The human is the training which allows us to observe performers in action, their interactions, their limitations, etc. Physical theatre moderates that process.

The machine is the interface that allows us to make sense of the signals by turning them into meaningful content. AI-powered cognitive sciences moderate that process.

The culture can come either before, as a situation for training—but then it interferes with the human—or after, as a way to build speculative scenarios based on what the machine tells us about the human. Speculative design moderates that process

-

In order to avoid regurgitating ready-made futures—even being critical or pushing them further—we need to avoid basing them on the technology.

We have a unique framework in the training, which allows us to base our speculation purely on the human. The machine is a tool to understand the human. An interesting research question would be their mutual influence:

— if the machine can tell us more about the human, can it help us know ourselves better?

— what would society & culture look like if humans knew themselves better, understood first-hand their own cognition, how it is embodied, how it develops?

— which technology would be developed in a society of humans with better metacognition / embodied metacognition?

— how would these technologies in turn influence these humans? What would it allo them to see? What is the next step up? Or down?

We mentioned before that our strength is in the ability to keep the research question fluid. Maybe that is a great opportunity to research the fluidity of interferences and feedback loops between humans and machines?
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