often concludes the confirmation of a subject's legal status as a form of apology.

I appreciate how Docot decided to anonymize the police officers in order not to impose on them the same cruelty that their surveillance imposes on her and also how, in the article, she emphasizes that not every police officer is the same. One officer simply refused to arrest undocumented Filipinos because for him "Filipinos work hard and do no harm to Japanese society." Such small acts of disobedience speak to the multiple ways that people attempt to resist oppressive immigration regimes and find ways to live their lives in spite of them. Another strong part of Docot's article are the paragraphs recounting the reflections the film elicited among the 50 people whose comments she collected after they had watched her film.

Discussions such as those between Docot and her interviewees and collaborators, as well as her own reflections, could have been the subject of an ethnographic film. This would have been a challenging and time-consuming ethnographic meta-commentary, but it seems to me that film is in fact particularly well equipped to explore in this way how our understandings, analyses, and representations of the world arise from our interactions with it.

Reply

Response: Imperfect Furtherings

This publication marks my arrival in one of anthropology's heavily peer-reviewed spaces. I acknowledge that as I reach this milestone, I have had to spend my time away from the urgent

work of political organizing that needs to be done at home, where the ongoing war on drugs under the Rodrigo Duterte regime, according to many news sources, has already resulted in more than 27,000 deaths. In times of ongoing human rights violations and injustice in the Philippines, Filipino academics are in peril and being red-baited for being at the forefront of critiquing the regime. Artists are centering their work to support a mass-based protest movement. Photographers and journalists are resigning from their salaried work to avoid censorship and to uphold their integrity. I acknowledge that the academic position from which I write is one of relative privilege and comfort.

This said, I am thankful to Julius Bautista, Michal Murawski, Jong Pairez, Eileen Legaspi-Ramirez, and Christian Suhr for generously contributing their time and energy to this academic engagement. I begin my response by addressing what the readers seem to have found to be the article's most useful intervention—the proposed strategy of "furtherings." Bautista calls furtherings a "progressive modality of reflexivity"; Murawski writes that furtherings are akin to being "open" and honest, but, as he correctly points out, furtherings raise a question about the extent of one's openness. Legaspi-Ramirez's response reflects the same concern, that I may have "held back" on certain aspects in my furtherings. Murawski wants to know more about the situation of interrogation by the police as experienced by Pairez. It is indeed possible to extend the furtherings that I had written for the article. Researchers have already addressed the concern of how comprehensive one's account is/can be—for instance, Ruth Behar's (2013) moving and intricate autoethnography, Carolyn Ellis's (2007) approach to relational ethics in ethnography, and Jeremy MacClancy's (2007) demonstration of how to write a multifaceted ethnographic biography, among others.

In my article, I referred to intentionality as an important factor that organizes one's passions, work, and advocacies as an anthropologist, researcher, artist, educator, and so forth. In another article that appeared in a geography journal (Docot 2017), I argued for the need to gauge one's commitments with the relationalities that could be produced or that could be broken apart by knowledge production. This means that non-production or not-doing within the modes expected by academia could be reframed in a positive sense; what I have called "negative production" potentially holds relationalities together even if not-doing goes against the expectations of academic productivity. Therefore, it could be said that just as making claims and activities such as research and writing are political acts, so is holding back. It is an academic preoccupation to sail through various tides of critique. For example, the peer-review process can generate well-meant productive criticism (Hojat, Gonnella, and Caellegh 2003), but it can also result in barely veiled posturing/embittered gatekeeping, and both types still need to be addressed, so some of the precious word count inevitably goes toward responding to those questions/concerns. Accordingly, holding back also means working to keep the relationships with the critics of one's work open and negotiable.