Sesión IV: De fóra para dentro e de dentro para fóra

Introduction: data without interpretation or interpretation without object?

Alexander Gerner · Universidade de Lisboa

The debate of the session "From the outside to the inside, and from inside out" posed two fundamental questions for the debate on migration related to works of visual art, photography and cinema, on the one hand, and literature, on the other.

> 1. Can migration in the arts be described as a journey or an open map, and in how far can cartographic cinema help us better understand "journeys" of migration?

> 2. Does data collection/organization/analysis of migration literature give us new possibilities at hand to interpret migration in the age of the digital humanities?

Mariana Castro's intervention entitled *Cartografias do Cinema e da Fotografia* questioned the possibility of dynamic filmic map-making and its permanent openness to change of plans and routes: «*A film that, even when we were halfway through shooting it, could still change totally.*» (Wenders, 1976). How is this road movie and open map-making an artistic strategy and praxis related to migration? Is migration another kind of existential journey or is it an ontologically different journey than making a movie, representing a road trip with open borders or being open to change the destiny and road map? Do migrants have to have a clear reason to migrate and do they have to follow a fixed route to arrive at their previously chosen destination? Or is at the moment of leaving the route, the map open to changes of direction towards unknown territories?

Can a film simulate a map in its contours and boundaries? How do mimetic approximations of the idea of limits (of map/narration), as in the idea of an abandoned American border post, appear

as a *symbol* showing us the delimitation of a route or territory. In which sense can we "mimic" these questions in the current "open borders*" versus* "closing borders" debate in Europe? Does Wim Wenders´ movie, coming from a West German background marked by the clear West/East divide of the post-WWII world order, still give us references to the current situation of migration today? A critical comment that this intervention would refer to an *interpretation without object,* in the sense of actually dealing with the topic of *journey* and not *migration,* raised the counter-question: Does the *possibility to interpret migration as a journey with an open route map* give us another concept of "freedom" at hand, which in the current migration debate is still not debated? Or does migration confront us exactly with the possibility of making new maps that deeply question the political choice to either control, close or even abandon national borders, implying a rethinking of borders as we know them? Or do none of these options make any sense when thinking about the complexity of migration? These questions take us beyond the classic debate if the *map is not the territory,* but only stands in a referential context for a real object and territory, or if actually the *map is the territory and changing the map implies changing reality itself*? How do migration and its artistic expressions reopen this dichotomy leading towards other synthetic solutions beyond our present limitation in using or interpreting maps and journeys, as shown in cinematic and photographic map-making related to migration?

46. TAMEN, M., Friends of Interpretable Objects, Boston, Harvard University Press, 2001.

Susana Justo Barreira and **Lorena Paz López**´s intervention called *¿Redimensionando la historia literaria nacional? Migración, canon y bases de datos en la historiografía literaria del espacio ibérico* confronted us with the question if their research object would be *data without interpretation* and thus indirectly with Miguel Tamen's thesis in his book *Friends of Interpretable Objects* that "there are no interpretable objects or intentional objects, only what counts as an interpretable object or, better, groups of people for whom certain objects count as interpretable and who, accordingly, deal with certain objects in recognizable ways" (Tamen[46] 2001, 3). The current research tools of data collection and data organization in the digital humanities confront us with the following question: How does the availability of open data

(Pollock[47] 2006) and big data, coupled with new data analytics, challenge established epistemologies across the sciences, in the social sciences and specifically in the humanities? Three fallacies- according to Kitchin[48] 2014 (cf. Brooks[49] 2013)- have to be considered: **Fallacy I**: *(big) data can capture the whole of a domain and provide full resolution*. **Fallacy II**: *there is no need for a priori theory, models or hypotheses*. Data collection may seek to be exhaustive. **Fallacy III**: *data can speak for itself, free from human bias or framing*.

With these fallacies in mind we have to be aware that digital data collection applications in the humanities, even if they are helpful *tools, still need to be refined,* and that they are always used within certain limitation of extension, usability, context and still call for necessary contextualized ***interpretation*** when dealing with complex objects such as (migration) literature, or the formulation of a "national" or comparative and cosmopolitical canon. Another question was raised in the debate: How should we define "migrant writers" and migration literature? Are migrant literature and national canon helpful and useful categories? What are their heuristic or argumentative values for the humanities and within the debate on migration? Saša Stanišić (2008)[50], for instance, debunks three myths about "migrant writers" we should keep in mind: "Myth 1: Immigrant literature is a philological category of its own, and thus comprises a fruitful anomaly in relation to national literatures. Myth 2: Immigrant literature deals monothematically with migration and multicultural issues. Immigrant authors have a closer and thus more authentic perspective on related questions. Myth 3: An author who doesn't write in his mother tongue enriches the language he has chosen to write in." Both authors were very apprehensive to further develop their work along these critical lines.

In *Five Philosophical Notes on "Migration" and its Metaphorology*, which appears as an afterword to these *Cadernos*, I focus on the urgency to critically analyze the migration debate in order to ***disentangle*** a) the ***debate on migration*** in relation to humanitarian aspects (refugee help) from b) *real dangers* inherent in ***cultural extremism*** against liberal democracy and

47. POLLOCK, R., "The Value of the Public Domain," IPPR, htpp://www.ippr.org/ publication/55/1526/ the-value-of-the-publi-domain-, 2006.

48. KITCHIN, R., "The Reframing of Science, Social Science and the Humanities Research," in Kitchin, R. (ed.), The Data Revolution. Big Data, Open Data, Data Infrastructures & Their Consequences. London, Sage, pp. 168-187, 2014.

49. BROOKS, D., "What Data Can´t Do," New York Times, 18.2.2013.

50. STANISIC, S., "Three Myths of Immigrant Writing: A View from Germany," available online at: http://wordswithoutborders.org/article/three-myths-of-immigrant-writing-a-view-from-germany. 2008.

51. ERIKSON, J.-
M.; STJERNFELT,
F., The Democratic
Contradictions of
Multiculturalism, New
York, Telos Press, 2012.

52. BLUMENBERG,
H., Paradigms for a
Metaphorology. Transl.
by Robert Savage, Ithaca,
Cornell University Press,
2010 [1960]

53. FLUSSER, V.,
"Taking up Residence
in Homelessness," in
Villem Flusser In STRÖL,
A. (ed.), Writings.
Minneapolis, University
of Minnesota Press, pp.
91-103, 2002.

54. POMBO
O., "Prácticas
Interdisciplinares,"
in Pombo, O. (ed.),
Interdiscipinaridade.
Ambições e Limites.
Lisboa, Relógio d´Água,
pp. 73-104, 2004.

an open society and its values and c), the seperation of these two from *fear-driven **culturalist**[51] **answers*** to the strategy of enforcing unreasonable security measures and right-wing populist restrictions of liberties, especially after the Paris and Brussels attaques. Hereby- with Hans Blumenberg´s critical metaphorology[52]- I try to put migration into perspective as a ***special case of European inconceivability*** while analyzing some public declarations of contemporary EU leaders related to present migration into Europe. The forth note deals with a phenomenological perspective on migration and revisits Villem Flusser's metaphor of ***existential "groundlessness"***[53] for this purpose. Finally the idea of **"*conceptual migrations*"** on an abstract, non-person level of migration introduces briefly the idea of "neuro" migrations to the humanities, and offers a brief insight into the conceptual grid of Olga Pombo´s[54] three basic interdisciplinary aspects of conceptual migration: (a) importation, (b) crossing and (c) convergence, adding a forth as a limit case: the *theoretical* possibility of a complete (d) disciplinary take-over/ absorption of a discipline by migrating concepts.